

1. For a), To prove that AB is bounded above, we take an arbitrary element $a \in A$ and $b \in B$. By the definition of a supremum, $\sup(A) \geq a$ and $\sup(B) \geq b$. This means that, especially considering $a, b \geq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} b\sup(A) &\geq ba \\ \sup(A)\sup(B) &\geq \sup(A)b \\ \sup(A)\sup(B) &\geq ba \end{aligned}$$

Since $\sup(A)\sup(B) \geq ab$ for any arbitrary ab , it is an upper bound for AB . It also implies $\sup(AB) \leq \sup(A)\sup(B)$.

For the second part, we define M where $M = \max(\sup(A), \sup(B))$. Let ϵ be arbitrary and $\epsilon > 0$. First, we analyze the case where $\epsilon < M^2$. We find $a \in A, b \in B$ s.t. $\sup(A) - (M - \sqrt{M^2 - \epsilon}) < a$ and $\sup(B) - (M - \sqrt{M^2 - \epsilon}) < b$. We perform the same inequalities from earlier for $(\sup(A) - (M - \sqrt{M^2 - \epsilon}))(\sup(B) - (M - \sqrt{M^2 - \epsilon})) < ab$ and expand it. To make things less messy, $\hat{\epsilon} = M - \sqrt{M^2 - \epsilon}$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup(A)\sup(B) - 2M\hat{\epsilon} + \epsilon^2 &\leq \sup(A)\sup(B) - \sup(A)\hat{\epsilon} - \sup(B)\hat{\epsilon} + \epsilon^2 < ab \\ \sup(A)\sup(B) + ((\hat{\epsilon} - M)^2 - M^2) &< ab \\ \sup(A)\sup(B) + (((M - \sqrt{M^2 - \epsilon}) - M)^2 - M^2) &< ab \\ \sup(A)\sup(B) - \epsilon &< ab \end{aligned}$$

For the case $\epsilon \geq M^2$, select $a \in A, b \in B$ where $\sup(A) - (M - \sqrt{M^2 - \frac{M^2}{2}}) < a$ and $\sup(B) - (M - \sqrt{M^2 - \frac{M^2}{2}}) < b$. Then, $\sup(A)\sup(B) - \epsilon < \sup(A)\sup(B) - \frac{M^2}{2} < ab$. Since $\epsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, $\sup(A)\sup(B) \leq ab \leq \sup(AB)$. Since $\sup(A)\sup(B) \leq \sup(AB)$ and $\sup(A)\sup(B) \geq \sup(AB)$, $\sup(A)\sup(B) = \sup(AB)$

For b), let $A = [-5, -2]$ and $B = [-2, -1]$, so $\sup(A) = -2$, $\sup(B) = -1$, and $\sup(A)\sup(B) = 2$. However, $5 \in AB$, so 2 is not an upper bound much less the least upper bound. Hence, $\sup(A)\sup(B) \neq \sup(AB)$

2. For (ii) \implies (i), we assume (ii) so given an arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$ and its associated $\delta > 0$, we can find some arbitrary $x, y \in [a, b]$ where $-\delta < x - c, y - c < \delta$ or $c - \delta < x, y < c + \delta$ and $|f(x) - f(c)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ and $|f(c) - f(y)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Using the triangle inequality, it results in:

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \leq |f(x) - f(c)| + |f(c) - f(y)| < \epsilon$$

ϵ is an upper bound for the set $X_\delta = \{|f(x) - f(y)| : x, y \in (c - \delta, c + \delta) \cap [a, b]\}$, so the $\sup(X_\delta) \leq \epsilon$. Now, we denote the set $W = \{\sup(X_\delta) : \delta > 0\}$. Thus, given an arbitrarily $w \in W$, $w \geq 0$, so 0 is a lower bound for W . Since our choice for ϵ is arbitrary and there exist a $\delta > 0$ where $0 < \sup(X_\delta) \leq \epsilon$:

$$\inf\{\sup\{|f(x) - f(y)| : x, y \in (c - \delta, c + \delta) \cap [a, b]\} : \delta > 0\} = 0$$

For (i) \implies (ii), we start with a proof by contrapositive. We assume there exist an $\epsilon > 0$ where there does not exist a $\delta > 0$, such that $|f(x) - f(c)| < \epsilon$ whenever $x \in [a, b]$ and $|x - c| < \delta$. Since we can set δ arbitrarily large, this means that $|f(x) - f(c)| \geq \epsilon$ for all $x \in [a, b]$. For any arbitrary $\delta > 0$ and an arbitrary $\hat{x} \in (c - \delta, c + \delta)$, considering $c \in (c - \delta, c + \delta)$:

$$\sup\{|f(x) - f(y)| : x, y \in (c - \delta, c + \delta) \cap [a, b]\} \geq |f(\hat{x}) - f(c)| \geq \epsilon$$

Thus ϵ is a lower bound for the set $\{\sup\{|f(x) - f(y)| : x, y \in (c - \delta, c + \delta) \cap [a, b]\} : \delta > 0\}$. Since $\epsilon > 0$, 0 is not the greatest lower bound.