

**Mathematics 131BH**  
**Terence Tao**  
**Second Midterm, May 23, 2003**

**Instructions:** Try to do all five problems; they are all of equal value. There is plenty of working space, and a blank page at the end. On the first page you will be supplied a list of standard definitions for easy reference.

Unless otherwise specified, you may use all the results from the class notes, textbook, or any other source; you do not need to give precise theorem numbers or page numbers (e.g. saying “by a theorem from the notes” will suffice). You are encouraged to be verbose in your proofs and explanations; a chain of equations with no explanation given may be insufficient for full credit.

You may enter in a nickname if you want your midterm score posted.

Good luck!

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Nickname:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Student ID:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

Problem 1. \_\_\_\_\_

Problem 2. \_\_\_\_\_

Problem 3. \_\_\_\_\_

Problem 4. \_\_\_\_\_

Problem 5. \_\_\_\_\_

**Total:** \_\_\_\_\_

## Reference sheet

This reference page contains some definitions from the Week 4-7 notes which are relevant to the midterm questions.

---

- **Compactly supported functions.** Let  $[a, b]$  be an interval. A function  $f : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  is said to be *supported* on  $[a, b]$  iff  $f(x) = 0$  for all  $x \notin [a, b]$ . We say that  $f$  is *compactly supported* iff it is supported on some interval  $[a, b]$ . If  $f$  is continuous and supported on  $[a, b]$ , we define the improper integral  $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f$  to be  $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f := \int_{[a,b]} f$ .

- **Convolution.** Let  $f : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  and  $g : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  be continuous, compactly supported functions. We define the *convolution*  $f * g : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  of  $f$  and  $g$  to be the function

$$f * g(x) := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(y)g(x-y) dy.$$

- **Fourier series.** For any function  $f \in C(\mathbf{R}/\mathbf{Z}; \mathbf{R})$ , and any integer  $n \in \mathbf{Z}$ , we define the  $n^{\text{th}}$  *Fourier coefficient* of  $f$ , denoted  $\hat{f}(n)$ , by the formula

$$\hat{f}(n) := \langle f, e_n \rangle = \int_{[0,1]} f(x)e^{-2\pi inx} dx.$$

The function  $\hat{f} : \mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  is called the *Fourier transform* of  $f$ .

- **Periodic functions.** A function  $f : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  is  *$\mathbf{Z}$ -periodic*, if we have  $f(x+k) = f(x)$  for every integer  $k$ . The space of complex-valued continuous  $\mathbf{Z}$ -periodic functions is denoted  $C(\mathbf{R}/\mathbf{Z}; \mathbf{C})$ .

**Problem 1.** Let  $f \in C(\mathbf{R}/\mathbf{Z}; \mathbf{C})$  be a continuous, 1-periodic function. Suppose also that  $f$  is differentiable, and  $f'$  is also in  $C(\mathbf{R}/\mathbf{Z}; \mathbf{C})$ . Show that  $\widehat{f'}(n) = 2\pi in \widehat{f}(n)$  for every integer  $n$ . (Hint: use integration by parts).

---

By definition, we have

$$\widehat{f'}(n) = \int_{[0,1]} f'(x) e^{-2\pi inx} dx.$$

Using the integration by parts formula

$$\int_{[0,1]} u'(x)v(x) dx = u(x)v(x) \Big|_{x=0}^{x=1} - \int_{[0,1]} u(x)v'(x) dx$$

with  $u(x) := f(x)$  and  $v(x) := e^{-2\pi inx}$  (note that both of these functions are continuously differentiable, and so the integration by parts formula is valid), we have

$$\int_{[0,1]} f'(x) e^{-2\pi inx} dx = f(x) e^{-2\pi inx} \Big|_{x=0}^{x=1} - \int_{[0,1]} f(x) (-2\pi in e^{-2\pi inx}) dx$$

so

$$\widehat{f'}(n) = f(1)e^{-2\pi in} - f(0)e^0 + 2\pi in \int_{[0,1]} f(x) e^{-2\pi inx} dx.$$

But since  $f$  is 1-periodic,  $f(1) = f(0)$ . Also,  $e^{-2\pi in} = e^0 = 1$ . Thus the first two terms cancel, and the third term is equal to  $2\pi in \widehat{f}(n)$ , as desired.

**Remark.** It is also possible to proceed via the Fourier-Plancherel theorem, but to make the argument below rigorous requires much more smoothness on  $f$  than is currently assumed (e.g. one may need  $f$  to be three times continuously differentiable). The idea is as follows. Starting with the Fourier inversion formula

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \widehat{f}(n) e_n(x)$$

one can differentiate both sides with respect to  $x$ . If one can interchange the derivative and integral, we will obtain

$$f'(x) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \widehat{f}(n) e'_n(x).$$

But

$$e'_n(x) = \frac{d}{dx} e^{2\pi inx} = 2\pi in e^{2\pi inx} = 2\pi in e_n$$

and so

$$f'(x) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \widehat{f}(n) 2\pi in e_n(x).$$

But from the Fourier inversion formula applied to  $f'$ , we have

$$f'(x) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{f}'(n)e_n(x).$$

The claim should then follow by equating Fourier coefficients. (One can modify Corollary 5 from Week 6 notes to show that any given function can have at most one set of Fourier coefficients; if  $\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} c_n e_n$  and  $\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} d_n e_n$  both converge to the same function  $f$ , then  $c_n = d_n = \hat{f}(n)$ .)

Unfortunately, the above proof is not rigorous because one has to justify a number of steps, in particular the interchanging of the derivative and integral. This can be done using Corollary 2 of Weeks 4/5 notes, but only if we know that  $\hat{f}(n)2\pi n$  is an absolutely convergent series. This turns out to be true for three (!) times continuously differentiable functions, but not necessarily true for others.

**Problem 2.** Obtain a power series for  $\arctan : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$  centered at the origin; indicate the radius of convergence, and justify your reasoning. (You may use without proof the assertion that  $\arctan$  is differentiable and that  $\frac{d}{dx} \arctan(x) = \frac{1}{1+x^2}$ ).

---

Starting with the geometric series

$$\frac{1}{1-x} = 1 + x + x^2 + \dots$$

which converges for all  $|x| < 1$ , we replace  $x$  by  $-x^2$  to obtain

$$\frac{1}{1+x^2} = 1 - x^2 + x^4 - x^6 + \dots$$

which converges whenever  $|-x^2| < 1$ , i.e. when  $|x| < 1$ . The radius of convergence of this series is 1 (as can be seen by e.g. the ratio test). In particular, it converges uniformly on  $[-r, r]$  for any  $0 < r < 1$ . We can then integrate from 0 to  $r$  to obtain

$$\int_{[0,r]} \frac{1}{1+x^2} dx = r - \frac{r^3}{3} + \frac{r^5}{5} - \dots$$

But by the fundamental theorem of calculus we have

$$\int_{[0,r]} \frac{1}{1+x^2} dx = \arctan(r) - \arctan(0) = \arctan(r).$$

Thus we have the power series expansion

$$\arctan(r) = r - \frac{r^3}{3} + \frac{r^5}{5} - \dots$$

for all  $0 < r < 1$ . This formula also clearly works for  $r = 0$ . For  $-1 < r < 0$ , we replace the integral on  $[0, r]$  by the negative integral on  $[r, 0]$ , and note that

$$-\int_{[r,0]} \frac{1}{1+x^2} dx = r - \frac{r^3}{3} + \frac{r^5}{5} - \dots$$

and

$$-\int_{[r,0]} \frac{1}{1+x^2} dx = -(\arctan(0) - \arctan(r)) = \arctan(r)$$

so we still have

$$\arctan(r) = r - \frac{r^3}{3} + \frac{r^5}{5} - \dots = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n r^{2n+1}}{2n+1}$$

when  $-1 < r < 0$ . Thus this formula is valid for all  $-1 < r < 1$ .

To compute the radius of convergence of this series, we may use for instance the ratio test. Observe that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|(-1)^{n+1} r^{2(n+1)+1} / (2(n+1)+1)|}{|(-1)^n r^{2n+1} / (2n+1)|} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |r| \frac{2n+1}{2n+3} = |r|,$$

so the series converges when  $|r| < 1$  and diverges when  $|r| > 1$ . Hence the radius of convergence is 1.

**Remark:** Using this power series expansion, the identity  $\arctan(1) = \frac{\pi}{4}$ , and Abel's theorem, one can deduce the famous formula

$$\pi = 4 - \frac{4}{3} + \frac{4}{5} - \frac{4}{7} + \frac{4}{9} - \dots$$

**Problem 3.** Let  $\vec{x} : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^3$  be a differentiable function, and let  $r : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  be the function  $r(t) := \|\vec{x}(t)\|$ , where  $\|\vec{x}\|$  denotes the length of  $\vec{x}$  as measured in the usual  $l^2$  metric. Let  $t_0$  be a real number. Show that if  $r(t_0) \neq 0$ , then  $r$  is differentiable at  $t_0$ , and

$$r'(t_0) = \frac{\vec{x}'(t_0) \cdot \vec{x}(t_0)}{r(t_0)}.$$

(Hint: Use the chain rule).

---

Let  $f : \mathbf{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  be the function  $f(\vec{x}) := \|\vec{x}\|$ , or in other words

$$f(x_1, x_2, x_3) := \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2}.$$

Then  $r(t)$  can be written as  $r(t) = \|\vec{x}(t)\| = f(\vec{x}(t))$ , i.e.  $r = f \circ \vec{x}$ . Since  $r(t_0)$  is assumed to be non-zero,  $\vec{x}(t_0)$  is non-zero, and so  $f$  is differentiable at  $\vec{x}(t_0)$  (note that  $x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2$  is differentiable everywhere, and  $\sqrt{y}$  is differentiable for  $y \neq 0$ ), so the chain rule applies, and we have

$$r'(t_0) = f'(\vec{x}(t_0))\vec{x}'(t_0).$$

Since the partial derivatives

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1} = \frac{x_1}{\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2}}$$

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2} = \frac{x_2}{\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2}}$$

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_3} = \frac{x_3}{\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2}}$$

are continuous away from the origin, we have

$$f'(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \left( \begin{array}{c} \frac{x_1}{\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2}} \\ \frac{x_2}{\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2}} \\ \frac{x_3}{\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2}} \end{array} \right)$$

so if we write  $\vec{x}(t_0) = (x_1(t_0), x_2(t_0), x_3(t_0))$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} f'(\vec{x}(t_0))\vec{x}'(t_0) &= \frac{x_1(t_0)x_1'(t_0) + x_2(t_0)x_2'(t_0) + x_3(t_0)x_3'(t_0)}{\sqrt{x_1^2(t_0) + x_2^2(t_0) + x_3^2(t_0)}} \\ &= \frac{\vec{x}(t_0) \cdot \vec{x}'(t_0)}{\|\vec{x}'(t_0)\|} \\ &= \frac{\vec{x}'(t_0) \cdot \vec{x}(t_0)}{r(t_0)} \end{aligned}$$

as desired.

**Alternate proof:** Observe that

$$r(t)^2 = \|\vec{x}(t)\|^2 = \vec{x}(t) \cdot \vec{x}(t).$$

By the product rule, we thus see that  $r^2$  is differentiable at  $t_0$  and

$$(r^2)'(t_0) = \vec{x}(t_0) \cdot \vec{x}'(t_0) + \vec{x}'(t_0) \cdot \vec{x}(t_0) = 2\vec{x}'(t_0) \cdot \vec{x}(t_0).$$

Since  $r^2$  is differentiable at  $t_0$ , and  $r^2(t_0)$  is non-zero, we thus see that  $r$  is also differentiable at  $t_0$  (this follows from the single-variable calculus chain rule, since  $r$  is the square root of  $r^2$ , and the square root function is differentiable away from zero). In particular, by the product rule or chain rule we have

$$(r^2)'(t_0) = 2r(t_0)r'(t_0).$$

Equating this with the previous equation we obtain the result.



**Problem 4.** Let  $f : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  and  $g : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  be continuous, compactly supported functions. Suppose that  $f$  is supported on the interval  $[0, 1]$ , and  $g$  is constant on the interval  $[0, 2]$  (i.e. there is a real number  $c$  such that  $g(x) = c$  for all  $x \in [0, 2]$ ). Show that the convolution  $f * g$  is constant on the interval  $[1, 2]$ .

---

Let  $x$  be any number in  $[1, 2]$ . We compute

$$f * g(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(y)g(x - y) dy.$$

Since  $f$  is supported on  $[0, 1]$ , so is  $f(y)g(x - y)$ , and we can rewrite the above integral as

$$f * g(x) = \int_{[0,1]} f(y)g(x - y) dy.$$

But if  $x \in [1, 2]$  and  $y \in [0, 1]$ , then  $x - y \in [0, 2]$ , and hence  $g(x - y) = c$  by hypothesis. Thus

$$f * g(x) = \int_{[0,1]} f(y)c dy.$$

The right-hand side does not depend on  $x$ ; thus  $f * g$  is constant on the interval  $[1, 2]$ .

**Remark.** This result is closely related to both Lemma 6 of Weeks 4/5 notes, and also the remark on page 12 of Week 6 notes regarding convolution with trigonometric polynomials.

**Problem 5.** Let  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  be a continuous function, and suppose that  $\int_{[0,1]} f(x)x^n dx = 0$  for all non-negative integers  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ . Show that  $f$  must be the zero function  $f \equiv 0$ . (Hint: First show that  $\int_{[0,1]} f(x)P(x) dx = 0$  for all polynomials  $P$ . Then, using the Weierstrass approximation theorem, show that  $\int_{[0,1]} f(x)f(x) dx = 0$ .)

---

First let  $P$  be any polynomial, thus  $P(x) = c_0 + c_1x + c_2x^2 + \dots + c_nx^n$  for some non-negative integer  $n$  and some real numbers  $c_0, c_1, \dots, c_n$ . Now compute

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[0,1]} f(x)P(x) dx &= \int_{[0,1]} f(x) \sum_{j=0}^n c_j x^j dx \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^n c_j \int_{[0,1]} f(x)x^j dx = \sum_{j=0}^n c_j 0 = 0 \end{aligned}$$

by hypothesis. Note that we can interchange the sum and integral without difficulty because the sum is finite.

Now we use the Weierstrass approximation theorem. Pick any  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Since  $f$  is continuous on  $[0, 1]$ , we know that there exists a polynomial  $P(x)$  on  $[0, 1]$  such that  $|P(x) - f(x)| \leq \varepsilon$  for all  $x \in [0, 1]$ , in other words

$$P(x) - \varepsilon \leq f(x) \leq P(x) + \varepsilon$$

for all  $x \in [0, 1]$ . Multiplying by  $f(x)$  (and being careful, because  $f(x)$  could be negative), we obtain

$$f(x)P(x) - \varepsilon|f(x)| \leq f(x)f(x) \leq f(x)P(x) + \varepsilon|f(x)|$$

for all  $x \in [0, 1]$ . Integrating over  $[0, 1]$ , we obtain

$$\int_{[0,1]} f(x)P(x) dx - \varepsilon \int_{[0,1]} |f(x)| dx \leq \int_{[0,1]} f(x)f(x) dx \leq \int_{[0,1]} f(x)P(x) dx + \varepsilon \int_{[0,1]} |f(x)| dx.$$

But we have just proved that  $\int_{[0,1]} f(x)P(x) dx = 0$ , hence we have

$$-\varepsilon \int_{[0,1]} |f(x)| dx \leq \int_{[0,1]} f(x)^2 dx \leq \varepsilon \int_{[0,1]} |f(x)| dx.$$

But this is true for any  $\varepsilon$ , and  $\int_{[0,1]} |f(x)| dx$  and  $\int_{[0,1]} f(x)^2 dx$  do not depend on  $\varepsilon$ ; hence we must have

$$\int_{[0,1]} f(x)^2 dx = 0.$$

But this implies that  $f \equiv 0$ , either by modifying Lemma 2(ii) of Week 6 notes, or observing that if  $f$  was not identically 0, then there must be some point  $x$  for which  $f(x) \neq 0$ , say  $|f(x)| = c > 0$ , then by continuity there would be some ball  $B(x, r) \cap [0, 1]$  around  $x$  for

which  $|f|$  was larger than  $c/2$  (say), which implies that  $\int_{[0,1]} f(x)^2$  is strictly greater than 0, contradiction.

**Remark.** The quantity  $\int f(x)x^n dx$  is sometimes called the  $n^{\text{th}}$  *moment* of  $f$ . The above problem thus asserts if a (continuous) function has all its moments vanishing, then it must itself vanish. A corollary of this is that if two continuous functions  $f, g$  have identical moments, i.e.  $\int f(x)x^n dx = \int g(x)x^n dx$  for all  $f, g$ , then they must themselves be identical (to see this, apply the above result to  $f - g$ ). Thus, in principle, one can work out what a function should be just by examining its moments.