MULTIPLE CHOICE QUESTIONS 1 : SOLUTIONS

1. (i) False : Take
$$E = E^{\circ} =]0, \frac{1}{2}[$$
 and $F = [0, 1]$. We have that $\frac{1}{2} \in \partial E$ but

$$\frac{1}{2} \notin \partial(E \cup F) = \partial[0,1] = \{0,1\}.$$

(*ii*) **True** : If $x \in \partial(E \cup F)$, then by definition

$$\forall r > 0, \mathcal{B}(x, r) \cap (E \cup F)^c \neq \emptyset \text{ and } \mathcal{B}(x, r) \cap (E \cup F) \neq \emptyset.$$

Therefore either for E or F (let say E), we have

$$\forall r > 0, \mathcal{B}(x, r) \cap (E \cup F)^c \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{B}(x, r) \cap E \neq \emptyset.$$

Since $E^c \supset (E \cup F)^c$,

$$\forall r > 0, \mathcal{B}(x, r) \cap E^c \neq \emptyset \text{ and } \mathcal{B}(x, r) \cap E \neq \emptyset,$$

we finally get that $x \in \partial E$, and thus that $\partial(E \cup F) \subset \partial E \cup \partial F$. Conversely, let $x \in \partial E \cup F$. Therefore either $x \in \partial E$ or $x \in \partial F$, let say without loss of generality that $x \in \partial E$. We have that $\partial E \subset \overline{E}$ and $\overline{E} \cap \overline{F} = \emptyset$, therefore $x \in \overline{F}^c$. Since \overline{F} is closed, \overline{F}^c is open and thus,

$$\exists r_0 > 0 : \forall r \le r_0, \mathcal{B}(x, r) \subset \mathcal{B}(x, r_0) \subset \overline{F}^c.$$

Therefore, for all $r \leq r_0$,

$$\mathcal{B}(x,r) \cap E \neq \emptyset, \quad \mathcal{B}(x,r) \cap E^c \neq \emptyset, \quad \mathcal{B}(x,r) \cap F = \emptyset \text{ and } \mathcal{B}(x,r) \subset F^c.$$

Therefore, for all $r \leq r_0$,

$$\mathcal{B}(x,r) \cap E \neq \emptyset$$
 and $\mathcal{B}(x,r) \cap (E \cup F)^c \neq \emptyset$,

and thus

$$\mathcal{B}(x,r) \cap (E \cup F) \neq \emptyset$$
 and $\mathcal{B}(x,r) \cap (E \cup F)^c \neq \emptyset$,

what prove that $x \in \partial(E \cup F)$.

(*iii*) False : Let E =]0, 1[and F = [1, 2]. We have that $1 \in \partial E$, but

$$\partial(E \cup F) = \partial[0, 1] = \{0, 2\},\$$

while

$$E^{\circ} \cap F^{\circ} =]0,1[\cap]1,2[=\emptyset.$$

(iv) False : same counter-example as (iii).

2. \mathcal{N} is not a norm since

$$\mathcal{N}(2x) = \frac{\|2x\|_2}{1 + \|2x\|_2} = \frac{2\|x\|_2}{1 + 2\|x\|_2} < 2 \cdot \frac{\|x\|_2}{1 + \|x\|_2} = 2\mathcal{N}(x),$$

and thus the homogeneity is not valid. On the other hand, d is indeed a distance. the fact that d(x, y) > 0 for all $x \neq y$ and d(x, x) = 0 is clear. Let show the triangle inequality. First, let observe that

$$t\longmapsto \frac{t}{1+t}$$

is increasing on $[0, \infty)$. Also, we see that for $u, v \ge 0$,

$$\frac{u}{1+u} + \frac{v}{1+v} - \frac{u+v}{1+u+v} = \frac{u(1+v)}{(1+u)(1+v)} + \frac{v(1+u)}{(1+v)(1+u)} - \frac{u+v}{1+u+v}$$

$$= \frac{u + v + 2uv}{1 + u + v + uv} - \frac{u + v}{1 + u + v}$$

$$=\frac{uv(u+v+2)}{(1+u+v)^2+(1+u+v)uv}\ge 0,$$

and thus

$$\frac{u+v}{1+u+v} \le \frac{u}{1+u} + \frac{v}{1+v},$$
(1)

for all $u, v \ge 0$. Using the fact that $\|\cdot\|_2$ is a norm, we get that

$$||x - z||_2 \le ||x - y||_2 + ||y - z||_2,$$

and thus, if $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$d(x,z) = \mathcal{N}(x-z) = \frac{\|x-z\|_2}{1+\|x-z\|_2} \le \frac{\|x-y\|_2 + \|y-z\|_2}{1+\|x-y\|_2 + \|y-z\|_2}$$
$$\le \frac{\|x-y\|_2}{1+\|x-y\|_2} + \frac{\|y-z\|_2}{1+\|y-z\|_2} = \mathcal{N}(x-y) + \mathcal{N}(y-z) = d(x,y) + d(y,z),$$

where the first inequality come from the fact that $t \mapsto \frac{t}{1+t}$ is increasing. The claim follow.

3. (i) **False :** E is not closed. Indeed, let consider the sequence defined by $x_n = \left(\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n^{3/2}}\right)$. Then (x_n) is a sequence of E. Moreover we have that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} x_n = (0, 0) \notin E,$$

and thus E is not closed.

(*ii*) **False :** since E is not closed.

(*iii*) **True :** Let show that E^c is closed. Remark that

$$E^{c} = \{(x, y) \mid y \le x^{2} \text{ or } y \ge x\} \cup (] - \infty, 0] \times \mathbb{R}) \cup ([1, +\infty[\times\mathbb{R})].$$

Since $] - \infty, 0] \times \mathbb{R}$ and $[1, +\infty[\times \mathbb{R} \text{ are closed, we just have to show that}]$

$$\{(x, y) \mid x \in [0, 1] \text{ and } (y \le x^2 \text{ or } y \ge x)\}$$

is closed (because a finite union of closed is closed). Let $((x_n, y_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ a convergent sequence of E. Let denote (a, b) the limit. If the limit is (0, 0) or (1, 1) then we are done. So we suppose $(a, b) \notin \{(0, 0), (1, 1)\}$. Let

$$A = \{n \mid y_n \le x_n^2\} := \{n_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ and } B = \{n \mid y_n \ge x_n\} := \{m_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}.$$

We necessarily have that |A| or |B| is finite. Indeed, if both where non-finite, then

$$b = \lim_{k \to \infty} y_{n_k} \le \lim_{k \to \infty} x_{n_k}^2 = a^2$$

and

$$b = \lim_{k \to \infty} y_{m_k} \ge \lim_{k \to \infty} x_{n_k} = a,$$

and thus $a \leq b \leq a^2$. Since $a \in [0,1]$ we have that $a^2 \leq a$ and thus we get $a = a^2 = b$ what implies that (a,b) = (0,0) or (a,b) = (1,1) which is impossible by our assumption on (a,b). Suppose without loss of generality that A is finite and B is non finite. In particular, there is $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n \in B$ for all $n \geq k$. Therefore, $x_n \leq y_n$ for all $n \geq k$ and thus

$$a = \lim_{n \to \infty} x_n \le \lim_{n \to \infty} y_n = b.$$

In particular $(a, b) \in E$, and thus E is closed. Let show that

$$\partial E = \{ (x, x) \mid x \in [0, 1] \} \cup \{ (x, x^2) \mid x \in [0, 1] \}.$$

The fact that $\partial E \subset \{(x,x) \mid x \in [0,1]\} \cup \{(x,x^2) \mid x \in [0,1]\}$ is obvious, and thus, we just have to show the converse inclusion. Also, the fact that (0,0) and (1,1) are in ∂E is obvious. Let $x \in]0,1[$ and consider the ball $\mathcal{B}\left((x,x),\frac{1}{n}\right)$ with $\frac{1}{n}$ small enough to have $x - \frac{1}{n} > x^2$. In particular if m > n, we have that $(x, x - \frac{1}{m}) \in E$ and $(x, x + \frac{1}{m}) \in E^c$. Therefore

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \mathcal{B}\left((x, x), \frac{1}{n}\right) \cap E \neq \emptyset \text{ and } \mathcal{B}\left((x, x), \frac{1}{n}\right) \cap E^c \neq \emptyset.$$

Therefore $(x, x) \in \partial E$. Let $x \in]0, 1[$, we consider n big enough to have $x^2 + \frac{1}{n} < x$. Take m > n and show that $(x, x^2 + \frac{1}{m}) \in E$ and $(x, x^2 - \frac{1}{m}) \in E^c$ what will prove the claim (to see things better, make a draw !).

- 4. (i) False : Take E = [0, 1].
 - (*ii*) **False :** Take E = [0, 1].

(*iii*) **True** : Let show that E^c is open. Suppose by contradiction that it's not open. So there is an $x \in E^c$ such that for all n,

$$\mathcal{B}\left(x,\frac{1}{n}\right)\cap E\neq\emptyset.$$

So let $x_n \in \mathcal{B}(x, \frac{1}{n}) \cap E$ for all n. In particular, (x_n) is a sequence of E that converge to x, and by assumption it converge in E. Therefore $x \in E$ which is a contradiction with $x \in E^c$. Therefore E^c is open, and thus E is closed.

- (*iv*) False : Take $E = \mathbb{R}^n$.
- 5. (i) False : Since E is countable, it can't contain any ball. Therefore it's not open.
 - (*ii*) False : Same reason as previously.
 - (*iii*) **False :** Since $\lim_{n \to \infty} \left(\frac{1}{n}, e^{-(\log(n))^{3/2}}\right) = (0, 0) \notin E$, it can't be closed.
 - (iv) True.