

## Homework 3

Yu-Chieh Kuo B07611039<sup>†</sup>

<sup>†</sup>Department of Information Management, National Taiwan University

### Problem 1

#### 1.(a)

To prove  $d_2$  is a metric on  $X$ , we need to show that

1.  $d_2(p, q) > 0$  if  $p \neq q$  and  $d(p, p) = 0$ .
2.  $d_2(p, q) = d_2(q, p)$ .
3.  $d_2(p, q) \leq d_2(p, r) + d_2(r, q) \forall r \in X$ .

Also, since  $d$  is a metric on  $X$ , we have  $d(p, q) > 0$  if  $p \neq q$  and  $d(p, p) = 0$ .

To 1., we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_2(p, q) &= \frac{d(p, q)}{1 + d(p, q)} > 0 \\ d_2(p, p) &= \frac{d(p, p)}{1 + d(p, p)} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

To 2., we have

$$d_2(p, q) = \frac{d(p, q)}{1 + d(p, q)} = \frac{d(p, q)}{1 + d(p, q)} = d_2(q, p).$$

To 3., if  $d(p, q) > 0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} d_2(p, q) &= \frac{d(p, q)}{1 + d(p, q)} = 1 - \frac{1}{1 + d(p, q)} \\ &\leq 1 - \frac{1}{1 + d(p, r) + d(r, q)} = \frac{d(p, r) + d(r, q)}{1 + d(p, r) + d(r, q)} \\ &\leq \frac{d(p, r)}{1 + d(p, r)} + \frac{d(r, q)}{1 + d(r, q)} = d_2(p, r) + d_2(r, q). \end{aligned}$$

This property holds when  $d(p, q) = 0$  as well.

The significance of  $d_2$  indicates that we can define another metric based on a defined metric.

#### 1.(b)

As 1.(a), we could find  $\rho$  is a metric by checking those three properties:

1.  $\rho(a, b) > 0$  if  $a \neq b$  and  $\rho(a, a) = 0$ .
2.  $\rho(a, b) = \rho(b, a)$ .
3.  $\rho(a, b) \leq \rho(a, c) + \rho(c, b) \forall c \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ .

To 1., we define  $\mathbb{N}_+$  as the set containing positive natural numbers and positive infinity. If  $a = b$ , then  $a_i = b_i \implies \rho(a, b) = 0$ , where  $i \in \mathbb{N}_+$ . If  $a \neq b$ , then there exists some  $i \in \mathbb{N}_+$  is a positive number such that  $a_i \neq b_i$ , which implies  $|a_i - b_i| > 0$ . Therefore,  $\rho(a, b) > 0$ .

To 2., since  $|a_i - b_i| = |b_i - a_i|$ , we have

$$\rho(a, b) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{|a_i - b_i|}{2^i} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{|b_i - a_i|}{2^i} = \rho(b, a).$$

To 3., since  $a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{R} \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_+$ , and the triangle inequality holds for real numbers, we can say that  $\forall c_i \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ ,  $|a_i + b_i| \leq |a_i - c_i| + |c_i - b_i|$  holds. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(a, b) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{|a_i - b_i|}{2^i} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{|a_i - c_i| + |c_i - b_i|}{2^i} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{|a_i - c_i|}{2^i} + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{|c_i - b_i|}{2^i} \\ &= \rho(a, c) + \rho(c, b). \end{aligned}$$

By checking the definition of metric, we can find that  $\rho$  is a metric.

After substituting  $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$  into the infinite product space  $Y = X_1 \times X_2 \times \cdots$ , and substituting  $|a_i - b_i|$  into  $d_i(a_i, b_i)$ , to check new  $\rho$  is a metric or not, we could still follow the same process as above.

At first, if  $a = b$ , then  $a_i = b_i \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_+$ , which implies  $d_i(a_i, b_i) = 0 \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_+$ . Hence, it's clearly that  $\rho(a, b) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_i(a_i, b_i)}{2^i} = 0$ . If  $a \neq b$ , then there exists some  $i \in \mathbb{N}_+$  is a positive number such that  $a_i \neq b_i$ , which implies  $d_i(a_i, b_i) > 0$  for this  $i$ . Therefore, it's clearly that  $\rho(a, b) > 0$ .

Secondly, since  $d_i$  is a metric for  $i \in \mathbb{N}_+$ , we have

$$\rho(a, b) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_i(a_i, b_i)}{2^i} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_i(b_i, a_i)}{2^i} = \rho(b, a).$$

Lastly, since  $d_i$  is a metric for  $i \in \mathbb{N}_+$ , the triangle inequality holds. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(a, b) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_i(a_i - b_i)}{2^i} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_i(a_i - c_i) + d_i(c_i - b_i)}{2^i} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_i(a_i - c_i)}{2^i} + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_i(c_i - b_i)}{2^i} \\ &= \rho(a, c) + \rho(c, b). \end{aligned}$$

By checking the definition of metric, we can find that  $\rho$  is a metric.

## Problem 2

First, we show that  $E'$  is closed.

By **Definition 2.18** in Rudin, it suffices to say every limit point of  $E'$  is a limit point of  $E$ . Given a limit point  $p \in E'$ , every neighborhood  $V$  of  $p$  contains a point  $p' \in E'$ . Since  $p'$  is a limit point of  $E$ , there exists an open neighborhood  $U$  of  $p'$  contains  $q \neq p'$  such that  $q \in E$ , where

$$U = V \cap B\left(p', \frac{1}{2}d(p, p')\right) \subseteq V.$$

(Note that  $B(a, b)$  means the open ball centering at  $a$  with radius  $b$ .)

Therefore, since  $q \neq p$ ,  $q \in U \subseteq V$ , and  $q \in E$ ,  $p$  is a limit point of  $E$ .

Next, we would like to show that  $X - E'$  is open, which is equivalent to prove  $E'$  is close. Given a point  $p \in X - E'$ , there exists an open neighborhood  $V$  of  $p$  contains no points  $q \neq p$  such that  $q \in E$ . Next, to show  $V$  is an open neighborhood of  $p$  such that  $V \subseteq X - E'$ , we assume by contradiction that there exists a limit point  $q$  of  $E$  such that  $q \neq p$  and  $q \in V$ , then here we could construct a neighborhood  $U$  as

$$U = V \cap B\left(q, \frac{1}{2}d(p, q)\right) \subseteq V,$$

where  $U$  is an open neighborhood of  $q$  containing on points of  $E$ , leading to a contrary. Consequently,  $V \subseteq X - E'$  is an open neighborhood of  $p \in X - E'$  i.e.,  $X - E'$  is open, equivalent to  $E'$  is closed.

Second, we want to prove that  $E$  and  $\bar{E}$  have the same limit points. It is equivalent to prove that whether  $E' = \bar{E}'$ .

- $(E' \subseteq \bar{E}')$ : Since  $E \subseteq \bar{E}$ ,  $E' \subseteq \bar{E}'$  obviously.
- $(\bar{E}' \subseteq E')$ : Given a limit point  $p$  of  $\bar{E} = E \cup E'$ . If  $p$  is a limit point of  $E$ , the proof is done; if  $p$  is a limit point of  $E'$ , since  $E'$  is closed, it has to be that  $p \in E'$  or  $p$  is a limit point of  $E$ . In any case,  $E' \subseteq \bar{E}'$  is true.

Lastly, the problem comes to whether  $E$  and  $E'$  always have the same limit point. It seems to have an easy yes; however, the answer is false. Consider

$$E = \left\{ \frac{1}{n} : n \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \right\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}.$$

Here  $E' = \{0\}$  but  $(E')' = \emptyset$ .

### Problem 3

- This problem is equivalent to show that  $E^\circ \subseteq (E^\circ)^\circ$ . Given any  $x \in E^\circ$ , there exists  $r > 0$  such that  $B(x, r) \subseteq E$ . Since  $B(x, r)$  is an open set, all points in  $B(x, r)$  are interior points. That is,  $\forall y \in B(x, r)$ ,  $\exists s > 0$  s.t.  $B(y, s) \subseteq B(x, r) \subseteq E$ . This implies that every  $y \in B(x, r)$  is an interior point of  $E$  i.e.,  $B(x, r) \subseteq E^\circ \implies x \in (E^\circ)^\circ \iff E^\circ \subseteq (E^\circ)^\circ$ .
- By **Definition 2.18** in Rudin, since  $E$  is open, every point of  $E$  is an interior point of  $E$  i.e.  $E \subseteq E^\circ$ . Also,  $E^\circ \subseteq E$  since all points in  $E^\circ$  must be in  $E$ . Thus,  $E = E^\circ$ .
- $G \subseteq E \implies G^\circ \subseteq E^\circ$ , and  $G = G^\circ$  by (b). Hence  $G = G^\circ \subseteq E^\circ$ .
- $((E^\circ)^c \subseteq \bar{E}^c)$ : Given any  $x \in (E^\circ)^c$ , if  $x \notin E$ , then  $x \in E^c \subseteq \bar{E}^c$ ; if  $x \in E$ , then every neighborhood  $U$  of  $x$  must satisfy  $U \cap E^c \neq \emptyset$  i.e.,  $x$  is a limit point of  $E^c$ , which means  $x \in (E^c)' \subseteq \bar{E}^c$ . For both cases,  $x \in \bar{E}^c$  at all.
  - $(\bar{E}^c \subseteq (E^\circ)^c)$ : Given any  $x \in \bar{E}^c$ , it shows that either  $x \in E^c$  or  $x \in (E^c)'$ . If  $x \in E^c$ , then  $x \notin E \implies x \notin E^\circ$  i.e.,  $x \in (E^\circ)^c$ . On the other hand, if  $x \in (E^c)'$ , then every neighborhood  $V$  of  $x$  must satisfy  $V \cap E^c \neq \emptyset$ . Hence,  $x$  is not an interior point of  $E$ , i.e.,  $E \not\subseteq E^\circ \implies x \in (E^\circ)^c$ .
- The answer is **NO**. Consider  $X$  is a metric space in  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $E = \mathbb{Q} \subseteq X$ . We have  $E^\circ = \emptyset$  since  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$  is dense in  $\mathbb{R}$ , and  $(\bar{E})^\circ = \mathbb{R}$  since  $\mathbb{Q}$  is dense in  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbb{R}$  is open.
- The answer is **NO**. Following by the setting in (e), we have  $\bar{E} = \mathbb{R}$  since  $\mathbb{Q}$  is dense in  $\mathbb{R}$ , and  $\bar{E}^\circ = \bar{\emptyset} = \emptyset$  since  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$  is dense in  $\mathbb{R}$ .

### Problem 4

#### 4.(a)

Consider  $E$  be the set of points having only rational coordinates. Since  $\mathbb{Q}$  is countable,  $E = \mathbb{Q}^k$  is also countable.

Now, given any  $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ , we would like to show that  $\mathbf{p}$  is a limit point of  $E$ .