Advanced Calc. Exam 2

Colin Williams

November 9, 2020

Honor Code

- (a) Which of the following constitute Honor Pledge violations? Mark all that apply?
 - (i) Unauthorized Collaboration: working together with people when you are not supposed to.
 - Violation
 - (ii) Plagiarism: taking someone else's ideas, words or thoughts and using them as your own without any citation, either intentionally or unintentionally.
 - Violation
 - (iii) Unauthorized Aid: using something in your academic work you are not allowed to use, such as unauthorized calculators, books or notes in an exam.
 - Violation
 - (iv) Falsification: lying about what has occurred.
 - Violation
- (b) According to the K-State Honor and Integrity System, which of the following are true?
 - (i) A grade of XF can result from a breach of academic honesty. The F indicates failure in the course; the X indicates the reason is an Honor Pledge violation.
 - True
 - (ii) After the 1994 cheating incident, the request for an honor system first came from the faculty and the administration.
 - False, it came from the students
 - (iii) You may be held accountable for an Honor Pledge violation for posting and/or viewing answers in online sites such as chegg, cramster, study soup, study blue, etc.
 - True
 - (iv) If a student has more than one violation during their time at K-State, they're looking at possible suspension or expulsion.
 - True

For what values of $p \in \mathbb{R}$ does the series $\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{(\ln n)^2}{n^p}$ converge?

Answer.

I claim that this series only converges for p > 1

Proof.

First, note that if $p \leq 1$, then we have the following:

$$\left| \frac{(\ln n)^2}{n^p} \right| > \frac{.3}{n^p}$$
 for all $n > 2$ since $\ln(2)^2 \approx .5$ and $\ln(\cdot)$ is an increasing function

The .3 was arbitrary here, but was just used to get the proper inequality for all values of the summation. Furthermore, we also know that $\sum \frac{.3}{n^p} = .3 \sum \frac{1}{n^p}$ diverges for all $p \le 1$ due to Theorem 15.1. Therefore, by the Comparison Test, our given series also diverges for all $p \le 1$.

Now, considering p > 1, I will apply the Integral Test, and consider the following integral:

$$\int_{2}^{\infty} \frac{(\ln x)^2}{x^p} dx = \lim_{b \to \infty} \int_{2}^{b} \frac{(\ln x)^2}{x^p} dx \tag{1}$$

$$= \lim_{b \to \infty} \left(\left[\frac{(\ln x)^2}{(1-p)x^{p-1}} \right]_{x=2}^{x=b} - \int_2^b \frac{2\ln x}{(1-p)x^p} dx \right)$$
 (2)

$$= \lim_{b \to \infty} \left(\frac{1}{1-p} \left[\frac{(\ln b)^2}{b^{p-1}} - \frac{(\ln 2)^2}{2^{p-1}} \right] - \frac{2}{1-p} \left[\frac{\ln x}{(1-p)x^{p-1}} \right]_{x=2}^{x=b} + \frac{2}{1-p} \int_2^b \frac{1}{(1-p)x^p} \right)$$
(3)

$$= \frac{1}{1-p} \lim_{b \to \infty} \left(\frac{(\ln b)^2}{b^{p-1}} - \frac{(\ln 2)^2}{2^{p-1}} - \frac{2}{1-p} \left[\frac{\ln b}{b^{p-1}} - \frac{\ln 2}{2^{p-1}} \right] + \frac{2}{1-p} \left[\frac{1}{(1-p)x^{p-1}} \right]_{x=2}^{x=b} \right)$$
(4)

$$= \frac{1}{1-p} \lim_{b \to \infty} \left(\frac{(\ln b)^2}{b^{p-1}} - \frac{(\ln 2)^2}{2^{p-1}} - \frac{2}{1-p} \left[\frac{\ln b}{b^{p-1}} - \frac{\ln 2}{2^{p-1}} \right] + \frac{2}{(1-p)^2} \left[\frac{1}{b^{p-1}} - \frac{1}{2^{p-1}} \right] \right)$$
 (5)

Where I used integration by parts in lines (2) and (3). In this final limit expression, all powers of (p-1) are strictly positive powers since p>1. Furthermore, we also know that all terms of the form $\frac{\ln b}{b^{p-1}}$ and $\frac{(\ln b)^2}{b^{p-1}}$ are monotonically decreasing after a certain point since power terms grow faster than logarithmic terms. Additionally, these terms are strictly positive (i.e. bounded below by 0) as long as b>1. Thus, all the above terms do indeed converge to some real number. What this number is is not important, but let's call it $M \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, by the Integral Test, we can say:

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{(\ln n)^2}{n^p} \le \int_2^{\infty} \frac{(\ln x)^2}{x^p} = M \quad \text{for } p > 1$$

Thus, I have shown that the series does converge for p > 1, but does not converge for any $p \le 1$ which finished the proof.

Consider a function $f: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that the sequence $(f(x_n)) \subset \mathbb{R}$ is Cauchy for every Cauchy sequence $(x_n) \subset \mathbb{R}$. Is f necessarily continuous on \mathbb{R} ?

Answer.

I claim that f must be continuous on \mathbb{R} .

Proof.

Let (x_n) be a Cauchy sequence in \mathbb{R} . Thus, by assumption, we know that $(f(x_n))$ is Cauchy. This means that for some fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an N_1 such that $|f(x_n) - f(x_m)| < \varepsilon$ for all $n, m > N_1$. Additionally, since (x_n) is Cauchy, this means that for $\delta > 0$ fixed, there exists some N_2 such that $|x_n - x_m| < \delta$ for all $n, m > N_2$. Thus, if we fix $m, n > \max\{N_1, N_2\}$, then we can conclude that for $|x_n - x_m| < \delta$, we also have $|f(x_n) - f(x_m)| < \varepsilon$ which means that f is uniformly continuous. In particular, f must be continuous.

Suppose that $f: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and that the sequence $(f(x_n)) \subset \mathbb{R}$ is Cauchy for every Cauchy sequence $(x_n) \subset \mathbb{R}$. Is f necessarily uniformly continuous on \mathbb{R} ?

Answer.

I claim that f may not be uniformly continuous on \mathbb{R}

Proof.

Consider $f(x) = x^2$. Clearly f is continuous and if (x_n) is a Cauchy sequence, then (x_n) is a convergent sequence (say, to x_0) by the completeness of \mathbb{R} . Furthermore, $f(x_n) = x_n^2$ converges to x_0^2 by Limit Theorems. Thus, $(f(x_n))$ is a Cauchy sequence. However, x^2 is not uniformly continuous on \mathbb{R} since for $\varepsilon = 1$ and $|x-y| < \delta$, we have $|x^2-y^2| = |x-y||x+y| > 1$ for |x+y| sufficiently large. Thus, f is not uniformly continuous on \mathbb{R}

Consider an arbitrary function $f: \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}$, is f necessarily continuous on \mathbb{N} ?

Answer.

I claim that f must be continuous.

Proof.

I will use the ε - δ definition of continuity. Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary, and fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Then, if we choose $\delta = 1$, we obtain $|x - x_0| < \delta = 1$. However, since x, x_0 must both be in the domain of f, they must both be natural numbers. Furthermore, the only way for the difference of two natural numbers to be less than 1 is if they are the same number. Thus, $|f(x) - f(x_0)| = |f(x_0) - f(x_0)| = 0 < \varepsilon$. Therefore, $|x - x_0| < 1$ implies $|f(x) - f(x_0)| < \varepsilon$ which means f is continuous.

Given a continuous function $f: \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}$, is f necessarily uniformly continuous on \mathbb{N} ?

Answer.

I claim that f must be uniformly continuous

Proof.

Using the definition of uniform continuity, for $x,y \in \mathbb{N}$ if we choose $\delta = 1$, then we obtain |x-y| < 1. However, as discussed in the last problem, this is only possible when x = y. Thus, given some fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ and |x-y| < 1 we can conclude that $|f(x) - f(y)| = |f(x) - f(x)| = 0 < \varepsilon$. Therefore, f is uniformly continuous.

Let us call a set $B \subset \mathbb{R}$ a Schumann set if every sequence $(x_n) \subset B$ has a subsequence that converges to some point in B. Is the set $[0,1] \cup [3,5]$ a Schumann set?

Answer.

I claim that $[0,1] \cup [3,5]$ is a Schumann set

Proof.

Let's say $S := [0,1] \cup [3,5]$. First, I claim that any sequence $(x_n) \subset S$ must be bounded. This is clear to see since $|x_n| \le 5$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ for any sequence $(x_n) \subset S$. Thus, the Bolzano-Weierstrass Theorem guarantees that every sequence $(x_n) \subset S$ has a convergent subsequence. I will fix some subsequence $(s_n) \subset (x_n) \subset S$ and I claim that $\lim s_n \in S$. This is clear to see by contradiction.

If $\lim s_n < 0$ then we have a contradiction because this tells us that for some some N, $s_n < 0$ for all n > N which contradicts $(s_n) \subset S$.

Likewise, if $1 < \lim s_n < 3$ we get a similar contradiction because this tells us that for some N, $1 < s_n < 3$ for all n > N which again contradicts $(s_n) \subset S$.

Lastly, if $\lim s_n > 5$ we know that for some $N, s_n > 5$ for all n > N which contradicts $(s_n) \subset S$.

Therefore, we must have that $\lim s_n \in S$ which proves the result.

Fix a Schumann set $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ and let $f: A \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function. Is it true that the image of A under f, that is, the set $f(A) := \{y \in \mathbb{R} : y = f(x) \text{ for some } x \in A\}$ is necessarily a Schumann set?

Proof.

Let (x_n) be some sequence in A with a subsequence (s_n) that converges to $s_0 \in A$ (this is possible since A is a Schumann set). Then since $x_n \in A$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we know that $s_n \in A$ for all n which means $f(x_n) \in f(A)$ for all n and $f(s_n) \in f(A)$ for all n. Thus, for every sequence $(x_n) \subset A$ with a converging subsequence (s_n) we have a corresponding sequence $(f(x_n))$ and its subsequence $(f(s_n))$ both in f(A). Thus, by the continuity of f, we know that $\lim_n f(s_n) = f(s_0)$ and since $s_0 \in A$, $f(s_0) \in f(A)$ which means that f(A) is a Schumann set.

Does the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\sqrt{n+1} - \sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{n+2}}$ converge?

Answer.

This series does not converge

 ${\it Proof.}$

First note the following:

$$\frac{\sqrt{n+1} - \sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{n+2}} = \frac{\sqrt{n+1} - \sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{n+2}} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{n+1} + \sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{n+1} + \sqrt{n}}$$

$$= \frac{(n+1) + \sqrt{n}\sqrt{n+1} - \sqrt{n}\sqrt{n+1} - (n)}{\sqrt{n+2}(\sqrt{n+1} + \sqrt{n})}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n^2 + 3n + 2} + \sqrt{n^2 + 2n}}$$

$$> \frac{1}{\sqrt{n^2} + \sqrt{n^2}}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2n}$$

However, we know that $\sum \frac{1}{2n} = \frac{1}{2} \sum \frac{1}{n}$ diverges by Theorem 15.1. Thus, by the Comparison Test, our original series also diverges.