## Problem Set 1

1. (a) Compute the inner product $\left[\begin{array}{l}1 \\ 2 \\ 3\end{array}\right] \cdot\left[\begin{array}{c}-1 \\ 1 \\ 2\end{array}\right]$.

## Solution.

$$
\left[\begin{array}{l}
1 \\
2 \\
3
\end{array}\right] \cdot\left[\begin{array}{c}
-1 \\
1 \\
2
\end{array}\right]=1 \times(-1)+2 \times 1+3 \times 2=7
$$

(b) Two vectors are orthogonal to each other if their inner product is equal to 0 . Let $x=\left[\begin{array}{c}3 \\ -2 \\ -1\end{array}\right]$ and $y=\left[\begin{array}{c}1 \\ 0 \\ -1\end{array}\right]$. Find the scalar $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the inner product of $x-c y$ and $y$ is zero. Solution.

$$
\begin{gathered}
0=(x-c y) \cdot y=\left(\left[\begin{array}{c}
3 \\
-2 \\
-1
\end{array}\right]-c\left[\begin{array}{c}
1 \\
0 \\
-1
\end{array}\right]\right) \cdot\left[\begin{array}{c}
1 \\
0 \\
-1
\end{array}\right]=(3-c) \times 1+(-2) \times 0+(-1+c) \times(-1) \Longrightarrow \\
0=4-2 c \Longrightarrow c=2
\end{gathered}
$$

(c) Let $x=\left[\begin{array}{c}4 \\ -8 \\ 2\end{array}\right], e_{1}=\left[\begin{array}{l}1 \\ 0 \\ 0\end{array}\right]$ and $e_{2}=\left[\begin{array}{l}0 \\ 1 \\ 0\end{array}\right]$. Find scalars $c_{1}, c_{2} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the inner product of $x-c_{1} e_{1}-c_{2} e_{2}$ with any of the two vectors $e_{1}$ and $e_{2}$ is zero.

## Solution.

$$
\begin{gathered}
0=\left(x-c_{1} e_{1}-c_{2} e_{2}\right) \cdot e_{1}=\left[\begin{array}{c}
4-c_{1} \\
-8-c_{2} \\
2
\end{array}\right] \cdot\left[\begin{array}{l}
1 \\
0 \\
0
\end{array}\right]=\left(4-c_{1}\right) \Longrightarrow c_{1}=4 \\
0=\left(x-c_{1} e_{1}-c_{2} e_{2}\right) \cdot e_{2}=\left[\begin{array}{c}
4-c_{1} \\
-8-c_{2} \\
2
\end{array}\right] \cdot\left[\begin{array}{l}
0 \\
1 \\
0
\end{array}\right]=\left(-8-c_{2}\right) \Longrightarrow c_{2}=-8
\end{gathered}
$$

2. Suppose $\left\{a_{i}\right\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a non-decreasing sequence of real numbers. That is to say:

$$
a_{0} \leq a_{1} \leq a_{2} \leq \ldots
$$

We want to show any such sequence is convergent. Let $z$ denote the least upper bound of the set $\left\{a_{0}, a_{1}, a_{2}, \ldots\right\}$.
(i) Show that for any positive real number $\delta$, there is $N$ such that $z-\delta \leq a_{N} \leq z$.

Solution. Since $z$ is the least upper bound of the set $\left\{a_{0}, a_{1}, a_{2}, \ldots\right\}$, there is an element of this set, say $a_{N}$, which is larger than $z-\delta$. Otherwise, $z-\delta$ would be another upper bound for this set which contradicts the assumption that $z$ is the least upper bound. Clearly, $a_{N} \leq z$ because $z$ is an upper bound for the set $\left\{a_{0}, a_{1}, a_{2}, \ldots\right\}$. Thus the chosen $a_{N}$ satisfies the desired inequalities $z-\delta \leq a_{N} \leq z$.
(ii) Use the assumption on $\left\{a_{i}\right\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ and the definition of $N$ to show that for any $n \geq N$, we have $z-\delta \leq a_{n} \leq z$.

Solution. Let $n$ be greater than or equal to the integer $N$ obtained in the last part. Since the sequence $\left\{a_{0}, a_{1}, a_{2}, \ldots\right\}$ is increasing $a_{n} \geq a_{N}$. In particular, $a_{n} \geq z-\delta$. We again have $a_{n} \leq z$ because $z$ is an upper bound for the set $\left\{a_{0}, a_{1}, a_{2}, \ldots\right\}$. In summary, $z-\delta \leq a_{n} \leq z$.
(iii) Use the last part to conclude that the sequence is convergent to $z$.

Solution. Let $\delta>0$ be an arbitrary real number. By the definition of convergence, we need to find an integer $N_{0}$ such that for $n \geq N_{0}$ we have $\left|z-a_{n}\right| \leq \delta$. We let $N_{0}$ be the integer $N$ obtained in part (i). Then part (ii) shows our desired claim for any $n \geq N$.
3. We want to show that the following set does not have a least upper bound in the set of rational numbers

$$
A=\left\{\left.\frac{m}{n} \in \mathbb{Q} \right\rvert\,\left(\frac{m}{n}\right)^{2}<2\right\} .
$$

We assume that there is a least upper bound $z$ for this set and then we get a contradiction.
(i) Firstly let $z^{2}<2$. Show that $\frac{3 z+2}{z+3}$ is a rational number strictly larger than $z$ and $\left(\frac{3 z+2}{z+3}\right)^{2}<2$. Why is it impossible?

Solution. Since $z$ is a rational number, clearly $\frac{3 z+2}{z+3}$ is also a rational number.

$$
\frac{3 z+2}{z+3}-z=\frac{2 z+2-z^{2}-3 z}{z+3}=\frac{2-z^{2}}{z+3}>0
$$

where in the last inequality we use the fact that $z^{2}<2$. We also have:

$$
2-\left(\frac{3 z+2}{z+3}\right)^{2}=\frac{2 z^{2}+12 z+18-9 z^{2}-12 z-4}{z^{2}+6 z+9}=\frac{7\left(2-z^{2}\right)}{(z+3)^{2}}>0
$$

where the last inequality is again a consequence of $z^{2}<2$. This shows that $\frac{3 z+2}{z+3}$ belongs to the set $A$. On the other hand, it is greater than $z$, an upper bound for $A$, which is a contradiction.
(ii) If $z^{2}>2$, then show that $\frac{3 z+2}{z+3}$ is a positive rational number which is less than $z$ and is an upper bound for the set $A$. Why is it impossible?

Solution. Note that $0 \in A$ and hence $z$ is a non-negative number. Since $z$ is a non-negative rational number, $\frac{3 z+2}{z+3}$ is clearly a positive rational number.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{3 z+2}{z+3}-z=\frac{2 z+2-z^{2}-3 z}{z+3}=\frac{2-z^{2}}{z+3}<0 \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the last follows from $z^{2}>2$. We also have:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\frac{3 z+2}{z+3}\right)^{2}-2=\frac{9 z^{2}+12 z+4-2 z^{2}-12 z-18}{z^{2}+6 z+9}=\frac{7\left(z^{2}-2\right)}{(z+3)^{2}}>0 \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the last inequality is again a consequence of $z^{2}>2$. Inequality (2) and positivity of $\frac{3 z+2}{z+3}$ shows that $\frac{3 z+2}{z+3}$ is an upper bound for the set $A$. On the other hand, (1) asserts that this upper bound is strictly less than the least upper bound $z$, which is a contradiction.
(iii) Using the last two parts and the fact that there is no rational number which squares to 2 (no need to prove this fact), conclude that $A$ does not have a rational least upper bound $z$.

Solution. By the last two parts, $z^{2}$ cannot be greater than or smaller than 2 . Therefore, $z^{2}=2$ which is again impossible. Therefore, the initial assumption on the existence of the least upper bound in the set of rational numbers is wrong.
4. (i) Show that intersection of finitely many open sets is again an open set.

Solution. Suppose $U_{1}, U_{2}, \ldots, U_{k}$ are open sets in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$, and $x$ is an arbitrary point in the intersection $\bigcap_{i=1}^{k} U_{i}$. Since $x \in U_{i}$ and $U_{i}$ is open, there is $r_{i}>0$ such that $B_{r_{i}}(x) \subset U_{i}$. Define:

$$
r=\min \left(r_{1}, r_{2}, \ldots, r_{k}\right)
$$

Then we have:

$$
B_{r}(x) \subset B_{r_{i}}(x) \subset U_{i}
$$

Therefore, $B_{r}(x)$ is a subset of the intersection $\bigcap_{i=1}^{k} U_{i}$ and hence $x$ is an interior point of the intersection. This shows that $\bigcap_{i=1}^{k} U_{i}$ is an open set.
(ii) Find infinitely many open subsets $X_{1}, X_{2}, \ldots$ of $\mathbb{R}^{2}$ such that:

$$
\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} X_{i}
$$

is not an open set.
Solution. Take $X_{i}=B_{\frac{1}{i}(0)}$. Then $\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} X_{i}=\{0\}$. The single element set $\{0\}$ is not open because there is no ball centered at the origin 0 which is contained in the set $\{0\}$.

