

## Solutions to Assignment 6

1. Applying l'Hôpital's rule in the variable  $h$  to this indeterminate form we have

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

Note that to apply l'Hôpital's rule we only need to check that the derivative of the denominator does not vanish for  $h \neq 0$ . Strictly speaking, you have to apply l'Hôpital twice in the form that Rudin states it: once on the interval  $(a, b) = (0, \delta)$  where  $\delta$  is small enough that the numerator is differentiable on this interval, and then once on the interval  $(a, b) = (-\delta, 0)$ . Anyway then you have the equality above, and you can say

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f'(x+h) - f'(x-h)}{2h} &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f'(x+h) - f'(x) - f'(x-h) + f'(x)}{2h} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f'(x+h) - f'(x)}{h} + \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f'(x-h) - f'(x)}{-h} \right] = f''(x). \end{aligned}$$

2. The difficulty with a problem like this is deciding how much you have to say. Since Rudin (in section 5.4) points out that the product and sum rules imply  $(x^n)' = nx^{n-1}$  for all  $n$ , you can certainly claim without proof that  $|x|^3$  is differentiable to all orders for  $x \neq 0$ . Moreover, since  $|x|^3 = x^3$  for  $x \geq 0$  and  $|x|^3 = -x^3$  for  $x \leq 0$ , you have for  $x \geq 0$

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{f(x+h) - f(x)}{h} = (x^3)' = 3x^2,$$

and for  $x \leq 0$

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0^-} \frac{f(x+h) - f(x)}{h} = (-x^3)' = -3x^2.$$

Since these limits are equal at  $x = 0$ ,  $f'(0)$  exists and is zero. Repeating this argument, now that you know  $(|x|^3)' = 3x^2$  for  $x \geq 0$  and  $(|x|^3)' = -3x^2$  for  $x \leq 0$ , you will see  $(|x|^3)'' = 6x$  for  $x \geq 0$  and  $(|x|^3)'' = -6x$  for  $x \leq 0$ . Thus

$$\frac{f''(0+h) - f''(0)}{h} = 6 \text{ for } h > 0, \text{ but } \frac{f''(0+h) - f''(0)}{h} = -6 \text{ for } h < 0$$

and the third derivative at zero is undefined.

3. Following Rudin's hint, you should rearrange

$$f(x+2h) = f(x) + 2hf'(x) + 2h^2f''(c) \text{ to get } f'(x) = \frac{1}{2h}[f(x+2h) - f(x)] - hf''(c)$$

Hence, for  $h > 0$

$$|f'(x)| \leq \frac{1}{2h} [|f(x+2h)| + |f(x)|] + h|f''(c)|.$$

Then, simply substituting the definitions of  $M_0$  and  $M_2$  gives

$$|f'(x)| \leq \frac{M_0}{h} + hM_2.$$

Now you just have to find the  $h$  which minimizes  $M_0/h + hM_2$ . Setting the derivative of  $M_0/h + hM_2$  equal to zero and solving, you will find that the minimum occurs at  $h = (M_0/M_2)^{1/2}$ . Substituting this shows  $|f'(x)| \leq 2(M_0M_2)^{1/2}$ . Since this holds for all  $x \in (a, \infty)$ , we have  $M_1^2 \leq 4M_0M_2$ .

I will assume that you were able to verify Rudin's example.

4. To show that  $f'(x)$  goes to zero as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , note that the hypothesis implies, given  $\delta > 0$ , there is an  $N$  such that  $|f(x)| < \delta$  for  $x > N$ . Apply Rudin's problem 15 (i.e. problem 3 in this assignment) with  $(a, \infty) = (N, \infty)$ . This shows that, for  $x > N$   $|f'(x)|^2 \leq 4\delta M_2$ . Hence, given  $\epsilon > 0$ , if we take  $\delta = \epsilon^2/(4M_2)$ , we have  $|f'(x)| < \epsilon$  for  $x > N$ , i.e.  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f'(x) = 0$ .

5. a) This is the MVT: if  $f(x) = x$  and  $f(y) = y$  where  $x < y$ , the MVT says there is a  $c \in (x, y)$  such that  $f(x) - f(y) = (x - y)f'(c)$ , i.e.  $x - y = (x - y)f'(c)$ . So  $f'(c) = 1$ , contradicting the hypothesis  $f'(t) \neq 1$ .

b)  $f(t) = t$  implies  $(1 + e^t)^{-1} = 0$  which implies  $1 = 0$ . So  $f(t)$  is never  $t$ . We have

$$f'(t) = 1 - e^t(1 + e^t)^{-2}.$$

Since  $e^t > 0$ , it follows that  $(1 + e^t)^2 > (1 + e^t)$  and so  $0 < e^t(1 + e^t)^{-2} < 1$ . Thus  $0 < f'(t) < 1$ .

c) This is the interesting part. Take  $x_0$  to be any point on the line, and define the sequence  $\{x_n\}$  by  $f(x_n) = x_{n+1}$ . It will suffice to show that  $\{x_n\}$  is a Cauchy sequence. If it is a Cauchy sequence in  $\mathbb{R}$ , it must converge to a point  $x_\infty \in \mathbb{R}$ , and, since  $f$  is continuous,

$$f(x_\infty) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(x_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_{n+1} = x_\infty.$$

To see that  $\{x_n\}$  is a Cauchy sequence, one can argue as follows. If we ever have  $x_{n+1} = x_n$ , we are done, so we can assume that this does not happen. Then by the MVT

$$f(x_{n+1}) - f(x_n) = (x_n - x_{n-1})f'(c)$$

for some  $c$  between  $x_{n-1}$  and  $x_n$ . Thus, by hypothesis,  $|x_{n+1} - x_n| \leq A|x_n - x_{n-1}|$  for all  $n > 0$ . Thus  $|x_{n+1} - x_n| \leq A^n B$  with  $B = |x_1 - x_0|$ . Now the triangle inequality gives

$$|x_{n+m} - x_n| \leq \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} |x_{n+k+1} - x_{n+k}| \leq B \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} A^{n+k} \leq BA^n(1 - A)^{-1}$$

by the formula for the sum of a geometric series. Since  $A^n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we can conclude that  $\{x_n\}$  is a Cauchy sequence.