

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2	3	0	3	6	2	5	5	5	4

Total: $35/70$

$$1 \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (b_n - a_n)$$

→ You have to prove first that (a_n) & (b_n) converge.

2/5

Using limit rules, we can write this out as

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$$

And since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_n$ is defined, both of those $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}$ exist.

We can then use limit sequence relationship to have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n = B$ has sequence related with $b_n \rightarrow B$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = A$ has sequence related with $a_n \rightarrow A$ so both a_n and b_n converge.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_n = 0 \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$$

$$0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n$$

3 We say x_n and y_n satisfy the condition.

(n/s) Let z_n be a sequence with $z_n = x_n$ and $z_{n+1} = y_n$.
Two subsequences of z_n converge to the same point. These subsequence fill up the real numbers, so any other subsequence also converges. This mean z_n converges and all subsequences converge to x_0 , $z_n \rightarrow x_0$. $f(z_n)$ converges because the assumption is that it is Cauchy because z_n satisfies all assumptions. Because x_n, y_n, z_n all converge to x_0 , the sequences $f(x_n), f(y_n), f(z_n)$ would all converge to $f(x_0)$ using sequence rules. We can then say that f converges to $f(x_0)$ for all subsequences meaning $f \rightarrow f(x_0)$. We can then say that f has a limit at $f(x_0)$ so the $\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f = f(x_0)$ meaning f has a limit at x_0 .

3 Say $\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_1} f$ so $|f(x) - L| < \epsilon$ with $|x - x_1| < \delta$

(n/s) so $x_1 - \delta < x < x_1 + \delta$ meaning $x \in (x_1 - \delta, x_1 + \delta)$. This is the definition of accumulation point, so $x_1 = \text{acc } D = x_0$.
So $\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f$ with $x_0 = \text{acc } D$ must be unique because $|f(x) - L| < \epsilon$ $|x - x_0| < \delta \rightarrow x \in (x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta)$ this would mean that acc is one pt.

4 If we take the lim of $f(x) \leq h(x)$, then

3/5

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x) \leq \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} h(x)$$

And with $h(x) \leq g(x)$, we get $\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} h(x) \leq \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} g(x)$

$$\text{And } \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} g(x) \text{ so } \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} h(x) \leq \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x)$$

$\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x) \leq \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} h(x) \leq \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x)$ so by sandwich theorem,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} h(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} g(x)$$

If $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ have limits at x_0 , there is a sequence $x_n \rightarrow x_0$, $x_n \in D_{f, g}$ so $f(x_n) \rightarrow A$ and $g(x_n) \rightarrow A$

Since $f(x) \leq h(x) \leq g(x)$, then $f(x_n) \leq h(x_n) \leq g(x_n)$,

And if we take this to infinity, we get that

$A \leq h(\infty) \leq A$, so sandwich Theorem says

that $h(x_n) \rightarrow A$ too, and since this converges, there is an associated $\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} h(x)$.

$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(x_n)$
exists by
the squeeze
thm. for
sequences

6/10

2/5

5 a) If $g: (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is bounded, then $g(x) < M$

$\forall x \in (0, \infty)$. Then, $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x) = 0$ so with limit rules we can write $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} g(x)f(x)$ as $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} g(x) \cdot 0$

since $g(x) < M$, $\forall x \in (0, \infty)$, $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} g(x) < M$, so $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} g(x) \cdot 0 \leq M \cdot 0 = 0$ so $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x)g(x) \leq 0$.

We can then do some thing with lower bound $-M$ to reach $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x)g(x) \geq 0$, so by sandwich theorem $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x)g(x) = 0$.

the limit
rules were
not presented
for the
limit at ∞ .

4 If we take the lim of $f(x) = h(x)$, then

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} h(x)$$

And with $h(x) = g(x)$, we get $\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} h(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} g(x)$

And $\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} g(x)$ so $\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} h(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x)$

$\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} h(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x)$ so by sandwich theorem,
 $\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} h(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} g(x)$

If $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ have limits at x_0 , there is a sequence $x_n \rightarrow x_0$ $x_n \neq x_0$ so $f(x_n) \rightarrow A$ and $g(x_n) \rightarrow A$.
Since $f(x) \leq h(x) \leq g(x)$, then $f(x_n) \leq h(x_n) \leq g(x_n)$.
And if we take this to infinity, we get that $A \leq h(\infty) \leq A$, so sandwich Theorems says that $h(x_n) \rightarrow A$ too, and since this converges, there is an associated $\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} h(x)$.

5 a) If $g: (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is bounded, then $g(x) < M$ $\forall x \in (0, \infty)$. Then, $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x) = 0$ so with limit rules we can write $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} g(x)f(x)$ as $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} g(x) \cdot 0$ since $g(x) < M$ $\forall x \in (0, \infty)$, $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} g(x) < M$, so $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} g(x) \cdot 0 \leq M \cdot 0 = 0$ so $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x)g(x) \leq 0$.

We can then do some thing with lower bound $-M$ to reach $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x)g(x) \geq 0$, so by sandwich theorem $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x)g(x) = 0$.

5 b.) If $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} g(x)$ exists, then $|g(0) - L| < \epsilon, |x| < \delta$

4/5

not
defined

So $g(0)$ approaches L , so plugging this into $f(x)$, we get $g(0) = f(1/0) = f(\infty)$. So as $x \rightarrow \infty$ $f(x) \rightarrow \frac{1}{L}$. So $g(x) = f(1/x)$ so $|f(\infty) - \frac{1}{L}| < \epsilon$

$|x| < \delta$ for g has a corresponding $|x| < \delta \rightarrow x > \frac{1}{\delta}$ for f .

We can use these to have $M = \frac{1}{\delta}$ where $\forall \epsilon > 0$, $\exists M = \frac{1}{\delta}$ that has $|f(\infty) - \frac{1}{L}| < \epsilon$ and $x > M$.

If the $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} g(x) = \text{DNE}$ then there is no δ to satisfy $M = \frac{1}{\delta}$.

Real Analysis HW #3

2/10

G. a.) The sequence $\frac{1}{n}$ converges. We can rewrite this sequence as a bunch of subsequences as $\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n+1}, \dots, \frac{1}{2n}$. All of these have n in the denominator, meaning all of them converge to 0. The sequence is then made up of sequences that converge, sequence addition says it converges to 0.

1/5

You can't apply the sum rule because the # of terms increase.

$$b.) a_n = \frac{1+2+\dots+n}{n^2}$$

$$n=1 \quad a_1 = \frac{1}{1^2} = 1 \quad n=2 \quad a_2 = \frac{1+2}{2^2} = \frac{3}{4}$$

$$a_{n+1} = \frac{1+2+\dots+n+n+1}{(n+1)^2}$$

1/5

$$\text{bounded? } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad \frac{1+2+\dots+n}{n^2} = \frac{n(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{2}{n} + \dots + 1)}{n^2} = \frac{(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{2}{n} + \dots + 1)}{n} \quad n \rightarrow \infty \quad a_n \rightarrow 0$$

Bounded below by 0. Bounded above by $n=1 \quad a_1=1$

$$a_n \geq a_{n+1} \quad \frac{1+2+\dots+n}{n^2} \geq \frac{1+2+\dots+n+1}{(n+1)^2}$$

See the solution on the course website.

$$(1+2+\dots+n)(n+1)^2 \geq (1+2+\dots+n+1)n^2$$

$$(1+\dots+n)(n^2+2n+1) \geq (1+\dots+n+1)n^2$$

$$(n^2+\dots+n^3)(2n+\dots+2n^2)(1+\dots+n) \geq (n^3+\dots+n^3+n^2)$$

$$(2n+\dots+2n^2)(1+\dots+n) \geq n^2$$

have $2n^2$ so $-n^2$

$$(2n+\dots) \geq 0 \quad n \text{ is positive so decreasing}$$

Decreasing and bounded means (a_n) converges.

Q7) What is limit? Has $\frac{0}{0}$, $N' = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{1+x}}$, $D' = 1$

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{1+x}} = \frac{1}{2} \quad \frac{1+x-1}{x(\sqrt{1+x}+1)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+x}+1} \xrightarrow{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2}$$

5/5

Let $\epsilon > 0$, $\exists \delta$ s.t. $|f(x) - L| < \epsilon$ $|x - x_0| < \delta$

$$\left| \frac{\sqrt{1+x}-1}{x} - \frac{1}{2} \right| < \epsilon \rightarrow \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+x}+1} - \frac{1}{2} \right| < \epsilon$$

$$\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon < \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+x}+1} < \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon \rightarrow \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} \geq \sqrt{1+x}+1 \geq \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}$$

$$\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} \geq \sqrt{1+x} \geq -1 + \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}$$

$$1 - \frac{2}{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} + \left(\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}\right)^2 \geq 1+x \geq -1 - \frac{2}{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} + \left(\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}\right)^2$$

$$-\frac{2}{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} + \left(\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}\right)^2 \geq 1+x \geq -1 - \frac{2}{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} + \left(\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}\right)^2 \rightarrow \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} + \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} > x > \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} + \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}$$

Let $\delta = \min\left(\frac{2\epsilon}{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon+\epsilon^2}, \frac{2\epsilon}{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}\right)$ then $|x-0| < \delta$

$\epsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, so $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sqrt{1+x}-1}{x} = \frac{1}{2}$

$$8.) \lim_{x \rightarrow 1} f(x) = 1 \quad x_0 = 1$$

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 1} \left(\frac{f(x)(1-f(x)^2)}{1-f(x)} \right) = \frac{f(x)(1-f(x)^2)}{1-f(x)} \cdot \frac{1+f(x)}{1+f(x)}$$

5/5

$$\frac{f(x)(1-f(x)^2)(1+f(x))}{(1-f(x)^2)} = f(x)(1+f(x)) = f(x) + f(x)^2$$

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 1} f(x)^2 = \left(\lim_{x \rightarrow 1} f(x) \right)^2 = (1)^2 = 1$$

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 1} f(x) + f(x)^2 = 1 + 1^2 = 2.$$

$$9 \quad \varepsilon > 0 \quad \delta > 0 \quad |f(x) - f(x_0)| < \varepsilon \quad |x - x_0| < \delta$$

So if $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, we want to show that

5/5

$$|f(x) - f(x_0)| < \varepsilon \quad \& \quad |x - x_0| < \delta$$

$$|f(x)| = |f(x)| \quad |f(x_0)| = |f(x_0)|$$

$$||f(x)| - |f(x_0)|| \leq |f(x) - f(x_0)| < \varepsilon$$

$$||f(x)| - |f(x_0)|| < \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad |x - x_0| < \delta$$

ε was arbitrary, so $\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} |f(x)|$ exists.

2/10

10 a) Let (x_n) be a sequence such that $x_k \rightarrow x_0, x_k \neq x_0, x_k \in \mathbb{R}$

4/5

We then have $f(x_k) \rightarrow x_0$. With sequence rules, we have that $f(x_k)^n \rightarrow x_0^n$. Then $f(x_k)^n \rightarrow x_0^n$ is related to the $\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} x^n \rightarrow x_0^n$. okay, but here $f(x) = x^n$.

use induction.

(b) ??