## MATH 3150 — HOMEWORK 2

**Problem 1** (p. 97, #5). Let  $x_n$  be a monotone increasing sequence bounded above and consider the set  $S = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots\}$ . Show that  $x_n$  converges to  $\sup(S)$ . Make a similar statement for decreasing sequences.

*Remark.* This shows that the *least upper bound property* — that every nonempty set with an upper bound has a least upper bound — implies the *monotone sequence property* — that every monotone increasing bounded sequence bounded above converges. Combined with the reverse implication proved in class, it follows that the least upper bound property is equivalent to completeness.

Solution. S is a set with an upper bound, so it has a supremum

$$x = \sup(S).$$

Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . By our characterization of the supremum, there is some  $x_N \in S$  such that  $x - \varepsilon < x_N$  and since  $x_n$  is increasing it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} x - \varepsilon < x_n, \ \forall \ n \ge N \\ \implies |x_n - x| < \varepsilon \ \forall \ n \ge N \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\lim_{n\to\infty} x_n = x = \sup(S)$ .

If  $x_n$  is a decreasing sequence bounded below, then  $x_n$  converges to  $\inf(\{x_n\})$  by a similar proof.

**Problem 2** (p. 97, #7). For nonempty sets  $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}$ , let  $A+B = \{x+y \mid x \in A \text{ and } y \in B\}$ . Show that  $\sup(A+B) = \sup(A) + \sup(B)$ .

Solution. Let  $a = \sup(A)$  and  $b = \sup(B)$ . Then since  $a \ge x$  for all  $x \in A$  and  $b \ge y$  for all  $y \in B$ , it follows that a + b is an upper bound for A + B, i.e.

 $a+b \ge x+y, \ \forall \ x+y \in A+B.$ 

Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then there is some  $x \in A$  and  $y \in B$  such that  $a - \varepsilon/2 < x$  and  $b - \varepsilon/2 < y$ , which means that

$$a + b - \varepsilon < x + y \in A + B,$$

and it follows that  $a + b = \sup(A + B)$ .

## **Problem 3** (p. 52, #4).

- (a) Let  $x_n$  be a Cauchy sequence. Suppose that for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is some  $n > 1/\varepsilon$  such that  $|x_n| < \varepsilon$ . Prove that  $x_n \longrightarrow 0$ .
- (b) Show that the hypothesis that  $x_n$  be Cauchy in (a) is necessary, by coming up with an example of a sequence  $x_n$  which does not converge, but which has the other property: that for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists some  $n > 1/\varepsilon$  such that  $|x_n| < \varepsilon$ .

Solution. (a) Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be given. Since  $x_n$  is Cauchy, there exists an N such that  $|x_n - x_m| < \varepsilon/2$  for all  $m, n \ge N$ . If we now let

$$\varepsilon_1 = \min(\varepsilon/2, 1/N)$$

then it follows from the other assumption that there is a  $k > 1/\varepsilon_1 \ge N$  such that

$$|x_k| < \varepsilon_1 \le \varepsilon/2$$

Thus, for  $x_n \ge N$ , we have

$$|x_n - 0| = |x_n - x_k + x_k| \le |x_n - x_k| + |x_k| < \varepsilon/2 + \varepsilon/2 = \varepsilon,$$

so that  $x_n \longrightarrow x$ .

(b) Consider the sequence

$$x_n = \begin{cases} 1 & n \text{ odd} \\ 1/n & n \text{ even.} \end{cases}$$

This clearly does not converge, and yet for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  we can choose an even  $n > 1/\varepsilon$  for which  $|x_n| < \varepsilon$ .

**Problem 4** (p. 99 #15). Let  $x_n$  be a sequence in  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $|x_n - x_{n+1}| \leq \frac{1}{2} |x_{n-1} - x_n|$ . Show that  $x_n$  is a Cauchy sequence.

Solution. To show that  $x_n$  is Cauchy, we must compare  $x_n$  and  $x_m$  for all  $n, m \ge N$  for various N, not just subsequent elements. To do this we first note that for arbitrary k > 0,

$$\begin{aligned} |x_n - x_{n+k}| &= |x_n - x_{n+1} + x_{n+1} - \dots - x_{n+k-1} + x_{n+k-1} - x_{n+k}| \\ &\leq |x_n - x_{n+1}| + |x_{n+1} - x_{n+2}| + \dots + |x_{n+k-1} - x_{n+k}| \\ &\leq |x_n - x_{n+1}| + \frac{1}{2} |x_n - x_{n+1}| + \frac{1}{4} |x_n - x_{n+1}| + \dots + \frac{1}{2^{k-1}} |x_n - x_{n+1}| \\ &= (1 + \frac{1}{2} + \dots + \frac{1}{2^{k-1}}) |x_n - x_{n+1}| \\ &\leq 2 |x_n - x_{n+1}| \\ &\leq \frac{2}{2^n} |x_0 - x_1| = \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} |x_0 - x_1|. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $M = |x_0 - x_1| \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then for an arbitrary  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we may choose N sufficiently large that  $\frac{1}{2^{N-1}} < \frac{\varepsilon}{M}$ . (This uses the fact that  $1/2^n \longrightarrow 0$ .) Thus for any  $n, m \ge N$ , supposing that  $m \ge n$ , we can write m = n + k for some  $k \ge 0$  and then

$$|x_n - x_m| = |x_n - x_{n+k}| < \frac{M}{2^{n-1}} \le \frac{M}{2^{N-1}} < \varepsilon,$$

so  $x_n$  is Cauchy.

**Problem 5.** Prove that an Archimedean ordered field in which every Cauchy sequence converges is complete (i.e. has the monotone sequence property). Here are some suggested steps:

(a) Denote the field by  $\mathbb{F}$ , and suppose  $x_n$  is a monotone increasing sequence bounded above by some  $M \in \mathbb{F}$ .

(b) Proceeding by contradiction, suppose  $x_n$  is not Cauchy. Deduce the existence of a subsequence  $y_k = x_{n_k}$  with the property that

$$y_k \ge y_{k-1} + \varepsilon, \ \forall \ k \tag{1}$$

for some fixed positive number  $\varepsilon > 0$  which does not depend on k.

- (c) Using the Archimedean property, argue that  $y_k$  cannot be bounded above by M, hence obtaining a contradiction.
- (d) Conclude that  $x_n$  converges.

*Proof.* Suppose  $\mathbb{F}$  is Archimedean and has the property that every Cauchy sequence in  $\mathbb{F}$  converges. Let  $x_n$  be a monotone sequence in  $\mathbb{F}$ , with an upper bound M, and suppose that  $x_n$  is not Cauchy. Then there exists an  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that, for all  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , there is a pair  $n, m \geq N$  for which

$$|x_n - x_m| \ge \varepsilon.$$

(This is just the negation of the statement that  $x_n$  is Cauchy.)

We construct a subsequece as suggested by the hint. Choose  $n_1 = 1$  (really it doesn't matter where you start), and by induction suppose that we have  $n_1 < n_2 < \cdots < n_k$  such that  $x_{n_k} \ge x_{n_{k-1}} + \varepsilon$ . Set  $N = n_k$ ; then by assumption there is a pair  $n_{k+1}, m_{k+1} \ge n_k$  (and without loss of generality we can suppose that  $n_{k+1} > m_{k+1}$ ) such that

$$\begin{aligned} |x_{n_{k+1}} - x_{m_{k+1}}| &\ge \varepsilon, \\ \implies x_{n_{k+1}} &\ge x_{m_{k+1}} + \varepsilon \\ &\ge x_{n_k} + \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

since the sequence is increasing. This completes the induction step and gives a subsequence  $y_k = x_{n_k}$  satisfying (1), where  $\varepsilon > 0$  is a fixed positive number, per our assumption that  $x_n$  is not Cauchy.

Let  $d = M - y_1$  be the distance from the first element of the subsequence to the upper bound for  $x_n$ . By the Archimedean property of  $\mathbb{F}$ , there exists some  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$N > d/\varepsilon, \iff \varepsilon N > d.$$

By the property (1) on the subsequence  $y_k$ , it follows that

$$y_N \ge y_1 + N\varepsilon > y_1 + d = M,$$

Since  $y_N = x_{n_N}$  is an element of the original sequence, this contradicts the assumption that  $x_n$  is bounded.

Since we reached this conclusion by assuming that our bounded increasing sequence  $x_n$  was not Cauchy, it follows that  $x_n$  must be Cauchy, hence convergent by the assumption on  $\mathbb{F}$ . Since  $x_n$  was an arbitrary increasing bounded sequence, it follows that  $\mathbb{F}$  has the monotone sequence property.