University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Math 444

## Graded Homework VII Correction.

1. Let  $u_n$  be the sequence defined by  $u_1 = \sqrt{2}$ ,  $u_2 = \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{2}}$ ,  $u_n = \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{2 + \dots \sqrt{2}}}$ . (a) Give an induction formula  $u_{n+1} = f(u_n)$  defining  $u_{n+1}$  as a function of  $u_n$ .

(b) Prove that  $(u_n)$  is convergent and compute its limit (hint : show that  $(u_n)$  is increasing and bounded above by 2).

**Correction.** (a) One has  $u_{n+1} = \sqrt{2+u_n}$ .

(b) Let us prove by induction that  $u_n \leq u_{n+1}$ : one has  $u_2 = \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{2}} \geq \sqrt{2} = u_1$ , so this is true if n = 1. Assuming that  $u_n \leq u_{n+1}$ , one has  $u_{n+2} = \sqrt{2 + u_{n+1}} \geq \sqrt{2 + u_n} = u_{n+1}$ , so the statement  $u_{n+1} \geq u_n$  is true for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Now, let us prove by induction that  $u_n \leq 2$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  : this is true for n = 1, and if  $u_n \leq 2$  then  $u_{n+1} = \sqrt{2+u_n} \le \sqrt{2+2} = 2$ . This shows that  $u_n \le 2$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

We proved that  $(u_n)$  is an increasing, bounded above sequence : therefore  $(u_n)$  is convergent.

Let  $l = \lim(u_n)$ ; then  $(\sqrt{2+u_n})$  is convergent and has limit  $\sqrt{2+l}$  (using an easy result proved in the textbook), so we obtain that  $l = \sqrt{2+l}$ . Thus  $l^2 = 2+l$ , and this implies that l = 2 or l = -1. Yet, since  $u_n \ge 0$  for all n, so  $\lim(u_n)$  must be  $\ge 0$ ; thus it is impossible that l = -1. This means that l = 2, so  $\lim(u_n) = 2.$ 

(Read the correction of this exercise carefully : we prove first that  $(u_n)$  converges. Then, using the definition of the sequence, we get that the only possible limits are 2 and -1; using the fact that the sequence is nonnegative we remark that -1 is not a possible limit. Since  $(u_n)$  has a limit, and only one limit is possible, we finally get  $\lim(u_n) = 2.$ 

2. Show that the sequences defined by the formulas  $u_n = \frac{1}{n} + \cos(\frac{n\pi}{3})$  and  $v_n = \frac{(-1)^n n^2 + n}{3n^2 + n}$  are not convergent.

**Correction.** One has  $u_{6n} = \frac{1}{6n} + \cos(2n\pi) = \frac{1}{6n} + 1$ , so  $(u_{6n})$  converges to 1. Similarly, one obtains

 $u_{6n+3} = \frac{1}{3n+3} - 1$ , so  $(u_{6n+3})$  converges to -1. Thus  $(u_n)$  has two subsequences which converge to different

3n+3limits, and this proves that  $(u_n)$  is not convergent. One has  $v_{2n} = \frac{(2n)^2 + 2n}{3(2n)^2 + 2n} = \frac{1 + \frac{1}{2n}}{3 + \frac{1}{2n}}$ , so  $(v_{2n})$  converges to  $\frac{1}{3}$ . A similar computation yields that  $(v_{2n+1})$ converges to  $-\frac{1}{3}$ ; as above, this is enough to show that  $(v_n)$  is not convergent.

3. Recall that we saw in class that if  $(u_n)$  is a sequence of real numbers such that  $(u_{2n+1})$  and  $(u_{2n})$  converge to the same limit l then  $(u_n)$  is convergent and  $\lim(u_n) = l$ .

(a) Use the same method to show that if  $(u_n)$  is a sequence of real numbers such that  $(u_{3n})$ ,  $(u_{3n+1})$  and  $(u_{3n+2})$  converge to the same limit l, then  $(u_n)$  is convergent and  $\lim(u_n) = l$ .

(b) Let  $(u_n)$  be a sequence of real numbers such that  $(u_{2n})$ ,  $(u_{2n+1})$  and  $(u_{3n})$  are all convergent; show that  $(u_n)$  is convergent (Hint : use the fact that  $(u_{3n})$  converges to prove that  $(u_{2n})$  and  $(u_{2n+1})$  converge to the same limit, then use the result seen in class).

**Correction.** (a) Call *l* the common limit of the three sequences  $(u_{3n})$ ,  $(u_{3n+1})$  and  $(u_{3n+3})$ . Pick  $\varepsilon > 0$ ; we know that there exist  $M_1, M_2, M_3$  such that  $n \ge M_1 \Rightarrow |u_{3n} - l| \le \varepsilon$ ,  $n \ge M_2 \Rightarrow |u_{3n+1} - l| \le \varepsilon$  and  $n \ge M_3 \Rightarrow |u_{3n+2} - l| \le \varepsilon$ . Let then  $M = 3M_1 + 3M_2 + 3M_3$ , and pick  $n \ge M$ . We either have n = 3k with  $k \ge M_1$ , or n = 3k + 1 with  $k \ge M_2$ , or 3k + 2 with  $k \ge M_3$ ; in any case we get  $|u_n - l| \le \varepsilon$ . This proves that  $(u_n)$  converges to l.

(b) Let l, l', l'' denote the limits of  $u_{2n}$ ,  $u_{2n+1}$  and  $u_{3n}$  (in that order). Then  $u_{6n} = u_{2(3n)}$ , so  $(u_{6n})$  is a

subsequence of  $(u_{2n})$ , which proves that  $(u_{6n})$  converges to l. But  $(u_{6n})$  is also a subsequence of  $(u_{3n})$  (why?), so it converges to l''. Since the limit of a sequence is unique, this yields l = l'. In the same way, one sees that  $(u_{6n+3})$  is a subsequence of both  $(u_{3n})$  and  $(u_{2n+1})$ , so their limits are equal and l' = l''.

Putting all this together, we obtain l = l', so  $(u_{2n})$  and  $(u_{2n+1})$  converge to the same limit, and we saw in class that this implies that  $(u_n)$  is convergent.

4. Given a sequence  $(u_n)$  of reals numbers, define another sequence  $s_n$  by the formula  $\frac{u_1 + u_2 + \ldots + u_n}{n}$ . (a) Here we assume that  $(u_n)$  is convergent and  $\lim(u_n) = 0$ . Show that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $z \geq N$ . that for all  $n \geq N$  one has

$$|s_n| \leq \frac{|u_1 + u_2 + \dots + u_N|}{n} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Use this to prove that  $\lim(s_n) = 0$ .

(HInt : for the inequality, pick some suitable N and then cut the sum in two parts; use the triangle inequality, and the fact that the sum of n-N reals having each an absolute value less than  $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$  has an absolute value less

that  $(n-N)\frac{c}{2}$ )

(b) Show that if  $(u_n)$  is convergent and  $\lim(u_n) = l$  then  $(s_n)$  is convergent and  $\lim(s_n) = l$ . (Hint : apply the result of question (a) to the sequence  $(u_n - l)$ )

(c) Show that the converse of this assertion is not true (look at what happens if  $(u_n) = (-1)^n$  for instance). **Correction.** (a) Pick  $\varepsilon > 0$ ; since  $\lim(u_n) = 0$ , we know that there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $n \ge N \Rightarrow |u_n| \le \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ (apply the definition of convergence with  $\varepsilon' = \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ . Then, for  $n \ge N$ , one has

$$|s_n| = \left|\frac{u_1 + u_2 + \ldots + u_n}{n}\right| \le \left|\frac{u_1 + u_2 + \ldots + u_N}{n}\right| + \frac{|u_{N+1}| + \ldots + |u_n|}{n} \le \frac{|u_1 + u_2 + \ldots + u_N|}{n} + \frac{(n-N)}{n}\frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Thus, we finally obtain that for  $n \ge N$  one has  $|s_n| \le \frac{1}{n} \frac{|u_1 + u_2 + \dots + u_N|}{1} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ .

Now pick  $\varepsilon > 0$  and find  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  as above; the sequence  $\frac{1}{n}(|u_1 + u_2 + \dots + u_N|)$  converges to 0, so for some  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  big enough one has  $n \ge M \Rightarrow \frac{1}{n}(|u_1| + |u_2| + \dots |u_N|) \le \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ . But then, the inequality above shows that, for any  $n \ge \max(M, N)$  one has  $|s_n| \le \varepsilon$ .

This proves that  $(s_n)$  converges to 0 if  $(u_n)$  converges to 0.

(b) If  $(u_n)$  converges to l, then  $(u_n - l)$  converges to 0; therefore the result of the preceding question tells us that  $\frac{(u_1) - l + (u_2 - l) + \dots + (u_n - l)}{n}$  converges to 0. But one has

$$\frac{(u_1-l)+(u_2-l)+\dots(u_n-l)}{n} = \frac{u_1+u_2+\dots+u_n-nl}{n} = \frac{u_1+u_2+\dots+u_n}{n} - l = s_n - l \; .$$

So, the result of question (a) tells us that  $(s_n - l)$  converges to 0, in other words that  $(s_n)$  is convergent and  $\lim(s_n) = l$ 

(c) If  $u_n = (-1)^n$ , then  $s_n = \frac{(-1)^n - 1}{2n}$  (proved by induction) so  $(s_n)$  converges to 0, whereas  $(u_n)$  does not converge. This means that the converse of the assertion in (b) is not true.

5. Show that a subsequence of a Cauchy sequence is also a Cauchy sequence.

**Correction.** Let  $\varphi \colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$  be strictly increasing, and let  $(u_n)$  be a Cauchy sequence. Pick  $\varepsilon > 0$ ; we know that there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for any  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $n, m \ge N \Rightarrow |u_n - u_m| \le \varepsilon$ . Since  $\varphi(n) \ge n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we get that

$$n, m \ge N \Rightarrow \varphi(n), \varphi(m) \ge N \Rightarrow |u_{\varphi(n)} - u_{\varphi(m)}| \le \varepsilon$$

This proves that  $(u_{\varphi(n)})$  is a Cauchy sequence.