

Teddy Einstein

Math 3110

#### HW4 Solutions

##### Problem 1: 6-1

Select  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$  and let  $x_0 = a, x_1 = b$ . Then continue the sequence by letting each new term be the average of the preceding two:

$$x_n = \frac{x_{n-1} + x_{n-2}}{2}, \quad n \geq 2$$

i. Prove  $x_n$  is Cauchy:

*Proof.* Claim: for  $n \geq 2$ ,  $x_n - x_{n-1} = 2^{-(n-1)}(b-a)$ . For  $n = 2$ :  $|x_2 - x_1| = \frac{1}{2}(x_1 - x_0)$  and the claim holds. Suppose the claim holds for  $2 \leq n \leq k$ . Then  $x_{k+1} - x_k = \frac{1}{2}(x_k - x_{k-1}) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2^{-(k-1)}}(b-a)$ , so the claim holds by induction.

Without loss of generality, assume  $m < n$ . By the triangle inequality:

$$|x_n - x_m| \leq \sum_{i=m+1}^n |x_i - x_{i-1}| \leq \sum_{i=m+1}^n \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} |b-a|$$

Observe that  $\sum_{i=m+1}^n \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} = \frac{1}{2^{-m-1}} \sum_{i=0}^{n-m-1} 2^{-i} \leq \frac{1}{2^m} \rightarrow 0$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus given  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $N$  such that if  $m > N$ ,  $\frac{1}{2^m} < \frac{\epsilon}{|a-b|}$ , so then if  $m > N$ :

$$|x_n - x_m| < \epsilon,$$

so  $x_n$  is Cauchy. □

ii. Find  $\lim x_n$  in terms of  $a, b$ .

*Solution:* By the preceding part

$$x_n = x_0 + (x_1 - x_0) + (x_2 - x_1) + \dots + (x_n - x_{n-1}) = x_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2^{-(i-1)}}(b-a)$$

which by the geometric sum formula:

$$= a + \frac{2}{3}(1 - 2^{-n})(b-a) \rightarrow \frac{1}{3}a + \frac{2}{3}b$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  (by the fact that  $(1 - 2^{-n}) \rightarrow 1$  by linearity of limits for sequences).

##### Problem 2: 6-2

Let  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  be bounded.

i. Prove that there exists a sequence in  $S$  that converges to  $\sup S$ .

*Proof.*  $\sup S$  exists because  $S$  is bounded. Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Suppose toward a contradiction that every  $x \in S$  has the property that  $x < \sup S - \frac{1}{n}$ . Then  $\sup S - \frac{1}{n}$  is an upper bound for  $S$  which is strictly less than  $\sup S$  contradicting the definition of  $\sup$ .

Hence there exists  $a_n \in S$  such that  $\sup S - \frac{1}{n} \leq a_n \leq \sup S$  (where the upper bound follows from the definition of  $\sup$ ). Since  $\frac{1}{n} \rightarrow 0$ , the squeeze theorem implies  $a_n \rightarrow \sup S$ .  $\square$

ii. Let  $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  which are bounded. Show  $\sup(A + B) = \sup A + \sup B$ .

*Proof.*  $A + B$  is trivially bounded, so  $\sup(A + B)$  exists. Let  $a \in A$  and  $b \in B$  so that  $a \leq \sup A$  and  $b \leq \sup B$ . Thus  $a + b \leq \sup A + \sup B$ . Since our choice of  $a, b$  was arbitrary, every element of  $A + B$  is at most  $\sup A + \sup B$ , so  $\sup(A + B) \leq \sup A + \sup B$ .

Suppose  $x$  is an upper bound of  $A + B$ . There exist sequences  $a_n \rightarrow \sup A$  and  $b_n \rightarrow \sup B$  in  $A, B$  respectively. Thus given  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $N$  such that if  $n > N$ ,  $\sup A - a_n \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$  and  $\sup B - b_n \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ . Thus  $\sup A + \sup B < a_n + b_n + \epsilon \leq x + \epsilon$ . Since  $\epsilon$  can be arbitrarily small, we conclude that  $x \geq \sup A + \sup B$ , so  $\sup A + \sup B$  is the least upper bound of  $A + B$ .  $\square$

### Problem 3: 6-4

Let  $(x_n, y_n)$  be a sequence in a bounded rectangle  $A \times B = R \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ . Prove that  $(x_n, y_n)$  has a convergent subsequence.

*Proof.* Since  $x_n$  is bounded, by the Bolzano-Weierstra theorem,  $x_n$  has a convergent subsequence  $x_{n_i} \rightarrow x$  for some  $x \in A$ . The sequence  $y_{n_i}$  is a subsequence of  $y_n$  and is hence bounded, so  $y_{n_i}$  has a convergent subsequence  $y_{n_{i_j}} \rightarrow y$  for some  $y \in B$ . Hence  $(x_{n_{i_j}}, y_{n_{i_j}}) \rightarrow (x, y) \in R$  is a convergent subsequence of  $(x_n, y_n)$  (observe  $|(x_n, y_n) - (x, y)| = \sqrt{(x_{n_{i_j}} - x)^2 + (y_{n_{i_j}} - y)^2}$  which can be made arbitrarily small).  $\square$

### Problem 4: 6-6

Let  $a_n$  be a bounded sequence in  $\mathbb{R}$ .

- i. Show that  $\liminf$  and  $\limsup$  are well defined. In other words, given a sequence  $a_n$ , define  $T_n$  to be the  $n$ th tail and let  $\overline{b}_n = \sup T_n$  and  $\underline{b}_n = \inf T_n$ , prove that  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \overline{b}_n$  and  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \underline{b}_n$  converge.

*Proof.* Observe that  $T_{n+1} \subseteq T_n$ , so every upper bound of  $T_n$  is an upper bound of  $T_{n+1}$ . Hence  $\sup T_n \geq \sup T_{n+1}$ , so  $\overline{b}_n$  is a non-increasing sequence. Further,  $T_n = \sup_{i \geq n} a_i$ , so  $T_n \geq a_i$  for all  $i \geq n$ ; in particular,  $T_n \geq a_n$ . Thus if  $a_n$  is bounded below, then so is  $T_n$ . Hence by the completeness property,  $\overline{b}_n$  converges and  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$  is well defined. By a similar argument  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$  is well defined.  $\square$

ii. Let  $x_n = \frac{1}{n} + (-1)^n$ . Compute  $\liminf x_n$  and  $\limsup x_n$ .

*Solution:* Since  $0 \leq \frac{1}{n} \leq 1$  is decreasing, if  $N$  is even,  $\frac{1}{N} + 1 \geq \frac{1}{n} + (-1)^n$  for all  $n > N$ . Hence  $\sup T_N = 1 + \frac{1}{N}$ , so  $\limsup x_n = 1$ .

On the other hand, observe that  $-1 < x_n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , but for any  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , since  $\frac{1}{n} \rightarrow 0$ , given  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $n > N$  such that  $x_n < -1 + \epsilon$ , so any lower bound of a tail of  $x_n$  is at most  $-1$ . Hence  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = -1$ .

iii. Prove  $\liminf a_n \leq \limsup a_n$ .

*Proof.* Observe that  $\sup T_n \geq a \geq \inf T_n$  for all  $a \in T_n$ , so because limits of convergent sequences preserve order,  $\limsup a_n \geq \liminf a_n$ .  $\square$

iv. Prove that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$  exists if and only if  $\limsup a_n = \liminf a_n$ .

*Proof.* Assume  $L := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$  exists. Then for all  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $n > N$ ,  $|a_n - L| < \epsilon$  so for  $n > N$ :

$$L - \epsilon < a_n < L + \epsilon$$

so  $L + \epsilon$  is an upper bound on  $T_n$  whenever  $n > N$ , so  $\sup T_n \leq L + \epsilon$ . Similarly,  $\inf T_n \geq L - \epsilon$ . Thus:

$$L - \epsilon \leq \inf T_n \leq \sup T_n \leq L + \epsilon \Rightarrow L - \epsilon \leq \liminf a_n \leq \limsup a_n \leq L + \epsilon$$

since  $\epsilon$  can be made arbitrarily small,  $\limsup a_n = \liminf a_n = L$ .

Conversely suppose  $\limsup a_n = \liminf a_n$ . Then by recycling arguments from before,  $\inf T_n \leq a_n \leq \sup T_n$ , so by the squeeze theorem,  $a_n \rightarrow \limsup a_n$ .  $\square$

### Problem 5: 6-7

Let  $S$  be the set of cluster points of a bounded sequence  $a_n$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Prove that  $\limsup a_n = \max S$  and  $\liminf a_n = \min S$ .

*Proof.* By the preceding problem  $M := \limsup a_n$  exists and the sequence  $\sup T_n \rightarrow M$ . Hence there exists  $N$  in naturals such that for  $n > N$   $|\sup T_n - M| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ ; choose such an  $n$ . By problem 6-2, there exists a sequence of points  $t_j \rightarrow \sup T_n$  such that  $t_j = a_i$  for some  $i \geq n$  because  $T_n$  is a subsequence of  $a_n$ . Thus there exists  $N' \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $N' > N$  and for all  $j > N'$ ,  $|t_j - \sup T_n| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ . Therefore by the triangle inequality:

$$|t_j - \sup T_n| < \epsilon$$

Let  $\delta > 0$  be given. Suppose toward a contradiction that there are only finitely many  $i$  such that  $|a_i - M| < \delta$ . Then there exists  $\alpha$  such that for all  $n > \alpha$ ,  $|a_n - M| \geq \delta$ . However, the argument in the preceding paragraph shows that there exists  $A > \alpha$  such that there is a  $t \in T_A$  such that  $|t - M| < \frac{\delta}{2} < \delta$ , so we have a contradiction, and  $M \in S$ .

Let  $p \in S$ . Then by the Cluster point theorem, there exists a subsequence of  $a_n$ ,  $a_{n_i}$ , which converges to  $p$ . However,  $\sup T_{n_i} \geq a_{n_i}$  by previous arguments. Thus by comparison of sequences,  $\limsup a_n \geq \lim_{n_i \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_i} = p$  because subsequences of convergent sequences converge to the same limit. Hence  $\limsup a_n = \max S$ . The argument for  $\liminf a_n = \min S$  is similar.  $\square$

**Problem 6:** 7.1.1

Evaluate the following series:

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2 - 1} \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{n(n+2)} \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n(n+k)}$$

*Solution:* By partial fraction decomposition

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

So the  $m$ th partial sum of the first series is:

$$s_m := \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{2(m+1)}$$

which converges to (provide more detail)  $\frac{3}{4}$ .

By partial fraction decomposition:

$$\frac{(-1)^n}{n(n+2)} = \frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{2} \left( \frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{(n+2)} \right)$$

The  $2m$ th partial sum of this series is:

$$s'_{2m} := \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2m+2} - \frac{1}{2m+1}$$

which converges to  $\frac{1}{4}$ . Similarly show that  $s'_{(2m+1)}$  converges to  $\frac{1}{4}$  and use this to argue that  $s'_m$  converges to  $\frac{1}{4}$ .

Finally:

$$\frac{1}{n(n+k)} = \frac{1}{k} \left( \frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{(n+k)} \right)$$

which has partial sums for  $m > k$ :

$$s''_m = \frac{1}{k} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \dots + \frac{1}{k} \right) - \frac{1}{kn} - \frac{1}{kn-1} - \dots - \frac{1}{kn-k}$$

by the tail convergence theorem, it follows that the final sum evaluates to  $\frac{1}{k} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \dots + \frac{1}{k} \right)$ .

**Problem 7:** 7.1.2

Translate the Cauchy criterion for sequences into a Cauchy criterion for series:

*Solution:* A series  $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i$  converges if and only if given  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $n > m > N$ :

$$\left| \sum_{i=m}^n a_i \right| < \epsilon$$

— that is, if  $s_i$  is the sequence of partial sums of the series,  $|s_m - s_n| < \epsilon$  so that  $s_i$  is a Cauchy sequence.

**Problem 8: 7.2.2**

Prove that if  $a_n \geq 0$  and  $\sum a_n$  converges, then so does  $\sum a_n^2$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\sum a_n$  converges,  $a_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence  $a_n$  is bounded above by some  $M$ . Therefore:

$$\sum_{n=0}^k a_n^2 \leq M \sum_{n=0}^k a_n \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n$$

so that the sequence of partial sums of  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n^2$  is non-decreasing (b/c  $a_n^2 > 0$ ) and bounded above. Thus  $\sum a_n$  converges because its sequence of partial sums converges by the completeness axiom.  $\square$

**Problem 9: 7.3.1**

Prove the infinite triangle inequality for an absolutely convergent series by using the finite triangle inequality, then prove it by mimicking the proof for the finite triangle inequality.

*Proof.* Let  $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i$  be an absolutely convergent series.

Let  $s_k$  be the  $k$ th partial sum of the series; then,

$$|s_k| \leq \sum_{i=0}^k |a_i|$$

by the finite triangle inequality. Since  $s_k$  converges because  $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i$  is absolutely convergent,  $|s_k|$  converges as well to  $|\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i|$ , so by sequence comparison, the result holds.  $\square$

*Proof.* Adopt the same notation as in the first proof:

$$-\sum_{i=0}^k |a_i| \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i \leq \sum_{i=0}^k |a_i|$$

Thus  $|\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i| \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |a_i|$  by sequence comparison.  $\square$

**Problem 10: 7.3.3**

Let  $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i$  be a series.

- i. Suppose the series converges absolutely. Show that for any subsequence  $a_{i_j}$ ,  $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_{i_j}$  converges.

*Proof.* Observe that:

$$\sum_{j=0}^N |a_{i_j}| \leq \sum_{i=0}^{i_N} |a_i| \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |a_i|$$

so the sequence of partial sums of  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |a_{i_j}|$  is non-decreasing and bounded above so that it converges by the completeness axiom. Hence  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_{i_j}$  is absolutely convergent and thus is convergent.  $\square$

ii. Show that the statement fails when absolute convergence is removed from the hypotheses.

*Proof.* Consider the example  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{n}$  which converges to  $\log(2)$ , but:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{2n}}{2n} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_1^{\infty} \frac{1}{n}$$

which diverges.

□