

HOMEWORK 9

SHUANGLIN SHAO

1. # 11.5.1

Proof. (a). By using Theorem 11.37, $f(a) = 1$,

$$f(x, y) = 1 + (-1, 1) \cdot (x + 1, y - 1) + ((x + 1)^2 + (x + 1)(y - 1) + (y - 1)^2).$$

(c). We compute the derivatives,

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} = ye^{xy}, \quad \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} = xe^{xy},$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x^2} = y^2 e^{xy}, \quad \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x \partial y} = xy e^{xy} + e^{xy}, \quad \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial y^2} = x^2 e^{xy},$$

$$\frac{\partial^3 f}{\partial x^3} = y^3 e^{xy}, \quad \frac{\partial^3 f}{\partial x^2 \partial y} = xy^2 e^{xy} + 2ye^{xy}, \quad \frac{\partial^3 f}{\partial x \partial y^2} = x^2 y e^{xy} + 2x e^{xy}, \quad \frac{\partial^3 f}{\partial y^3} = x^3 e^{xy},$$

$$\frac{\partial^4 f}{\partial x^4} = y^4 e^{xy}, \quad \frac{\partial^4 f}{\partial x^3 \partial y} = xy^3 e^{xy} + 3y^2 e^{xy}, \quad \frac{\partial^4 f}{\partial x^2 \partial y^2} = x^2 y^2 e^{xy} + 2xy e^{xy} + 2e^{xy},$$

$$\frac{\partial^4 f}{\partial x \partial y^3} = x^3 y e^{xy} + 3x^2 e^{xy}, \quad \frac{\partial^4 f}{\partial y^4} = x^4 e^{xy}.$$

Therefore by Theorem 11.37, there exists $c = (c_1, c_2)$ such that

$$f(x, y) = 1 + xy + \frac{1}{4!} (e^{c_1 c_2} c_2^4 x^4 + 4(e^{c_1 c_2} c_1 c_2^3 + 3e^{c_1 c_2} c_2^2) x^3 y + 6(e^{c_1 c_2} c_1^2 c_2^2 + 4e^{c_1 c_2} c_1 c_2 + 2e^{c_1 c_2}) x^2 y^2 + 4(e^{c_1 c_2} c_1^3 c_2 + 3e^{c_1 c_2} c_1^2) xy^3 + e^{c_1 c_2} c_1^4 y^4).$$

□

2. # 11.5.2

Proof. This follows directly from Theorem 11.37. For $a = (x_0, y_0)$,

$$\sum_{i_1=1}^2 \cdots \sum_{i_k=1}^2 \frac{\partial^k f(a)}{\partial x_{i_1} \cdots \partial x_{i_k}} h_{i_1} \cdots h_{i_k} = \sum_{i+j=k} \binom{k}{i} \frac{\partial^k f(a)}{\partial x^i \partial y^j} (x - x_0)^i (y - y_0)^j.$$

□

3. # 11.5.5

Proof. We prove it by mathematics induction. The case where $k = 1$ follows from the fundamental theorem of Calculus. Suppose it is true for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then write

$$(1 - t)^{p-1} = -\frac{1}{p} ((1 - t)^p)'$$

Then by the integration by parts,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{(p-1)!} \int_0^1 (1-t)^{p-1} D^{(p)} f(a+th; h) dt &= -\frac{1}{p!} \int_0^1 (1-t)^p D^{(p)} f(a+th; h) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{(p-1)!} D^p f(a; h) + \frac{1}{p!} \int_0^1 (1-t)^p D^{p+1} f(a+th; h) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the formula for $k + 1$ follows. \square

4. # 11.5.6

Proof. (a).

$$g'(t) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x-a) + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(y-b).$$

(b). By the mean value theorem for one-dimensional function, there exists $\theta \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$g(1) - g(0) = g'(\theta),$$

i.e.,

$$f(x, y) - f(a, b) = (x-a)f_x(c, y) + (y-b)f_y(a, d),$$

where

$$c = \theta x + (1-\theta)a, d = \theta y + (1-\theta)b.$$

\square

5. # 11.5.8

Proof. This follows from Theorem 11.37.

$$\nabla f(a) = 0.$$

Since $f \in \mathbb{C}^2$, for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, it implies that $\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}$ is continuous on V and hence is bounded on the compact set H . Since there is n^2 's $\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}$, and

$$|(x_i - a_i)(x_j - a_j)| \leq \frac{(x_i - a_i)^2 + (x_j - a_j)^2}{2} \leq \|x - a\|,$$

we see that

$$|f(x) - f(a)| \leq M \|x - a\|$$

for some $M > 0$. □

6. # 11.5.11

Proof. (a). Without loss of generality, suppose that $a < b$ and $c > 0$. Since $u \in \mathbb{C}^2(V)$, u is continuous on V and therefore u is uniformly continuous on H . For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\theta > 0$ satisfying $2\delta < \min\{c, b - a\}$ such that for $\|(x, y) - (x_0, y_0)\| < \delta$, we have

$$|f(x, y) - f(x_0, y_0)| < \epsilon.$$

Let $K = [a + \frac{\delta}{2}, b - \frac{\delta}{2}] \times [\frac{\delta}{2}, c - \frac{\delta}{2}]$. Therefore K is a compact subset of H and $K \subset H^0$. For any $(x, y) \in H \setminus K$, for any $(x_0, y_0) \in \partial H$,

$$f(x, y) \geq f(x_0, y_0) - \epsilon \geq \epsilon.$$

(b). Here $\epsilon = \frac{\epsilon}{2} - rt_1 > 0$. Then by part (a), there exists a compact set $K \subset H^0$ such that

$$w \geq -\epsilon.$$

Since u is continuous on H and H is compact, then there exists $(x_2, t_2) \in H$ such that $u(x_2, t_2)$ is the minimum point. If $(x_2, t_2) \in H \setminus K$, then

$$-l \geq u(x_2, t_2) + rt \geq -\frac{l}{2} + 2rt_1.$$

Hence $2rt_1 \leq -\frac{l}{2} < 0$. A contradiction. So $(x_2, t_2) \in K$.

(c). We prove it by contradiction. Suppose that u attains the minimum at the interior point, $(x_1, t_1) \in H^0$ and $u(x_1, t_1) = -l < 0$ for some $l > 0$. By part (b), the function w attains the minimum at some $(x_2, t_2) \in K \subset H^0$. Therefore

$$w_t(x_2, t_2) = 0, \text{ and } w_{xx}(x_2, t_2) \geq 0.$$

Since u satisfies $u_t = u_{xx}$, then

$$0 = w_t = u_t + r = u_{xx} + r \geq r > 0.$$

We obtain a contradiction. Thus $u(x, t) \geq 0$ on H . □

7. # 11.5.12

Proof. (a). We prove it by contradiction. If E is separated by two relatively open, nonempty subsets of U and V such that

$$E = U \cup V, \text{ and } U \cap V = \emptyset.$$

Since U and V are not empty and E is a convex set, there exist $x_0 \in U$ and $y_0 \in V$ such that

$$L(x_0, y_0) \subset E.$$

The line segment $L(x_0, y_0) = \{tx_0 + (1-t)y_0 : 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$ is the continuous image of $[0, 1]$. Hence it is connected.

However $L = (L \cap U) \cup (L \cap V)$ and $(L \cap U) \cap (L \cap V) = \emptyset$. We claim that $L \cap U$ and $L \cap V$ are relatively open sets in L . Since U is relatively open in \mathbb{R}^n , there exists an open set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$U \cap L = E \cap A \cap L = L \cap A.$$

Then $U \cap L$ is relatively open in L . This proves that L is not connected. A contradiction. The proof that a convex set is connected in \mathbb{R}^n is complete.

(b). We take the following example.

$$E := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 1 \leq x^2 + y^2 \leq 4.\}$$

Then E is connected but not convex. The proof that E is connected is similar to part (a). The difference that we cannot connect two points $x_0, y_0 \in E$ by a line segment $L(x_0, y_0)$. However, we can choose a polygon line to connect them, and regard them as a continuous image of $[0, 1]$.

But it is clear that E is not convex because $(1, 0), (-1, 0) \in E$ but $(0, 0) \notin E$.

□

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KU, LAWRENCE, KS 66045

E-mail address: slshao@math.ku.edu