

**Graded Homework IX**  
Due Monday, November 13.

1. Let  $(u_n)$  be a sequence of real numbers. We say that  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  is an *accumulation point* of  $(u_n)$  if there exists a subsequence of  $(u_n)$  which converges to  $a$ .

(a) What are the accumulation points of a convergent sequence?

(b) What are the accumulation points of the sequence  $u_n = \cos(n\frac{\pi}{3})$ ?

(c) Let  $(u_n)$  be a bounded, divergent sequence. Prove that it has at least two (distinct) accumulation points (Hint : why does there exist one accumulation point? Can you use the fact that this point is not the limit of  $(u_n)$ ?)

**Correction.** (a) If a sequence is convergent to a limit  $l$ , then all its subsequences are convergent to that same limit, so a convergent sequence has exactly one accumulation point : its limit.

(b) One can see that for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  one has  $u_{6n} = 1$ ,  $u_{6n+1} = \cos(\frac{\pi}{3}) = \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $u_{6n+2} = \cos(\frac{2\pi}{3}) = -\frac{1}{2}$ ,  $u_{6n+3} = \cos(\pi) = -1$ ,  $u_{6n+4} = \cos(\frac{4\pi}{3}) = -\frac{1}{2}$ , and  $u_{6n+5} = \cos(\frac{5\pi}{3}) = \frac{1}{2}$ . Thus,  $1, \frac{1}{2}, -1, -\frac{1}{2}$  are accumulation points of  $(u_n)$ . Conversely, if  $\varphi: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is any strictly increasing map, there exists at least one  $k = 0, 1, \dots, 5$  and infinitely many  $n$  such that  $\varphi(n) = 6m+k$  (because  $\mathbb{N}$  is infinite and for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  the remainder of its euclidean division by 6 is in the set  $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ , and if an infinite set is the union of six subsets then at least one of these subsets is infinite). This implies that any subsequence of  $(u_n)$  has a further subsequence which is also a subsequence of  $(u_{n+k})$  for some  $k = 0, 1, \dots, 5$  (there may be more than one such  $k$ ). But then, if  $(u_{\varphi(n)})$  is convergent, its limit has to be the same as that of any of its subsequences, so that  $\lim(u_{\varphi(n)}) \in \{1, -1, \frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}\}$ ; this shows that these are the only accumulation points of  $(u_n)$ .

(c) The Bolzano-Weierstrass theorem tells us that  $(u_n)$  has a convergent subsequence, with limit  $l$  (so it has at least one accumulation point) because it is a bounded sequence. Since we are told that  $(u_n)$  is not convergent, it cannot be convergent to  $l$  : this means that there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that for any  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  there is  $n \geq K$  such that  $|u_n - l| \geq \varepsilon$ . One can then use this to build a subsequence  $(x_{n_k})$  of  $(x_n)$  with the property that  $|x_{n_k} - l| \geq \varepsilon$ . Indeed, one can pick any  $n_1$  such that  $|x_{n_1} - l| \geq \varepsilon$ ; assume now that  $n_1, \dots, n_k$  have been defined. Applying the above property for  $K = n_k + 1$ , we get that there exists some  $n \geq K$  such that  $|x_n - l| \geq \varepsilon$ ; pick some such  $n$ , set  $n_{k+1} = n$ , and go on to the next step.

So, we just proved that there exists a subsequence  $(x_{\varphi(n)})$  of  $(x_n)$  with the property that  $|x_{\varphi(n)} - l| \geq \varepsilon$ ; since it is bounded,  $(x_{\varphi(n)})$  has a convergent subsequence, and its limit  $l'$  has to satisfy  $|l' - l| \geq \varepsilon$ . But  $l'$  is an accumulation point of  $(x_n)$ , so we proved that a bounded divergent sequence of reals has at least two accumulation points.

*Remark.* The sequence may have just two accumulation points, as shown by the sequence defined by  $x_n = (-1)^n$ , or it may have any finite number of accumulation points (can you build an example?), or countably many accumulation points, or even uncountably many (for instance, a whole interval of accumulation points). That being said, not just any set can be a set of accumulation points for a given sequence; sets with this property are the *closed* subsets of the real line, and are an important class of subsets of the real line.

2. We define a sequence by setting  $u_1 = \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $u_{n+1} = 1 - u_n^2$ . Show that  $(u_{2n})$  is increasing,  $u_{2n+1}$  is decreasing and both sequences are convergent. Show that  $(u_n)$  is divergent.

**Correction.** The function  $f: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  defined by  $f(x) = 1 - x^2$  is decreasing. So  $f \circ f$  is increasing, and we know (it was in the last homework assignment) that the sequences  $u_{2n}$ ,  $u_{2n-1}$  are monotone. One has  $u_1 = \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $u_2 = \frac{3}{4}$ ,  $u_3 = \frac{7}{16}$  and  $u_4 = \frac{207}{256}$ . We then see that  $u_2 < u_4$ ,  $u_1 > u_3$ . Since  $(u_{2n-1})$ ,  $(u_{2n})$  are known to be monotone, this proves that  $(u_{2n})$  is increasing, and  $(u_{2n-1})$  (hence  $(u_{2n+1})$ ) is decreasing. To compute the

limits  $l, l'$  of  $(u_{2n}), (u_{2n+1})$ , we use the inductive definition of the sequences to obtain  $l = 1 - (1 - l^2)^2 = 2l^2 - l^4$ . Thus we get  $l(l^3 - 2l + 1) = 0$ , or  $l(l - 1)(l^2 + l - 1) = 0$ . Using the fact that  $l$  is between 0 and 1, we obtain that  $l$  is equal to 0, 1 or  $\frac{\sqrt{3} - 1}{2}$ . Since  $u_{2n}$  is increasing, and  $u_2 = \frac{3}{4}$ , the only possible limit for  $(u_{2n})$  is  $l = 1$ . But then, since  $u_{2n+1} = 1 - u_{2n}^2$ , algebraic manipulation of limits yields  $l' = 1 - l^2 = 0$ . Since two sequences of  $(u_n)$  converge to different limits, we see that  $(u_n)$  is not convergent.

3. Let  $a, b$  be two reals different from 0. We define a sequence  $(u_n)$  by setting  $u_1 = u \neq 0, u_{n+1} = a + \frac{b}{u_n}$ . We assume that  $u$  is chosen in such a way that  $u_n \neq 0$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

(a) What are the possible limits for  $(u_n)$ ?

(b) We suppose that the equation  $x^2 = ax + b$  has two distinct solutions  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$  and that  $\alpha < \beta$ . Prove that the sequence defined by  $v_n = \frac{u_n - \alpha}{u_n - \beta}$  is geometric (i.e.  $\frac{v_{n+1}}{v_n}$  is constant) and use this to determine the limit of  $(u_n)$  (depending on  $u$ ).

**Correction.** (a) If  $(u_n)$  was convergent to a limit  $l$ , then  $u_{n+1}$  would be convergent to the same limit. Thus one would have  $l = a + \frac{b}{l}$ , in other words a possible limit  $l$  of  $(u_n)$  has to be a solution of the equation  $l^2 = al + b$ .

(b) If  $\alpha < \beta$  are solutions of the equation  $x^2 = ax + b$ , then they are different from 0 (because  $b \neq 0$ ) and one has  $a = \alpha - \frac{b}{\alpha} = \beta - \frac{b}{\beta}$ . Thus,

$$v_{n+1} = \frac{u_{n+1} - \alpha}{u_{n+1} - \beta} = \frac{a + \frac{b}{u_n} - \alpha}{a + \frac{b}{u_n} - \beta} = \frac{\alpha - \frac{b}{\alpha} + \frac{b}{u_n} - \alpha}{\beta - \frac{b}{\beta} + \frac{b}{u_n} - \beta} = \frac{b \frac{\alpha - u_n}{u_n \alpha}}{b \frac{\beta - u_n}{u_n \beta}} = \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \cdot \frac{u_n - \alpha}{u_n - \beta} = \frac{\beta}{\alpha} v_n.$$

Thus, we obtain  $v_n = \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)^n v_1$ .

Now, there are several possibilities :

- $\left|\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right| < 1$ ; then we get that  $(v_n)$  converges to 0 no matter what  $v_1$  is, thus  $\frac{u_n - \alpha}{u_n - \beta}$  converges to 0, and this is only possible if  $(u_n)$  converges to  $\alpha$ ; since  $(v_n)$  is defined only if  $u \neq \beta$ , in which case  $u_n = \beta$  for all  $n$ , we get that either  $(u_n)$  is constant equal to  $\beta$  (if  $u = \beta$ ), or it converges to  $\alpha$  (in all the other cases).

- $\left|\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right| > 1$ ; then we see that  $|v_n|$  diverges to  $+\infty$  (provided that  $v_1 \neq 0$ ), and this is possible only if  $u_n$  converges to  $\beta$  (this is the same argument as before : indeed  $\frac{1}{v_n}$  converges to 0, so  $(u_n)$  converges to  $\beta$ ). Thus either  $(u_n)$  is constant equal to  $\alpha$  (if  $u = \alpha$ ) or is convergent to  $\beta$  (in all the other cases).

- $\alpha = -\beta$ ; then we get  $v_n = (-1)^{n+1} v_1$ , so  $(u_n)$  is not convergent unless one has  $u = \alpha$  or  $u = \beta$ , in which case the sequence  $(u_n)$  is constant ; in all the other cases the sequence  $(u_n)$  is not convergent.

4. Pick  $0 < x_1 < y_1$  and define two sequences  $(x_n), (y_n)$  by setting  $\begin{cases} x_{n+1} = \frac{x_n^2}{x_n + y_n} \\ y_{n+1} = \frac{y_n^2}{x_n + y_n} \end{cases}$ . Show that these sequences are convergent and compute their limit.

**Correction.** First, one can prove by induction that for all  $n$  one has  $x_n > 0, y_n > 0$  : it is true for  $n = 1$ , and if it is true for some  $n$  then  $x_{n+1} = \frac{x_n^2}{x_n + y_n} > 0, y_{n+1} = \frac{y_n^2}{x_n + y_n} > 0$ . But then for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  one has

$x_n + y_n > x_n$  and  $x_n + y_n > y_n$ , hence  $x_{n+1} = \frac{x_n^2}{x_n + y_n} < \frac{x_n^2}{x_n} = x_n$ , and similarly  $y_{n+1} = \frac{y_n^2}{x_n + y_n} < y_n$ .

This shows that the two sequences  $(x_n), (y_n)$  are decreasing; since they are bounded below by 0, we know that the sequences are convergent (let us call their respective limits  $x, y$ ). The problem is now to find enough information from the definition of the sequences to determine  $x, y$ . First, we can write that  $x_n(x_n + y_n) = x_n^2$ , which yields  $x(x + y) = x^2$ , or  $xy = 0$ . Thus,  $x = 0$  or  $y = 0$ . Going back to the definition of our sequences, we see (again, an easy induction proof works) that  $x_n < y_n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ; this implies that  $x \leq y$ . Since both  $x, y \geq 0, xy = 0$  is only possible if  $x = 0$ . We have now determined one of the limits (this was the easy one); the problem is to find some information about the other one. The definition of  $y_{n+1}$  only yields again that  $x = 0$ , so we need to do something more, using the definition of the sequences; here, one has, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , that

$x_{n+1} - y_{n+1} = \frac{x_n^2 - y_n^2}{x_n + y_n} = x_n - y_n$ . Thus, the sequence  $(x_n - y_n)$  is a constant sequence, so  $x_n - y_n = x_1 - y_1$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . But then, the algebraic theorems about limits give us  $x - y = x_1 - y_1$ , and since  $x = 0$  we get  $y = y_1 - x_1$ .

*Remark.* Actually one could have proved that  $\frac{x_n}{y_n} = \left(\frac{x_1}{y_1}\right)^{2^n}$  (why?) and then obtained, using the fact that  $x_n - y_n$  is constant, a formula for  $x_n, y_n$ .