

THE CHINESE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG
Department of Mathematics
MATH2060B Mathematical Analysis II (Spring 2017)
Solution to Midterm Examination

Tongou Yang and Yan Lung Li

1. Define a function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$f(x) := \begin{cases} x^2, & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{Q} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Show that $f'(0)$ exists but $f'(x)$ does not exist for any $x \neq 0$.

Proof. • We first show that $f'(0)$ exists. (The term x^2 suggests that $f'(0) = 0$). Since $f(0) = 0$, it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x)}{x} = 0.$$

Let $\epsilon > 0$, and take $\delta := \epsilon$. For any $|x| < \delta$, if $x \in \mathbb{Q}$, then

$$\left| \frac{f(x)}{x} \right| = \left| \frac{x^2}{x} \right| = |x| < \epsilon.$$

If $x \notin \mathbb{Q}$, then

$$\left| \frac{f(x)}{x} \right| = \left| \frac{0}{x} \right| = 0 < \epsilon.$$

This proves that $f'(0) = 0$.

- Next we show that for $x \neq 0$, $f'(x)$ does not exist. It is easier to show that f is not continuous at x , hence not differentiable at x . By the sequential criterion it suffices to exhibit a sequence x_n converging to x but $f(x_n)$ does not converge to $f(x)$. We consider two cases.
 - $x \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\}$. In this case, $f(x) = x^2 \neq 0$. However, by density of irrational numbers, there exists a sequence $x_n \notin \mathbb{Q}$ so that $x_n \rightarrow x$. Thus $f(x_n) = 0 \rightarrow 0 \neq f(x)$. Hence f is discontinuous at x .
 - $x \notin \mathbb{Q}$. In this case, $f(x) = 0$. By density of rational numbers, take $x_n \in \mathbb{Q}$ so that $x_n \rightarrow x$. Thus $f(x_n) = x_n^2 \rightarrow x^2 \neq 0$, since $x \neq 0$. Hence f is discontinuous at x .

To conclude, $f'(x)$ does not exist at $x \neq 0$.

□

2. Suppose f is differentiable on a bounded open interval (a, b) .

- (a) Show that if f is unbounded on the interval (a, b) , then f' is also unbounded on (a, b) .

(b) Does the converse of part (a) hold?

Proof. (a) We prove by contradiction. Suppose f' is bounded on (a, b) . We have two different approaches to show that f is bounded on (a, b) .

- Method 1: Since f' is bounded on (a, b) , let $M := \sup_{x \in (a, b)} |f'(x)| < \infty$. We show that f is Lipschitz continuous. Indeed, given $a < x < y < b$, since f is continuous on $[x, y]$ and differentiable on (x, y) , by the mean value theorem, there is some $z \in (x, y)$ so that

$$f(y) - f(x) = f'(z)(y - x).$$

But then

$$|f(y) - f(x)| = |f'(z)(y - x)| \leq M|y - x|,$$

showing that f is Lipschitz continuous on (a, b) . Then f is in particular uniformly continuous on (a, b) . By the uniform extension theorem, f can be continuously extended to $\tilde{f} : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ so that \tilde{f} is uniformly continuous. In particular, \tilde{f} is bounded on $[a, b]$. In particular, f is bounded on (a, b) .

- Method 2: Fix an arbitrary $c \in (a, b)$. For any $x \in (c, b)$, since f is continuous on $[c, x]$ and differentiable on (c, x) , by the mean value theorem, there is some $z \in (c, x)$ so that

$$f(x) - f(c) = f'(z)(x - c).$$

But then

$$|f(x) - f(c)| = |f'(z)(x - c)| \leq M|x - c| \leq M(b - a),$$

thus by the triangle inequality, for any $x \in (c, b)$,

$$|f(x)| \leq |f(x) - f(c)| + |f(c)| \leq M(b - a) + |f(c)|.$$

Similarly, for any $x \in (a, c)$, $|f(x)| \leq M(b - a) + |f(c)|$. Therefore for any $x \in (a, b)$, $|f(x)| \leq M(b - a) + |f(c)|$, which is a finite constant. Hence f is bounded on (a, b) .

- (b) The converse does not hold. Consider $f(x) := \sqrt{x}$ defined on $x \in (0, 1)$. Then $f'(x) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{x}}$ on $(0, 1)$, which is unbounded. However, $0 < f(x) < 1$ on $(0, 1)$, hence f is bounded.

□

3. Define a function $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\begin{cases} x, & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1] \\ -x, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Find the upper and lower integrals of f .

Proof. We claim that $\overline{\int}_0^1 f = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\underline{\int}_0^1 f = -\frac{1}{2}$:

For any partition $P = \{x_0 = 0, \dots, x_N = 1\}$ of $[0, 1]$, we first show that for each $1 \leq i \leq N$,

$$\sup_{[x_{i-1}, x_i]} f = x_i$$

and similarly

$$\inf_{[x_{i-1}, x_i]} f = -x_i$$

For the former one, first by definition of f we immediately see that $f(x) \leq x_i$ for all $x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$, and therefore $\sup_{[x_{i-1}, x_i]} f \leq x_i$; On the other hand, fix any $\epsilon > 0$, by density theorem of rational numbers, there exists $y_i \in (x_i - \epsilon, x_i) \cap \mathbb{Q}$. Therefore, $x_i - \epsilon < f(y_i) < x_i$. Since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, we have

$$\sup_{[x_{i-1}, x_i]} f = x_i.$$

For the latter one the argument is analogous: by definition of f we immediately see that $f(x) \geq -x_i$ for all $x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$, and therefore $\inf_{[x_{i-1}, x_i]} f \geq -x_i$; On the other hand, fix any $\epsilon > 0$, by density theorem of irrational numbers, there exists $z_i \in (x_i - \epsilon, x_i) \cap (\mathbb{R} - \mathbb{Q})$. Therefore, $-x_i < f(z_i) < -x_i + \epsilon$. Since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, we have

$$\inf_{[x_{i-1}, x_i]} f = -x_i.$$

Therefore, $U(f, P) = \sum_{i=1}^N x_i(x_i - x_{i-1}) = U(g, P)$ and $L(f, P) = \sum_{i=1}^N (-x_i)(x_i - x_{i-1}) = L(h, P)$, where $g, h : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by $g(x) = x$ and $h(x) = -x$.

Since g, h are continuous, they are Riemann integrable, i.e. $\overline{\int}_0^1 g = \int_0^1 x dx = \frac{1}{2}$ and

$$\underline{\int}_0^1 h = \int_0^1 (-x) dx = -\frac{1}{2}.$$

Finally, we compute $\overline{\int}_0^1 f$ and $\underline{\int}_0^1 f$:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\int}_0^1 f &= \inf_P U(f, P) = \inf_P U(g, P) = \int_0^1 g = \frac{1}{2} \\ \underline{\int}_0^1 f &= \sup_P L(f, P) = \sup_P L(h, P) = \int_0^1 h = -\frac{1}{2} \end{aligned}$$

□

4. Define a function f on $[0, 1]$ by

$$f(x) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x = \frac{1}{n}, n = 1, 2, \dots \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Show that f is Riemann integrable and find $\int_0^1 f$.

Proof. It is reasonable to guess that $\int_0^1 f = 0$. Hence it suffices to show: for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a partition P such that $U(f, P) - L(f, P) < \epsilon$. But it is easy to see that $L(f, P) = 0$ for any partition P . Hence it suffices to show that $U(f, P) < \epsilon$, which also implies that $\int_0^1 f = 0$.

Let $\epsilon > 0$. Assume $\epsilon < 0.1$ without loss of generality. Let N be the least integer such that $N > \frac{1}{\epsilon}$. Note then $N \geq 10$. Consider the points $\frac{1}{k}, k = 1, 2, \dots, N-1$, and take

$$\delta := \min \left\{ \frac{1}{N-2} - \frac{1}{N-1}, \frac{1}{N-1} - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \right\} \in \left(0, \frac{2}{N(N-1)} \right).$$

Consider the partition P given by:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = x_0 &< \frac{\epsilon}{2} < \frac{1}{N-1} - \frac{\delta}{100} < \frac{1}{N-1} + \frac{\delta}{100} < \frac{1}{N-2} - \frac{\delta}{100} < \frac{1}{N-2} + \frac{\delta}{100} \\ &< \dots < \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\delta}{100} < 1 - \frac{\delta}{100} < 1 = x_n. \end{aligned}$$

Then we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} U(f, P) &= \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - x_{i-1}) \sup_{x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]} f(x) \\ &= (x_1 - x_0) \sup_{x \in [0, \frac{\epsilon}{2}]} f(x) + \sum_{i=2}^n (x_i - x_{i-1}) \sup_{x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]} f(x) \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \cdot 1 + (N-1) \cdot \frac{\delta}{50} \cdot 1 \\ &= \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{(N-1)\delta}{50} \\ &< \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{1}{25N} \\ &< \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

□