- 1. Given a number x_n with $x_n \ge -40$ set $x_{n+1} = \sqrt{x_n + 40}$.
 - (a) (10 pts) Show by mathematical induction that if $x_1 = -39$, then $x_{n+1} > x_n$ for all integers $n \ge 1$.

Solution: Assume $x_1 = -39$ and let P(n) be the statement that $x_{n+1} > x_n$. The proof that P(n) is true for all $n \ge 1$ is by induction. The base case is n = 1.

Given that $x_1 = -39$, we have that $x_2 = \sqrt{x_1 + 40} = \sqrt{-39 + 40} = \sqrt{1} = 1$ so $x_1 < x_2$, and hence, P(1) is true.

For the inductve step assume P(n) is true. Then we have

$$x_{n+1} > x_n$$

$$x_{n+1} + 40 > x_n + 40$$

$$\sqrt{x_{n+1} + 40} > \sqrt{x_n + 40}$$

$$x_{(n+1)+1} > x_{(n+1)}$$

From the last line, it follows that P(n + 1) is true and the proof that $x_{n+1} > x_n$ for all $n \ge 1$ is complete.

(b) (10 pts) Show by mathematical induction that if $x_1 = 24$, then $x_{n+1} < x_n$ for all integers $n \ge 1$.

Solution: Assume $x_1 = 24$ and let Q(n) be the statement that $x_{n+1} < x_n$. The proof that Q(n) is true for all $n \ge 1$ is by induction. The base case is n = 1.

Given that $x_1 = 24$, we have that $x_2 = \sqrt{x_1 + 40} = \sqrt{24 + 40} = \sqrt{64} = 8$ so $x_2 < x_1$, and hence, Q(1) is true.

For the inductve step assume Q(n) is true. Then we have

$$x_{n+1} < x_n$$

$$x_{n+1} + 40 < x_n + 40$$

$$\sqrt{x_{n+1} + 40} < \sqrt{x_n + 40}$$

$$x_{(n+1)+1} < x_{(n+1)}$$

From the last line, it follows that Q(n + 1) is true and the proof that $x_{n+1} < x_n$ for all $n \ge 1$ is complete.

2. (15 pts) Show by induction that

(I(n))
$$\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{3}{4} \cdot \frac{5}{6} \cdots \frac{2n-1}{2n} \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{3n+1}}$$

Solution: For n = 1, we have that I(1) is the inequality

(I(1))
$$\frac{1}{2} \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{3(1)+1}} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

In this case, both the inequality and the equality hold.

To proceed by induction, assume that the inequality I(n) is true for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We want to show that the inequality

$$(I(n+1)) \qquad \qquad \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{3}{4} \cdot \frac{5}{6} \cdot \dots \cdot \frac{2n+1}{2n+2} \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{3n+4}}$$

is true. Using the inequality I(n), this is to prove

$$\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{3}{4} \cdot \frac{5}{6} \cdot \dots \cdot \frac{2n-1}{2n} \cdot \frac{2n+1}{2n+2} \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{3n+1}} \cdot \frac{2n+1}{2n+2} \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{3n+4}}$$

So we want to show

$$\frac{2n+1}{2n+2} \le \frac{\sqrt{3n+1}}{\sqrt{3n+4}}.$$

By taking a square of both sides and then simplifying it is equivalent to show

(1)
$$(3n+4)(4n^2+4n+1) \le (3n+1)(4n^2+8n+4).$$

The left hand side of the inequality (1) simplifies to

$$(3n+4)(4n^2+4n+1) = 12n^3 + 12n^2 + 3n + 16n^2 + 16n + 4$$
$$= 12n^3 + 28n^2 + 19n + 4$$

and the right hand side of the inequality (1) simplifies to

$$(3n+1)(4n^2+8n+4) = 12n^3+24n^2+12n+4n^2+8n+4$$
$$= 12n^3+28n^2+20n+4$$

Thus, the inequality in equation (1) is equivalent to the inequality

(2)

$$19n \leq 20n$$
.

Since the inequality in equation (2) is true for all $n \ge 1$, the proof by induction that the inequality in equation I(n) holds for all $n \ge 1$ is complete.

Also, since 19n < 20n for all $n \ge 1$, equality in I(n) is not obtained for n > 1. Therefore, the equality is obtained if and only if n = 1.

3. (10 pts) Determine whether $(2 + \sqrt{3})^{2/3}$ is a rational number, and explain your reasoning.

Solution: First approach. The first step is to see that $\sqrt{3}$ is not rational as follows. $a = \sqrt{3}$ is a solution to the equation $a^2 - 3 = 0$. By the Rational Zeros Theorem the only possible rational solutions are $\pm 1, \pm 3$. Since none of these values is a solution to $a^2 - 3 = 0$, it follows that $a^2 - 3 = 0$ does not have any rational solutions, and hence, $\sqrt{3}$ is not rational.

We can now show that $(2 + \sqrt{3})^{2/3}$ is not rational as follows. Suppose $a = (2 + \sqrt{3})^{2/3}$ is rational, then

$$a^3 = (2 + \sqrt{3})^2 = 4 + 4\sqrt{3} + 3 = 7 + 4\sqrt{3}$$

is rational, and hence $(a^3 - 7)/4 = \sqrt{3}$ is rational. Thus the assumption that $a = (2 + \sqrt{3})^{2/3}$ is rational implies that $\sqrt{3}$ is rational. This is a contradiction, so the assumption must be false, and it follows that $a = (2 + \sqrt{3})^{2/3}$ is not rational.

Second approach. If $a = (2 + \sqrt{3})^{2/3}$ is rational, then

$$a^{3} = (2 + \sqrt{3})^{2} = 4 + 4\sqrt{3} + 3 \text{ so}$$

$$a^{3} - 7 = 4\sqrt{3} \text{ hence}$$

$$(a^{3} - 7)^{2} = 16(3) \text{ and we have}$$

$$a^{6} - 14a^{3} + 49 = 48$$

$$a^{6} - 14a^{3} + 1 = 0$$

Thus, $a = (2 + \sqrt{3})^{2/3}$ is a solution to $p(a) = a^6 - 14a^3 + 1 = 0$. By the Rational Zeros Theorem the only possible rational solutions are ± 1 . Since neither of these is a solution to p(a) = 0, it follows that p(a) = 0 has no rational solutions, and hence $(2 + \sqrt{3})^{2/3}$ is not a rational number.

4. (10 pts) Use the Rational Zeros Theorem to find all rational solutions, if any, to the equation

(3)
$$p(x) = 3x^4 - 4x^3 - x^2 - 4x - 4 = 0.$$

Explain your reasoning.

Solution: By the Rational Zeros Theorem, if r = c/d is a solution to equation (3) where *c* and *d* are integers with no common factors, then *c* divides 4 and *d* divides 3. Thus $c = \pm 1, \pm 2, \pm 4$ and $d = \pm 1, \pm 3$, so the only possible rational solutions to equation (3) are

$$\pm 1, \pm 2, \pm 4, \pm 1/3, \pm 2/3, \pm 4/3$$

Using a calculator or computer gives the following values for $p(x) = 3x^4 - 4x^3 - x^2 - 4x - 4$ rounded to 1 decimal place

p(1) = -10	p(2) = 0	p(4) = 476
p(-1) = 6	p(-2) = 80	p(-4) = 1020
p(1/3) = -5.6	p(2/3) = -7.7	p(4/3) = -11.1
p(-1/3) = -2.6	p(-2/3) = 0	p(-4/3) = 18.5

Thus, there are two, and only two, rational solutions to p(x) = 0. The solutions are x = 2 and x = -2/3.

5. (10 pts) Show by induction using the triangle inequality that

(4)
$$|a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n| \le |a_1| + |a_2| + \dots + |a_n|$$

for all $a_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $n \ge 2$.

Solution: Recall the triangle inequality states that

$$|a+b| \le |a|+|b|$$
 for all $a, b \in R$

Thus the inequality (4) holds for n = 2.

Now assume the inequality (4) holds for a given $n \ge 2$ then

$$|a_1 + \cdots + a_n + a_{n+1}| \le |a_1 + \cdots + a_n| + |a_{n+1}|$$
by (4)
$$\le |a_1| + \cdots + |a_n| + |a_{n+1}|$$
by the inductive assumption

and the proof is complete.

6. Show that for $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ we have

(a) (10 pts) $|a + b| + |a - b| = 2 \max\{|a|, |b|\}$. **Solution:** We have $|a+b| = \max\{a+b, -a-b\}, |a-b| = \max\{a-b, b-a\}, \text{ so } |a+b|+|-a-b|$ is equal to

$$\max\{(a+b) + |a-b|, -a-b+|a-b|\}$$

= max{(a+b) + (a-b), (a+b) - (a-b),
- a-b + (a+b), -a-b, -a-b}
= max{2a, 2b, -2b, -2a}
= 2 max{|a|, |b|}.

(b) (10 pts) $||a + b| - |a - b|| \le 2 \min\{|a|, |b|\}$

Solution: Since $(a + b) \le (a - b) + 2b \le |a - b| + 2|b|$, we get $a + b \le |a - b| + 2|b|$. Replacing *a* by -a and *b* by -b gives $-a - b \le |b - a| + 2|b| = |a - b| + 2|b|$, therefore $|a + b| = \max\{a + b, -a - b\} \le |a - b| + 2|b|$ and $|a + b| - |a - b| \le 2|b|$.

Switching a and b gives $|a+b| - |a-b| = |b+a| - |b-a| \le 2|a|$, so we get $|a+b| - |a-b| \le 2 \min\{|a|, |b|\}$. Replacing b by -b yields

$$-(|a+b| - |a-b|) = |a-b| - |a+b| \le 2\min\{|a|, |-b|\} = 2\min\{|a|, |b|\},$$

so we conclude that

$$||a + b| - |a - b|| \le 2\min\{|a|, |b|\}.$$

7. (15 pts) Given nonempty subsets A and B of \mathbb{R} , define the set A - B by

$$A - B = \{a - b \colon a \in A, b \in B\}.$$

State and prove a formula for $\inf(A - B)$ in terms of $\inf(A)$, $\sup(A)$, $\inf(B)$, and $\sup(B)$. Solution: We will show that

$$inf(A - B) = inf(A) - sup(B)$$

Set $a := \inf(A)$ and $b := \sup(B)$. We prove (5) by first showing that $\inf(A - B) \ge a - b$, and then showing that $a - b \ge \inf(A - B)$.

To prove the first inequality, let $x \in A$ and $y \in B$. By the definition of $a = \inf(A)$, we have that $x \ge a$. Likewise, by the definition of $b = \sup(B)$, we have that $y \le b$, or, $-y \ge -b$. Therefore,

$$x - y \ge a - b.$$

Since any element in the set A - B is of the form x - y, for some $x \in A$ and $y \in B$, it follows from the definition of infimum that $\inf(A - B) \ge a - b$.

To prove the second inequality, let $\varepsilon > 0$. By the definition of $a = \inf(A)$, there in an element $x \in A$ such that $a + \varepsilon/2 \ge x$. Likewise, by the definition of $b = \sup(B)$, there in an element $y \in B$ such that $b - \varepsilon/2 \le y$, or, $-b + \varepsilon/2 \ge -y$. Therefore, $(a + \varepsilon/2) + (-b + \varepsilon/2) \ge x - y$, or,

$$a-b+\varepsilon \ge x-y.$$

Using now the definition of inf(A - B), we infer that

$$a - b + \varepsilon \ge \inf(A - B).$$

But this inequality holds for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we conclude that

$$a-b \ge \inf(A-B),$$

and this completes the proof.