

# Workshop Notes

Robert Dougherty-Bliss

10 February 2021

## Logistics

Nothing to say here.

## New stuff

Since I last saw you, you learned more about sequences and got some new homework. We're going to talk about some sequence topics and a problem from the new homework, as well as any other questions you might have.

## Cesàro means

If we have a sequence  $x(n)$ , then we can take *averages* of it by defining

$$y(n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n x(k).$$

**Plausible statement:** If  $x(n)$  converges, then the averages also converge to the same thing.

This is true. It's called Cesàro summation. The proof illustrates one of the main techniques of analysis: Splitting a problem into two manageable parts.

**Theorem 1.** *If  $x(n) \rightarrow x$ , then*

$$y(n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n x(k) \rightarrow x.$$

*Proof.* We want to show that, given any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists some integer  $N$  such that

$$|y(n) - x| < \epsilon$$

for  $n > N$ .

The trick about averaging is that we can break up a single  $x$  into many terms:

$$y(n) - x = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n x(k) - x = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n (x(k) - x).$$

Therefore, by the triangle inequality,

$$|y(n) - x| \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n |x(k) - x|.$$

For “large”  $k$ , we have the “sharp” bound  $|x(k) - x| < \epsilon$ . For “small”  $k$ , we only have the “coarse” fact that  $|x(k) - x|$  is bounded, since  $x(k) - x \rightarrow 0$ .

To make this idea rigorous, pick  $M$  such that  $|x(k) - x| \leq M$  for all  $k$  (by boundedness), and  $N$  such that  $|x(k) - x| < \epsilon$  for  $k > N$  (by convergence). Then, for  $n > N$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |y(n) - x| &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^N |x(k) - x| + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{N < k \leq n} |x(k) - x| \\ &\leq \frac{NM}{n} + \frac{\epsilon(n - N)}{n} \\ &\leq \frac{NM}{n} + \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

To get the right bound here, we need to turn that  $NM/n$  into something involving  $\epsilon$ . But  $N$  and  $M$  are both fixed relative to  $\epsilon$ , so we can just require  $n$  to be really big in comparison. That is, let  $N'$  be such that  $N' > N$  and  $NM/n < \epsilon$  for  $n > N'$ . Then, for  $n > N'$ , the bound becomes

$$|y(n) - x| \leq \epsilon + \epsilon = 2\epsilon.$$

Since  $\epsilon$  was arbitrary, this is equivalent and shows that  $y(n) \rightarrow x$ . □

**Interesting question:** If the averages converge, does  $x(n)$  converge?

## Limits superior and inferior

Not every sequence has a limit, but sometimes we want to talk about “limits” even when they don’t exist. For example,  $a(n) = (-1)^n$  does not “converge,” but it kind of has two “pseudo-limits,” 1 and  $-1$ . These “peusdo-limits” are made precise by the *limits superior and inferior*.

Given any sequence  $a(n)$ , there exists a number  $\beta$  (possibly  $\infty$ ) such that:

1. For every  $\epsilon > 0$ , we have  $a(n) < \beta + \epsilon$  eventually.
2. For every  $\epsilon > 0$ , there are infinitely many  $n$  such that  $a(n)$  is in  $(\beta - \epsilon, \beta]$ .

The number  $\beta$  is called the *limit superior* of  $a(n)$ , and we denote it by  $\beta = \limsup_n a(n)$ .

The above properties actually uniquely define the limit superior, but they don’t prove that it exists. Let’s go through how Abbott does it. For now, suppose that  $a(n)$  is a bounded sequence.

- (a) Prove that  $y(n) = \sup\{a(k) \mid k \geq n\}$  converges. Let  $\limsup_n a(n) = \lim_n y(n)$ .
- (b) Give the analogous definition for  $\liminf_n a(n)$ .
- (c) Show that  $\liminf_n a(n) \leq \limsup_n a(n)$ . [Hint: If  $x(n)$  and  $y(n)$  converge and  $x(n) \leq y(n)$ , then  $\lim_n x(n) \leq \lim_n y(n)$ . (You should prove this!)]
- (d) Show that  $\lim_n a(n) = x$  iff  $\liminf_n a(n) = x = \limsup_n a(n)$ . (You can’t use the above properties I mentioned unless you prove them!)

**Exercise 1** If  $a(n) \leq b(n)$ , we can’t always say that  $\lim_n a(n) \leq \lim_n b(n)$ , because the limits might not even exist. Show that

$$\limsup_n a(n) \leq \limsup_n b(n)$$

and

$$\liminf_n a(n) \leq \liminf_n b(n)$$

whenever  $a(n) \leq b(n)$  for all  $n$ .