- No use of textbook, notes, or calculators is allowed.
- Some problems have multiple parts. You may use the results of an earlier part even if you did not do it.
- Unless told otherwise, you may quote results that you learned during the class. When you do, state precisely the result that you are using.
- Be sure to justify your answers, and show clearly all steps of your solutions.
- 1. For each of the following statements determine if it is true or false. Give a brief justification or a counterexample.
 - (a) (1 point) Suppose f: [a, b] → R is a continuous function, and U ⊂ [a, b] is open in [a, b]. Then f(U) is an open subset of R.
 Answer: False. For example, let f be the inclusion function; f(x) = x for all a ≤ x ≤ b. Then [a, b] is an open subset of itself, but f([a, b]) = [a, b] is not an open subset of R.
 - (b) (1 point) Suppose $f: [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function, and $C \subset [a, b]$ is closed in [a, b]. Then f(C) is a closed subset of \mathbb{R} .

Answer: True. If C is a closed subset of [a, b] then C is compact, and therefore f(C) is compact, and therefore closed.

- (c) (1 point) If $U \subset \mathbb{R}$ is an open subset then $\operatorname{int}(\overline{U}) = U$. **Answer**: False. For example, let $U = (1, 2) \cup (2, 3)$. Then $\overline{U} = [1, 3]$, and $\operatorname{int}(\overline{U}) = (1, 3) \neq U$.
- (d) (1 point) Let $f_n: [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}$ be a sequence of differentiable functions. Suppose that $\{f_n\}$ converges uniformly to a differentiable function f. Then $\{f'_n\}$ converges uniformly to f'. **Answer**: False. Let [a, b] be an arbitrary interval, and define $f_n(x) = \frac{\sin(nx)}{n}$. Then it is clear that f_n converges uniformly to the zero function, but the sequence $f'_n(x) = \cos(nx)$ clearly does not converge to the zero function.
- 2. (a) (2 points) Let U ⊂ R be an interval and let f: U → R be a continuous 1-1 function. Prove that f is monotonic (either increasing or decreasing).
 Answer: Assume that f is continuous and 1 1. First, we prove that f is monotonic on any closed interval contained in U. Suppose a, b ∈ U, with a < b. Since f is 1 1, f(a) ≠ f(b), so either f(a) < f(b) or f(a) > f(b).
 Claim: if f(a) < f(b) then for all t ∈]a, b[, f(a) < f(t) < f(b), and if f(a) > f(b) then for all t ∈]a, b[, it holds that f(a) > f(b).

Proof. Suppose, for example, that f(a) < f(b) and a < t < b. Suppose, by contradiction, that it is not true that f(a) < f(t) < f(b). Then either f(t) > f(b) or f(t) < f(a). Suppose f(t) > f(b). Then also f(a) < f(t). Choose a z such that

$$\max(f(a), f(b)) < z < f(t).$$

By the intermediate value theorem there exist points p, q such that asuch that <math>f(p) = f(q) = z, contradicting the assumption that f is 1-1. The case when f(t) < f(a) is handled similarly. Finally, the case when f(a) > f(b) is handled similarly as well. This proves the claim.

It follows from the claim that if $a \leq c < d \leq b$ and f(a) < f(b) then f(c) < f(d) and conversely if f(a) > f(b) then f(c) > f(d). So we have shown that f is monotonic on [a, b], for any closed interval $[a, b] \subset U$. Now we prove that f is monotonic on U. Suppose not. Then there exist points p < q in U such that f(p) > f(q) and points s < t in U such that f(s) < f(t). Let $a = \min(p, q, s, t)$ and $b = \max(p, q, s, t)$. Then f is not monotonic on [a, b], contradicting the claim.

(b) (2 points) Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an open interval, and suppose $f: U \to \mathbb{R}$ is a differentiable function. Suppose that exists points $a, b \in U$ such that f'(a) < 0 and f'(b) > 0. Prove that there exists a point $\xi \in U$ for which $f'(\xi) = 0$. Notice that we are not assuming that f' is continuous. Hint: try to mimic the proof of Rolle's theorem.

Answer: Let us assume that a < b. The case a > b is proved similarly. Since f'(a) < 0 it follows that there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that for all $x \in (a, a + \delta)$, f(x) < f(a). Similarly, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that for all $x \in (b - \delta, b)$, f(x) < f(b).

Since f is continuous on [a, b], there exists a $\xi \in [a, b]$ such that $f(\xi) \leq f(x)$ for all $x \in [a, b]$. It follows from the previous paragraph that in fact $a < \xi < b$. So ξ is a point in (a, b) and f attains a local minimum at ξ . It follows that $f'(\xi) = 0$.

- 3. (4 points) Let $f: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be a function satisfying the following conditions:
 - 1. f is continuous.
 - 2. $f(\bar{0}) > 0$
 - 3. For all $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $f(\bar{x}) \le \frac{1}{\|\bar{x}\|^2 + 1}$.

Prove that f attains a maximum. That is, prove that there exists an $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $f(\bar{x}) \geq f(\bar{y})$ for all $\bar{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Answer: Consider the set

$$D = \left\{ \bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|\bar{x}\| \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{f(\bar{0})}} \right\}.$$

Then D is a compact set, and therefore f attains a maximum on D. There exists a point $\bar{x} \in D$ such that $f(\bar{x}) \ge f(\bar{y})$ for all $\bar{y} \in D$. In particular, $f(\bar{x}) \ge f(\bar{0})$.

We claim that $f(\bar{x}) \geq f(\bar{y})$ for all $\bar{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We already know this for $\bar{y} \in D$, so it remains to verify the claim for $\bar{y} \notin D$. In this case $\|\bar{y}\| > \frac{1}{\sqrt{f(\bar{0})}}$, so $\frac{1}{\|\bar{y}\|^2} < f(\bar{0})$, and we have the inequalities

$$f(\bar{y}) \le \frac{1}{\|\bar{y}\|^2 + 1} < \frac{1}{\|\bar{y}\|^2} < f(\bar{0}) \le f(\bar{x}).$$

This is what we wanted to prove.

4. (4 points) Let $f: [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded function and let $\alpha: [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}$ be a monotonic increasing function. Let P and Q be two partitions of the interval [a, b]. Prove, using just the

definitions of upper and lower sums, that

$$L(P, f, \alpha) \le U(Q, f, \alpha).$$

Answer: First we consider the case when P and Q are the same partition. Suppose P consists of points $a = t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \cdots \leq t_n = b$. For $i = 1, \ldots n$ let m_i and M_i denote the infimum and the supremum of f on the interval $[t_{i-1}, t_i]$. Also let $\Delta \alpha_i = \alpha(t_i) - \alpha(t_{i-1})$. By definition

$$L(P, f, \alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i \Delta \alpha_i$$
, and $U(P, f, \alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} M_i \Delta \alpha_i$.

Since for all *i* we have $m_i \leq M_i$ and $\Delta \alpha_i \geq 0$, it follows that $L(P, f, \alpha) \leq U(P, f, \alpha)$.

Next we claim that if P' is a refinement of P then $L(P, f, \alpha) \leq L(P', f, \alpha)$ and $U(P, f, \alpha) \geq U(P', f, \alpha)$.

We will prove the claim for lower sums. The proof for upper sums is exactly the same. Recall that P' is a refinement of P if P' is obtained by adding finitely many points to P. It is enough to prove the claim when P' is obtained by adding one point to P.

So, let P be as above, and suppose P' consists of points $a = t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \cdots \leq t_{j-1} \leq \xi \leq t_j \leq \cdots \leq t_n = b$. For all $i = 1, \ldots, n$, let $m_i, M_i, \Delta \alpha_i$ be defined as above. Also let m'_j, m''_j be the infimum of f on the intervals $[t_{j-1}, \xi]$ and $[\xi, t_j]$ respectively. Finally, let $\Delta \alpha'_j = \alpha(\xi) - \alpha(x_{j-1})$ and $\Delta \alpha''_j = \alpha(x_j) - \alpha(\xi)$. It is clear that we have inequalities $m_j \leq m'_j, m''_j$, and equality $\Delta \alpha_j = \Delta \alpha'_j + \Delta \alpha''_j$.

Now we have the following

$$L(P, f, \alpha) = m_1 \Delta \alpha_1 + \dots + m_j \Delta \alpha_j + \dots + m_n \Delta \alpha_n =$$

= $m_1 \Delta \alpha_1 + \dots + m_j \Delta \alpha'_j + m_j \Delta \alpha''_j + \dots + m_n \Delta \alpha_n \leq$
 $\leq m_1 \Delta \alpha_1 + \dots + m'_j \Delta \alpha'_j + m''_j \Delta \alpha''_j + \dots + m_n \Delta \alpha_n = L(P', f, \alpha).$

Finally, given two partitions P and Q, we can form their common refinement $P \cup Q$. We have the following inequalities

$$L(P, f, \alpha) \le L(P \cup Q, f, \alpha) \le U(P \cup Q, f, \alpha) \le U(Q, f, \alpha).$$

5. (4 points) Consider the function $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$

$$f(x,y) = \begin{cases} xy \sin\left(\frac{1}{x^2 + y^4}\right) & (x,y) \neq (0,0) \\ 0 & (x,y) = (0,0) \end{cases}$$

Is f differentiable at (0,0)? Be sure to justify your answer.

Answer: Yes, f is differentiable at (0,0), and moreover f'(0,0) is the zero transformation. To prove this, we have to prove that

$$\lim_{(x,y)\to(0,0)}\frac{|f(x,y)-f(0,0)|}{\sqrt{x^2+y^2}}=0.$$

This means proving that

$$\lim_{(x,y)\to(0,0)} \frac{\left|xy\sin\left(\frac{1}{x^2+y^4}\right)\right|}{\sqrt{x^2+y^2}} = 0$$

It follows from the inequalities $(x \pm y)^2 \ge 0$ that $|xy| \le \frac{x^2 + y^2}{2}$. Therefore, we have inequalities

$$0 \le \frac{\left|xy\sin\left(\frac{1}{x^2+y^4}\right)\right|}{\sqrt{x^2+y^2}} \le \frac{\left|\sqrt{x^2+y^2}\sin\left(\frac{1}{x^2+y^4}\right)\right|}{2}.$$

Since $\lim_{(x,y)\to(0,0)} \sqrt{x^2 + y^2} = 0$, and $\sin\left(\frac{1}{x^2 + y^4}\right)$ is bounded, it follows that

$$\lim_{(x,y)\to(0,0)} \frac{\left|\sqrt{x^2 + y^2} \sin\left(\frac{1}{x^2 + y^4}\right)\right|}{2} = 0$$

and therefore also

$$\lim_{(x,y)\to(0,0)} \frac{\left| xy \sin\left(\frac{1}{x^2 + y^4}\right) \right|}{\sqrt{x^2 + y^2}} = 0.$$

Remark: Note that we are not saying that f is *continuously* differentiable at (0, 0).

- 6. (a) (2 points) Show that there exists an open subset $W \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ containing (1, 1), and a differentiable function $F = (f_1, f_2)$ from W to \mathbb{R}^2 , that satisfies
 - 1. $f_1(1,1) = f_2(1,1) = 1$
 - 2. For all $(x,y) \in W$, $xy + xf_1(x,y) + yf_2(x,y) = 3$ and $f_1(x,y)^2 f_2(x,y) + x^2 y = 2$.

Answer: Let us define the function $G = (g_1, g_2) \colon \mathbb{R}^4 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ as follows

$$g_1(x, y, u, v) = xy + xu + yv - 3;$$
 $g_2(x, y, u, v) = u^2v + x^2y - 2.$

It is clear that G(1, 1, 1, 1) = (0, 0). Let us calculate the derivatives of G with respect to u and v at (1, 1, 1, 1).

$$\frac{\partial g_1}{\partial u} = x = 1 \qquad \frac{\partial g_1}{\partial v} = y = 1$$
$$\frac{\partial g_2}{\partial u} = 2uv = 2 \qquad \frac{\partial g_2}{\partial v} = u^2 = 1.$$

It is clear that the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ is invertible, and therefore the answer follows by the implicit function theorem.

(b) (2 points) Show that F is invertible in some neighbourhood of (1, 1). Answer: Now let us calculate the derivatives of G with respect to x and y at (1, 1, 1, 1).

$$\frac{\partial g_1}{\partial x} = y + u = 2 \quad \frac{\partial g_1}{\partial y} = x + v = 2$$
$$\frac{\partial g_2}{\partial x} = 2xy = 2 \quad \frac{\partial g_2}{\partial y} = x^2 = 1.$$

Once again, the matrix of derivatives $\begin{bmatrix} 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ is invertible. By the implicit function theo-

rem, the matrix of derivatives of the implicitly defined function F at (1,1) is

$$-\begin{bmatrix}1&1\\2&1\end{bmatrix}^{-1}\begin{bmatrix}2&2\\2&1\end{bmatrix}.$$

This is a product of invertible matrices, so it is invertible. Moreover, it is clear that F is continuously differentiable near (1, 1). Therefore, by the inverse function theorem, F is invertible (i;.e., 1-1) on some open neighbourhood of (1, 1).