## Solutions to Homework 11

Problem 1. Solve the following initial value problems

1. $y^{\prime}=\frac{\sin t}{y}, y(\pi / 2)=1$.

Solution. Rearranging and integrating the equation gives

$$
\log |y|=\int \frac{d y}{y}=\int \frac{y^{\prime}}{y} d t=\int \sin t d t=-\cos t+C
$$

where the constant $C$ is determined by plugging in the initial condition:

$$
\log |1|=-0+C
$$

So $C=0$. Note that this also implies that the sign $y$ is positive when we drop the absolute value inside the logarithm (why?). We conclude that

$$
\log y(t)=-\cos t \quad \Rightarrow \quad y(t)=e^{-\cos t} .
$$

2. $\left(1+t^{2}\right) y^{\prime}+4 t y=\left(1+t^{2}\right)^{-2}, y(1)=0$.

Solution. First we replace the right side with zero and solve the 'homogenized' version of the equation, obtaining

$$
y_{h}(t)=\frac{A}{\left(1+t^{2}\right)^{2}} .
$$

Then we assume that $y$ has the form $y(t)=A(t)\left(1+t^{2}\right)^{2}$ for some unknown function $A(t)$. Plugging this back into the original differential equation leads to the following formula for $A^{\prime}$ :

$$
A^{\prime}(t)=\frac{1}{1+t^{2}} .
$$

Antidifferentiating both sides yields $A(t)=\tan ^{-1} t+C$. So

$$
y(t)=\frac{C+\tan ^{-1} t}{\left(1+t^{2}\right)^{2}}
$$

Finally, we plug in the initial condition to compute that $C=-\pi / 4$. In conclusion,

$$
y(t)=\frac{-\pi / 4+\tan ^{-1} t}{\left(1+t^{2}\right)^{2}}
$$

Problem 2. Disillusioned about mathematics, you descend the ivory tower and set yourself the task of becoming a millionaire by age 50 . The plan is simple. You will stash away money continuously from now til then at a constant rate of $R \$$ per year. You figure that in your new life as day trader, you can make a reliable $8 \%$ annual interest (compounded continuously, of course) on your savings. Unfortunatly, college has left you broke as well as disillusioned, so you're starting from nothing. At what rate $R$ will you need to be saving your money?

Solution. If $y(t)$ is the amount of money saved up (with interest) at time $t$, then then $y$ satisfies the following conditions ( $t=0$ is now, $t=30$ is age 50 ).

$$
y(0)=0, \quad y(30)=10^{6}, \quad y^{\prime}=.08 y+R .
$$

The differential equation is separable, and solving it gives

$$
y(t)=-\frac{R}{.08}+A e^{.08 t}
$$

for some constant $A$. Using the two additional conditions gives us

$$
0=-R / .08+A, \quad 10^{6}=-R / .08+A e^{2.4}
$$

and these can be solved together to give $R=.08 \cdot 10^{6}\left(e^{2.4}-1\right) \approx \$ 7981.5$ per year.

Problem 3. This problem was mis-stated: the function $f$ should have been $C^{2}$ instead of $C^{1}$, and the second item should have said $N\left(N_{\delta}(r)\right) \subset N_{\delta}(r)$ rather than $f\left(N_{\delta}(r)\right) \subset N_{\delta}(r)$. The upshot is that I'll let this one go without grading. The correct (I hope) statement and solution of the problem are as follows.

Remember Newton's method? The idea is that you have a $C^{2}$ function $f: \rightarrow$. You know that $f(r)=0$ for some point $r \in U$, and you have a decent initial guess $x_{0}$ at the location of $r$. Beginning with this guess, you then produce a sequence of (hopefully better) approximations of $r$ by setting

$$
x_{n+1}=N\left(x_{n}\right)
$$

for every $n \in$, where $N(x)=x-f(x) / f^{\prime}(x)$. Now assume that $r$ is a non-degenerate root of $f$-i.e. that $f^{\prime}(r) \neq 0$. Prove the following.

- $r$ is a fixed point of $N$.

Solution. $N(r)=r-f(r) / f^{\prime}(r)=r-0 / f^{\prime}(r)=r$.

- There exists $\delta>0$ such that $N\left(N_{\delta}(r)\right) \subset N_{\delta}(r)$

Solution. Given $x$, the mean value theorem gives us a number $c$ between $x$ and $r$ such that

$$
N(x)-N(r)=N^{\prime}(c)(x-r)=\frac{f^{\prime \prime}(c) f(c)}{f(c)^{2}}(x-r)
$$

Moreover, since $f$ is $C^{2}, f^{\prime}(r) \neq 0$, and $f(r)=0$, the function $N^{\prime}=f f^{\prime \prime} /\left(f^{\prime}\right)^{2}$ is continuous in some neighborhood $N_{\delta_{0}}(r)$ (i.e. on any open set where $f^{\prime}(r)$ does not vanish) and satisfies $N^{\prime}(r)=0$. Hence there exists $0<\delta<\delta_{0}$ such that $|x-r|<\delta$ implies that

$$
\left|N^{\prime}(x)\right|=\left|N^{\prime}(x)-N^{\prime}(r)\right|<\frac{1}{2} .
$$

Putting the two displayed equations together allows us to conclude that

$$
|N(x)-r|=|N(x)-N(r)|<\frac{1}{2}|x-r|
$$

for all $x \in N_{\delta}(r)$. In particular $x \in N_{\delta}(r)$ implies that $N(x) \in N_{\delta / 2}(r)$. That is,

$$
N\left(N_{\delta}(r)\right) \subset N_{\delta / 2}(r) \subset N_{\delta}(r)
$$

as asserted.

- The (restricted) function $N: N_{\delta}(r) \rightarrow N_{\delta}(r)$ is a contraction mapping.

Solution. Let $\delta$ be as in the solution to the previous item. Then for any points $x_{1}, x_{2} \in N_{\delta}(r)$, we have

$$
\left|N\left(x_{1}\right)-N\left(x_{2}\right)\right|=\left|N^{\prime}(c)\right|\left|x_{1}-x_{2}\right| \leq \frac{1}{2}\left|x_{1}-x_{2}\right|
$$

where $c$ is between $x_{1}$ and $x_{2}$ (and therefore belongs to $N_{\delta}(r)$ ).
(The mean value theorem will be useful in the second and third items.) What can you conclude from all this about how well Newton's method works?

Answer. $r$ is the unique fixed point of $N$ in the open interval $N_{\delta}(r)$, and if the initial guess $x_{0}$ happens to be in $N_{\delta}(r)$, then the sequence $x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots$ of subsequent guesses will remain in $N_{\delta}(r)$ and converge to $r$. In short, Newton's method works if the initial guess is good enough.

Problem 4. Suppose that $f, g:^{2} \rightarrow$ are continuous functions and that $f(y, t)>g(y, t)$ for all points $(y, t) \in^{2}$. Let $y_{1}, y_{2}: \rightarrow$ be functions satisfying

$$
y_{1}^{\prime}=f\left(y_{1}, t\right), \quad y_{2}^{\prime}=g\left(y_{2}, t\right)
$$

for all $t \in$. Show that $y_{1}\left(t_{0}\right)=y_{2}\left(t_{0}\right)$ for at most one point $t_{0} \in$.
Solution. Let $h: \rightarrow$ be the function $h(t)=y_{1}(t)-y_{2}(t)$. Then in particular, $h^{\prime}(t)=f\left(y_{1}(t), t\right)-$ $g\left(y_{2}(t), t\right)$ exists and is continuous and every point $t \in$. Also, if $t_{0} \in$ is any point where $y_{0}:=$ $y_{1}\left(t_{0}\right)=y_{2}\left(t_{0}\right)$, then

$$
h\left(t_{0}\right)=0, \quad h^{\prime}\left(t_{0}\right)=f\left(y_{0}, t_{0}\right)-g\left(y_{0}, t_{0}\right)>0
$$

By continuity, we see that there exists $\delta_{0}>0$ such that $h^{\prime}(t)>0$ for all $\left|t-t_{0}\right|<\delta_{0}$. That is, $h$ is strictly increasing on $\left(t_{0}-\delta_{0}, t_{0}+\delta_{0}\right)$. So $h(t)>h\left(t_{0}\right)$ for all $t \in\left(t_{0}, t_{0}+\delta_{0}\right)$ and $h(t)<h\left(t_{0}\right)$ for all $t \in\left(t_{0}-\delta_{0}, t_{0}\right)$.

Now suppose, for the sake of obtaining a contradiction, that there is a second point at which $y_{1}$ equals $y_{2}$. We can suppose without loss of generality that this point is larger than $t_{0}$. Then it is meaningful to define

$$
t_{1}:=\inf \left\{t>t_{0}: h(t)=y_{1}(t)-y_{2}(t)=0\right\}
$$

(i.e. we're not taking the infimum of the empty set). By continuity $h\left(t_{1}\right)=0$. Clearly, $t_{1} \geq t_{0}$, so the work above implies in fact that $t_{1} \geq t_{0}+\delta_{0}>t_{0}$. Repeating the arguments used on for $t_{0}$, we see that there exists $\delta_{1}>0$ such that, among other things, $h(t)<0$ for $t \in\left(t_{1}-\delta_{1}, t_{1}\right)$.

So to be perfectly specific, let us consider for example the points $s_{0}=t_{0}+\delta_{0} / 2$ and $s_{1}=t_{1}-\delta_{1} / 2$. Then

$$
t_{0}<s_{0}<s_{1}<t_{1}, \quad \text { and } \quad h\left(s_{0}\right)>0>h\left(s_{1}\right) .
$$

The intermediate value theorem therefore gives us a point $s \in\left(s_{0}, s_{1}\right) \subset\left(t_{0}, t_{1}\right)$ such that $h(s)=$ $y_{1}(s)-y_{2}(s)=0$. This contradicts the fact that $t_{1}$ was supposed to be the smallest root of $h$ larger than $t_{0}$. It follows that there is no point other than $t_{0}$ at which $y_{1}=y_{2}$.

Problem 5. Let $f: \rightarrow$ be a function. The support of $f$ is the set

$$
K:=\overline{\{x \in: f(x) \neq 0\}}
$$

Show that if $f$ is real analytic (and not the zero function), then $K$ cannot be compact. Show by giving an example that $K$ can be compact if $f$ is merely $C^{\infty}$.
Solution. Suppose that $f$ is analytic and let $g(x) \equiv 0$ be the zero function, which is also analytic. If the support $K$ of $f$ is compact, then the set $E=\{x \in: f(x)=g(x)\}$ contains all points in the non-empty open set $-K$. This directly contradicts Theorem 8.5 , which says that $E$ has no limit points unless $f$ and $g$ are equal. Hence $K$ is not compact.

To see that $C^{\infty}$ functions can have compact support, let $h: \rightarrow$ be the function considered in class

$$
h(x)=\left\{\begin{array}{lll}
0 & \text { if } & x \leq 0 \\
e^{-1 / x} & \text { if } & x>0
\end{array} .\right.
$$

Set $f(x)=h(1-x) h(x+1)$. Then it is not hard to see that $f(x)=0$ if $|x| \geq 1$ but $f(x)>0$ if $|x|<1$. So the support of $f$ is $[-1,1]$ which is compact.

Problem 6. Redo supplementary problem 2 from the homework assigned on 11/3/03:
Solution. Given $\epsilon>0$, we seek to construct a partition $P$ of $[0,1]$ satisfying

$$
U(P, f)-L(P, f)<\epsilon
$$

This time, however, we let

$$
S=\{x \in[0,1]: f(x) \geq \epsilon / 2\} .
$$

I claim that there are only finitely many points in $S$. Indeed any $x \in S$ is rational, and can be written $x=p / q$ where $\operatorname{gcd}(p, q)=1$ and $q \leq 2 / \epsilon$ (since $f(x)=1 / q)$. So if $N \in$ exceeds $2 / \epsilon$, then the denominator $q$ is $x$ can only range from 1 to $N$. Moreover, for fixed denominator $q$, the numerator of $x$ must range between 0 and $q$. So all told, $S$ contains at most $\sum_{q=1}^{N}(q+1)=(q+1)(q+2) / 2$ elements.

Clearly then, we can cover $S$ with disjoint open intervals $I_{j}=\left(a_{j}, b_{j}\right), j=1, \ldots, n:=\# S$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^{n} b_{j}-a_{j}<\epsilon / 2$. Putting the intervals in order and intersecting them with $[0,1]$ we obtain a partition $P$ of $[0,1]$ consisting of the points

$$
a=a_{1}<b_{1} \leq a_{2}<b_{2} \leq \ldots \leq a_{n}<b_{n}=b .
$$

Since $0 \leq f(x) \leq 1$ for all $x$, we have

$$
0 \leq L(P, f) \leq U(P, f) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n} 1\left(b_{j}-a_{j}\right)+\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \epsilon / 2\left(a_{j+1}-b_{j}\right) .
$$

The first sum is equal to the sum of the lengths of the intervals $I_{j}$ and the second is no larger than $\epsilon / 2$ times the length of the full interval $[0,1]$. Hence

$$
U(P, f)-L(P, f)<\epsilon
$$

and we conclude that $f$ is integrable.

