In class, we proved that [0,1] is sequentially compact, can you prove that $[0,1]^2 \in \mathbb{R}$ is sequentially compact? (In general, if metric space X and Y are sequentially compact, we can show that $X \times Y$ is sequentially compact.

Solution We know from lecture that [0, 1] is compact because it is a closed and bounded. By the Bolzano Weierstrass theorem, this implies that each point $p \in [0, 1]$ is a convergent sub-sequence (p_n) .

We want to show that a similar notion of sequential compactness holds in 2 dimensions.

Take any point $[i,j] \in [0,1]^2$

We know that individually, there must be convergent sub-sequences that approach any point in [0,1].

Define the sub-sequences in singular dimensions

 $\exists N_i s.t. \forall n > N_i, d([u_n, 0], [u, 0]) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$

 $\exists N_j s.t. \forall n > N_j, d([0, v_n], [0, v]) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$

If we take $\overline{N} = \max(N_i, N_j)$, then the following pair must hold.

 $\forall n > \bar{N}, d([u_n, v_n], [u, v]) < d([u_n, 0], [u, 0]) + d([0, v_n], [0, v]) = \epsilon$

Then, for any point in $[0,1]^2$

 $[u_n, v_n] \to [u, v]$

Let E be the set of points $x \in [0, 1]$ whose decimal expansion consist of only 4 and 7 (e.g. 0.4747744 is allowed), is E countable? is E compact?

Solution Assume that E is finite, then we can enumerate every number $p \in E$ in the following way.

$$p_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{4}{10^i}$$
$$p_1 = 0.4$$

 $p_2 = 0.44$

If we have enumerated all finitely many **n** of them, $p_1 ... p_n$

We can always construct one that is not enumerated by taking $p_{n+1} \in E$

Thus, E is not countable.

For compactness,

We can show that there exists a point in

Let A_1, A_2, \cdots be subset of a metric space. If $B = \bigcup_i A_i$, then $\overline{B} \supset \bigcup_i \overline{A}_i$. Is it possible that this inclusion is an strict inclusion?

Solution

Take A to be the following set of covers

 $A_i = (1/i, 1)$

taking the infinite union of all the subsets, we will construct B as the following:

$$B = \bigcup_i A_i = (0, 1)$$

Taking the closure of this infinite set B,

$$\bar{B} = [0, 1]$$

This closure contains right end point of 0,

However, there can not be a closure of A that can contain 0.

 $\forall i, \{0\} \bigcap [1/i, 1] = \emptyset$

We have a point in \overline{B} that is not in $\bigcup_i A_i = (0, 1)$, thus showing that the subset is strict in this case.

Last time, we showed that any open subset of \mathbb{R} is a countable disjoint union of open intervals. Here is a claim and argument about closed set: every closed subset of \mathbb{R} is a countable union of closed intervals. Because every closed set is the complement of an open set, and adjacent open intervals sandwich a closed interval. Can you see where the argument is wrong? Can you give an example of a closed set which is not a countable union of closed intervals? (here countable include countably infinite and finite)

Solution Take the set of real numbers R, which is a subset of R. We know that by definition, R itself is closed in R trivially because it contains all the limit points in R. However, we also know that R is not countable.

No matter how many closed intervals we use to try and cover R, we can not fully reconstruct R using a union of finite closed intervals.

Take any finite set of intervals U. $\forall i, U_i = [i, i]$

The union of all the intervals is just the largest interval since the U_{i+1} interval is a strict subset of the U_i

 $\bigcup U_i = U_{max(i)}$

There exists a real number $i + \epsilon$ that exists outside of this union. Thus, we can not cover R using a finite set of closed intervals.