

425 Final Solutions¹

1. QUESTION 1

(a) The set of rational numbers \mathbf{Q} is complete.

False. $\sqrt{2} \notin \mathbf{Q}$, but there is a Cauchy sequence in \mathbf{Q} that converges to $\sqrt{2}$. Consider for example a_n which is an n -digit approximation to $\sqrt{2}$.

(b) For all $x \in \mathbf{R}$, we have $-\log(1-x) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} x^j/j$.

(Here \log denotes the natural logarithm.)

False. When $x = -2$, $-\log(1-x) = -\log(3) \in \mathbf{R}$, but the sum diverges when $x = -2$ from the ratio test, since $|a_{j+1}/a_j| = |x|(j+1)/j \rightarrow 2 > 1$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$.

(c) Let $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be differentiable. Then f is continuous.

True. For any $x \in \mathbf{R}$, $f(x) - f(y) = (x-y) \frac{f(x)-f(y)}{x-y}$. Since f is differentiable $\frac{f(x)-f(y)}{x-y} \rightarrow f'(x)$ as $y \rightarrow x$, so from the product limit law $(x-y) \frac{f(x)-f(y)}{x-y} \rightarrow 0$ as $x \rightarrow y$, i.e. $f(x) - f(y) \rightarrow 0$ as $x \rightarrow y$.

(d) Let $f: \mathbf{R}^6 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a continuous function. Let $K \subseteq \mathbf{R}^6$ be a compact set. Then $f(K)$ is compact.

True. This was a Theorem in the notes. Continuous functions map compact sets to compact sets.

(e) Let $f: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a continuous function. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exists a polynomial $p: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that

$$\sup_{x \in [0, 1]} |f(x) - p(x)| < \varepsilon.$$

True. This is the Weierstrass Approximation Theorem.

(f) Let $V = \{(x, y) \in \mathbf{R}^2: 1 \leq x \leq 2 \text{ or } 3 \leq x \leq 4\}$. Then there is a continuous function $f: [0, 1] \rightarrow V$ such that $f(0) = (1, 0)$ and $f(1) = (4, 0)$.

False. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that f exists as stated. $[0, 1]$ is connected but V is not. If $f(0) = (1, 0)$ and $f(1) = (4, 0)$ then $f(V)$ is disconnected also. Since $f([0, 1])$ must be connected by a Theorem from the notes (generalizing the intermediate value theorem), we get a contradiction.

2. QUESTION 2

Let $(a_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be a Cauchy sequence of real numbers.

Prove that $(a_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is bounded.

Solution. Let $\varepsilon = 1$. Then there exists $N > 0$ such that for all $n, m \geq N$, we have $|a_n - a_m| < \varepsilon = 1$. That is, $|a_n - a_N| \leq 1$ for all $n \geq N$. Let $A := \max_{n=0, \dots, N} |a_n|$. We claim that $|a_n| \leq 1 + A$ for all $n \geq 0$. The case $0 \leq n \leq N$ follows by definition of A . Also by definition of A , we have $|a_N| \leq A$. So, by the triangle inequality, when $n \geq N$, we have $|a_n| = |a_n - a_N| + |a_N| \leq 1 + A$.

3. QUESTION 3

Prove the following:

For any positive integer n ,

$$n^3 + 2n$$

¹May 9, 2025, © 2025 Steven Heilman, All Rights Reserved.

is divisible by 3. (That is, show that $n^3 + 2n$ is a multiple of 3.)

Solution. We induct on n . We begin with the base case $n = 1$. In this case $n^3 + 2n = 1 + 2 = 3$ which is a multiple of 3. We now do the inductive step. Assume that $n^3 + 2n$ is a multiple of 3. We need to show that $(n + 1)^3 + 2(n + 1)$ is also a multiple of 3. We have

$$(n + 1)^3 + 2(n + 1) = n^3 + 3n^2 + 3n + 1 + 2n + 2 = (n^3 + 2n) + 3(n^2 + n) + 3.$$

By the inductive hypothesis $n^3 + 2n$ is a multiple of 3. The remaining terms in the sum are also multiples of 3, since $3(n^2 + n) + 3$ is a multiple of 3. The sum of all these terms is therefore a multiple of 3. We have therefore completed the inductive step. The proof is therefore complete.

4. QUESTION 4

Consider the set $A = \{(x, y) \in \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R} : x + y \in \mathbf{Q}\}$. Is this set finite, countable, or uncountable? Prove your assertion.

Solution. This set is uncountable. To see this, recall that the real numbers \mathbf{R} are uncountable. Define a function $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow A$ by $f(x) = (x, -x)$ for all $x \in \mathbf{R}$. Note that $f(x)$ is in A for all $x \in \mathbf{R}$, since $x + (-x) = 0 \in \mathbf{Q}$. We now claim that f is a bijection onto its image in A . That is, if we define $f(\mathbf{R}) = \{f(x) : x \in \mathbf{R}\} = \{(x, -x) : x \in \mathbf{R}\}$, then $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow f(\mathbf{R})$ is a bijection. Indeed, given any element y of $f(\mathbf{R})$ we have $y = (x, -x)$ for some $x \in \mathbf{R}$, so $f(x) = y = (x, -x)$. And this x is unique, since if $f(x) = f(x')$ for some $x, x' \in \mathbf{R}$, then $(x, -x) = (x', -x')$, so that $x = x'$. In conclusion, $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow f(\mathbf{R})$ is a bijection. We now show that A is uncountable. It cannot be the case that A is countable, since A contains the uncountable set $f(\mathbf{R})$. Similarly, A cannot be finite. Therefore, A is uncountable, as desired.

5. QUESTION 5

Let $f: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a Riemann integrable function such that $\int_0^1 f = 0$. Assume that f is continuous. Prove that $f(x) = 0$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$.

Solution. We argue by contradiction. Assume that $f(x) > 0$ for some $x \in [0, 1]$. Since f is continuous, if we choose $\varepsilon := f(x)/2$, then there exists $\delta > 0$ such that, for all $y \in [0, 1]$ with $|y - x| < \delta$ such that $|f(x) - f(y)| < \varepsilon = f(x)/2$. From the reverse triangle inequality, $|f(y)| = |f(y) - f(x) + f(x)| \geq |f(x)| - |f(y) - f(x)| \geq f(x) - f(x)/2 = f(x)/2 > 0$. That is, we have uniform lower bound on all such y . So, if P is any partition of $[0, 1]$ that includes $\{x - \delta, x, x + \delta\} \cap [0, 1]$, we have $L(f, P) \geq \delta f(x)/2$, by definition of $L(f, P)$. By definition of the Riemann integral, we therefore have $\int_0^1 f \geq L(f, P) \geq \delta f(x)/2 > 0$, a contradiction to the fact that f has integral 0. We conclude that in fact $f = 0$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$, as desired.

6. QUESTION 6

Let $x \in \mathbf{R}$, and let j be a positive integer. Define the function

$$f_j(x) := \frac{x}{1 + jx^2}.$$

- Show that the sequence of functions $(f_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ converges uniformly to some function f .
- We use the function f from the first part of the question. Show that, if $x \neq 0$, then $f'(x) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} f'_j(x)$. Show that, if $x = 0$, then $f'(x) \neq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} f'_j(x)$.

Solution. Let $f(x) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbf{R}$. Let $j > 0$, $j \in \mathbf{Z}$. Let $h_j(x) = 1/(1 + jx^2)$ for any $j > 0$, $j \in \mathbf{Z}$. Note that $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} h_j(x) = 0 = \lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} h_j(x)$. Also, $h'_j(x) = -2jx/(1 + jx^2)$. That is, on the set $(-\infty, -j^{-1/4}] \cup [j^{1/4}, +\infty)$, h_j achieves its maximum value at $x = j^{-1/4}$ and at $x = -j^{-1/4}$. This maximum value is $h_j(j^{-1/4}) = 1/(1 + j^{1/2})$.

For any $x \in [-j^{-1/4}, j^{1/4}]$, we use the bound $|f_j(x)| \leq |x| \leq j^{-1/4}$, and for any other $x \in \mathbf{R}$, we use the bound $|f_j|(x) \leq 1/(1 + j^{1/2})$. That is, for any $x \in \mathbf{R}$, we have $|f_j(x)| \leq \max(j^{-1/4}, 1/(1 + j^{1/2}))$. That is, for any $j > 0$, we have $d_\infty(f, f_j) \leq \max(j^{-1/4}, 1/(1 + j^{1/2}))$. That is, f_j converges to f uniformly as $j \rightarrow \infty$.

(b) Show that, if $x \neq 0$, then $f'(x) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} f'_j(x)$. Show that, if $x = 0$, then $f'(x) \neq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} f'_j(x)$.

Note: $f'_j(x) = \frac{1+jx^2-x(2jx)}{(1+jx^2)^2} = \frac{1-jx^2}{(1+jx^2)^2}$. So, if $x \neq 0$, then $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} f'_j(x) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-jx^2}{(1+jx^2)^2} = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-jx^2}{1+2jx^2+j^2x^4} = 0$, since the numerator has a factor of j , but the denominator has a factor of j^2 (since $x \neq 0$). Since $f = 0$, we have $f'(x) = 0$, so $f'(x) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} f'_j(x)$. If $x = 0$, then $f'_j(x) = 1$ for all $j > 1$, while $f'(x) = 0$, so $f'(x) \neq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} f'_j(x)$.

7. QUESTION 7

Prove the first Fundamental Theorem of Calculus:

Let $a < b$ be real numbers. Let $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a continuous function on $[a, b]$. Assume that f is also differentiable on $[a, b]$, and f' is Riemann integrable on $[a, b]$. Then $\int_a^b f' = f(b) - f(a)$.

(Hint: write the Riemann sum for $\int_a^b f'$, then apply a certain Theorem to write terms of the form $f'(c_i)(x_i - x_{i-1})$ in a different form.)

Solution. Let $P = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ be a partition of $[a, b]$. Then

$$f(b) - f(a) = f(x_n) - f(x_0) = \sum_{i=1}^n (f(x_i) - f(x_{i-1})). \quad (*)$$

By the Mean Value Theorem, for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ there exists $y_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$ such that

$$(x_i - x_{i-1})f'(y_i) = f(x_i) - f(x_{i-1}).$$

Substituting these equalities into $(*)$, we get

$$f(b) - f(a) = \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - x_{i-1})f'(y_i).$$

Applying the definitions of $L(f', P)$ and $U(f', Q)$, we have: for all partitions P, Q of $[a, b]$,

$$L(f', P) \leq f(b) - f(a) \leq U(f', Q).$$

From Definition of the lower and upper Riemann integrals, we then get

$$\int_a^b f' \leq f(b) - f(a) \leq \overline{\int_a^b f'}. \quad (**)$$

Since f' is Riemann integrable, $\int_a^b f' = \overline{\int_a^b f'} = \int_a^b f'$. So, $(**)$ implies that $\int_a^b f' = f(b) - f(a)$, as desired.

8. QUESTION 8

Let $\ell_2(\mathbf{N}) = \{(a_j)_{j=0}^\infty : \sum_{j=0}^\infty a_j^2 < \infty, a_j \in \mathbf{R} \forall j \geq 0\}$. That is, $\ell_2(\mathbf{N})$ is the set of square-summable real sequences on \mathbf{N} . You can freely use that $\ell_2(\mathbf{N})$ is a real inner product space, with inner product given by $\langle (a_j)_{j=0}^\infty, (b_j)_{j=0}^\infty \rangle := \sum_{j=0}^\infty a_j b_j$. From this inner product, we then obtain a norm $\|(a_j)_{j=0}^\infty\| := \langle (a_j)_{j=0}^\infty, (a_j)_{j=0}^\infty \rangle^{1/2} = \sqrt{\sum_{j=0}^\infty a_j^2}$ and associated metric on $\ell_2(\mathbf{N})$ defined by $d((a_j)_{j=0}^\infty, (b_j)_{j=0}^\infty) := \sqrt{\sum_{j=0}^\infty (a_j - b_j)^2}$. That is, $\ell_2(\mathbf{N})$ is a metric space with respect to this metric. (You can freely use this fact.)

Define

$$B(0, 1) := \{(a_j)_{j=0}^\infty \in \ell_2(\mathbf{N}) : \|(a_j)_{j=0}^\infty\| \leq 1\}.$$

Is $B(0, 1)$ compact (with respect to the metric d)? Prove your assertion.

Solution. $B(0, 1)$ is not compact. It is closed and bounded but not compact. To see this, we just need to find a bounded sequence $z^{(1)}, z^{(2)}, \dots \subseteq \ell_2(\mathbf{N})$ that has no convergent subsequence. Define $z^{(i)}$ so that $z^{(i)} = (0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots)$, i.e. so that the i^{th} element of $z^{(i)}$ is 1 while all other elements of $z^{(i)}$ are zero. Then $\|z^{(i)}\| = 1$ for all $i \geq 1$ (so that the sequence is bounded), and $\|z^{(i)} - z^{(j)}\| = \sqrt{2}$ for all $i, j \geq 1$ with $i \neq j$. And any subsequence of $z^{(1)}, z^{(2)}, \dots$ also has these properties. Since $\|z^{(i)} - z^{(j)}\| = \sqrt{2}$ for all $i, j \geq 1$ with $i \neq j$, this sequence (or any subsequence) cannot be a Cauchy sequence. That is, any subsequence cannot be convergent. Therefore, $B(0, 1)$ is not compact.