

Lecture Notes for Real Analysis

Hao Zhu

*Department of Computer Science
University of Freiburg*



Contents

1. Basic set theory
2. Real numbers
3. Sequences
4. Series
5. Continuous functions
6. Derivative
7. Riemann integral
8. Sequences of functions
9. Metric spaces

1. Basic set theory

- sets
- mathematical induction
- functions
- cardinality

1-1

Sets

Definition 1.1 A **set** is a collection of objects called elements or members. A set with no objects is called the **empty set** and is denoted by \emptyset (or sometimes by $\{\}$).

notation:

- $a \in S$ means that ' a is an element in S '
- $a \notin S$ means that ' a is not an element in S '
- \forall means 'for all'
- \exists means 'there exists'
- $\exists!$ means 'there exists a unique'
- \implies means 'implies'
- \iff means 'if and only if'

Definition 1.2

- A set A is a **subset** of a set B if $x \in A$ implies $x \in B$, denoted as $A \subseteq B$.
 - Two sets A and B are **equal** if $A \subseteq B$ and $B \subseteq A$, denoted as $A = B$.
 - A set A is a **proper subset** of B if $A \subseteq B$ and $A \neq B$, denoted as $A \subsetneq B$.
-

set building notation: we write

$$\{x \in A \mid P(x)\} \quad \text{or} \quad \{x \mid P(x)\}$$

to mean ‘all $x \in A$ that satisfies property $P(x)$ ’

examples:

- $\mathbf{N} = \{1, 2, 3, 4, \dots\}$: the set of natural numbers
- $\mathbf{Z} = \{0, 1, -1, 2, -2, 3, -3, \dots\}$: the set of integers
- $\mathbf{Q} = \{m/n \mid m, n \in \mathbf{Z}, n \neq 0\}$: the set of rational numbers
- \mathbf{R} : the set of real numbers

it follows that $\mathbf{N} \subseteq \mathbf{Z} \subseteq \mathbf{Q} \subseteq \mathbf{R}$

Definition 1.3 Given sets A and B :

- The **union** of A and B is the set $A \cup B = \{x \mid x \in A \text{ or } x \in B\}$.
 - The **intersection** of A and B is the set $A \cap B = \{x \mid x \in A \text{ and } x \in B\}$.
 - The **set difference** of A and B is the set $A \setminus B = \{x \in A \mid x \notin B\}$.
 - The complement of A is the set $A^c = \{x \mid x \notin A\}$.
 - A and B are **disjoint** if $A \cap B = \emptyset$.
-

Theorem 1.4 *De Morgan's Laws.* If A, B, C are sets, then

- $(B \cup C)^c = B^c \cap C^c$;
 - $(B \cap C)^c = B^c \cup C^c$;
 - $A \setminus (B \cup C) = A \setminus B \cap A \setminus C$;
 - $A \setminus (B \cap C) = A \setminus B \cup A \setminus C$.
-

proof: we prove the first statement:

- let B, C be sets, we need to show that

$$(B \cup C)^c \subseteq B^c \cap C^c \quad \text{and} \quad B^c \cap C^c \subseteq (B \cup C)^c$$

- $x \in (B \cup C)^c \implies x \notin B \cup C \implies x \notin B \text{ and } x \notin C$
 $\implies x \in B^c \text{ and } x \in C^c \implies x \in B^c \cap C^c \implies (B \cup C)^c \subseteq B^c \cap C^c$
- $x \in B^c \cap C^c \implies x \in B^c \text{ and } x \in C^c \implies x \notin B \text{ and } x \notin C$
 $\implies x \notin B \cup C \implies x \in (B \cup C)^c \implies B^c \cap C^c \subseteq (B \cup C)^c$

Mathematical induction

Axiom 1.5 *Well ordering property.* If the set $S \subseteq \mathbf{N}$ is nonempty, then there exists some $x \in S$ such that $x \leq y$ for all $y \in S$, i.e., the set S always has a **least element**.

Theorem 1.6 *Induction.* Let $P(n)$ be a statement depending on $n \in \mathbf{N}$. Assume that we have:

1. *Base case.* The statement $P(1)$ is true.
 2. *Inductive step.* If $P(m)$ is true then $P(m + 1)$ is true.
- Then, $P(n)$ is true for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$.
-

proof:

- suppose $S \neq \emptyset$, then S has a least element $m \in S$
- since $P(1)$ is true, we have $m \neq 1$, i.e., $m > 1$
- since m is a least element, we have $m - 1 \notin S \implies P(m - 1)$ is true
- this implies that $P(m)$ is true $\implies m \notin S$, which is a contradiction
- hence, $S = \emptyset$, i.e., $P(n)$ is true for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$

Example 1.7 For all $c \in \mathbf{R}$, $c \neq 1$, and for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$,

$$1 + c + c^2 + \cdots + c^n = \frac{1 - c^{n+1}}{1 - c}.$$

proof:

- the base case ($n = 1$): the left hand side of the equation is $1 + c$; the right hand side is $\frac{1-c^2}{1-c} = \frac{(1+c)(1-c)}{1-c} = 1 + c$, which equals to the left hand side
- the inductive step: assume that the equation is true for $k \in \mathbf{N}$, *i.e.*,

$$1 + c + c^2 + \cdots + c^k = \frac{1 - c^{k+1}}{1 - c},$$

Basic set theory

1-9

we have

$$\begin{aligned} & 1 + c + c^2 + \cdots + c^k + c^{k+1} \\ &= \frac{1 - c^{k+1}}{1 - c} + c^{k+1} \\ &= \frac{1 - c^{k+1} + c^{k+1} - c^{(k+1)+1}}{1 - c} \\ &= \frac{1 - c^{(k+1)+1}}{1 - c} \end{aligned}$$

Example 1.8 *Bernoulli's inequality.* For all $c \geq -1$, $(1 + c)^n \geq 1 + nc$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$.

proof:

- for the base case ($n = 1$), we have $(1 + c)^1 \geq 1 + 1 \cdot c$
- the inductive step: suppose $m \in \mathbf{N}$, $m > 1$ and $(1 + c)^m \geq 1 + mc$, then

$$(1 + c)^{m+1} \geq (1 + mc)(1 + c) = 1 + (m + 1)c + mc^2 \geq 1 + (m + 1)c$$

Functions

Definition 1.9 If A and B are sets, a **function** $f: A \rightarrow B$ is a mapping that assigns each $x \in A$ to a unique element in B denoted $f(x)$.

Definition 1.10 Consider a function $f: A \rightarrow B$. Define the **image** (or direct image) of a subset $C \subseteq A$ as

$$f(C) = \{f(x) \in B \mid x \in C\}.$$

Define the **inverse image** of a subset $D \subseteq B$ as

$$f^{-1}(D) = \{x \in A \mid f(x) \in D\}.$$

examples:

- $f: \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \rightarrow \{a, b\}$ where $f(1) = f(2) = a$, $f(3) = f(4) = b$, we have $f(\{1, 2\}) = \{a\}$, $f^{-1}(\{b\}) = \{3, 4\}$
- $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ where $f(x) = \sin(\pi x)$, we have $f([0, 1/2]) = [0, 1]$, $f^{-1}(\{0\}) = \mathbf{Z}$

Definition 1.11 Let $f: A \rightarrow B$ be a function.

- The function f is **injective** or **one-to-one** if $f(x_1) = f(x_2)$ implies $x_1 = x_2$.
 - The function f is **surjective** or **onto** if $f(A) = B$.
 - The function f is **bijective** if f is both surjective and injective. In this case, the function $f^{-1}: B \rightarrow A$ is the **inverse function** of f , which assigns each $y \in B$ to the unique $x \in A$ such that $f(x) = y$.
-

- if the function f is a bijection, then $f(f^{-1}(x)) = x$
- example: for the bijection $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ given by $f(x) = x^3$, we have $f^{-1}(x) = \sqrt[3]{x}$

Definition 1.12 Consider $f: A \rightarrow B$ and $g: B \rightarrow C$. The **composition** of the functions f and g is the function $g \circ f: A \rightarrow C$ defined as

$$(g \circ f)(x) = g(f(x)).$$

-
- example: if $f(x) = x^3$ and $g(y) = \sin(y)$, then $(g \circ f)(x) = \sin(x^3)$

Cardinality

Definition 1.13 We state that the two sets A and B have the same **cardinality** if there exists a bijection $f: A \rightarrow B$.

notation:

- $|A|$ denotes the cardinality of the set A
- $|A| = |B|$ if the sets A and B have the same cardinality
- $|A| = n$ if $|A| = |\{1, \dots, n\}|$
- $|A| \leq |B|$ if there exists an injection $f: A \rightarrow B$
- $|A| < |B|$ if $|A| \leq |B|$ and $|A| \neq |B|$

Theorem 1.14

- If $|A| = |B|$, then $|B| = |A|$.
 - If $|A| = |B|$, and $|B| = |C|$, then $|A| = |C|$.
-

proof:

- show that the inverse function $f^{-1}: B \rightarrow A$ of $f: A \rightarrow B$ is a bijection
 - show that the composition $g \circ f: A \rightarrow C$ of functions $f: A \rightarrow B$ and $g: B \rightarrow C$ is a bijection
-

Theorem 1.15 *Cantor-Schröder-Bernstein.* If $|A| \leq |B|$ and $|B| \leq |A|$ then $|A| = |B|$.

Definition 1.16 The set A is **countably finite** if $|A| = |\mathbb{N}|$. Specifically, the set A is **finite** if $|A| = n \in \mathbb{N}$. The set A is **countable** if A is finite or countably infinite. Otherwise, we say A is **uncountable**.

Example 1.17 The set of even natural numbers and the set of odd natural numbers have the same cardinality as \mathbf{N} , *i.e.*, $|\{2n \mid n \in \mathbf{N}\}| = |\{2n - 1 \mid n \in \mathbf{N}\}| = |\mathbf{N}|$.

proof: consider the bijection $f: \mathbf{N} \rightarrow \{2n \mid n \in \mathbf{N}\}$ given by $f(n) = 2n$ and $g: \mathbf{N} \rightarrow \{2n - 1 \mid n \in \mathbf{N}\}$ given by $g(n) = 2n - 1$

Example 1.18 The set of all integers has the same cardinality as \mathbf{N} , *i.e.*, $|\mathbf{Z}| = |\mathbf{N}|$.

proof: consider the bijection $f: \mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ given by

$$f(n) = \begin{cases} 2n & n \geq 0 \\ -(2n + 1) & n < 0 \end{cases}$$

Definition 1.19 The **powerset** of a set A , denoted by $\mathcal{P}(A)$, is the set of all subsets of A , *i.e.*, $\mathcal{P}(A) = \{B \mid B \subseteq A\}$.

- for a finite set A of cardinality n , the cardinality of $\mathcal{P}(A)$ is 2^n

examples:

- $A = \emptyset$ then $\mathcal{P}(A) = \{\emptyset\}$
- $A = \{1\}$ then $\mathcal{P}(A) = \{\emptyset, \{1\}\}$
- $A = \{1, 2\}$ then $\mathcal{P}(A) = \{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{1, 2\}\}$

Theorem 1.20 Cantor. If A is a set, then $|A| < |\mathcal{P}(A)|$.

- therefore, $|\mathbf{N}| < |\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{N})| < |\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{N}))| < \dots$, *i.e.*, there are infinite number of infinite sets

proof:

- we first show that $|A| \leq |\mathcal{P}(A)|$
 - consider the function $f: A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A)$ given by $f(x) = \{x\}$
 - the function f is a injection since

$$f(x_1) = f(x_2) \implies \{x_1\} = \{x_2\} \implies x_1 = x_2$$

- we now show that $|A| \neq |\mathcal{P}(A)|$ by contradiction
 - suppose $|A| = |\mathcal{P}(A)|$, then there is a surjection $g: A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A)$
 - consider the set $B \subseteq A$ given by

$$B = \{x \in A \mid x \notin g(x)\} \in \mathcal{P}(A)$$

- since g is surjective and $B \in \mathcal{P}(A)$, there exists a $b \in A$ such that $g(b) = B$

- there are two cases
 1. $b \in B \implies b \notin g(b) \implies b \notin B$
 2. $b \notin B \implies b \notin g(b) \implies b \in B$where in either case we obtain a contradiction
 - hence, g is not surjective $\implies |A| \neq |\mathcal{P}(A)|$

Corollary 1.21 For all $n \in \mathbf{N} \cup \{0\}$, $n < 2^n$.

2. Real numbers

- ordered sets
- least upper bound property
- fields
- real numbers
- archimedian property
- using supremum and infimum
- absolute value
- triangle inequality
- uncountability of the real numbers

2-1

Ordered sets

Definition 2.1 An **ordered set** is a set S with a relation $<$ called an 'ordering' such that:

1. *Trichotomy.* For all $x, y \in S$, either $x < y$, $x = y$, or $x > y$.
 2. *Transitivity.* If $x, y, z \in S$ have $x < y$ and $y < z$, then $x < z$.
-

examples:

- \mathbf{Z} is an ordered set with ordering $m > n \iff m - n \in \mathbf{N}$
- \mathbf{Q} is an ordered set with ordering $p > q \iff p - q = m/n$ for some $m, n \in \mathbf{N}$
- $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$ is an ordered set with dictionary ordering $(q, r) > (s, t) \iff q > s$, or $q = s$ and $r > t$
- the set $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{N})$ with ordering defined by $A \prec B$ if $A \subseteq B$ is *not* an ordered set

Least upper bound property

Definition 2.2 Let S be an ordered set and let $E \subseteq S$, then:

- If there exists some $b \in S$ such that $x \leq b$ for all $x \in E$, then E is **bounded above** and b is an **upper bound** of E .
- If there exists some $c \in S$ such that $x \geq c$ for all $x \in E$, then E is **bounded below** and c is a **lower bound** of E .
- If there exists an upper bound b_0 of E such that $b_0 \leq b$ for all upper bounds b of E , then b_0 is the **least upper bound** or the **supremum** of E , written as

$$b_0 = \sup E.$$

- If there exists a lower bound c_0 of E such that $c_0 \geq c$ for all lower bounds c of E , then c_0 is the **greatest lower bound** or the **infimum** of E , written as

$$c_0 = \inf E.$$

examples:

- $S = \mathbf{Z}$ and $E = \{-2, -1, 0, 1, 2\}$, then $\inf E = -2$ and $\sup E = 2$
- $S = \mathbf{Q}$ and $E = \{q \in \mathbf{Q} \mid 0 \leq q < 1\}$, then $\inf E = 0$ and $\sup E = 1 \notin E$, *i.e.*, the supremum or infimum need not be in E
- $S = \mathbf{Z}$ and $E = \mathbf{N}$, then $\inf E = 1$ but $\sup E$ does not exist

Definition 2.3 *Least upper bound property.* An ordered set S has the least upper bound property if every $E \subseteq S$ which is nonempty and bounded above has a supremum in S .

example: $-\mathbf{N} = \{-1, -2, -3, \dots\}$, to show this (informally), suppose $E \subseteq -\mathbf{N}$ is bounded above, then $-E \subseteq \mathbf{N}$ is bounded below and according to the well ordering principle, $-E$ has a least element $x \in -E$, and thus $-x = \sup E$

Theorem 2.4 If $x \in \mathbf{Q}$ and

$$x = \sup\{q \in \mathbf{Q} \mid q > 0, q^2 < 2\},$$

then $x \geq 1$ and $x^2 = 2$.

proof: let $E = \{q \in \mathbf{Q} \mid q > 0, q^2 < 2\}$

- $x \geq 1$ since $1 \in E \implies \sup E \geq 1$
- we show $x^2 \geq 2$ by contradiction: suppose $x^2 < 2$, let

$$h = \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2}, \frac{2 - x^2}{2(2x + 1)} \right\}$$

- since $x \geq 1$ and $x^2 < 2$, we have $0 < h \leq 1/2 < 1$
- $h < 1 \implies (x + h)^2 = x^2 + 2hx + h^2 < x^2 + 2hx + h$

Real numbers

2-5

- since $h \leq \frac{2-x^2}{2(2x+1)}$, we have

$$(x + h)^2 < x^2 + (2x + 1)h \leq x^2 + \frac{1}{2}(2 - x^2) < x^2 + 2 - x^2 = 2$$

$$\implies x + h \in E$$

- $h > 0 \implies x + h > x$, but $x + h \in E \implies x$ is not an upper bound for E , i.e., $x \neq \sup E$, which is a contradiction

- we now show $x^2 \not> 2$ by contradiction: suppose $x^2 > 2$, let

$$h = \frac{x^2 - 2}{2x}$$

- since $x^2 > 2$ and $x \geq 1$, we have $h > 0$
- $h > 0 \implies (x - h)^2 = x^2 - 2hx + h^2 > x^2 - 2hx = x^2 - (x^2 - 2) = 2$

Real numbers

2-6

– let $q \in E$, then $q^2 < 2 < (x - h)^2$, hence

$$(x - h)^2 - q^2 = ((x - h) + q)((x - h) - q) > 0$$

$\implies (x - h) - q > 0$, i.e., $x - h > q$ for all $q \in E \implies x - h$ is an upper bound for E

– $h > 0 \implies x > x - h \implies x \neq \sup E$, which is a contradiction

- therefore, $x^2 = 2$

Theorem 2.5 The set $E = \{q \in \mathbf{Q} \mid q > 0, q^2 < 2\}$ does not have a supremum in \mathbf{Q} .

proof (by contradiction): suppose there exists some $x \in \mathbf{Q}$ such that $x = \sup E$

- by theorem 2.4, we have $x \geq 1$ and $x^2 = 2$
- in particular, $x > 1$ since if $x = 1 \implies x^2 = 1 \neq 2$
- $x \in \mathbf{Q} \implies$ there exist $m, n \in \mathbf{N}$ ($m > n$) such that $x = m/n$, i.e., $m = nx \in \mathbf{N}$
- let $S = \{k \in \mathbf{N} \mid kx \in \mathbf{N}\} \subseteq \mathbf{N}$, then $S \neq \emptyset$ since $n \in S$
- by the well ordering property, there is a least element $k_0 \in S$

- let $k_1 = k_0(x - 1) = k_0x - k_0 \in \mathbf{Z}$, in particular, $k_1 \in \mathbf{N}$ since $x > 1 \implies k_1 > 0$
- $x^2 = 2 \implies x < 2$ as otherwise $x^2 \geq 4$, hence

$$k_1 = k_0(x - 1) < k_0(2 - 1) = k_0 \implies k_1 \notin S$$

- $k_1 = k_0(x - 1) \implies k_1x = k_0x^2 - k_0x$, since $x^2 = 2$, we have

$$k_1x = 2k_0 - k_0x = k_0 - k_0(x - 1) = k_0 - k_1 \in \mathbf{N} \implies k_1 \in S,$$

which is a contradiction

Fields

Definition 2.6 A set F is a **field** if it has two operations: addition (+) and multiplication (\cdot) with the following properties.

(A1) If $x, y \in F$ then $x + y \in F$.

(A2) *Commutativity*. For all $x, y \in F$, $x + y = y + x$.

(A3) *Associativity*. For all $x, y, z \in F$, $(x + y) + z = x + (y + z)$.

(A4) There exists an element $0 \in F$ such that $0 + x = x = x + 0$ for all $x \in F$.

(A5) For all $x \in F$, there exists a $y \in F$ such that $x + y = 0$, denoted by $y = -x$.

(M1) If $x, y \in F$ then $x \cdot y \in F$.

(M2) *Commutativity*. For all $x, y \in F$, $x \cdot y = y \cdot x$.

(M3) *Associativity*. For all $x, y, z \in F$, $(x \cdot y) \cdot z = x \cdot (y \cdot z)$.

(M4) There exists an element $1 \in F$ such that $1 \cdot x = x = x \cdot 1$ for all $x \in F$.

(M5) For all $x \in F \setminus \{0\}$, there exists an $x^{-1} \in F$ such that $x \cdot x^{-1} = 1$.

(D) *Distributativity*. For all $x, y, z \in F$, $(x + y) \cdot z = x \cdot z + y \cdot z$.

examples:

- \mathbf{Q} is a field
- \mathbf{Z} is not a field since it fails (M5)
- $\mathbf{Z}_2 = \{0, 1\}$ where $1 + 1 = 0 \pmod{2}$ is a field
- $\mathbf{Z}_3 = \{0, 1, 2\}$ with $c = a + b \pmod{3}$, *i.e.*,

$$2 + 1 = 3 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad 2 \cdot 2 = 4 = 3 + 1 = 1,$$

is a field

Theorem 2.7 If $x \in F$ where F is a field then $0x = 0$.

proof: $xx = (x + 0)x = xx + 0x \implies 0x = 0$

Definition 2.8 A field F is an **ordered field** if F is also an ordered set with ordering $<$ and satisfies:

1. For all $x, y, z \in F$, $x < y \implies x + z < y + z$.

2. If $x > 0$ and $y > 0$ then $xy > 0$.

If $x > 0$ we say x is **positive**, and if $x \geq 0$ we say x is **nonnegative**.

examples:

- \mathbf{Q} is an ordered field
- $\mathbf{Z}_2 = \{0, 1\}$ where $1 + 1 = 0$ is not a ordered field
(if $0 > 1 \implies 0 + 1 > 1 + 1 \implies 1 > 0$;
if $1 > 0 \implies 1 + 1 > 1 + 0 \implies 0 > 1$)

Theorem 2.9 Let F be an ordered field and $x, y, z, w \in F$, then:

- If $x > 0$ then $-x < 0$ (and vice versa).
 - If $x > 0$ and $y < z$ then $xy < xz$.
 - If $x < 0$ and $y < z$ then $xy > xz$.
 - If $x \neq 0$ then $x^2 > 0$.
 - If $0 < x < y$ then $0 < 1/y < 1/x$.
 - If $0 < x < y$ then $x^2 < y^2$.
 - If $x \leq y$ and $z \leq w$ then $x + z \leq y + w$.
-

Theorem 2.10 Let $x, y \in F$ where F is an ordered field. If $x > 0$ and $y < 0$ or $x < 0$ and $y > 0$, then $xy < 0$.

proof:

- $x > 0, y < 0 \implies x > 0, -y > 0 \implies -xy > 0 \implies xy < 0$
- $x < 0, y > 0 \implies -x > 0, y > 0 \implies -xy > 0 \implies xy < 0$

Theorem 2.11 *Greatest lower bound.* Let F be an ordered field with the least upper bound property. If $A \subseteq F$ is nonempty and bounded below, then $\inf A$ exists in F .

proof: let $B = \{-x \mid x \in A\}$

- $A \subseteq F$ bounded below $\implies \exists a \in F, \forall x \in A, a \leq x \implies \exists a \in F, \forall x \in A, -a \geq -x \implies \exists a \in F, \forall x \in B, -a \geq x \implies B \subseteq F$ has an upper bound $-a$
(this also shows that if a is a lower bound of A then $-a$ is an upper bound of B)
- F has the least upper bound property $\implies \sup B \in F$
- let $c = \sup B$, then $c \geq x, \forall x \in B \implies -c \leq -x, \forall x \in B \implies -c \leq x, \forall x \in A \implies -c \in F$ is a lower bound of A
- we also have $c \leq -a$ with a being a lower bound of $A \implies -c \geq a \implies -c \in F$ is the greatest lower bound of A , i.e., $-c = \inf A \in F$

Real nubmers

Theorem 2.12 There exists a “unique” ordered field, labeled \mathbf{R} , such that $\mathbf{Q} \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ and \mathbf{R} has the least upper bound property.

- one can construct \mathbf{R} using Dedekind cuts or as equivalence classes of Cauchy sequences.

Theorem 2.13 There exists a unique $r \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $r \geq 1$ and $r^2 = 2$, i.e., $\sqrt{2} \in \mathbf{R}$ but $\sqrt{2} \notin \mathbf{Q}$.

proof: let $E = \{x \in \mathbf{R} \mid x > 0, x^2 < 2\} \subseteq \mathbf{R}$

- we have $x < 2$ for all $x \in E$ (since if $x \geq 2 \implies x^2 \geq 4$) $\implies E$ is bounded above $\implies \sup E$ exists in \mathbf{R}
- let $r = \sup E$, using the same proof for theorem 2.4 we have $r \geq 1$ and $r^2 = 2$

- to show the uniqueness, suppose $\tilde{r} \geq 1$, $\tilde{r}^2 = 2$, then

$$r^2 - \tilde{r}^2 = 0 \implies (r + \tilde{r})(r - \tilde{r}) = 0 \implies r - \tilde{r} = 0 \implies r = \tilde{r}$$

(since $r \geq 1$, $\tilde{r} \geq 1 \implies r + \tilde{r} > 0$)

Theorem 2.14 If $x \in \mathbf{R}$ satisfies $x < \epsilon$ for all $\epsilon \in \mathbf{R}$, $\epsilon > 0$, then $x \leq 0$.

proof by contradiction:

- suppose $x > 0$ satisfies $x \leq \epsilon$ for all $\epsilon > 0$
- $x > 0 \implies 2x > x > 0 \implies x > x/2 > 0$
- take $\epsilon = x/2$ we have $x > \epsilon > 0$, which is a contradiction

Archimedian property

Theorem 2.15 *Archimedian property.* If $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$ and $x > 0$, then there exists an $n \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $nx > y$.

proof by contradiction:

- suppose $nx \leq y$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N} \implies \forall n \in \mathbf{N}, n \leq y/x \implies \mathbf{N}$ is bounded above by $y/x \implies$ there exists $\sup \mathbf{N} \in \mathbf{R}$
- let $a = \sup \mathbf{N} \implies a - 1 < a$ is not an upper bound of $\mathbf{N} \implies \exists m \in \mathbf{N}, a - 1 < m \implies a < m + 1 \in \mathbf{N} \implies a$ is not an upper bound of \mathbf{N} , which is a contradiction

Theorem 2.16 *Density of \mathbf{Q} .* If $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$ and $x < y$ then there exists some $r \in \mathbf{Q}$ such that $x < r < y$.

proof:

- first suppose $0 \leq x < y$, by the Archimedian property, we have

$$n(y - x) > 1 \implies ny > nx + 1$$

for some $n \in \mathbf{N}$

- let $S = \{k \in \mathbf{N} \mid k > nx\} \subseteq \mathbf{N}$, by Archimedian property, there exists some $p \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $p > nx \implies S \neq \emptyset$
- by the well ordering property, there is a least element $m \in S$ such that $m > nx$
- $m \in \mathbf{N} \implies m \geq 1$
- if $m = 1$, then $m - 1 = 0 \implies nx \geq m - 1 = 0$ since $x \geq 0$

Real numbers

2-19

- if $m > 1$, then $m - 1 \in \mathbf{N}$ but $m - 1 \notin S$ since $m > m - 1$ is the least element $\implies nx \geq m - 1 \implies m \leq nx + 1 < ny$
- hence, we have

$$nx < m < ny \implies x < m/n < y$$

for some $m, n \in \mathbf{N}$, *i.e.*, there exists an $r = m/n \in \mathbf{Q}$ such that $x < r < y$

- now suppose $x < 0$, if $x < 0 < y$ then simply take $r = 0$; if $x < y \leq 0$, we have $0 \leq -y < -x$, thus there exists some $\tilde{r} \in \mathbf{Q}$ such that

$$-y < \tilde{r} < -x \implies x < -\tilde{r} < y$$

(by the first case), *i.e.*, we have $x < r < y$ by taking $r = -\tilde{r}$

Theorem 2.17 Suppose $S \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ is nonempty and bounded above. Then, $x = \sup S$ if and only if:

1. x is an upper bound of S .
 2. For all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists some $y \in S$ such that $x - \epsilon < y \leq x$.
-

proof:

- first suppose $x = \sup S$
 - obviously, x is an upper bound of S
 - for all $\epsilon > 0$, we have $x > x - \epsilon \implies x - \epsilon$ is not an upper bound of S , *i.e.*, there exists some $y \in S$ such that $x - \epsilon < y \leq x$
- now suppose x is an upper bound of S , and satisfies $x - \epsilon < y \leq x$ for all $\epsilon > 0$ and for some $y \in S$, we only need to show that for all z that is an upper bound of S , we have $x \leq z$
 - assume there exists an upper bound z of S smaller than x , *i.e.*, $y \leq z < x$ for all $y \in S$

Real numbers

2-21

- take $\epsilon = x - z > 0$ (since $x > z$)
 - $\implies x \geq y > x - \epsilon = x - x + z = z$
 - $\implies y > z$ for some $y \in S$
 - i.e.*, z is not an upper bound of S , which is a contradiction

Theorem 2.18 Let $S = \{1 - \frac{1}{n} \mid n \in \mathbf{N}\}$, then $\sup S = 1$.

proof:

- if $n \in \mathbf{N}$, then $1 - \frac{1}{n} < 1 \implies 1$ is an upper bound of S
- let $\epsilon > 0$, then by the Archimedian property, for some $n \in \mathbf{N}$, we have

$$n\epsilon > 1 \implies \epsilon > \frac{1}{n} \implies -\epsilon < -\frac{1}{n} \implies 1 - \epsilon < 1 - \frac{1}{n} \leq 1$$

by theorem 2.17, we have $\sup S = 1$

Real numbers

2-22

Remark 2.19 We have similar property as theorem 2.17 for infimum. Suppose $S \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ is nonempty and bounded below, then $x = \inf S$ if and only if:

- x is a lower bound of S .
 - For all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists some $y \in S$ such that $x \leq y < x + \epsilon$.
-

Using supremum and infimum

Definition 2.20 For $x \in \mathbf{R}$ and $A \subseteq \mathbf{R}$, define

$$x + A = \{x + a \mid a \in A\}, \quad xA = \{xa \mid a \in A\}.$$

Theorem 2.21 Let $A \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ be nonempty, we have:

- If $x \in \mathbf{R}$ and A is bounded above, then $\sup(x + A) = x + \sup A$.
 - If $x > 0$ and A is bounded above, then $\sup(xA) = x \sup A$.
-

proof:

- suppose $x \in \mathbf{R}$ and A is bounded above:
 - for all $a \in A$, we have $a \leq \sup A \implies x + a \leq x + \sup A$, i.e., the set $x + A$ is bounded by $x + \sup A$

– let $\epsilon > 0$, for some $b \in A$, we have

$$\sup A - \epsilon < b \leq \sup A \implies (x + \sup A) - \epsilon < x + b \leq x + \sup A,$$

$$\text{i.e., } \sup(x + A) = x + \sup A$$

• suppose $x > 0$ and A is bounded above:

– for all $a \in A$, $a \leq \sup A \implies xa \leq x \sup A$, i.e., the set xA is bounded by $x \sup A$

– let $\epsilon > 0 \implies \epsilon/x > 0$, for some $b \in A$, we have

$$\sup A - \epsilon/x < b \leq \sup A \implies x \sup A - \epsilon < xb \leq x \sup A,$$

$$\text{i.e., } \sup(xA) = x \sup A$$

Remark 2.22 Similarly, we can also show that:

- If $x \in \mathbf{R}$ and A is bounded below, then $\inf(x + A) = x + \inf A$.
- If $x > 0$ and A is bounded below, then $\inf(xA) = x \inf A$.
- If $x < 0$ and A is bounded below, then $\sup(xA) = x \inf A$.
- If $x < 0$ and A is bounded above, then $\inf(xA) = x \sup A$.

Theorem 2.23 Let $A, B \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ where $x \leq y$ for all $x \in A$, $y \in B$, then $\sup A \leq \inf B$.

proof: for all $x \in A$, $y \in B$, $x \leq y \implies B$ is bounded below by $x \implies x \leq \inf B \implies A$ is bounded above by $\inf B \implies \sup A \leq \inf B$

Absolute value

Definition 2.24 If $x \in \mathbf{R}$, we define the **absolute value** of x as

$$|x| = \begin{cases} x & x \geq 0 \\ -x & x < 0. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 2.25

- $|x| \geq 0$, and, $|x| = 0$ if and only if $x = 0$.
 - $|-x| = |x|$ for all $x \in \mathbf{R}$.
 - $|xy| = |x||y|$ for all $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$.
 - $|x|^2 = x^2$ for all $x \in \mathbf{R}$.
 - $|x| \leq y$ if and only if $-y \leq x \leq y$.
 - $-|x| \leq x \leq |x|$ for all $x \in \mathbf{R}$.
-

Triangle inequality

Theorem 2.26 *Triangle inequality.* For all $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$,

$$|x + y| \leq |x| + |y|.$$

proof: let $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$

- $x + y \leq |x| + |y|$
- $-x + -y \leq |-x| + |-y| = |x| + |y| \implies -(|x| + |y|) \leq x + y$
- hence, we have

$$-(|x| + |y|) \leq x + y \leq |x| + |y| \implies |x + y| \leq |x| + |y|$$

Corollary 2.27 *Reverse triangle inequality.* For all $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$,

$$||x| - |y|| \leq |x - y|.$$

Uncountability of the real numbers

Definition 2.28 Let $x \in (0, 1]$ and let $d_{-i} \in \{0, 1, \dots, 9\}$. We say that x is represented by the digits $\{d_{-i} \mid i \in \mathbf{N}\}$, *i.e.*, $x = 0.d_{-1}d_{-2}\dots$, if

$$x = \sup\{10^{-1}d_{-1} + 10^{-2}d_{-2} + \dots + 10^{-n}d_{-n} \mid n \in \mathbf{N}\}.$$

example:

$$0.2500\dots = \sup\left\{\frac{2}{10}, \frac{2}{10} + \frac{5}{100}, \frac{2}{10} + \frac{5}{100} + \frac{0}{1000}, \dots\right\} = \sup\left\{\frac{1}{5}, \frac{1}{4}\right\} = \frac{1}{4}$$

Theorem 2.29

- For all set of digits $\{d_{-i} \mid i \in \mathbf{N}\}$, there exists a unique $x \in [0, 1]$ such that $x = 0.d_{-1}d_{-2}\cdots$.
- For all $x \in (0, 1]$, there exists a unique sequence of digits d_{-i} such that $x = 0.d_{-1}d_{-2}\cdots$ and

$$0.d_{-1}d_{-2}\cdots d_{-n} < x \leq 0.d_{-1}d_{-2}\cdots d_{-n} + 10^{-n}, \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbf{N}. \quad (2.1)$$

- the second part indicates that the digital representation of $1/2$ is $0.4999\cdots$

Theorem 2.30 *Cantor.* The set $(0, 1]$ is uncountable.

proof (by contradiction):

- assume $(0, 1]$ is countable, then there exists a bijection $x: \mathbf{N} \rightarrow (0, 1]$, let

$$x(n) = 0.d_{-1}^{(n)}d_{-2}^{(n)}\cdots, \quad n \in \mathbf{N},$$

where $d_{-i}^{(n)}$ denotes the i th decimal of the real number $x(n) \in (0, 1]$, and let

$$e_{-i} = \begin{cases} 1 & d_{-i}^{(i)} \neq 1 \\ 2 & d_{-i}^{(i)} = 1 \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

- let $y = 0.e_{-1}e_{-2}\cdots$, since all e_{-i} are nonzero, e_{-1}, e_{-2}, \dots satisfies (2.1); according to theorem 2.29, we have $0.e_{-1}e_{-2}\cdots$ being the unique decimal representation of y
- again according to theorem 2.29 and all e_{-i} are nonzero, we have $y \in (0, 1] \implies \exists m \in \mathbf{N}, y = x(m) = 0.d_{-1}^{(m)}d_{-2}^{(m)}\cdots = 0.e_{-1}e_{-2}\cdots$, however, we have $e_{-m} \neq d_{-m}^{(m)}$ since (2.2), i.e., for all $m \in \mathbf{N}$, $x(m) \neq y$, which is a contradiction

Corollary 2.31 The set of real numbers \mathbf{R} is uncountable.

3. Sequences

- sequences and limits
- monotone sequences and subsequences
- inequalities and operations involving limits
- limit superior and limit inferior
- Bolzano-Weierstrass theorem
- Cauchy sequences

3-1

Sequences and limits

Definition 3.1 A **sequence** (of real numbers) is a function $x: \mathbf{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. To denote a sequence we write $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$, where x_n is the n th element in the sequence.

- sequence need not start at $n = 1$, *e.g.*, the sequence $x: \{n \in \mathbf{Z} \mid n \geq m\} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is denoted $(x_n)_{n=m}^{\infty}$
-

Definition 3.2 A sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is **bounded** if there exists some $B \geq 0$ such that $|x_n| \leq B$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$.

examples:

- the sequence $(\frac{1}{n})_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded since $\frac{1}{n} \leq 1$ for all n
- the sequence $(n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is not bounded since for all $B \geq 0$ there exists some $n \geq B$ according to the Archimedean property

Definition 3.3 A sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is said to **converge** to $x \in \mathbf{R}$ if for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an $M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that for all $n \geq M$, we have $|x_n - x| < \epsilon$. The number x is called a **limit** of the sequence. If the limit x is unique, we write

$$x = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n.$$

A sequence that converges is said to be **convergent**, and otherwise is **divergent**.

Remark 3.4 A sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is divergent if for all $x \in \mathbf{R}$, there exists some $\epsilon > 0$, such that for all $M \in \mathbf{N}$, there exists an $n \geq M$, so that $|x_n - x| \geq \epsilon$.

Theorem 3.5 Let $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$. If for all $\epsilon > 0$, $|x - y| < \epsilon$, then $x = y$.

proof: assume $x \neq y \implies |x - y| > 0$; take $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}|x - y|$
 $\implies |x - y| < \frac{1}{2}|x - y| \implies |x - y| < 0$, which is a contradiction

Theorem 3.6 If $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to x and y , then $x = y$, i.e., a convergent sequence has a unique limit.

proof: let $\epsilon > 0$

- $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to $x \implies \exists M_1 \in \mathbf{N}, \forall n \geq M_1, |x_n - x| < \epsilon/2$
- $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to $y \implies \exists M_2 \in \mathbf{N}, \forall n \geq M_2, |x_n - y| < \epsilon/2$
- let $M = M_1 + M_2$, then $M \geq M_1$ and $M \geq M_2$, then we have

$$|x_M - x| < \epsilon/2 \quad \text{and} \quad |x_M - y| < \epsilon/2,$$

hence,

$$\begin{aligned} |x - y| &= |(x - x_M) + (x_M - y)| \\ &\leq |x - x_M| + |y - x_M| < \epsilon/2 + \epsilon/2 = \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

- according to theorem 3.5, we have $x = y$

Remark 3.7 Sometimes we write ‘ $x_n \rightarrow x$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ ’ to mean $x = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n$. We may also avoid the ‘as $n \rightarrow \infty$ ’ part if the limiting process is clear from the context.

Example 3.8 Given the sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ with $x_n = c \in \mathbf{R}$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = c$.

proof: let $\epsilon > 0$, $M = 1$, then for all $n \geq M$, we have

$$|x_n - c| = |c - c| = 0 < \epsilon$$

Example 3.9 The sequence $(\frac{1}{n})_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to $x = 0$, i.e., $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} = 0$.

proof: let $\epsilon > 0$, choose an $M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $M > 1/\epsilon$ (such an M exists according to the Archimedian property), then for all $n \geq M$, we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} - 0 \right| = \left| \frac{1}{n} \right| \leq \frac{1}{M} < \epsilon$$

Example 3.10 The sequence $\left(\frac{1}{n^2+2n+100} \right)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to $x = 0$.

proof: let $\epsilon > 0$ choose $M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $M \geq \epsilon^{-1}/2$, then for all $n \geq M$, we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{n^2 + 2n + 100} - 0 \right| = \frac{1}{n^2 + 2n + 100} \leq \frac{1}{2n} \leq \frac{1}{2M} < \epsilon$$

Example 3.11 The sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ where $x_n = (-1)^n$ is divergent.

proof: let $x \in \mathbf{R}$, $M \in \mathbf{N}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} |x_M - x_{M+1}| &= \left| (-1)^M - (-1)^{M+1} \right| = 2 \\ \implies 2 &= |(x_M - x) + (x - x_{M+1})| \leq |x_M - x| + |x_{M+1} - x| \\ \implies |x_M - x| &\geq 1 \quad \text{or} \quad |x_{M+1} - x| \geq 1, \end{aligned}$$

i.e., let $\epsilon = 1$, $n = M$, we have either $|x_n - x| \geq \epsilon$ or $|x_{n+1} - x| \geq \epsilon$

Theorem 3.12 If $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is convergent, then $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded.

proof:

- suppose $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to x , let $\epsilon = 1$, then there exists some $M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that for all $n \geq M$, $|x_n - x| < 1 \implies x_n < |x| + 1$
- let $B = \max\{|x_1|, |x_2|, \dots, |x_M|, |x| + 1\}$, since $x_n \leq |x_n|$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, $n \leq M$, and $x_n < |x| + 1$ for all $n \geq M$, we have $B \geq |x_n|$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$

Monotone sequences

Definition 3.13

- A sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is **monotone increasing** if $x_n \leq x_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$.
 - A sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is **monotone decreasing** if $x_n \geq x_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$.
 - If $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is either monotone increasing or monotone decreasing, we say the sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is **monotone** (or monotonic).
-

examples:

- the sequence $(\frac{1}{n})_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is monotone decreasing
- the sequence $(-\frac{1}{n})_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is monotone increasing
- the sequence $((-1)^n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is not monotone

Theorem 3.14 A monotone sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges if and only if it is bounded.

- If the sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is monotone increasing and bounded, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = \sup\{x_n \mid n \in \mathbf{N}\}.$$

- If the sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is monotone decreasing and bounded, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = \inf\{x_n \mid n \in \mathbf{N}\}.$$

proof: we prove for monotone increasing sequences

- suppose $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is convergent, according to theorem 3.12, it is bounded
- suppose $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is monotone increasing and bounded
 - $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is monotone increasing $\implies x_n \leq x_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$

Sequences

3-9

- $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded \implies the set $\{x_n \mid n \in \mathbf{N}\}$ has supremum $x = \sup\{x_n \mid n \in \mathbf{N}\}$
- let $\epsilon > 0$, according to theorem 2.17, there exists some $M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $x - \epsilon < x_M \leq x$, then for all $n \geq M$, we have

$$x - \epsilon < x_M \leq x_n \leq x < x + \epsilon \implies |x_n - x| < \epsilon$$

Example

recall the following lemma from example 1.8:

Lemma 3.15 *Bernoulli's inequality.* If $x \geq -1$ then $(x + 1)^n \geq 1 + nx$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Theorem 3.16 If $c \in (0, 1)$ then the sequence $(c^n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c^n = 0$. If $c > 1$, the sequence $(c^n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ does not converge.

proof:

- if $c > 1$, we show that the sequence $(c^n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is unbounded (and hence does not converge):

- let $B \geq 0$, then there exists some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n > \frac{B}{c-1}$ such that

$$c^n = ((c - 1) + 1)^n \geq 1 + n(c - 1) > n(c - 1) > B$$

(the first inequality is because of lemma 3.15)

Sequences

3-11

- if $c \in (0, 1)$, we first show that $(c^n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is monotone decreasing and bounded (and hence, convergent), *i.e.*, show that $c^{n+1} \leq c^n \leq c$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by induction:

- suppose $n = 1 \implies c^2 \leq c \leq c$, the first inequality holds since $0 < c < 1$

- suppose $n > 1$, and $c^{n+1} \leq c^n \leq c$, then we have

$$c^{n+2} \leq c^{n+1} \leq c^n \leq c$$

let $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c^n = L$, we now show that $L = 0$:

- let $\epsilon > 0$, then there exists some $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq M$ such that

$$|c^n - L| < \frac{1}{2}(1 - c)\epsilon$$

Sequences

3-12

– hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (1 - c)|L| &= |L - cL| \\
 &= |(L - c^{M+1}) + (c^{M+1} - cL)| \\
 &\leq |L - c^{M+1}| + c|c^M - L| \\
 &< |L - c^{M+1}| + |c^M - L| \\
 &< \frac{1}{2}(1 - c)\epsilon + \frac{1}{2}(1 - c)\epsilon \\
 &= (1 - c)\epsilon,
 \end{aligned}$$

i.e., $|L| < \epsilon$ for all $\epsilon > 0$ (according to theorem 2.14) $\implies |L| \leq 0$
 $\implies L = 0$

Subsequences

Definition 3.17 Let $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence and $(n_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be a strictly increasing sequence of natural numbers. The sequence $(x_{n_i})_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is called a **subsequence** of $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$.

example: consider the sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty} = (n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$, *i.e.*, $1, 2, 3, 4, \dots$

- the following are subsequences of $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$:
 - $1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, \dots$, described with $(x_{n_i})_{i=1}^{\infty} = (x_{2i-1})_{i=1}^{\infty}$
 - $2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, \dots$, described with $(x_{n_i})_{i=1}^{\infty} = (x_{2i})_{i=1}^{\infty}$
 - $2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, \dots$, described with $(x_{n_i})_{i=1}^{\infty}$ where n_i are primes
- the following are not subsequences of $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$:
 - $1, 1, 1, 1, 1, \dots$
 - $1, 1, 3, 3, 5, 5, \dots$

Theorem 3.18 If $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$, then all subsequences of $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converge to x .

proof:

- let $(x_{n_i})_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be a subsequence of $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$
- let $\epsilon > 0$, then there exists some $M_0 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $|x_n - x| < \epsilon$ for all $n \geq M_0$
- let $M = M_0$, then for all $i \geq M$, since $n_i \geq i \geq M = M_0$, we have

$$|x_{n_i} - x| < \epsilon$$

Remark 3.19 Theorem 3.18 implies that the sequence $((-1)^n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is divergent.

Inequalities involving limits

Theorem 3.20 The sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$ if and only if $(|x_n - x|)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |x_n - x| = 0$.

proof: let $\epsilon > 0$

- suppose $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$, then $\exists M_0 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall n \geq M_0$, $|x_n - x| < \epsilon$; let $M = M_0$, then $\forall n \geq M = M_0$, we have

$$|x_n - x - 0| = |x_n - x| < \epsilon$$

- suppose $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |x_n - x| = 0$, then $\exists M \in \mathbf{N}$, $\forall n \geq M$, we have $|x_n - x - 0| < \epsilon$, i.e., $|x_n - x| < \epsilon$

Theorem 3.21 *Squeeze theorem.* Let $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$, $(b_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$, and $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be sequences such that

$$a_n \leq x_n \leq b_n$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $(b_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converge and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = x = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n.$$

Then $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$.

proof: let $\epsilon > 0$

- $a_n \rightarrow x \implies \exists M_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\forall n \geq M_1, |a_n - x| < \epsilon$
- $b_n \rightarrow x \implies \exists M_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\forall n \geq M_2, |b_n - x| < \epsilon$
- $a_n \leq x_n \leq b_n \implies a_n - x \leq x_n - x \leq b_n - x$
- take $M = \max\{M_1, M_2\}$, then $\forall n \geq M$, we have

$$-\epsilon < a_n - x \leq x_n - x \leq b_n - x < \epsilon \implies |x_n - x| < \epsilon$$

Example 3.22 The sequence $\left(\frac{n^2}{n^2+n+1}\right)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges with

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n^2}{n^2+n+1} = 1.$$

proof:

- let $\epsilon > 0$, we have

$$0 \leq \left| \frac{n^2}{n^2+n+1} - 1 \right| = \left| \frac{n+1}{n^2+n+1} \right| \leq \frac{n+1}{n^2+n} = \frac{1}{n}$$

- $0 \rightarrow 0$ and $\frac{1}{n} \rightarrow 0 \implies \left| \frac{n^2}{n^2+n+1} - 1 \right| \rightarrow 0 \implies \frac{n^2}{n^2+n+1} \rightarrow 1$

Theorem 3.23 Let $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $(y_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be sequences.

- If $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $(y_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converge and $x_n \leq y_n$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, then we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n.$$

- If $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges and $a \leq x_n \leq b$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, then

$$a \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n \leq b.$$

proof: we show the first statement; the second statement can then be proved by considering $(y_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $(z_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ where $y_n = a \leq x_n \leq b = z_n$

- let $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n = y$, suppose $x > y$
- $x > y \implies x - y > 0$, let $\epsilon = \frac{x-y}{2} > 0$
- $x_n \rightarrow x \implies \exists M_1 \in \mathbf{N}$ s.t. $\forall n \geq M_1, |x_n - x| < \frac{x-y}{2}$
- $y_n \rightarrow y \implies \exists M_2 \in \mathbf{N}$ s.t. $\forall n \geq M_2, |y_n - y| < \frac{x-y}{2}$

Sequences

3-19

- let $M = \max\{M_1, M_2\}$, we have $x_M - x > -\frac{x-y}{2}$ and $y_M - y < \frac{x-y}{2}$, hence,

$$x_M > x - \frac{x-y}{2} = \frac{x+y}{2} = y + \frac{x-y}{2} > y_M,$$

which contradicts to $x_n \leq y_n$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$

Operations involving limits

Theorem 3.24 Suppose $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n = y$.

- The sequence $(x_n + y_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is convergent and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (x_n + y_n) = x + y$.
- For all $c \in \mathbf{R}$, the sequence $(cx_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} cx_n = cx$.
- The sequence $(x_n y_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is convergent and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n y_n = xy$.
- If $y_n \neq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$ and $y \neq 0$, then the sequence $\left(\frac{x_n}{y_n}\right)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is convergent and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{x_n}{y_n} = \frac{x}{y}$.

proof:

- to show $x_n \rightarrow x, y_n \rightarrow y \implies x_n + y_n \rightarrow x + y$, let $\epsilon > 0$
 - $x_n \rightarrow x \implies \exists M_1 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall n \geq M_1, |x_n - x| < \epsilon/2$
 - $y_n \rightarrow y \implies \exists M_2 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall n \geq M_2, |y_n - y| < \epsilon/2$

Sequences

3-21

- let $M = \max\{M_1, M_2\}$, then for all $n \geq M$, we have

$$|(x_n + y_n) - (x + y)| \leq |x_n - x| + |y_n - y| < \epsilon/2 + \epsilon/2 = \epsilon$$

- to show $x_n \rightarrow x \implies cx_n \rightarrow cx$, let $\epsilon > 0$
 - $x_n \rightarrow x \implies \exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall n \geq M, |x_n - x| < \frac{1}{|c|+1}\epsilon$
 - then for all $n \geq M$, we have $|cx_n - cx| = |c||x_n - x| < \frac{|c|}{|c|+1}\epsilon < \epsilon$
- we show that $x_n \rightarrow x, y_n \rightarrow y \implies x_n y_n \rightarrow xy$:
 - $x_n \rightarrow x \implies |x_n - x| \rightarrow 0$
 - $y_n \rightarrow y \implies |y_n - y| \rightarrow 0$, and $(y_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded, i.e., $\exists B \geq 0, |y_n| \leq B$

– hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 \leq |x_n y_n - xy| &= |x_n y_n + x y_n - x y_n - xy| \\
 &= |(x_n - x)y_n + (y_n - y)x| \\
 &\leq |x_n - x||y_n| + |y_n - y||x| \\
 &\leq |x_n - x|B + |y_n - y||x|
 \end{aligned}$$

– according to the previous statements, we have

$$|x_n - x| \rightarrow 0 \implies |x_n - x|B \rightarrow 0$$

and

$$|y_n - y| \rightarrow 0 \implies |y_n - y||x| \rightarrow 0,$$

then $|x_n - x|B + |y_n - y||x| \rightarrow 0$

– hence, according to theorem 3.21, $|x_n y_n - xy| \rightarrow 0$

- to prove $x_n \rightarrow x$, $y_n \rightarrow y$ ($y_n \neq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $y \neq 0$) $\implies \frac{x_n}{y_n} \rightarrow \frac{x}{y}$, we first show that there exists some $b > 0$ such that $|y_n| \geq b$:

- let $\epsilon = \frac{|y|}{2}$, then $y_n \rightarrow y \implies \exists M \in \mathbb{N}$ s.t. $\forall n \geq M$, $|y_n - y| < \frac{|y|}{2}$
- then for all $n \geq M$, we have

$$\frac{|y|}{2} > |y_n - y| \geq ||y_n| - |y|| \implies |y_n| > \frac{|y|}{2}$$

(the second inequality is from the reverse triangle inequality)

- take $b = \min\{|y_1|, \dots, |y_M|, |y|/2\}$, we have $|y_n| \geq b$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

we then show that $\left(\frac{1}{y_n}\right)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{y_n} = \frac{1}{y}$: note that

$$0 \leq \left| \frac{1}{y_n} - \frac{1}{y} \right| = \left| \frac{y_n - y}{y_n y} \right| = \frac{|y_n - y|}{|y_n||y|} \leq \frac{|y_n - y|}{b|y|},$$

and $y_n \rightarrow y \implies \frac{|y_n - y|}{b|y|} \rightarrow 0$, hence, $\left| \frac{1}{y_n} - \frac{1}{y} \right| \rightarrow 0$, i.e., $\frac{1}{y_n} \rightarrow \frac{1}{y}$

put together, $x_n \rightarrow x$ and $\frac{1}{y_n} \rightarrow \frac{1}{y} \implies \frac{x_n}{y_n} \rightarrow \frac{x}{y}$

Theorem 3.25 If $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a convergent sequence with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$, and $x_n \geq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then the sequence $(\sqrt{x_n})_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is convergent and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{x_n} = \sqrt{x}$.

proof:

- suppose $x = 0$, let $\epsilon > 0$, we have $x_n \rightarrow 0 \implies \exists M \in \mathbb{N}$ s.t. $\forall n \geq M$, $|x_n - 0| = |x_n| < \epsilon^2 \implies \forall n \geq M$, $|\sqrt{x_n} - \sqrt{x}| = |\sqrt{x_n}| < \sqrt{\epsilon^2} < \epsilon$
- suppose $x > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq |\sqrt{x_n} - \sqrt{x}| &= \left| \frac{(\sqrt{x_n} - \sqrt{x})(\sqrt{x_n} + \sqrt{x})}{\sqrt{x_n} + \sqrt{x}} \right| \\ &= \frac{|x_n - x|}{\sqrt{x_n} + \sqrt{x}} \leq \frac{|x_n - x|}{\sqrt{x}}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{hence, } x_n \rightarrow x &\implies |x_n - x| \rightarrow 0 \implies \frac{|x_n - x|}{\sqrt{x}} \rightarrow 0 \\ &\implies |\sqrt{x_n} - \sqrt{x}| \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.26 Suppose the sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is convergent and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$. One can prove that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n^k = x^k$$

by induction. Moreover, if $x_n \geq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, one can also prove that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[k]{x_n} = \sqrt[k]{x}.$$

Theorem 3.27 If $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is convergent and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$, then $(|x_n|)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is convergent and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |x_n| = |x|$.

proof: let $\epsilon > 0$; $x_n \rightarrow x \implies \exists M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\forall n \geq M$, $|x_n - x| < \epsilon$; hence, by reverse triangle inequality, for all $n \geq M$, we have

$$||x_n| - |x|| \leq |x_n - x| < \epsilon$$

Some special sequences

Theorem 3.28 If $p > 0$ then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-p} = 0$.

proof: let $\epsilon > 0$, choose $M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $M > (1/\epsilon)^{1/p}$, then for all $n \geq M$, $|n^{-p} - 0| = 1/n^p \leq 1/M^p < \epsilon$

Theorem 3.29 If $p > 0$ then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p^{1/n} = 1$.

proof:

- if $p = 1$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p^{1/n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} 1^{1/n} = 1$
- suppose $p > 1$
 - $p > 1 \implies p^{1/n} > 1^{1/n} = 1 \implies p^{1/n} - 1 > 0$

Sequences

3-27

- according to the Bernoulli's inequality (example 1.8), we have

$$\left(1 + (p^{1/n} - 1)\right)^n \geq 1 + n(p^{1/n} - 1) \implies \frac{p - 1}{n} \geq p^{1/n} - 1 > 0$$

$$- \frac{p-1}{n} \rightarrow 0 \implies p^{1/n} - 1 \rightarrow 0 \implies p^{1/n} \rightarrow 1$$

- if $0 < p < 1 \implies 1/p > 1$, hence, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p^{1/n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(1/p)^{1/n}} = 1/1 = 1$$

Theorem 3.30 The sequence $(n^{1/n})_{n=1}^{\infty}$ satisfies $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{1/n} = 1$.

proof:

- one can simply show that $n^{1/n} \geq 1$ by induction $\implies n^{1/n} - 1 > 0$
- according to the binomial theorem, for all $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$ and $n \in \mathbf{N}$, we have $(x + y)^n = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} x^{n-k} y^k$, where $\binom{n}{k} = \frac{n!}{k!(n-k)!}$
- let $x = 1$, $y = n^{1/n} - 1$, for all $n > 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 n &= (1 + n^{1/n} - 1)^n = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} (n^{1/n} - 1)^k \geq \binom{n}{2} (n^{1/n} - 1)^2 \\
 \implies n &\geq \frac{n!}{2!(n-2)!} (n^{1/n} - 1)^2 = \frac{1}{2} n(n-1) (n^{1/n} - 1)^2 \\
 \implies \sqrt{\frac{2}{n-1}} &\geq n^{1/n} - 1 > 0 \\
 \implies n^{1/n} - 1 &\rightarrow 0 \implies n^{1/n} \rightarrow 1
 \end{aligned}$$

Limit superior and limit inferior

Definition 3.31 Let $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a bounded sequence. Define, if the limits exist, the **limit superior** and **limit inferior** respectively, as

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sup\{x_k \mid k \geq n\})$$

and

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\inf\{x_k \mid k \geq n\}).$$

Theorem 3.32 Let $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a bounded sequence; let

$$a_n = \sup\{x_k \mid k \geq n\} \quad \text{and} \quad b_n = \inf\{x_k \mid k \geq n\}.$$

Then:

- The sequence $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is monotone decreasing and bounded.
 - The sequence $(b_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is monotone increasing and bounded.
 - We have $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n$.
-

proof:

- we first prove the following lemma:

Lemma 3.33 Let $A, B \subseteq \mathbf{R}$, $A, B \neq \emptyset$, and A, B are bounded. If $A \subseteq B$ then we have $\inf B \leq \inf A \leq \sup A \leq \sup B$.

$$- A \subseteq B \implies \sup B \text{ is an upper bound of } A \implies \sup A \leq \sup B$$

Sequences

3-31

$$\begin{aligned} - & \text{ similarly, } \inf B \text{ is an lower bound of } A \implies \inf B \leq \inf A \\ - & A, B \neq \emptyset \implies \inf A \leq \sup A \implies \inf B \leq \inf A \leq \sup A \leq \sup B \end{aligned}$$

- we now show the first two statements in the theorem
 - $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded \implies there exists some $B \geq 0$ such that $-B \leq x_n \leq B$
 - we have $\forall n \in \mathbf{N}$, $\{x_k \mid k \geq n+1\} \subseteq \{x_k \mid k \geq n\} \subseteq \{x_n \mid n \in \mathbf{N}\}$, according to lemma 3.33, this implies that

$$-B \leq b_n \leq b_{n+1} \leq a_{n+1} \leq a_n \leq B,$$

i.e., $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded monotone decreasing and $(b_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded monotone increasing ($\implies (a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $(b_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converge)

- according to the previous inequalities, we have $b_n \leq a_n$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$
 $\implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$ (theorem 3.23), *i.e.*, $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n$

Sequences

3-32

Example 3.34 We have the following:

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (-1)^n = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (-1)^n = -1.$$

proof: we have $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$, the set $\{(-1)^k \mid k \geq n\} = \{-1, 1\} \implies \sup\{(-1)^k \mid k \geq n\} = 1$ and $\inf\{(-1)^k \mid k \geq n\} = -1 \implies \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (-1)^n = 1$ and $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (-1)^n = -1$

Example 3.35 We have $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} = 0$.

proof: $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\sup\{1/k \mid k \geq n\} = 1/n$ and $\inf\{1/k \mid k \geq n\} = 0$, hence,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 = 0$$

Bolzano-Weierstrass theorem

Theorem 3.36 Let $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a bounded sequence. Then, there exists subsequences $(x_{n_i})_{i=1}^{\infty}$ and $(x_{m_i})_{i=1}^{\infty}$ such that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} x_{n_i} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} x_{m_i} = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n.$$

proof: let $a_n = \sup\{x_k \mid k \geq n\}$

- $a_1 = \sup\{x_k \mid k \geq 1\} \implies \exists n_1 \geq 1$ such that $a_1 - 1 < x_{n_1} \leq a_1$
- $a_{n_1+1} = \sup\{x_k \mid k \geq n_1 + 1\} \implies \exists n_2 > n_1$ such that $a_{n_1+1} - \frac{1}{2} < x_{n_2} \leq a_{n_1+1}$
- $a_{n_2+1} = \sup\{x_k \mid k \geq n_2 + 1\} \implies \exists n_3 > n_1$ such that $a_{n_2+1} - \frac{1}{3} < x_{n_3} \leq a_{n_2+1}$

- repeatedly, we can find a sequence of integers $n_1 < n_2 < \dots$ such that

$$a_{n_{i-1}+1} - \frac{1}{i} < x_{n_i} \leq a_{n_{i-1}+1}$$

(defining $n_0 = 0$)

- $(a_{n_{i-1}+1})_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is a subsequence of $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$, and
 $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n \implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_{i-1}+1} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n$
 $\implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_{n_i} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n$
- similarly, we can find a subsequence of $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ that converges to $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n$

Theorem 3.37 Bolzano-Weierstrass. Every bounded sequence consisting of real numbers has a convergent subsequence.

Theorem 3.38 Let $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a bounded sequence. Then, $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges if and only if $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n$.

proof:

- suppose $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$, then the subsequences that converge to $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n$ and $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n$ must converge to x (theorem 3.18)
- suppose $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, according to the squeeze theorem,

$$\inf\{x_k \mid k \geq n\} \leq x_n \leq \sup\{x_k \mid k \geq n\} \implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$$

Cauchy sequences

Definition 3.39 A sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is **Cauchy** if for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an $M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that for all $n, k \geq M$, we have $|x_n - x_k| < \epsilon$.

Remark 3.40 A sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is not Cauchy if there exists some $\epsilon > 0$, such that for all $M \in \mathbf{N}$, there exists some $n, k \geq M$, so that we have $|x_n - x_k| \geq \epsilon$.

Example 3.41 The sequence $(\frac{1}{n})_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is Cauchy.

proof: let $\epsilon > 0$, choose $M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $M > 2/\epsilon$, then for all $n, k \geq M$, we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{k} \right| \leq \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{k} \leq \frac{2}{M} < \epsilon$$

Example 3.42 The sequence $((-1)^n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is not Cauchy.

proof: let $\epsilon = 1$, $M \in \mathbf{N}$, $n = M$, $k = M + 1$, then

$$\left| (-1)^n - (-1)^k \right| = 2 \geq \epsilon$$

Theorem 3.43 If the sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is Cauchy, then it is bounded.

proof:

- let $\epsilon = 1$, $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is Cauchy $\implies \exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall n, k \geq M$, $|x_n - x_k| < 1$
- let $k = M \implies \forall n \geq M$, $|x_n - x_M| < 1 \implies \forall n \geq M$, we have $|x_n| < |x_M| + 1$
- take $B = \max\{|x_1|, |x_2|, \dots, |x_M|, |x_M| + 1\}$, then $|x_n| \leq B$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$

Theorem 3.44 If the sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is Cauchy and a subsequence $(x_{n_i})_{i=1}^{\infty}$ converges, then $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges.

proof: let $\epsilon > 0$

- $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is Cauchy $\implies \exists M_1 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall n, k \geq M_1$,
 $|x_n - x_k| < \epsilon/2$
- let $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} x_{n_i} = x \implies \exists M_2 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall i \geq M_2$, $|x_{n_i} - x| < \epsilon/2$
- let $M = \max\{M_1, M_2\}$, then $\forall k \geq M$, $n_k \geq k \geq M_1$, $n_k \geq k \geq M_2$,
hence,

$$|x_k - x| \leq |x_k - x_{n_k}| + |x_{n_k} - x| < \epsilon/2 + \epsilon/2 = \epsilon$$

Theorem 3.45 *Completeness of the real numbers.* A sequence of real numbers $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is Cauchy if and only if the sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is convergent.

proof:

- suppose $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is Cauchy $\implies (x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded (theorem 3.43)
 \implies by theorem 3.37 there exists convergent subsequence of $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$
 $\implies (x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is convergent (theorem 3.44)
- suppose $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$, let $\epsilon > 0$, then $\exists M \in \mathbf{N}$, $\forall n \geq M$, we have
 $|x_n - x| < \epsilon/2$; let $k \geq M$, then

$$|x_n - x_k| \leq |x_n - x| + |x - x_k| < \epsilon/2 + \epsilon/2 = \epsilon$$

Remark 3.46 We say a set is **Cauchy-complete**, or just **complete**, if all Cauchy sequence of elements in the set converges to some point in the set. Theorem 3.45 indicates that \mathbf{R} is complete.

Remark 3.47 The set \mathbf{Q} is *not* complete. Since \mathbf{Q} does not have the least upper bound property, then, *e.g.*, $\sup\{x_n \mid n \in \mathbf{N}\}$, $\sup\{x_k \mid k \geq n\}$, *etc.*, might not exist in \mathbf{Q} .

4. Series

- series
- Cauchy series
- linearity of series
- absolute convergence
- comparison, ratio, and root tests
- alternating series
- rearrangements

4-1

Series

Definition 4.1 Given a sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$, the formal object $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ is called a **series**.

A series **converges** if the sequence $(s_m)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ defined by

$$s_m = \sum_{n=1}^m x_n = x_1 + \cdots + x_m$$

converges. The numbers s_m are called **partial sums**. If the series converges, we write

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} s_m.$$

In this case, we treat $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ as a number.

If the sequence $(s_m)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ diverges, we say the series is **divergent**. In this case, $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ is simply a formal object and not a number.

Remark 4.2 Series need not start at $n = 1$.

Example 4.3 The series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n(n+1)}$ converges.

proof: the sequence of partial sums $(s_m)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} s_m &= \sum_{n=1}^m \frac{1}{n(n+1)} \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^m \frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{n+1} \\ &= 1 - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{4} + \cdots + \frac{1}{m} - \frac{1}{m+1} \\ &= 1 - \frac{1}{m+1}, \end{aligned}$$

hence, $s_m \rightarrow 1 \implies \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n(n+1)}$ converges and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n(n+1)} = 1$

Theorem 4.4 If $|r| < 1$, then $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r^n$ converges and $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r^n = \frac{1}{1-r}$.

proof:

- the sequence of partial sums $(s_m)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is given by:

$$s_m = \sum_{n=0}^m r^n = \frac{(\sum_{n=0}^m r^n)(1-r)}{1-r} = \frac{\sum_{n=0}^m (r^n - r^{n+1})}{1-r} = \frac{1 - r^{m+1}}{1-r}$$

- $|r| < 1 \implies r^n \rightarrow 0$ (theorem 3.16) $\implies s_m \rightarrow \frac{1}{1-r}$

Remark 4.5 Series of the form $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha r^n$ with $\alpha, r \in \mathbf{R}$ are called **geometric series**.

Theorem 4.6 Let $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence and let $M \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ converges if and only if $\sum_{n=M}^{\infty} x_n$ converges.

proof:

- for all $m \geq M$, we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^m x_n = \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} x_n + \sum_{n=M}^m x_n$$

- suppose $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ converges, we have

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=M}^m x_n = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{n=1}^m x_n - \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} x_n \right) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{n=1}^m x_n \right) - \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} x_n$$

- suppose $\sum_{n=M}^{\infty} x_n$ converges, we have

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^m x_n = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{n=M}^m x_n + \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} x_n \right) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{n=M}^m x_n \right) + \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} x_n$$

Cauchy series

Definition 4.7 The series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ is **Cauchy** if the sequence of partial sums $(s_m)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is Cauchy.

Theorem 4.8 The series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ is Cauchy if and only if $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ is convergent.

proof: according to theorem 3.45

- suppose $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ is Cauchy $\implies (s_m)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is Cauchy $\implies (s_m)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is convergent $\implies \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ is convergent
- suppose $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ is convergent $\implies (s_m)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is convergent $\implies (s_m)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is Cauchy $\implies \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ is Cauchy

Theorem 4.9 The series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ is Cauchy if and only if for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an $M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that for all $m \geq M$ and $k > m$, we have $\left| \sum_{n=m+1}^k x_n \right| < \epsilon$.

proof: let $\epsilon > 0$

- suppose $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ is Cauchy $\implies (\sum_{n=1}^m x_n)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is Cauchy $\implies \exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall m, k \geq M$ (assume $k > m$), we have

$$\left| \sum_{n=1}^m x_n - \sum_{n=1}^k x_n \right| < \epsilon \implies \left| \sum_{n=m+1}^k x_n \right| < \epsilon$$

- suppose $\exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that for all $k > m \geq M$, $\left| \sum_{n=m+1}^k x_n \right| < \epsilon$, then we have

$$\left| \sum_{n=1}^m x_n - \sum_{n=1}^k x_n \right| = \left| \sum_{n=m+1}^k x_n \right| < \epsilon,$$

i.e., $(\sum_{n=1}^m x_n)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is Cauchy $\implies \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ is Cauchy

Theorem 4.10 If the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ converges then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = 0$.

proof: let $\epsilon > 0$

- $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ converges $\implies \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ is Cauchy $\implies \exists M_0 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall k > m \geq M_0$, we have $\left| \sum_{n=m+1}^k x_n \right| < \epsilon$ (theorem 4.9)
- choose $M = M_0 + 1$, then $\forall m \geq M$, by taking $k = m > m - 1 \geq M_0$, we have

$$|x_m - 0| = |x_m| = \left| \sum_{n=m-1+1}^m x_n \right| < \epsilon \implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = 0$$

Remark 4.11 The converse of theorem 4.10 does not hold.

Theorem 4.12 If $|r| \geq 1$ then the series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r^n$ diverges.

proof: $|r| \geq 1 \implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r^n \neq 0$, by theorem 4.10, $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r^n$ diverges

Corollary 4.13 The series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha r^n$ with $\alpha, r \in \mathbf{R}$ converges if and only if $|r| < 1$.

Theorem 4.14 The **harmonic series** $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n}$ does not converge.

proof: we show that a subsequence of $(s_m)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is unbounded

- consider the subsequence $(s_{2^i})_{i=1}^{\infty}$, given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 s_{2^i} &= \sum_{n=1}^{2^i} \frac{1}{n} = 1 + \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{4}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{5} + \cdots + \frac{1}{8}\right) + \cdots + \left(\frac{1}{2^{i-1}+1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{2^i}\right) \\
 &= 1 + \sum_{k=1}^i \sum_{n=2^{k-1}+1}^{2^k} \frac{1}{n} \\
 &\geq 1 + \sum_{k=1}^i \sum_{n=2^{k-1}+1}^{2^k} \frac{1}{2^k} = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^i \frac{1}{2^k} (2^k - (2^{k-1} + 1) + 1) \\
 &= 1 + \sum_{k=1}^i \frac{2^{k-1}}{2^k} = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^i \frac{1}{2} = 1 + \frac{i}{2}
 \end{aligned}$$

- $(1 + i/2)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is unbounded $\implies (s_{2^i})_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is unbounded $\implies (s_m)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is unbounded $\implies \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n}$ does not converge

Linearity of series

Theorem 4.15 Let $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}$ and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} y_n$ be convergent series. Then the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\alpha x_n + y_n)$ converges and

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\alpha x_n + y_n) = \alpha \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} y_n.$$

proof: consider the partial sums of $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\alpha x_n + y_n)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^m (\alpha x_n + y_n) &= \alpha \sum_{n=1}^m x_n + \sum_{n=1}^m y_n \\ \Rightarrow \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^m (\alpha x_n + y_n) &= \alpha \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^m x_n + \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^m y_n \\ \Rightarrow \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\alpha x_n + y_n) &= \alpha \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} y_n \end{aligned}$$

Absolute convergence

Theorem 4.16 If $x_n \geq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, then the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ converges if and only if the sequence of partial sums $(s_m)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded.

proof:

- suppose $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ converges $\Rightarrow (s_m)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ converges $\Rightarrow (s_m)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded
- suppose $(s_m)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded, since $x_n \geq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, we have

$$s_m = \sum_{n=1}^m x_n \leq \sum_{n=1}^m x_n + x_{m+1} = s_{m+1},$$

i.e., $(s_m)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is monotone increasing $\Rightarrow (s_m)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ converges $\Rightarrow \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ converges

Definition 4.17 The series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ **converges absolutely** if $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n|$ converges.

Theorem 4.18 If the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ converges absolutely then $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ converges.

proof:

- we first prove the following claim by induction:

Lemma 4.19 For all $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbf{R}$, we have $|\sum_{i=1}^n x_i| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|$.

- suppose $n = 2$, we have the triangle inequality $|x_1 + x_2| \leq |x_1| + |x_2|$
- suppose $n > 2$, and $|\sum_{i=1}^n x_i| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|$ holds, we have

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} x_i \right| \leq \left| \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right| + |x_{n+1}| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i| + |x_{n+1}| = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} |x_i|$$

- $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ converges absolutely $\implies \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n|$ converges \implies let $\epsilon > 0$, $\exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ s.t. $\forall k > m \geq M$, $|\sum_{n=m+1}^k x_n| = \sum_{n=m+1}^k |x_n| < \epsilon$
- hence, for all $k > m \geq M$, we have $|\sum_{n=m+1}^k x_n| \leq \sum_{n=m+1}^k |x_n| < \epsilon$
 $\implies \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ converges

Remark 4.20 The converse of theorem 4.18 does not hold.

Comparison test

Theorem 4.21 *Comparison test.* Suppose $0 \leq x_n \leq y_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

- If $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} y_n$ converges then $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ converges.
- If $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ diverges then $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} y_n$ diverges.

proof:

- suppose $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} y_n$ converges $\implies (\sum_{n=1}^m y_n)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded $\implies \exists B \geq 0$ s.t. $\forall m \in \mathbb{N}$, $|\sum_{n=1}^m y_n| = \sum_{n=1}^m y_n \leq B \implies \forall m \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$0 \leq \sum_{n=1}^m x_n \leq \sum_{n=1}^m y_n \leq B$$

$\implies (\sum_{n=1}^m x_n)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded \implies by theorem 4.16, the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ converges

Series

4-15

- suppose $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ diverges \implies by theorem 4.16, $(\sum_{n=1}^m x_n)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is unbounded $\implies \forall B \geq 0$, $\exists m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\left| \sum_{n=1}^m x_n \right| = \sum_{n=1}^m x_n > B,$$

hence, for this m ,

$$\sum_{n=1}^m y_n \geq \sum_{n=1}^m x_n > B$$

$\implies (\sum_{n=1}^m y_n)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is unbounded $\implies \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} y_n$ diverges

Series

4-16

Theorem 4.22 The series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^p}$ converges if and only if $p > 1$.

proof:

- suppose $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^p}$ converges, assume $p \leq 1$, then we have $0 < \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{n^p}$; the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n}$ diverges $\implies \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^p}$ diverges (theorem 4.21), which is a contradiction
- suppose $p > 1$, let $s_m = \sum_{n=1}^m \frac{1}{n^p}$
 - we first show that $s_m \leq s_{2^m}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$: by induction, we have $2^m > m$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N} \implies s_m = \sum_{n=1}^m \frac{1}{n^p} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{2^m} \frac{1}{n^p} = s_{2^m}$
 - we now show that s_{2^m} is bounded by $1 + \frac{1}{1-2^{-(p-1)}}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 s_{2^m} &= \sum_{n=1}^{2^m} \frac{1}{n^p} \\
 &= 1 + \left(\frac{1}{2^p}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{3^p} + \frac{1}{4^p}\right) + \cdots + \left(\frac{1}{(2^{m-1}+1)^p} + \cdots + \frac{1}{(2^m)^p}\right) \\
 &= 1 + \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{n=2^{k-1}+1}^{2^k} \frac{1}{n^p} \leq 1 + \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{n=2^{k-1}+1}^{2^k} \frac{1}{(2^{k-1}+1)^p}
 \end{aligned}$$

Series

4-17

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\leq 1 + \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{n=2^{k-1}+1}^{2^k} \frac{1}{(2^{k-1})^p} = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^m 2^{-p(k-1)} (2^k - (2^{k-1} + 1) + 1) \\
 &= 1 + \sum_{k=1}^m 2^{-(p-1)(k-1)} = 1 + \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} 2^{-(p-1)k} \\
 &\leq 1 + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-(p-1)k} = 1 + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(2^{-(p-1)}\right)^k \\
 &= 1 + \frac{1}{1 - 2^{-(p-1)}},
 \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is from the fact that $p - 1 > 0$, and using the properties of geometric series (theorem 4.4)

- put together, we have $0 < s_m \leq s_{2^m} \leq 1 + \frac{1}{1-2^{-(p-1)}} \implies (s_m)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is monotone increasing and bounded $\implies (s_m)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ converges $\implies \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^p}$ converges

Ratio test

Theorem 4.23 *Ratio test.* Suppose $x_n \neq 0$ for all n and the limit

$$L = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|x_{n+1}|}{|x_n|}$$

exists.

- If $L > 1$ then $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ diverges.
- If $L < 1$ then $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ converges absolutely.

proof:

- suppose $L > 1$, then $\exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall n \geq M, \frac{|x_{n+1}|}{|x_n|} \geq 1 \implies \forall n \geq M, |x_{n+1}| \geq |x_n| \implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n \neq 0 \implies \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ diverges (theorem 4.10)

Series

4-19

- suppose $L < 1$, let $L < \alpha < 1$
 - $\exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ s.t. $\forall n \geq M, \frac{|x_{n+1}|}{|x_n|} \leq \alpha \implies \forall n \geq M, |x_{n+1}| \leq \alpha |x_n|$
 $\implies |x_n| \leq \alpha |x_{n-1}| \leq \alpha^2 |x_{n-2}| \leq \dots \leq \alpha^{n-M} |x_M|$
 $\implies \forall n \geq M, \text{ we have } |x_n| \leq \alpha^{n-M} |x_M|$
 - consider the partial sums of the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n|$, assume $m > M$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^m |x_n| &= \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} |x_n| + \sum_{n=M}^m |x_n| \leq \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} |x_n| + \sum_{n=M}^{\infty} |x_n| \\ &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} |x_n| + \sum_{n=M}^{\infty} \alpha^{n-M} |x_M| = \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} |x_n| + |x_M| \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha^n \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} |x_n| + \frac{|x_M|}{1 - \alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is from the properties of geometric series and $0 < \alpha < 1$

- hence, the sequence of partial sums $(\sum_{n=1}^m |x_n|)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is monotone increasing and bounded $\implies \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n|$ converges $\implies \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ converges absolutely

Series

4-20

Remark 4.24 If $L = 1$ in theorem 4.23 then the test doesn't apply. For example, $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n}$ diverges, and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2}$ converges.

Example 4.25 The series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{n^2+1}$ converges absolutely.

proof:

$$\left| \frac{(-1)^n}{n^2+1} \right| = \frac{1}{n^2+1} < \frac{1}{n^2} \implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\left| \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{(n+1)^2+1} \right|}{\left| \frac{(-1)^n}{n^2+1} \right|} < \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n^2}{(n+1)^2} = 1$$

Example 4.26 The series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^n}{n!}$ converges absolutely for all $x \in \mathbf{R}$.

proof:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\left| \frac{x^{n+1}}{(n+1)!} \right|}{\left| \frac{x^n}{n!} \right|} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|x|}{n+1} = 0 < 1$$

Root test

Theorem 4.27 *Root test.* Let $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ be a series and suppose that the limit

$$L = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |x_n|^{1/n}$$

exists.

- If $L > 1$ then $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ diverges.
- If $L < 1$ then $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ converges absolutely.

proof:

- suppose $L > 1$, then $\exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ s.t. $\forall n \geq M, |x_n|^{1/n} \geq 1 \implies \forall n \geq M, |x_n| \geq 1 \implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n \neq 0 \implies \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ diverges (theorem 4.10)
- suppose $L < 1$, let $L < \alpha < 1$
 - $\exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall n \geq M, |x_n|^{1/n} \leq \alpha \implies \forall n \geq M, |x_n| \leq \alpha^n$

Series

4-23

- consider the partial sums of the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n|$, assume $m > M$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^m |x_n| &= \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} |x_n| + \sum_{n=M}^m |x_n| \leq \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} |x_n| + \sum_{n=M}^{\infty} |x_n| \\ &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} |x_n| + \sum_{n=M}^{\infty} \alpha^n = \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} |x_n| + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha^{M+n} \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} |x_n| + \alpha^M \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha^n \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} |x_n| + \frac{\alpha^M}{1 - \alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is from the properties of geometric series and $0 < \alpha < 1$

- hence, the sequence of partial sums $(\sum_{n=1}^m |x_n|)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is monotone increasing and bounded $\implies \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n|$ converges $\implies \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ converges absolutely

Series

4-24

Remark 4.28 Similarly, if $L = 1$ in theorem 4.27 then the test doesn't apply.

Alternating series

Theorem 4.29 Let $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a monotone decreasing sequence with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = 0$. Then the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^n x_n$ converges.

proof: consider the partial sums $s_m = \sum_{n=1}^m (-1)^n x_n$

- $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is monotone decreasing and $x_n \rightarrow 0 \implies \forall n \in \mathbf{N}$, we have

$$x_n \geq x_{n+1} \geq 0$$

- we first show that the subsequence $(s_{2m})_{m=1}^{\infty}$ converges, notice that

$$s_{2m} = \sum_{n=1}^{2m} (-1)^n x_n = -x_1 + x_2 - x_3 + \cdots - x_{2m-1} + x_{2m} \quad (4.1)$$

– rearranging the terms in (4.1), since $x_{n+1} \leq x_n, \forall n \in \mathbf{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} s_{2m} &= (x_2 - x_1) + (x_4 - x_3) + \cdots + (x_{2m} - x_{2m-1}) \\ &\geq (x_2 - x_1) + (x_3 - x_2) + \cdots \\ &\quad + (x_{2m} - x_{2m-1}) + (x_{2m+2} - x_{2m+1}) \\ &= s_{2(m+1)} \end{aligned}$$

$\implies (s_{2m})_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is monotone decreasing

– rearranging the terms in (4.1) differently, since $x_n \geq x_{n+1} \geq 0, \forall n \in \mathbf{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} s_{2m} &= -x_1 + (x_2 - x_3) + (x_4 - x_5) + \cdots \\ &\quad + (x_{2m-2} - x_{2m-1}) + x_{2m} \geq -x_1 \end{aligned}$$

$\implies (s_{2m})_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded below

– put together, we conclude that $(s_{2m})_{m=1}^{\infty}$ converges, let $s_{2m} \rightarrow x$

• we now show that $(s_m)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ also converges to x , let $\epsilon > 0$

– $s_{2m} \rightarrow x \implies \exists M_1 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall m \geq M_1, |s_{2m} - x| < \epsilon/2$

– $x_n \rightarrow 0 \implies \exists M_2 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall m \geq M_2, |x_m| < \epsilon/2$

let $M = \max\{2M_1 + 1, M_2\}$, then $\forall m \geq M, m \geq 2M_1 + 1, m \geq M_2$

– if m is even $\implies \frac{m}{2} \geq M_1$, hence

$$|s_m - x| = \left| s_{2 \cdot \frac{m}{2}} - x \right| < \epsilon/2 < \epsilon$$

– if m is odd, then $m - 1$ is even and $m - 1 \geq 2M_1 \implies \frac{m-1}{2} \geq M_1$, hence

$$\begin{aligned} |s_m - x| &= |s_{m-1} - x + x_m| = \left| s_{2 \cdot \frac{m-1}{2}} - x + x_m \right| \\ &\leq \left| s_{2 \cdot \frac{m-1}{2}} - x \right| + |x_m| < \epsilon/2 + \epsilon/2 = \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

put together, $(s_m)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ converges $\implies \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^n x_n$ converges

Corollary 4.30 The series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{n}$ converges but does not converge absolutely.

proof:

- since $\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is monotone decreasing with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} = 0$, it follows immediately from theorem 4.29 that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{n}$ converges
- since $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left| \frac{(-1)^n}{n} \right| = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n}$, and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n}$ diverges, we conclude that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{n}$ does not converge absolutely

Rearrangements

Theorem 4.31 Suppose $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ converges absolutely and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n = x$. Let $\sigma: \mathbf{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ be a bijective function. Then, the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_{\sigma(n)}$ is absolutely convergent and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_{\sigma(n)} = x$. In other words, absolute convergence implies, if we rearrange the sequence, the new series will still converge to the same value of the original series.

proof:

- we first show $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_{\sigma(n)}|$ converges, i.e., $\left(\sum_{n=1}^m |x_{\sigma(n)}|\right)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded
 - $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n|$ converges $\implies \left(\sum_{n=1}^m |x_n|\right)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded $\implies \exists B \geq 0$ such that $\forall m \in \mathbf{N}, \sum_{n=1}^m |x_n| \leq B$
 - $\forall m \in \mathbf{N}, \{1, \dots, m\}$ is a finite set $\implies \exists k \in \mathbf{N}$ such that

$$\sigma(\{1, \dots, m\}) \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\},$$

hence,

$$\sum_{n=1}^m |x_{\sigma(n)}| = \sum_{n \in \sigma(\{1, \dots, m\})} |x_n| \leq \sum_{n=1}^k |x_n| \leq B$$

$$\implies \forall m \in \mathbf{N}, \sum_{n=1}^m |x_{\sigma(n)}| \text{ is bounded}$$

- we now show that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_{\sigma(n)} = x$, let $\epsilon > 0$
 - $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n = x \implies \exists M_0 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that for all $k > m \geq M_0$, we have

$$\left| \sum_{n=1}^m x_n - x \right| < \epsilon/2 \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \sum_{n=m+1}^k x_n \right| < \epsilon/2$$

- the set $\{1, \dots, M_0\}$ is finite $\implies \exists M \in \mathbf{N}, M > M_0$ such that

$$\{1, \dots, M_0\} \subseteq \sigma(\{1, \dots, M\}),$$

hence, for all $m \geq M$, let $p = \max(\sigma(\{1, \dots, m\})) > M_0$, we have

$$\sigma(\{1, \dots, m\}) = \{1, \dots, M_0\} \cup \{M_0 + 1, \dots, p\}$$

- consider the partial sums of $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_{\sigma(n)}$, for all $m \geq M$, we have

$$\left| \sum_{n=1}^m x_{\sigma(n)} - x \right| = \left| \sum_{n \in \sigma(\{1, \dots, m\})} x_n - x \right| = \left| \sum_{n=1}^{M_0} x_n - x + \sum_{n=M_0+1}^p x_n \right|$$

$$\leq \left| \sum_{n=1}^{M_0} x_n - x \right| + \left| \sum_{n=M_0+1}^p x_n \right| < \epsilon/2 + \epsilon/2 = \epsilon$$

$$\implies \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^m x_{\sigma(n)} = x \implies \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_{\sigma(n)} = x$$

5. Continuous functions

- cluster points of sets
- limits of functions and sequential properties
- left and right limits
- continuous functions
- operations that preserves continuity
- extreme value theorem
- intermediate value theorem
- uniform and Lipschitz continuity

5-1

Cluster points of sets

Definition 5.1 Let $S \subseteq \mathbf{R}$. We say that the point $c \in \mathbf{R}$ is a **cluster point** of S if for all $\delta > 0$, we have $(c - \delta, c + \delta) \cap S \setminus \{c\} \neq \emptyset$, i.e., for all $\delta > 0$, there exists some $x \in S$, such that $0 < |x - c| < \delta$.

examples:

- $S = \{1/n \mid n \in \mathbf{N}\}$ has a cluster point $c = 0$
- $S = (0, 1)$ has a set of cluster points given by $[0, 1]$
- $S = \mathbf{Q}$ has a set of cluster points given by \mathbf{R}
- $S = \{0\}$ has no cluster points
- $S = \mathbf{Z}$ has no cluster points

Theorem 5.2 Let $S \subseteq \mathbf{R}$. Then $c \in \mathbf{R}$ is a cluster point of S if and only if there exists a sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of elements in $S \setminus \{c\}$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = c$.

proof:

- suppose c is a cluster point of S , then $\forall \delta > 0$, $\exists x \in S$ such that $0 < |x - c| < \delta$
 - $\forall n \in \mathbf{N}$, choose $x_n \in S$ such that $0 < |x_n - c| < \frac{1}{n}$
 - $\frac{1}{n} \rightarrow 0 \implies |x_n - c| \rightarrow 0 \implies x_n \rightarrow c$
- suppose there exists a sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ with $x_n \in S \setminus \{c\}$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $x_n \rightarrow c$, let $\delta > 0$
 - $x_n \rightarrow c$ with $x_n \in S \setminus \{c\} \implies \exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall n \geq M$, $0 < |x_n - c| < \delta$
 - choose $x = x_M$, then we have $0 < |x - c| < \delta \implies S$ has cluster point c

Limits of functions

Definition 5.3 Let $f: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function and c be a cluster point of $S \subseteq \mathbf{R}$. Suppose there exists an $L \in \mathbf{R}$, and for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists some $\delta > 0$ such that for all $x \in S$ and $0 < |x - c| < \delta$, we have $|f(x) - L| < \epsilon$. We then say $f(x)$ **converges** to L as x goes to c , and we write

$$f(x) \rightarrow L \quad \text{as} \quad x \rightarrow c.$$

We say L is a **limit** of $f(x)$ as x goes to c , and if L is unique, we write

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x) = L.$$

Remark 5.4 The function $f: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ does not converge to $L \in \mathbf{R}$ as x goes to a cluster point c of S implies that there exists some $\epsilon > 0$, such that for all $\delta > 0$, there exists some $x \in S$ and $0 < |x - c| < \delta$, so that $|f(x) - L| \geq \epsilon$.

Theorem 5.5 Let $f: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function and c be a cluster point of $S \subseteq \mathbf{R}$. If $f(x) \rightarrow L_1$ and $f(x) \rightarrow L_2$ as $x \rightarrow c$, then $L_1 = L_2$.

proof: let $\epsilon > 0$

- $f(x) \rightarrow L_1$ as $x \rightarrow c \implies \exists \delta_1 > 0$ such that for all $x \in S$ and $0 < |x - c| < \delta_1$, $|f(x) - L_1| < \epsilon/2$
- $f(x) \rightarrow L_2$ as $x \rightarrow c \implies \exists \delta_2 > 0$ such that for all $x \in S$ and $0 < |x - c| < \delta_2$, $|f(x) - L_2| < \epsilon/2$
- choose $\delta = \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$, then for all $x \in S$ and $0 < |x - c| < \delta$, we have

$$|L_1 - L_2| = |L_1 - f(x) + f(x) - L_2| \leq |f(x) - L_1| + |f(x) - L_2| < \epsilon/2 + \epsilon/2 = \epsilon$$

$$\implies L_1 = L_2$$

Example 5.6 Let the function $f(x) = ax + b$. Then, for all $c \in \mathbf{R}$, we have $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x) = ac + b$.

proof: let $\epsilon > 0$, choose $\delta = \frac{\epsilon}{|a|+1}$, then for all $x \in \mathbf{R}$ and $0 < |x - c| < \delta$, we have

$$|f(x) - (ac + b)| = |(ax + b) - (ac + b)| = |a||x - c| < |a|\delta = \frac{|a|}{|a| + 1}\epsilon \leq \epsilon$$

Example 5.7 Let $f: (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ with $f(x) = \sqrt{x}$. Then, for all $c > 0$, we have $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x) = \sqrt{c}$.

proof: let $\epsilon > 0$, choose $\delta = \epsilon\sqrt{c}$, then for all $x > 0$ and $0 < |x - c| < \delta$, we have

$$|f(x) - \sqrt{c}| = |\sqrt{x} - \sqrt{c}| = \left| \frac{(\sqrt{x} - \sqrt{c})(\sqrt{x} + \sqrt{c})}{\sqrt{x} + \sqrt{c}} \right|$$

$$= \left| \frac{x - c}{\sqrt{x} + \sqrt{c}} \right| \leq \frac{|x - c|}{\sqrt{c}} < \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{c}} < \epsilon$$

Example 5.8 Let $f(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \neq 0 \\ 2 & x = 0 \end{cases}$. Then, $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} f(x) = 1$ ($\neq f(0)$).

proof: let $\epsilon > 0$, choose $\delta = 1$, then $\forall x$ satisfies $0 < |x| < \delta$, we have $x \neq 0 \implies \forall x$ satisfies $0 < |x| < \delta$, we have $|f(x) - 1| = |1 - 1| = 0 < \epsilon$

Theorem 5.9 Let $f: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function and c be a cluster point of $S \subseteq \mathbf{R}$. Then, the following statements are equivalent:

- The function $f(x)$ converges to $L \in \mathbf{R}$ as x goes to c , i.e.,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x) = L.$$

- For all sequences $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in $S \setminus \{c\}$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = c$, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(x_n) = L$.
-

proof:

- suppose $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x) = L$, let $\epsilon > 0$
 - $\exists \delta > 0$, such that for all $x \in S$ and $0 < |x - c| < \delta$, we have $|f(x) - L| < \epsilon$
 - $x_n \rightarrow c, x_n \in S \setminus \{c\} \implies \exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall n \geq M$, $0 < |x_n - c| < \delta \implies \forall n \geq M$, we have $|f(x_n) - L| < \epsilon$, i.e., $f(x_n) \rightarrow L$
- suppose for all sequences in $S \setminus \{c\}$ s.t. $x_n \rightarrow c$, we have $f(x_n) \rightarrow L$
 - assume $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x) \neq L \implies \exists \epsilon > 0$ s.t. $\forall \delta > 0$, there exists some $x \in S$ and $0 < |x - c| < \delta$, so that $|f(x) - L| \geq \epsilon$
 - choose a sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ such that $\forall n \in \mathbf{N}, x_n \in S \setminus \{c\}$, $0 < |x_n - c| < \frac{1}{n}$, and $|f(x_n) - L| \geq \epsilon$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$
 - however, $\frac{1}{n} \rightarrow 0 \implies x_n \rightarrow c \implies f(x_n) \rightarrow L \implies \exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ s.t. $\forall n \geq M, |f(x_n) - L| < \epsilon$, which is a contradiction

Theorem 5.10 For all $c \in \mathbf{R}$, we have $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} x^2 = c^2$.

proof: let $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence in $\mathbf{R} \setminus \{c\}$ such that $x_n \rightarrow c$, then according to theorem 3.24, we have $x_n^2 \rightarrow c^2 \implies \lim_{x \rightarrow c} x^2 = c^2$ (theorem 5.9)

Theorem 5.11 The limit $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \sin(1/x)$ does not exist, but $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} x \sin(1/x) = 0$.

proof:

- we first show that $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} x \sin(1/x) = 0$: let $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence in $\mathbf{R} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $x_n \rightarrow 0$; since $\forall n \in \mathbf{N}$, $0 \leq |x_n \sin(1/x_n)| \leq |x_n|$, and $x_n \rightarrow 0$, we have $|x_n \sin(1/x_n)| \rightarrow 0 \implies \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} x \sin(1/x) = 0$
- we now show that $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \sin(1/x)$ does not exist:
 - choose a sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ where $x_n = \frac{2}{(2n-1)\pi}$, then we have $x_n \rightarrow 0$

Continuous functions

5-9

- consider the sequence $(\sin(1/x_n))_{n=1}^{\infty}$, we have

$$\sin(1/x_n) = \sin\left(\frac{(2n-1)\pi}{2}\right) = (-1)^{n+1}$$

$\implies (\sin(1/x_n))_{n=1}^{\infty}$ does not converge $\implies \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \sin(1/x)$ does not exist

Sequential properties

Theorem 5.12 Let $f, g: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be functions and c be a cluster point of $S \subseteq \mathbf{R}$. Suppose $f(x) \leq g(x)$ for all $x \in S$, and we have $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x)$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} g(x)$ both exist, then $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x) \leq \lim_{x \rightarrow c} g(x)$.

proof: let $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence in $S \setminus \{c\}$ such that $x_n \rightarrow c$

- $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x)$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} g(x)$ exist $\implies (f(x_n))_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $(g(x_n))_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges
- let $f(x_n) \rightarrow L_1$, $g(x_n) \rightarrow L_2$, since $f(x) \leq g(x)$ for all $x \in S$, we have $L_1 \leq L_2$, i.e., $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x) \leq \lim_{x \rightarrow c} g(x)$

similarly, we can prove the following theorems:

Theorem 5.13 Let $f: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function and c be a cluster point of $S \subseteq \mathbf{R}$. Suppose the limit $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x)$ exists, and there exists $a, b \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $a \leq f(x) \leq b$ for all $x \in S \setminus \{c\}$, then $a \leq \lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x) \leq b$.

Theorem 5.14 Let c be a cluster point of $S \subseteq \mathbf{R}$, and $f, g, h: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be functions such that $f(x) \leq g(x) \leq h(x)$ for all $x \in S \setminus \{c\}$. Suppose $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow c} h(x)$, then

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow c} g(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow c} h(x).$$

Theorem 5.15 Let c be a cluster point of $S \subseteq \mathbf{R}$, and $f, g: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be functions such that $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x)$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} g(x)$ both exist, we have:

- $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} (f(x) + g(x)) = \lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x) + \lim_{x \rightarrow c} g(x)$;
- $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} (f(x) \cdot g(x)) = \lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x) \cdot \lim_{x \rightarrow c} g(x)$;
- if $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} g(x) \neq 0$ and $g(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in S \setminus \{c\}$, then

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} = \frac{\lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x)}{\lim_{x \rightarrow c} g(x)}.$$

Theorem 5.16 Let c be a cluster point of $S \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ and $f: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function such that $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x)$ exists, then we have

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow c} |f(x)| = |\lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x)|.$$

Left and right limits

Definition 5.17 Let $S \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ and $f: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function.

Suppose c is a cluster point of $S \cap (-\infty, c)$, we say $f(x)$ converges to L as $x \rightarrow c^-$, if for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that for all $x \in S$ and $c - \delta < x < c$, we have $|f(x) - L| < \epsilon$. We call such a limit the **left limit** of f at c , denoted $\lim_{x \rightarrow c^-} f(x)$.

Suppose c is a cluster point of $S \cap (c, \infty)$, we say $f(x)$ converges to L as $x \rightarrow c^+$, if for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that for all $x \in S$ and $c < x < c + \delta$, we have $|f(x) - L| < \epsilon$. We call such a limit the **right limit** of f at c , denoted $\lim_{x \rightarrow c^+} f(x)$.

Example 5.18 Consider the function f given by

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x > 0 \\ 0 & x < 0, \end{cases}$$

then $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^-} f(x) = 0$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} f(x) = 1$, even if $f(0)$ is undefined.

Continuous functions

Definition 5.19 Let $S \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ and $c \in S$. We say the function f is **continuous** at c if for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that for all $x \in S$ and $|x - c| < \delta$, we have $|f(x) - f(c)| < \epsilon$.

We say the function f is continuous on the set U for $U \subseteq S$ if f is continuous at every point of U .

Remark 5.20 The function f is not continuous at point $c \in S$ if there exists some $\epsilon > 0$ such that for all $\delta > 0$, there exists some $x \in S$ and $|x - c| < \delta$, so that $|f(x) - f(c)| \geq \epsilon$.

Example 5.21 The function $f(x) = ax + b$ is continuous on \mathbf{R} .

proof: let $c \in \mathbf{R}$, $\epsilon > 0$, choose $\delta = \frac{\epsilon}{|a|+1}$, then for all $x \in \mathbf{R}$, $|x - c| < \delta$:

$$|f(x) - f(c)| = |ax + b - ac - b| = |a||x - c| < |a|\delta = \frac{|a|}{|a|+1}\epsilon \leq \epsilon$$

Example 5.22 The function f given by

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \neq 0 \\ 2 & x = 0 \end{cases}$$

is not continuous at $c = 0$.

proof: choose $\epsilon = 1$ and let $\delta > 0$, then $x = \delta/2$ satisfies $|x| < \delta$, but

$$|f(x) - f(0)| = |1 - 2| = 1 \geq \epsilon$$

Theorem 5.23 Let $S \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ be a set, $c \in S$ be a point, and $f: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function.

- If c is not a cluster point of S , then the function f is continuous at c .
 - If c is a cluster point of S , then the function f is continuous at c if and only if $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x) = f(c)$.
 - The function f is continuous at c if and only if for all sequences $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in S with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = c$, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(x_n) = f(c)$.
-

proof: to show the first statement, let $\epsilon > 0$

- $c \in S$ and c is not a cluster point of $S \implies \exists \delta > 0$ such that

$$(c - \delta, c + \delta) \cap S = \{c\}$$

- then for all $x \in S$ such that $|x - c| < \delta$, we have $x = c$, and hence,

$$|f(x) - f(c)| = |f(c) - f(c)| = 0 < \epsilon$$

we now show the second statement:

- suppose f is continuous at c , let $\epsilon > 0$
 - f is continuous at $c \implies \exists \delta > 0$ such that for all $x \in S$ and $|x - c| < \delta$, we have $|f(x) - f(c)| < \epsilon$
 - then $\forall x \in S$ such that $0 < |x - c| < \delta$, $|f(x) - f(c)| < \epsilon \implies \lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x) = f(c)$
- suppose $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x) = f(c)$, let $\epsilon > 0$
 - $f(x) \rightarrow f(c)$ as $x \rightarrow c \implies \exists \delta > 0$ such that for all $x \in S$ and $0 < |x - c| < \delta$, we have $|f(x) - f(c)| < \epsilon$
 - then for all $x \in S$ such that $|x - c| < \delta$: if $x = c$, we have

$$|f(x) - f(c)| = |f(c) - f(c)| = 0 < \epsilon$$

if $x \neq c$, we have $0 < |x - c| < \delta \implies |f(x) - f(c)| < \epsilon$

- put together, we conclude that the function f is continuous at c

we now show the third statement

- suppose f is continuous at c , let $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence in S , $x_n \rightarrow c$, let $\epsilon > 0$
 - f is continuous at $c \implies \exists \delta > 0$ such that for all $x \in S$ and $|x - c| < \delta$, we have $|f(x) - f(c)| < \epsilon$
 - $x_n \rightarrow c \implies \exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall n \geq M, |x_n - c| < \delta \implies \forall n \geq M, |f(x_n) - f(c)| < \epsilon \implies (f(x_n))_{n=1}^{\infty} \rightarrow f(c)$
- suppose for all $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in S such that $x_n \rightarrow c$, we have $f(x_n) \rightarrow f(c)$
 - assume f is not continuous at $c \implies \exists \epsilon > 0, \forall \delta > 0, \exists x \in S$ such that $|x - c| < \delta$, but $|f(x) - f(c)| \geq \epsilon$
 - choose $x_n \in S$ s.t. $\forall n \in \mathbf{N}, 0 \leq |x_n - c| < \frac{1}{n}$ but $|f(x_n) - f(c)| \geq \epsilon$
 - $\frac{1}{n} \rightarrow 0 \implies x_n \rightarrow c \implies f(x_n) \rightarrow f(c) \implies \exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall n \geq M, |f(x_n) - f(c)| < \epsilon$, which is a contradiction

Theorem 5.24 The functions $\sin x$ and $\cos x$ are continuous on \mathbf{R} .

proof:

- recall the following properties of $\sin x$ and $\cos x$ for all $x \in \mathbf{R}$:
 - $\sin^2(x) + \cos^2(x) = 1 \implies |\sin x| \leq 1$ and $|\cos x| \leq 1$
 - $|\sin x| \leq |x|$
 - $\sin(a + b) = \cos(a) \sin(b) + \sin(a) \cos(b)$
 - $\sin(a) - \sin(b) = 2 \sin\left(\frac{a-b}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{a+b}{2}\right)$
- we first show that $\sin x$ is continuous, let $c \in \mathbf{R}$, let $\epsilon > 0$, choose $\delta = \epsilon$, then for all $x \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $|x - c| < \delta$, we have

$$|\sin x - \sin c| = \left| 2 \sin\left(\frac{x-c}{2}\right) \cos\left(\frac{x+c}{2}\right) \right| \leq 2 \left| \sin\left(\frac{x-c}{2}\right) \right| \leq 2 \frac{|x-c|}{2} = |x-c| < \epsilon$$
- we now show that $\cos x$ is continuous, let $c \in \mathbf{R}$, let $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence with $x_n \rightarrow c$, then we have $x_n + \frac{\pi}{2} \rightarrow c + \frac{\pi}{2}$, and hence,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \cos x_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sin\left(x_n + \frac{\pi}{2}\right) = \sin\left(c + \frac{\pi}{2}\right) = \cos c$$

Theorem 5.25 *Dirichlet function.* The Dirichlet function given by

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \in \mathbf{Q} \\ 0 & x \notin \mathbf{Q} \end{cases}$$

is not continuous on all of \mathbf{R} .

proof: let $c \in \mathbf{R}$

- if $c \in \mathbf{Q}$, then for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, there exists $x_n \notin \mathbf{Q}$ s.t. $c < x_n < c + \frac{1}{n}$;
 $\frac{1}{n} \rightarrow 0 \implies x_n \rightarrow c$, however,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(x_n) = 0 \neq f(c) = 1$$

$\implies (f(x_n))_{n=1}^{\infty}$ does not converge to $f(c)$

Continuous functions

5-21

- if $c \notin \mathbf{Q}$, then for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, there exists $x_n \in \mathbf{Q}$ s.t. $c < x_n < c + \frac{1}{n}$;
 $\frac{1}{n} \rightarrow 0 \implies x_n \rightarrow c$, however,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(x_n) = 1 \neq f(c) = 0$$

$\implies (f(x_n))_{n=1}^{\infty}$ does not converge to $f(c)$

Operations that preserves continuity

Theorem 5.26 Let $f, g: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be functions on $S \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ and are continuous at $c \in S$.

- The function $f + g$ is continuous at c .
 - The function $f \cdot g$ is continuous at c .
 - If $g(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in S$, then the function f/g is continuous at c .
-

proof: we show that the function $f + g$ is continuous at c , the other two statements can be proved similarly; let $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence in S with $x_n \rightarrow c$

- f is continuous at $c \implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(x_n) = f(c)$
- g is continuous at $c \implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(x_n) = g(c)$
- hence, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (f(x_n) + g(x_n)) = f(c) + g(c) \implies f + g$ is continuous at c

Theorem 5.27 Let $f: B \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ and $g: A \rightarrow B$ be functions on $A, B \subseteq \mathbf{R}$. If g is continuous at $c \in A$ and f is continuous at $g(c) \in B$, then $f \circ g$ is continuous at c .

proof: let $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence in A and $x_n \rightarrow c \implies g(x_n) \rightarrow g(c) \implies f(g(x_n)) \rightarrow f(g(c)) \implies f \circ g$ is continuous at c

Theorem 5.28 Let f be a polynomial function of the form

$$f(x) = a_p x^p + \cdots + a_1 x + a_0.$$

Then, the function f is continuous on \mathbf{R} .

proof: let $c \in \mathbf{R}$, let $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence in \mathbf{R} and $x_n \rightarrow c$, then:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(x_n) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_p x_n^p + \cdots + a_1 x_n + a_0) \\ &= a_p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n^p + \cdots + a_1 \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n + a_0 \\ &= a_p c^p + \cdots + a_1 c + a_0 = f(c) \end{aligned}$$

Example 5.29 Theorems 5.26 and 5.27 allows us to show that some given function is continuous without a huge $\epsilon - \delta$ proof, for example:

- The function $1/x^2$ is continuous on $(0, \infty)$, since x^2 is continuous on $(0, \infty)$.
 - The function $(\cos(1/x^2))^2$ is continuous on $(0, \infty)$, since $\cos x$ is continuous on \mathbf{R} , and x^2 is continuous on $(0, \infty)$.
-

Extreme value theorem

Definition 5.30 A function $f: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is **bounded** if there exists some $B \geq 0$ such that for all $x \in S$, we have $|f(x)| \leq B$.

Theorem 5.31 If the function $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is continuous then f is bounded.

proof:

- suppose f is unbounded, then $\forall B \geq 0, \exists x \in [a, b]$ such that $|f(x)| > B$
- let $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence in $[a, b]$ such that for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, $|f(x_n)| > n$
- $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is in $[a, b] \implies (x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded \implies there exists a subsequence $(x_{n_i})_{i=1}^{\infty}$ (theorem 3.37) that converges to $c \in \mathbf{R}$

- $a \leq x_n \leq b \implies a \leq x_{n_i} \leq b \implies c \in [a, b]$
- f is continuous on $[a, b] \implies f(x_{n_i}) \rightarrow f(c) \implies (f(x_{n_i}))_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded
- $|f(x_{n_i})| > n_i \implies (n_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded, which is a contradiction

Definition 5.32 Let $f: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function. We say the function f achieves an **absolute minimum** at c if $f(x) \geq f(c)$ for all $x \in S$. We say the function f achieves an **absolute maximum** at d if $f(x) \leq f(d)$ for all $x \in S$.

Theorem 5.33 *Extreme value theorem.* Let $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function on a closed, bounded interval $[a, b]$. If the function f is continuous on $[a, b]$, then f achieves absolute maximum and absolute minimum on $[a, b]$.

proof: we show the case for absolute maximum

- f is continuous on $[a, b] \implies f$ is bounded \implies the set $E = \{f(x) \mid x \in [a, b]\}$ is bounded $\implies \sup E \in \mathbf{R}$ exists
- $\sup E$ is the supremum of $\{f(x) \mid x \in [a, b]\} \implies \forall x \in [a, b], f(x) \leq \sup E$, and, there exists some sequence $(f(x_n))_{n=1}^{\infty}$ with $x_n \in [a, b]$ such that $f(x_n) \rightarrow \sup E$
- $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is in $[a, b] \implies$ there exists a subsequence $(x_{n_i})_{i=1}^{\infty}$ such that $x_{n_i} \rightarrow d$ and $d \in [a, b] \implies f(x_{n_i}) \rightarrow f(d)$ (since f is continuous)
- $f(x_n) \rightarrow \sup E \implies f(x_{n_i}) \rightarrow \sup E \implies \sup E = f(d) \implies$ there exists a point $d \in [a, b]$ such that $f(x) \leq f(d)$ for all $x \in [a, b]$

Remark 5.34 To apply the extreme value theorem, the function f has to be continuous on a closed, bounded interval.

If the function $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is not continuous, consider the function given by

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & x = 0 \text{ or } x = 1 \\ x & x \in (0, 1), \end{cases}$$

which neither achieves an absolute maximum nor an absolute minimum on $[0, 1]$.

If the function $f: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is continuous but S not closed and bounded, consider the function given by

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{x} - \frac{1}{1-x}, \quad S = (0, 1),$$

which neither achieves an absolute maximum nor an absolute minimum on $[0, 1]$.

Intermediate value theorem

Theorem 5.35 Let $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a continuous function. If $f(a) < 0$ and $f(b) > 0$, then there exists some $c \in (a, b)$ such that $f(c) = 0$.

proof: let $a_1 = a$, $b_1 = b$, for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, given a_n and b_n , define a_{n+1} and b_{n+1} as:

- $a_{n+1} = a_n$, $b_{n+1} = \frac{a_n + b_n}{2}$, if $f\left(\frac{a_n + b_n}{2}\right) \geq 0$
- $a_{n+1} = \frac{a_n + b_n}{2}$, $b_{n+1} = b_n$, if $f\left(\frac{a_n + b_n}{2}\right) < 0$

then the sequences $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $(b_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ has the following properties:

- $a \leq a_n \leq a_{n+1} \leq b_{n+1} \leq b_n \leq b$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N} \implies (a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $(b_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ are monotone and bounded $\implies (a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $(b_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converge, let $a_n \rightarrow c$, $b_n \rightarrow d$
- $f(a_n) \leq 0$, $f(b_n) \geq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, since f is continuous, $c, d \in [a, b] \implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(a_n) = f(c) \leq 0$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(b_n) = f(d) \geq 0$

- $b_{n+1} - a_{n+1} = \frac{b_n - a_n}{2} = \frac{b_{n-1} - a_{n-1}}{2^2} = \dots = \frac{b - a}{2^n} \implies b_n - a_n = \frac{b - a}{2^{n-1}},$
and hence, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (b_n - a_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{b - a}{2^{n-1}} = 0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$$

$$\implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n \implies c = d$$

put together, we have $f(c) \leq 0$, $f(d) \geq 0$, and $f(c) = f(d)$
 $\implies f(c) = f(d) = 0 \implies \exists c \in (a, b)$ such that $f(c) = 0$

Theorem 5.36 *Bolzano's intermediate value theorem.* Let $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a continuous function. Suppose $y \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $f(a) < y < f(b)$ or $f(b) < y < f(a)$, then there exists a $c \in (a, b)$ such that $f(c) = y$.

proof: we consider the case for $f(a) < y < f(b)$, the other case is similar

- let $g: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function given by $g(x) = f(x) - y$, then g is continuous on $[a, b]$ (theorem 5.26)
- $f(a) < y < f(b) \implies g(a) = f(a) - y < 0$, $g(b) = f(b) - y > 0$
 $\implies \exists c \in (a, b)$ such that $g(c) = f(c) - y = 0$ (theorem 5.35)
 $\implies \exists c \in (a, b)$ such that $f(c) = y$

Theorem 5.37 Let $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a continuous function. Suppose the function f achieves absolute minimum at $c \in [a, b]$, and achieves absolute maximum at $d \in [a, b]$. Then, we have $f([a, b]) = [f(c), f(d)]$, i.e., every value between the absolute minimum value and the absolute maximum value is achieved.

proof:

- according to theorem 5.33, we have $f([a, b]) \subseteq [f(c), f(d)]$
 - according to theorem 5.36, we have $[f(c), f(d)] \subseteq f([c, d]) \subseteq f([a, b])$
 - hence, $f([a, b]) = [f(c), f(d)]$
-

Remark 5.38 Similarly, theorem 5.36 is false if f is not continuous.

Example 5.39 The polynomial given by $f(x) = x^{2021} + x^{2020} + 9.03x + 1$ has at least one real root.

proof: we have $f(0) = 1 > 0$ and $f(-1) = -8.03 < 0$, hence, by theorem 5.36, there exists some $c \in (-1, 0)$ such that $f(c) = 0$

Uniform continuity

Example 5.40 The function $f(x) = \frac{1}{x}$ is continuous on $(0, 1)$.

proof: let $c \in (0, 1)$ and $\epsilon > 0$, choose $\delta = \min \left\{ \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \right\}$, then $\forall x \in (0, 1)$ such that $|x - c| < \delta$, we have

- $||x| - |c|| \leq |x - c| < \delta \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \implies -\frac{\epsilon}{2} < |x| - c \implies \frac{1}{|x|} < \frac{2}{c}$
 - hence, $\left| \frac{1}{x} - \frac{1}{c} \right| = \frac{|x - c|}{|x|c} < \frac{\delta}{|x|c} < \frac{2\delta}{c^2} \leq \frac{2}{c^2} \cdot \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \epsilon = \epsilon$
-

Remark 5.41 Example 5.40 shows that in the definition of function continuity, the number δ can depend on both the number ϵ and the point c .

Definition 5.42 Let $f: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function. We say the function f is **uniformly continuous** on S if for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists some $\delta > 0$ such that for all $x, c \in S$ and $|x - c| < \delta$, we have $|f(x) - f(c)| < \epsilon$.

Remark 5.43 In the definition of uniform continuity, the number δ only depends on ϵ .

Example 5.44 The function $f(x) = x^2$ is uniformly continuous on $[0, 1]$.

proof: let $\epsilon > 0$, choose $\delta = \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, then for all $x, c \in [0, 1]$ and $|x - c| < \delta$, we have $|x + c| \leq 2$, and hence,

$$|f(x) - f(c)| = |x^2 - c^2| = |x + c||x - c| < |x + c|\delta \leq 2\delta = 2 \cdot \epsilon = \epsilon$$

Remark 5.45 Let $f: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function. We say the function f is not uniformly continuous on S if there exists some $\epsilon > 0$ such that for all $\delta > 0$, there exists some $x, c \in S$ and $|x - c| < \delta$ so that $|f(x) - f(c)| \geq \epsilon$.

Example 5.46 The function given by $f(x) = \frac{1}{x}$ is not uniformly continuous on $(0, 1)$.

proof: choose $\epsilon = 2$, let $\delta > 0$, choose $c = \min \left\{ \delta, \frac{1}{2} \right\}$, $x = \frac{c}{2}$, then:

- $x, c \in (0, 1)$ and $|x - c| = \frac{c}{2} \leq \frac{\delta}{2} < \delta$
 - $\left| \frac{1}{x} - \frac{1}{c} \right| = \frac{|x - c|}{|x||c|} = \frac{c}{2} \cdot \frac{2}{c^2} = \frac{1}{c} \geq 2 = \epsilon$
-

Example 5.47 The function $f(x) = x^2$ is not uniformly continuous on \mathbf{R} .

proof: choose $\epsilon = 2$, let $\delta > 0$, choose $c = \frac{2}{\delta}$, $x = c + \frac{\delta}{2}$, then we have

- $x, c \in \mathbf{R}$ and $|x - c| = \frac{\delta}{2} < \delta$
- $|x^2 - c^2| = |x + c||x - c| = (2c + \frac{\delta}{2}) \cdot \frac{\delta}{2} = (\frac{4}{\delta} + \frac{\delta}{2}) \cdot \frac{\delta}{2} = 2 + \frac{\delta^2}{4} \geq 2 = \epsilon$

Theorem 5.48 Let $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function. Then, the function f is continuous on $[a, b]$ if and only if f is uniformly continuous on $[a, b]$.

proof:

- suppose f is uniformly continuous on $[a, b]$: let $c \in [a, b]$, $\epsilon > 0$, then according to uniform continuity, $\exists \delta > 0$ such that for all $x \in [a, b]$ and $|x - c| < \delta$, we have $|f(x) - f(c)| < \epsilon$
- suppose f is continuous on $[a, b]$
 - assume f is not uniformly continuous on $[a, b]$, then $\exists \epsilon > 0$ such that $\forall \delta > 0$, there exists $x, c \in [a, b]$ s.t. $|x - c| < \delta$ but $|f(x) - f(c)| \geq \epsilon$
 - choose sequences $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $(c_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ such that for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, $x_n, c_n \in [a, b]$, $|x_n - c_n| < \frac{1}{n}$, but $|f(x_n) - f(c_n)| \geq \epsilon$
 - since $x_n \in [a, b]$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, there exists a subsequence $(x_{n_i})_{i=1}^{\infty}$ of $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ such that $x_{n_i} \rightarrow c$ and $c \in [a, b]$ (theorem 3.37)

Continuous functions

5-37

- take subsequence $(c_{n_i})_{i=1}^{\infty}$ of $(c_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ according to the indexes n_i of $(x_{n_i})_{i=1}^{\infty}$, then $c_{n_i} \in [a, b]$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N} \implies$ there exists a subsequence $(c_{n_{i_j}})_{j=1}^{\infty}$ such that $c_{n_{i_j}} \rightarrow d$ and $d \in [a, b]$
- take subsequence $(x_{n_{i_j}})_{j=1}^{\infty}$ of $(x_{n_i})_{i=1}^{\infty}$ according to the indexes n_{i_j} of $(c_{n_{i_j}})_{j=1}^{\infty}$, then $x_{n_{i_j}} \rightarrow c$ since $x_{n_i} \rightarrow c$
- $0 \leq |x_{n_{i_j}} - c_{n_{i_j}}| < \frac{1}{n_{i_j}}$ and $\frac{1}{n_{i_j}} \rightarrow 0 \implies \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |x_{n_{i_j}} - c_{n_{i_j}}| = 0 \implies \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} x_{n_{i_j}} = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} c_{n_{i_j}} \implies c = d$
- since f is continuous on $[a, b]$ and $x_{n_{i_j}} \rightarrow c$, $c_{n_{i_j}} \rightarrow c$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} f(x_{n_{i_j}}) &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} f(c_{n_{i_j}}) = f(c) \\ \implies 0 &= |f(c) - f(c)| = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |f(x_{n_{i_j}}) - f(c_{n_{i_j}})| \geq \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction

Continuous functions

5-38

Lipschitz continuity

Definition 5.49 Let $f: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function. We say the function f is **Lipschitz continuous** on S if there exists some $K \geq 0$ such that for all $x, y \in S$, we have $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq K|x - y|$.

Remark 5.50 Geometrically, the function f is Lipschitz continuous if and only if all lines intersects the graph of f in at least two distinct points has slope in absolute value less than or equal to K .

Theorem 5.51 Let $f: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function. If the function f is Lipschitz continuous, then f is uniformly continuous.

proof: let $\epsilon > 0$

- f is Lipschitz continuous $\implies \exists K \geq 0$ such that for all $x, y \in S$, we have $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq K|x - y|$
- choose $\delta = \epsilon/(K + 1)$, then for all $x, y \in S$ and $|x - y| < \delta$, we have

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \leq K|x - y| < K\delta = \frac{K}{K + 1}\epsilon < \epsilon$$

Example 5.52 The function $f(x) = \sqrt{x}$ is Lipschitz continuous on $[1, \infty)$, but is not Lipschitz continuous on $[0, \infty)$.

proof:

- consider the function $f: [1, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ given by $f(x) = \sqrt{x}$, then $\forall x, y \in [1, \infty)$:

- $x \geq 1, y \geq 1 \implies \sqrt{x} + \sqrt{y} \geq 2$

- hence,

$$|f(x) - f(y)| = |\sqrt{x} - \sqrt{y}| = \frac{|x - y|}{\sqrt{x} + \sqrt{y}} \leq \frac{1}{2}|x - y|$$

$$\implies f \text{ is Lipschitz continuous with } K = 1/2$$

- consider the function $g: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ given by $g(x) = \sqrt{x}$, let $K \geq 0$, choose $x = 0, y = \frac{1}{K^2+1}$, then

$$\left| \frac{f(x) - f(y)}{x - y} \right| = \left| \frac{\sqrt{x} - \sqrt{y}}{x - y} \right| = \frac{\sqrt{y}}{y} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{y}} = \sqrt{K^2 + 1} > \sqrt{K^2} = K$$

$$\implies |f(x) - f(y)| > K|x - y|$$

6. Derivative

- definition
- basic properties
- differentiation rules
- Rolle's theorem
- mean value theorem
- Taylor's theorem

6-1

Derivative of functions

Definition 6.1 Let I be an interval, let $f: I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function, and let $c \in I$. We say the function f is **differentiable** at c if the limit

$$L = \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{f(x) - f(c)}{x - c}$$

exists. We call L the **derivative** of f at c , and we write $f'(c) = L$.

If f is differentiable at all $c \in I$, then we say the function f is differentiable, and we write f' or $\frac{df}{dx}$ for the function $f'(x)$, $x \in I$.

Example 6.2 Consider the function $f(x) = ax + b$, then $f'(c) = a$ for all $c \in \mathbf{R}$.

proof: let $x, c \in \mathbf{R}$, then we have

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{f(x) - f(c)}{x - c} = \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{ax + b - (ac + b)}{x - c} = \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{a(x - c)}{x - c} = \lim_{x \rightarrow c} a = a$$

Example 6.3 Consider the function $f(x) = x^2$, then $f'(c) = 2c$ for all $c \in \mathbf{R}$.

proof: let $x, c \in \mathbf{R}$, then we have

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{f(x) - f(c)}{x - c} = \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{x^2 - c^2}{x - c} = \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{(x + c)(x - c)}{x - c} = \lim_{x \rightarrow c} (x + c) = 2c$$

Theorem 6.4 Suppose the function $f: I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is differentiable at $c \in I$, then f is continuous at c .

proof: f is differentiable at $c \in I \implies$ the limit $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{f(x) - f(c)}{x - c}$ exists, and hence,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \left(\frac{f(x) - f(c)}{x - c} (x - c) + f(c) \right) = f'(c) \cdot 0 + f(c) = f(c)$$

Remark 6.5 The converse of theorem 6.4 does not hold.

Example 6.6 The function $f(x) = |x|$ is not differentiable at 0.

proof: let $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence with $x_n = \frac{(-1)^n}{n}$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$

- $0 \leq \left| \frac{(-1)^n}{n} \right| \leq \frac{1}{n}$ and $\frac{1}{n} \rightarrow 0 \implies x_n \rightarrow 0$
- consider the sequence $\left(\frac{f(x_n) - f(0)}{x_n - 0} \right)_{n=1}^{\infty}$, we have

$$\frac{f(x_n) - f(0)}{x_n - 0} = \frac{|x_n|}{x_n} = \frac{\left| \frac{(-1)^n}{n} \right|}{\frac{(-1)^n}{n}} = (-1)^n$$

- $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (-1)^n$ does not exist $\implies \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x) - f(0)}{x - 0}$ does not exist
-

Remark 6.7 There exist functions that are continuous but nowhere differentiable.

Differentiation rules

Theorem 6.8 Let I be an interval, let $f: I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ and $g: I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be differentiable functions at $c \in I$.

- *Linearity.* Let $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}$. Define $h(x) = \alpha f(x) + g(x)$, then $h'(c) = \alpha f'(c) + g'(c)$.
- *Product rule.* Define $h(x) = f(x)g(x)$, then $h'(c) = f'(c)g(c) + f(c)g'(c)$.
- *Quotient rule.* If $g(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in I$, define $h(x) = f(x)/g(x)$, then

$$h'(c) = \frac{f'(c)g(c) - f(c)g'(c)}{(g(c))^2}.$$

proof: f, g differentiable at $c \implies \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{f(x) - f(c)}{x - c}$, $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{g(x) - g(c)}{x - c}$ exists; f, g continuous at $c \implies \lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x) = f(c)$, $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} g(x) = g(c)$

Derivative

6-5

- if $h(x) = \alpha f(x) + g(x)$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{h(x) - h(c)}{x - c} &= \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{\alpha f(x) + g(x) - \alpha f(c) - g(c)}{x - c} \\ &= \alpha \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{f(x) - f(c)}{x - c} + \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{g(x) - g(c)}{x - c} = \alpha f'(c) + g'(c) \end{aligned}$$

- if $h(x) = f(x)g(x)$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{h(x) - h(c)}{x - c} &= \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{f(x)g(x) - f(c)g(c)}{x - c} \\ &= \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{f(x)g(x) - f(c)g(c) + f(x)g(c) - f(x)g(c)}{x - c} \\ &= \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{g(c)(f(x) - f(c)) + f(x)(g(x) - g(c))}{x - c} \\ &= g(c) \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{f(x) - f(c)}{x - c} + \lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x) \frac{g(x) - g(c)}{x - c} \\ &= f'(c)g(c) + f(c)g'(c) \end{aligned}$$

Derivative

6-6

- if $h(x) = f(x)/g(x)$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{h(x) - h(c)}{x - c} \\
&= \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{f(x)/g(x) - f(c)/g(c)}{x - c} \\
&= \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{1}{g(x)g(c)} \frac{f(x)g(c) - f(c)g(x)}{x - c} \\
&= \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{1}{g(x)g(c)} \frac{f(x)g(c) - f(c)g(x) + f(x)g(x) - f(x)g(x)}{x - c} \\
&= \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{1}{g(x)g(c)} \frac{g(x)(f(x) - f(c)) - f(x)(g(x) - g(c))}{x - c} \\
&= \frac{f'(c)g(c) - f(c)g'(c)}{(g(c))^2}
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 6.9 Chain rule. Let I_1, I_2 be two intervals. Let $g: I_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be differentiable at $c \in I_1$ and $f: I_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be differentiable at $g(c)$. Define $h: I_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ by $h = f \circ g$, then h is differentiable at c , and

$$h'(c) = f'(g(c))g'(c).$$

proof: let $d = g(c)$

- define the following functions:

$$u(y) = \begin{cases} \frac{f(y) - f(d)}{y - d} & y \neq d \\ f'(d) & y = d \end{cases}$$

and

$$v(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{g(x) - g(c)}{x - c} & x \neq c \\ g'(c) & x = c, \end{cases}$$

then we have

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow d} u(y) = \lim_{y \rightarrow d} \frac{f(y) - f(d)}{y - d} = f'(d) = u(d)$$

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow c} v(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{g(x) - g(c)}{x - c} = g'(c) = v(c),$$

i.e., u is continuous at d , v is continuous at c

- note that $f(y) - f(d) = u(y)(y - d)$ and $g(x) - d = v(x)(x - c)$, we have

$$h(x) - h(c) = f(g(x)) - f(d) = u(g(x))(g(x) - d) = u(g(x))v(x)(x - c)$$

- put together, we have

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{h(x) - h(c)}{x - c} = \lim_{x \rightarrow c} u(g(x))v(x) = u(g(c))v(c) = f'(g(c))g'(c)$$

Rolle's theorem

Definition 6.10 Let $f: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ with $S \subseteq \mathbf{R}$.

The function f is said to have a **relative maximum** at $c \in S$ if there exists some $\delta > 0$ such that for all $x \in S$ and $|x - c| < \delta$, we have $f(x) \leq f(c)$.

The function f is said to have a **relative minimum** at $c \in S$ if there exists some $\delta > 0$ such that for all $x \in S$ and $|x - c| < \delta$, we have $f(x) \geq f(c)$.

Theorem 6.11 If the function $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ has a relative maximum or minimum at $c \in (a, b)$ and f is differentiable at c , then $f'(c) = 0$.

proof: we show the case for c being a relative maximum point

- $c \in (a, b)$ is an relative maximum point $\implies \exists \delta > 0$ such that for all $x \in [a, b]$ and $|x - c| < \delta$, we have $f(x) \leq f(c)$
- let $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence with $x_n = c - \frac{\delta}{2n}$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, then we have $x_n < c$, $x_n \rightarrow c$, and $|x_n - c| < \delta$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N} \implies$

$$f'(c) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(x_n) - f(c)}{x_n - c} \geq 0$$

- let $(y_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence with $y_n = c + \frac{\delta}{2n}$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, then we have $y_n > c$, $y_n \rightarrow c$, and $|y_n - c| < \delta$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$
 $\implies f'(c) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(y_n) - f(c)}{y_n - c} \leq 0$

Remark 6.12 In theorem 6.11, the function f does not necessarily have to be defined on a closed interval, but the point c where the relative extremum is achieved has to be on the open interval (a, b) .

Remark 6.13 Absolute extremum is a special case of relative extremum.

Theorem 6.14 Rolle. Let the function $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be continuous and differentiable on (a, b) . If $f(a) = f(b)$, then there exists some $c \in (a, b)$ such that $f'(c) = 0$.

proof: let $f(a) = f(b) = K$; f is continuous on $[a, b] \implies$ there exists an absolute maximum point $c_1 \in [a, b]$ and an absolute minimum point $c_2 \in [a, b]$ (theorem 5.33)

- if $c_1 > K$, then $c_1 \in (a, b) \implies f'(c_1) = 0$ (theorem 6.11)
- if $c_2 < K$, then $c_2 \in (a, b) \implies f'(c_2) = 0$ (theorem 6.11)
- if $c_1 = c_2 = K$, then $K \leq f(x) \leq K$ for all $x \in [a, b] \implies f(x) = K$ for all $x \in [a, b] \implies f'(c) = 0$ for all $c \in (a, b)$

Mean value theorem

Theorem 6.15 *Mean value theorem.* Let the function $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be continuous and differentiable on (a, b) , then there exists some $c \in (a, b)$ such that

$$f(b) - f(a) = f'(c)(b - a).$$

proof:

- define $g: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ with $g(x) = f(x) - f(b) + \frac{f(b)-f(a)}{b-a}(b-x)$
- since $g(a) = g(b) = 0$, by theorem 6.14, there exists $c \in (a, b)$ such that

$$g'(c) = 0 = f'(c) - \frac{f(b) - f(a)}{b - a}$$

$$\implies f(b) - f(a) = f'(c)(b - a)$$

Theorem 6.16 If the function $f: I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is differentiable and $f'(x) = 0$ for all $x \in I$, then f is constant.

proof: let $a, b \in I$ with $a < b$, then f is continuous on $[a, b]$ and differentiable on $(a, b) \implies \exists c \in (a, b)$ such that

$$f(b) - f(a) = f'(c)(b - a) = 0$$

$$(\text{since } f'(x) = 0 \text{ for all } x \in I) \implies f(b) = f(a)$$

Theorem 6.17 Let $f: I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a differentiable function.

- The function f is increasing if and only if $f'(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in I$.
 - The function f is decreasing if and only if $f'(x) \leq 0$ for all $x \in I$.
-

proof: we prove the first statement

- suppose $f'(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in I$, let $a, b \in I$ with $a < b$, then f is continuous on $[a, b]$ and differentiable on $(a, b) \implies \exists c \in (a, b)$ s.t. $f(b) - f(a) = f'(c)(b - a)$ (theorem 6.15) and $f'(c) \geq 0 \implies f(b) - f(a) \geq 0 \implies f(a) \leq f(b)$
- suppose f is increasing, let $c \in I$, then we can find a sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ with either $x_n < c$ or $x_n > c$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $x_n \rightarrow c$
 - if $x_n < c$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N} \implies f(x_n) \leq f(c)$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, and hence

$$f'(c) = \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{f(x) - f(c)}{x - c} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(x_n) - f(c)}{x_n - c} \geq 0$$

- if $x_n > c$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N} \implies f(x_n) \geq f(c)$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, and hence

$$f'(c) = \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{f(x) - f(c)}{x - c} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(x_n) - f(c)}{x_n - c} \geq 0$$

in either case, we have $f'(c) \geq 0$

Taylor's theorem

Definition 6.18 We say the function $f: I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is **n -times differentiable** on $J \subseteq I$ if $f', f'', \dots, f^{(n)}$ exist at every point in J , where $f^{(n)}$ denotes the n th derivative of f .

Theorem 6.19 *Taylor.* Suppose the function $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is continuous and has n continuous derivatives on $[a, b]$ such that $f^{(n+1)}$ exists on (a, b) . Given $x_0, x \in [a, b]$, there exists some $c \in (x_0, x)$ such that

$$f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{1}{k!} f^{(k)}(x_0)(x - x_0)^k + \frac{f^{(n+1)}(c)}{(n+1)!} (x - x_0)^{n+1}.$$

We denote

$$P_n(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{1}{k!} f^{(k)}(x_0)(x - x_0)^k \quad \text{and} \quad R_n(x) = \frac{f^{(n+1)}(c)}{(n+1)!} (x - x_0)^{n+1}$$

as the **n th order Taylor polynomial** and the **n th order remainder** of f , respectively.

proof: let $x, x_0 \in [a, b]$ and $x \neq x_0$ (if $x = x_0$ then any c satisfies the theorem)

- let $M_{x,x_0} = \frac{f(x) - P_n(x)}{(x - x_0)^{n+1}}$, then we have

$$f(x) = P_n(x) + M_{x,x_0}(x - x_0)^{n+1}$$

- note that for all $0 \leq k \leq n$, we have $f^{(k)}(x_0) = P_n^{(k)}(x_0)$
- let $g(s) = f(s) - P_n(s) - M_{x,x_0}(s - x_0)^{n+1}$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} g(x_0) &= f(x_0) - P_n(x_0) - M_{x,x_0}(x_0 - x_0)^{n+1} = 0 \\ g'(x_0) &= f'(x_0) - P_n'(x_0) - M_{x,x_0}(n+1)(x_0 - x_0)^n = 0 \\ &\vdots \\ g^{(n)}(x_0) &= f^{(n)}(x_0) - P_n^{(n)}(x_0) - M_{x,x_0}(n+1)!(x_0 - x_0) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Derivative

6-17

- by theorem 6.15:

$$\begin{aligned} g(x_0) = g(x_1) = 0 &\implies \exists x_1 \text{ between } x_0 \text{ and } x \text{ s.t. } g'(x_1) = 0 \\ g'(x_0) = g'(x_1) = 0 &\implies \exists x_2 \text{ between } x_0 \text{ and } x_1 \text{ s.t. } g''(x_2) = 0 \\ &\vdots \\ g^{(n-1)}(x_0) = g^{(n-1)}(x_{n-1}) = 0 &\implies \exists x_n \text{ between } x_0 \text{ and } x_{n-1} \text{ s.t. } g^{(n)}(x_n) = 0 \\ g^{(n)}(x_0) = g^{(n)}(x_n) = 0 &\implies \exists c \text{ between } x_0 \text{ and } x_n \text{ s.t. } g^{(n+1)}(c) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

- note that

$$\frac{d^{n+1}}{ds^{n+1}} M_{x,x_0}(s - x_0)^{n+1} = M_{x,x_0}(n+1)! \quad \text{and} \quad P_n^{(n+1)}(c) = 0$$

- we have the $(n+1)$ -times derivative of g at c given by

$$0 = g^{(n+1)}(c) = f^{(n+1)}(c) - M_{x,x_0}(n+1)! \implies M_{x,x_0} = \frac{f^{(n+1)}(c)}{(n+1)!}$$

- hence, we have

$$f(x) = P_n(x) + M_{x,x_0}(x - x_0)^{n+1} = P_n(x) + \frac{f^{(n+1)}(c)}{(n+1)!}(x - x_0)^{n+1}$$

Derivative

6-18

Theorem 6.20 *Second derivative test.* Suppose the function $f: (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ has two continuous derivatives. If $x_0 \in (a, b)$ such that $f'(x_0) = 0$ and $f''(x_0) > 0$, then f has a strict relative minimum at x_0 .

proof:

- it is easy to show that f'' is continuous and $f''(x_0) > 0 \implies \exists \delta > 0$ such that $\forall c \in (x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta)$, we have $f''(c) > 0$
- then for all $x \in (x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta)$, by theorem 6.19, there exists some c_0 between x and x_0 such that

$$f(x) = f(x_0) + f'(x_0)(x - x_0) + \frac{1}{2}f''(c_0)(x - x_0)^2$$

- c_0 between x and $x_0 \implies c_0 \in (x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta) \implies f''(c) > 0$, and since $f'(x_0) = 0$, we have

$$f(x) - f(x_0) = \frac{1}{2}f''(c_0)(x - x_0)^2 > 0 \implies f(x) > f(x_0)$$

7. Riemann integral

- Riemann sum and some useful facts
- Riemann integral of continuous functions
- properties of Riemann integral
- fundamental theorem of calculus
- integration by parts
- change of variables

7-1

Riemann sum

Definition 7.1 A **partition** $\underline{x} = \{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ of $[a, b]$ is a finite set such that

$$a = x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_n = b.$$

The **norm** of \underline{x} , denoted $\|\underline{x}\|$, is a number defined as

$$\|\underline{x}\| = \max\{x_1 - x_0, x_2 - x_1, \dots, x_n - x_{n-1}\}.$$

Definition 7.2 let \underline{x} be a partition of $[a, b]$. A **tag** of \underline{x} is a finite set $\underline{\xi} = \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n\}$ such that

$$a = x_0 \leq \xi_1 \leq x_1 \leq \xi_2 \leq x_2 \leq \dots \leq x_{n-1} \leq \xi_n \leq x_n = b.$$

The pair $(\underline{x}, \underline{\xi})$ is referred to as a **tagged partition**.

example: $(\underline{x}, \underline{\xi}) = (\{1, 3/2, 2, 3\}, \{5/4, 7/4, 5/2\})$ is a tagged partition with norm

$$\|\underline{x}\| = \max\{3/2 - 1, 2 - 3/2, 3 - 2\} = 1$$

Definition 7.3 The **Riemann sum** of f corresponding to $(\underline{x}, \underline{\xi})$ is the number

$$S_f(\underline{x}, \underline{\xi}) = \sum_{i=1}^n f(\xi_i)(x_i - x_{i-1}).$$

Remark 7.4 For a continuous function f on $[a, b]$ that is positive, the Riemann sum $S_f(\underline{x}, \underline{\xi})$ is an approximate area under the graph of f . As $\|\underline{x}\| \rightarrow 0$, we should expect these approximate areas to converge to some number, which we **interpret** as the area under the graph of f on the interval $[a, b]$.

Some useful facts

Definition 7.5 We define the set

$$\mathcal{C}([a, b]) = \{f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R} \mid f \text{ is continuous}\}.$$

Definition 7.6 Let $f \in \mathcal{C}([a, b])$ and $\tau > 0$, we define the **modulus of continuity** of the function f as

$$w_f(\tau) = \sup\{|f(x) - f(y)| \mid |x - y| \leq \tau\}.$$

Theorem 7.7 For all $f \in \mathcal{C}([a, b])$, we have $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} w_f(\tau) = 0$, i.e., for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists some $\delta > 0$ such that for all $\tau < \delta$, we have $w_f(\tau) < \epsilon$.

proof: let $\epsilon > 0$

- $f \in \mathcal{C}([a, b]) \implies f$ is uniformly continuous on $[a, b] \implies \exists \delta > 0$ such that for all $x, y \in [a, b]$ and $|x - y| < \delta$, we have $|f(x) - f(y)| < \epsilon/2$
 - let $\tau < \delta$, then for all $x, y \in [a, b]$ and $|x - y| \leq \tau$, we have $|x - y| < \delta \implies |f(x) - f(y)| < \epsilon/2$ for all $x, y \in [a, b]$ and $|x - y| \leq \tau \implies \epsilon/2$ is an upper bound of the set $\{|f(x) - f(y)| \mid |x - y| \leq \tau\} \implies w_f(\tau) \leq \epsilon/2 < \epsilon$
-

Theorem 7.8 Let $f \in \mathcal{C}([a, b])$, then $w_f(\tau)$ has the following properties:

- For all $x, y \in [a, b]$, we have $w_f(|x - y|) \geq |f(x) - f(y)|$.
 - *Monotonicity.* If $\tau_1 \leq \tau_2$, then $w_f(\tau_1) \leq w_f(\tau_2)$.
-

Definition 7.9 Let $(\underline{x}, \underline{\xi})$ and $(\underline{x}', \underline{\xi}')$ be tagged partitions of $[a, b]$. We say \underline{x}' is a **refinement** of \underline{x} if $\underline{x} \subseteq \underline{x}'$.

Theorem 7.10 Let $(\underline{x}, \underline{\xi})$ and $(\underline{x}', \underline{\xi}')$ be tagged partitions of $[a, b]$ such that \underline{x}' is a refinement of \underline{x} . If $f \in \mathcal{C}([a, b])$, then

$$|S_f(\underline{x}, \underline{\xi}) - S_f(\underline{x}', \underline{\xi}')| \leq w_f(\|\underline{x}\|)(b - a).$$

proof: let $\underline{x} = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$, $\underline{\xi} = \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n\}$, $\underline{x}' = \{x'_0, \dots, x'_n\}$, and $\underline{\xi}' = \{\xi'_1, \dots, \xi'_n\}$

- for $i = 1, \dots, n$, let

$$\underline{y}^{(i)} = \{x'_q, x'_{q+1}, \dots, x'_k\} \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{\zeta}^{(i)} = \{\xi'_{q+1}, \xi'_{q+2}, \dots, \xi'_k\}$$

such that

$$x_{i-1} = x'_q < x'_{q+1} < \dots < x'_k = x_i$$

- then for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |f(\xi_i)(x_i - x_{i-1}) - S_f(\underline{y}^{(i)}, \underline{\zeta}^{(i)})| \\
&= \left| f(\xi_i) \sum_{\ell=q+1}^k (x'_\ell - x'_{\ell-1}) - \sum_{\ell=q+1}^k f(\xi'_\ell)(x'_\ell - x'_{\ell-1}) \right| \\
&= \left| \sum_{\ell=q+1}^k (f(\xi_i) - f(\xi'_\ell))(x'_\ell - x'_{\ell-1}) \right| \leq \sum_{\ell=q+1}^k |f(\xi_i) - f(\xi'_\ell)|(x'_\ell - x'_{\ell-1}) \\
&\leq \sum_{\ell=q+1}^k w_f(x_i - x_{i-1})(x'_\ell - x'_{\ell-1}) \leq \sum_{\ell=q+1}^k w_f(\|\underline{x}\|)(x'_\ell - x'_{\ell-1}) \\
&= w_f(\|\underline{x}\|)(x_i - x_{i-1}) \tag{7.1}
\end{aligned}$$

- the first inequality is by lemma 4.19
- the second inequality is from $\xi_i, \xi'_\ell \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$
- the third inequality is by the second statement of theorem 7.8, and $\|\underline{x}\| \geq x_i - x_{i-1}$

Riemann integral

7-7

- put together, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|S_f(\underline{x}, \underline{\xi}) - S_f(\underline{x}', \underline{\xi}')| &= \left| \sum_{i=1}^n (f(\xi_i)(x_i - x_{i-1}) - S_f(\underline{y}^{(i)}, \underline{\zeta}^{(i)})) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^n |f(\xi_i)(x_i - x_{i-1}) - S_f(\underline{y}^{(i)}, \underline{\zeta}^{(i)})| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n w_f(\|\underline{x}\|)(x_i - x_{i-1}) \\
&= w_f(\|\underline{x}\|)(b - a),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is by plugging in (7.1)

Theorem 7.11 Let $(\underline{x}, \underline{\xi})$ and $(\underline{x}', \underline{\xi}')$ be any two tagged partitions of $[a, b]$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}([a, b])$, then

$$|S_f(\underline{x}, \underline{\xi}) - S_f(\underline{x}', \underline{\xi}')| \leq (w_f(\|\underline{x}\|) + w_f(\|\underline{x}'\|))(b - a).$$

proof: let $\underline{x}'' = \underline{x} \cup \underline{x}'$ and $\underline{\xi}''$ be a tag of \underline{x}'' , then by theorem 7.10:

$$\begin{aligned} & |S_f(\underline{x}, \underline{\xi}) - S_f(\underline{x}', \underline{\xi}')| \\ & \leq |S_f(\underline{x}, \underline{\xi}) - S_f(\underline{x}'', \underline{\xi}'')| + |S_f(\underline{x}'', \underline{\xi}'') - S_f(\underline{x}', \underline{\xi}')| \\ & \leq (w_f(\|\underline{x}\|) + w_f(\|\underline{x}'\|))(b - a) \end{aligned}$$

Riemann integral of continuous functions

Theorem 7.12 Let $f \in \mathcal{C}([a, b])$, then there exists a unique number denoted $\int_a^b f(x) dx$ with the following property: For all sequences of tagged partitions $\left((\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)})\right)_{r=1}^{\infty}$ such that $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \|\underline{x}^{(r)}\| = 0$, we have

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} S_f(\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)}) = \int_a^b f(x) dx.$$

proof: uniqueness follows immediately from uniqueness of limits of sequences of real numbers, we only need to show the existence

- let $\left((\underline{y}^{(r)}, \underline{\zeta}^{(r)})\right)_{r=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of tagged partitions with $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \|\underline{y}^{(r)}\| = 0$, we first show that $\left(S_f(\underline{y}^{(r)}, \underline{\zeta}^{(r)})\right)_{r=1}^{\infty}$ is a Cauchy sequence; let $\epsilon > 0$

- by theorem 7.7, $\exists \delta > 0$ such that for all $\tau < \delta$, $w_f(\tau) < \frac{\epsilon}{2(b-a)}$
- $\|\underline{y}^{(r)}\| \rightarrow 0 \implies \exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ s.t. $\forall r, s \geq M$, $\|\underline{y}^{(r)}\| < \delta$, $\|\underline{y}^{(s)}\| < \delta$
 $\implies \forall r, s \geq M$, we have $w_f(\|\underline{y}^{(r)}\|) < \frac{\epsilon}{2(b-a)}$, $w_f(\|\underline{y}^{(s)}\|) < \frac{\epsilon}{2(b-a)}$
- hence, for all $r, s \geq M$, by theorem 7.11, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |S_f(\underline{y}^{(r)}, \underline{\zeta}^{(r)}) - S_f(\underline{y}^{(s)}, \underline{\zeta}^{(s)})| \\
& \leq (w_f(\|\underline{y}^{(r)}\|) + w_f(\|\underline{y}^{(s)}\|))(b-a) \\
& < \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2(b-a)} + \frac{\epsilon}{2(b-a)} \right) (b-a) \\
& = \epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

let $L = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} S_f(\underline{y}^{(r)}, \underline{\zeta}^{(r)})$ (which exists by theorem 3.45)

- let $\left((\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)}) \right)_{r=1}^{\infty}$ be any sequence of partitions s.t. $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \|\underline{x}^{(r)}\| = 0$,
we now show that $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} S_f(\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)}) = L$
- since $\|\underline{x}^{(r)}\| \rightarrow 0$, $\|\underline{y}^{(r)}\| \rightarrow 0$, by theorem 7.7, we have

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} (w_f(\|\underline{x}^{(r)}\|) + w_f(\|\underline{y}^{(r)}\|))(b-a) = 0$$

- $S_f(\underline{y}^{(r)}, \underline{\zeta}^{(r)}) \rightarrow L \implies |S_f(\underline{y}^{(r)}, \underline{\zeta}^{(r)}) - L| \rightarrow 0$
- by theorem 7.11, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 & \leq |S_f(\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)}) - L| \\
& \leq |S_f(\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)}) - S_f(\underline{y}^{(r)}, \underline{\zeta}^{(r)})| + |S_f(\underline{y}^{(r)}, \underline{\zeta}^{(r)}) - L| \\
& \leq (w_f(\|\underline{x}^{(r)}\|) + w_f(\|\underline{y}^{(r)}\|))(b-a) + |S_f(\underline{y}^{(r)}, \underline{\zeta}^{(r)}) - L|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\implies \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} |S_f(\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)}) - L| = 0 \text{ (theorem 3.21)}$$

Remark 7.13 Let $f \in \mathcal{C}([a, b])$. We sometimes write

$$\int_a^b f(x) \, dx = \int_a^b f.$$

By convention, we also define

$$\int_a^a f = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_b^a f = - \int_a^b f.$$

Properties of Riemann integral

Theorem 7.14 *Linearity.* Let $f, g \in \mathcal{C}([a, b])$ and $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}$, then

$$\int_a^b (\alpha f + g) = \alpha \int_a^b f + \int_a^b g.$$

proof: let $\left((\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)}) \right)_{r=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of tagged partitions such that $\|\underline{x}^{(r)}\| \rightarrow 0$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^b (\alpha f + g) &= \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} S_{\alpha f + g}(\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)}) \\ &= \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} (\alpha S_f(\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)}) + S_g(\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)})) \\ &= \alpha \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} S_f(\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)}) + \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} S_g(\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)}) \\ &= \alpha \int_a^b f + \int_a^b g \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 7.15 Additivity. Let $f \in \mathcal{C}([a, b])$ and $a < c < b$, then we have

$$\int_a^b f = \int_a^c f + \int_c^b f.$$

proof:

- let $\left((\underline{y}^{(r)}, \underline{\zeta}^{(r)}) \right)_{r=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of tagged partitions of $[a, c]$ with $\|\underline{y}^{(r)}\| \rightarrow 0$
- let $\left((\underline{z}^{(r)}, \underline{\eta}^{(r)}) \right)_{r=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of tagged partitions of $[c, b]$ with $\|\underline{z}^{(r)}\| \rightarrow 0$
- then $\left((\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)}) \right)_{r=1}^{\infty}$ with $\underline{x}^{(r)} = \underline{y}^{(r)} \cup \underline{z}^{(r)}$ and $\underline{\xi}^{(r)} = \underline{\zeta}^{(r)} \cup \underline{\eta}^{(r)}$ is a sequence of tagged partitions of $[a, b]$
- $\|\underline{y}^{(r)}\| \rightarrow 0$ and $\|\underline{z}^{(r)}\| \rightarrow 0 \implies \|\underline{x}^{(r)}\| \leq \|\underline{y}^{(r)}\| + \|\underline{z}^{(r)}\| \rightarrow 0$

Riemann integral

7-15

- hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^b f &= \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} S_f(\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)}) = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} (S_f(\underline{y}^{(r)}, \underline{\zeta}^{(r)}) + S_f(\underline{z}^{(r)}, \underline{\eta}^{(r)})) \\ &= \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} S_f(\underline{y}^{(r)}, \underline{\zeta}^{(r)}) + \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} S_f(\underline{z}^{(r)}, \underline{\eta}^{(r)}) = \int_a^c f + \int_c^b f \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 7.16 Let $f, g \in \mathcal{C}([a, b])$ and $f(x) \leq g(x)$ for all $x \in [a, b]$, then we have

$$\int_a^b f \leq \int_a^b g.$$

proof: let $\left((\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)}) \right)_{r=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of tagged partitions with $\|\underline{x}^{(r)}\| \rightarrow 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} S_f(\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)}) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n^{(r)}} f(\xi_i^{(r)})(x_i^{(r)} - x_{i-1}^{(r)}) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n^{(r)}} g(\xi_i^{(r)})(x_i^{(r)} - x_{i-1}^{(r)}) \\ &= S_g(\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\implies \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} S_f(\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)}) \leq \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} S_g(\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)}) \implies \int_a^b f \leq \int_a^b g$$

Corollary 7.17 Let $f \in \mathcal{C}([a, b])$, then we have:

$$\left| \int_a^b f \right| \leq \int_a^b |f|.$$

proof: $\pm f(x) \leq |f(x)| \implies \int_a^b \pm f = \pm \int_a^b f \leq \int_a^b |f|$ (theorem 7.16)

Theorem 7.18 Let $f \in \mathcal{C}([a, b])$, and

$$m_f = \inf\{f(x) \mid x \in [a, b]\}, \quad M_f = \sup\{f(x) \mid x \in [a, b]\}.$$

Then, we have

$$m_f(b - a) \leq \int_a^b f \leq M_f(b - a).$$

proof: let $\left((\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)})\right)_{r=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of tagged partitions with $\|\underline{x}^{(r)}\| \rightarrow 0$, then

$$S_f(\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n^{(r)}} f(\xi_i^{(r)})(x_i^{(r)} - x_{i-1}^{(r)}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n^{(r)}} m_f(x_i^{(r)} - x_{i-1}^{(r)}) = m_f(b - a)$$

$$S_f(\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n^{(r)}} f(\xi_i^{(r)})(x_i^{(r)} - x_{i-1}^{(r)}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n^{(r)}} M_f(x_i^{(r)} - x_{i-1}^{(r)}) = M_f(b - a)$$

$$\implies m_f(b - a) \leq \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} S_f(\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)}) \leq M_f(b - a)$$

Fundamental theorem of calculus

Theorem 7.19 *Fundamental theorem of calculus.* Let $f \in \mathcal{C}([a, b])$.

- If $F: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is differentiable and $F' = f$, then

$$\int_a^b f = F(b) - F(a).$$

- The function $G(x) = \int_a^x f$ is differentiable on $[a, b]$ with

$$G(a) = 0, \quad G'(x) = f(x).$$

proof:

- let $\left(\underline{x}^{(r)}\right)_{r=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of partitions with $\|\underline{x}^{(r)}\| \rightarrow 0$, then by theorem 6.15, there exist tags $\underline{\xi}^{(r)}$ with $\xi_i^{(r)} \in [x_{i-1}^{(r)}, x_i^{(r)}]$, $i = 1, \dots, n^{(r)}$, such that

$$F(x_i^{(r)}) - F(x_{i-1}^{(r)}) = F'(\xi_i^{(r)})(x_i^{(r)} - x_{i-1}^{(r)}) = f(\xi_i^{(r)})(x_i^{(r)} - x_{i-1}^{(r)})$$

hence, for the sequence of tagged partitions $\left(\left(\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)}\right)\right)_{r=1}^{\infty}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_f(\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)}) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n^{(r)}} f(\xi_i^{(r)})(x_i^{(r)} - x_{i-1}^{(r)}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n^{(r)}} F(x_i^{(r)}) - F(x_{i-1}^{(r)}) \\ &= F(b) - F(a) \end{aligned}$$

$$\implies \int_a^b f = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} S_f(\underline{x}^{(r)}, \underline{\xi}^{(r)}) = F(b) - F(a)$$

- we only need to show that G is differentiable and $G' = f$, i.e., let $c \in [a, b]$, we need to prove that $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{G(x) - G(c)}{x - c} = \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{\int_a^x f - \int_a^c f}{x - c} = f(c)$; let $\epsilon > 0$
 - f continuous on $[a, b] \implies \exists \delta > 0$ such that for all $t \in [a, b]$ and $|t - c| < \delta$, we have $|f(t) - f(c)| < \epsilon/2$
 - suppose $x \in (c, c + \delta)$, then for all $t \in [c, x]$, we have $|f(t) - f(c)| < \epsilon/2$, hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\int_a^x f - \int_a^c f}{x - c} - f(c) \right| &= \left| \frac{\int_c^x f(t) dt}{x - c} - f(c) \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{1}{x - c} \left(\int_c^x f(t) dt - \int_c^x f(c) dt \right) \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{x - c} \left| \int_c^x (f(t) - f(c)) dt \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{x - c} \int_c^x |f(t) - f(c)| dt \leq \frac{1}{x - c} \int_c^x \frac{\epsilon}{2} dt \\ &= \frac{1}{x - c} \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{2} (x - c) = \frac{\epsilon}{2} < \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

(the first inequality is by corollary 7.17)

- suppose $x \in (c - \delta, c)$, using similar argument, we have $\left| \frac{\int_a^x f - \int_a^c f}{x - c} - f(c) \right| < \epsilon$
- put together, we conclude that for all $x \in [a, b]$ and $0 < |x - c| < \delta$, we have

$$\left| \frac{\int_a^x f - \int_a^c f}{x - c} - f(c) \right| < \epsilon$$

$$\implies \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{G(x) - G(c)}{x - c} = \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{\int_a^x f - \int_a^c f}{x - c} = f(c)$$

Integration by parts

Theorem 7.20 *Integration by parts.* Suppose $f, g \in \mathcal{C}([a, b])$, $f', g' \in \mathcal{C}([a, b])$, then

$$\int_a^b f'g = (f(b)g(b) - f(a)g(a)) - \int_a^b fg'.$$

proof: let $F \in \mathcal{C}([a, b])$ with $F(x) = f(x)g(x)$, by theorem 6.8, we have

$$F'(x) = f'(x)g(x) + f(x)g'(x),$$

and hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^b f'(x)g(x) dx + \int_a^b f(x)g'(x) dx &= \int_a^b (f'(x)g(x) + f(x)g'(x)) dx \\ &= \int_a^b F'(x) dx = F(b) - F(a) = f(b)g(b) - f(a)g(a) \end{aligned}$$

$$\implies \int_a^b f'g = (f(b)g(b) - f(a)g(a)) - \int_a^b fg'$$

Change of variables

Theorem 7.21 *Change of variables.* Let $f \in \mathcal{C}([c, d])$ and $\varphi: [a, b] \rightarrow [c, d]$ be continuously differentiable with $\varphi(a) = c$ and $\varphi(b) = d$. Then, we have

$$\int_c^d f(u) \, du = \int_a^b f(\varphi(x))\varphi'(x) \, dx.$$

proof:

- let $F: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function with $F' = f$, then we have

$$\int_c^d f(u) \, du = F(d) - F(c)$$

- by theorem 6.9, we have $(F \circ \varphi)'(x) = F'(\varphi(x))\varphi'(x) = f(\varphi(x))\varphi'(x)$, hence,

$$\int_a^b f(\varphi(x))\varphi'(x) \, dx = F(\varphi(b)) - F(\varphi(a)) = F(d) - F(c) = \int_c^d f(u) \, du$$

8. Sequences of functions

- power series
- pointwise and uniform convergence
- interchange of limits
- Weierstrass M-test
- properties of power series

8-1

Power series

Definition 8.1 A **power series** about $x_0 \in \mathbf{R}$ is a series of the form

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_m (x - x_0)^m.$$

Definition 8.2 Let $\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_m (x - x_0)^m$ be a power series, if the limit

$$R = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} |a_m|^{1/m}$$

exists, we define the **radius of convergence** ρ as

$$\rho = \begin{cases} 1/R & R > 0 \\ \infty & R = 0. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 8.3 Let $\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_m(x - x_0)^m$ be a power series and suppose $R = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} |a_m|^{1/m}$ exists. If $R = 0$, the series converges absolutely for all $x \in \mathbf{R}$. If $R > 0$, the series converges absolutely if $|x - x_0| < \rho$ and diverges if $|x - x_0| > \rho$.

proof: consider the root test (theorem 4.27), we have

$$L = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} |a_m(x - x_0)^m|^{1/m} = |x - x_0| \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} |a_m|^{1/m} = R|x - x_0|$$

- suppose $R = 0$, then we have $L = 0 < 1$ for all $x \in \mathbf{R}$
 $\implies \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_m(x - x_0)^m$ converges absolutely for all $x \in \mathbf{R}$
- suppose $R > 0$
 - if $|x - x_0| < \rho \implies L < R\rho = 1 \implies \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_m(x - x_0)^m$ converges absolutely
 - if $|x - x_0| > \rho \implies L > R\rho = 1 \implies \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_m(x - x_0)^m$ diverges

Remark 8.4 Let $\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_m(x - x_0)^m$ be a power series with radius of convergence ρ . Define $f: (x_0 - \rho, x_0 + \rho) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that

$$f(x) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_m(x - x_0)^m,$$

then, the function f is the limit of a sequence of functions $(f_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$, given by

$$f(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x), \quad f_n(x) = \sum_{m=0}^n a_m(x - x_0)^m.$$

Example 8.5 Consider the geometric series $\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} x^m$ (which is a power series with $a_m = 1$, $x_0 = 0$), we have $f: (-1, 1) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ given by

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{1 - x} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} x^m = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x), \quad f_n(x) = \sum_{m=0}^n x^m.$$

Example 8.6 *Exponential function.* Consider the power series with $a_m = \frac{1}{m!}$, $x_0 = 0$, we have the exponential function $f(x): \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, given by

$$f(x) = \exp(x) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^m}{m!} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x), \quad f_n(x) = \sum_{m=0}^n \frac{x^m}{m!}.$$

Remark 8.7 Based on remark 8.4, we may ask several questions.

(1) Is the function f continuous?

(2) If (1) is true, is f differentiable, and does $f' = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f'_n$?

(3) If (1) is true, does $\int_a^b f = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b f_n$?


Pointwise convergence

Definition 8.8 Let $(f_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ with $f_n: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$ be a sequence of functions, and let $f: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function. We say that $(f_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ **converges pointwise** (or just **converges**) to f if for all $x \in S$, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) = f(x)$.

Example 8.9 Let $f_n(x) = x^n$ be defined on $[0, 1]$, then we have the sequence of functions $(f_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges pointwise to $f(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x \in [0, 1) \\ 1 & x = 1 \end{cases}$.

proof:

- if $x \in [0, 1)$: $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x^n = 0$
- if $x = 1$: $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} 1^n = 1$



Remark 8.10 A sequence of continuous functions may not converge pointwise to a continuous function.

Example 8.11 Let $f_n(x): [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be defined by





$$f_n(x) = \begin{cases} 4n^2x & x \in [0, \frac{1}{2n}] \\ 4n - 4n^2x & x \in [\frac{1}{2n}, \frac{1}{n}] \\ 0 & x \in [\frac{1}{n}, 1] \end{cases},$$

then $(f_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges pointwise to $f(x) = 0$ ($x \in [0, 1]$).

proof:

- if $x = 0$, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(0) = 0$
- if $x \in (0, 1]$, then $\exists M \in [0, 1]$ such that $\forall n \geq M, \frac{1}{n} < x$, and hence,

$$(f_n(x))_{n=1}^{\infty} = f_1(x), \dots, f_{M-1}(x), 0, 0, 0, \dots \implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) = 0$$



Uniform convergence

Definition 8.12 Let $(f_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ with $f_n: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$ be a sequence of functions, and let $f: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function. We say that $(f_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ **converges uniformly** to f if for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists some $M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that for all $n \geq M$ and $x \in S$, we have $|f_n(x) - f(x)| < \epsilon$.

Theorem 8.13 Let $f: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, $f_n: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$ be functions. If the sequence of functions $(f_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges uniformly to f , then $(f_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges pointwise to f .

proof: let $c \in S$, $\epsilon > 0$

- $(f_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges uniformly to $f \implies \exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that for all $n \geq M$ and $x \in S$, $|f_n(x) - f(x)| < \epsilon$
- hence, $\forall n \geq M$, $|f_n(c) - f(c)| < \epsilon \implies (f_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges pointwise to f

Remark 8.14 Let $f: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, $f_n: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$ be functions. The sequence $(f_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ does not converge to f uniformly if there exists some $\epsilon > 0$ such that for all $M \in \mathbf{N}$, there exist some $n \geq M$ and some $x \in S$, so that $|f_n(x) - f(x)| \geq \epsilon$.

Theorem 8.15 Let $f_n(x) = x^n$, $n \in \mathbf{N}$, and let

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x \in [0, 1) \\ 1 & x = 1. \end{cases}$$

- The sequence $(f_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges uniformly to f on $[0, b]$ for all $0 < b < 1$.
 - The sequence $(f_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ does not converges to f uniformly on $[0, 1]$.
-

proof:

- let $\epsilon > 0$, $b \in (0, 1)$, then $b^n \rightarrow 0 \implies \exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall n \geq M$, $b^n < \epsilon \implies \forall n \geq M$ and $x \in [0, b]$, we have

$$|f_n(x) - f(x)| = x^n \leq b^n < \epsilon$$

- choose $\epsilon = 1/2$, then $\forall M \in \mathbf{N}$, choose $n = M$, $x = (1/2)^{1/M} < 1$, we have

$$|f_M(x) - f(x)| = x^M = 1/2 \geq \epsilon$$

Interchange of limits

Example 8.16 In general, limits cannot be interchanged. For example,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n/k}{n/k + 1} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 = 0, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n/k}{n/k + 1} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} 1 = 1.$$

Remark 8.17 Based on example 8.16, we may ask the following questions.

- If $f_n: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ with f_n continuous for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$ and $(f_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ converges to f uniformly or pointwise, then is f continuous?
- If $f_n: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ with f_n differentiable for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, and $(f_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ converges to f , $(f'_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ converges to g uniformly or pointwise, then is f differentiable and does $f' = g$?
- If $f_n: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, $n \in \mathbf{N}$, $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, with f_n and f continuous, and $(f_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ converges to f uniformly or pointwise, then does $\int_a^b f = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b f_n$?

Remark 8.18 If convergence is only pointwise, the answer is *no* for all questions in remark 8.17.

- Let $f_n(x) = x^n$ on $[0, 1]$, $n \in \mathbf{N}$. Example 8.9 shows that $(f_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ converges pointwise to a noncontinuous function.
- Let $f_n(x) = \frac{x^{n+1}}{n+1}$ on $[0, 1]$, then $(f_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ converges to $f(x) = 0$ pointwise on $[0, 1]$ and $(f'_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ converges pointwise to g given by $g(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x \in [0, 1) \\ 1 & x = 1 \end{cases}$, but $f'(1) = 0 \neq g(1) = 1$.
- Let $f_n: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be given by $f_n(x) = \begin{cases} 4n^2x & x \in [0, \frac{1}{2n}] \\ 4n - 4n^2x & x \in [\frac{1}{2n}, \frac{1}{n}] \\ 0 & x \in [\frac{1}{n}, 1] \end{cases}$, then $(f_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ converges to $f(x) = 0$ pointwise on $[0, 1]$ (example 8.11), but

$$\int_0^1 f = 0 \neq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 f_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \cdot 2n \right) = 1.$$

Theorem 8.19 If $f_n: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is continuous for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, $f: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, and $(f_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ converges to f uniformly, then f is continuous.

proof: let $c \in S$, $\epsilon > 0$

- f_n continuous on S , $c \in S \implies \exists \delta > 0$ such that for all $x \in S$ and $|x - c| < \delta$, we have $|f_n(x) - f_n(c)| < \epsilon/3$
- $f_n \rightarrow f$ uniformly $\implies \exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that for all $n \geq M$ and $x \in S$, we have $|f(x) - f_n(x)| < \epsilon/3$
- hence, for all $x \in S$ and $|x - c| < \delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |f(x) - f(c)| &= |f(x) - f_M(x) + f_M(x) - f_M(c) + f_M(c) - f(c)| \\ &\leq |f(x) - f_M(x)| + |f_M(x) - f_M(c)| + |f_M(c) - f(c)| \\ &< \frac{\epsilon}{3} + \frac{\epsilon}{3} + \frac{\epsilon}{3} = \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 8.20 If $f_n: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is continuous for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, and $(f_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ converges to f uniformly, then $\int_a^b f = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b f_n$.

proof: let $\epsilon > 0$

- by theorem 8.19, we know that f is continuous on $[a, b]$
- $(f_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ converges uniformly to $f \implies \exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that for all $n \geq M$ and $x \in [a, b]$, we have $|f_n(x) - f(x)| < \frac{\epsilon}{b-a}$
- hence, for all $n \geq M$, we have

$$\left| \int_a^b f_n - \int_a^b f \right| = \left| \int_a^b (f_n - f) \right| \leq \int_a^b |f_n - f| < \int_a^b \frac{\epsilon}{b-a} = \epsilon,$$

where the first inequality is by corollary 7.17

Remark 8.21 Notationally, theorem 8.20 says that

$$\int_a^b f = \int_a^b \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b f_n.$$

Theorem 8.22 If $f_n: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is continuously differentiable, $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, $g: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, and

- $(f_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to f pointwise,
 - $(f'_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to g uniformly,
- then f is continuously differentiable and $f' = g$.
-

proof: let $x \in [a, b]$

- by theorem 8.19, we know that g is continuous on $[a, b]$
- by theorem 7.19, we have

$$\int_a^x f'_n = f_n(x) - f_n(a) \implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^x f'_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(a)$$

- $f_n \rightarrow f$ pointwise $\implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(a) = f(x) - f(a)$
- $f'_n \rightarrow g$ uniformly $\implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^x f'_n = \int_a^x g$ (theorem 8.20)
- put together, we have

$$\int_a^x g = f(x) - f(a) \implies \left(\int_a^x g \right)' = g(x) = f'(x)$$

Weierstrass M-test

Theorem 8.23 *Weierstrass M-test.* Let $f_k: S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ for all $k \in \mathbf{N}$. Suppose there exists $M_k > 0$, $k \in \mathbf{N}$, such that

(a) $|f_k(x)| \leq M_k$ for all $x \in S$,

(b) $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} M_k$ converges.

Then, we have the following conclusion.

(1) The series $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} f_k(x)$ converges absolutely for all $x \in S$.

(2) Let $f(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} f_k(x)$ for all $x \in S$, then the sequence $(\sum_{k=1}^n f_k)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to f uniformly on S .

proof:

(1) $|f_k(x)| \leq M_k$, $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} M_k$ converges $\implies \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |f_k(x)|$ converges
(theorem 4.21) $\implies \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} f_k(x)$ converges absolutely

(2) let $\epsilon > 0$; $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} M_k$ converges $\implies \exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ s.t. $\forall n \geq M$, we have

$$\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} M_k = \left| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} M_k - \sum_{k=1}^n M_k \right| < \epsilon$$

then, for all $n \geq M$ and $x \in S$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} f_k(x) - \sum_{k=1}^n f_k(x) \right| &= \left| \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} f_k(x) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} |f_k(x)| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} M_k \\ &< \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Properties of power series

Theorem 8.24 Let $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k(x - x_0)^k$ be a power series with radius of convergence $\rho \in (0, \infty]$, then for all $r \in (0, \rho)$, the series $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k(x - x_0)^k$ converges uniformly on $[x_0 - r, x_0 + r]$.

proof:

- note that we have $|x - x_0| \leq r$ for all $x \in [x_0 - r, x_0 + r]$
- let $f_k = a_k(x - x_0)^k$, choose $M_k = |a_k|r^k$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then for all $x \in [x_0 - r, x_0 + r]$, we have

$$|f_k(x)| = |a_k(x - x_0)^k| = |a_k||x - x_0|^k \leq |a_k|r^k = M_k$$

Sequences of functions

8-21

- consider the root test (theorem 4.27) for $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} M_k$, we have

$$L = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} M_k^{1/k} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (|a_k|r^k)^{1/k} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |a_k|^{1/k} r = \begin{cases} r/\rho & \rho < \infty \\ 0 & \rho = \infty, \end{cases}$$

since $r \in (0, \rho)$, we have $L < 1 \implies \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} M_k$ converges absolutely

- put together, by theorem 8.23, we have

$$\left(\sum_{k=0}^n f_k \right)_{n=1}^{\infty} = \left(\sum_{k=0}^n a_k(x - x_0)^k \right)_{n=1}^{\infty}$$

converges uniformly on $[x_0 - r, x_0 + r]$

Theorem 8.25 Let $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k(x - x_0)^k$ be a power series with radius of convergence $\rho \in (0, \infty]$, then we have the following conclusion.

- For all $c \in (x_0 - \rho, x_0 + \rho)$, the function given by the series $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k(x - x_0)^k$ is differentiable at c , and

$$\left. \frac{d}{dx} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k(x - x_0)^k \right) \right|_{x=c} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{d}{dx} (a_k(x - x_0)^k) \Big|_{x=c}.$$

- For all a, b such that $x_0 - \rho < a < b < x_0 + \rho$,

$$\int_a^b \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k(x - x_0)^k dx = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_a^b a_k(x - x_0)^k dx.$$

9. Metric spaces

- metric spaces
- Cauchy-Schwarz inequality
- open and closed sets
- closure and boundary
- sequences and convergence in metric spaces
- convergence properties of topology
- Cauchy sequences and completeness

9-1

Metric spaces

Definition 9.1 Let A and B be sets. The **Cartesian product** is the set of tuples defined as

$$A \times B = \{(x, y) \mid x \in A, y \in B\}.$$

examples:

- $\{a, b\} \times \{c, d\} = \{(a, c), (a, d), (b, c), (b, d)\}$
- the set $\mathbf{R}^2 = \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ is the Cartesian plane
- the set $[0, 1]^2 = [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ is a subset of the Cartesian plane bounded by a square with vertices $(0, 0)$, $(0, 1)$, $(1, 0)$, and $(1, 1)$

Remark 9.2 To denote an element in \mathbf{R}^n , we write $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbf{R}^n$, or simply $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$, where the subscripts $i = 1, \dots, n$ denote the i th entry of the tuple (x_1, \dots, x_n) that describes x .

We also simply write $0 \in \mathbf{R}^n$ to mean the point $(0, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbf{R}^n$.

Definition 9.3 Let X be a set, and let $d: X \times X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function such that for all $x, y, z \in X$, we have

- $d(x, y) \geq 0$, (*nonnegativity*)
- $d(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $x = y$,
- $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$, and (*symmetry*)
- $d(x, z) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, z)$. (*triangle inequality*)

Then the pair (X, d) is called a **metric space**. The function d is called the **metric** or the **distance function**. Sometimes we just write X as the metric space if the metric is clear from context.

Example 9.4 The real numbers \mathbf{R} is a metric space with the metric $d(x, y) = |x - y|$.

proof:

- the first three properties follows immediately from the properties of the absolute value (theorem 2.25)
- to show the triangle inequality, let $x, y, z \in \mathbf{R}$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, z) &= |x - z| = |x - y + y - z| \\ &\leq |x - y| + |y - z| = d(x, y) + d(y, z) \end{aligned}$$

Definition 9.5 Let (X, d) be a metric space. A set $S \subseteq X$ is said to be **bounded** if there exists a point $p \in X$ and some number $B \in \mathbf{R}$ such that

$$d(p, x) \leq B \quad \text{for all } x \in S.$$

We say (X, d) is bounded if X is a bounded set.

Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

Theorem 9.6 *Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.* Suppose $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbf{R}^n$, $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbf{R}^n$, then

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i \right)^2 \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n y_i^2 \right).$$

proof:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n (x_i y_j - x_j y_i)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n (x_i^2 y_j^2 - 2x_i y_j x_j y_i + x_j^2 y_i^2) \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^n y_j^2 \right) + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n y_i^2 \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^n x_j^2 \right) - 2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^n x_j y_j \right) \\ &\Rightarrow \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i \right)^2 \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n y_i^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 9.7 The function $f: \mathbf{R}^n \times \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ given by

$$f(x, y) = \sqrt{(x_1 - y_1)^2 + \cdots + (x_n - y_n)^2} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - y_i)^2}$$

is a metric for \mathbf{R}^n .

proof: we show that f satisfies the triangle inequality, by theorem 9.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (f(x, z))^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - z_i)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - y_i + y_i - z_i)^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - y_i)^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - y_i)(y_i - z_i) + \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - z_i)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Metric spaces

9-7

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - y_i)^2 + 2 \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - y_i)^2 \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - z_i)^2} + \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - z_i)^2 \\ &= \left(\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - y_i)^2} + \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - z_i)^2} \right)^2 = (f(x, y) + f(y, z))^2 \end{aligned}$$

n -dimensional Euclidean space

Definition 9.8 The n -dimensional Euclidean space is the metric space (\mathbf{R}^n, d) with the metric d defined by

$$d(x, y) = \sqrt{(x_1 - y_1)^2 + \cdots + (x_n - y_n)^2} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - y_i)^2}. \quad (9.1)$$

Remark 9.9 For $n = 1$, the n -dimensional Euclidean space reduces to the real numbers and the metric given by (9.1) agrees with the standard metric for the set of real numbers $d(x, y) = |x - y|$ in example 9.4.

Open and closed sets

Definition 9.10 Let (X, d) be a metric space, $x \in X$, and $\delta > 0$. Define the **open ball** and **closed ball**, of radius δ around x as

$$B(x, \delta) = \{y \in X \mid d(x, y) < \delta\} \quad \text{and} \quad C(x, \delta) = \{y \in X \mid d(x, y) \leq \delta\},$$

respectively.

Example 9.11 Consider the metric space \mathbf{R} , for $x \in \mathbf{R}$ and $\delta > 0$, we have

$$B(x, \delta) = (x - \delta, x + \delta) \quad \text{and} \quad C(x, \delta) = [x - \delta, x + \delta].$$

Example 9.12 Consider the metric space \mathbf{R}^2 , for $x \in \mathbf{R}^2$ and $\delta > 0$, we have

$$B(x, \delta) = \{y \in \mathbf{R}^2 \mid (x_1 - y_1)^2 + (x_2 - y_2)^2 < \delta^2\}.$$

Definition 9.13 Let (X, d) be a metric space. A subset $V \subseteq X$ is **open** if for all $x \in V$, there exists some $\delta > 0$ such that $B(x, \delta) \subseteq V$. A subset $E \subseteq X$ is **closed** if the complement $E^c = X \setminus E$ is open.

examples:

- $(0, \infty) \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ is open; $[0, \infty) \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ is closed
 - $[0, 1) \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ is neither open nor closed
 - the singleton $\{x\}$ with $x \in X$ is closed
-

Theorem 9.14 Let (X, d) be a metric space.

- (1) The sets \emptyset and X are open.
 - (2) If V_1, \dots, V_k are subsets of X , then $\bigcap_{i=1}^k V_i$ is open, *i.e.*, a *finite* intersection of open sets is open.
 - (3) Let $\{V_i \subseteq X \mid i \in I\}$ be a collection of open subsets of X , where I is an arbitrary index set, then $\bigcup_{i \in I} V_i$ is open, *i.e.*, a union of open sets is open.
-

proof:

- the sets \emptyset and X are obviously open
- let $x \in \bigcap_{i=1}^k V_i$, then $x \in V_1, \dots, V_k$
 - V_1, \dots, V_k are open \implies there exists $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_k > 0$ such that

$$B(x, \delta_1) \subseteq V_1, \dots, B(x, \delta_k) \subseteq V_k$$

- choose $\delta = \min\{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_k\}$, then $B(x, \delta) \subseteq V_1, \dots, V_k$
 $\implies B(x, \delta) \subseteq \bigcap_{i=1}^k V_i$

- let $x \in \bigcup_{i \in I} V_i$, then $\exists V_k \in \{V_i \mid i \in I\}$ such that $x \in V_k$
 - V_k is open $\implies \exists \delta > 0$ such that $B(x, \delta) \subseteq V_k \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in I} V_i$

Theorem 9.15 Let (X, d) be a metric space.

- (1) The sets \emptyset and X are closed.
 - (3) Let $\{V_i \subseteq X \mid i \in I\}$ be a collection of closed subsets of X , where I is an arbitrary index set, then $\bigcap_{i \in I} V_i$ is closed, *i.e.*, an intersection of closed sets is closed.
 - (2) If V_1, \dots, V_k are subsets of X , then $\bigcup_{i=1}^k V_i$ is closed, *i.e.*, a *finite* union of closed sets is closed.
-

Remark 9.16 Note that in theorem 9.14, the statement (2) is not true for an arbitrary intersection. For example, the set $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1/n, 1/n) = \{0\}$ is not open in \mathbf{R} .

Similarly, in theorem 9.15, the statement (3) is not true for an arbitrary intersection. For example, consider the set $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} [1/n, \infty) = (0, \infty)$, which is not closed in \mathbf{R} .

Theorem 9.17 Let (X, d) be a metric space, $x \in X$, and $\delta > 0$. Then $B(x, \delta)$ is open and $C(x, \delta)$ is closed.

proof: we show that $B(x, \delta)$ is open; let $z \in B(x, \delta)$, then $d(x, z) < \delta$

- choose $\epsilon = \delta - d(x, z)$, let $B(z, \epsilon) = \{y \in X \mid d(y, z) < \epsilon\}$ be an open ball
- let $y \in B(z, \epsilon)$, we have $d(y, z) < \epsilon$, and hence

$$d(x, y) \leq d(x, z) + d(z, y) < d(x, z) + \epsilon = d(x, z) + \delta - d(x, z) = \delta$$

$$\implies y \in B(x, \delta) \implies B(z, \epsilon) \subseteq B(x, \delta)$$

Closure and boundary

Definition 9.18 Let (X, d) be a metric space and $A \subseteq X$. The **closure** of A is the set

$$\mathbf{cl} A = \bigcap \{E \subseteq X \mid E \text{ is closed and } A \subseteq E\},$$

i.e., $\mathbf{cl} A$ is the intersection of all closed sets that contain A .

Definition 9.19 Let (X, d) be a metric space and $A \subseteq X$. The **interior** of A is the set

$$\mathbf{int} A = \{x \in A \mid B(x, \delta) \subseteq A \text{ for some } \delta > 0\}.$$

The **boundary** of A is the set

$$\mathbf{bd} A = \mathbf{cl} A \setminus \mathbf{int} A.$$

example: consider $A = (0, 1]$ and $X = \mathbf{R}$, then we have $\mathbf{cl} A = [0, 1]$, $\mathbf{int} A = (0, 1)$, and $\mathbf{bd} A = \{0, 1\}$

Remark 9.20 Notationally, in some textbooks, the closure, interior, and boundary of some set A are denoted as

$$\overline{A} = \mathbf{cl} A, \quad A^\circ = \mathbf{int} A, \quad \text{and} \quad \partial A = \mathbf{bd} A,$$

respectively.

Theorem 9.21 Let (X, d) be a metric space and $A \subseteq X$.

- The closure $\text{cl } A$ is closed and $A \subseteq \text{cl } A$.
 - If A is closed, then $\text{cl } A = A$.
-

proof: let $\text{cl } A = \bigcap \{E \subseteq X \mid E \text{ is closed and } A \subseteq E\}$

- the first statement follows directly from the definition of closure and theorem 9.15
- if A is closed, then $A \in \{E \subseteq X \mid E \text{ is closed and } A \subseteq E\} \implies \text{cl } A \subseteq A \implies A = \text{cl } A$

Theorem 9.22 Let (X, d) be a metric space and $A \subseteq X$, then $x \in \text{cl } A$ if and only if for all $\delta > 0$, we have $B(x, \delta) \cap A \neq \emptyset$.

proof: we show the following claim: $x \notin \text{cl } A$ if and only if there exists some $\delta > 0$ such that $B(x, \delta) \cap A = \emptyset$

- suppose $x \notin \text{cl } A$, then $x \in (\text{cl } A)^c$
 - $\text{cl } A$ is closed $\implies (\text{cl } A)^c$ is open \implies there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $B(x, \delta) \subseteq (\text{cl } A)^c \subseteq A^c \implies B(x, \delta) \cap A = \emptyset$
- suppose $\exists \delta > 0$ such that $B(x, \delta) \cap A = \emptyset$, let $x \in X$
 - $B(x, \delta)$ is open $\implies (B(x, \delta))^c$ is closed
 - $B(x, \delta) \cap A = \emptyset \implies A \subseteq (B(x, \delta))^c \implies \text{cl } A \subseteq (B(x, \delta))^c$
 - $x \in B(x, \delta) \implies x \notin (B(x, \delta))^c$
 - put together, we have $x \notin \text{cl } A$

Theorem 9.23 Let (X, d) be a metric space and $A \subseteq X$, then $\text{int } A$ is open and $\text{bd } A$ is closed.

proof:

- let $x \in \text{int } A$
 - $x \in \text{int } A \implies \exists \delta > 0$ such that $B(x, \delta) \subseteq A$
 - let $z \in B(x, \delta)$; $B(x, \delta)$ open $\implies \exists \epsilon > 0$ s.t. $B(z, \epsilon) \subseteq B(x, \delta) \subseteq A$
 $\implies z \in \text{int } A \implies B(x, \delta) \subseteq \text{int } A \implies \text{int } A$ is open
- $\text{int } A$ open $\implies (\text{int } A)^c$ closed \implies

$$\text{bd } A = \text{cl } A \setminus \text{int } A = \text{cl } A \cap (\text{int } A)^c$$

is closed (theorem 9.15)

Theorem 9.24 Let (X, d) be a metric space and $A \subseteq X$, then $x \in \text{bd } A$ if and only if for all $\delta > 0$, we have the sets $B(x, \delta) \cap A$ and $B(x, \delta) \cap A^c$ are both nonempty.

proof:

- suppose $x \in \text{bd } A$, let $\delta > 0$
 - $x \in \text{bd } A \implies x \in \text{cl } A$, and hence, by theorem 9.22, we have $B(x, \delta) \cap A \neq \emptyset$
 - assume $B(x, \delta) \cap A^c = \emptyset$, then we have $B(x, \delta) \subseteq A \implies x \in \text{int } A$, which is a contradiction
- suppose $B(x, \delta) \cap A \neq \emptyset$ and $B(x, \delta) \cap A^c \neq \emptyset$ for all $\delta > 0$, assume $x \notin \text{bd } A$
 - $x \notin \text{bd } A \implies x \notin \text{cl } A$ or $x \in \text{int } A$
 - if $x \notin \text{cl } A \implies \exists \delta_0 > 0$ such that $B(x, \delta_0) \cap A = \emptyset$, which is a contradiction
 - if $x \in \text{int } A \implies \exists \delta_0 > 0$ such that $B(x, \delta_0) \subseteq A \implies B(x, \delta_0) \cap A^c = \emptyset$, which is a contradiction

Theorem 9.25 Let (X, d) be a metric space and $A \subseteq X$, then $\text{bd } A = \text{cl } A \cap \text{cl}(A^c)$.

proof: let $x \in \text{bd } A$, $\delta > 0$

- by theorem 9.24, we have $B(x, \delta) \cap A$ and $B(x, \delta) \cap A^c$ nonempty
- by theorem 9.22, $B(x, \delta) \cap A \neq \emptyset \implies x \in \text{cl } A$ and $B(x, \delta) \cap A^c \neq \emptyset \implies x \in \text{cl } A^c$
- hence, we have $\text{bd } A = \text{cl } A \cap \text{cl}(A^c)$

Sequences in metric spaces

Definition 9.26 A **sequence** in a metric space (X, d) is a function $x: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow X$. To denote a sequence we write $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$, where x_n is the n th element in the sequence.

A sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is **bounded** if there exists a point $p \in X$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $d(p, x_n) \leq B$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $(n_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be a strictly increasing sequence of natural numbers, then the sequence $(x_{n_i})_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is called a **subsequence** of $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$.

Definition 9.27 A sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in a metric space (X, d) is said to **converge** to a point $p \in X$ if for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists some $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq M$, we have $d(x_n, p) < \epsilon$.

The point p is called a **limit** of $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$. If the limit p is unique, we write

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = p.$$

A sequence that converges is said to be **convergent**, and otherwise is **divergent**.

Theorem 9.28 A convergent sequence in a metric space has unique limit.

proof: let $x, y \in X$ such that $x_n \rightarrow x$ and $x_n \rightarrow y$; let $\epsilon > 0$

- $x_n \rightarrow x \implies \exists M_1 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall n \geq M_1, d(x_n, x) < \epsilon/2$
- $x_n \rightarrow y \implies \exists M_2 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall n \geq M_2, d(x_n, y) < \epsilon/2$
- hence, for all $n \geq M$, we have

$$d(x, y) \leq d(x_n, x) + d(x_n, y) < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon$$

$$\implies d(x, y) = 0 \implies x = y$$

Theorem 9.29 A convergent sequence in a metric space is bounded.

proof: suppose $x_n \rightarrow p \in X$

- let $\epsilon > 0, x_n \rightarrow p \implies \exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall n \geq M, d(x_n, p) < \epsilon$
- choose $B = \max\{d(x_1, p), \dots, d(x_M, p), \epsilon\}$, then for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, we have $d(x_n, p) \leq B$

Theorem 9.30 A sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in a metric space (X, d) converges to $p \in X$ if and only if there exists a sequence $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of real numbers such that for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, we have

$$d(x_n, p) \leq a_n \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = 0.$$

proof:

- suppose $x_n \rightarrow p$
 - $x_n \rightarrow p \implies \forall \epsilon > 0, \exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall n \geq M, d(x_n, p) < \epsilon$
 $\implies d(x_n, p) \rightarrow 0$
 - choose $a_n = d(x_n, p)$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$, then we have $d(x_n, p) \leq a_n$ and $a_n \rightarrow 0$
- suppose $a_n \rightarrow 0$ with $a_n \in \mathbf{R}$ and $d(x_n, p) \leq a_n$, let $\epsilon > 0$
 - $0 \leq d(x_n, p) \leq a_n, a_n \rightarrow 0 \implies d(x_n, p) \rightarrow 0$ (theorem 3.21)
 - $d(x_n, p) \rightarrow 0 \implies \exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall n \geq M, d(x_n, p) < \epsilon$
 $\implies x_n \rightarrow p$

Theorem 9.31 Let $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence in a metric space (X, d) . If $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to $p \in X$, then all subsequences of $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to p .

proof: let $\epsilon > 0$

- let $x_n \rightarrow p$, then $\exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall n \geq M, d(x_n, p) < \epsilon$
- let $(x_{n_i})_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be a subsequence of $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$, then we have $n_i \geq i$
- hence, for all $i \geq M$, we have $n_i \geq M \implies \forall i \geq M, d(x_{n_i}, p) < \epsilon$

Convergence in Euclidean space

Theorem 9.32 Let $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence in \mathbf{R}^k , where $x_n \in \mathbf{R}^k$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$. Then $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges if and only if $(x_{n,i})_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges for all $i = 1, \dots, k$, i.e.,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_{n,1}, \dots, \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_{n,k} \right).$$

proof:

- suppose $x_n \rightarrow p \in \mathbf{R}^k$, let $\epsilon > 0$; $x_n \rightarrow p \implies \exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall n \geq M, d(x_n, p) < \epsilon$; hence, $\forall n \geq M$, we have

$$(d(x_n, p))^2 = \sum_{i=1}^k (x_{n,i} - p_i)^2 < \epsilon^2 \implies (x_{n,i} - p_i)^2 < \epsilon^2, \quad i = 1, \dots, k$$

$$\implies |x_{n,i} - p_i| < \epsilon, \quad i = 1, \dots, k \implies x_{n,i} \rightarrow p_i \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, k$$

Metric spaces

9-27

- suppose $x_{n,i} \rightarrow p_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$, let $\epsilon > 0$, $p = (p_1, \dots, p_k)$
 - $x_{n,i} \rightarrow p_i, i = 1, \dots, k \implies \exists M_1, \dots, M_k \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall n \geq M_i$, we have $|x_{n,i} - p_i| < \epsilon/\sqrt{k}, i = 1, \dots, k$
 - choose $M = \max\{M_1, \dots, M_k\}$, then $\forall n \geq M$, we have

$$d(x_n, p) = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k (x_{n,i} - p_i)^2} < \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k \left(\frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{k}}\right)^2} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\epsilon^2}{k}} = \sqrt{\epsilon^2} = \epsilon$$

$$\implies x_n \rightarrow p$$

Convergence properties of topology

Theorem 9.33 Let (X, d) be a metric space and $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence in X , then $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to $p \in X$ if and only if for all open sets $U \subseteq X$ with $p \in U$, there exists some $M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that for all $n \geq M$, we have $x_n \in U$.

proof:

- suppose $x_n \rightarrow p$, let $U \subseteq X$ be open and $p \in U$
 - U is an open set contains $p \implies \exists \delta > 0$ such that $B(p, \delta) \subseteq U$
 - $x_n \rightarrow p \implies \exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ s.t. $\forall n \geq M, d(x_n, p) < \delta \implies \forall n \geq M, x_n \in B(p, \delta) \implies \forall n \geq M, x_n \in U$
- suppose for all open sets $U \subseteq X$ with $p \in U$, there exists some $M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $x_n \in U$ for all $n \geq M$; let $\epsilon > 0$
 - choose $U = B(p, \epsilon)$, then $\exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall n \geq M, x_n \in B(p, \epsilon)$
 - hence, $\forall n \geq M, d(x_n, p) < \epsilon \implies x_n \rightarrow p$

Theorem 9.34 Let (X, d) be a metric space, $E \subseteq X$ be a closed set, and $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence in E that converges to some $p \in X$, then we have $p \in E$.

proof: assume $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in E converges to p but $p \notin E$

- $p \notin E \implies p \in E^c$
- E is closed $\implies E^c$ is open, then by theorem 9.33, $\exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall n \geq M, x_n \in E^c \implies \forall n \geq M, x_n \notin E$, which is a contradiction

Theorem 9.35 Let (X, d) be a metric space and $A \subseteq X$, then $p \in \text{cl } A$ if and only if there exists a sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of elements in A such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = p$.

proof:

- suppose $p \in \text{cl } A$, by theorem 9.22, $\forall \delta > 0$, we have $B(p, \delta) \cap A \neq \emptyset$
 - choose $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ such that $x_n \in A$ and $d(x_n, p) < \frac{1}{n}$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$
 - $0 \leq d(x_n, p) < \frac{1}{n}$ and $\frac{1}{n} \rightarrow 0 \implies d(x_n, p) \rightarrow 0 \implies x_n \rightarrow p$ (theorem 9.30)
- suppose $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in A and $x_n \rightarrow p$, let $\delta > 0$
 - $x_n \rightarrow p \implies \exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ s.t. $\forall n \geq M, d(x_n, p) < \delta \implies \forall n \geq M$, we have $x_n \in B(p, \delta)$
 - since $x_n \in A$, we have $B(p, \delta) \cap A \neq \emptyset \implies p \in \text{cl } A$ (theorem 9.22)

Cauchy sequences and completeness

Definition 9.36 Let (X, d) be a metric space. A sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in X is **Cauchy** if for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists some $M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that for all $n, k \geq M$, we have $d(x_n, x_k) < \epsilon$.

Theorem 9.37 A convergent sequence in a metric space is Cauchy.

proof: let $x_n \rightarrow p$, $\epsilon > 0$, then $\exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall n, k \geq M$, we have $d(x_n, p) < \epsilon/2$ and $d(x_k, p) < \epsilon/2$, and hence $\forall n, k \geq M$, we have

$$d(x_n, x_k) \leq d(x_n, p) + d(x_k, p) < \epsilon/2 + \epsilon/2 = \epsilon$$

Definition 9.38 We say a metric space (X, d) is **complete** or **Cauchy-complete** if all Cauchy sequences in X converges to some point in X .

Theorem 9.39 The Euclidean space \mathbf{R}^k is a complete metric space.

proof: let $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be Cauchy with $x_n \in \mathbf{R}^k$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$; let $\epsilon > 0$

- $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is Cauchy $\implies \exists M \in \mathbf{N}$ s.t. $\forall m, n \geq M, d(x_m - x_n) < \epsilon$
- hence, for all $m, n \geq M$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (d(x_m, x_n))^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^k (x_{m,i} - x_{n,i})^2 < \epsilon^2 \\ \implies |x_{m,i} - x_{n,i}| &< \epsilon, \quad i = 1, \dots, k \end{aligned}$$

$\implies \forall i = 1, \dots, k$, the sequence of real numbers $(x_{n,i})_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is Cauchy

- by theorem 3.45, we have $(x_{n,i})_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges for all $i = 1, \dots, k$
- then, by theorem 9.32, we conclude the sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges