# Analysis 2

## 1 Integrals

**Definition 1.1** (Riemann integrability). A function  $f: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$  is said to be Riemann integrable on the interval [a,b] if there exists  $I \in \mathbb{R}$  such that for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that for any partition  $X = (x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n)$  with  $\lambda(X) < \delta$ , any sequence  $(c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_n)$  such that  $c_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$  for all  $1 \le i \le n$  also satisfies:

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^{n} f(c_i) \Delta X_i - I \right| < \varepsilon.$$

We also denote  $I = \int_a^b f(x) dx$ .

**Proposition 1.1.** Suppose f is a Riemann integrable function, then  $f^2$  is also Riemann integrable.

*Proof.* We can notice that

$$\begin{split} &U(f,P) - D(f,P) < \varepsilon \\ \Rightarrow &U(f,P) < D(f,P) + \varepsilon \\ \Rightarrow &U(f,P)^2 < D(f,P)^2 + 2\varepsilon D(f,P) + \varepsilon^2 \\ \Rightarrow &U(f,P)^2 - D(f,P)^2 < \varepsilon (2D(f,P) + \varepsilon) \end{split}$$

Since f is integrable we know  $2D(f,P) + \varepsilon$  is bounded. Denote the bound M. Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Choose the  $\delta$  that matches  $\varepsilon_{\delta} = \min(\frac{\varepsilon}{2M+1}, 1)$  under f's integrability. We get:

$$\begin{split} &U(f,P) - D(f,P) < \varepsilon_{\delta} \\ \Rightarrow &U(f,P)^2 - D(f,P)^2 < \varepsilon_{\delta}(2D(f,P) + \varepsilon_{\delta}) \\ \Rightarrow &U(f,P)^2 - D(f,P)^2 < \frac{\varepsilon}{2M+1}(2M+1) = \varepsilon \\ \Rightarrow &U(f^2,P) - D(f^2,P) < \varepsilon \end{split}$$

This shows that  $f^2$  is Darboux integrable, which implies it is Riemann integrable, which completes the proof.

**Definition 1.2.** If f is continuous, then f is integrable.

*Proof.* Let f be continuous on [a, b]. By the Cantor–Heine theorem it is uniformally continuous. We have

$$U(f,P) - L(f,P) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (M_i - m_i) \Delta X_i <^* \sum_{i=1}^{n} \varepsilon \Delta X_i = \varepsilon (b-a)$$

(\*) This is because by definition we have that for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $d(x,y) < \delta$ . This implies that  $d(f(x),f(y)) < \varepsilon$  and that delta is exactly what we wanted, which completes the proof.

**Proposition 1.2** (Intermediate Value Theorem for Integrals). Let f be a continuous funtion on [a,b] then exists  $x_0 \in [a,b]$  such that:

$$\int_a^b f(x) dx = f(x_0)(b-a).$$

*Proof.* Since f is continuous it is Riemann integrable. From Weierstrass's theorem f has a minimum and maximum in [a, b] which we will denote m and M. We know have

$$m(b-a) \le \int_a^b f(x) dx \le M(b-a).$$

From this follows that

$$m \le \frac{\int_a^b f(x) \, dx}{b - a} \le M.$$

Denote  $c := \frac{\int_a^b f(x) dx}{b-a}$ . By the intermediate value theorem we know that exists  $x_0 \in (a,b)$  such that  $f(x_0) = c$  and thus:

$$\int_a^b f(x) \, dx = f(x_0)(b-a)$$

## 2 The Fundamental Theorem of Calculus

Theorem 2.1. (Fundamental theorem of calculus, part one). Let f be a continuous real-valued function defined on a closed interval [a,b]. Let F be the function defined as:

$$F(x) = \int_{a}^{x} f(t) dt$$

for all  $x \in [a, b]$ . Then F is uniformly continuous on [a, b] and differentiable on the open interval (a, b), and

$$F'(x) = f(x) \quad \forall x \in (a, b).$$

Theorem 2.2. (Fundamental theorem of calculus, part two). Under the conditions of part one, if f is Riemann integrable on [a,b]. Then:

$$\int_{a}^{b} f(x) dx = F(b) - F(a).$$

*Proof.* Part One For any  $x_1, x_1 + \Delta x \in [a, b]$  we get:

$$F(x_1 + \Delta x) - F(x_1) = \int_a^{x_1 + \Delta x} f(t) dt - \int_a^{x_1} f(t) dt = \int_{x_1}^{x_1 + \Delta x} f(t) dt$$

According to the mean value theorem for integration we get that for  $c \in [x_1, x_1 + \Delta x]$ :

$$\int_{x_1}^{x_1+\Delta x} f(t) dt = f(c)\Delta x$$

$$\lim_{\Delta x \to 0} \frac{F(x_1 + \Delta x) - F(x_1)}{\Delta x} = \lim_{\Delta x \to 0} f(c) = f(x_1)$$

And thus from the squeeze theorem and f's continuity we get  $F'(x_1) = f(x_1)$ .

*Proof.* Part Two Let  $P = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n)$  be a partition of [a, b] such that  $(x_0, x_n) = (a, b)$ . Then we have:

$$F(b) - F(a) = F(x_n) + [F(x_{n-1}) - F(x_{n-1})] + \dots + [F(x_1) - F(x_1)] - F(x_0)$$

$$= [F(x_n) - F(x_{n-1})] + [F(x_{n-1}) - F(x_{n-2})] + \dots + [F(x_1) - F(x_0)]$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{n} [F(x_i) - F(x_{i-1})].$$

Because F is continuous on [a, b] and differentiable on (a, b), we can use Lagrange's theorem on  $[x_i, x_{i-1}]$ . Thus, there exists  $c_i \in [x_i, x_{i-1}]$  such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} [F(x_i) - F(x_{i-1})] = \sum_{i=1}^{n} [F'(c_i)(x_i - x_{i-1})].$$

According to part one we get that  $F'(c_i) = f(c_i)$  and so

$$F(b) - F(a) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} [f(c_i)(\Delta x_i)]$$

$$\iff$$

$$\lim_{\|\Delta x_i\| \to 0} (F(b) - F(a)) = \lim_{\|\Delta x_i\| \to 0} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} [f(c_i)(\Delta x_i)]\right)$$

$$\iff$$

$$F(b) - F(a) = \int_{a}^{b} f(x) dx.$$

#### 2.1 Length of a curve

Using integrals, we can actually find a formula for the length of a continuous graph. Approximating the length of a graph using the pythagorian theorem for partition  $X = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n)$  we get:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sqrt{d(x_{i-1}, x_i)^2 + d(f(x_{i-1}), f(x)_i)^2}.$$

Assuming f is continuous on [a, b] and differentiable on (a, b) from Lagrange's theorem we get:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sqrt{d(x_{i-1}, x_i)^2 + d(f(x_{i-1}), f(x)_i)^2} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sqrt{(x_i - x_{i-1})^2 + (f'(c_i)(x_i - x_{i-1}))^2}$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sqrt{(x_i - x_{i-1})^2 (1 + (f'(c_i))^2)}$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sqrt{1 + (f'(c_i))^2} \Delta X_i.$$

We can see that this summation is matching the integral

$$\lim_{\|\Delta x_i\| \to 0} \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{1 + (f'(c_i))^2} \Delta X_i = \int_a^b \sqrt{1 + (f'(x))^2} \, dx$$

The result of this integral will give us the length of any continuous graph.

**Proposition 2.3** (Limit comparison test). Let f, g be two integrable positive functions on [a, M] for any  $M \in \mathbb{R}$ . Suppose that

$$\lim_{x \to \infty} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} = c.$$

Then

- If  $c \in (0, \infty)$  then either both series converge or both series diverge.
- If c = 0 the convergance of f implies the convergance of g.
- If  $c = \infty$  the convergance of g implies the convergance of f.

*Proof.* Assume  $c \in (0, \infty)$ . Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  we know that exists  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  such that for all  $x_0 < x$  we have:

$$g(x)(c-\varepsilon) < f(x) < g(x)(c+\varepsilon).$$

If g(x) converges then f(x) converges by the squeeze theorem. Similarly if g diverges we know that

$$g(x)(c-\varepsilon) < f(x),$$

So from a certain point onwards f will meet the requirements of the direct comparison test and will diverge which completes the proof.

## 3 Some Practise

Exercise 3.1. Find the value of

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left( \frac{1}{n+1} + \frac{1}{n+2} + \dots + \frac{1}{2n} \right).$$

**Solution.** By direct calculation we have:

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \left( \frac{1}{n+1} + \frac{1}{n+2} + \dots + \frac{1}{2n} \right) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{1}{n+k}$$

$$= \lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{k}{n}} \frac{1}{n}$$

$$= \lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{k=1}^{n} f(\frac{k}{n}) \frac{1}{n}$$

$$= \int_{0}^{1} \frac{1}{1+x}$$

Exercise 3.2. Check if the following integral converges or diverges:

$$\int_{\frac{1}{2}}^{1} \frac{1}{x\sqrt{1-x}}.$$

**Solution.** This function seems to behave like  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x}}$  near 1 so let's compare them using the limit comparison test:

$$\lim_{x \to 1^{-}} \frac{\frac{1}{x\sqrt{1-x}}}{\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x}}} = \lim_{x \to 1^{-}} \frac{1}{x} = 1.$$

By the limit comparison test we get that the integral converges.

**Definition 3.1** (Absolute convergence). An improper integral of a function f is said to converge absolutely if the integral of the absolute value of the integrand is finite—that is, if  $\int_a^\infty |f(x)| dx = L$  for some finite  $L \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**Remark 3.1.** An improper integral of a function f that converges, but does not converge absolutely, is said to converge conditionally.

**Proposition 3.1.** Let  $\int_a^{\infty} f(x) dx$  be an improper integral that converge absolutely, then it also converges. In other words:

$$\int_{a}^{\infty} |f(x)| dx$$
 converges  $\Longrightarrow \int_{a}^{\infty} f(x) dx$  converges.

Proof. Suppose f converges absolutely. Consider:

$$f^{+} = \begin{cases} f(x), & f(x) > 0 \\ 0, & f(x) \le 0 \end{cases}$$
$$f^{-} = \begin{cases} -f(x), & f(x) < 0 \\ 0, & f(x) \ge 0 \end{cases}$$

We know that  $|f| = f^+ + f^-$  converges and so by the direct comparison test we get that  $\int_a^\infty f^+$  and  $\int_a^\infty f^-$  converge. Since  $f = f^+ - f^-$  we also get that  $\int_a^\infty f$  converges as well which completes the proof.

**Proposition 3.2** (Dirichlet's Test). If  $a_n$  is a monotonic sequence and  $\lim_{n\to\infty} a_n = 0$  and  $\sum b_n$  is bounded by M then

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n b_n \quad \text{converges.}$$

*Proof.* Denote  $B_n = \sum_{k=1}^n b_k$  and by summation by parts we see that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} a_n b_n = a_n B_n - \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (a_{k+1} - a_k) B_k.$$

Since  $a_n$  converges to 0 and  $B_n$  is bounded  $\lim_{n\to\infty} a_n B_n$  exists. WLOG assume  $a_n$  is increasing, we can also see that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} |(a_{k+1} - a_k)B_k| \le \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} M |(a_{k+1} - a_k)| \le M \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (a_{k+1} - a_k)$$

And

$$M\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (a_{k+1} - a_k) = M(a_n - a_1)$$

Which converges to  $-Ma_1$  since  $\lim_{n\to\infty}a_n=0$ . That means that this sequence is bounded. Which means that  $\sum_{k=1}^{n-1}|(a_{k+1}-a_k)B_k|$  is also bounded. It is also monotonic which means it converges. And if  $\sum_{k=1}^{n-1}(a_{k+1}-a_k)B_k$  converges absolutly it also converges conditionally which means  $\sum_{k=1}^{n-1}(a_{k+1}-a_k)B_k$  converges. And by additivity of limits we know  $\lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{k=1}^n a_nb_n$  exists so  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}a_nb_n$  converges.

**Proposition 3.3** (Abel's test). Suppose  $\sum_{1}^{\infty} a_n$  converges, and  $b_n$  is monotone and bounded. Then  $\sum_{1}^{\infty} a_n b_n$  also converges.

*Proof.* We know  $b_n$  is monotone and bounded so it has a limit  $\lim_{n\to\infty} b_n = b$  This implies  $\lim_{n\to\infty} b_n - b = 0$ . Since  $b_n - b$  is also monotonic we know by Dirichle's test that  $\sum_{1}^{\infty} a_n(b_n - b)$  converges. And by homogenity of series we know that  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n b$  converges as well. That means  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (a_n b) + a_n (b_n - b)$  converges. So  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (a_n b) + a_n (b_n - b) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n b_n$  converges.  $\square$ 

## 3.1 Root And Quotient Test

Let  $a_n$  be a sequence and suppose

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \left| \frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n} \right| = q > 1$$

Then eventually  $\left|\frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n}\right|$  will be greater than q. which means  $a_n$  is diverging so  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$  diverges as well. If q < 1 then eventually  $\left|\frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n}\right|$  will be smaller than q. That means  $a_n$  will converges to 0 and then we know that  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (a_n)$  converges absolutly and that implies it converges it the usual sense as well. The Root test is very similar and stronger in general.

#### 4 Rabbe's Test

In case the quotient test doesn't work - let  $a_n$  be a positive sequence then if

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \left( n \left( 1 - \frac{a_n + 1}{a_n} \right) \right) = q$$

Then for

$$\begin{cases} q>1 & \text{the series converges}\\ q<1 & \text{the series diverges}\\ q=1 & \text{we must check using a better test...} \end{cases}$$

## 5 Integral Test for Series

Let f(x) be a positive monotone decreasing function on  $[1, \infty]$ . Define  $a_n = f(n)$  then:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n \quad \text{converges} \iff \int_1^{\infty} f(x) dx \quad \text{converges}$$

Suppose the series converges then we get:

$$\left| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n < M \right|$$

But we also know that:

$$0 \le \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} a_n \le \int_1^{N+1} f(x) dx \le \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$$

That means that the integral is increasing and bounded so it's converging. Suppose the integral was converging, to prove the series is also converging we could show similarly it's "bounded" by the integral's bound.

# 6 Cauchy Condensation Test

Let  $a_n$  be a non-increasing sequence of non-negative number.

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f(n) \le \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^n f(2^n) \le 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f(n)$$

This is because of simple rearrangement of the numbers:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f(n) = f(1) + f(2) + f(3) + f(4) + f(5) + f(6) + f(7) + \cdots$$

$$= f(1) + (f(2) + f(3)) + (f(4) + f(5) + f(6) + f(7)) + \cdots$$

$$\leq f(1) + (f(2) + f(2)) + (f(4) + f(4) + f(4) + f(4)) + \cdots$$

$$= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^n f(2^n)$$

$$= f(1) + (f(2) + f(2)) + (f(4) + f(4) + f(4) + f(4)) + \cdots$$

$$\leq (f(1) + f(1)) + (f(2) + f(2)) + (f(3) + f(3)) + (f(4) + f(4)) \cdots$$

$$= 2\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f(n)$$

## 7 Leibniz's Test

Let  $a_n$  be a monotone decreasing positive sequence such that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} a_n = 0$$

Then

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{\infty} a_n \quad \text{converges}$$

Since  $a_n$  is monotonically decreasing then we can say that

$$S_{2(m+1)} = S_{2m} + (a_{2m+1} - a_{2m}) \ge S_{2m}$$
  
$$S_{2(m+1)+1} = S_{2m+1} - (a_{2m+2} + a_{2m+3}) \le S_{2m+1}$$

Or in other words  $S_{2m}$  monotonically increases and  $S_{2m+1}$  monotonically decreases. But we also know that

$$S_{2m+1} - S_{2m} = a_{2m+1} \ge 0$$

And that means that

$$a_1 - a_2 = S_2 \le S_{2m} \le S_{2m+1} \le S_1 = a_1$$

In other words our monotone sequences are bounded and so they converge. Recall as  $m \to \infty$ 

$$S_{2m+1} - S_{2m} = a_{2m+1} \to 0$$

So by Cantor's lemma  $S_{2m+1}$ ,  $S_{2m}$  converge to the same limit L. Moreover

$$S_{2m} \le L \le S_{2m+1}$$

And also

$$|S_k - L| \le a_{k+1}$$

## 8 Riemann Series Theorem

Suppose that  $(a_1, a_2, a_3, ...)$  is a sequence of real numbers, and that  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$  is conditionally convergent. Let M be a real number. Then there exists a permutation  $\sigma$  such that:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_{\sigma(n)} = M$$

This is also the case for  $M = \pm \infty$ . If  $a_n$  is absolutely converging then rearrangement of the elements is possible. If a series is converging then putting parentheses is valid. This can be shown by generating a new sequence such that each summation is an element, and showing that it converges.

#### 8.1 Dini's Theorem

Let  $f_n(x) \to f(x)$  converge pointwise in D = [a, b] if  $\forall x \in D(f_n(x))$  is monotonic) and  $f, f_n$  are continuous then  $f_n(x) \to f(x)$  converges uniformally.

# 9 Properties of Uniformally Converging Function Sequences

## 9.1 Continuity

Suppose  $f_n \to f$  converges uniformally, and  $f_n$  is continuous for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then f is continuous. The proof is based on the triangle inequality.

## 9.2 Integrability

Suppose  $f_n \to f$  converges uniformally on [a,b], and  $f_n$  is integrable for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  then f is integrable and as  $n \to \infty$ 

$$\int_{a}^{b} \int f_{n} \to \int_{a}^{b} \int f$$

## 9.3 Differentiability

Suppose  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N} : f_n \in C^1$  on I such that:

- $f'_n$  uniformally converges on I
- $\exists x_0 : f_n(x_0)$  converges

Then  $f_n$  uniformally converge on I to f and

$$f'_n \to f'$$

## 10 Weierstrass M-Test

Let  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n(x)$  be a function series. Suppose exists a sequence  $M_n$  such that:

- $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}(|f_n(x)| \leq M_n)$
- $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} M_n$  converges.

Then  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n(x)$  converges uniformally.

#### 10.1 **Proof**

Since  $M_n$  converges we can use an quivalent definition for the convergence of the series and so

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 \colon \exists N \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } (n > N) \land (p \in \mathbb{N}) \to \left( \left| \sum_{k=1}^{n+p} M_k(x) - \sum_{k=1}^n M_k(x) \right| < \varepsilon \right)$$

And since  $0 \leq M_n$  that implies

$$\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+p} M_k(x) < \varepsilon$$

And so we get that:

$$\left| \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+p} f_k(x) \right| \le \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+p} |f_k(x)| \le \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+p} M_n < \varepsilon$$

#### 11 Power Series Theorems

Suppose  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n x^n$  converges for some  $x_0$ , then it absolutely converges for any x such that  $|x| < |x_0|$ . Since the power series converges  $\lim_{n\to\infty} a_n x_0^n = 0$  and so the sequence is bounded and we denote that bound M.

$$0 \le |a_n x^n| = |a_n x_0^n| \left| \frac{x^n}{x_0^n} \right| < M \left| \frac{x}{x_0} \right|^n$$

And this sequence's sum is a geometric series so it converges and so does  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |a_n x^n|$ . We also know that  $|a_n x^n| < |a_n x_0^n|$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  so according to Weierstrass's M test  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |a_n x^n|$  uniformally converges. Let

$$X = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n x^n \text{ converges}\}$$

We claim that exists  $R = \sup X$  - the radius of convergance - and that the series converges if |x| < |R| and diverges fo |x| > |R|. For any x > R the series diverges by definition of R. If x < -R we know that exists  $x_1$  such that  $R < x_1 < |x|$  such that the series converges, in contradiction to R's defintion. if |x| < |R| than there exists  $x_2$  such that  $|x| < |x_2| < |R|$  for which the series converges and then it converges for x as well.

#### 11.1 Some exercises

- We know the series converges uniformally for any close intervel properly inside [-R, R]. If it converges uniformally on [0, R] then it is converging in R as well.
- Let a function series converge uniformally to f. Prove f is continuous on (a,b)

## 12 Cauchy–Hadamard + D'alembert Theorem

Let  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n x^n$  be a series and let R be the radius of convergence of the series - that is to say the series converges for any  $x \in (-R, R)$  then:

$$R = \frac{1}{\limsup_{n \to \infty} \sqrt[n]{|a_n|}} = \frac{1}{\lim_{n \to \infty} \left| \frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n} \right|}$$

#### 12.1 Proof the 1st

Let

$$\begin{split} &\lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt[n]{|a_n|} = L \\ &\Rightarrow \sqrt[n]{|a_nx^n|} = \sqrt[n]{|a_n|}|x| \to L|x| \\ &\Rightarrow \begin{cases} |x| < \frac{1}{L} = R & \text{The series converges} \\ |x| > \frac{1}{L} = R & \text{The series diverges} \end{cases} \end{split}$$

This proves the series converges/diverges absolutely according to the root test. If it converges absolutly this implies it converges in the usual sense. Suppose it diverges - by the root test we know that if the series diverges the partial sums don't converge to 0 so the series must diverge as well.

#### 12.2 Proof the 2nd

Let

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n \to \infty} \left| \frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n} \right| = L \\ &\Rightarrow \frac{|a_{n+1}x^{n+1}|}{|a_nx^n|} = \frac{|a_{n+1}|}{|a_n|} |x| \to L|x| \\ &\Rightarrow \begin{cases} |x| < \frac{1}{L} = R & \text{The series converges} \\ |x| > \frac{1}{L} = R & \text{The series diverges} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

If the series converges absolutly we can be sure yet again that it converges. If it diverges - than by the quotient test the partial sums diverge and so the series must also diverge, and the series will diverge as we claimed.

# 13 A Note on the Taylor Series

If f is smooth on (-R, R) then f can be the limit of a power series if and only if:

$$\forall x \in (-R, R)$$

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} R_n(x) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} a_n x^n = 0$$

This is because the following are equivalent:

$$f$$
 can be the limit of a power series 
$$\lim_{n\to\infty} S_n(x) = f(x), \forall x \in (-R, R)$$
$$\lim_{n\to\infty} R_n(x) = \lim_{n\to\infty} f(x) - S_n(x) = 0, \quad \forall x \in (-R, R)$$

## 14 Continuous Partial Derivatives imply Differentiability

#### 14.1 Semi-Proof

We want to find the tangetial plane to f for  $(x_0, y_0)$  assuming that the partial derivatives are continuous at that point. Let's denote

$$z_o = f(x_0, y_0)$$
 and  $A = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x_0, y_0)$  and  $B = \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x_0, y_0)$ 

Now the tangential lines that intersect at  $z_0$  and are parallel to the axes (and in turn are perpendicular to one another) are (since the derivatives are continuous)

$$z = B(y - y_0) + z_0$$
$$z = A(x - x_0) + z_0$$

Their directional vectors are in turn

$$\vec{\beta} = (0, 1, B)$$
$$\vec{\alpha} = (1, 0, A)$$

And the normal vector to their spanning plane is

$$\vec{N} = \begin{vmatrix} \hat{i} & \hat{j} & \hat{k} \\ 0 & 1 & B \\ 1 & 0 & A \end{vmatrix} = (A, B, -1)$$

And so the plane equation is

$$A(x - x_0) + B(y - y_0) - (z - z_0) = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow z = z_0 + \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x - x_0) + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x_0, y_0)(y - y_0)$$

We have shown that if continuous partial derivatives exists at  $(x_0, y_0)$  then f has a tangential plane at  $(x_0, y_0)$  which is equivalent to being differentiable at  $(x_0, y_0)$ 

#### 14.2 Note on Diffferentiability

We say that f is differentiable at  $(x_0, y_0)$  if exist A, B such that

$$f(x_0 + h, y_0 + k) - f(x_0, y_0) = Ah + Bk + \alpha(h, k)\sqrt{h^2 + k^2} = Ah + Bj + \alpha(h, k)h + \beta(h, k)k$$
  
and  $\lim_{(h,k)\to(0,0)} \alpha(h,k) = 0$  and  $\lim_{(h,k)\to(0,0)} \beta(h,k) = 0$ . That's equivalent to

$$\lim_{(x,y)\to(x_0,y_0)} \frac{f(x,y) - f(x_0,y_0) - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x_0,y_0) - \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x_0,y_0)}{\sqrt{(y-y_0)^2 + (y-y_0)^2}} = 0$$

## 15 Leibniz integral rule

Let f(x,y) be continuous on a rectangle  $[a,b] \times [c,d]$  and suppose  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,y)$  exists and is continuous on  $[a,b] \times [c,d]$ . Define  $F(y) = \int_a^b f(x,y) \, dx$  then F is differentiable on [c,d] and

$$F'(y) = \frac{d}{dy} \int_{a}^{b} f(x, y) dx = \int_{a}^{b} \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, y) dx$$

#### 15.1 Lemma

Lemma: if f(x,y) is continuous on  $[a,b] \times [c,d]$  then  $F(y) = \int_a^b f(x,y) dx$  is uniforally continuous on [c,d].

We know f is continuous on a compact space so it is uniformally continuous there. This means that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for any  $p_1 = (x_1, y_2)$ ,  $p_2 = (x_2, y_2)$  such that  $d(p_1, p_2) < \delta$  we have

$$|f(p_1) - f(p_2)| < \varepsilon.$$

Now consider  $y_1, y_2 \in [c, d]$  such that  $d(y_1, y_2) < \delta$ . We know that for all  $x \in [a, b]$  that  $d((x, y_1), (x, y_2)) > \delta$  and then we can see that

$$|F(y_1) - F(y_2)| = \left| \int_a^b f(x, y_1) \, dx - \int_a^b f(x, y_2) \, dx \right| = \left| \int_a^b \left( f(x, y_1) - f(x, y_2) \right) \, dx \right|$$

$$\leq \int_a^b \left| \left( f(x, y_1) - f(x, y_2) \right) \right| \, dx < \varepsilon(b - a)$$

#### 15.2 The Rule

Now denote  $G(y) = \int_a^b \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,y) dx$ , by the lemma G is continuous.

$$\Delta F = F(y + \Delta y) - F(y) = \int_{a}^{b} f(x, y + \Delta y) \, dx - \int_{a}^{b} f(x, y) \, dx = \int_{a}^{b} \left( f(x, y + \Delta y) - f(x, y) \right) \, dx$$

We know by the Lagrange theorem that  $\exists t \in (0,1)$  such that

$$\begin{split} &\frac{f(x,y+\Delta y)-f(x,y)}{\Delta y} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,y+\Delta y) \\ &\Rightarrow \int_a^b \left(f(x,y+\Delta y)-f(x,y)\right) dx = \int_a^b \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,y+t\Delta y)\Delta y\right) dx \\ &\Rightarrow \frac{\Delta F}{\Delta y} = \int_a^b \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,y+t\Delta y)\right) dx = {}^2G(y+t\Delta y) \to G(y) \end{split}$$

#### 15.3 Generalization

Let f(x,y) be continuously differentiable on a rectangle  $[a,b] \times [c,d]$  and suppose  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,y)$  exists and is continuous on  $[a,b] \times [c,d]$ , and  $\alpha(y),\beta(y)$  are differentiable on [c,d]. Define  $F(y) = \int_{\alpha(y)}^{\beta(y)} f(x,y) \, dx$  then F is differentiable on [c,d] and

$$F'(y) = \int_{\alpha(y)}^{\beta(y)} \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, y) \, dx + f(\beta(y), y)\beta'(y) - f(\alpha(y), y)\alpha'(y)$$

Denote  $\Phi(s,t,y) = \int_s^t f(x,y) \, dx$  then:

$$F(y) = \Phi(\alpha(y), \beta(y), y) = \int_{s}^{t} f(x, y) dx$$

And now

$$F'(y) = \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial s} \frac{ds}{dy} + \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t} \frac{dt}{dy} + \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial y} \frac{dy}{dy}$$

So by the rule we proved earlier and the fundamental theorem

$$F'(y) = -f(\alpha(y), y)\alpha'(y) + f(\beta(y), y)\beta'(y) + \int_{\alpha(y)}^{\beta(y)} \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, y) dx$$

#### 16 Fubini's Theorem

Let f(x,y) be continuous on rectangle  $[a,b] \times [c,d]$  then

$$\int_{a}^{b} \left( \int_{c}^{d} f(x, y) \, dy \right) \, dx = \int_{c}^{d} \left( \int_{a}^{b} f(x, y) \, dx \right) \, dy$$

#### 16.1 Proof

Denote

$$\begin{cases} \varphi(t) = \int_{c}^{t} \left( \int_{a}^{b} f(x, y) \, dx \right) \, dy \\ \Psi(t) = \int_{a}^{b} \left( \int_{c}^{t} f(x, y) \, dy \right) \, dx \end{cases}$$

Since f is continuous we know that  $F(y) = \int_a^b f(x,y) \, dx$  is continuous and so by the fundemetal theorem:

$$\varphi'(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \int_{c}^{t} F(y) \, dy = F(t) = \int_{a}^{b} f(x, t) \, dx$$

Denote  $G(x,t) = \int_{c}^{t} f(x,y) dy$ . Then by the fundamental theorem we get

$$\frac{\partial G}{\partial t} = f(x, t)$$

And thus by the Leibniz Integral Rule

$$\Psi'(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \int_a^b G(x,t) dx = \int_a^b f(x,t) dx$$

We concluded that  $\varphi, \Psi$  have the same derivative. That means that

$$\varphi = \Psi + const.$$

We know that  $\varphi(c) = \Psi(c) = 0$  and so const. = 0 and so

$$\varphi = \Psi$$

and specifically

$$\varphi(d) = \Psi(d)$$

$$\int_{a}^{b} \left( \int_{c}^{d} f(x, y) \, dy \right) \, dx = \int_{c}^{d} \left( \int_{a}^{b} f(x, y) \, dx \right) \, dy$$

## 17 The Chain Rule

Let f(x,y) have continuous partial derivatives on domain D. Let x(t), y(t) be differentiable on Interval I such that  $\forall t \in I : (x(t), y(t) \in D)$  and denote F(t) = f(x(t), y(t)) then

$$F'(t) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \Big|_{(x(t),y(t))} \frac{dx}{dt} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \Big|_{(x(t),y(t))} \frac{dy}{dt}$$

#### 17.1 Proof

$$\frac{dF}{dt} = \lim_{\Delta t \to 0} \frac{F(t + \Delta t) - F(t)}{\Delta t} = \lim_{\Delta t \to 0} \frac{f(x(t + \Delta t), y(t + \Delta t)) - f(x(t), y(t))}{\Delta t}$$

Denote

$$\begin{cases} \Delta x = x(t + \Delta t) - x(t) \\ \Delta y = y(t + \Delta t) - y(t) \end{cases}$$
$$= \lim_{\Delta t \to 0} \frac{f(x(t) + \Delta x, y(t) + \Delta y) - f(x(t), y(t))}{\Delta t} = \lim_{\Delta t \to 0} \frac{\Delta f}{\Delta t}$$

Since f is differentiable

$$\Delta f = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \Delta x + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \Delta y + \alpha(\Delta x, \Delta y) \Delta x + \beta(\Delta x, \Delta y) \Delta y$$

Where  $\alpha, \beta \to 0$  So:

$$F'(t) = \lim_{\Delta t \to 0} \frac{\Delta f}{\Delta t} = \lim_{\Delta t \to 0} \frac{\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \Delta x + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \Delta y + \alpha(\Delta x, \Delta y) \Delta x + \beta(\Delta x, \Delta y) \Delta y}{\Delta t}$$
$$= \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \Big|_{(x(t), y(t))} \frac{dx}{dt} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \Big|_{(x(t), y(t))} \frac{dy}{dt}$$

#### 17.2 Corollary

suppose F(u, v) = f(x(u, v), y(u, v)) then we see that

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial u} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \frac{\partial x}{\partial u} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \frac{\partial y}{\partial u}$$
$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial v} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \frac{\partial x}{\partial v} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial u} \frac{\partial y}{\partial v}$$

# 18 Substitution For Multiple Variables

Let f be integrable over Domain D. Let x(u,v) and y(u,v) be in  $C_1^{-1}$  and let them define an invertible transformation  $\varphi: D \to E$  where D is defined on an xy plane and E on an uv plane. Now suppose

$$\mathbb{J} = \frac{\partial(x,y)}{\partial(u,v)} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial x}{\partial u} & \frac{\partial x}{\partial v} \\ \frac{\partial y}{\partial u} & \frac{\partial y}{\partial v} \end{bmatrix} \neq 0 \quad \forall (u,v) \in E$$

\*It can be equal to 0 in the domain if the measure of the set of those points is 0.

Then

$$\iint\limits_D f(x,y) \, dx \, dy = \iint\limits_E f(x(u,v),y(u,v)) |\mathbb{J}| \, du \, dv$$

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>continuously differentiable

Exercise 18.1. Calculate the value of the following Gaussian integral:

$$\iint_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-x^2}.$$

Solution.

$$\left( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-x^2} \, dx \right)^2 = \left( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-x^2} \, dx \right) \left( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-y^2} \, dy \right) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-(x^2 + y^2)} \, dx \, dy$$

Now consider the integral in polar coordinates.

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-(x^2 + y^2)} dx dy = \int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{2\pi} e^{-r^2} r^2 d\theta dr = \int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{2\pi} r e^{-r^2} d\theta dr$$
$$= \int_{0}^{\infty} \theta r e^{-r^2} \Big|_{\theta=0}^{\theta=2\pi} dr = 2\pi \int_{0}^{\infty} r e^{-r^2} dr$$
$$= 2\pi \int_{0}^{\infty} r e^{-r^2} dr$$

And

$$2\pi \int_0^\infty re^{-r^2} dr = 2\pi \lim_{M \to \infty} -\frac{1}{2}e^{-r^2} \Big|_0^M$$

$$= 2\pi \lim_{M \to \infty} -\frac{1}{2}(e^{-M^2} - e^{-0^2}) = 2\pi(-\frac{1}{2}(0 - 1)) = \pi$$

$$\Rightarrow \left(\int_{-\infty}^\infty e^{-x^2} dx\right)^2 = \pi$$

$$\Rightarrow \int_{-\infty}^\infty e^{-x^2} dx = \sqrt{\pi}$$