

## Math 325, Section 1

### Exam 1 Practice Exam Solutions

1. Show that if  $x, y \geq 0$  then the arithmetic mean  $m = \frac{x+y}{2}$  and the geometric mean  $\mu = \sqrt{xy}$  always satisfies  $m \geq \mu$ . Show by an example that this inequality can be strict.

If we compute  $2(m - \mu) = 2\left(\frac{x+y}{2} - \sqrt{xy}\right) = x - 2\sqrt{xy} + y = (\sqrt{x} - \sqrt{y})^2 = (\sqrt{x} - \sqrt{y})^2$ , then we find, in particular, that  $2(m - \mu) \geq 0$ , so  $m - \mu \geq 0$ , so  $m \geq \mu$ , as desired.

Essentially any pair of (distinct!) non-negative number will have  $m > \mu$ ; for example,  $x = 1$  and  $y = 9$  give  $m = 5$  and  $\mu = 3$ , and  $5 > 3$ .

2. Show, using the Rational Roots Theorem, that  $\alpha = \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{7}}$  is **not** a rational number.

There are (at least) two ways to show this. Via the Rat'l Roots Thm, we find a polynomial having  $\alpha$  as a root:

$$\alpha^2 = 2 + \sqrt{7}, \text{ so } \alpha^2 - 2 = \sqrt{7}, \text{ so } (\alpha^2 - 2)^2 = 7, \text{ so}$$
$$(\alpha^2 - 2)^2 - 7 = \alpha^4 - 4\alpha^2 + 4 - 7 = \alpha^4 - 4\alpha^2 - 3 = 0.$$

So  $\alpha$  is a root of the polynomial  $p(x) = x^4 - 4x^2 - 3$ . But the Rat'l Roots Thm. tells us that the only possible rational roots of this polynomial are 1, -1, 3, and/or -3. But we can either plug all of these into  $p$  and note that none of them are roots of  $p$  (this is probably the preferred way?), or we can be a little sneakier. Note that  $\alpha^2 = 2 + \sqrt{7} > 2 + \sqrt{4} = 2 + 2 = 4$ , so  $\alpha > 2$ , but  $\alpha^2 = 2 + \sqrt{7} \leq 2 + \sqrt{9} = 2 + 3 = 5 < 9$ , so  $\alpha < 3$ . So  $\alpha$  cannot be equal to any of these possible roots. In either case we then know that  $\alpha$ , which is a root of  $p$ , cannot be equal to any of the possible rational roots of  $p$ , so  $\alpha$  cannot be rational!

Alternate proof: suppose  $\alpha = p/q$  is rational. Then  $\alpha^2 = p^2/q^2$  is also rational, so  $\alpha^2 - 2 = (p^2 - 2q^2)/q^2$  is rational. But! by the work above,  $\alpha^2 - 2 = \sqrt{7} = \beta$  is then rational. But  $\beta$  is a root of  $r(x) = x^2 - 7$ , whose only possible rational roots, 1, -1, 7, -7, aren't roots! So  $\beta$  isn't rational. But if  $\alpha$  is rational so is  $\beta$ ! So  $\alpha$  cannot be rational.

3. We will define a sequence  $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$  by setting  $a_1 = 2$ , and for  $n \geq 1$  (inductively) setting

$$a_{n+1} = 3 + \sqrt{2a_n}.$$

Show that this sequence is both monotonically increasing and bounded from above (so the sequence converges).

$a_2 = 3 + \sqrt{2 \cdot 2} = 3 + \sqrt{4} = 3 + 2 = 5 \geq 2 = a_1$ , so  $a_2 \geq a_1$ , which gets us started on an induction. If we now suppose (as our inductive hypothesis) that  $a_{n+1} \geq a_n$ , then  $2a_{n+1} \geq 2a_n$  (since  $2a_{n+1} - 2a_n = 2(a_{n+1} - a_n)$  is the product of a positive number (2) and a non-negative one). But then  $\sqrt{2a_{n+1}} \geq \sqrt{2a_n}$ , from a result in class, and so  $a_{n+2} = 3 + \sqrt{2a_{n+1}} \geq 3 + \sqrt{2a_n} = a_{n+1}$ .

So  $a_{n+1} \geq a_n$  implies that  $a_{n+2} \geq a_{n+1}$ , giving our inductive step. So  $a_{n+1} \geq a_n$  for every  $n \geq 1$ , by induction.

To show that the sequence is bounded, we could just pick an impossibly large number and give it a try. Or we could use techniques like we have before to find out when  $M = 3 + \sqrt{2M}$ , and use that. Or we could note that the thing which controls the size of  $a_{n+1}$  is  $\sqrt{2a_n}$ , which for  $a_n$  “large” is a lot smaller than  $a_n$ , for example,  $a_n = 50$  gives  $a_{n+1} = 3 + \sqrt{100} = 13$ , which is a lot smaller than 50.

So let’s pick  $M = 50$ , say, and show that  $a_n \leq 50$  for every  $n$ , by induction!  $a_1 = 2 \leq 50$  is true, so our base case works. Then if  $a_n \leq 50$ , then  $2a_n - n \leq 100$ ; so  $\sqrt{2a_n} \leq \sqrt{100} = 10$ , so  $a_{n+1} = 3 + \sqrt{2a_n} \leq 3 + 10 = 13 \leq 50$ . This is our inductive step;  $a_n \leq 50$  implies that  $a_{n+1} \leq 50$ . So  $a_n \leq 50$  for all  $n \geq 1$ , by induction; so the sequence is bounded above.

Because it is a monotone increasing sequence which is bounded above, it then follows that the sequence converges.

[N.B.: We can, in fact, find the limit of the sequence; as with examples from class our limit properties allow us to conclude that the limit,  $L$ , satisfies  $L = 3 + \sqrt{2L}$ , so  $(L - 3)^2 - 2L = L^2 - 8L + 9 = 0$ . Using the quadratic formula, we conclude that

$$L = (8 \pm \sqrt{64 - 36})/2 = (8 \pm 2\sqrt{7})/2 = 4 \pm \sqrt{7}.$$

Since  $L \geq a_2 = 5$  (since  $a_n \geq a_2$  for every  $n \geq 2$ ) and  $4 - \sqrt{7} \leq 4 - \sqrt{4} = 4 - 2 = 2$ , we conclude that  $L = 4 + \sqrt{7}$ .]

4. Given sequences  $(a_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  and  $(b_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ , show that if the sequences

$$c_n = a_n + b_n \quad \text{and} \quad d_n = a_n - b_n$$

both converge, then the sequences  $a_n$  and  $b_n$  also both converge!

Since  $c_n$  and  $d_n$  both converge, we know that  $c_n + d_n = (a_n + b_n) + (a_n - b_n) = 2a_n$  also converges. So  $a_n = (1/2)(2a_n)$  also converges!

But then  $a_n$  and  $c_n = a_n + b_n$  converge, and so  $c_n - a_n = (a_n + b_n) - a_n = b_n$  must converge, as well. So both  $(a_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  and  $(b_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  must be convergent sequences.

A somewhat different way to write the same thing is:

If  $c_n = a_n + b_n \rightarrow L$  and  $d_n = a_n - b_n \rightarrow M$ , then  $c_n + d_n = 2a_n \rightarrow L + M$ , so  $a_n = (1/2)(2a_n) \rightarrow (1/2)(L + M)$ . In particular  $a_n$  has a limit, so it converges! Then  $b_n = (a_n + b_n) - a_n \rightarrow L - (1/2)(L + M) = (1/2)(L - M)$ , so  $b_n$  has a limit, so  $b_n$  converges!

[There are several other, roughly equivalent, ways to see how to build  $a_n$  and  $b_n$  out of  $c_n$  and  $d_n$ , leading to the same conclusions.]

5. Use induction to show that for every  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$a_n = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{k(k+2)} = \frac{n(3n+5)}{4(n+1)(n+2)} = f(n).$$

(Hint: write out what  $f(n+1)$  is; it'll help.

Our base case is  $n = 1$ , and we have  $a_1 = \frac{1}{(1)(1+2)} = \frac{1}{3} = \frac{8}{4 \cdot 2 \cdot 3} = \frac{(1)(3 \cdot 1 + 5)}{4(1+1)(1+2)}$ , as desired.

For the inductive step, if we suppose that  $a_n = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{k(k+2)} = \frac{n(3n+5)}{4(n+1)(n+2)}$ , then  $a_{n+1} = a_n + \frac{1}{(n+1)(n+3)} = \frac{n(3n+5)}{4(n+1)(n+2)} + \frac{1}{(n+1)(n+3)}$ . Putting over a common denominator, this last sum is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{n(3n+5)(n+3)}{4(n+1)(n+2)(n+3)} + \frac{4(n+2)}{4(n+1)(n+2)(n+3)} &= \frac{n(3n^2+5n+9n+15)+4n+8}{4(n+1)(n+2)(n+3)} = \\ \frac{3n^3+14n^2+19n+8}{4(n+1)(n+2)(n+3)} &= \frac{(n+1)(3n^2+11n+8)}{4(n+1)(n+2)(n+3)} = \frac{3n^2+11n+8}{4(n+2)(n+3)} = \frac{(3n+8)(n+1)}{4(n+2)(n+3)} = \\ \frac{(n+1)(3(n+1)+5)}{4((n+1)+1)((n+1)+2)} &= f(n+1). \end{aligned}$$

So we have shown that  $a_1 = f(1)$ , and  $a_n = f(n)$  implies that  $a_{n+1} = f(n+1)$ . So, by induction, we have shown that  $a_n = f(n)$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n \geq 1$ , as desired.

An alternate approach: Noting that  $\frac{1}{k(k+2)} = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{k} - \frac{1}{k+2})$ , we can show (by induction!) that  $a_n = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{1} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{(n+1)} - \frac{1}{(n+2)})$  (\*), since (check!) this is true for  $n = 1$ , and then in the inductive step

$$a_{n+1} = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{1} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{(n+1)} - \frac{1}{(n+2)}) + \frac{1}{(n+1)(n+3)} = \frac{1}{2}([\frac{1}{1} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{(n+1)} - \frac{1}{(n+2)}] + \frac{1}{(n+1)} - \frac{1}{(n+3)}) = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{1} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{(n+2)} - \frac{1}{(n+3)}), \text{ as desired.}$$

Putting the expression (\*) over a common denominator yields the result.

**6.** Use the Rational Roots Theorem to show that  $r = \sqrt{2} - \sqrt{5}$  is not a rational number.

If  $r = \sqrt{2} - \sqrt{5}$ , then  $\alpha^2 = (\sqrt{2} - \sqrt{5})^2 = 2 - 2\sqrt{2}\sqrt{5} + 5 = 7 - 2\sqrt{10}$ , Then  $r^2 - 7 = 2\sqrt{10}$ , so  $(r^2 - 7)^2 = 4 \cdot 10 = 40$ . so  $0 = (r^2 - 7)^2 - 40 = r^4 - 14r^2 + 49 - 40 = r^4 - 14r^2 + 9$ .

So  $r$  is a root of the polynomial  $f(x) = x^4 - 14x^2 + 9$ . But the Rational Roots Theorem tells us that if  $f$  has a rational root, then it must be one of the numbers  $-1, 1, -3, 3, -9, 9$  (since these are the rational numbers  $a/b$  with  $a$  dividing 9 and  $b$  dividing 1). But we can check that none of these are roots:  $f(\pm 1) = 1 - 14 + 9 = -4 \neq 0$ ,  $f(\pm 3) = 81 - 14 \cdot 9 + 9 = 90 - 126 = -36 \neq 0$ , and  $f(\pm 9) = 81^2 - 14 \cdot 81 + 9 = 64 \cdot 81 + 9 > 0$ . So  $f$  has no rational roots, so  $\alpha$ , which is a root, cannot be rational.

**7.** Find the limit of the sequence  $a_n = \frac{n^2 - n + 1}{3n^2 - 1}$

and prove you are right using the  $\epsilon$ - $N$  definition of the limit. [Also: show how to do this quicker using our limit theorems!]

Our limit theorems tell us that  $a_n = \frac{n^2 - n + 1}{3n^2 - 1} = \frac{1 - (1/n) + (1/n)^2}{3 - (1/n)^2}$  has limit  $1/3$ , since the limit of a quotient is the quotient of the limits, and, since  $1/n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , the numerator converges to  $1 - 0 + (0)^2 = 1$ , since limits behave well under sum and difference and product, while the denominator converges to  $3 - (0)^2$  for the same reasons.

Having found the limit we prove that it works by computing

$$|a_n - \frac{1}{3}| = \left| \frac{n^2 - n + 1}{3n^2 - 1} - \frac{1}{3} \right| = \left| \frac{(n^2 - n + 1)(3) - (1)(3n^2 - 1)}{(3n^2 - 1)(3)} \right| = \left| \frac{3n^2 - 3n + 3 - 3n^2 + 1}{(3n^2 - 1)(3)} \right| = \left| \frac{4 - 3n}{(3n^2 - 1)(3)} \right| = \frac{3n - 4}{3(3n^2 - 1)},$$

since the numerator of  $\frac{4 - 3n}{(3n^2 - 1)(3)}$  is negative for  $n \geq 2$  and the denominator is positive for  $n \geq 1$ . This is the quantity that we wish to show can be made small ( $< \epsilon$ ), so long as  $n$  is large enough.

But  $|a_n - \frac{1}{3}| = \frac{3n - 4}{3(3n^2 - 1)} < \frac{3n}{3(3n^2 - 1)} < \frac{3n}{3(3n^2 - n^2)} = \frac{3n}{3(2n^2)} = \frac{1}{2n}$ , since at every step we either made the numerator larger or the denominator smaller (but not negative!). So, given an  $\epsilon > 0$ , if we choose an  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  so that  $N \geq \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ , then  $n \geq N$  implies that  $|a_n - \frac{1}{3}| < \frac{1}{2n} < \frac{1}{2N} < \frac{1}{N} < \frac{1}{1/\epsilon} = \epsilon$ .

[There are many other ways that we could have done this.]

So for every  $\epsilon > 0$  we can find an  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  so that  $n \geq N$  implies that  $|a_n - \frac{1}{3}| < \epsilon$ .  
SO  $a_n \rightarrow \frac{1}{3}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .