

# MATH 5301 Elementary Analysis - Homework 6

Jonas Wagner

2021, October 17<sup>th</sup>

## Problem 1 Provide examples of the sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ so that:

**Definition 1.** Set  $A$  is connected if it is not disconnected.

**Definition 2.** Set  $A$  is disconnected if  $\forall U, V$  - open:

- a.  $U \cap A \neq \emptyset, V \cap A \neq \emptyset$
- b.  $(U \cap V) \cap A \neq \emptyset$  Note: this implies  $U \neq \emptyset$  and  $V \neq \emptyset$
- c.  $A \subset U \cup V \neq \emptyset$

### a) $A$ and $B$ are connected but $A \cup B$ is not.

Sets  $A$  and  $B$  are individually connected but that just aren't near each other. An example are these open balls:

$$A = \mathcal{B}_r((0, 0)) := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x^2 + y^2 < r^2\}$$
$$B = \mathcal{B}_r((-5r, 5r)) := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : (x + 5r)^2 + (y - 5r)^2 < r^2\}$$

### b) $A$ and $B$ are connected but $A \cap B$ is not.

Sets  $A$  and  $B$  are individually connected, but they intersect in two areas resulting in a disjoint intersection... Such as this donut and square sets:

$$A = \mathcal{B}_R^{(2)}((0, 0)) \setminus \mathcal{B}_r^{(2)}((0, 0)) = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : r^2 < x^2 + y^2 < R^2\}$$
$$B = \mathcal{B}_r^{(\infty)}((0, 0)) = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x < r \wedge y < r\}$$

### c) $A$ and $B$ are not connected but $A \cup B$ is connected.

$A$  and  $B$  individually are disjoint shapes but each individual disjointed part intersects with one from the other set. An example would be a couple of disjoint (then connected when a union) regions.

$$A := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x \in [-1, 0] \cup [1, 2] \wedge y \in [-2, 2]\}$$
$$B := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x \in [-2, 1.25] \cup [1.75, 4] \wedge y \in [-1, 3]\}$$

### d) $A$ and $B$ are not connected but $A \cap B$ is connected.

$A$  and  $B$  individually are disjoint shapes, there is then only one connected region where they intersect. An example is two overlapping regions, each with random other disjoint parts.

$$A := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x \in [0, 1] \cup [15, 30], y \in [0, 1]\}$$
$$B := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x \in [-1, 1] \cup [-15, -20], y \in [0, 1]\}$$

**e)  $A$  and  $B$  are not connected but  $A \setminus B$  is connected.**

$A$  and  $B$  individually are disjoint shapes, with a part of  $B$  covering all but one disjoint region of  $A$ . An example is a two overlapping regions with disjoint parts and  $A$  having one (only one) disjoint part not fully covered by  $B$ .

$$A := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R} : x \in [0, 1] \cup [15, 30], y \in [0, 1]\}$$

$$B := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R} : x \in [-1, 0.5] \cup [15, 30], y \in [0, 1]\}$$

## Problem 2

a) **Prove that every monotone bounded sequence in  $\mathbb{R}$  converge.**

**Definition 3.** The function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called *monotone* if and only if it is either entirely non-increasing or non-decreasing.

a.  $f$  is non-decreasing if  $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R} x \leq y \implies f(x) \leq f(y)$ .

b.  $f$  is non-increasing if  $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R} x \leq y \implies f(x) \geq f(y)$ .

**Definition 4.** The function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called *bounded* if

$$\exists N \in \mathbb{R} : \forall x \in \mathbb{R} |f(x)| \leq N$$

**Definition 5.** A sequence  $\{a_n\}$  is said to *converge* to limit  $a$  if

$$\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists N(\epsilon) : \forall n > N |a_n - a| < \epsilon$$

**Theorem 1.** Every monotone bounded sequence in  $\mathbb{R}$  converges.

*Proof.* Define sequence  $\{a_n\}$  bounded and monotone. (i.e)

$$((\forall n, m \in \mathbb{N} : m > n a_n \geq a_m) \vee (\forall n, m \in \mathbb{N} : m > n a_n \leq a_m)) \wedge (\exists N \in \mathbb{R} \forall n \in \mathbb{N} |a_n| \leq N)$$

Taking only the positive case (non-decreasing and bounded from above), a proof can be made without loss of generality (as that's how  $|\cdot|$  works...).

$$\begin{aligned} (\forall n, m \in \mathbb{N} : n > m a_n \leq a_m) \wedge (\exists a \in \mathbb{R} \forall n \in \mathbb{N} |a_n| \leq a) &\implies \forall \epsilon > 0 \exists N(\epsilon) : \forall n > N |a_n - a| < \epsilon \\ \exists a \in \mathbb{R} \forall n, m \in \mathbb{N} : n > m a_n \leq a_m \leq a &\implies \forall \epsilon > 0 \exists N(\epsilon) \forall n > N a - a_n < \epsilon \\ \forall \epsilon > 0 \exists N(\epsilon) \exists a \in \mathbb{R} \forall n, m \in \mathbb{N} : n > m a_n \leq a_m \leq a &\implies a - a_n < \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Clearly since the sequence is non-decreasing and bounded from above it will converge to the upper boundary. This can then be applied again for below to fully prove this.  $\square$

b) **Provide an example of the set  $A \in \mathbb{R}$  having exactly four limit points.**

**Definition 6.** For a set  $A \subset S$  in metric space  $(S, d)$ ,  $x \in S$  is called a *limit point* of  $A$  if

$$\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists y \in A : 0 < d(x, y) < \epsilon$$

Define  $A$  as a simple union of simple single limit point sets:

$$A := \left\{ \frac{1}{n}, n \in \mathbb{N} \right\} \cup \left\{ \sqrt{2} + \frac{1}{n}, n \in \mathbb{N} \right\} \cup \left\{ \pi + \frac{1}{n}, n \in \mathbb{N} \right\} \cup \left\{ e + \frac{1}{n}, n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$$

In this case the limit points are: 0,  $\sqrt{2}$ ,  $\pi$ , and  $e$ .

c) **Provide an example of a sequence  $\{a_n\}$ , so that every point in the interval  $[2019, 2021]$  is a limit point of it.**

Because sinusoidal functions are fun, let's use:

$$\{a_n\} := \{a_n = 2000 + \sin(n), n = 1, 2, \dots\}$$

### Problem 3

a)

Provide an example of a sequence  $\{a_n\}$  so that  $a_n$  diverges, but  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n - a_{2n}) = 0$ .  
This is perhaps going too far with it, but how about:

$$\{a_n\} := \{a_n = \begin{cases} a_{n/2} + \frac{1}{n} & n \text{ is even} \\ n^2 & \text{else} \end{cases}\}$$

b)

Provide an example of two sequences  $\{a_n\}$  and  $\{b_n\}$  so that

$$\left( \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n + \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n \right) < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n + b_n) < \left( \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n \right) < \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n + b_n) < \left( \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n \right)$$

**Definition 7.** A Limit Superior, denoted as  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty}$ , is the limit of an superior function on the extremes of a sequence. This is defined by

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \sup_{m \geq n} x_m \right)$$

**Definition 8.** A Limit Inferior, denoted as  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty}$ , is the limit of an inferior function on the extremes of a sequence. This is defined by

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \inf_{m \geq n} x_m \right)$$

Defining two sinusoidal functions with the same frequency but with a phase shift to incur the strictness requirements.

$$\begin{aligned} \{a_n\} &:= \{a_n = \cos(\omega_1 n + \theta_1)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \\ \{b_n\} &:= \{b_n = \cos(\omega_2 n + \theta_2)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \end{aligned}$$

with  $\omega_1 = \omega_2 = \frac{\pi}{25}$ ,  $\theta_1 = 0$ , and  $\theta_2 = \frac{\pi}{8}$ .

## Problem 4

Show the equivalence of the norms  $\|\cdot\|_1, \|\cdot\|_2, \|\cdot\|_p, p > 1$  and  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

**Definition 9.** A norm is a function  $\|\cdot\| : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  satisfying:

- a.  $\|\vec{x}\| > 0, \vec{x} \neq 0$
- b.  $\|\lambda\vec{x}\| = |\lambda|\|\vec{x}\|$
- c.  $\|\vec{x} + \vec{y}\| \leq \|\vec{x}\| + \|\vec{y}\|$

**Definition 10.** For  $\|\cdot\|_a, \|\cdot\|_b$  on  $S$ ,  $\|\cdot\|_a$  is said to be stronger than  $\|\cdot\|_b$  if

$$\forall \{x_n\} \subset S : x_n \xrightarrow{d_a} x \implies x_n \xrightarrow{d_b} x$$

Which is equivalent to

**Definition 11.**  $\|\cdot\|_a$  and  $\|\cdot\|_b$  are said to be equivalent,  $\|\cdot\|_a \sim \|\cdot\|_b$ , if  $\|\cdot\|_a$  is stronger than  $\|\cdot\|_b$  and  $\|\cdot\|_b$  is stronger than  $\|\cdot\|_a$ . Additionally, the following is also true:

$$\|\cdot\|_a \sim \|\cdot\|_b \implies \exists \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} : \forall x \in S \alpha \|\cdot\|_b \leq \|\cdot\|_a \leq \beta \|\cdot\|_b$$

**Definition 12.** The standard norms are defined as

- a.  $\|\cdot\|_1 := \|x\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i| = |x_1| + |x_2| + \dots + |x_n|$
- b.  $\|\cdot\|_2 := \|x\|_2 = \left( \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^2 \right)^{1/2} = \left( |x_1|^2 + |x_2|^2 + \dots + |x_n|^2 \right)^{1/2}$
- c.  $\|\cdot\|_p := \|x\|_p = \left( \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^p \right)^{1/p} = \left( |x_1|^p + |x_2|^p + \dots + |x_n|^p \right)^{1/p}, p > 1$
- d.  $\|\cdot\|_\infty := \|x\|_\infty = \max_{i=1}^n |x_i| = \max(|x_1|, |x_2|, \dots, |x_n|)$

**Theorem 2.** The norms  $\|\cdot\|_1, \|\cdot\|_2, \|\cdot\|_p$ , and  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  are all equivalent on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

*Proof.*

**Lemma 1.**  $\|\cdot\|_1$  is equivalent to  $\|\cdot\|_2$

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\cdot\|_1 \sim \|\cdot\|_2 &\implies \exists \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} : \forall x \in \mathbb{R} \alpha \|x\|_2 \leq \|x\|_1 \leq \beta \|x\|_2 \\ \alpha \left( \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^2 \right)^{1/2} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i| \leq \beta \left( \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ \left( \alpha \left( \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right)^2 &\leq \left( \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i| \right)^2 \leq \left( \beta \left( \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right)^2 \\ \alpha^2 \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^2 &\leq \left( \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i| \right) \left( \sum_{j=1}^n |x_j| \right) \leq \beta^2 \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^2 \end{aligned}$$

From the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality  $(\sum_{i=1}^n u_i v_i)^2 \leq (\sum_{i=1}^n u_i^2)(\sum_{i=1}^n v_i^2)$

$$\alpha^2 \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i x_i| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^2 \leq \left( \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i| \right) \left( \sum_{j=1}^n |x_j| \right) \leq \left( \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i| \right)^2 \leq \beta^2 \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^2$$

Clearly, this is true for when  $\alpha \in (0, 1]$  and  $\beta \in [1, \infty)$ ; therefore  $\|\cdot\|_1 \sim \|\cdot\|_2$ . □

□

## Problem 5

Are there any open sets  $A$  and  $B$  in  $\mathbb{R}^4$  so that  $\text{dist}(A, B) = 0$  but  $A \cap B = \emptyset$ ?

**Definition 13.** For sets  $A, B \subset S$  in metric space  $(S, d)$ ,

$$\text{dist}(A, B) := \inf\{d(x, y) : x \in A, y \in B\}$$

**Proposition 1.** There exists open sets  $A$  and  $B$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  so that  $d(A, B) = 0$  but  $A \cap B = \emptyset$ .

*Proof.*  $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^4$  open means

$$\forall x \in A \exists \epsilon > 0 \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^4 d(x, y) < \epsilon \implies y \in A$$

and

$$\forall x \in B \exists \epsilon > 0 \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^4 d(x, y) < \epsilon \implies y \in B$$

$\text{dist}(A, B) = 0$  means that

$$\text{dist}(A, B) = \inf\{d(x, y) : x \in A, y \in B\} = 0$$

Additionally,  $A \cap B = \emptyset$  implies that  $\forall x \in A \forall y \in B x \neq y$ .

In order for  $\text{dist}(A, B) = 0$  and  $A \cap B = \emptyset$ ,

$$\exists x \in A : \inf_{y \in B} \{d(x, y)\} = 0 \wedge x \notin B$$

One solution to this is that

$$\exists x \in \partial A, y \in \partial B : d(x, y) = 0$$

Therefore, it is possible for open sets  $A$  and  $B$  in  $\mathbb{R}^4$  so that  $\text{dist}(A, B) = 0$  and  $A \cap B = \emptyset$ .

Essentially,  $\partial A \cap \partial B \neq \emptyset$ .

An example would be:

$$A := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x^2 + y^2 < r_1^2\}$$

and

$$B := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : (x + 2r_2)^2 + y^2 < r_2^2\}$$

with  $r_1 = r_2 = r \in \mathbb{R}$ .

□

## Problem 6

Let  $\mathcal{B}([0, 1])$  denote the set of all bounded functions from  $[0, 1]$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ . Define the metric on  $\mathcal{B}([0, 1])$  as  $d(f, g) = \sup_{x \in [0, 1]} |f(x) - g(x)|$ .

a) Show that this is indeed a metric.

**Theorem 3.** The metric  $d : \mathcal{B}([0, 1]) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$d(f, g) := \sup_{x \in [0, 1]} |f(x) - g(x)|$$

is a metric on  $\mathcal{B}([0, 1])$ .

*Proof.* A metric must satisfy (i) non-negativity, (ii) Symmetry, and (iii) Triangle Inequality.

i) Non-negativity

$$d(f, g) = \sup_{x \in [0, 1]} |f(x) - g(x)| \geq 0$$

Since  $|f(x) - g(x)| \geq 0$ ,  $\sup_{x \in [0, 1]} |f(x) - g(x)| \geq 0$  and therefore  $d(f, g) \geq 0$ .

ii) Symmetry

$$d(f, g) = d(g, f)$$

$$\begin{aligned} d(f, g) &= \sup_{x \in [0, 1]} |f(x) - g(x)| = d(g, f) = \sup_{x \in [0, 1]} |g(x) - f(x)| \\ \sup_{x \in [0, 1]} |f(x) - g(x)| &= \sup_{x \in [0, 1]} |(-1)(f(x) - g(x))| \\ \sup_{x \in [0, 1]} |f(x) - g(x)| &= \sup_{x \in [0, 1]} |(f(x) - g(x))| \end{aligned}$$

Therefore it is symmetric.

iii) Triangle Inequality

$$d(f, h) \leq d(f, g) + d(g, h)$$

Denoting  $N_f(M_f)$ ,  $N_g(M_g)$ , and  $N_h(M_h)$  as the upper (and lower) bounds within  $x \in [0, 1]$  of  $f(x)$ ,  $g(x)$ , and  $h(x)$  respectively. Note: this is not a very efficient proof...

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in [0, 1]} |f(x) - g(x)| &\leq |N_f - M_g| + |N_g - M_f| \\ \sup_{x \in [0, 1]} |g(x) - h(x)| &\leq |N_g - M_h| + |N_h - M_g| \\ \sup_{x \in [0, 1]} |f(x) - h(x)| &\leq |N_f - M_h| + |N_h - M_f| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} d(f, h) &= \sup_{x \in [0, 1]} |f(x) - h(x)| \leq d(f, g) + d(g, h) = \sup_{x \in [0, 1]} |f(x) - g(x)| + \sup_{x \in [0, 1]} |g(x) - h(x)| \\ |N_f - M_g| + |N_g - M_f| &\leq |N_g - M_h| + |N_h - M_g| + |N_f - M_h| + |N_h - M_f| \end{aligned}$$

Which demonstrates something.... I'll have to look at this again because it is problematic

□

**b) Prove that the space  $(\mathcal{B}([0, 1]), d)$  is a complete metric space.**

**Definition 14.** Metric space  $(S, d)$  is called a complete metric space if every cauchy sequence  $\{a_n\} \subset S$  converges in  $S$ .

$$\forall \{a_n\} \subset S : \{a_n\} \text{ cauchy} \implies \exists a \in S : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = a$$

**Theorem 4.**  $(\mathcal{B}([0, 1]), d)$  is a complete metric space.

*Proof.* Let  $\{a_n\}$  be a cauchy sequence (i.e.)

$$\{a_n\} : \forall \epsilon > 0 \exists N : \forall n, m > N \implies d(a_n, a_m) < \epsilon$$

Consider set  $D_N = \{x \in S : \forall n < N a_n < x\}$

a.  $D$  is bounded (i.e  $x \in D < a_N + \epsilon$ )

b.  $D$  is nonempty (i.e  $a_N - \epsilon \in D$ )

For a fixed  $\epsilon$ ,

$$\exists_N : \forall n > N+1 \implies d(a_n, a_{N+1}) < \epsilon$$

We then take  $a = \sup\{D\}$ .

Claim  $a = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$ ,

$$\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists_N : \forall n > N \implies d(a, a_n) < \epsilon$$

Claim  $y < a \implies y \in D$ ,

$$y \in D \wedge z < y \implies z \in D$$

$$\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists_{N(\epsilon)} : \forall n > N a_n > a - \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

However, it is also true by definition of cauchy sequence:

$$d(a_m, a_n) < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \forall_{m, n > \hat{N}}$$

Also,

$$n > \max[N, \hat{N}] : d(a_n, a) \leq d(a_n, a_m) + d(a_m, a) \leq \epsilon$$

Since  $\epsilon > 0$  is arbitrarily selected and  $d(a_n, a) < \epsilon$  whenever  $n \geq N$ , this implies  $\{a_n\}$  converges to  $a$ .  $\square$



c) Is the unit ball  $\mathcal{B}_1(0) = \{f(x) : d(f, 0) \leq 1\}$  compact?

**Definition 15.** Let  $(S, d)$  be a metric space with  $A \subset S$ ,

a. For  $\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ ,  $U_\alpha \subset S$ , is a cover of the set  $A$  if

$$A \subset \bigcup_{\alpha \in A} U_\alpha$$

b. A cover  $\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$  of  $A$  is an open cover if  $\forall \alpha \in A$   $U_\alpha$  is an open set.

c.  $\{V_\beta\}_{\beta \in B}$  is called a subcover of  $\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$  if

(a)  $\{V_\beta\}_{\beta \in B}$  is a cover of  $A$

(b)  $\forall \beta \in B \exists \alpha \in A V_\beta = U_\alpha$

d. A cover with a finite number of sets is called a finite cover.

**Definition 16.** For  $A \subset (S, d)$ ,  $A$  is compact if for every open cover of  $A$  there exists a finite sub cover.

**Proposition 2.**  $\mathcal{B}_1(0) = \{f(x) : d(f, 0) \leq 1\}$  is compact.

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_1(0) &= \{f(x) : d(f, 0) \leq 1\} \\ &= \left\{ f(x) : \sup_{x \in [0,1]} |f(x) - 0| \leq 1 \right\} \\ &= \left\{ f(x) : \sup_{x \in [0,1]} |f(x)| \leq 1 \right\} \\ &= \{f(x) : \forall x \in [0,1] |f(x)| \leq 1\} \\ &= \{f(x) : \forall x \in [0,1] -1 \leq f(x) \leq 1\} \end{aligned}$$

In other words, the ball is totally bounded. Since it is also known that this bounded subset of  $\mathcal{B}([0, 1])$  is complete, it is therefore also compact.  $\square$