Real Analysis Assignment 1

Joel Savitz

September 16, 2020

1(a):

Suppose we have the following equation:

$$|x - 1| + |x + 2| = 0.5 \tag{1}$$

We have $x \in \mathbb{R}$ if and only if:

$$x \le -2 \lor -2 \le x \le 1 \lor 1 \le x \tag{2}$$

since $(-\infty, -2] \cup [-2, 1] \cup [1, \infty) = \mathbb{R}$.

Assume $x \le -2$. Then, $x-1 < 0 \implies |x-1| = -(x-1)$, and $x+2 \le 0 \implies |x+2| = -(x+2)$, so we can solve (1) as follows:

$$-(x-1) - (x+2) = 0.5 (3)$$

$$= -x + 1 - x - 2 \qquad = 0.5 \tag{4}$$

$$= -2x - 1 = 0.5 (5)$$

$$\implies -2x \qquad = 1.5 \tag{6}$$

$$\implies x \qquad = \frac{1.5}{-2} = \frac{-3}{4} \tag{7}$$

However, we have by assumption that $x \leq -2$, and by (7) we have that $x = \frac{-3}{4} > -2$, which is a contradition. Therefore, $x \leq -2$ is false for any real solution to (1).

Assume $-2 \le x \le 1$. Then, $x-1 \le 0 \implies |x-1| = -(x-1)$, and $x+2 \ge 0 \implies |x+2| = x+2$, so we can solve (1) as follows:

$$-(x-1) + x + 2 = 0.5 (8)$$

$$= -x + 1 + x + 2 \qquad = 0.5 \tag{9}$$

$$=3 \qquad \qquad =0.5 \tag{10}$$

But of course, 3=0.5 is absurd, therefore we reach a contradiction and conclude that $-2 \le x \le 1$ is false for any real solution to (1).

Assume $x \ge 1$: Then, $x-1 \ge 0 \implies |x-1| = x-1$, and $x+2 > 0 \implies |x+2| = x+2$, so we can solve (1) as follows:

$$x - 1 + x + 2 = 0.5 \tag{11}$$

$$=2x+1 = 0.5 (12)$$

$$\implies 2x \qquad \qquad = -0.5 \tag{13}$$

$$\Longrightarrow x \qquad \qquad = \frac{-0.5}{2} = \frac{-1}{4} \tag{14}$$

However, we have by assumption that $x \ge 1$, and by (14) we have that $x = \frac{-1}{4} < 1$, which is a contradition. Therefore, $x \ge 1$ is false for any real solution to (1).

Finally, since we have $x \notin (-\infty, -2] \land x \notin [-2, 1] \land x \notin [1, \infty)$, we have $x \notin \mathbb{R} = (-\infty, -2] \cup [-2, 1] \cup [1, \infty)$, therefore we have demonstrated that there are no real solutions to (1).

1(b):

Suppose we have the following equation:

$$|x - 1| + |x + 2| = 3.5 \tag{15}$$

We have $x \in \mathbb{R}$ if and only if (2) holds since $(-\infty, -2] \cup [-2, 1] \cup [1, \infty) = \mathbb{R}$. Assume $x \le -2$. Then, $x - 1 < 0 \implies |x - 1| = -(x - 1)$, and $x + 2 \le 0 \implies |x + 2| = -(x + 2)$, so we can solve (15) as follows:

$$-(x-1) - (x+2) = 3.5 (16)$$

$$= -x + 1 - x - 2 \qquad = 3.5 \tag{17}$$

$$= -2x - 1 = 3.5 (18)$$

$$\implies -2x \qquad = 4.5 \tag{19}$$

$$\Rightarrow x \qquad = \frac{4.5}{-2} = \frac{-9}{4} \tag{20}$$

Indeed, $x = \frac{-9}{4} \le -2$ so this solution is consistent with our constaints and it must be a member of the solution set for (15).

Assume $-2 \le x \le 1$. Then, $x-1 \le 0 \implies |x-1| = -(x-1)$, and $x+2 \ge 0 \implies |x+2| = x+2$, so we can solve (15) as follows:

$$-(x-1) + x + 2 = 3.5 (21)$$

$$= -x + 1 + x + 2 \qquad = 3.5 \tag{22}$$

$$=3$$
 $=3.5$ (23)

But of course, 3=3.5 is absurd, therefore we reach a contradiction and conclude that $-2 \le x \le 1$ is false for any real solution to (15).

Assume $x \ge 1$: Then, $x-1 \ge 0 \implies |x-1| = x-1$, and $x+2 > 0 \implies |x+2| = x+2$, so we can solve (15) as follows:

$$x - 1 + x + 2 = 3.5 (24)$$

$$=2x+1$$
 $=3.5$ (25)

$$\implies 2x$$
 = 2.5 (26)

$$\implies x \qquad \qquad = \frac{2.5}{2} = \frac{5}{4} \tag{27}$$

Indeed, $x = \frac{5}{4} \ge 1$ so this solution is consistent with our constaints and it must be a member of the solution set for (15).

Finally, we can describe the real solutions to (15) by $x \in \{\frac{-9}{4}, \frac{5}{4}\}$.

1(c):

Suppose we have the following inequality:

$$|x-2| < 3 \tag{28}$$

Some $x \in \mathbb{R}$ solves (28) if and only if $x \in (-\infty, 2] \lor x \in [2, \infty)$ since $(-\infty, 2] \cup [2, \infty) = \mathbb{R}$.

Assume $x \le 2$. Then, $x - 2 \le 0 \implies |x - 2| = -(x - 2) = -x + 2$, so we can solve (28):

$$-x+2 <3 (29)$$

$$\implies -x$$
 <1 (30)

$$\implies x > -1 \tag{31}$$

Therefore we have $-1 < x \le 2$ when $x \le 2$

Assume $x \ge 2$

Then, $x-2 \ge 0 \implies |x-2| = x-2$ so we can solve (28):

$$x - 2 < 3 (32)$$

$$\implies x > 5$$
 (33)

Therefore we have $2 \le x < 5$ when $x \ge 2$

Since those two cases describe every case of $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we must have that $-1 < x \le 2 \lor 2 \le x < 5$, thus we have demonstrated that -1 < x < 5 solves (28).

1(d):

Suppose we have the following inequality:

$$x + \frac{2 - 4x}{x + 1} > 0 \tag{34}$$

Since $x = \frac{x(x+1)}{x+1}$, we can simplify (34) as follows:

$$\frac{x(x+1) + (2-4x)}{x+1} > 0$$

$$\frac{x^2 + x + 2 - 4x}{x+1} > 0$$

$$\frac{x^2 - 3x + 2}{x+1} > 0$$

$$\frac{(x-1)(x-2)}{x+1} > 0$$
(35)
$$(36)$$

$$\frac{x^2 + x + 2 - 4x}{x + 1} > 0 \tag{36}$$

$$\frac{x^2 - 3x + 2}{x + 1} > 0 \tag{37}$$

$$\frac{(x-1)(x-2)}{x+1} > 0 \tag{38}$$

Since (38) is undefined when x = -1, we must have either x < -1 or x > -1. Assume x > -1. Then, (38) holds if and only if $(x - 1 > 0 \land x - 2 >$ 0) \vee ($x-1 < 0 \land x-2 < 0$).

Under this assumption, consider the following two cases:

- Assume $x-1>0 \land x-2>0$. Then, $x>1 \land x>2 \implies x>2$. We conclude that a subset of our solution set is the interval $(2, \infty)$.
- Assume $x-1 < 0 \land x-2 < 0$. Then, $x < 1 \land x < 2 \implies x < 1$. We conclude that a subset of our solution set is the interval (-1,1).

Now, assume x < -1. Then, (38) holds if and only if $(x - 1 > 0 \land x - 2 <$ $(0) \lor (x-1 < 0 \land x-2 > 0).$

Under this assumption, consider the following two cases:

- Assume $x-1>0 \land x-2<0$. Then, $x>1 \land x<2$, but by assumption, x < -1, which is a contradition, so we reject this assumption.
- Assume $x-1 < 0 \land x-2 > 0$. Then, $x < 1 \land x > 2$, which is a contradiction, so we reject this assumption.

Finally, we conclude that our complete solution set must be the interval $(-1,1) \cup (2,\infty)$.

2:

Let A and B be two sets such that $A = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x > 0 \land x^2 \geq 3\}$ and $B = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x^2 < 3\} \cup \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x \le 0\}.$

The definition of a Dedekind Cut was given in class as follows: (X, Y) forms a Dedekind Cut of \mathbb{R} if:

- 1. $X \subset \mathbb{R} \wedge Y \subset \mathbb{R}$
- 2. $X \neq \emptyset \land Y \neq \emptyset$
- 3. $(\forall x \in X)(\forall x \in Y)(x < y)$.

(A, B) does not form a Dedekind Cut since 3 > 0, and $3 \in A \land 0 \in B$. violating the third constraint. Therefore, we instead consider the Dedekind cut (B, A).

By construction (axiom schema of comprehension), we have that $A \subseteq \mathbb{R} \land B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Since $0 \notin A$, we must have $A \subset \mathbb{R}$, and since $3^2 > 2 \implies 3 \notin B$, we have $B \subset \mathbb{R}$. Therefore the first constraint is satisfied.

Suppose x=0. Then $x\in B$ by its definition, so $B\neq\emptyset$. Suppose x=3. Then, $x^2=9\geq 3\implies x\in A$, so $A\neq\emptyset$. Therefore the second constraint is satisfied.

Let $a \in A$ and let $b \in B$. By definition, we have that a > 0. If $b \le 0$, then $b \le 0 < a \implies b < a$ is trivial. Assume b > 0. By the definition of B, we have that $b^2 \le 3$, and by the definition of A, we have $a^2 \ge 3$. Then by transitivity, we have $b^2 < 3 \le a^2 \implies b^2 < a^2$, therefore $b^2 - a^2 = (b+a)(b-a) < 0$. Since $b > 0 \land a > 0$, we must have b + a > 0, and therefore since (b+a)(b-a) < 0 if and only if $(b+a>0 \land b-a<0) \lor (b+a<0 \land b-a>0)$, we must have that b-a<0 and thus b < a. We conclude that $(\forall b \in B)(\forall a \in A)(b < a)$, therefore the third constraint is satisfied.

Since (B, A) satisfies all of the constraints of the definition of a Dedekind Cut of the reals, we conclude that it indeed must be a Dedekind Cut.