

10.6 (a) Suppose  $(s_n)$  is a sequence s.t.  $|s_{n+1} - s_n| < 2^{-n}$   
 $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Thm:  $(s_n)$  is a Cauchy sequence.

pf: Consider some  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Assume WLOG  $m \geq n$ .

WTS that ~~prop~~ the proposition:

$$|s_m - s_n| < \sum_{i=n}^{m-1} \frac{1}{2^i} = \frac{2^{m-n} - 1}{2^{m-1}} \text{ for } m > n$$

Base Step:  $m = n+1$ :

$$|s_{n+1} - s_n| < \frac{1}{2^n} = \sum_{i=n}^n \frac{1}{2^i} = \frac{2^{n-n} - 1}{2^{n-1}}$$

Induction Step: Assume the proposition for  $m$ .

$$|s_m - s_n| < \sum_{i=n}^{m-1} \frac{1}{2^i} = \frac{2^{m-n} - 1}{2^{m-1}}$$

$\Delta$  inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} |s_{m+1} - s_n| &= |(s_{m+1} - s_m) + (s_m - s_n)| \leq |s_{m+1} - s_m| + |s_m - s_n| \\ &< \sum_{i=n}^{m-1} \frac{1}{2^i} + \frac{1}{2^m} = \sum_{i=n}^{(m+1)-1} \frac{1}{2^i} = \frac{2^{(m+1)-n} - 1}{2^{m-1}} + \frac{1}{2^m} = \frac{2^{(m+1)-n} - 2}{2^m} + \frac{1}{2^m} \\ &= \frac{2^{(m+1)-n} - 1}{2^{(m+1)-1}} \end{aligned}$$

Thus the proposition is true for  $m > n$ .

Now, WTS that  $|s_m - s_n| < \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}$ . The case  $m = n$  is trivial since  $1/2^{n+1} > 0$ . The case  $m > n$  uses the fact that

$$|s_m - s_n| < \frac{2^{m-n} - 1}{2^{m-1}} = \frac{2^{m-n}}{2^{m-1}} - \frac{1}{2^{m-1}} = \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} - \frac{1}{2^{m-1}} < \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}$$

$\therefore |s_m - s_n| < \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \forall m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ .  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} = 0$   
 $\rightarrow$  for any  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\exists N$  s.t.  $|\frac{1}{2^{n-1}} - 0| = \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} < \epsilon$ .  
 Select  $m, n > N$  and  $|s_m - s_n| < \epsilon \rightarrow (s_n)$  is Cauchy.  $\square$

(b) Suppose instead that  $|S_{n+1} - S_n| < \frac{1}{n}$ . The result in (a) is not necessarily true.

Similarly to the argument in (a),

$$|S_{m+1} - S_n| < \frac{1}{n} \rightarrow |S_m - S_n| < \sum_{i=n}^{m-1} \frac{1}{i} \text{ for } m > n.$$

We cannot use the argument that this sum is bounded since  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n}$  is a divergent series. For

some arbitrarily small  $\epsilon > 0$ , for any  $n$ , we can pick a large enough  $m$  s.t.  $\sum_{i=n}^{m-1} \frac{1}{i} > \epsilon$  since the series, and every tail of it, diverges.

$$a_n = (-1)^n, \quad b_n = \frac{1}{n}, \quad c_n = n^2, \quad d_n = \frac{6n+4}{7n-3}$$

11.2 (a)  $a_n \rightarrow 1, 1, 1, 1, \dots$  subsequence of all 1's is monotone.

For  $b_n, c_n, d_n$ , they are already monotone so any subsequence will be monotone.

$$b_n \rightarrow b_1, b_3, b_5, b_7, \dots \text{ (odd } n\text{'s)}$$

$$c_n \rightarrow c_2, c_3, c_4, c_5, \dots \text{ (exclude } c_1\text{)}$$

$$d_n \rightarrow d_1, d_3, d_4, d_5, \dots \text{ (exclude } d_2\text{)}$$

$$(b) \quad a_n \rightarrow \{1, -1\}$$

$$b_n \rightarrow \{0\} \quad \text{since } b_n \text{ converges to } 0$$

$$c_n \rightarrow \{+\infty\} \quad \text{since } c_n \text{ diverges to } +\infty$$

$$d_n \rightarrow \{6/7\} \quad \text{since } d_n \text{ converges to } 6/7.$$

(c)  $\limsup = \sup$  of set of subsequential limits

$\liminf = \inf$  of set of subsequential limits

$$a_n \rightarrow \limsup a_n = 1, \quad \liminf a_n = -1$$

$$b_n \rightarrow \limsup b_n = \liminf b_n = 0$$

$$c_n \rightarrow \limsup c_n = \liminf c_n = +\infty$$

$$d_n \rightarrow \limsup d_n = \liminf d_n = 6/7.$$

(d)  $b_n$  &  $d_n$  converge because the set of subsequential limits has  $\perp \mathbb{R}$  ~~term~~ element.  $c_n$  diverges because the set of subsequential limits contains only  $+\infty$ .  $a_n$  oscillates.

(e)  $a_n$  is bounded by  $-1$  &  $1$ .

$b_n$  is bounded by  $0$  &  $1$ .

$c_n$  is bounded below by  $1$ , but not above.

$d_n$  is bounded ~~above~~ by  $\frac{5}{2}$  &  $\frac{6}{7}$ .

$$S_n = \cos\left(\frac{n\pi}{3}\right), t_n = \frac{3}{4n+1}, u_n = \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)^n, v_n = (-1)^n + \frac{1}{n}$$

11.3 (a)  $S_n \rightarrow S_1, S_7, S_{13}, S_{19}$  (since  $S_{6k+1}$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  equals  $1/2$ ).

$t_n \rightarrow t_1, t_3, t_4, t_5, t_6, \dots$  (just remove  $t_2$  since  $(t_n)$  is already monotone).

$u_n \rightarrow u_1, u_3, u_5, u_7$  (odd  $n$ 's means only ~~positive~~ <sup>negative</sup> increasing ~~terms~~ terms).

$v_n \rightarrow v_1, v_3, v_5, v_7, \dots$  (odd  $n$ 's means negative increasing terms).

(b)  $S_n \rightarrow \left\{ \frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, -1, 1 \right\}$

$t_n \rightarrow \{0\}, u_n = \{0\}, v_n = \{-1, 1\}$

(c)  $\limsup S_n = 1, \liminf S_n = -1$

$\limsup t_n = \liminf t_n = 0$

$\limsup u_n = \liminf u_n = 0$

$\limsup v_n = 1, \liminf v_n = -1.$

(d)  $t_n$  &  $u_n$  converge.  $v_n$  &  $S_n$  oscillate.

(e)  $S_n$  is bounded by  $-1$  &  $1$

$t_n$  is bounded by  $3/5$  &  $0$ .

$u_n$  is bounded by  $1/4$  &  $-1/2$ .

$v_n$  is bounded by  $3/2$  &  $-1$ .

11.5 (a) Let  $(q_n)$  be an enumeration of all rationals in the interval  $(0, 1]$ .

The set of subsequential limits is

$$\{r \mid r \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } 0 \leq r \leq 1\}$$

Consider an arbitrarily small  $\epsilon > 0$ . Due to the denseness of  $\mathbb{Q}$ ,  $\therefore$  infinitely many rationals  $q$  s.t.  $r - \epsilon < q < r$  and infinitely many  $q$  s.t.  $r < q < r + \epsilon$ . In the special cases of  $r = 0, 1$ , ~~at the first~~ ~~intervals~~  $\exists$  infinitely many rationals  $q$  only on the 2nd & 1st intervals, respectively.

However this is sufficient to argue that the set  $\{n \mid |q_n - r| < \epsilon\}$  is infinite for all  $\epsilon > 0$ . Now consider a limit outside of the interval  $0 \leq r \leq 1$ .

If  $r < 0$ , the set  $\{n \mid |q_n - r| < \epsilon\}$  is empty for  $\epsilon < |r|$ . For  $r > 1$ , the set  $\{n \mid |q_n - r| < \epsilon\}$  is empty for  $\epsilon < r - 1$ . Therefore the previously described set of subsequential limits is complete.

$$(b) \limsup (q_n) = \sup \{r \mid r \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } 0 \leq r \leq 1\}$$
$$\rightarrow \limsup (q_n) = 1$$

$$\liminf (q_n) = \inf \{r \mid r \in \mathbb{R} \text{ \& } 0 \leq r \leq 1\}$$
$$\rightarrow \liminf (q_n) = 0$$

$$2. \quad \limsup S_n = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup \{ S_n : n > N \}$$

$\limsup$  describes the end behavior of a sequence and provides an upper bound for terms in the tail of a sequence. The "sup" portion of  $\limsup$  is that  $\limsup$  acts as an upper bound on terms of a sequence. The "lim" portion of  $\limsup$  describes how we are looking at the behavior of a tail that starts an infinite number of terms away from the start of the sequence.

$\limsup$  applies to sequences in contrast to  $\sup$  which applies to sets. Furthermore  $\limsup$  is not an upper bound for the entirety of a sequence. In fact  $\limsup$  can easily be less than such an upper bound. So the statement  $\limsup(S_n)$  is larger than every  $S_n$  is ~~not~~ not strictly true since  $\limsup$  describes end behavior of a tail, not all of a sequence.