

Solve the following 6 problems.

1. Prove that if series  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n x^n$  converges for all  $x$  such that  $|x| < 1$ , then the series  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n \frac{x^n}{1-x^n}$  converges as well if  $|x| < 1$ .

**Solution:**

For  $|x| < 1$ ,  $x^n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , so there exists an  $N$  such that  $|x^n| \leq \frac{1}{2}$  for all  $n \geq N$ . Thus,

$$\forall n \geq N : \left| a_n \frac{x^n}{1-x^n} \right| \leq \left| a_n \frac{x^n}{1-\frac{1}{2}} \right| = 2|a_n x^n|$$

Since  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n x^n$  converges for all  $x$  such that  $|x| < 1$ , the radius of convergence of this power series is at least 1. Thus, the convergence is absolute for all  $|x| < 1$  by a standard result. Furthermore,  $2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n x^n = \sum 2a_n x^n$  also converges absolutely for all  $|x| < 1$ .

Therefore, by the comparison test<sup>1</sup>, for all  $|x| < 1$ , the series  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n \frac{x^n}{1-x^n}$  converges.  $\square$

---

<sup>1</sup>Theorem 3.25(a) in Rudin

2. Let  $X$  be a nonempty set and  $d$  be a metric on  $X$ . Prove the standard theorem that the set of all limit points of  $X$  is closed.

**Solution 1:**

Let  $A$  be the set of all limit points of  $X$ . We show that  $A$  is closed by showing that it contains all of its limit points.

If  $A$  is empty, then it is closed by definition. Otherwise, consider any limit point  $x$  of  $A$ . Since  $A \subset X$ , this implies that  $x$  is a limit point of  $X$ , so  $x \in A$  by construction.  $\square$

**Solution 2:**

Let  $A$  be the set of all limit points of  $X$ .

By a standard result, proving  $A$  is closed is equivalent to proving that  $A^c$  is open. We prove that  $A^c$  is open by showing that all of its points are interior to  $A^c$ .

If  $A^c$  is either equal to the empty set or equal to  $X$ , then it is open by definition. Otherwise, consider any  $x \in A^c$ .

By assumption,  $x$  is not a limit point of  $X$ , which implies it is an isolated point by definition. This implies there exists an  $r > 0$  such that  $B_r(x) = \{x\}$ , so  $B_r(x) \subset A^c$ . Thus,  $x$  is an interior point of  $A^c$ . Since  $x \in A^c$  was arbitrary, this proves  $A^c$  is open and that  $A$  must be closed.  $\square$

**Solution 3 (proving a more general result):**

Let  $E \subset X$ ,  $E'$  denote the set of all limit points of  $E$ , and  $E''$  denote the set of all limit points from  $E'$ . We prove that  $E'$  is closed by showing that  $E'' \subset E'$ .

If  $E''$  is empty, then  $E'$  is closed by definition, so assume  $E''$  is not empty and let  $x \in E''$ .

By definition, for any  $r > 0$  there exists  $y \in E'$  such that  $0 < d(x, y) < r/2$ . By definition of  $E'$ , there exists  $z \in E$  such that  $0 < d(y, z) < d(x, y) < r/2$  (which implies  $z \neq x$ ). Thus,  $0 < d(x, z) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, z) < r$ , so  $x$  is a limit point of  $E$ , which implies  $x \in E'$  and it follows that  $E'' \subset E'$ .

Since  $X \subset X$ , the result holds for  $X$  as well.  $\square$

3. Let  $X$  be a nonempty set and  $d$  be a metric on  $X$ . We say that  $K \subset X$  is *sequentially compact* if for every sequence  $\{x_n\} \subset K$  there exists a subsequence  $\{a_{n_k}\}$  that converges to a point  $x \in K$ . For a fixed  $\epsilon > 0$ , we call  $\{x_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A} \subset X$  an  $\epsilon$ -net of  $K \subset X$  if the family of open balls  $\{B_\epsilon(x_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in A}$  is an open cover of  $K$ . We say that  $K \subset X$  is *totally bounded* if there exists a finite  $\epsilon$ -net for every  $\epsilon > 0$ . Use these definitions to prove the standard theorem that a nonempty sequentially compact subset of a metric space is complete and totally bounded.

**Solution:**

Suppose  $K \subset X$  is sequentially compact.

Consider any Cauchy sequence  $\{x_n\} \subset K$ . The sequential compactness of  $K$  implies there exists a convergent subsequence  $\{x_{n_k}\}$ . By a standard result, the Cauchy sequence must also converge to the same limit as the convergent subsequence<sup>2</sup>.

Assume  $K$  is not totally bounded, so that there exists an  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $K$  has no finite  $\epsilon$ -net.

This means that every finite subset  $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \subset K$  has the property that  $\cup_{i=1}^n B_\epsilon(x_i)$  is not a cover for  $K$ . In other words,  $K \setminus (\cup_{i=1}^n B_\epsilon(x_i))$  is not empty.

Pick any  $x_1 \in K$ , and choose  $x_2$  from  $K \setminus B_\epsilon(x_1)$ . Having chosen the first  $n$  points, choose  $x_{n+1}$  from  $K \setminus (\cup_{i=1}^n B_\epsilon(x_i))$ . This inductively constructs a sequence  $\{x_n\} \subset K$  such that  $d(x_n, x_m) > \epsilon$  for any  $n \neq m$ , which implies that any subsequence is *not* Cauchy. Thus, there cannot exist a convergent subsequence, a contradiction of  $K$  being sequentially compact. Therefore,  $K$  is totally bounded.  $\square$

---

<sup>2</sup>This is also easily proved by an  $\epsilon/2$  argument if the result is not remembered.

4. Let  $X$  be a nonempty set and  $d$  be a metric on  $X$ . Suppose  $f$  is a continuous function on  $A \subset X$  to  $\mathbb{R}^n$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Using only the definitions of a set being compact and a function being uniformly continuous, prove that if  $A$  is compact, then  $f$  is uniformly continuous, and provide a counterexample to the converse.

**Solution:**

Suppose  $A$  is compact and  $f : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is continuous.

Let  $\epsilon > 0$ .

For any  $x \in A$ , since  $f$  is continuous, there exists  $\delta_x > 0$  such that for all  $y \in B_{\delta_x}(x)$ ,  $\|f(x) - f(y)\| < \epsilon/2$ .

The set  $\{B_{\delta_x/2}(x)\}_{x \in A}$  forms an open cover of  $A$ . Since  $A$  is compact, there exists a finite subcover that we denote by  $\{B_{\delta_{x_i}/2}(x_i)\}_{1 \leq i \leq k}$ .

Let  $\delta = \min\{\delta_{x_1}/2, \dots, \delta_{x_k}/2\}$ .

Consider any  $y, z \in A$  such that  $d(y, z) < \delta$ . Then, there exists some  $x_i$  such that  $y, z \in B_{\delta_{x_i}}(x_i)$ . By the triangle inequality,

$$\|f(y) - f(z)\| \leq \|f(y) - f(x_i)\| + \|f(x_i) - f(z)\| < \epsilon.$$

For a counterexample, suppose that  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is the zero map, i.e.,  $f(x) = \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then, for any  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\|f(x) - f(y)\| = 0 < \epsilon,$$

which shows that  $f$  is uniformly continuous, but  $\mathbb{R}$  is not compact since it is not bounded.  $\square$

5. Let  $a < b$  be real numbers and  $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . For a partition  $P = \{a = x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_n = b\}$  of  $[a, b]$ , the upper and lower Darboux sums of  $f$  on  $P$  are defined as

$$U(f, P) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \sup_{x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]} f(x) \right) (x_i - x_{i-1}),$$

and

$$L(f, P) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \inf_{y \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]} f(y) \right) (x_i - x_{i-1}),$$

respectively. We say that  $f$  is Riemann integrable on  $[a, b]$  if for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists a partition  $P$  of  $[a, b]$  such that  $U(f, P) - L(f, P) < \epsilon$ .

Suppose that  $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is bounded. Using the above definitions, prove that if  $f$  is Riemann integrable, then  $f^2$  is Riemann integrable, and provide a counterexample to the converse.

*Hint: You may find it useful to exploit the fact that for any set  $A$ , and any real-valued function  $f$  defined on  $A$  that  $\sup_{x \in A} f(x) - \inf_{y \in A} f(y) = \sup_{x, y \in A} |f(x) - f(y)|$ .*

**Solution:**

Since  $f$  is bounded on  $[a, b]$  there exists  $M > 0$  such that  $|f(x)| < M$  for all  $x \in [a, b]$ . Thus, for any  $x, y \in [a, b]$ , we have that

$$|f^2(x) - f^2(y)| = |f(x) - f(y)| \cdot |f(x) + f(y)| \leq 2M|f(x) - f(y)|.$$

Let  $\epsilon > 0$ .

Since  $f$  is Riemann integrable, there exists a partition  $P$  on  $[a, b]$  such that  $U(f, P) - L(f, P) < \epsilon/(2M)$ .

Then, for this partition  $P$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} U(f^2, P) - L(f^2, P) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \sup_{[x_{i-1}, x_i]} f^2(x) - \inf_{[x_{i-1}, x_i]} f^2(x) \right) (x_i - x_{i-1}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \sup_{x, y \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]} |f^2(x) - f^2(y)| \right) (x_i - x_{i-1}) \\ &\leq 2M \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \sup_{x, y \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]} |f(x) - f(y)| \right) (x_i - x_{i-1}) \\ &= 2M \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \sup_{x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]} f(x) - \inf_{y \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]} f(y) \right) (x_i - x_{i-1}) \\ &= 2M[U(f, P) - L(f, P)] \\ &< \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

For a counterexample, suppose  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined by  $f(x) = 1$  whenever  $x \in [0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$ , and  $f(x) = -1$  otherwise. Then,  $f^2(x) = 1$  for all  $x \in [0, 1]$ , which is clearly Riemann integrable, but, for any partition  $P$  of  $[0, 1]$ , we have  $U(f, P) = 1 \neq -1 = L(f, P)$ , so  $f$  is not Riemann integrable.  $\square$

6. Let  $\mathcal{C}^1([a, b])$  denote the space of real-valued continuously differentiable functions on  $[a, b]$  where  $a < b$  are real numbers. Define the metric  $d$  on  $\mathcal{C}^1([a, b])$  as follows (where  $f, g \in \mathcal{C}^1([a, b])$ )

$$d(f, g) = \sup_{[a, b]} |f(x) - g(x)| + \sup_{[a, b]} |f'(x) - g'(x)|.$$

Suppose  $\{f_n\} \subset (\mathcal{C}^1([a, b]), d)$  is a bounded sequence. Prove that if  $\{f'_n\}$  is equicontinuous, then there exists a subsequence of  $\{f_n\}$  that converges in  $\mathcal{C}^1([a, b], d)$ .

**Solution:**

Since  $\{f_n\}$  is bounded in  $\mathcal{C}^1([a, b])$ , there exists an  $M$  such that  $\{f_n\} \subset B_M(0)$  (where 0 indicates the zero function). By the definition of the metric, this implies that both  $\{f_n\}$  and  $\{f'_n\}$  are uniformly bounded.

Since  $\{f'_n\}$  is equicontinuous, the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem implies that there exists a subsequence  $\{f'_{n_k}\}$  that converges uniformly to  $g \in \mathcal{C}([a, b])$ .

Since  $\{f_{n_k}\}$  is uniformly bounded,  $\{f_{n_k}(a)\}$  is a bounded set of real numbers, so there exists a convergent subsequence  $\{f_{n_{k_l}}(a)\}$ . Let  $f(a)$  define this limit.

By the fundamental theorem of calculus, for each  $l$ ,

$$f_{n_{k_l}}(x) = f_{n_{k_l}}(a) + \int_a^x f'_{n_{k_l}}(y) dy.$$

Since  $\{f'_{n_{k_l}}\}$  also converges uniformly to  $g$ , then we can take the limit as  $l \rightarrow \infty$  above for each  $x \in [a, b]$  and bring the limit through the integral by a standard result to define  $f(x)$  by

$$f(x) = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} f_{n_{k_l}}(x) = f(a) + \int_a^x g(y) dy.$$

By the fundamental theorem of calculus, we have that  $f' = g(x)$ , so  $f \in \mathcal{C}^1([a, b])$ .  $\square$