

# HW 6

Samuel Lindskog

March 27, 2025

**Proposition 0.1.** If  $B$  is the set of upper bounds of a set  $R$ , and  $Y$  is the set of convergent points of all convergent sequences in  $B$ ,  $B = Y$

*Proof:* Suppose  $(b_n)_{n=0}^\infty$  is a sequence in  $B$ , the set of all upper bounds of  $R$ , and let  $(b_n)_{n=0}^\infty$  converge to  $L \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then for all  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $n > N$  implies  $|a_n - L| < \epsilon$ . If there exists  $r \in R$  such that  $r > L$ , then  $r = L + a$  for some  $a \in \mathbb{R}^+$ . But there exists  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $n > M$  implies  $|b_n - L| < a/2$ , so

$$\begin{aligned} L - a/2 < b_n < L + a/2 < L + a < c \\ b_n < c, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. Therefore  $Y \subseteq B$ .

If  $b \in B$ , the sequence  $(b_n = b)_{n=0}^\infty$  is  $\epsilon$ -close to  $b$  for all  $\epsilon > 0$ , and thus converges to  $b$ . Thus  $B \subseteq Y$ .  $\square$

## Problem 1

- (a) If a nonempty set  $R \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  has an upper bound then it has a least upper bound (supremum).

*Proof:* Let  $R$  be a nonempty set with an upper bound. Let  $B$  be the set of all upper bounds of  $R$ . Suppose to the contrary that for all decreasing sequences  $(b_n)_{n=0}^\infty$  in  $B$ ,

$$\exists b \in B, \forall N \in \mathbb{N}, \exists n \in \mathbb{N} (n > N \wedge b_n > b). \quad (1)$$

The constant sequence  $(b_n = b)_{n=0}^\infty$  in  $B$  contradicts claim (1). Thus there exists a decreasing sequence  $(b'_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  in  $B$  such that

$$\forall b \in B, \exists N \in \mathbb{N}, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, (n > N \Rightarrow b'_n \leq b). \quad (2)$$

It follows from proposition 6.3.8 (Tao) that any decreasing sequence in  $\mathbb{R}$  bounded below converges. Because for all  $b \in B$  and all  $r \in R$ ,  $b > r$ ,  $B$  is bounded below. Thus  $(b'_n)_{n=0}^\infty$  converges (by proposition 0.1) to some  $l \in B$ . Because the sequence is decreasing, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $b'_n \geq l$ . It then follows from equation (2) that for all  $b \in B$ ,  $l \leq b$ . Thus  $\sup R$  exists.  $\square$

- (b) If a nonempty subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  has an infimum, then it is bounded.

*Proof:* Let  $R \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , and  $l = \inf R$ . Then  $R$  is bounded below by  $l$ , i.e.

$$\forall r \in R, r > l.$$

If there exists  $l' \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $l' \geq 0$  such that  $\forall r \in R, |r| \leq l'$ , then

$$l' < r < l'$$

But  $r$  can be arbitrarily large, so this is not necessarily true. Therefore the statement is false. A correct statement could be "If a nonempty set of  $\mathbb{R}$  has an infimum and a supremum, then it is bounded."  $\square$

- (c) Every nonempty bounded subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  has a maximum and a minimum.

*Proof:* If  $R = [0, 1)$ , then for all  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $r \in R$  such that  $|1 - r| < \epsilon$ , and  $1 \notin R$ . Because for all  $r \in R$  we have  $r < 1$ ,  $|1 - r| = 1 - r > 0$ . Therefore for any  $r$ , there exists  $a = r + (1 - r)/2 = r/2 + 1/2 < 1$ , so  $a > r$  and  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ .  $|r| < 2$  for all  $r \in R$ , so  $R$  is bounded. Therefore, the bounded set  $R$  has no maximum and the statement is false.  $\square$

- (d) Let  $S$  be a nonempty subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ . If  $m = \inf S$  and  $m' < m$  then  $m'$  is a lower bound of  $S$ .

*Proof:* Because  $m = \inf S$ ,  $m$  is a lower bound for  $S$ , and thus for all  $s \in S$ ,  $s \geq m$ . Because  $m' < m$ , it follows from elementary properties of the ordering of the reals that for all  $s \in S$ ,  $s \geq m > m'$ , so the statement is true.  $\square$

## Problem 2

- (a) The interval  $I = (0, 4]$  has supremum 4, and infimum 0. For any upper (lower) bound smaller (greater) than 4 (0), there exists  $i \in I$  such that  $i$  is greater (lesser) than that upper (lower) bound. The maximum is 4, and no minimum, because supremum  $S$  is an element of  $S$ , but infimum  $S$  is not. The set is bounded because it is both bounded above and below by its supremum and infimum.
- (b) The set  $A = \{1/n \mid n > 0, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  has supremum 1, and an infimum 0. The supremum of  $A$  is 1 because 1 is the maximum value of  $A$ . As  $n$  increases,  $1/n$  is strictly larger than zero and becomes arbitrarily close to zero. Thus for any number  $a$  greater than 0, there exists  $n$  such that  $1/n < a$ , so zero is the infimum.  $0 \notin A$ , so the set has no minimum. The set is bounded because it is both bounded above and below by its supremum and infimum.