

**ECON 703, Fall 2007**  
**Answer Key, HW5**

1.

(1) A metric on vector space  $X$  is a function  $d : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that satisfies the following conditions for all  $x, y, z$  in  $X$ :

- 1) Positivity:  $d(x, y) \geq 0$ , with equality iff  $x=y$ .
- 2) Symmetry:  $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$ .
- 3) Triangle Inequality:  $d(x, z) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, z)$ .

We need to check these conditions.

For 1), we know  $d(x, y) = \max |x_i - y_i| \geq |x_i - y_i| \geq 0$ . And  $d(x, y) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \max |x_i - y_i| = 0 \Leftrightarrow |x_i - y_i| = 0 \forall i$  (because  $|x_i - y_i| \geq 0 \forall i$ )  $\Leftrightarrow x_i = y_i \forall i \Leftrightarrow x = y$ .

For 2), we know that  $d(x, y) = \max |x_i - y_i| = \max |y_i - x_i| = d(y, x)$ .

For 3),  $d(x, y) = \max |x_i - y_i| = \max |x_i - z_i + z_i - y_i| \leq \max (|x_i - z_i| + |z_i - y_i|) \leq \max |x_i - z_i| + \max |z_i - y_i|$ .

(Another way to state: Observe that  $|x_i - y_i| + |y_i - z_i| \geq |x_i - z_i| \forall i$ , where  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n), y, z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Taking maxima on both side implies  $\max_i (|x_i - y_i| + |y_i - z_i|) \geq \max_i |x_i - z_i|$ . So  $\max_i |x_i - y_i| + \max_i |y_i - z_i| \geq \max_i (|x_i - y_i| + |y_i - z_i|) \geq \max_i |x_i - z_i|$ .)

(2) The basic open set  $B(x, r)$  of  $x$  is  $\{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \max_i |y_i - x_i| < r\}$ . Draw a graph in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , it is an  $2r \times 2r$  open square centered at  $x$ .

(3) " $\Rightarrow$ ":  $A$  is open in  $(\mathbb{R}^n, d_2)$  means for all  $x \in A$ ,  $\exists B_{d_2}(x, r) \subset A$ . So, for any  $y \in B_{d_2}(x, r)$ , we have  $\max |x_i - y_i| < r$ . If we can show that there exists a  $B_{d_1}(x, r') \subset B_{d_2}(x, r)$ , then  $x \in A, \exists B_{d_1}(x, r') \subset A$ , that is,  $A$  is open in  $(\mathbb{R}^n, d_1)$ .

Now we show that there exists a  $B_{d_1}(x, r') \subset B_{d_2}(x, r)$ . For any  $y \in B_{d_1}(x, r')$ , we have  $d_1(x, y) = \sqrt{\sum (x_i - y_i)^2} < r', \Rightarrow (x_i - y_i)^2 < r'^2, \Rightarrow |x_i - y_i| < r'$  for all  $i$ ,  $\Rightarrow \max |x_i - y_i| < r'$  for all  $i$ , i.e.  $d_2(x, y) < r', \Rightarrow y \in B_{d_2}(x, r')$ . Now just let  $r' = r$ , we have  $B_{d_1}(x, r) \subset B_{d_2}(x, r)$ .

" $\Leftarrow$ ": Similarly, we need to prove that there exist a  $B_{d_2}(x, r') \subset B_{d_1}(x, r)$ . For any  $y \in B_{d_2}(x, r')$ , we have  $d_2(x, y) = \max |x_i - y_i| < r'$ . Then  $d_1(x, y) = \sqrt{\sum (x_i - y_i)^2} \leq \sqrt{\sum (\max |x_i - y_i|)^2} < \sqrt{\sum r'^2} = \sqrt{n} r'$ . So  $y \in B_{d_1}(x, \sqrt{n} r')$ . Now just let  $r' = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} r$ , we have  $B_{d_2}(x, r') \subset B_{d_1}(x, r)$ .

Note: This statement is equivalent to the statement "metric  $d_2$  is equivalent to metric  $d_1$  in the sense that they lead to the same topology". It is sufficient to show that for every basic open set  $B_2(x, r)$  of  $x$  in  $(X, d_2)$  there exists a basic open set  $B_1(x, s)$  of  $x$  in  $(X, d_1)$  s.t.  $B_1(x, s) \subset B_2(x, r)$  and vice versa.  $\square$

2.

(a) First, consider that  $f$  is separately continuous in  $x$ .

For fixed  $y_0 \neq 0$ ,  $f(x, y_0)$  is a function of  $x$ . It is continuous since the nominator is continuous and its denominator is continuous and not equal to 0 for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .

For  $y_0 = 0$ ,  $f(x, y_0) = 0$  for  $x=0$ , and  $f(x, y_0) = \frac{0}{x^2} = 0$  for all  $x \neq 0$ , so it  $f(x, y_0) = 0$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . It is a constant function, so it is continuous, too.

Since  $f$  is symmetric, the above arguments also hold for any fixed  $x_0$ .

(b)  $f(x, x) = \frac{1}{2}$  when  $x \neq 0$ ;  $f(x, x) = 0$  when  $x = 0$ .

(c) Let  $(x_n, y_n) = (\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n})$ , then

$$f(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (x_n, y_n)) = f(0, 0) = 0 \neq \frac{1}{2} = \lim f(x_n, y_n).$$

So  $f$  is not continuous.

3.

Way1: Let  $A_x = \{y | y = \lambda x, \lambda \in [0, 1]\}$ . If  $x \in A$ , then  $A_x \subset A$ . Then  $A = \cup_{x \in A} A_x$ . Because  $0 \in A_x$ , then  $\cap_{x \in A} A_x \neq \emptyset$ . We know that  $A_x$  is connected (we need to prove this statement, as we proved in the discussion section), So  $A$  is connected too.

Way2: Suppose to the contrary that  $A_1 \neq \emptyset$ ,  $A_2 \neq \emptyset$  are a separation of  $A$ . Since  $0 \in A$ , then 0 belongs to either  $A_1$  or  $A_2$ , but not both. Without loss of generality suppose  $0 \in A_1$ . Let  $x$  be any point in  $A_2$ ,  $\Lambda = \{\lambda \in [0, 1] : \lambda x \in A_2\}$ , and  $\lambda_0 = \inf \{\Lambda\}$ .

Claim:  $\lambda_0 = 0$ .

Suppose  $\lambda_0 > 0$  instead. First  $\lambda_0 x \in A_2$ . This is because either  $\Lambda$  is finite or  $\lambda_0 x$  is a limit point of  $A_2$ . In the first case  $\lambda_0 x \in A_2$ . In the second case, since  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  are a separation of  $A$ ,  $\lambda_0 x \notin A_1$ , so  $\lambda_0 x \in A_2$  (since  $\lambda_0 x \in A$ ). Now since  $\lambda_0 x \in A_2$ , it should not be a limit point of  $A_1$ . Thus there must exist  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $\lambda \in (\lambda_0 - \varepsilon, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon)$  implies  $\lambda x \notin A_1$ , hence  $\lambda x \in A_2$ . But this contradicts  $\lambda_0 = \inf \{\Lambda\}$ . The claim is proved.

Now we can see 0 is a limit point of  $A_2$ , contradicting  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  being a separation of  $A$ .

4.

The statement is correct: Let  $h(x) = f(x) - g(x)$ , then  $h(x) > 0$  and is continuous in  $[0, 1]$ . And  $[0, 1]$  is compact. Then according to the Weierstrass Theorem, there exists  $x_0 \in [0, 1]$  such that  $h(x) \geq h(x_0) > 0$  for all  $x \in [0, 1]$ , i.e.,  $f(x) \geq g(x) + h(x_0)$ . Let  $\Delta = h(x_0)$ .

It would not be true if  $f, g$  were only left continuous. Let  $g(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in [0, 1]$ . Let  $f(x) = x$  if  $x \in (0, 1]$  and  $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}$  if  $x = 0$ . So  $f$  and  $g$  are both left continuous. There exists no such  $\Delta > 0$  since  $\inf_{x \in [0, 1]} h(x) = 0$ .

Note: We know from the condition that  $f(x) - g(x) > 0$ . We are asked to show there is a  $\Delta$  s.t.  $f(x) - g(x) > \Delta$  for all  $x \in [0, 1]$ . So we only need to prove that the minimum of the distance between  $f(x)$  and  $g(x)$  exists, and then let it be  $\delta$ . Think about the Weierstrass theorem for the existence of minimum.