



S.O.S. Mathematics CyberBoard

Your Resource for mathematics help on the web!

[Logout \[helmut \]](#) [0 new messages](#)
[FAQ](#) [Search](#) [Members](#) [User Control Panel](#)

Last visit was: Sun, 03 May 2020 08:58

It is currently Sun, 03 May 2020 12:25

[View unanswered posts](#) | [View active topics](#)
[View unread posts](#) | [View new posts](#) | [View your posts](#)
[Board index](#) » [Math 3341](#) » [Chapter 2](#)

All times are UTC - 6 hours

2.19

Moderator: [helmut](#)[[Moderator Control Panel](#)]

Page 1 of 1 [8 posts]

[Subscribe topic](#) | [Bookmark topic](#) | [Print view](#) | [E-mail friend](#)
[Previous topic](#) | [Next topic](#)

Author

helmut**online**

Site Admin



Joined: Sat, 26 Apr 2003 15:14
Posts: 2259
Location: El Paso TX (USA)

Message

Post subject: 2.19**Posted:** Sun, 05 Apr 2020 17:02

Here s an outline for the missing direction, using the last hint in the notes.

Let $B = \{b \in \mathbb{R} \mid b \text{ is an upper bound of } A\}$

Step 1:

Show that B is an interval of the form (b, ∞) or of the form $[b, \infty)$ for some $b \in \mathbb{R}$.

Step 2:

Show $B = [b, \infty)$. How: It suffices to show that the limit of any decreasing sequence of elements in B converges to an element in B. (Why?) You may use the CA for decreasing sequences.

Step 3:

Show that b is the least upper bound of A.

The greater danger for most of us lies not in setting our aim too high and falling short; but in setting our aim too low, and achieving our mark. - Michelangelo Buonarroti



Top

**solivas11****Post subject:** Re: 2.19**Posted:** Tue, 14 Apr 2020 00:03**offline**

Member

Joined: Mon, 30 Mar 2020 21:12
Posts: 15

2.19 The Completeness Axiom is equivalent to the following: Every non-empty set of real numbers which is bounded from above has a supremum.

 $(CA \iff \text{supremum property})$ First half (Vivian's portion - $\text{sup property} \Rightarrow CA$)

Suppose every set bounded from above has a supremum.

Let a_n be an increasing, bounded sequence.Let $A = \{a_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, $a = \sup(A)$

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists a_m \text{ s.t. } |a - a_m| < \varepsilon$$

$$a - \varepsilon < a_m < a + \varepsilon$$

$\Rightarrow$

$$a - \varepsilon < a_m < a$$

since a_n bounded from above.

Since (a_n) is an increasing sequence,

if $m < n$, $a_m < a_n$,

then $a - \varepsilon < a_m < a_n < a$,

so $|a_n - a| < \varepsilon$

Thus $a_n \rightarrow a$

Other half ($CA \Rightarrow \text{sup property}$)

Let a_n be an increasing, bounded sequence.

Let $A = \{a_n | n \in \mathbb{N}\}$

Let $B = \{b \in \mathbb{R} | b = UB(A) \text{ is true}\}$

$\iff B = \{b \in \mathbb{R} | \forall a \in A : a \leq b\}$

helmut wrote:

Step 1:

Show that B is an interval of the form (b, ∞) or of the form $[b, \infty)$ for some $b \in \mathbb{R}$.

$$b = UB(A) \iff \exists b \in \mathbb{R}, \forall a \in A : a \leq b$$

Let $\delta \in \mathbb{R} : \delta > 0$

Since $a \leq b < b + \delta \Rightarrow a < b + \delta \forall \delta$

Then, $b + \delta = UB(A) \forall \delta$

By this, B is unbounded from above.

If $a < b + \delta \forall \delta$, then $B = (b, \infty)$

For a special case $\delta \geq 0$, if $a < b + \delta \forall \delta$, then $B = [b, \infty)$

helmut wrote:

Step 2:

Show $B = [b, \infty)$. How: It suffices to show that the limit of any decreasing sequence of elements in B converges to an element in B. (Why?) You may use the CA for decreasing sequences.

Let b_n be a decreasing sequence whose range is defined as

$$\{b \in \mathbb{R} | b = UB(A) \text{ is true}\}$$

$\iff$

b_n be a decreasing sequence whose range is defined by B

Since B is bounded from below by $[b, \infty)$, and b_n is decreasing, by CA , $b_n \rightarrow k \in \mathbb{R}$

Now do a proof by contradiction to show $k \in [b, \infty)$

We know $b_n \in [b, \infty)$

Suppose $b_n \rightarrow k$, where $k < b$

$$\text{Let } \varepsilon = \frac{b - k}{2}$$

$\forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|b_n - k| < \varepsilon \forall n \geq N$

$$|b_n - k| < \frac{b - k}{2}$$

$$\frac{k - b}{2} + k < b_n < \frac{b - k}{2} + k$$

$$\frac{k - b}{2} + k < b_n < \frac{k - b}{2} + b$$

$$k < b_n + \frac{b - k}{2} < b$$

$\Rightarrow$

$$b_n + \varepsilon < b$$

But we previously stated that $b_n \in [b, \infty)$

Yet, we showed $b_n < b$

Therefore, $b_n \rightarrow k$, where $k \in [b, \infty)$

helmut wrote:

Step 3:

Show that b is the least upper bound of A.

Let $A = \{a_n | n \in \mathbb{N}\}$

Let $B = [b, \infty)$

Have to show:

$$\sup(A) = b \iff b \geq a, \forall a \in A, \text{ and } b \leq x, \forall x \in B$$

$\iff$

$$b = UB(A), \text{ and } b \leq x, \forall x \in B$$

Let $m < b$

Suppose

$$\sup(A) = m \iff$$

$$m \geq a, \forall a \in A, \text{ and } m \leq x, \forall x \in B \iff$$

$$m = UB(A), \text{ and } m \leq x, \forall x \in B$$

However, if $m < b \Rightarrow m \notin B \Rightarrow m \neq UB(A) \Rightarrow m \neq \sup(A)$

Additionally, earlier on we showed $\forall a \in A, a \leq b < b + \delta \forall \delta > 0$

Therefore, $b \geq a, \forall a \in A, \text{ and } b \leq x, \forall x \in B \iff b = \sup(A)$

Questions?



Top



helmut

Post subject: Re: 2.19

Posted: Sun, 19 Apr 2020 21:22

online

Site Admin



Joined: Sat, 26 Apr 2003
15:14
Posts: 2259
Location: El Paso TX (USA)

Quote:

Other half ($CA \Rightarrow \sup$ property)Let a_n be an increasing, bounded sequence.

Don't you have to start with a bounded set instead of a sequence?

I don't understand your Step 1 either.

The greater danger for most of us lies not in setting our aim too high and falling short; but in setting our aim too low, and achieving our mark. - Michelangelo Buonarroti



Top



solivas11

Post subject: Re: 2.19

Posted: Wed, 29 Apr 2020 19:15

offline

Member

Joined: Mon, 30 Mar 2020
21:12
Posts: 15

helmut wrote:

Quote:

Other half ($CA \Rightarrow \sup$ property)Let a_n be an increasing, bounded sequence.

Don't you have to start with a bounded set instead of a sequence?

Okay. I've also changed the hints just a bit.

Other half ($CA \Rightarrow \sup$ property)Let A be a set bounded from above.Let B be the set of upper bounds for A i.e.

$$B = \{b \in \mathbb{R} \mid b = UB(A) \text{ is true}\}$$

$$\iff B = \{b \in \mathbb{R} \mid \forall a \in A : a \leq b\}$$

helmut wrote:

Step 1:

Show that B is an interval of the form (c, ∞) or of the form $[c, \infty)$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$.

You may use the CA for decreasing sequences.

Choose $a_1 \in A$, $b_1 \in B$.

Now, select $c_1 \in (a_1, b_1) \cap (A \cup B)$ s.t. $|c_1 - a_1| \leq \frac{1}{2}|b_1 - a_1|$

If $c_1 \in A$, then let $a_2 = c_1$, and $b_2 = b_1$.

If $c_1 \in B$, then let $a_2 = a_1$, and $b_2 = c_1$.

Now, select $c_2 \in (a_2, b_2) \cap (A \cup B)$ s.t. $|c_2 - a_2| \leq \frac{1}{2}|b_2 - a_2|$

If $c_2 \in A$, then let $a_3 = c_2$, and $b_3 = b_2$.

If $c_2 \in B$, then let $a_3 = a_2$, and $b_3 = c_2$.

.

.

Now, select $c_m \in (a_m, b_m) \cap (A \cup B)$ s.t. $|c_m - a_m| \leq \frac{1}{2}|b_m - a_m|$

If $c_m \in A$, then let $a_{m+1} = c_m$, and $b_{m+1} = b_m$.

If $c_m \in B$, then let $a_{m+1} = a_m$, and $b_{m+1} = c_m$.

By repeating the above, an increasing sequence a_n and a decreasing sequence b_n are created.

Define the range of a_n as $\{a_n | n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, and define the range of b_n as $\{b_n | n \in \mathbb{N}\}$

Since a_n is increasing and bounded from above, via CA $a_n \rightarrow c \in \mathbb{R}$.

Since b_n is decreasing and bounded from below, via CA $b_n \rightarrow c \in \mathbb{R}$

Since $b_n \rightarrow c$, then either $c \in \{b_n | n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ or $c \notin \{b_n | n \in \mathbb{N}\}$,
and since B is unbounded from above, then B is in the form of $[c, \infty)$ or (c, ∞) .

helmut wrote:

Step 2:

Show $B = [c, \infty)$. How: It suffices to show that the limit of any decreasing sequence of elements in B converges to an element in B . (Why?)

Suppose $c \notin B \iff c \neq UB(A) \iff \exists n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } a_n > c$

However, since $a_n \rightarrow c$, and a_n is increasing and bounded, then $a_n \leq c \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$, otherwise would contradict increasing.

Thus, B is of the form $[c, \infty)$

helmut wrote:

Step 3:

Show that c is the least upper bound of A .

Have to show:

$\sup(A) = c \iff c \geq a, \forall a \in A, \text{ and } c \leq x, \forall x \in B$

$\iff$

$c = UB(A), \text{ and } c \leq x, \forall x \in B$

Let $m < c$

Suppose

$$\begin{aligned} \sup(A) = m &\iff \\ m \geq a, \forall a \in A, \text{ and } m \leq x, \forall x \in B &\iff \\ m = UB(A), \text{ and } m \leq x, \forall x \in B \end{aligned}$$

However, if $m < c \Rightarrow m \notin B \Rightarrow m \neq UB(A) \Rightarrow m \neq \sup(A)$
 Therefore, $b \geq a, \forall a \in A, \text{ and } b \leq x, \forall x \in B \iff b = \sup(A)$

Hope these fixes were sufficient.



Top



helmut

Post subject: Re: 2.19

Posted: Thu, 30 Apr 2020 15:58

online

Site Admin



Joined: Sat, 26 Apr 2003
 15:14
 Posts: 2259
 Location: El Paso TX (USA)



Top



solivas11

Post subject: Re: 2.19

Posted: Thu, 30 Apr 2020 17:33

offline

Member

Joined: Mon, 30 Mar 2020
 21:12
 Posts: 15

helmut wrote:

In Step 1, it looks like one could always pick $c_n = a_1$. You don't want that, right?

Since I set it up as an open interval, I thought I would avoid $c_n = a_1$. I did think about letting $c_1 = \frac{a_1+b_1}{2}$ - I could incorporate an algorithm like that.

helmut wrote:

Also: Why is $(a_1, b_1) \cap (A \cup B) \neq \emptyset$?

If A is finite, and if $a_1 \neq \max(A) \Rightarrow \exists w \in A \text{ s.t. } w > a_1$.
 If A is infinite, then $\exists w \in A \text{ s.t. } w > a_1$, assuming $a_1 \neq \sup(A)$, but it hasn't been demonstrated what the sup is.

B is an infinite set in the $\mathbb{R}$. Unless $b_1 = \inf(B)$, then $\exists w \in B \text{ s.t. } w < b_1$.



Top

**solivas11****Post subject:** Re: 2.19**Posted:** Thu, 30 Apr 2020 18:57**offline**

Member

Joined: Mon, 30 Mar 2020

21:12

Posts: 15

Updated.

Other half ($CA \Rightarrow \text{sup property}$)Let A be a set bounded from above.Let B be the set of upper bounds for A i.e.

$$B = \{b \in \mathbb{R} \mid b = UB(A) \text{ is true}\}$$

$$\iff B = \{b \in \mathbb{R} \mid \forall a \in A : a \leq b\}$$

helmut wrote:

Step 1:

Show that B is an interval of the form (c, ∞) or of the form $[c, \infty)$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$. You may use the CA for decreasing sequences.

Choose $a_1 \in A$, $b_1 \in B$.Now, select $c_1 = \frac{a_1 + b_1}{2}$ If $c_1 \in B$, then let $a_2 = a_1$, and $b_2 = c_1$.If $c_1 \notin B$, $\Rightarrow c_1 \neq UB(A) \Rightarrow \exists a_2 \in A$ s.t. $a_2 > c_1$. Also let $b_2 = b_1$.Now, select $c_2 = \frac{a_2 + b_2}{2}$ If $c_2 \in B$, then let $a_3 = a_2$, and $b_3 = c_2$.If $c_2 \notin B$, $\Rightarrow c_2 \neq UB(A) \Rightarrow \exists a_3 \in A$ s.t. $a_3 > c_2$. Also let $b_3 = b_2$.

.

.

.

Now, select $c_m = \frac{a_m + b_m}{2}$ If $c_m \in B$, then let $a_{m+1} = a_m$, and $b_{m+1} = c_m$.

If

 $c_m \notin B$, $\Rightarrow c_m \neq UB(A) \Rightarrow \exists a_{m+1} \in A$ s.t. $a_{m+1} > c_m$. Let $b_{m+1} = b_m$.By repeating the above, an increasing sequence a_n and a decreasing sequence b_n are created.Define the range of a_n as $\{a_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, and define the range of b_n as $\{b_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ Since a_n is increasing and bounded from above, via CA $a_n \rightarrow c \in \mathbb{R}$.Since b_n is decreasing and bounded from below, via CA $b_n \rightarrow c \in \mathbb{R}$ Since $b_n \rightarrow c$, then either $c \in \{b_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ or $c \notin \{b_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$,and since B is unbounded from above, then B is in the form of $[c, \infty)$ or (c, ∞) .**helmut wrote:**

Step 2:

Show $B = [c, \infty)$. How: It suffices to show that the limit of any decreasing sequence of elements in B converges to an element in B . (Why?)

Suppose $c \notin B \iff c \neq UB(A) \iff \exists n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } a_n > c$
 However, since $a_n \rightarrow c$, and a_n is increasing and bounded, then $a_n \leq c \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$,
 otherwise would contradict increasing.
 Thus, B is of the form $[c, \infty)$

helmut wrote:

Step 3:

Show that c is the least upper bound of A .

Have to show:

$$\sup(A) = c \iff c \geq a, \forall a \in A, \text{ and } c \leq x, \forall x \in B$$

$\iff$

$$c = UB(A), \text{ and } c \leq x, \forall x \in B$$

Let $m < c$

Suppose

$$\sup(A) = m \iff$$

$$m \geq a, \forall a \in A, \text{ and } m \leq x, \forall x \in B \iff$$

$$m = UB(A), \text{ and } m \leq x, \forall x \in B$$

However, if $m < c \Rightarrow m \notin B \Rightarrow m \neq UB(A) \Rightarrow m \neq \sup(A)$

Therefore, $b \geq a, \forall a \in A, \text{ and } b \leq x, \forall x \in B \iff b = \sup(A)$



Top



helmut

Post subject: Re: 2.19

Posted: Sun, 03 May 2020 12:24

online

Site Admin



Very nice, Sergio! 1 hard-earned credit!

The greater danger for most of us lies not in setting our aim too high and falling short; but in setting our aim too low, and achieving our mark. - Michelangelo Buonarroti



Joined: Sat, 26 Apr 2003

15:14

Posts: 2259

Location: El Paso TX (USA)

Top



Display posts from previous: All posts ▼ Sort by Post time ▼ Ascending ▼ Go



Page 1 of 1 [8 posts]

Board index » Math 3341 » Chapter 2

All times are UTC - 6 hours

Who is online

Users browsing this forum: **helmut**

Quick-mod tools:

You **can** post new topics in this forum
You **can** reply to topics in this forum
You **can** edit your posts in this forum
You **can** delete your posts in this forum

Search for:

Jump to:

[[Administration Control Panel](#)]

[Contact Us](#) | [S.O.S. Mathematics Homepage](#)

[Privacy Statement](#) | [Search the "old" CyberBoard](#)

474 users online during the last hour

Powered by [phpBB](#) © 2001, 2005-2017 phpBB Group.

Copyright © 1999-2017 MathMedics, LLC. All rights reserved.

Math Medics, LLC. - P.O. Box 12395 - El Paso TX 79913 - USA