## Research Methods in Mathematics Lecture 8: The intermediate value theorem

T. PERUTZ

## The intermediate value theorem

**Theorem 1** (Intermediate value theorem) Suppose that f is a continuous function on the interval [a,b]. Suppose that f(a) < 0 and f(b) > 0. Then there is some x in (a,b) with f(x) = 0.

This statement shows that our definition of the real numbers is on the right track. If we work not with real numbers but with the rational numbers  $\mathbb{Q}$ , the intermediate value theorem fails: Define a function f by setting f(x)=-1 if  $x^2<2$ , and f(x)=1 if  $x^2>2$ . This is a continuous function on  $\mathbb{Q}$  (after all, where could it be discontinuous—only at  $\pm\sqrt{2}$ , but those are not points in the domain). It gets from -1 to 1 without ever taking the value 0.

**Proof** Let  $A = \{t \in [a,b] : f(t) \le 0\}$ . Then A is non-empty (because  $a \in A$ ). It is bounded above (by b). So, by the completeness axiom, A has a supremum  $x = \sup A$ . I claim that f(x) = 0.

Let y = f(x). To prove the claim, we must rule out two possibilities: (i) that y < 0, and (ii) that y > 0. Suppose first that y < 0. Let  $\epsilon = -y/2$ . Then there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that, when  $0 < |x' - x| < \delta$ , we have  $|f(x') - f(x)| < \epsilon$ . Let  $x' = x + \delta/2$ . Then  $0 < |x' - x| < \delta$ , so  $|f(x') - y| < \epsilon$ , and hence  $f(x') < y + \epsilon = y/2 < 0$ . But this says that  $x' \in A$ , contradicting the fact that it is bigger than the supposed upper bound x.

Now suppose that y>0. Let  $\epsilon=y/2$ . Then there exists  $\delta>0$  such that, when  $0<|x'-x|<\delta$ , we have  $|f(x')-f(x)|<\epsilon$ . Then for any  $x'\in[x-\delta,x]$ , we will have  $|f(x')-y|<\epsilon$ , and hence  $f(x')>y-\epsilon=y/2>0$ . Hence  $x-\delta/2$  is an upper bound for A, contradicting the fact that x is the least upper bound.

This leaves only the possibility that y = 0, and hence finishes the proof.

**Corollary 2** Every positive real number a has a real square root.

T. Perutz

**Proof** 

**Corollary 3** Let p be a polynomial of odd degree and leading coefficient 1, say

$$p(x) = x^{2n+1} + a_{2n}x^{2n} + \dots + a_1x + a_0.$$

Then there exists a real number x with p(x) = 0.

**Proof** I claim that for x large enough, p(x) > 0. Indeed, suppose x > 1. Then

$$|a_{2n}x^{2n} + \dots + a_1x + a_0| \le |a_{2n}|x^{2n} + |a_{2n-1}|x^{2n-1} + \dots + |a_0|$$

$$\le |a_{2n}|x^{2n} + |a_{2n-1}|x^{2n} + \dots + |a_0|x^{2n}$$

$$= |a_{2n} + |a_{2n-1}| + \dots + |a_0||x^{2n}.$$

Put  $C = 1 + |a_{2n} + |a_{2n-1}| + \cdots + |a_0||$ . Then, when x > C,

$$p(x) \ge x^{2n+1} - |a_{2n}x^{2n} + \dots + a_1x + a_0| \ge x^{2n+1} - Cx^2n > x^{2n+1} - x^{2n+1} = 0.$$

This proves the claim. Similarly (!?), when x < -C, we have p(x) < 0.

Sums and products of continuous functions are continuous. Therefore (by an inductive argument) p is continuous.

So, by the IVT, p has a zero somewhere in [-C, C].

Spivak reference: Chapter 6, Chapters 7–8 (only one of the 'hard theorems').