

## What I Threw Out

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} f(x, y) &= \text{st} \left( \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial y} f(x + dx, y) - \frac{\partial}{\partial y} f(x, y)}{dx} \right) \\
(\text{This doesn't exist}) &= \text{st} \left( \frac{\text{st} \left( \frac{f(x+dx, y+dy) - f(x+dx, y)}{dy} \right) - \text{st} \left( \frac{f(x, y+dy) - f(x, y)}{dy} \right)}{dx} \right) \\
(\text{This probably doesn't either}) &= \text{st} \left( \frac{f(x + dx, y + dy) - f(x + dx, y) - f(x, y + dy) + f(x, y)}{dxdy} \right) \\
(\text{This still doesn't}) &= \text{st} \left( \frac{\text{st} \left( \frac{f(x+dx, y+dy) - f(x, y+dy)}{dx} \right) - \text{st} \left( \frac{f(x+dx, y) - f(x, y)}{dx} \right)}{dy} \right) \\
&= \text{st} \left( \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial x} f(x, x + dy) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} f(x, y)}{dy} \right) \\
&= \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} f(x, y)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that we can shift the scope of  $\text{st}$  around because  $\text{st}(x+y) = \text{st}x + \text{st}y$ ,  $\text{st}(x-y) = \text{st}x - \text{st}y$ ,  $\text{st}(xy) = \text{st}x \text{st}y$ , and  $\text{st}(x/y) = \text{st}x / \text{st}y$  (proofs are fairly trivial). (WEEK 4 NOTE: Except this is wrong because  $\text{st}(x/y) = \text{st}(x) / \text{st}(y)$  only when  $y \not\approx 0$ , because division by 0 is undefined. And in any case  $x/y$  has to be finite in order for  $\text{st}(x/y)$  to exist). This is easy—too easy. This equality shouldn't hold when the second partial derivatives aren't continuous. Take

$$f(x, y) = \begin{cases} \frac{xy(x^2 - y^2)}{x^2 + y^2} & \text{for } (x, y) \neq (0, 0) \\ 0 & \text{for } (x, y) = (0, 0) \end{cases}$$

Standardly, this function has  $\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} = 1$  and  $\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} = -1$ . If we use the approach above, we find that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} = \text{st} \left( \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial y} f(dx, 0) - \frac{\partial}{\partial y} f(0, 0)}{dx} \right)$$

Note that  $f(0, y) = f(x, 0) = 0$  for any  $x, y$ . Now,  $\frac{\partial}{\partial y} f(0, 0) = \text{st} \left( \frac{f(0, dy) - f(0, 0)}{dy} \right) = 0$  and  $\frac{\partial}{\partial y} f(dx, 0) = \text{st} \left( \frac{f(dx, dy) - f(dx, 0)}{dy} \right) = \text{st} \left( \frac{dx dy (dx^2 - dy^2)}{dy (dx^2 + dy^2)} \right) = \text{st} \left( \frac{dx (dx^2 - dy^2)}{dx^2 + dy^2} \right)$ . So

$$\text{st} \left( \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial y} f(dx, 0) - \frac{\partial}{\partial y} f(0, 0)}{dx} \right) = \text{st} \left( \frac{dx^2 - dy^2}{dx^2 + dy^2} \right)$$

Which clearly depends on our choice of  $dx$  and  $dy$ , suggesting the second partial doesn't exist here.

**Week 4 Note:** This doesn't seem like a lot but it's so many L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X symbols it took me a while. I probably should have triple-checked this before TeXing it. Lesson learned. At least I noticed something was wrong in that we proved "too much."

Also, I should note: I took that example of a function that doesn't have symmetrical second partials from Wikipedia, which claims it's "due to Peano." I assume that if I wanted to actually use it, I'd have to find some sort of scholarly source for that claim? Would I even need to cite where the function came from, if it's considered common knowledge? Obviously I can't claim to have come up with it, which seems like what I'm tacitly doing by not citing, but I'm not sure the exact procedure.