

# Continuity & differentiability of a function of single variables

Dr. Sunil Jee  
S.B. College Ara

Def<sup>n</sup>.) Continuity: - The function  $f(x)$  is said to be continuous when  $x = a$  if  $f(x)$  possesses a definite limit as  $x$  tends to the value  $a$  from either side and ~~value~~ each of these limits is equal to  $f(a)$ ;

$$\text{i.e. } \lim_{x \rightarrow a-0} f(x) = f(a) = \lim_{x \rightarrow a+0} f(x).$$

Def<sup>n</sup>.) Continuity in an interval: - A function  $f(x)$  is said to be continuous in the closed interval  $[a, b]$ , i.e.,  $a \leq x \leq b$ , if it is continuous at every point of the open interval  $]a, b[$ , i.e.  $a < x < b$ , and if  $f(a+0)$  exists and is equal to  $f(a)$ , and  $f(b-0)$  exists and is equal to  $f(b)$ .

Def<sup>n</sup>.) (Differentiability): - A function  $f(x)$  defined at a point  $a$  and in a certain neighbourhood of  $a$  is said to be differentiable at  $a$  if the limits

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(a+h) - f(a)}{h} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(a-h) - f(a)}{-h}$$

both exist and have the same value.

The value is called the differential coefficient of  $f(x)$  at  $a$  and is denoted by  $f'(a)$ .

(Theorem) If a function is differentiable at a point, then prove that it must be continuous at that point.

Proof: - Let  $f(x)$  be differentiable at  $x = a$ .

Then, by def<sup>n</sup> -

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(a+h) - f(a)}{h} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(a-h) - f(a)}{-h} = A$$



$$\therefore |f(a+h) - f(a)| = |h| [A+E], \text{ where } E \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } h \rightarrow 0$$

$$\text{i.e. } f(a+h) - f(a) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } h \rightarrow 0$$

$$\text{i.e. } f(a+h) \rightarrow f(a) \text{ as } h \rightarrow 0 \text{ --- (1)}$$

$$\text{Also, } |f(a-h) - f(a)| = |h| [A+E_1], \text{ where } E_1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } h \rightarrow 0$$

$$\text{i.e. } f(a-h) - f(a) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } h \rightarrow 0$$

$$\text{i.e. } f(a-h) \rightarrow f(a) \text{ as } h \rightarrow 0 \text{ --- (2)}$$

From (1) and (2), we have

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} f(a+h) = f(a) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} f(a-h)$$

Hence, the function is continuous at  $x=a$ .

(Theorem):- Show that Continuity is a weaker condition on a function than differentiability.

or, Prove that the converse of this theorem is not necessarily true.

Proof:- Let us examine the continuity and the differentiability of the function  $f(x) = |x|$  at  $x=0$

The function  $f(x)$  is said to be continuous at  $x=0$  if

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} f(0+h) = f(0) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} f(0-h)$$

$$\text{Now, } \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} f(0+h) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} |0+h| = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} |h| = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} h = 0$$

$$f(0) = |0| = 0$$

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} f(0-h) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} |0-h| = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} |-h| = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} h = 0$$

$$\therefore \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} f(0+h) = f(0) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} f(0-h)$$

Hence, the function  $f(x) = |x|$  is continuous at  $x=0$ .



According as  $x$  is  $\pm ve$ .

Hence  $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x) - f(0)}{x}$  does not exist.

So,  $f(x)$  is not differentiable at  $x=0$ .

Thus the function under consideration is continuous at  $x=0$  but not differentiable at  $x=0$ .

Theorem:- If a function is continuous in a closed interval, Prove that it is bounded in that interval.

Proof:- Let the function  $f(x)$  be continuous in the closed interval  $[a, b]$ .

Let the interval  $[a, b]$  be divided into a finite no. of sub-intervals, say  $n$  such that the oscillation of  $f(x) < \epsilon$  in each sub-interval.

Let the dividing point be  $x_0 = a, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_n = b$ .

Considering the first sub-interval  $[a, x_1]$ , we have

$$|f(x)| = |f(a) + f(x) - f(a)|$$

$$\text{or, } |f(x)| \leq |f(a)| + |f(x) - f(a)|$$

$$\text{or } |f(x)| < |f(a)| + \epsilon$$

In Particular when  $x = x_1$ ,

$$|f(x_1)| < |f(a)| + \epsilon \quad \text{--- (1)}$$

Again, Considering the second sub-interval  $[x_1, x_2]$ , we have

$$|f(x)| = |f(x_1) + f(x) - f(x_1)|$$

$$\text{or, } |f(x)| \leq |f(x_1)| + |f(x) - f(x_1)|$$



$$\text{or } |f(x)| < |f(x_1)| + \epsilon$$

$$\text{or } |f(x)| < |f(a)| + \epsilon + \epsilon, \text{ [by eqn. of (1)]}$$

$$\text{or } |f(x)| < |f(a)| + 2\epsilon$$

In Particular, when  $x = x_2$ ,

$$|f(x_2)| < |f(a)| + 2\epsilon$$

By proceeding in this way, when  $x$  lies in the  $n$ th sub-interval  $[x_{n-1}, x_n]$ , we have,

$$|f(x)| < |f(a)| + n\epsilon \quad \text{--- (2)}$$

Since the inequality (2) is clearly satisfied in the whole interval  $[a, b]$ , therefore  $f(x)$  is bounded in  $[a, b]$ .

Hence the theorem is proved.

Theorem: - If  $f(x)$  be continuous in the closed interval  $[a, b]$ , Prove that it attains its bounds at least once in this interval.

Proof: - We know that a function which is continuous in an interval is bounded. Therefore  $f(x)$  must be bounded in  $[a, b]$ .

Let the least upper bound and the glb of  $f(x)$  be  $M$  and  $m$  respectively,

Now it will be proved that these are at least attained  $\alpha$  &  $\beta$  in  $[a, b]$  such that  $f(\alpha) = M$ , &  $f(\beta) = m$ .

First suppose that  $f(x) \neq M$ , for any value of  $x$  in  $[a, b]$ .

$\therefore M - f(x) \neq 0$ , for any value of  $x$  in  $[a, b]$ .

Let us now consider the function

$$\phi(x) = \frac{1}{M - f(x)}$$



Since  $f(x)$  is continuous in  $[a, b]$ ,  
therefore  $M - f(x)$  is also continuous in  $[a, b]$ .

$\therefore \frac{1}{M - f(x)}$ , that is  $\phi(x)$ .

is also continuous in  $[a, b]$ , as  $M - f(x) \neq 0$ .  
So  $\phi(x)$  is bounded in  $[a, b]$ .

Let  $G_1$  be the lub of  $\phi(x)$  in  $[a, b]$ .

By the property of bound, we have

$$\phi(x) \leq G_1,$$

$$\text{or, } \frac{1}{M - f(x)} \leq G_1$$

$$\text{or } M - f(x) \geq \frac{1}{G_1}$$

$$\text{or, } f(x) < M - \frac{1}{G_1}, \text{ for all } x \text{ in } [a, b].$$

This contradicts the fact that  $M$  is the  
lub of  $f(x)$  in  $[a, b]$ .

Hence our supposition that  $M$  is  
not attained by the function  $f(x)$  at any  
point  $x$  in  $[a, b]$  is wrong.

Thus  $f(x)$  must attain  $M$  at least  
once in  $[a, b]$ .

Similarly it can be shown that the  
greatest lower bound  $m$  is attained by  $f(x)$   
at least once in  $[a, b]$ .

Hence the theorem is completely  
proved.