

## MATH 140B - HW 2 SOLUTIONS

**Problem 1** (WR Ch 5 #11). Suppose  $f$  is defined in a neighborhood of  $x$ , and suppose  $f''(x)$  exists. Show that

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x+h) + f(x-h) - 2f(x)}{h^2} = f''(x).$$

Show by an example that the limit may exist even if  $f''(x)$  does not.

*Solution.* Since  $f'(x) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x+h) - f(x)}{h}$ , and since  $h \rightarrow 0$  iff  $-h \rightarrow 0$ , if we replace  $h$  by  $-h$  in this expression, we have

$$f'(x) = \lim_{(-h) \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x+(-h)) - f(x)}{(-h)} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x) - f(x-h)}{h}.$$

Therefore,

$$f''(x) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f'(x+h) - f'(x)}{h} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\lim_{h_1 \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x+h) - f(x+h-h_1)}{h_1} - \lim_{h_2 \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x) - f(x-h_2)}{h_2}}{h},$$

and letting  $h_1 = h = h_2$ , i.e. taking them all to zero at the same rate (which we can do by Theorem 4.2), we have

$$f''(x) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\frac{f(x+h) - f(x+h-h)}{h} - \frac{f(x) - f(x-h)}{h}}{h} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x+h) + f(x-h) - 2f(x)}{h^2}.$$

For the second portion, we would like to find an  $f$  so that  $f'(x) = |x|$ . One such choice of  $f$  could be  $f(x) = \int_0^x |t| dt = \frac{1}{2}|x||x|$ . Now let  $x = 0$ . By continuity of  $f$  at  $x = 0$  we have

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} [f(x+h) + f(x-h) - 2f(x)] = f(0) + f(0) - 2f(0) = 0.$$

Also, clearly  $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} h^2 = 0$ . So by L'Hôpital's rule we have

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x+h) + f(x-h) - 2f(x)}{h^2} \stackrel{\text{L'H}}{=} \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f'(x+h) - f'(x-h)}{2h} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{|0+h| - |0-h|}{2h} = 0.$$

That means the limit exists at  $x = 0$ , but  $f'(x) = |x|$  is not differentiable at 0, so  $f''(0)$  does not exist.

**Problem 2** (WR Ch 5 #12). If  $f(x) = |x|^3$ , compute  $f'(x)$ ,  $f''(x)$  for all real  $x$ , and show that  $f^{(3)}(0)$  does not exist.

*Solution.* For  $x \neq 0$ ,  $|x|$  is a differentiable function with derivative

$$\operatorname{sgn}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x > 0 \\ -1 & \text{if } x < 0 \end{cases}.$$

Thus by the chain rule in the first line and by the product rule in the second line,

$$\begin{aligned} f'(x) &= 3|x|^2 \operatorname{sgn}(x) = 3x|x|. \\ f''(x) &= 3|x| + 3x \operatorname{sgn}(x) = 3|x| + 3|x| = 6|x|. \end{aligned}$$

Checking the cases for  $x = 0$  by hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f'(0) &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x+h) - f(x)}{h} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{|h|^3 - 0}{h} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} h|h| = 0. \\ f''(0) &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f'(x+h) - f'(x)}{h} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{3h|h| - 0}{h} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} 3|h| = 0. \\ f'''(0) &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f''(x+h) - f''(x)}{h} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{6|h| - 0}{h} = 6 \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{|h|}{h} = \text{DNE} \end{aligned}$$

**Problem 3** (WR Ch 6 #2). Suppose  $f \geq 0$ ,  $f$  is continuous on  $[a, b]$ , and  $\int_a^b f(x) dx = 0$ . Prove that  $f(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in [a, b]$ .

*Solution.* Assume by way of contradiction that there is some  $y \in [a, b]$  such that  $f(y) > 0$ , and let  $\epsilon = \frac{f(y)}{2}$ . Since  $f$  is continuous, there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$0 < |y - x| < \delta \quad \implies \quad |f(y) - f(x)| < \epsilon = \frac{f(y)}{2},$$

for  $x \in [a, b]$ . This last inequality gives us

$$f(y) - f(x) \leq |f(y) - f(x)| < \frac{f(y)}{2} \quad \implies \quad f(x) > \frac{f(y)}{2} > 0.$$

Let  $I = (y - \delta, y + \delta) \cap [a, b]$ . What we have shown so far is that if  $x \in I$ , then  $f(x) > \frac{f(y)}{2} > 0$ . Now, given some partition  $P$  of  $[a, b]$ , we make a refinement  $P^*$  by adding if necessary (and if possible) a point in  $(y - \delta, y) \cap [a, b]$  and a point in  $(y, y + \delta) \cap [a, b]$  so that  $y \in (x_{k-1}, x_k) \subset I$  with  $x_{k-1}, x_k \in P^*$  for some  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . Then

$$0 = \int_a^b f(x) dx = \sup_P L(P, f) \geq L(P^*, f) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \inf_{x_{i-1} \leq x \leq x_i} f(x) \right) \Delta x_i \geq \frac{f(y)}{2} \Delta x_k > 0,$$

a contradiction.

**Problem 4** (WR Ch 6 #4). If  $f(x) = 0$  for all irrational  $x$ ,  $f(x) = 1$  for all rational  $x$ , prove that  $f \notin \mathcal{R}$  on  $[a, b]$  for any  $a < b$ .

*Solution.* For any partition  $P = \{a = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_n = b\}$ , we have

$$L(P, f) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \inf_{x_{i-1} \leq x \leq x_i} f(x) \right) \Delta x_i = \sum_{i=1}^n (0) \Delta x_i = 0 \quad \text{by the density of } \mathbb{Q}^c,$$

$$U(P, f) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \sup_{x_{i-1} \leq x \leq x_i} f(x) \right) \Delta x_i = \sum_{i=1}^n (1) \Delta x_i = (b - a) \quad \text{by the density of } \mathbb{Q}.$$

$$\int_a^b f = \sup_P L(P, f) = 0 \neq (b - a) = \inf_P U(P, f) = \int_a^b \bar{f},$$

so  $f \notin \mathcal{R}$  on  $[a, b]$ .

**Problem 5** (WR Ch 6 #5). Suppose  $f$  is a bounded real function on  $[a, b]$ , and  $f^2 \in \mathcal{R}$  on  $[a, b]$ . Does it follow that  $f \in \mathcal{R}$ ? Does the answer change if we assume that  $f^3 \in \mathcal{R}$ ?

*Solution.* In the first case, we have the following counterexample. Let

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in (\mathbb{Q}^c \cap [a, b]) \\ -1 & \text{if } x \in (\mathbb{Q} \cap [a, b]) \end{cases}.$$

Then by the previous proof with  $-1$  in place of  $0$ ,  $f \notin \mathcal{R}$  on  $[a, b]$ . But  $f^2 \equiv 1 \in \mathcal{R}$  on  $[a, b]$ . So it does **not** necessarily follow that if  $f^2 \in \mathcal{R}$  on  $[a, b]$  then  $f \in \mathcal{R}$ .

In the second case, it **does** necessarily follow that if  $f^3 \in \mathcal{R}$  on  $[a, b]$  then  $f \in \mathcal{R}$  by the following proof. The reason this works for  $f^3$  and not for  $f^2$  is that the inverse of the cube function on  $\mathbb{R}$  is well-defined and is  $\phi(x) = \sqrt[3]{x}$ . The square function does not have a well-defined inverse on all of  $\mathbb{R}$  (since if  $y = x^2$  then  $x = \pm\sqrt{y}$ ).

By Theorem 6.11, since  $\phi$  is continuous on all of  $\mathbb{R}$ , then

$$\phi(f^3(x)) = \sqrt[3]{f^3(x)} = f(x) \text{ is in } \mathcal{R} \text{ on } [a, b].$$

**Problem 6** (WR Ch 6 #10). Let  $p$  and  $q$  be positive real numbers such that

$$\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1.$$

Prove the following statements.

(a) If  $u \geq 0$  and  $v \geq 0$ , then

$$uv \leq \frac{u^p}{p} + \frac{v^q}{q}.$$

Equality holds if and only if  $u^p = v^q$ .

(b) If  $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ ,  $g \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ ,  $f \geq 0$ ,  $g \geq 0$ , and

$$\int_a^b f^p d\alpha = 1 = \int_a^b g^q d\alpha,$$

then

$$\int_a^b fg d\alpha = 1.$$

(c) If  $f$  and  $g$  are complex functions in  $\mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ , then

$$\left| \int_a^b fg d\alpha \right| \leq \left\{ \int_a^b |f|^p d\alpha \right\}^{1/p} \left\{ \int_a^b |g|^q d\alpha \right\}^{1/q}.$$

This is *Hölder's inequality*. When  $p = q = 2$  it is usually called the Schwarz inequality.

(d) Show that Hölder's inequality is also true for the "improper" integrals described in Exercises 6.7 and 6.8.

*Solution.*

**Claim.**  $f(x) = e^x$  is a convex function.

Let  $x < t < y$ . By the Mean Value Theorem, there exists some  $a \in (x, t)$  such that

$$f(t) - f(x) = (t - x)f'(a) \quad \text{which means} \quad f'(a) = \frac{f(t) - f(x)}{t - x}.$$

Once again, by the Mean Value Theorem, there exists some  $b \in (t, y)$  such that

$$f(y) - f(t) = (y - t)f'(b) \quad \text{which means} \quad f'(b) = \frac{f(y) - f(t)}{y - t}.$$

Notice that  $f''(x) = e^x > 0$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . This means that  $f'(x)$  is strictly increasing. Therefore, since  $a < b$ , we have  $f'(a) \leq f'(b)$ , so

$$\frac{f(t) - f(x)}{t - x} = f'(a) \leq f'(b) = \frac{f(y) - f(t)}{y - t}.$$

Now for any  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$  we have  $x < (\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y) < y$ , so letting  $t = (\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y)$  the above

inequality becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{f(t) - f(x)}{(\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y) - x} &\leq \frac{f(y) - f(t)}{y - (\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y)} \\ \frac{f(t) - f(x)}{(1 - \lambda)(y - x)} &\leq \frac{f(y) - f(t)}{\lambda(y - x)} \\ \lambda f(t) - \lambda f(x) &\leq (1 - \lambda)f(y) - (1 - \lambda)f(t) \\ f(t) &\leq \lambda f(x) + (1 - \lambda)f(y) \\ f(\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y) &\leq \lambda f(x) + (1 - \lambda)f(y),\end{aligned}$$

so  $f(x) = e^x$  is convex.

(a) From here, we let  $\lambda = \frac{1}{p}$ , so that  $(1 - \lambda) = \frac{1}{q}$ . The desired result is trivial if  $u = 0$  or  $v = 0$ , so assume they are both strictly positive. Letting  $x = \log u^p$  and  $y = \log v^q$ , the above inequality becomes

$$\begin{aligned}e^{\frac{1}{p} \log u^p + \frac{1}{q} \log v^q} &\leq \frac{1}{p} e^{\log u^p} + \frac{1}{q} e^{\log v^q} \\ e^{\log u + \log v} &\leq \frac{u^p}{p} + \frac{v^q}{q} \\ uv &\leq \frac{u^p}{p} + \frac{v^q}{q}.\end{aligned}$$

(b) By part (a), for every  $x \in [a, b]$  we have

$$f(x)g(x) \leq \frac{(f(x))^p}{p} + \frac{(g(x))^q}{q}.$$

Therefore, taking integrals, we have

$$\int_a^b fg \, d\alpha \leq \frac{\int_a^b f^p \, d\alpha}{p} + \frac{\int_a^b g^q \, d\alpha}{q} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1.$$

(c) If  $\int_a^b |f| \, d\alpha = 0$  or  $\int_a^b |g| \, d\alpha = 0$  the inequality is trivial. Otherwise, let  $A = \left\{ \int_a^b |f|^p \, d\alpha \right\}^{1/p} > 0$  and let  $B = \left\{ \int_a^b |g|^q \, d\alpha \right\}^{1/q} > 0$ , and let

$$F(x) = \frac{|f(x)|}{A} \quad \text{and} \quad G(x) = \frac{|g(x)|}{B}.$$

These functions satisfy the hypotheses of part (b), so

$$\begin{aligned}\int_a^b FG \, d\alpha &\leq 1 \\ \int_a^b \frac{|f|}{A} \frac{|g|}{B} \, d\alpha &\leq 1 \\ \left| \int_a^b fg \, d\alpha \right| &\leq \int_a^b |f| |g| \, d\alpha \leq AB = \left\{ \int_a^b |f|^p \, d\alpha \right\}^{1/p} \left\{ \int_a^b |g|^q \, d\alpha \right\}^{1/q}.\end{aligned}$$

(c) Since  $x \mapsto |x|$  and  $x \mapsto x^{1/p}$  and  $x \mapsto x^{1/q}$  are continuous functions (for  $x > 0$ ), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left| \int_0^1 fg \, d\alpha \right| &= \left| \lim_{c \rightarrow 0} \int_c^1 fg \, d\alpha \right| = \lim_{c \rightarrow 0} \left| \int_c^1 fg \, d\alpha \right| \\
 &\leq \lim_{c \rightarrow 0} \left( \left\{ \int_c^1 |f|^p \, d\alpha \right\}^{1/p} \left\{ \int_c^1 |g|^q \, d\alpha \right\}^{1/q} \right) \\
 &= \left( \lim_{c \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \int_c^1 |f|^p \, d\alpha \right\}^{1/p} \right) \cdot \left( \lim_{c \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \int_c^1 |g|^q \, d\alpha \right\}^{1/q} \right) \\
 &= \left\{ \lim_{c \rightarrow 0} \int_c^1 |f|^p \, d\alpha \right\}^{1/p} \cdot \left\{ \lim_{c \rightarrow 0} \int_c^1 |g|^q \, d\alpha \right\}^{1/q} \\
 &= \left\{ \int_0^1 |f|^p \, d\alpha \right\}^{1/p} \left\{ \int_0^1 |g|^q \, d\alpha \right\}^{1/q},
 \end{aligned}$$

assuming the integrals are all nonzero and finite. If they are not, the inequality is trivial. The proof follows similarly for  $\int_a^\infty$ .