

## MATH 140A – MOCK MIDTERM 2 – SOLUTIONS

1. **STEP 1** By assumption with  $r = 1$ , we know that  $(s - 1, s + 1)$  has infinitely many terms of  $(s_n)$ , hence it must include at least one term, let's call it  $s_{n_1}$ . Hence  $s_{n_1} \in (s - 1, s + 1)$

**STEP 2** Suppose you defined  $s_{n_1}, s_{n_2}, \dots, s_{n_k}$  with  $n_1 < n_2 < \dots < n_k$  such that  $s_{n_j} \in \left(s - \frac{1}{j}, s + \frac{1}{j}\right)$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, k$

By assumption with  $r = \frac{1}{k+1}$ ,  $\left(s - \frac{1}{k+1}, s + \frac{1}{k+1}\right)$  has infinitely many terms of  $(s_n)$ , hence it must include at least one term different from  $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{n_k}$ . Let's call that term  $s_{n_{k+1}}$ . So  $s_{n_{k+1}} \in \left(s - \frac{1}{k+1}, s + \frac{1}{k+1}\right)$  and  $n_{k+1} > n_k$  because otherwise  $s_{n_{k+1}}$  would be one of the terms  $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{n_k} \Rightarrow \Leftarrow \checkmark$

**STEP 3** Therefore we have constructed a subsequence  $(s_{n_k})$  such that  $s_{n_k} \in \left(s - \frac{1}{k}, s + \frac{1}{k}\right)$  for all  $k$ , so  $|s_{n_k} - s| < \frac{1}{k}$ .

**Claim:**  $s_{n_k} \rightarrow s$

Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be given, let  $K = \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ , then if  $k > K$ , we have:

$$|s_{n_k} - s| < \frac{1}{k} < \frac{1}{K} = \frac{1}{\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)} = \epsilon \quad \square$$

**2. STEP 1:** Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be such that  $\alpha < \alpha + \epsilon < 1$ . Then, by assumption

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |a_n|^{\frac{1}{n}} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup \left\{ |a_n|^{\frac{1}{n}} \mid n > N \right\} = \alpha$$

By definition of a limit, this means that there is  $N_1$  such that if  $N > N_1$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sup \left\{ |a_n|^{\frac{1}{n}} \mid n > N \right\} - \alpha \right| < \epsilon &\Rightarrow \sup \left\{ |a_n|^{\frac{1}{n}} \mid n > N \right\} - \alpha < \epsilon \\ &\Rightarrow \sup \left\{ |a_n|^{\frac{1}{n}} \mid n > N \right\} < \alpha + \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Since this is true for all  $N > N_1$ , it is in particular true for *some*  $N$ . By definition of sup, this means that for all  $n > N$ , we have:  $|a_n|^{\frac{1}{n}} < \alpha + \epsilon$

**STEP 2:** But then, if  $n > N$ , we have:  $|a_n| < (\alpha + \epsilon)^n$

Therefore

$$\sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} |a_n| \leq \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} (\alpha + \epsilon)^n = \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} r^n$$

But the latter is just a geometric series with  $r = \alpha + \epsilon < 1$ , so converges, and therefore, by the comparison test,  $\sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} |a_n|$  converges, and so

$$\sum |a_n| = |a_1| + |a_2| + \cdots + |a_N| + \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} |a_n| \text{ converges}$$

Hence  $\sum |a_n|$  converges, so  $\sum a_n$  converges absolutely.  $\square$

**3. STEP 1:** Let  $(x^{(n)}) = (x_1^n, x_2^n)$  be a Cauchy sequence in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Then for all  $\epsilon > 0$  there is  $N$  such that if  $m, n > N$

$$d\left(x^{(n)}, x^{(m)}\right) = |x_1^n - x_1^m| + |x_2^n - x_2^m| < \epsilon$$

But then, in particular, if  $m, n > N$ , then

$$|x_1^n - x_1^m| \leq |x_1^n - x_1^m| + |x_2^n - x_2^m| < \epsilon$$

And

$$|x_2^n - x_2^m| \leq |x_1^n - x_1^m| + |x_2^n - x_2^m| < \epsilon$$

So  $(x_1^n)$  and  $(x_2^n)$  are Cauchy sequences in  $\mathbb{R}$

**STEP 2:** Therefore, since  $\mathbb{R}$  is complete,  $(x_1^n)$  and  $(x_2^n)$  converge to some  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Let  $x = (x_1, x_2)$

**STEP 3: Claim:**  $(x^{(n)})$  converges to  $x$ .

Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be given, then since  $x_1^n \rightarrow x_1$  there is  $N_1$  such that if  $n > N_1$ , then  $|x_1^n - x_1| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$

And since  $x_2^n \rightarrow x_2$  there is  $N_2$  such that if  $n > N_2$ , then  $|x_2^n - x_2| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$

Now let  $N = \max\{N_1, N_2\}$ , then if  $n > N$ , we get:

$$d\left(x^{(n)}, x\right) = |x_1^n - x_1| + |x_2^n - x_2| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon \quad \square$$

**4. STEP 1:** Let's show  $\overline{E^c} \subseteq (E^\circ)^c$

Suppose  $x \in \overline{E^c}$ , then there is a sequence  $(s_n)$  in  $E^c$  that converges to  $x$ . Since  $s_n \in E^c$ , we must have  $s_n \notin E$

Since  $s_n \rightarrow x$ , for all  $r > 0$  there is  $N$  such that if  $n > N$ , then  $d(s_n, x) < r \Rightarrow s_n \in B(x, r)$

But then this means that for all  $r > 0$ ,  $B(x, r) \not\subseteq E$  because  $B(x, r)$  contains at least one element  $s_n$  that is not in  $E$ .

So by definition of  $E^\circ$ ,  $x \notin E^\circ$ , so  $x \in (E^\circ)^c$  ✓

**STEP 2:** Let's show  $(E^\circ)^c \subseteq \overline{E^c}$ .

Suppose  $x \in (E^\circ)^c$ , so  $x \notin E^\circ$ , and therefore for every  $r > 0$ ,  $B(x, r) \not\subseteq E$ , which means for every  $r > 0$ ,  $B(x, r)$  must contain at least one element not in  $E$ .

But with  $r = \frac{1}{n}$ , this means that  $B(x, \frac{1}{n})$  must contain at least one element, call it  $s_n$  in  $E^c$ .

**Claim:**  $s_n \rightarrow x$

Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be given, let  $N = \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ , then if  $n > N$ , we have

$$d(s_n, x) < \frac{1}{n} < \frac{1}{N} = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\epsilon}} = \epsilon$$

(the first inequality follows from  $s_n \in B(x, \frac{1}{n})$ )

But then, since  $(s_n)$  is a sequence in  $E^c$  that converges to  $x$ , we get  $x \in \overline{E^c}$  ✓ □

4. (a) Let  $E$  and  $F$  be compact subsets of  $S$ , and suppose  $\mathcal{U}$  is an open cover of  $E \cup F$ . We want to show that  $\mathcal{U}$  has a finite sub-cover.

But since  $E \subseteq E \cup F$ ,  $\mathcal{U}$  covers  $E$ . Hence, since  $E$  is compact, there is a finite sub-cover  $\mathcal{V}_1 = \{U_1^1, \dots, U_{N_1}^1\}$  of  $\mathcal{U}$

Similarly, since  $F \subseteq E \cup F$ ,  $\mathcal{U}$  covers  $F$ . Hence, since  $F$  is compact, there is a finite sub-cover  $\mathcal{V}_2 = \{U_1^2, \dots, U_{N_2}^2\}$  of  $\mathcal{U}$

Let  $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_1 \cup \mathcal{V}_2$ , then  $\mathcal{V}$  is a subset of  $\mathcal{U}$  that has at most  $N_1 + N_2$  elements, hence is finite. Moreover,  $\mathcal{V}$  covers  $E \cup F$ , because if  $x \in E \cup F$ , then either  $x \in E$ , so there is  $U_k^1 \in \mathcal{V}$  with  $x \in U_k^1$ , or  $x \in F$ , so there is  $U_k^2 \in \mathcal{V}$  with  $x \in U_k^2$ .

Hence  $\mathcal{V}$  is a finite sub-cover of  $\mathcal{U}$ , and therefore  $\mathcal{U}$  has a finite sub-cover. Hence  $E \cup F$  is compact  $\square$

- (b) Suppose  $E$  and  $F$  are compact subsets of  $S$ , then in particular  $E$  and  $F$  are closed. But then  $E \cup F$  is closed, so  $E \cup F$  is a closed subset of a compact set  $S$ , and hence  $E \cup F$  is compact.