

Midterm Exam #1, Math 311:03, Fall 2009
Sample Solutions

The solutions to Part 1 appear on the last page of this packet.

Task 2.1 [16 points]

Suppose that $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, $A = \text{lub}(S)$, and $T = \{-a : a \in S\}$

a. [8 points] Show that $-A$ is a lower bound for T .

Proof: We must show that every t in T satisfies the condition $-A \leq t$.

Consider an arbitrary t in T . This t can be expressed as $t = -a$ for some a in S . We know that $a \leq \text{lub}(S) = A$ and that $-a \geq -A$. Thus $-A \leq -a = t$.

b. [8] Show that if C is an arbitrary lower bound for T , then $C \leq -A$.

Proof: It is sufficient to show that $-C \geq A$.

Consider an arbitrary a in S . We know both that $-a \in T$ and $a \leq A$. Since C is a lower bound for T , $-a \geq C$ and thus $a \leq -C$. Thus $-C$ is an upper bound for S and $A = \text{lub}(S) \leq -C$.

Task 2.2 [16 points] Suppose that $A = \text{lub}(S)$ but $A \notin S$.

a. Show that there is a sequence $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in S such that

$$\text{for all indices, } |a_n - A| < \frac{1}{n}$$

Proof: We must show how to select each a_n to form the sequence.

Consider an arbitrary positive integer n . Note that $A - 1/n < A$. Thus $A - 1/n$ cannot be an upper bound for the set and therefore there must be an element of S which is larger than $A - 1/n$. Pick one such element and call it a_n .

Now for each n we have

$$a_n \leq A < A + \frac{1}{n} \text{ since } A \text{ is an upper bound for } S \text{ and } \frac{1}{n} > 0$$
$$A - \frac{1}{n} < a_n \text{ since that was how we chose } a_n.$$

So

$$A - \frac{1}{n} < a_n < A + \frac{1}{n} \quad \text{and thus} \quad |a_n - A| < \frac{1}{n}.$$

Task 2.3 [22 points]

a. [11] Using theorems about arithmetic properties of sequences explain why

$$\lim \left(4 \cdot \frac{3n+6}{9n+3} \right) = \frac{4}{3}$$

Explanation

Consider an arbitrary n in \mathbb{N} . Let $q_n = \frac{3n+6}{9n+3}$. Divide top and bottom by n . Note that now

$$q_n = \frac{t_n}{b_n} \quad \text{where} \quad t_n = 3 + 6 \cdot \frac{1}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad b_n = 9 + 3 \cdot \frac{1}{n}$$

We know that $\lim(1/n) = glb(1/n) = 0$. By results on limits of constant sequences and limits of sums and limits of products we get

$$\lim(t_n) = 3 + 6 \cdot 0 = 3 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim(b_n) = 9 + 3 \cdot 0 = 9.$$

Now use the theorem on limits of quotients noting that $\lim(b_n) \neq 0$ to get

$$\lim(q_n) = \frac{3}{9} = \frac{1}{3}$$

and use the theorem on limits of constant multiples to get

$$\lim \left(4 \cdot \frac{3n+6}{9n+3} \right) = 4 \cdot \lim(q_n) = 4 \cdot \frac{1}{3} = \frac{4}{3}$$

b. [11] Give an $\varepsilon - N$ proof that

$$\lim \frac{2n-3}{5n-4} = \frac{2}{5}$$

Proof: We must show that for each positive ε there is a positive integer N such that whenever $n \geq N$ then also

$$\left| \frac{2n-3}{5n-4} - \frac{2}{5} \right| < \varepsilon.$$

We do some preliminary "simplification". For all indices

$$\frac{2n-3}{5n-4} - \frac{2}{5} = \frac{5(2n-3) - (5n-4)2}{5(5n-4)} = \frac{(10n-15) - (10n-8)}{25n-20} = \frac{-7}{25n-20}.$$

Note that the bottom of the last fraction on the right is always positive since $n \geq 1$. Thus, still for all indices we have

$$\left| \frac{2n-3}{5n-4} - \frac{2}{5} \right| = \left| \frac{-7}{25n-20} \right| = \frac{7}{25n-20}.$$

For all indices we have

$$\frac{7}{25n-20} < \varepsilon \Leftrightarrow \frac{7}{\varepsilon} < 25n-20 \Leftrightarrow \frac{(7/\varepsilon)+20}{25} < n.$$

We complete the proof by taking

$$N = \left\lceil \frac{(7/\varepsilon)+20}{25} \right\rceil + 1.$$

Whenever $n \geq N$ we also have

$$\frac{(7/\varepsilon)+20}{25} < n \quad \text{and thus} \quad \left| \frac{2n-3}{5n-4} - \frac{2}{5} \right| = \frac{7}{25n-20} < \varepsilon.$$

Task 2.4 [16] Suppose that

(H1) $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are Cauchy sequences

(H2) for all indices, $|a_n| \leq 60$ and $|b_n| \leq 80$

Using only the definition of Cauchy sequence (that is, without using any general theorems about Cauchy sequences) show that

(R) the product sequence $(a_n b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence.

Proof: Consider an arbitrary positive ε . We need to provide a positive integer H so that whenever both $j \geq H$ and $k \geq H$ then also $|a_j b_j - a_k b_k| < \varepsilon$.

First we note that for all indices

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad |a_j b_j - a_k b_k| &= |(a_j - a_k) b_j + a_k (b_j - b_k)| \\ &\leq |a_j - a_k| |b_j| + |a_k| |b_j - b_k| \leq 80 |a_j - a_k| + 60 |b_j - b_k|. \end{aligned}$$

Set

$$\varepsilon_1 = \frac{\varepsilon}{160} \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_2 = \frac{\varepsilon}{120}.$$

By (H1) we get positive integers H_1 and H_2 such that

whenever both $j \geq H_1$ and $k \geq H_1$ then also (2) $|a_j - a_k| < \varepsilon_1$ and

whenever both $j \geq H_2$ and $k \geq H_2$ then also (3) $|b_j - b_k| < \varepsilon_2$.

Now choose $H = \max(H_1, H_2)$. Suppose both $j \geq H$ and $k \geq H$. We then have

$j \geq H_1$ and $k \geq H_1$ so inequality (2) holds and

$j \geq H_2$ and $k \geq H_2$ so inequality (3) holds.

From these and the inequality (1) we see that whenever both $\lfloor y \rfloor j \geq H$ and $k \geq H$ we get both (2) and (3) and thus

$$|a_j b_j - a_k b_k| < 80 \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{160} + 60 \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{120} = \varepsilon.$$

Task 2.5 [15 points]

For a real y , use the notation

$$\begin{aligned} \lfloor y \rfloor &= \text{the largest integer which is not bigger than } y \\ &= \max\{m : m \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } m \leq y\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for every real y , we have $\lfloor y \rfloor \leq y < \lfloor y \rfloor + 1$.

Consider an arbitrary real x .

a. [5] Suppose that k is an arbitrary positive integer.

Explain why $k[x] \leq [kx]$.

WORK Both k and $[x]$ are integers. So the product $k[x]$ is an integer. Since $[x] \leq x$ and $k > 0$ we get $k[x] \leq kx$. Thus

$$k[x] \in \{m \text{ in } \mathbb{Z} : m \leq kx\}$$

and

$$k[x] \leq \max\{m \text{ in } \mathbb{Z} : m \leq kx\} = [kx].$$

b. [5] Suppose that k is an arbitrary positive integer.

Explain why $kx - k < [kx] < kx + 1$.

You may use the result of (a), whether or not you finished (a).

WORK By the definition of the greatest integers function we get

$$[kx] \leq kx < [kx] + 1$$

Using only the first of those inequalities we get $[kx] \leq kx < kx + 1$ so $[kx] < kx + 1$.

By definition again we get $x < [x] + 1$. Multiply by k . We get $kx < k[x] + k$ and thus $kx - k < k[x] \leq [kx]$. Thus $kx - k < [kx] < kx + 1$.

For each n in \mathbb{N} , set

$$a_n = \frac{[x] + [2x] + \dots + [nx]}{n^2} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n [kx]}{n^2}$$

c. [5] Show that $\lim(a_n) = x/2$.

NOTE As a result of a typographical error, the inequality in (b) is not quite strong enough to get the desired result. HINT The sum of the first n positive integers is $n(n+1)/2$.

We work first with the inequality $[kx] < kx + 1$, which is valid for all k in \mathbb{N} ..

$$\begin{aligned} a_n &= \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n [kx]}{n^2} < \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n (kx + 1)}{n^2} = \frac{x \sum_{k=1}^n k + \sum_{k=1}^n 1}{n^2} \\ &= \frac{x n(n+1)}{n^2} + \frac{n}{n^2} = \frac{x n + 1}{2n} + \frac{1}{n} \end{aligned}$$

Using the order properties of limits we get $\lim(a_n) \leq x/2$, assuming that the limit exists..

Using the inequality $kx - k < \lfloor kx \rfloor$ we can get only

$$\frac{x n (n + 1)}{2 n^2} - \frac{n (n + 1)}{2 n^2} < a_n$$

which gets us only

$$\frac{x}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \leq \lim(a_n) \text{ assuming that the limit exists.}$$

However we know that $\lfloor kx \rfloor \leq kx < \lfloor kx \rfloor + 1$ from which we get a better inequality

$$(b') \quad kx - 1 < \lfloor kx \rfloor$$

From this we get

$$a_n = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n \lfloor kx \rfloor}{n^2} > \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n (kx - 1)}{n^2} = \frac{x n (n + 1)}{2 n^2} - \frac{n}{n^2} = \frac{x}{2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{n} \right) - \frac{1}{n}$$

Now we can apply the squeeze theorem to the inequalities

$$\frac{x}{2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{n} \right) - \frac{1}{n} < a_n < \frac{x}{2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{n} \right) + \frac{1}{n}$$

to get the existence and value of the limit.

#1, Solutions to Part 1, Math 311:03, Fall 2009

Task 1.1 Complete the following definitions

- a. Suppose that $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and $A \in \mathbb{R}$.

We say that " A is the least upper bound of S " if and only if

$$A = \min(\mathcal{UB}(S))$$

Recall that $B \in \mathcal{UB}(S) \iff$ for all s in S , $s \leq B$

- b. Suppose that $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of real numbers.

We say that this sequence is *bounded* if and only if

there exists at least one positive M such that $\forall n$ in \mathbb{N} , $|x_n| \leq M$.

- c. Suppose that $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of real numbers and that $L \in \mathbb{R}$.

We say that " $\lim(x_n) = L$ " if and only if

$$\forall \varepsilon \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^+, \exists N \text{ in } \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } \forall n \text{ in } \mathbb{N}, n \geq N \implies |x_n - L| < \varepsilon.$$

- d. Suppose that $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of real numbers.

We say that " $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a *Cauchy sequence*" if and only if

$$\forall \varepsilon \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^+, \exists H \text{ in } \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } \forall j, k \text{ in } \mathbb{N}, [j \geq H \text{ and } k \geq H] \implies |x_j - x_k| < \varepsilon$$

Task 1.2.

- a. *The Axiom of Completeness*

Suppose that S is a non-empty subset of \mathbb{R}

If S is bounded above,

then there exists a real number A such that $A = \text{lub}(S)$.

- b. *The Monotone Convergence Theorem* (my preferred version)

Suppose that $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence in \mathbb{R} .

If $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is decreasing and bounded below

then $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to its greatest lower bound.

If $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is increasing and bounded above

then $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to its least upper bound.

- c. *The Bolzano-Weierstrass Theorem* (my preferred version)

Every bounded sequence of real numbers contains a convergent subsequence.