

Suggested Solutions 2

1. Using the fact that every Cauchy sequence converges, prove the Bolzano-Weierstrass theorem. (Hint: First show every bounded sequence admits a monotonic sub-sequence. Second, show bounded monotonic sequences are Cauchy.)

Solution. The Bolzano-Weierstrass theorem states every bounded sequence has a convergent sub-sequence. Our strategy to prove it using Cauchy sequences will be:

- Show that every bounded sequence admits a monotonic sub-sequence.
- Show every bounded monotonic sequence is Cauchy.

For the first part, the claim is, formally,

- For each m there exists some $n > m$ s.t. $x_m \geq x_n$
- Or for each k there exists some $n > k$ s.t. $x_k \leq x_n$.

Maybe both are true, but if at least one is true then we have the first step. By contradiction, suppose this claim is false, meaning both statements must be false. That is,

- $\exists m_1$ s.t. $\forall n > m_1$ we have $x_{m_1} < x_n$
- and $\exists k_1$ s.t. $\forall n > k_1$ we have $x_{k_1} > x_n$.

In other words, for $n \geq M_1 \equiv \max\{m_1, k_1\}$ we have $x_n \in (x_{m_1}, x_{k_1})$. Now we can iterate the claim: Suppose there is no monotonic sub-sequence of x_m for $m \geq M_1$. Then

- $\exists m_2$ s.t. $\forall n > m_2$ we have $x_{m_2} < x_n$
- and $\exists k_2$ s.t. $\forall n > k_2$ we have $x_{k_2} > x_n$.

Note m_2, k_2 must each be larger than M_1 , so $x_{m_2}, x_{k_2} \in (x_{m_1}, x_{k_1})$, and for $n \geq M_2 \equiv \max\{m_2, k_2\}$ we have $x_n \in (x_{m_2}, x_{k_2}) \subset (x_{m_1}, x_{k_1})$. We can proceed by induction, and construct a sequence (two sequences, actually) x_{m_i} strictly increasing and x_{k_i} strictly decreasing. These are strictly monotonic sub-sequences of x_m , which is a contradiction.

For the second step, we again by contradiction suppose that monotonic sequences are not Cauchy. Remember the definition of Cauchy is for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists some M s.t. $d(x_k, x_n) < \varepsilon$ whenever $n, k \geq M$. If a sequence is not Cauchy, then $\exists \varepsilon > 0$ s.t. for each k, n we have

$$d(x_k, x_n) \geq \varepsilon$$

Consider x_{m_k} any monotonic sub-sequence of x_m and suppose it is increasing. We know that sequential elements of this sub-sequence are at least ε away from each other, since this is true of any two elements of x_m . Hence we can write

$$x_{m_1} + \varepsilon \leq x_{m_2} \quad x_{m_2} + \varepsilon \leq x_{m_3} \quad x_{m_1} + 2\varepsilon \leq x_{m_3} \quad \dots$$

In general, we can find that

$$x_{m_1} + (K - 1)\varepsilon \leq x_{m_K}$$

for any K . Since $\varepsilon > 0$, take any upper bound of the sequence U . We have that

$$K > \frac{U - x_{m_1}}{\varepsilon} + 1 \implies x_{m_1} + (K - 1)\varepsilon > U \implies x_{m_K} > U$$

meaning U is not an upper bound, contradiction. The proof for a decreasing sub-sequence is analogous. Thus we have shown every bounded sequence admits a monotonic sub-sequence; this sub-sequence is Cauchy, and since Cauchy sequences converge this sub-sequence converges.

2. Let (x_m) be any sequence. We define

$$\limsup = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sup_{k \geq m} x_k \right)$$

and

$$\liminf = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(\inf_{k \geq m} x_k \right)$$

Consider $(x_m) \in \mathbb{R}$ bounded. Show $x_m \rightarrow x \iff \limsup x_m = \liminf x_m = x$.

Solution. First \implies , that is, given $x_m \rightarrow x$ we show $\limsup x_m = \liminf x_m = x$. By definition,

$$\limsup x_m = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{k \geq m} x_k$$

Let $b_m \equiv \sup_{k \geq m} x_k$; we want to show $b_m \rightarrow x$. By definition of the sup, we know for any $\varepsilon_m = 1/m > 0$ there exists some x_{n_m} with $n_m \geq m$ s.t. $b_m - \varepsilon_m < x_{n_m} \leq b_m$. Now by the triangle inequality,

$$d(b_m, x) \leq d(b_m, x_{n_m}) + d(x, x_{n_m}) < 1/m + d(x, x_{n_m})$$

Pick any $\varepsilon > 0$; we know $\exists M$ s.t. $m \geq M$ implies $d(x_{n_m}, x) < \varepsilon/2$ (since x_{n_m} is a sub-sequence and must share the main sequence's limit). Further, for $m > 2/\varepsilon$ we have $d(b_m, x_{n_m}) < 1/m < \varepsilon/2$. Hence

$$m > \max\{2/\varepsilon, M\} \implies d(b_m, x) < \varepsilon/2 + \varepsilon/2 = \varepsilon$$

which proves $b_m \rightarrow x$. The steps for the inf are analogous. Now we show \Leftarrow . Note

$$a_m \equiv \inf_{k \geq m} x_k \leq x_m \leq \sup_{k \geq m} x_k \equiv b_m$$

for each m , with $a_m \rightarrow x, b_m \rightarrow x$ by premise. This already shows that $x_m \rightarrow x$, but let's show this explicitly. We want to show that for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is some M s.t.

$$m > M \implies d(x_m, x) < \varepsilon$$

Note $d(x_m, x) < \varepsilon \iff x - \varepsilon < x_m < x + \varepsilon$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is some M_1, M_2 s.t.

$$m > M_1 \implies d(b_m, x) < \varepsilon \text{ and } m > M_2 \implies d(a_m, x) < \varepsilon$$

Take $M > \max\{M_1, M_2\}$. Then we have

$$x - \varepsilon < a_m < x + \varepsilon \text{ and } x - \varepsilon < b_m < x + \varepsilon$$

To finish, we leverage $a_m \leq x_m \leq b_m$. Hence we have

$$x - \varepsilon < a_m \leq x_m \leq b_m < x + \varepsilon \implies x - \varepsilon < x_m < x + \varepsilon$$

which is what we wanted. This shows generically $a_m \leq x_m \leq b_m$ with $a_m, b_m \rightarrow x$ implies $x_m \rightarrow x$.

3. Given a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ we say that a function $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is **uniformly continuous** if $\forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists \delta > 0$ s.t. $\forall x, y \in S$

$$|x - y| < \delta \implies |f(x) - f(y)| < \varepsilon$$

The main difference between this and the usual definition of continuity, is that the latter can have different values of δ given $x, y \in S$. If a function is uniformly continuous, we need δ picked for any x, y (although it might depend on ε .)

- a) Take $f(x) = 1/x$ for $f : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Show f is continuous.

Solution. First, note for any $x \in (0, 1)$ and $\delta > 0$ small enough we have

$$\begin{aligned} |x - a| < \delta &\implies \frac{1}{a} \in \left(\frac{1}{x + \delta}, \frac{1}{x - \delta} \right) \\ &\implies \left| \frac{1}{x} - \frac{1}{a} \right| = \left| \frac{x - a}{xa} \right| < \left| \frac{1}{x} - \frac{1}{a} \right| < \left| \frac{\delta}{x(x - \delta)} \right| \end{aligned}$$

Let $\delta \equiv \varepsilon x^2 / (1 + \varepsilon x)$ (noting $x \in (0, 1)$). We have that

$$|x - a| < \delta \implies \left| \frac{1}{x} - \frac{1}{a} \right| < \left| \frac{\delta}{x(x - \delta)} \right| = \frac{\frac{\varepsilon x^2}{1 + \varepsilon x}}{x \left(x - \frac{\varepsilon x^2}{1 + \varepsilon x} \right)} = \varepsilon$$

which shows that $1/x$ is continuous.

- b) Show that for any two sequences $(x_m), (y_m) \in S$ with $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (x_m - y_m) = 0$ and s.t. $\exists \varepsilon > 0$ with $|g(x_m) - g(y_m)| > \varepsilon \forall m \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $g : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is not uniformly continuous.

Solution. First, note every ε_1 there is some M s.t.

$$m > M \implies |x_m - y_m| < \varepsilon_1$$

$g : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is uniformly continuous if for every ε_2 there is some δ such that for all $x, y \in A$,

$$|x - y| < \delta \implies |g(x) - g(y)| < \varepsilon_2$$

Suppose $g(\cdot)$ is uniformly continuous and let $\varepsilon_1 = \delta, \varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon$. Then we know there is some M s.t. $m > M$ gives $|x_m - y_m| < \delta$, which in turn would imply $|g(x_m) - g(y_m)| < \varepsilon$. However, we assumed $\varepsilon < |g(x_m) - g(y_m)|$, which is a contradiction.

- c) Use the result above to check that f defined in (a) is not uniformly continuous.

Solution. Let $x_m = 1/m$ and $y_m = 1/(m + 1)$. Clearly,

$$\frac{1}{m} - \frac{1}{m + 1} = \frac{m + 1 - m}{m(m + 1)} = \frac{1}{m(m + 1)} \rightarrow 0$$

However,

$$\left| f\left(\frac{1}{m}\right) - f\left(\frac{1}{m + 1}\right) \right| = \left| \frac{1}{1/m} - \frac{1}{1/(m + 1)} \right| = |m - (m + 1)| = 1 > \varepsilon$$

for, say, $\varepsilon = 1/2 > 0$. By (b) we know then that f is not uniformly continuous.

- d) Show that if $(x_m) \in S$ is Cauchy, then (y_m) defined by $y_m = h(x_m)$ is also Cauchy when $h : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is uniformly continuous.

Solution. If $h(\cdot)$ is uniformly continuous, we know for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is some $\delta > 0$ s.t.

$$|x - y| < \delta \implies |h(x) - h(y)| < \varepsilon$$

If x_m is Cauchy, we know that for this $\delta > 0$, we can find some M s.t.

$$m, n \geq M \implies |x_m - x_n| < \delta$$

Since $h(\cdot)$ is uniformly continuous, this in turn implies

$$|y_m - y_n| = |h(x_m) - h(x_n)| < \varepsilon$$

and by definition y_m is Cauchy.

e) Check $x_m = 1/m$ is Cauchy but $x_m = m$ is not.

Solution. $x_m = m$ and $x_{m+1} = m + 1$ gives $|x_m - x_{m+1}| = |m - (m + 1)| = |1| = 1 > \varepsilon$ for all $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, so it cannot be Cauchy. Note

$$\left| \frac{1}{m} - \frac{1}{n} \right| \leq \left| \frac{1}{m} \right| + \left| \frac{1}{n} \right| < \frac{1}{\min\{n, m\}} + \frac{1}{\min\{n, m\}} = \frac{2}{\min\{n, m\}}$$

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, let

$$M = \left\lceil \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \right\rceil + 1 > \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \implies \varepsilon > \frac{2}{M}$$

Hence for any $m, n \geq M$,

$$\left| \frac{1}{m} - \frac{1}{n} \right| < \frac{2}{\min\{n, m\}} \leq \frac{2}{M} < \varepsilon$$

f) Use the sequences in (e) and the result in (d) to give an alternative proof that the function defined in (a) is not uniformly continuous.

Solution. If $f(\cdot)$ is uniformly continuous, then $y_m \equiv f(x_m)$ is Cauchy for any x_m that is Cauchy. However, we just proved that $x_m = 1/m$ is Cauchy while $y_m = 1/(1/m) = m$ is not Cauchy, which is a contradiction. Hence $f(\cdot)$ cannot be uniformly continuous.

4. A function $f : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is homogeneous of degree $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ if $\forall t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ we have

$$f(tx) = t^r f(x)$$

a) Show if $f(x)$ is homogeneous of degree r the partial derivative is homogeneous of degree $r - 1$.

Solution. If we can assume that the partial derivative exists, then we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} f(tx) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} [t^r f(x)] = t^r \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(x)$$

where we substituted $f(tx)$ with $t^r f(x)$. However, by the chain rule,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} f(tx) = t \cdot \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} f(x) \right]_{x=tx} = t \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(tx)$$

Finally,

$$t \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(tx) = t^r \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(x) \implies \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(tx) = t^{r-1} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(x)$$

which is the definition of homogeneity of degree $r - 1$ for $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}$.

b) Show that if $f(x)$ is homogeneous of degree r and differentiable then for any \tilde{x} we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\partial f(\tilde{x})}{\partial x_n} \tilde{x}_n = r f(\tilde{x})$$

that is, $\nabla f(\tilde{x}) \cdot \tilde{x} = rf(\tilde{x})$.

Solution. Take derivatives with respect to t , then we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}f(tx) = \frac{d}{dt}t^r f(x) = \sum_{n=1}^N \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_n} f(tx) \right) \underbrace{\left(\frac{d}{dt}(tx_n) \right)}_{x_n} = rt^{r-1} f(x)$$

is true for every t . So simply choose $t = 1$, and we get

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\partial}{\partial x_n} f(x) x_n = rf(x)$$

which is what we wanted.¹

5. Take the simplified IS-LM system of equations

$$Y - C(Y - T) - I(r) = G \quad M^D(Y, r) = M^S$$

Suppose that $0 < C'(x) < 1$, $I'(r) < 0$, $\frac{\partial M}{\partial Y} > 0$ and $\frac{\partial M}{\partial r} < 0$.

- a) Use the IFT to check that one can represent the endogenous variables Y, r as a function of the exogenous variables G, M^S, T .

Solution. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} Y - C(Y - T) - I(r) - G &= 0 \\ M^S - M^D(Y, r) &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

with endogenous variables $x \equiv (Y, r)$, national income and the interest rate, and exogenous variables $\theta \equiv (M^S, G, T)$, money supply, government spending, and taxes.

$$(1) \quad f(\theta, x) = \begin{bmatrix} f_1(\theta, x) \\ f_2(\theta, x) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} Y - C(Y - T) - I(r) - G \\ M^S - M^D(Y, r) \end{bmatrix} = 0$$

is the exact type of equation where IFT applies. If $D_x f$ is non-singular, then for some open neighborhood of θ and some h we can write

$$(2) \quad h(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} Y(M^S, G, T) \\ r(M^S, G, T) \end{bmatrix}$$

$$D_{\theta'} f(\theta, h(\theta)) + D_x f(\theta, h(\theta)) D_{\theta} h(\theta) = 0$$

We find that

$$D_{\theta'} f(\theta, h(\theta)) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 & C'(Y(\cdot) - T) \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

¹I think the only sticky point here is to show that

$$\frac{d}{dt}f(tx) = \nabla f(tx) \cdot \frac{d}{dt}tx$$

which is true by the chain rule.

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{x'} f(\theta, h(\theta)) &= \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial Y} = 1 - C'(Y(\cdot) - T) & \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial r} = -I'(r(\cdot)) \\ \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial Y} = -\frac{\partial M^D}{\partial Y} & \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial r} = -\frac{\partial M^D}{\partial r} \end{bmatrix} \\
[D_{x'} f(\theta, h(\theta))]^{-1} &= \frac{1}{D} \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{\partial M^D}{\partial r} & I'(r(\cdot)) \\ \frac{\partial M^D}{\partial Y} & 1 - C'(Y(\cdot) - T) \end{bmatrix} \\
D &= -\underbrace{\frac{\partial M^D}{\partial r} \underbrace{(1 - C'(Y(\cdot) - T))}_{>0}}_{>0} - \underbrace{\overbrace{I'(r(\cdot))}^{<0} \underbrace{\frac{\partial M^D}{\partial Y}}_{>0}}_{>0} \implies D > 0
\end{aligned}$$

A non-zero determinant \implies the inverse exists, and we can use [Equation \(2\)](#) to characterize $D_{\theta'} h(\theta)$

- b) Check the sign of the effect of an infinitesimal increase in government spending G on r and Y keeping M^S and T fixed.

Solution. Using the results from the previous section, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{\theta'} h(\theta) &= \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial Y}{\partial M^S} & \frac{\partial Y}{\partial G} & \frac{\partial Y}{\partial T} \\ \frac{\partial r}{\partial M^S} & \frac{\partial r}{\partial G} & \frac{\partial r}{\partial T} \end{bmatrix} \\
&= -\frac{1}{D} \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{\partial M^D}{\partial r} & I'(r(\cdot)) \\ \frac{\partial M^D}{\partial Y} & 1 - C'(Y(\cdot) - T) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 & C'(Y(\cdot) - T) \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\
&= -\frac{1}{D} \begin{bmatrix} I'(r(\cdot)) & \frac{\partial M^D}{\partial r} & -\frac{\partial M^D}{\partial r} C'(Y(\cdot) - T) \\ 1 - C'(Y(\cdot) - T) & -\frac{\partial M^D}{\partial Y} & \frac{\partial M^D}{\partial Y} C'(Y(\cdot) - T) \end{bmatrix} \\
&= -\frac{1}{D} \begin{bmatrix} <0 & <0 & >0 \\ >0 & <0 & >0 \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{D} \begin{bmatrix} >0 & >0 & <0 \\ <0 & >0 & <0 \end{bmatrix}
\end{aligned}$$

Which means that for some $x = (Y, r)$, $\theta = (M^S, G, T)$ that satisfies [Equation \(1\)](#) there is some local neighborhood around θ where we can characterize the behavior of (Y, r) with respect to each of the variables in θ . In particular, income reacts positively to increases money supply or government spending but negatively to taxes, while the interest rate goes down with increases in the money supply or taxes but goes up with increases in government spending.

6. Take the correspondence $f : \mathbb{R}_{++}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$ (i.e. with strictly positive arguments) defined by

$$f(p_1, p_2, w) = \begin{cases} \left\{ \left(\frac{w}{2p_1}, \frac{w}{2p_2} \right) \right\} & \text{if } \frac{w^2}{4p_1 p_2} \neq 1 \\ \emptyset & \text{if } \frac{w^2}{4p_1 p_2} = 1 \end{cases}$$

(Note $\left(\frac{w}{2p_1}, \frac{w}{2p_2}\right)$ is a single point, a coordinate.)

Solution. I intended the “correspondence” to be made up of singleton points, and the point of this exercise was to show you can poke a hole in a continuous function and lose continuity but still get upper or lower hemicontinuity. However, some people interpreted this as an interval (in which case we’d need to write $f : \mathbb{R}_{++}^3 \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}$), so do the solution both ways (i.e. if the correspondence was singleton-valued or interval-valued).

(a) Is f upper hemicontinuous?

Solution. Either way it’s not uhc. First, for singleton-valued, take

$$p_1^m, p_2^m = \left(1 - \frac{1}{m}, 1 - \frac{1}{m}\right) \quad w_m = 2$$

Hence $(p_1^m, p_2^m, w_m) \rightarrow (1, 1, 2)$, and $f(1, 1, 2) = \emptyset$ because $2^2/4 = 1$. However

$$y_m \equiv f(p_1^m, p_2^m, w_m) = \left(\frac{2}{2(1-1/m)}, \frac{2}{2(1-1/m)}\right) = \left(\frac{m}{m-1}, \frac{m}{m-1}\right) \rightarrow (1, 1)$$

Hence $y_m \rightarrow 1$ and there is no sub-sequence of y_m that converges to a point in the empty set. For the interval-valued interpretation we cannot use the sequential definition given this is an open interval. (If they were closed intervals then a very similar proof would be sufficient since they would be closed and bounded real intervals. An earlier version of this solution had such a proof, but it was pointed out to me the intervals were open in the interval interpretation.)

So fix a point $\tilde{x} \equiv (\tilde{p}_1, \tilde{p}_2, \tilde{w})$ and consider instead the open set

$$O = \left(\frac{\tilde{w}}{2\tilde{p}_1}, \frac{\tilde{w}}{2\tilde{p}_2}\right) \subseteq O$$

We can do this because the point is fixed, so they are just values (i.e. not numbers). But now the upper inverse image will contain this point, and there is no neighborhood of \tilde{x} that is entirely contained in O . For any $\varepsilon > 0$, the point $(\tilde{p}_1, \tilde{p}_2, \tilde{w} - \varepsilon) \in B_\varepsilon(\tilde{x})$, yet

$$\left(\frac{\tilde{w} - \varepsilon}{2\tilde{p}_1}, \frac{\tilde{w} - \varepsilon}{2\tilde{p}_2}\right) \notin O$$

Since $\frac{\tilde{w} - \varepsilon}{2\tilde{p}_1} < \frac{\tilde{w}}{2\tilde{p}_1}$.

Remark 1. I want to clarify a point: I believe I have an example in class and in the notes that the correspondence, for instance, $\Gamma(x) = (1, 2)$, i.e. “constant” real intervals, was uhc. This is true because for any open set containing $(1, 2)$ the upper inverse image is the entire space. However, consider $\Gamma(x) = (-x, x)$. This is not uhc for the exact same reason the correspondence in this problem set is not uhc (the upper inverse image of any open set (a, b) will either be \emptyset if $a, b > 0$ or the closed set $[-\min\{|a|, |b|\}, \min\{|a|, |b|\}]$). \square

(b) Is f lower hemicontinuous?

Solution. Either way it is lhc. Take any $(p_1^m, p_2^m, w_m) \rightarrow (p_1, p_2, w)$. We want to show for each $y \in f(p_1, p_2, w)$ then $\exists y_m$ s.t. $y_m \rightarrow y$ with $y_m \in f(p_1^m, p_2^m, w_m)$. If $f(p_1, p_2, w) = \emptyset$ then this holds vacuously; otherwise note $w/2p_1$ and $w/2p_2$ are continuous so the result holds by continuity (if $y_m = (w_m/2p_1^m, w_m/2p_2^m)$ then $y_m \rightarrow (w/2p_1, w/2p_2)$ by continuity). Unlike uhc, the fact y_m converges is not a contradiction.

Now for the interval interpretation there are two cases: First case is when $w/2p_1 < w/2p_2$, and for

any $y \in f(p_1, p_2, w)$ we have

$$\frac{w}{2p_1} < y < \frac{w}{2p_2}$$

means that for some $\varepsilon > 0$ we have

$$\frac{w}{2p_1} + \varepsilon < y < \frac{w}{2p_2} - \varepsilon$$

(in particular this works for any $\varepsilon < \min\{y - (w/2p_1), (w/2p_2) - y\}$). By convergence, $\exists M_1$ s.t.

$$\frac{w^m}{2p_1^m} < \frac{w}{2p_1} + \varepsilon < y < \frac{w}{2p_2} - \varepsilon < \frac{w^m}{2p_2^m}$$

whenever $m \geq M_1$ and by the Archimedean principle (!) there is some M_2 s.t. $1/M_2 < \varepsilon$. Let $M \equiv \max\{M_1, M_2\}$ and we have that the sequence $y_m = y + \frac{1}{m}$ is s.t.

$$\frac{w^m}{2p_1^m} < y_m < \frac{w^m}{2p_2^m}$$

for any $m \geq M$. Since $1/m \rightarrow 0$ we have $y_m \rightarrow y$ for any $y \in f(p_1, p_2, w)$ given $f(p_1, p_2, w) \neq \emptyset$. Now to finish we need to consider $w/2p_2 \leq w/2p_1$. Note

$$(a, b) = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : a < x < b\} = \emptyset \quad \text{if } b \leq a$$

Hence for any such (p_1, p_2, w) we have $f(p_1, p_2, w) = \emptyset$ and lhc again holds vacuously.

Remark 2. There's a slight issue with the theorem I gave regarding lhc correspondences. I said $\Gamma : X \rightrightarrows Y$ is lhc at $x \in X \iff \forall (x_m) \in X$ s.t. $x_m \rightarrow x \in X$ and $\forall y \in \Gamma(x)$ $\exists (y_m) \in Y$ s.t. $y_m \rightarrow y$ and $y_m \in \Gamma(x_m)$. However, in this case we don't necessarily have $y_m \in \Gamma(x_m)$ for all m ; rather, what we have is $y_m \in \Gamma(x_m)$ whenever $m \geq M$ for some finite M . If $\Gamma(x_m)$ is not empty for each m , then we can just pick y_1, \dots, y_{M-1} to be arbitrary elements therein. However, if $\Gamma(x_m) = \emptyset$ we cannot do that. Hence the actual statement of the theorem should add the caveat that $y_m \in \Gamma(x_m)$ whenever $m \geq M$ for some finite M . \square