

MATH 217 FALL 2013 HOMEWORK 3 SOLUTIONS

- This homework consists of 6 problems of 5 points each. The total is 30.
- You need to fully justify your answer – prove that your function indeed has the specified property – for each problem.
- Please read this week’s lecture notes before working on the problems.

Question 1. (Convexity)

a) Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be defined by

$$E := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid \|\mathbf{x}\| < 1\} \cup \{(1, 0, \dots, 0)\}. \quad (1)$$

Is E convex? Justify your answer.

b) Let $S \subseteq S(\mathbf{0}, 1) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid \|\mathbf{x}\| = 1\}$ be any subset of the unit sphere. Define

$$E := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid \|\mathbf{x}\| < 1\} \cup S. \quad (2)$$

Is E convex? Justify your answer.

Solution.

a) Yes. Take any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in E$. Let $t \in [0, 1]$ be arbitrary.

We discuss two cases.

- Case 1: Both $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \neq (1, 0, \dots, 0)$. Then $\|\mathbf{x}\|, \|\mathbf{y}\| < 1$ and triangle inequality gives

$$\|t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y}\| \leq \|t\mathbf{x}\| + \|(1-t)\mathbf{y}\| < t + (1-t) = 1. \quad (3)$$

Therefore $t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y} \in E$.

- Case 2: One of $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$. Wlog assume it’s \mathbf{x} . Then $\|\mathbf{y}\| < 1$. Note that since $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in E$. We only need to show

$$t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y} \in E \quad (4)$$

for all $t \in (0, 1)$. This implies

$$\|t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y}\| \leq \|t\mathbf{x}\| + \|(1-t)\mathbf{y}\| < t + (1-t) < 1. \quad (5)$$

Therefore $t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y} \in E$.

b) Yes. Note that the difficulty here is that both $\|\mathbf{x}\|, \|\mathbf{y}\|$ may be 1 and the simple application of triangle inequality giving

$$\|t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y}\| \leq \|t\mathbf{x}\| + \|(1-t)\mathbf{y}\| \leq t + (1-t) = 1. \quad (6)$$

is not enough to conclude $t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y} \in E$.

Thus we try to prove that if $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}$, $\|\mathbf{x}\| = \|\mathbf{y}\| = 1$, and $t \in (0, 1)$, then $\|t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y}\| < 1$.¹
We check:

$$\begin{aligned} \|t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y}\|^2 &= [t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y}] \cdot [t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y}] \\ &= t^2\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{x} + 2t(1-t)\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} + (1-t)^2\mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{y} \\ &\leq [t^2 + (1-t)^2] + 2t(1-t)\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

1. This is a property of the norm itself. Such norms are called “strictly convex”.

Now recall that

$$(x_1 y_1 + \cdots + x_N y_N)^2 = (x_1^2 + \cdots + x_N^2)(y_1^2 + \cdots + y_N^2) - \sum_{i \neq j} (x_i y_j - x_j y_i)^2 \quad (8)$$

which means

$$|\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y}| < \|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{y}\| = 1 \quad (9)$$

unless

$$x_i y_j = x_j y_i \quad (10)$$

for all $i \neq j$. Taking square and sum over i , using the fact that $\sum_{i=1}^N x_i^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N y_i^2 = 1$ we reach

$$y_j^2 = x_j^2 \quad \forall j = 1, 2, \dots, N. \quad (11)$$

Now reviewing $x_i y_j = x_j y_i$ we see that there are only two cases, either $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}$ or $\mathbf{x} = -\mathbf{y}$. The former is excluded by assumption. In the latter case, we have

$$\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} = -\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 = -1 < 1. \quad (12)$$

Thus we have show that

$$\|t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y}\| < 1 \quad (13)$$

which gives $t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{y} \in E$ when both $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in S$.

When $\|\mathbf{x}\| < 1$ or $\|\mathbf{y}\| < 1$ the proof is the same as in a).

Question 2. (Limit) Let $k, l, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Consider the following function:

$$f(x, y) = \frac{x^k y^l}{x^{2m} + y^{2n}}. \quad (14)$$

Find all k, l, m, n such that the limit $\lim_{(x,y) \rightarrow (0,0)} f(x, y)$ exist. Justify your answer. (You may find the following Young's inequality useful: $p, q > 0, \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1 \implies |xy| \leq \frac{|x|^p}{p} + \frac{|y|^q}{q}$.)

Solution. We claim that the limit is 0 when $\frac{k}{m} + \frac{l}{n} > 2$ and does not exist for all other k, l, m, n .

- $\frac{k}{m} + \frac{l}{n} > 2$. There are $r < \frac{k}{m}, s < \frac{l}{n}$ such that $r + s = 2$. Denote $\mu := \frac{k}{m} - r > 0$ and $\nu := \frac{l}{n} - s > 0$. Now apply Young's inequality:

$$|x^k y^l| = |x^m|^r |y^n|^s |x^{m\mu}| |y^{n\nu}| \leq |x^{m\mu}| |y^{n\nu}| \left(\frac{2}{r} x^{2m} + \frac{2}{s} y^{2n} \right). \quad (15)$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned} |f(x, y)| &\leq \max\left(\frac{2}{r}, \frac{2}{s}\right) |x^{m\mu}| |y^{n\nu}| \\ &\leq \max\left(\frac{2}{r}, \frac{2}{s}\right) (x^2 + y^2)^{\frac{m\mu + n\nu}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Now for any $\varepsilon > 0$, take $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\max\left(\frac{2}{r}, \frac{2}{s}\right) \delta^{m\mu + n\nu} < \varepsilon. \quad (17)$$

We have whenever $\|(x, y)\| < \delta$, $|f(x, y)| < \varepsilon$.

- $\frac{k}{m} + \frac{l}{n} \leq 2$. We show that for every $\delta > 0$, there are $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)$ satisfying $\|(x_1, y_1)\| < \delta$, $\|(x_2, y_2)\| < \delta$, and $|f(x_1, y_1) - f(x_2, y_2)| \geq 1/2$.

Take any $\delta > 0$.

- Take $(x_1, y_1) = \left(\frac{\delta}{2}, 0\right)$. Then $\|(x_1, y_1)\| < \delta$ and $f(x_1, y_1) = 0$.
- Take $(x_2, y_2) = (t^{1/m}, t^{1/n})$ where $t = \min\left(1, \frac{\delta^{m+n}}{2}\right)$. We have $\|(x_2, y_2)\| < \delta$ and

$$|f(x_2, y_2)| = \frac{1}{2} t^{2 - \left(\frac{k}{m} + \frac{l}{n}\right)} \geq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (18)$$

Question 3. (Limit at infinity) Let $f: \mathbb{R}^N \mapsto \mathbb{R}^M$. We define its limit at infinity as follows. $\lim_{\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \infty} f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{L} \in \mathbb{R}^M$ if and only if

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists R > 0 \forall \mathbf{x} \text{ satisfying } \|\mathbf{x}\| > R \quad \|f(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{L}\| < \varepsilon. \quad (19)$$

Study the limit

$$\lim_{(x,y) \rightarrow \infty} x y e^{-x^2 y^2}. \quad (20)$$

Does it exist? If it does, what is the limit? Justify your answer.

Solution. It does not exist. For any $R > 0$, consider $(x_1, y_1) = \left(R, \frac{1}{R}\right)$ and $(x_2, y_2) = \left(R, \frac{2}{R}\right)$. Then we have $\|(x_1, y_1)\| > R$, $\|(x_2, y_2)\| > R$, but

$$|f(x_1, y_1) - f(x_2, y_2)| = |e^{-1} - 2e^{-2}| = (e - 2)e^{-2} > 0. \quad (21)$$

Thus the limit cannot exist.

Question 4. (Continuity) Let $f: \mathbb{R}^N \mapsto \mathbb{R}^M$ be a linear function. Prove that it is continuous (that is, it is continuous at every point in its domain.)

Proof. Let $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ be arbitrary. Since f is linear, it is a matrix representation $A = (a_{ij})$. Now we have, for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}_0)\| &= \|A\mathbf{x} - A\mathbf{x}_0\| \\ &= \|A(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)\| \\ &= [(a_{11}(x_1 - x_{01}) + \dots + a_{1N}(x_N - x_{0N}))^2 + \dots + (a_{M1}(x_1 - x_{01})^2 + \dots)^2]^{1/2} \\ &\leq [MN^2 (\max |a_{ij}|)^2 (\max |x_l - x_{0l}|)^2]^{1/2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{MN} \max |a_{ij}| \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0\|. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Now for any $\varepsilon > 0$, take $\delta = \frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{MN} \max |a_{ij}|}$, we have

$$\|f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}_0)\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} < \varepsilon. \quad (23)$$

Therefore f is continuous. □

Question 5. (Open/closed sets) Let $A := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x < y\}$.

- a) Is it open? Is it closed?
- b) Find its interior.
- c) Find its closure.
- d) Find its boundary.
- e) Find its cluster points.

Justify all your answers.

Solution.

a) A is open but not closed.

- A is open.

Take any $(x_0, y_0) \in A$. Take $r = \frac{y_0 - x_0}{2}$. Then for all $(x, y) \in B((x_0, y_0), r)$, we have

$$|x - x_0| < r, |y - y_0| < r \quad (24)$$

which gives

$$y - x \geq (y_0 - x_0) - |x - x_0| - |y - y_0| > 0. \quad (25)$$

Thus $B((x_0, y_0), r) \subseteq A$.

- A is not closed. We prove $A^c = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x \geq y\}$ is not open.

Take $(x_0, y_0) = (0, 0) \in A^c$. Then for any $r > 0$, the point $(\frac{r}{2}, 0) \in B(\mathbf{0}, r)$ but is not a member of A .

b) Since A is open, $A^o = A$.

c) We claim it's closure is $B := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x \leq y\}$. First similar to a) we can prove that B^c is open so B is closed. As $A \subseteq B$, $\bar{A} \subseteq B$ by definition of closure.

Let F be any closed set, $A \subseteq F$, we now prove $B \subseteq F$. Once this is done, we can conclude that $B \subseteq \bigcap_{A \subseteq F, F \text{ closed}} F = \bar{A}$ and consequently $B = \bar{A}$.

We show $B \subseteq F$ through proving $F^c \subseteq B^c$, that is, if $(x_0, y_0) \in F^c$, then $x_0 > y_0$. Take any $(x_0, y_0) \in F^c$. Then since F^c is open there is $r > 0$ such that

$$B((x_0, y_0), r) \subseteq F^c \subseteq A^c = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x \geq y\}. \quad (26)$$

Now consider $(x, y) = (x_0 - r/2, y_0) \in B((x_0, y_0), r)$. We have

$$x_0 - \frac{r}{2} \geq y_0 \implies x_0 > y_0 \implies (x_0, y_0) \in B^c. \quad (27)$$

Thus the proof ends.

d) The boundary is $\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x = y\}$.

e) The cluster points are $\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x \leq y\}$. Take any (x_0, y_0) satisfying $x_0 \leq y_0$. Let U be any open set containing (x_0, y_0) . Then there is $r > 0$ such that

$$B((x_0, y_0), r) \subseteq U. \quad (28)$$

All we need to show is

$$[B((x_0, y_0), r) - \{(x_0, y_0)\}] \cap A \neq \emptyset \quad (29)$$

or equivalently, there is $(x, y) \in B((x_0, y_0), r)$ different from (x_0, y_0) such that $x < y$. This is easy: Take

$$x = x_0 - r/2, y = y_0. \quad (30)$$

Question 6. (Open/closed sets) Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$. Prove $(\bar{A}^c)^c = A^o$.

Proof. We prove through two steps:

1. $(\bar{A}^c)^c \subseteq A^o$.

Since $A^c \subseteq \bar{A}^c$, $(\bar{A}^c)^c \subseteq (A^c)^c = A$. Furthermore as \bar{A}^c is closed, $(\bar{A}^c)^c$ is open. Now by definition of A^o , $(\bar{A}^c)^c \subseteq A^o$.

2. $A^o \subseteq (\overline{A^c})^c$.

Let $\mathbf{x} \in A^o$. Then there is an open set U such that $\mathbf{x} \in U \subseteq A$. This means $U \cap (A^c) = \emptyset \implies A^c \subseteq U^c$. But U^c is closed. Therefore $\overline{A^c} \subseteq U^c$ which means $U \subseteq (\overline{A^c})^c$. Consequently $\mathbf{x} \in (\overline{A^c})^c$ and the proof ends. \square

Remark. A better way to prove 2. is the following.

$(A^o)^c$ is closed. And since $A^o \subseteq A$, $A^c \subseteq (A^o)^c$. Now by definition of closure we have

$$\overline{A^c} \subseteq (A^o)^c \iff (\overline{A^c})^c \supseteq A^o. \quad (31)$$