

Ex 1. Let  $S$  be the set of all sequences of complex numbers.

Set  $d(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \frac{|\xi_i - \eta_i|}{1 + |\xi_i - \eta_i|}$ , where  $x = \{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ ,  $y = \{\eta_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ .

Show that  $(S, d)$  is a complete metric space.

Pf: Step 1:  $(S, d)$  is a metric space.

(i) It is clear that  $d$  is nonnegative and symmetric, and  $d(x, y) = 0$  iff  $x = y$ .

(ii) Now, it suffices to show  $d$  satisfies the triangle inequality.

Indeed, note that  $f(t) = \frac{t}{1+t} = 1 - \frac{1}{1+t} \uparrow$  on  $[0, \infty)$ .

So,  $f(|a+b|) \leq f(|a|+|b|)$ , i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|a+b|}{1+|a+b|} &\leq \frac{|a|+|b|}{1+|a|+|b|} \leq \frac{|a|}{1+|a|+|b|} + \frac{|b|}{1+|a|+|b|} \\ &\leq \frac{|a|}{1+|a|} + \frac{|b|}{1+|b|} \end{aligned}$$

Then,  $\forall x = \{\xi_i\}$ ,  $y = \{\eta_i\}$ ,  $z = \{\zeta_i\}$

by choosing  $a = \xi_i - \zeta_i$ ,  $b = \zeta_i - \eta_i$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\xi_i - \eta_i|}{1+|\xi_i - \eta_i|} &\leq \frac{|\xi_i - \zeta_i|}{1+|\xi_i - \zeta_i|} + \frac{|\zeta_i - \eta_i|}{1+|\zeta_i - \eta_i|} \\ \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \frac{|\xi_i - \eta_i|}{1+|\xi_i - \eta_i|} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \frac{|\xi_i - \zeta_i|}{1+|\xi_i - \zeta_i|} + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \frac{|\zeta_i - \eta_i|}{1+|\zeta_i - \eta_i|} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $d(x, y) \leq d(x, z) + d(z, y)$ .

Step 2:  $(S, d)$  is complete.

Let  $\{x^{(n)}\}$  be a Cauchy sequence, i.e.

$$d(x^{(n)}, x^{(m)}) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \frac{|x_i^{(n)} - x_i^{(m)}|}{1+|x_i^{(n)} - x_i^{(m)}|} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n, m \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then,  $\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  s.t.  $\forall n, m > N$

$$\frac{1}{2^k} \frac{|x_k^{(n)} - x_k^{(m)}|}{1+|x_k^{(n)} - x_k^{(m)}|} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \frac{|x_i^{(n)} - x_i^{(m)}|}{1+|x_i^{(n)} - x_i^{(m)}|} < \frac{\epsilon}{2^{k+1}}.$$

$$\Rightarrow |x_k^{(n)} - x_k^{(m)}| < \frac{\frac{\epsilon}{2^{k+1}}}{1 - \frac{1}{2}} < \epsilon.$$

So, for any fixed  $k$ ,  $\{x_k^{(n)}\}$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $\mathbb{C}$ . By the completeness of  $\mathbb{C}$ , there exist  $x_k$  such that  $x_k^{(n)} \rightarrow x_k$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Denote by  $x = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k, \dots\}$ . We claim that  $\{x^{(n)}\}$  converges to  $x$ , i.e.  $d(x^{(n)}, x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} \frac{|x_k^{(n)} - x_k|}{1 + |x_k^{(n)} - x_k|} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Indeed,  $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists n_0 = 1 - \log_2 \varepsilon$

$$\sum_{k=n_0+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} \frac{|x_k^{(n)} - x_k|}{1 + |x_k^{(n)} - x_k|} \leq \sum_{k=n_0+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} = \frac{1}{2^{n_0}} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$$

For any  $k \leq n_0$ , since  $\{x_k^{(n)}\}$  converge to  $x_k$ ,

$$\exists N_k \text{ s.t. } |x_k^{(n)} - x_k| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \forall n > N_k.$$

Choosing  $N = \max\{N_1, N_2, \dots, N_{n_0}\}$ , then,  $\forall n > N$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n_0} \frac{1}{2^k} \frac{|x_k^{(n)} - x_k|}{1 + |x_k^{(n)} - x_k|} < \sum_{k=1}^{n_0} \frac{1}{2^k} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{2} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

$$\text{Therefore, } \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} \frac{|x_k^{(n)} - x_k|}{1 + |x_k^{(n)} - x_k|} < \varepsilon.$$

#

We do this because we can't have a uniform  $N$  for infinite many sequence  $\{x_k^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$

Contradiction =

$$x^{(n)} = \begin{cases} 0 & k \neq n \\ n & k = n \end{cases}$$

$$x = 0$$

Ex 2. Let  $F$  be the set of all sequences of real number with only finite nonzero elements. Define  $d$  by

$$d(x, y) = \sup_{k \geq 1} |\xi_k - \eta_k|, \forall x = \{\xi_k\}, y = \{\eta_k\} \in F.$$

Show that  $(F, d)$  is not complete.

What is the completion of  $(F, d)$ ?

Solu: To show  $(F, d)$  is not complete, it suffices to construct a Cauchy sequence in  $F$  but not converge associated with metric  $d$ .

For example, we can construct as follows.

$$\text{Set } x^{(n)} = \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{2}, \dots, \frac{1}{n}, 0, 0, \dots, 0, \dots \right\}.$$

It is clear that  $x^{(n)} \in F, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Moreover, w.l.o.g.  $\forall m > n$

$$d(x^{(n)}, x^{(m)}) = \frac{1}{n+1} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

$$\text{Since } x^{(n)} - x^{(m)} = \left\{ 0, \dots, 0, \frac{1}{n+1}, \dots, \frac{1}{m}, 0, \dots, 0, \dots \right\}.$$

That is  $\{x^{(n)}\}$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $F$ .

$$\text{Let } x = \left\{ \frac{1}{k} \right\}_{k=1}^{\infty}. \text{ Then } d(x^{(n)}, x) = \frac{1}{n+1} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

So,  $x^{(n)}$  converge to  $x$ . But it is clear that  $x \notin F$ .

② It is not difficult to guess that the completion of  $(F, d)$  has the property that sequences there must converge to zero, i.e.  $C_0$  which consists of all the sequences converging to 0.

Now, we prove this claim;

The completion of  $(F, d)$  is  $(C_0, d)$ .

Step 1:  $C_0$  is complete.

Let  $\{x^{(n)}\}$  be a Cauchy sequence in  $C_0$ , i.e.

$$d(x^{(n)}, x^{(m)}) = \sup_{k \geq 1} |x_k^{(n)} - x_k^{(m)}| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n, m \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then,  $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists N$  s.t.  $n, m > N$ ,

$$\sup_{k \geq 1} |x_k^{(n)} - x_k^{(m)}| < \varepsilon \Rightarrow |x_k^{(n)} - x_k^{(m)}| < \varepsilon, \forall k \in \mathbb{N} \quad (*)$$

So,  $\{x_k^{(n)}\}$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $\mathbb{C}$ , which implies that

$$\exists x_k \text{ s.t. } |x_k^{(n)} - x_k| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Set  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_k, \dots)$ . Taking  $m \rightarrow \infty$  gives that

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists N \text{ s.t. } n > N,$$

$$|x_k^{(n)} - x_k| < \varepsilon \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}$$

Therefore, it remains to show  $x \in C_0$ , i.e.  $x_k \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .

Indeed,  $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists N$  s.t.  $\forall n, k > N$ ,

$$|x_k| \leq |x_k - x_k^{(n)}| + |x_k^{(n)}| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon$$

Step 2:  $F$  is dense in  $C_0$ , i.e.  $\forall x \in C_0, \exists \{x^{(n)}\} \subset F$  s.t.  $d(x^{(n)}, x) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Indeed,  $\forall x = \{x_k\} \in C_0$ , Define  $x^{(n)} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, 0, \dots, 0\}$ .

It is clear that  $x^{(n)} \in F$  and

$$d(x^{(n)}, x) = \sup_{k > n} |x_k| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty, \text{ since } x \in C_0.$$

#