

There are other good approaches to many of the problems

1. True/false. If true, prove it; if false, provide a counter-example.
 - (a) If one point is deleted from a closed subset of a metric space, the resulting set is still closed.
False. For example, $[0, 1]$ is closed, but $[0, 1] \setminus \{\frac{1}{2}\} = [0, \frac{1}{2}) \cup (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ is not.
 - (b) If one point is deleted from an open subset of a metric space, the resulting set is still open.
True. We need to show that if A is open and $p \in A$, $B := A \setminus \{p\}$ is open, i.e. that if $q \in B$, then q is an interior point of B . Since A is open, q is an interior point of A , so there exists $r > 0$ such that $N_r(q) \subseteq A$. Let $s := \min\{r, d(p, q)\}$; then $N_s(q) \subseteq B$, so q is an interior point of B .
 - (c) $\overline{\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n} = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \overline{A_n}$ for any countable collection of subsets A_n of a metric space X .
False. For example, let $A_n := (0, \frac{1}{n})$. $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n = \emptyset$, and $\overline{\emptyset} = \emptyset$. On the other hand, $\overline{A_n} = [0, \frac{1}{n}]$, so $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \overline{A_n} = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} [0, \frac{1}{n}] = \{0\} \neq \emptyset$.
2. Show that a choice of a subset \mathcal{P} of a field \mathcal{F} satisfying
 - (a) for each $x \in \mathcal{P}$ exactly one of the following is true: $x \in \mathcal{P}$; $x = 0$; $-x \in \mathcal{P}$
 - (b) $x \in \mathcal{P}$ and $y \in \mathcal{P}$ implies $x + y \in \mathcal{P}$
 - (c) $x \in \mathcal{P}$ and $y \in \mathcal{P}$ implies $xy \in \mathcal{P}$

makes \mathcal{F} an ordered field, with $x < y \iff y - x \in \mathcal{P}$.

Given $x, y \in \mathcal{P}$, exactly one of the following is true:

- $y - x \in \mathcal{P}$, and hence $y > x$
- $y - x = 0$, and hence $y = x$
- $x - y = -(y - x) \in \mathcal{P}$, and hence $x > y$.

If $x, y, z \in \mathcal{F}$, $x < y$, i.e. $y - x \in \mathcal{P}$, and $y < z$, i.e. $z - y \in \mathcal{P}$, then (b) implies that $z - x = (z - y) + (y - x) \in \mathcal{P}$, and hence $z > x$. Hence \mathcal{P} determines an ordering on \mathcal{F} .

If $x, y, z \in \mathcal{F}$ and $y < z$, i.e. $z - y \in \mathcal{P}$, then $(x + z) - (x + y) = z - y \in \mathcal{P}$ implies that $x + z > x + y$. $x > 0 \iff x = x - 0 \in \mathcal{P}$ (N.B. “ \mathcal{P} ” stands for positive); hence (c) implies that if $x > 0$ and $y > 0$, then $xy > 0$. Thus the ordering determined by \mathcal{P} makes \mathcal{F} an ordered field.

3. (a) Show that if A and B are bounded subsets of \mathbb{R} , then $A \cup B$ is bounded.
A bounded implies there exists $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $r > 0$ such that $A \subseteq N_r(x)$; analogously, $B \subseteq N_s(y)$ for some $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $s > 0$. Let $M := \max\{r + |x|, s + |y|\}$. Then $z \in A \cup B$ implies that either $z \in A$, and hence $|z| \leq |z - x| + |x| < r + |x| \leq M$, or $z \in B$, and hence $|z| \leq |z - y| + |y| < s + |y| \leq M$. Thus $A \cup B \subseteq N_M(0)$.
- (b) Show that if A and B are compact subsets of \mathbb{R} , then $A \cup B$ is compact.
The Heine-Borel Theorem implies that A and B are both closed and bounded. Finite unions of closed sets are closed, so $A \cup B$ is closed, and part (a) implies that $A \cup B$ is bounded. Hence the Heine-Borel Theorem implies that $A \cup B$ is compact.

4. The *distance* from a point p in a metric space X to a nonempty subset S of X is defined as

$$\text{dist}(p, S) := \inf\{d(p, s) : s \in S\}.$$

Show that $p \in \overline{S} \iff \text{dist}(p, S) = 0$.

If $\text{dist}(p, S) = 0$, that implies that for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $s \in S$ such that $d(p, s) < \epsilon$. (If not, ϵ would be a lower bound of the set $D := \{d(p, s) : s \in S\}$ and hence $\text{dist}(p, S)$ would be at least ϵ .) Hence either $p \in S$ or p is a limit point of S (possibly both), so $p \in \overline{S}$.

If $p \in \overline{S}$, then either $p \in S$ or p is a limit point of S (possibly both). If $p \in S$, then $0 \in D$ and hence, since 0 is a lower bound of D , $\text{dist}(p, S) = 0$. If p is a limit point of S , for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $s \in S$ such that $\text{dist}(p, S) \leq d(p, s) < \epsilon$; this implies $\text{dist}(p, S) = 0$.

5. Fill in the following outline of a proof that for any compact subset K of \mathbb{R} and any point $c \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists a point $a \in K$ such that $|c - a| = \text{dist}(c, K) = \inf\{|c - x| : x \in K\}$.

(a) For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $x_n \in K$ satisfying $|c - x_n| < \text{dist}(c, K) + \frac{1}{n}$.

If not, $\text{dist}(c, K) + \frac{1}{n}$ would be a lower bound of $\{|c - x| : x \in K\}$, but $\text{dist}(c, K)$ is the greatest lower bound of that set.

(b) If the set $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is finite, then $|c - x_j| = \text{dist}(c, K)$ for some $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Assume $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ contains a finite number of distinct elements $\{x_{n_1}, \dots, x_{n_k}\}$. $\text{dist}(c, K) \leq \min\{|c - x_{n_1}|, \dots, |c - x_{n_k}|\} \leq \text{dist}(c, K) + \frac{1}{n}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ implies $\min\{|c - x_{n_1}|, \dots, |c - x_{n_k}|\} = \text{dist}(c, K)$. If the minimum is achieved at n_ℓ (not necessarily unique), let $j = n_\ell$.

(c) If the set $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is infinite, it has a limit point $a \in K$ satisfying $|c - a| = \text{dist}(c, K)$.

Any infinite subset of a compact set has a limit point; let a be a limit point of $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, the neighborhood $N_{\epsilon/2}(a)$ must contain infinitely many elements of $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $\frac{1}{m} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, so that $n \geq m$ implies that $|c - x_n| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$; since there are only $m - 1$ points in $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with index less than m , there are infinitely many x_n with index greater than or equal to m in $N_{\epsilon/2}(a)$.