

# Intro to Real Analysis

## HW #1

Ozaner Hansha

January 30, 2021

Let  $\mathbb{J}$  be the set of positive integers.

### Problem 1

**Problem:** Prove the following:

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{J}, 4 \cdot 3^n > (n+2)^2$$

**Solution:** Consider the predicate  $P(n) \equiv 4 \cdot 3^n > (n+2)^2$ . We can prove  $P(1)$  quite simply:

$$\begin{aligned} P(1) &\equiv 4 \cdot 3 > (1+2)^2 \\ &\equiv 12 > 9 \\ &\equiv \top \end{aligned}$$

Now let us consider the following lemma  $\forall n \in \mathbb{J}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< 2n^2 + 6n + 3 && (n > 0 \implies 2n^2 + 6n + 3 > 0) \\ n^2 + 6n + 9 &< 3n^2 + 12n + 12 \\ (n+3)^2 &< 3(n+2)^2 && (\text{Lemma 1}) \end{aligned}$$

Now we will prove that  $P(n) \implies P(n+1)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} 4 \cdot 3^{n+1} &= 3(4 \cdot 3^n) && (\text{additive prop. of exponent}) \\ &> 3(n+2)^2 && (\text{assume the antecedent, } P(n)) \\ &> (n+3)^2 && (\text{Lemma 1}) \\ 4 \cdot 3^{n+1} &> (n+1+2)^2 && (P(n+1)) \end{aligned}$$

And so we have shown  $P(1)$  and  $P(n) \implies P(n+1)$ . By the principle of mathematical induction, this implies that  $P(n)$  holds for all integers greater than or equal to 1, in other words:

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{J}, 4 \cdot 3^n > (n+2)^2$$

### Problem 2

**Problem:** For an integer  $k$ , let  $k\mathbb{J}$  be the set of positive integers which are multiples of  $k$ . Prove that  $\text{card}(2\mathbb{J}) = \text{card}(3\mathbb{J})$ .

**Solution:** Recall that for two sets to have the same cardinality there must exist a bijection between them. Consider the function  $f : 2\mathbb{J} \rightarrow 3\mathbb{J}$  defined by  $n \rightarrow \frac{3n}{2}$ . We will first prove that  $f$  is injective. Consider arbitrary  $x, y \in 2\mathbb{J}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) = f(y) &\implies \frac{3x}{2} = \frac{3y}{2} && (\text{def. of } f) \\ &\implies x = y && (\text{algebra}) \end{aligned}$$

And so we have shown that  $f(x) = f(y) \implies x = y$ , which is the definition of an injective function.

Next we will show  $f$  is surjective. Consider an arbitrary  $y \in 3\mathbb{J}$ . There exists an  $x$  such that  $f(x) = y$ , namely  $x = \frac{2y}{3}$ . We prove this below:

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= f\left(\frac{2y}{3}\right) && \text{(def. of } x) \\ &= \frac{3}{2} \cdot \frac{2y}{3} && \text{(def. of } f) \\ &= y \end{aligned}$$

And so we have shown that  $(\forall y \in 3\mathbb{J})(\exists x \in 2\mathbb{J}) f(x) = y$ , which is the definition of a surjective function.

Since a function that is both injective and surjective is a bijection, we have shown that  $f$  is bijective and thus, by the definition of cardinality, that:

$$\text{card}(2\mathbb{J}) = \text{card}(3\mathbb{J})$$

### Problem 3

Consider the set of polynomials with integer coefficients  $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ . Given two polynomials  $f, g \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ , we define the relation  $\sim$  as:

$$f \sim g \equiv \exists h \in \mathbb{Z}[x], f - g = h'$$

**Part a:** Prove that  $f \sim f$ .

**Solution:** Consider an arbitrary polynomial  $f \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ . We have  $f - f = 0$  and since there exists an  $h \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$  such that  $h' = 0$ , in particular any integer constant  $C$ , we have that  $f \sim f$ .

**Part b:** Prove that  $f \sim g \implies g \sim f$ .

**Solution:** If for two functions  $f, g \in \mathbb{Z}$  we have  $f \sim g$  this means that:

$$\exists h \in \mathbb{Z}[x], f - g = h'$$

Now recall that for any function  $a$ , the derivative of the negative is equal to the negative of the derivative:

$$(-a)' = -a'$$

Also recall that for any function  $a \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$  we also have  $-a \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$  since the integers (i.e. its coefficients) are closed under negation. Putting these together we have that:

$$g - f = -h'$$

And since  $-h' = (-h)'$  and  $-h \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ , since  $h \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ , we have that  $g \sim f$ .

**Part c:** Prove that  $f \sim g \wedge g \sim h \implies f \sim h$ .

**Solution:** If for functions  $f, g, h \in \mathbb{Z}$  we have  $f \sim g \wedge g \sim h$  this means that:

$$\begin{aligned} \exists a \in \mathbb{Z}[x], f - g &= a' \\ \exists b \in \mathbb{Z}[x], g - h &= b' \end{aligned}$$

Now recall that for any functions  $a, b$ , the derivative of their sum is the sum of their derivatives:

$$(a + b)' = a' + b'$$

Also recall that for any functions  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$  we also have  $a + b \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$  since the integers (i.e. their coefficients) are closed under addition. Putting these together we have that:

$$f - h = (f - g) + (g - h) = a' + b'$$

And since  $a' + b' = (a + b)'$  and  $a + b \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ , since  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ , we have that  $f \sim h$ .

**Part d:** For any  $f, g \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ , is  $f \sim g$ ?

**Solution:** No. To see this consider  $f = 2x$  and  $g = x$ :

$$2x - x = x$$

For  $2x \sim x$  it must be the case that their difference  $x$  be the derivative of some function  $h \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ . Let us solve for all such possible  $h$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dh}{dx} &= x \\ h_C &= \frac{x^2}{2} + C\end{aligned}$$

Notice that no solution  $h_C$  is contained in  $\mathbb{Z}[x]$  since the squared term of the solutions have a coefficient of  $\frac{1}{2} \notin \mathbb{Z}$ . Thus we have shown by counterexample that:

$$\neg \forall f, g \in \mathbb{Z}[x], f \sim g$$

## Problem 4

**Problem:** Prove Bernoulli's inequality. That is, prove the following:

$$\forall m, n \in \mathbb{J}, (1 + m)^n \geq 1 + mn$$

**Solution:** Consider an arbitrary  $m \in \mathbb{J}$ , we have the following predicate:

$$P(n) \equiv (1 + m)^n \geq 1 + mn$$

We can prove  $P(1)$  immediately:

$$\begin{aligned}P(1) &\equiv 1 + m \geq 1 + m \\ &\equiv \top\end{aligned}$$

Now we will prove that  $P(n) \implies P(n + 1)$ :

$$\begin{aligned}(1 + m)^{n+1} &= (1 + m)(1 + m)^n && \text{(additive prop. of exponent)} \\ &> (1 + m)(1 + mn) && \text{(assume the antecedent, } P(n)) \\ &= 1 + mn + m^2n + m && \text{(algebra)} \\ &\geq 1 + mn + m && (m, n \in \mathbb{J} \implies m^2n > 0) \\ (1 + m)^{n+1} &\geq 1 + m(n + 1) && (P(n + 1))\end{aligned}$$

And so we have shown  $P(1)$  and  $P(n) \implies P(n + 1)$ . By the principle of mathematical induction, this implies that  $P(n)$  holds for all integers greater than or equal to 1, in other words:

$$\forall m, n \in \mathbb{J}, (1 + m)^n \geq 1 + mn$$

## Problem 5

**Problem:** Prove that  $P(\mathbb{J})$  is not countable.

**Solution:** Before we prove the desired statement, let us establish Cantor's theorem. First, consider a set  $A$  and its power set  $\mathcal{P}(A)$ . The function  $g : A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A)$  defined by  $x \mapsto \{x\}$  is clearly an injection from  $A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A)$ . Since an injection exists between these two sets we have, by the definition of cardinality:

$$\text{card}(A) \leq \text{card}(\mathcal{P}(A)) \quad (\text{Lemma 1})$$

Next, consider an arbitrary function  $f : A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A)$ , and the set  $B = \{x \in A \mid x \notin f(x)\}$ . Suppose  $f$  is surjective. This means that  $\forall y \in \mathcal{P}(A)$  there exists an  $x \in A$  such that  $f(x) = y$ , in particular it implies that:

$$\exists c \in A, f(c) = B \qquad (f \text{ is surjective \& } B \in \mathcal{P}(A))$$

But now we have a contradiction:

$$\begin{aligned} c \in f(c) &\iff c \in B && (f(c) = B \text{ \& def. of set equality}) \\ c \in f(c) &\iff c \notin B && (\text{def. of } B) \end{aligned}$$

And so our assumption that  $f$  was surjective is false, and thus no map from a set  $A$  to its powerset  $\mathcal{P}(A)$  can be surjective. By the definition of cardinality this means:

$$\text{card}(A) \not\geq \text{card}(\mathcal{P}(A)) \qquad (\text{Lemma 2})$$

Putting these two lemmas together we have that for an arbitrary set  $A$ :

$\text{card}(A) \leq \text{card}(\mathcal{P}(A))$	(Lemma 1)
$\text{card}(A) \not\geq \text{card}(\mathcal{P}(A))$	(Lemma 2)
<hr style="width: 100%; border: 0.5px solid black;"/>	
$\text{card}(A) < \text{card}(\mathcal{P}(A))$	(Cantor's Theorem)

Or in other words, the cardinality of a set is strictly smaller than that of its powerset. In the case of  $\mathbb{J}$  this implies:

$$\text{card}(\mathbb{J}) < \text{card}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{J}))$$

And since, by definition, any cardinality larger than countably infinite (i.e.  $\text{card}(\mathbb{J}) = \aleph_0$ ) is uncountably infinite, we are done.