# Homework Assignment 3

Joshua Cragun \* Prof. Gordan Savin, MATH 3210 October 2018

<sup>\*</sup>u1025691

Let  $x_n$  be a sequence of positive real numbers such that  $\lim_n x_n = x > 0$ . Prove that

- $\bullet \ \lim_n x_n^2 = x^2.$
- $\lim_n \sqrt{x_n} = \sqrt{x}$ .

Part 1: Using the identity

$$x_n^2 - x^2 = (x_n - x)^2 + 2x(x_n - x)$$

Where for any given  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists an integer N such that for any  $m \geq N$ ,  $|x_m - x| < \sqrt{\varepsilon}$ . This implies that  $|(x_n - x)^2| < \varepsilon$  and therefore  $\lim_{n \to \infty} (x_n - x)^2 = 0$ . And clearly

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} 2x(x_n - x) = 2x \cdot 0 = 0$$

Thus  $\lim_{n\to\infty} x_n^2 - x^2 = 0$  and therefore

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} x_n^2 = x^2$$

Part 2:

By what was given, one need not consider the cases where  $x \leq 0$ . If x > 0 then there exists an N such that if  $m \geq N$ ,  $|x_m - x| < \varepsilon \sqrt{x}$ . Then, because this is over positive real numbers,

$$|\sqrt{x_m} - \sqrt{x}| = \frac{|x_m - x|}{|\sqrt{x_m} + \sqrt{x}|} < \frac{|x_m - x|}{\sqrt{x}} < \frac{\varepsilon\sqrt{x}}{\sqrt{x}} = \varepsilon$$

Thus  $\lim_{n} \sqrt{x_n} = \sqrt{x}$ .

Define a sequence by  $s_1 = 1$  and  $s_{n+1} = \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{s_n}}$ . Prove that  $s_n < 2$  for all n, and that  $s_n$  is an increasing sequence. Find the limit.

To begin, one sees immediately that  $s_n$  increases between  $s_1 = 1$  and  $s_2 = \sqrt{3}$ . Suppose that  $s_n$  is increasing from n = 1, ..., m. Then,

$$s_{m} = \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{s_{m-1}}} > s_{m-1}$$

$$\sqrt[4]{2 + \sqrt{s_{m-1}}} > \sqrt{s_{m-1}}$$

$$2 + \sqrt[4]{2 + \sqrt{s_{m-1}}} > 2 + \sqrt{s_{m-1}}$$

$$\sqrt{2 + \sqrt[4]{2 + \sqrt{s_{m-1}}}} = s_{m+1} > \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{s_{m-1}}} = s_{m}$$

Hence  $s_{m+1} > s_m$ . Thus the sequence is increasing for all  $n \ge 1$ . Next, suppose that some  $s_m \ge 2$ . Then,

$$2 \le \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{s_{m-1}}}$$

$$4 \le 2 + \sqrt{s_{m-1}}$$

$$2 \le \sqrt{s_{m-1}}$$

$$4 < s_{m-1}$$

Thus, if  $s_m \geq 2$  then  $s_{m-1} \geq 4$ . But this contradicts the fact that the sequence is strictly increasing. Thus  $s_n < 2$  for all  $n \geq 1$ . To find the limit of the sequence, let  $\lim_n \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{s_n}} = L$ . Then

$$L = \sqrt{\lim_{n} (2 + \sqrt{s_n})} = \sqrt{2 + \lim_{n} \sqrt{s_n}} = \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{\lim_{n} s_n}} = \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{L}}$$

Thus the limit will be a solution to the expression above, or when rearranged:

$$L^4 - 4L^2 - L + 4 = 0$$

Which is approximately 1.83118, or in exact form:

$$\frac{1}{3}\left(-1+\sqrt[3]{\frac{1}{2}(79-3\sqrt{249})}+\sqrt[3]{\frac{1}{2}(79+3\sqrt{249})}\right)$$

Let  $X = \mathbb{Z}$  and d(x, x) = 0 or  $d(x, y) = \frac{1}{2^n}$ , if  $x \neq y$ , where  $2^n$  is the largest power of 2 dividing x - y. Prove that the following two series are Cauchy. One of them is convergent (find its sum) while the other not (explain).

- $\bullet \ \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^n$
- $\bullet \ \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-2)^n$

To begin, let s denote the first series, and let r denote the second. Consider two nonequal partial sums  $s_n$ , and  $s_m$ . Then,

$$s_n = 2^0 + 2^1 + \dots + 2^n$$
  
 $s_m = 2^0 + 2^1 + \dots + 2^m$ 

Without loss of generality, assume m > n. Then,

$$s_m - s_n = 2^{n+1} + \dots + 2^m$$
  
=  $2^{n+1} (1 + 2^1 + \dots + 2^{m-n-1})$ 

Thus the differences between any two nonequal partial sums of degrees m and n with m > n is  $\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}$ . If n = m then the distance is zero, by definition. One can easily see that the same is true for r by simply replacing any 2 in the steps above with (-2) and then factoring out  $2^{n+1}$  at the very end.

With this is it very straightforward to show that both series are Cauchy. Given any  $\varepsilon > 0$  one can find a j such that  $0 < \frac{1}{2^j} < \varepsilon$  and  $\varepsilon \le \frac{1}{2^{j+1}}$ . Without loss of generality, take any partial sum of degree k > j of s, then

$$d(s_k, s_j) = \frac{1}{2^{k+1}} < \frac{1}{2^j} < \varepsilon$$

It is very easy to see that this is equally true for r. Hence, both series are Cauchy.

Although both are Cauchy, only s is convergent, and it converges to -1. The reason is through considerations of the limit of the similar sequence  $\lim_{n\to\infty} 2^n$ . One sees that the distance between 0 and any  $2^n$  is  $\frac{1}{2^n}$  since 0 is divisible by any integer. Hence,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} d(0, 2^n) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{2^n} = 0$$

Thus  $\lim_{n\to\infty} 2^n = 0$  and since any partial sum of  $s, s_n = 2^{n+1} - 1$ ,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} s_n = \lim_{n \to \infty} 2^{n+1} - 1 = 0 - 1 = -1$$

The other series does not converge because its partial sums do not approach a single point.

## Question 4

Let  $c_n$  be a sequence of positive numbers. Prove that

$$\liminf_{n} \frac{c_{n+1}}{c_n} \le \liminf_{n} \sqrt[n]{c_n}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\alpha' = \liminf_n \sqrt[n]{c_n}$  and  $\alpha = \liminf_n \frac{c_{n+1}}{c_n}$ . Also let B be an arbitrary positive number such that  $B < \alpha$  and let  $z_m = \liminf_{m \ge n} \frac{c_{m+1}}{c_m}$ . Then  $\exists N$  such that  $z_N \ge B$  for all  $m \ge N$ . In other words we have,

$$B < \frac{c_{N+1}}{c_N}, B < \frac{c_{N+2}}{c_{N+1}}, \cdots, B \le \frac{c_{m+1}}{c_m}$$

Or,

$$c_{N+1} \ge Bc_N, c_{N+2} \ge B^2 c_N, \cdots, c_m \ge B^{m-N} c_N$$

So then in another form,  $c_m \geq \frac{c_N}{B^N} B^m$ . Then we also have that

$$\sqrt[m]{c_m} \ge \sqrt[m]{\frac{c_N}{B^N}B^m}$$

However note that  $\frac{c_N}{B^N}$  is constant, so as m increases, the value of that quotient approaches 1, so we then have

$$\sqrt[m]{c_m} \ge \sqrt[m]{\frac{c_N}{B^N}B^m} \to \sqrt[m]{B^m} = B$$

Thus for all  $B < \alpha, \alpha' \ge B$ . This implies that  $\alpha' \ge \alpha$ . In other words,

$$\liminf_{n} \sqrt[n]{c_n} \ge \lim\inf_{n} \frac{c_{n+1}}{c_n}.$$

Let (X, d) be a metric space. Let  $x = \{x_n\}$  and  $y = \{y_n\}$  be two Cauchy sequences. Prove that the sequence of distances  $d(x_n, y_n)$  is a Cauchy sequence of real numbers.

## Question 6

Let (X, d) be a metric space. Two Cauchy sequences  $x = \{x_n\}$  and  $y = \{y_n\}$  are equivalent if for every  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists n such that  $d(x_m, y_m) < \epsilon$  for all  $m \ge n$ . Prove that this is an equivalence relation.

## Question 7

Let Y be a non-empty set and  $d: Y \times Y \to [0, \infty)$  a "distance" function such that

- d(x,x) = 0 for all  $x \in Y$ .
- d(x,y) = d(y,x) for all  $x, y \in Y$ .
- $d(x,z) \le d(x,y) + d(y,z)$  for all  $x, y, z \in Y$ .

In words, d is almost a distance function, however, d(x,y) = 0 is allowed for different x and y. We say that x and y are equivalent if d(x,y) = 0. Prove that this is an equivalence relation. Prove that, if x is equivalent to y then d(x,z) = d(y,z) for all  $z \in Y$ .