

# Homework #1 Solutions

Thayer Anderson, Davis Lazowski, Handong Park, Rohil Prasad  
Eric Peterson

## 1 For submission to Thayer Anderson

**Problem 1.1.** For  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , write  $x = x_1e_1 + \cdots + x_n e_n$  in some orthonormal basis. Show  $\|x\| \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \|x_j\|$ .

*Solution.* By definition,  $\|x\|^2 = \langle x, x \rangle$ . Then manipulate as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \|x\|^2 &= \langle x, x \rangle = \left\langle \sum_{j=1}^n \|x_j\| e_j, \sum_{j=1}^n \|x_j\| e_j \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \|x_j\| \left\langle e_j, \sum_{j=1}^n \|x_j\| e_j \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \|x_j\| \delta_{ij} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \|x_j\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

And then because  $a^2 + b^2 \leq (a + b)^2$  for  $a, b > 0$ , the desired result is obtained. (TA)

**Problem 1.2.** 1. For a linear function  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ , show there exists a real number  $M$  such that  $\|f(v)\| \leq M\|v\|$  for all  $v$ . (Note that  $M$  is not allowed to depend on  $v$ ).

2. Show that a linear function  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is automatically continuous.

*Solution.* 1. Fix an orthonormal basis for  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $e_1, \dots, e_n$ . Let  $S = \{\|f(v)\| : \|v\| = 1\}$ . I claim that  $S$  is bounded. To show this, I exhibit the following bound. Let  $B = \max\{\|f(e_1)\|, \dots, \|f(e_n)\|\}$ . As the maximum of a finite set of numbers,  $B$  exists. Then suppose  $v = x_1e_1 + \cdots + x_n e_n$  arbitrary such that  $\|v\| = 1$ . Then

$$\|f(v)\| = \|x_1f(e_1) + \cdots + x_nf(e_n)\| \leq \sum \|x_i\| \leq n \cdot B$$

by Problem 1. Thus  $n \cdot B$  bounds  $S$  from above. Then  $M := \sup(S)$  exists. Take  $v$  arbitrary. Then  $\|f(v)\| \leq M\|v\|$ . To see this, suppose the contrary, namely that there exists a vector  $v$  with  $\|f(v)\| > M\|v\|$ . then we see

$$\|f(v/\|v\|)\| = \frac{1}{\|v\|} \|f(v)\| > M \cdot \frac{\|v\|}{\|v\|} = M$$

In that case, we see that the vector  $v/\|v\|$  has norm 1 and  $\|f(v/\|v\|)\|$  exceeds the upper bound  $M$ . This is a contradiction.

2. To show that  $f$  is continuous, we show that it is continuous at every point. Fix a vector  $v$ . Suppose that  $\varepsilon > 0$  arbitrary. Let  $M$  be as above with respect to the function  $f$ . Then take  $\delta = \varepsilon/2M$ . Suppose that  $u$  satisfies  $d(u, v) < \delta$ . Then

$$d(f(u), f(v)) = \|f(u) - f(v)\| = \|f(u - v)\| \leq M \cdot \|u - v\| < \varepsilon/2$$

and we are done. (TA)

**Problem 1.3.** Show that if  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is differentiable at  $a$ , then it is also continuous at  $a$ .

*Solution.* Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  be a function differentiable at  $a$ . Suppose for the sake of contradiction that  $f$  is not continuous at  $a$ . Then there exists some fixed  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  such that there does not exist any  $\delta > 0$  satisfying  $\|x - a\| < \delta \Rightarrow \|f(x) - f(a)\| < \varepsilon_0$ . By differentiability of  $f$  at  $a$ , there exists a  $\delta_0$  such that  $\|x - a\| < \delta_0$  implies

$$\frac{\|f(x) - f(a)\|}{\|x - a\|} < \varepsilon_0$$

(note this is the same  $\varepsilon_0$  as fixed above.) Then taking  $\delta = \min\{1, \delta_0\}$ . We see that  $\|x - a\| < \delta_0$  implies that  $\|f(x) - f(a)\| < \varepsilon_0$  which is a contradiction. (TA)

## 2 For submission to Davis Lazowski

**Problem 2.1.** For any subset  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  which is not closed, show that there exists a continuous function  $f : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which is not bounded.

*Solution.* Then there is a sequence  $\{a_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $A$  which converges in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  but does not converge in  $A$ . Let  $\ell := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$ .

Define  $f_\ell : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as  $f_\ell(x) := \frac{1}{\|\ell - x\|}$ .

*Claim.*  $f_\ell$  is not bounded on  $A$ .

If  $f_\ell$  were bounded on  $A$ , it would be bounded on the sequence  $a_n$ . So there would be some  $C$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\|\ell - a_n\|} = f_\ell(a_n) &\leq C < \infty \\ \iff 0 < \frac{1}{C} &\leq \|\ell - a_n\| \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the  $a_n$  cannot converge to  $\ell$ , therefore contradiction.

*Claim.*  $f_\ell$  is continuous.

Importantly, this is with respect to the metric on  $A$ :  $f_\ell$  isn't even well defined on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

Let  $\{b_n\}$  be a sequence in  $A$  which converges to  $b$ . Then  $\|b_n\| \rightarrow \|b\|$ , and by translation invariance  $\|b_n - \ell\| \rightarrow \|b - \ell\|$ . Therefore  $\frac{1}{\|b_n - \ell\|} \rightarrow \frac{1}{\|b - \ell\|}$ , as desired. (DL)

**Problem 2.2.** Suppose that  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is a closed set, that  $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is a compact set, and that  $A \cap B = \emptyset$ .

1. For fixed  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus A$ , show there exists a real value  $d > 0$  such that for any  $x \in A$ ,  $\|x - y\| \geq d$ .
2. Show that every continuous function  $f : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  achieves a minimum and maximum value.
3. Show that there exists a real value  $d > 0$  such that for any  $x \in A$  and  $y \in B$ , we have  $\|x - y\| \geq d$ .
4. Show that parts 2 and 3 both fail in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  if we merely ask  $B$  to be closed but not compact.

*Solution.* 1. Otherwise, we can find a sequence  $x_n$  so that  $\|x_n - y\| < \frac{1}{n}$ . The sequence  $x_n$  converges to  $y$ . But  $A$  is closed and  $y \notin A$ , therefore contradiction.

2.  $f(B)$  is compact, so by Heine-Borel is closed and bounded. Its upper bound will be the maximum; its lower bound will be the minimum.

3. Since  $B$  is bounded, there is some closed interval containing it – say  $[-b, b]$ . Enlarge this closed interval to  $[-b - \varepsilon, b + \varepsilon]$ .

Now  $\tilde{A} := A \cap [-b - \varepsilon, b + \varepsilon]$  is a closed and bounded set, so is compact.  $\tilde{A}$  also includes every point in  $A$  which is in at least  $\varepsilon$  of  $B$ . So if  $\tilde{A} = \emptyset$ , take  $\varepsilon := d$ .

Now we can define a function  $f : \tilde{A} \times B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $f(a, b) = \|a - b\|$ . This function is continuous, and  $\tilde{A} \times B$  is compact. Therefore  $f(\tilde{A} \times B)$  is compact, so achieves a minimum and maximum. Call this minimum  $d$ . Now  $d > 0$ , because for every  $a$  the image  $f(a, B)$  is compact, so has a minimum  $\ell_a$ , with  $\ell_a > 0$  by part a), so  $0 \notin f(\tilde{A} \times B)$ .

4. If  $B$  is closed, there are counterexamples to 2). For example, take  $f = \text{id}$ .

There are also counterexamples to 3). Take

$$A := \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} [j, j + \frac{1}{2}]$$

$$B := \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}, |j| > 4} [j + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{|j|}, j + 0.9]$$

Then we can find  $j + \frac{1}{2} \in A$ ,  $j + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{|j|} \in B$ , so that the distance between these points is  $\frac{1}{|j|}$ , which converges to 0 as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . (DL)

**Problem 2.3.** Suppose that  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies  $|f(x)| \leq \|x\|^2$ . Show that  $f$  is automatically differentiable at 0.

*Solution.* We need to find some  $D_0f$  such that

$$f(h) = f(0) + D_0f(h) + \varepsilon(h)$$

And

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varepsilon(h)}{\|h\|} = 0$$

Suppose such a  $D_0f$  existed. We have

$$|\varepsilon(h)| = |f(h) - f(0) - D_0f(h)|$$

$$\leq \|h\|^2 + |D_0f(h)|$$

So

$$\frac{|\varepsilon(h)|}{\|h\|} \leq \|h\| + \frac{|D_0f(h)|}{\|h\|}$$

If  $D_0f$  were not zero, then  $\frac{|D_0f(h)|}{\|h\|}$  would not converge to zero. This suggests that we guess  $D_0f = 0$ . An alternative motivation for this guess could be: the derivative is supposed to be the linear change at a given point; but our bound tells us that there is only second order change in  $f$  at 0.

Then we can verify

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{|f(h) - f(0)|}{\|h\|} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{|f(h)|}{\|h\|} \leq \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\|h\|^2}{\|h\|} \leq \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \|h\| = 0 \quad (\text{DL})$$

### 3 For submission to Handong Park

**Problem 3.1.** 1. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a family of open sets, possibly infinite in length. Show that the union  $\bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{F}} U$  is again an open set.

2. Let  $U$  and  $V$  be two individual open sets. Show that  $U \cap V$  is again an open set.

3. Show that there exists a family  $\mathcal{F}$  of open sets such that  $\bigcap_{U \in \mathcal{F}} U$  is *not* an open set.

*Solution.* 1. Call the union  $M = \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{F}} U$ . Given any point  $m$  in  $M$ , we must show that there exists  $R > 0$  such that  $B_R(m) \in M$ . But for any  $m \in M$ ,  $m \in U$  for one of the open sets  $U \in \mathcal{F}$ . Since each  $U$  is open, exists  $R_U$  such that  $B_{R_U}(m) \subset U$  is completely contained. Since  $U \subset M$ ,  $B_{R_U}(m) \subset M$  is completely contained, and we are done.

2. Given  $U$  and  $V$  open, and any  $x \in U \cap V$ , there exists  $R_U > 0$  such that  $B_{R_U}(x) \subset U$  and  $R_V > 0$  such that  $B_{R_V}(x) \subset V$ . Take the minimum of  $R_U$  and  $R_V$ , call this  $R_{min}$ . Then  $B_{R_{min}}(x) \subset U$  and  $B_{R_{min}}(x) \subset V$ , so  $B_{R_{min}}(x) \subset U \cap V$ , showing openness.

3. There are several examples that work. One simple one is to take the set of all  $(-\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n})$  open intervals for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and intersect them, giving us the closed set  $[0, 0]$ , which is not open. (HP)

**Problem 3.2.** Let  $U \neq \emptyset$  be an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and let  $C \subseteq U$  be compact. Show that there exists a compact set  $D$  such that

$$C \subseteq D^\circ \subseteq D \subseteq U,$$

where  $D^\circ$  denote the interior of  $D$ .

*Solution.* First off, we know that since  $U$  is open,  $U^C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  must be closed. We know that by part 2.2.3 of this homework, there must exist some  $d > 0 \in \mathbb{R}$  such that given any  $x \in U^C$  and  $y \in C$ ,  $\|x - y\| \geq d$ .

We can then use the fact that  $C$  is compact by considering the following open cover of  $C$  - for each  $c \in C$ , take  $B_{0.5}(c)$ . Then, the union of all these open balls gives us an open cover of  $C$ , since each  $c \in C$  is contained. But since  $C$  is compact, only a finite subcover is needed - call this finite subcover  $D^\circ = U_1, \dots, U_n$ , where each  $U_i$  is one of the open balls.

Then consider the cover given by  $\bar{U}_1, \dots, \bar{U}_n$  where each  $\bar{U}_i$  is the closure of the corresponding  $U_i$  - this is still a cover of  $C$  since all we've done is include more points (namely the boundary of each ball). Call this closed ball cover  $D$ .

$D$  is completely contained in  $U$  since these balls have radius  $\frac{d}{2}$ , while the minimum distance between any point in  $C$  and  $U^C$  is  $d$  as stated above. Since  $D$  is just the closure of  $D^\circ$ , we get

$$C \subset D^\circ \subset D \subset U$$

as desired. (HP)

**Problem 3.3.** Let  $f = \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \end{pmatrix}$  be a function  $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ . Show that  $f$  is differentiable at  $a$  if and only if

$f_1$  and  $f_2$  both are, and in that case then  $D_a f = \begin{pmatrix} D_a f_1 \\ D_a f_2 \end{pmatrix}$ .

*Solution.* First, we must prove that if  $f$  is differentiable at  $a$ , then  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  are also both differentiable and  $D_a f$  is the desired expression.  $D_a f$  is just a linear operator, so let's call its linear components  $(D_a)_1$  and

$(D_a)_2$ . So  $f$ 's differentiability and the definition of  $f$  yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\|f(a+h) - f(a) - D_a f(h)\|}{\|h\|} &= 0 \\ \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\left| \begin{array}{cc} f_1(a+h) & - f_1(a) - (D_a)_1(h) \\ f_2(a+h) & - f_2(a) - (D_a)_2(h) \end{array} \right|}{\|h\|} &= 0 \\ \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\left| \begin{array}{c} f_1(a+h) - f_1(a) - (D_a)_1(h) \\ f_2(a+h) - f_2(a) - (D_a)_2(h) \end{array} \right|}{\|h\|} &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

From here, we just work with the norms and redistribute  $\|h\| = \sqrt{h^2}$  to get

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{\frac{(f_1(a+h) - f_1(a) - (D_a)_1(h))^2}{h^2} + \frac{(f_2(a+h) - f_2(a) - (D_a)_2(h))^2}{h^2}} = 0$$

Since we have two squared numbers that add to 0, we must have that each individual number is 0, which is only true if

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f_1(a+h) - f_1(a) - (D_a)_1(h)}{h} = 0$$

meaning that  $f_1$  is differentiable at  $a$ , and if

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f_2(a+h) - f_2(a) - (D_a)_2(h)}{h} = 0$$

meaning that  $f_2$  is also differentiable at  $a$ . In addition, these two are just the derivative definitions - by uniqueness of derivatives, we must have that  $(D_a)_1$  was indeed  $D_a f_1$  and that  $(D_a)_2$  was in fact  $D_a f_2$ .

Now, we will prove that if  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  are both differentiable at  $a$  and  $D_a f$  is the desired expression, then  $f$  is differentiable at  $a$ . This time, we must prove that

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\|f(a+h) - f(a) - D_a f(h)\|}{\|h\|} = 0$$

Working through the exact same calculations as above, we again arrive at the expression

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{\frac{(f_1(a+h) - f_1(a) - (D_a)_1(h))^2}{h^2} + \frac{(f_2(a+h) - f_2(a) - (D_a)_2(h))^2}{h^2}} = 0$$

this time with the hope that the equals sign is true. But the equals sign must hold, since the first term is 0 by  $f_1$ 's differentiability and the second term is 0 by  $f_2$ 's differentiability. (HP)

## 4 For submission to Rohil Prasad

**Problem 4.1.** Show that if  $A$  is closed and  $[0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q} \subseteq A$ , then actually  $[0, 1] \subseteq A$ .

*Solution.* Assume for the sake of contradiction that there is some irrational  $r \in [0, 1]$  which does not lie in  $A$ . Since  $A$  is closed, the complement of  $A$  is open.

Therefore, there exists some  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that the interval  $(r - \varepsilon, r + \varepsilon)$  does not intersect  $A$ . However, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is a rational number  $q$  in  $(r - \varepsilon, r + \varepsilon)$ . For small enough  $\varepsilon$ , we have  $(r - \varepsilon, r + \varepsilon) \subset [0, 1]$  so it follows that any open interval around  $r$  intersects  $[0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$ .

As a result, any open interval around  $r$  intersects  $A$  and we arrive at a contradiction, so  $r$  must lie in  $A$ . (RP)

**Problem 4.2.** Let  $A$  denote the subset  $\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x > 0, 0 < y < x^2\}$ , and let  $\chi_A : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  denote the indicator function

$$\chi_A(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (x, y) \in A, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

1. Let  $L$  be any line through the origin. Show that there is a neighborhood of the origin in  $L$  that has no intersection with  $A$ .
2. For each  $h \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , let  $g_h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  parameterize a line by

$$g_h(t) = h \cdot t$$

Show that  $\chi_A \circ g_h$  always defines a continuous function at the origin.

3. Nonetheless, show that  $\chi_A$  is not a continuous function. (Exhibit a continuous curve  $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  with  $\gamma(0) = (0, 0)$  such that  $\chi_A \circ \gamma$  is not a continuous function.)

*Solution.* 1. Let  $L$  be given by  $(tx, ty)$  for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  with either  $x$  or  $y$  being greater than or equal to zero. It is clear that  $L$  does not intersect  $A$  for  $t \leq 0$ , so the problem statement is equivalent to showing that there exists some  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that either  $tx \leq 0$ ,  $ty \leq 0$ , or  $ty \geq t^2x^2$  for all  $t \in (0, \varepsilon)$ .

If either  $x < 0$  or  $y < 0$  then it is clear that  $tx$  and  $ty$  are respectively negative for all  $t$ .

Thus, we have reduced to the case where both  $x, y$  are positive. In this case, we have  $ty \geq t^2x^2$  is equivalent to  $y/x^2 \geq t$ . Therefore, we can pick  $\varepsilon = y/x^2$  in this case.

2. To show continuity at the origin, we must show for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $|t| < \delta$  implies  $|(\chi_A \circ g_h)(t)| < \varepsilon$ . Since  $\chi_A$  is either equal to 0 or 1, it suffices to show that there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $|t| < \delta$  implies  $(\chi_A \circ g_h)(t) = 0$ . The latter statement is equivalent to  $g_h(t) \notin A$ . Since  $g_h$  is a line through the origin, we now have the problem statement is equivalent to showing there is a neighborhood of the origin in  $g_h$  that does not intersect  $A$ . This is exactly the result of part 1.
3. If  $\chi_A$  were continuous, then since the composition of continuous functions is continuous the function  $\chi_A \circ \gamma$  for  $\gamma$  continuous would be continuous as well.

Therefore, showing it is not continuous amounts to showing  $\chi_A \circ \gamma$  is not continuous.

We can set  $\gamma$  to send  $t$  to  $(t, t) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ . For  $t \in (-\infty, 0]$  it is clear that  $\gamma(t) \notin A$ . For  $t \in (0, 1]$  we have  $t \geq t^2$ , so we have  $\gamma(t) \notin A$  in this case as well. For  $t \in (1, \infty)$  we have both that  $t > 0$  and  $t < t^2$ , so then  $\gamma(t) \in A$ .

Therefore,  $\chi_A \circ \gamma$  is the function that is 0 on  $(-\infty, 1]$  and 1 on  $(1, \infty)$ . It is immediate that it is then discontinuous at 1. (RP)

**Problem 4.3.** Let  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be an arbitrarily differentiable function on the real line, and let  $P_{f@a}^n(x)$  denote the  $n^{\text{th}}$  order Taylor polynomial of  $f$ :

$$P_{f@a}^n(x) = \sum_{j=0}^n \frac{f^{(j)}(a) \cdot (x-a)^j}{j!}.$$

Show that  $f$  and  $P_{f@a}^n$  agree to  $n^{\text{th}}$  order  $a$ , i.e.,

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(a+h) - P_{f@a}^n(a+h)}{h^n} = 0$$

(Feel free to use tools you know from calculus to evaluate this limit.)

*Solution.* We will prove this by induction. For  $n = 0$ , we have  $P_{f@a}^0(x) = f(a)$  and the statement is immediate.

Now assume that the statement holds for any smooth function  $f$  up to  $(n - 1)$ th order.

From plugging in  $h = 0$  into the limit, it is clear that both the top and bottom evaluate to 0. Therefore, we can apply L'Hopital's rule to obtain

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(a+h) - P_{f@a}^n(a+h)}{h^n} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f'(a+h) - \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{f^{(j)}(a) \cdot h^{j-1}}{(j-1)!}}{nh^{n-1}}$$

However, by definition the latter expression is just equal to  $\frac{f'(a+h) - P_{f@a}^{n-1}(a+h)}{nh^{n-1}}$ , which by our inductive assumption equals 0 as desired. (RP)