

Some Midterm Solutions

3.(iii) Let G be our open connected set.

Note that $x \sim y$ iff there is a path $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow G$ with $\gamma(0) = x, \gamma(1) = y$ defines an equivalence relation.

- Symmetry and reflexivity are obvious.
- Transitivity is proven just by concatenating paths.

We claim that each equivalence class is open. Indeed, consider $\{z \in G : z \sim x = [x]\}$. Since G is open, there is some open ball $B_r(x) \subset G$. But this ball is visibly path connected (it is convex)! Hence, $y \sim x$ for each $y \in B_r(x)$, i.e. $B_r(x) \subset [x]$.

But we know \sim partitions G into disjoint equivalence classes, which are all open. More than one equivalence class would disconnect G . Hence, G contains only one equivalence class, i.e. G is path connected. \square

4. We define the supposed inner product via

$$\langle x, y \rangle := \frac{1}{4}(\|x + y\|^2 - \|x - y\|^2).$$

- (i) Positivity $\langle x, x \rangle = \frac{1}{4}(\|x + x\|^2 + \|x - x\|^2) = \|x\|^2 \geq 0$ with equality iff $x = 0$, by positive definiteness of the norm $\|\cdot\|$. So, $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is positive and induces the norm $\|\cdot\|$.
- (ii) Symmetry Since $\|z\| = \|-z\|$ for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$, (and in particular for $z = x - y$) it follows that $\langle x, y \rangle = \langle y, x \rangle$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
- (ii) Additivity

$$\begin{aligned} 4 \langle x + z, y \rangle &= \|x + z + y\|^2 - \|x + z - y\|^2 \\ &= 2\|z\|^2 + 2\|x + y\|^2 - \|x + y - z\|^2 - \|x + z - y\|^2 \\ &= 2\|z\|^2 + 2\|x + y\|^2 - (2\|y - z\|^2 + 2\|x\|^2 - \|y - z - x\|^2) - \|x - (y - z)\|^2 \\ &= 2\|z\|^2 + 2\|x + y\|^2 - 2\|y - z\|^2 - 2\|x\|^2 \\ &= 2\|z\|^2 + 2\|y\|^2 + 2\|x + y\|^2 - 2\|y - z\|^2 - 2\|x\|^2 - 2\|y\|^2 \\ &= \|y + z\|^2 + \|y - z\|^2 - 2\|y - z\|^2 + 2\|x + y\|^2 - (\|x + y\|^2 + \|x - y\|^2) \\ &= (\|y + z\|^2 - \|y - z\|^2) + (\|x + y\|^2 - \|x - y\|^2) \\ &= 4 \langle z, y \rangle + 4 \langle x, y \rangle . \end{aligned}$$

(iv) Homogeneity Proving that $\langle cx, y \rangle = c \langle x, y \rangle$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$ is the last and most difficult part of the proof.

Note that for fixed $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $f(t) := \langle tx, y \rangle$ is a continuous function of t which satisfies $f(t_1 + t_2) = f(t_1) + f(t_2)$ (by the additivity which has already been proven). Any such function must satisfy $f(t) = tf(1)$, as you will prove on a subsequent homework assignment (this is where the real work is hiding). Hence, $\langle cx, y \rangle = f(c) = cf(1) = c \langle x, y \rangle$, as required.

Thus, $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is indeed an inner product and we are done. \square

Remark. The above formula for the inner product is not difficult to think of. Indeed, if you assume the result of the problem before hand, i.e. that the normed vector space $(\mathbb{R}^n, \|\cdot\|)$ is actually an inner

product space, then $\frac{1}{4}(\|x+y\|^2 - \|x-y\|^2) = \frac{1}{4}(\langle x, x \rangle + 2\langle x, y \rangle + \langle y, y \rangle - (\langle x, x \rangle - 2\langle x, y \rangle + \langle y, y \rangle)) = \langle x, y \rangle$. Another equivalent way of writing this, using the parallelogram identity, is as $\langle x, y \rangle := \frac{1}{2}(\|x\|^2 + \|y\|^2 - \|x-y\|^2)$; it is easier to see that this “equals the inner product” but this alternative form is less convenient for calculation and typesetting.

5. (i) Since a_n converges, the sequence $|a_n - \beta|$ is certainly bounded, say $|a_n - \beta| \leq R$ for all n . Since a_n converges, choose N_0 such that for all $n \geq N_0$, we have $|a_n - \beta| < \epsilon$.

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup |s_n - \beta| &\leq \limsup \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{|a_k - \beta|}{n} \\ &\leq \limsup \sum_{k=1}^{N_0} \frac{|a_k - \beta|}{n} + \limsup \frac{\sum_{k=N_0+1}^n |a_k - \beta|}{n} \\ &\leq \limsup N_0 \times \frac{R}{n} + \limsup \frac{\sum |a_k - \beta|}{n} \\ &\leq 0 + \limsup \frac{(n - N_0) \times \epsilon}{n} \\ &\leq \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, it follows that $\limsup |s_n - \beta| = 0$, implying that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = \beta$, as required.

- (ii) No, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$ does not necessarily exist if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n$ exists. For example, for $a_n = (-1)^n$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = 0$ but $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$ clearly does not exist.
6. (a) Note that for all $a \in A$ we have $d(x, a) \leq d(y, a) + d(x, y)$, by the triangle. Taking the infimum of both sides over all $a \in A$, this shows that $d(x, A) \leq d(y, A) + d(x, y)$. Reversing the roles of x and y , this also shows that $d(y, A) \leq d(x, A) + d(x, y)$. Combining these two inequalities gives that

$$|f(x) - f(y)| = |d(x, A) - d(y, A)| \leq d(x, y).$$

Thus, f is actually uniformly continuous: if $d(x, y) < \epsilon$, then $|f(x) - f(y)| < \epsilon$.

Now note that $A \subset f^{-1}(0) = \{x \in X : f(x) = 0\}$ is closed since f is continuous. Thus, if $f(x) = 0$ implies that $x \in A$, we must have $A = f^{-1}(0)$ is closed.

Conversely, if $x \in A$ and $f(x) = 0$, then there must exist a sequence $a_n \in A$ with $a_n \rightarrow x$. But since A is closed, A contains all of its limit points. Thus, $x \in A$.

- (b) The function

$$g(x) = \frac{d(x, A)}{d(x, A) + d(x, B)}$$

does the trick. Indeed, by part (a), since A and B are disjoint closed sets,

$d(x, A) + d(x, B) > 0$ for all $x \in X$. Thus, g is the ratio of two continuous functions (with the denominator never vanishing), implying that g is continuous. It's also clear that

$$g|_A = 0, g|_B = 1. \quad \square$$

7. Let $S_k := \{10^k \leq n < 10^{k+1} : n \text{ does not contain any 9's in its base 10 expansion}\}$. Then every $n \in S_k$ can be uniquely expressed in the form $10n' + r$ for some $n' \in S_{k-1}$ and $r \in \{0, 1, \dots, 9\}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n \in S_k} \frac{1}{n} &= \sum_{n' \in S_{k-1}} \\
&= \sum_{n' \in S_{k-1}} \sum_{r=0}^8 \frac{1}{10n' + r} \\
&\leq \sum_{n' \in S_{k-1}} \sum_{r=0}^n \frac{1}{10n'} \\
&= \frac{9}{10} \sum_{n' \in S_{k-1}} \frac{1}{n'}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we may iterate this inequality to get $\sum_{n \in S_k} \frac{1}{n} \leq (\frac{9}{10})^k S_0$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n \in A} \frac{1}{n} &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n \in S_k} \frac{1}{n} \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\frac{9}{10})^k S_0 \\
&= 10S_0 \\
&< \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square