

# MATH 217 FALL 2013 HOMEWORK 4 SOLUTIONS

DUE THURSDAY OCT. 10, 2013 5PM

- 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.** Let  $f: [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$  be defined as

$$f(x, y) = \frac{1}{1 - xy}. \quad (1)$$

Prove that  $f$  is continuous (not necessarily by definition) but not uniformly continuous.

**Solution.**

- $f$  is continuous. This follows directly from the fact that  $f$  is the ratio of two continuous functions  $1, 1 - xy$  and  $1 - xy \neq 0$  for all  $(x, y) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ .
- $f$  is not uniformly continuous. For any  $1 > \delta > 0$ , let  $x_1 = 1 - \delta/2, x_2 = 1 - \delta$ . Then

$$\|(x_1, x_1) - (x_2, x_2)\| = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \delta < \delta, \quad (2)$$

but

$$|f(x_1, x_1) - f(x_2, x_2)| = \frac{1}{\delta - \delta^2/4} - \frac{1}{2\delta - \delta^2} > \frac{1}{\delta/2 - \delta^2/4} - \frac{1}{2\delta - \delta^2} > \frac{1}{\delta - \delta^2/2} > 2. \quad (3)$$

**Question 2.** Prove by definition (without using Heine-Borel):

- $E = \{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$  is compact;
- $E = \{(x, y) \mid x \in \mathbb{N}, y \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is not compact;

**Proof.**

- Let  $W$  be any open covering of  $E$ . Then for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , since  $\mathbf{x}_i \in \cup_{O \in W} O$ , there is  $O_i \in W$  such that  $\mathbf{x}_i \in O_i$ . Now we have the desired finite covering

$$E \subseteq \cup_{i=1}^n O_i. \quad (4)$$

- Consider the open covering

$$E \subseteq \cup_{i,j=1}^{\infty} O_{ij} \quad (5)$$

where

$$O_{ij} := B((i, j), 1). \quad (6)$$

Then we see that each  $(i, j) \in E$  satisfies  $(i, j) \in O_{ij}$  but

$$\forall (k, l) \neq (i, j) \quad (i, j) \notin O_{kl}. \quad (7)$$

Therefore any finite covering can only cover finitely many points in  $E$  and cannot cover  $E$ .  $\square$

**Question 3.** Let  $\mathbf{f}: \mathbb{R}^N \mapsto \mathbb{R}^M$  be continuous. Let  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$ .

- Prove that  $\mathbf{f}(\overline{A}) \subseteq \overline{\mathbf{f}(A)}$ ;

- b) Give an example where  $\mathbf{f}(\overline{A}) \subset \overline{\mathbf{f}(A)}$  (that is  $\mathbf{f}(\overline{A}) \subseteq \overline{\mathbf{f}(A)}$  but  $\mathbf{f}(\overline{A}) \neq \overline{\mathbf{f}(A)}$ ).
- c) What is the weakest additional assumption on  $E$  you can find that guarantees  $\mathbf{f}(\overline{A}) = \overline{\mathbf{f}(A)}$  for all continuous  $\mathbf{f}$ ? Justify your answer.

**Solution.**

a) Take any  $\mathbf{y}_0 \in \mathbf{f}(\overline{A})$ . Then there is  $\mathbf{x} \in \overline{A}$  such that  $\mathbf{y}_0 = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ . Two cases:

1.  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in A$ . Then  $\mathbf{y}_0 \in \mathbf{f}(A) \subseteq \overline{\mathbf{f}(A)}$ ;
2.  $\mathbf{x}_0 \notin A$ . Then we claim that for every  $r > 0$ ,  $B(\mathbf{x}_0, r) \cap A \neq \emptyset$ . To see this, assume otherwise. Then there is  $r_0 > 0$  such that  $B(\mathbf{x}_0, r_0) \cap A = \emptyset \implies A \subseteq B(\mathbf{x}_0, r_0)^c$ . Now we have  $A \subseteq \overline{A} \cap B(\mathbf{x}_0, r_0)^c \subset \overline{A}$ . Note that the middle set is closed. This contradicts the definition of closure as the intersection of all closed sets containing  $A$ .

Since  $\mathbf{f}$  is continuous, for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0\| < \delta \implies \|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0)\| < \varepsilon$ . We know that  $B(\mathbf{x}_0, \delta) \cap A \neq \emptyset$  therefore  $\mathbf{f}(A) \cap B(\mathbf{y}_0, \varepsilon) \neq \emptyset$ . This is true for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , so  $\mathbf{y}_0 \in \overline{\mathbf{f}(A)}$ .

b) Consider

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = e^{-\|\mathbf{x}\|}. \quad (8)$$

and  $\overline{A} = A = \mathbb{R}^N$  and  $f(A) = (0, 1]$ .

c) The weakest addition condition is “ $\overline{A}$  is compact”.

- If  $\overline{A}$  is further compact, then  $\mathbf{f}(\overline{A}) = \overline{\mathbf{f}(A)}$ .

Since  $\mathbf{f}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{f}(\overline{A})$ , all we need to show is  $\mathbf{f}(\overline{A})$  is closed. By Heine-Borel it suffices to show  $\mathbf{f}(\overline{A})$  is compact. Let  $W$  be an open covering of  $\mathbf{f}(\overline{A})$ . Then

$$W' := \{\mathbf{f}^{-1}(O) \mid O \in W\} \quad (9)$$

is an open covering of  $\overline{A}$ . By compactness there is a subcovering

$$\overline{A} \subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^n \mathbf{f}^{-1}(O_k). \quad (10)$$

Now this gives

$$\mathbf{f}(\overline{A}) \subseteq \mathbf{f}(\bigcup_{k=1}^n \mathbf{f}^{-1}(O_k)) \subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^n \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{f}^{-1}(O_k)) \subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^n O_k. \quad (11)$$

This is a finite covering of  $\mathbf{f}(\overline{A})$ .

- Now we show that if  $\mathbf{f}(\overline{A}) = \overline{\mathbf{f}(A)}$  for all continuous  $\mathbf{f}$ , then  $\overline{A}$  must be compact.

Assume otherwise. By Heine-Borel,  $\overline{A}$  is not bounded. We claim that  $A$  is not bounded either. Assume otherwise, then there is  $R > 0$  such that  $A \subseteq B(\mathbf{0}, R)$ . Since  $\overline{A}$  is not bounded, there is  $\mathbf{x} \in \overline{A}$  such that  $\|\mathbf{x}\| > R + 1$ . Note that  $\mathbf{x} \notin A$ . Now consider the set

$$B := \overline{A} \cap B(\mathbf{x}, 1)^c. \quad (12)$$

Then clearly

1.  $B$  is closed;
2.  $A \subseteq B \subset \overline{A}$ .

This contradicts the fact that  $\overline{A}$  is the intersection of all closed sets containing  $A$ .

Now define  $f(\mathbf{x}) := \exp(-\|\mathbf{x}\|)$  and obviously  $0 \in \overline{f(A)}$  but  $0 \notin f(\overline{A})$ .

**Remark.** Sets  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$  satisfying  $\overline{A}$  is compact are called “precompact”.

**Question 4.** Let  $f(x, y, z) = x^2 + y^2 + z^2$ . Prove by definition that  $f$  is differentiable at  $(1, 1, 1)$  and find its differential there.

**Proof.** Guess  $Df(1, 1, 1)(u, v, w) = 2u + 2v + 2w$ .

Now set  $x = 1 + u$ ,  $y = 1 + v$ ,  $z = 1 + w$  and check

$$\frac{|f(x, y, z) - f(1, 1, 1) - (2u + 2v + 2w)|}{(u^2 + v^2 + w^2)^{1/2}} = \frac{u^2 + v^2 + w^2}{(u^2 + v^2 + w^2)^{1/2}} = (u^2 + v^2 + w^2)^{1/2}. \quad (13)$$

Thus

$$\lim_{(u, v, w) \rightarrow (0, 0, 0)} \frac{|f(x, y, z) - f(1, 1, 1) - (2u + 2v + 2w)|}{(u^2 + v^2 + w^2)^{1/2}} = 0 \quad (14)$$

and the proof ends.  $\square$

**Question 5.** Let  $f(x, y, z) = y^2 z + \sin(5xy)$ . Calculate its three partial derivatives.

**Solution.** We have

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x, y, z) = 5y \cos(5xy), \quad \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, y, z) = 2yz + 5x \cos(5xy), \quad \frac{\partial f}{\partial z}(x, y, z) = y^2. \quad (15)$$

**Question 6.** Let  $f(x, y) = |x + y|$ . Find all directions  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^3$  such that  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{v}}$  exists. Justify your answer. Note that the answer may be different at different points  $(x, y)$ .

**Solution.** There are two cases.  $x + y = 0$  and  $x + y \neq 0$ . We denote  $\mathbf{v} = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix}$ .

1.  $x + y = 0$ . In this case  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{v}}(x, y)$  exists if and only if  $u + v = 0$ .

- If. In this case we have

$$f((x, y) + h(u, v)) = f(x, y) \quad (16)$$

so obviously

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{v}}(x, y) = 0. \quad (17)$$

- Only if. We show that if  $u + v \neq 0$ , then  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{v}}(x, y)$  does not exist.

Wlog assume  $u + v > 0$ . Then since  $x + y = 0$ , we have

$$f((x, y) + h(u, v)) = \begin{cases} h(u + v) & h > 0 \\ -h(u + v) & h < 0 \end{cases} = |h|(u + v) \quad (18)$$

The limit

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{|h|(u + v)}{h} \quad (19)$$

doesn't exist.

2.  $x + y \neq 0$ . In this case  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{v}}(x, y)$  for all directions  $\mathbf{v}$ .

Wlog assume  $x + y =: \delta > 0$ . Now for all  $|h| < \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{2}\|\mathbf{v}\|}$ , we have by Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$|u + v| = |1 \cdot u + 1 \cdot v| \leq \sqrt{2} (u^2 + v^2)^{1/2}. \quad (20)$$

This gives

$$|hu + hv| \leq \sqrt{2} |h| \|\mathbf{v}\| < \delta \quad (21)$$

and consequently

$$(x + hu) + (y + hv) > 0 \implies f(x + hu, y + hv) = (x + hu) + (y + hv). \quad (22)$$

Thus

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x + hu, y + hv) - f(x, y)}{h} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} (u + v) = u + v. \quad (23)$$