

CHAPTER II

MAXIMA AND MINIMA



Definition II.1

The function $f(x)$ in the domain of real numbers is said to be maximum at $x = h$, if there exists $\mu > 0$ such that if $0 < \delta < \mu$,

$$\text{then } f(h) > f(h + \delta)$$

$$\text{and } f(h) > f(h - \delta),$$

Definition II.2

The function $f(x)$ is said to be minimum at $x = h$, if there exists $\mu > 0$ such that if, $0 < \delta < \mu$,

$$\text{then } f(h) < f(h + \delta)$$

$$\text{and } f(h) < f(h - \delta)$$

Example II.3

Prove that the function $f(x) = |x|$ is minimum at $x = 0$.

$$\text{We have } f(0) = 0$$

$$\text{and } f(0 + \delta) = |\delta|$$

$$= \delta$$

$$f(0 - \delta) = |-\delta|$$

$$= \delta$$

$\therefore f(0) < f(0 + \delta)$ and $f(0) < f(0 - \delta)$ for all $\delta > 0$

$\therefore \mu$ can be chosen.

Example II.4

Prove that the function $f(x) = x^3 - 6x^2 + 9x$ is maximum at $x = 1$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{We have } f(1) &= 1 - 6 + 9 \\ &= 4 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} f(1 + \partial) &= (1 + \partial)^3 - 6(1 + \partial)^2 + 9(1 + \partial) \\ &= 4 - 3\partial^2 + \partial^3 \\ &= 4 - \partial^2(3 - \partial) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} f(1 - \partial) &= (1 - \partial)^3 - 6(1 - \partial)^2 + 9(1 - \partial) \\ &= 4 - 3\partial^2 - \partial^3 \\ &= 4 - \partial^2(3 + \partial) \end{aligned}$$

Clearly see that we can make both $f(1 + \partial)$ and $f(1 - \partial)$ less than $f(1)$ by making both $\partial^2(3 - \partial)$ and $\partial^2(3 + \partial)$ positive.

i.e. by choosing $\mu = 3$.

Lemma II.5

If $0 < \partial < 1$ and $\partial < \frac{|a_k|}{|a_{k+1}| + \dots + |a_n|}$, then

the polynomials $P_1 = a_k + a_{k+1}\partial + \dots + a_n\partial^{n-k}$

and $P_2 = a_k + a_{k+1}(-\partial) + \dots + a_n(-\partial)^{n-k}$

have the same sign as a_k .

Proof. $P_1 - a_k = \partial \left[a_{k+1} + a_{k+2} \partial + \dots + a_n \partial^{n-k-1} \right]$

$$\therefore |P_1 - a_k| \leq |\partial| \left(|a_{k+1}| + |a_{k+2}| |\partial| + \dots + |a_n| |\partial|^{n-k-1} \right)$$

$$\therefore |P_1 - a_k| < \partial \left(|a_{k+1}| + |a_{k+2}| + \dots + |a_n| \right)$$

$$|P_1 - a_k| < |a_k| \dots \dots \dots (1)$$

If $a_k > 0$, (1) implies

$$|P_1 - a_k| < a_k$$

$$\therefore -a_k < P_1 - a_k < a_k$$

$$\therefore 0 < P_1 < 2a_k$$

$$\therefore P_1 > 0.$$

If $a_k < 0$, (1) implies

$$|P_1 - a_k| < -a_k$$

$$\therefore -(-a_k) < P_1 - a_k < -a_k$$

$$\therefore P_1 < 0$$

Again $P_2 - a_k = (-\partial) \left[a_{k+1} + a_{k+2} (-\partial) + \dots + a_n (-\partial)^{n-k-1} \right]$

$$\therefore |P_2 - a_k| \leq |(-\partial)| \left[|a_{k+1}| + |a_{k+2}| |(-\partial)| + \dots + |a_n| |(-\partial)^{n-k-1}| \right]$$

$$\therefore |P_2 - a_k| < \partial \left(|a_{k+1}| + \dots + |a_n| \right)$$

$$\therefore |P_2 - a_k| < |a_k| \dots \dots \dots (2)$$

If $a_k > 0$, (2) implies

$$|P_2 - a_k| < a_k$$

$$\therefore -a_k < P_2 - a_k < a_k$$

$$\therefore 0 < P_2 < 2a_k$$

$$\therefore P_2 > 0$$

If $a_k < 0$, (2) implies

$$|P_2 - a_k| < -a_k$$

$$\therefore -(-a_k) < P_2 - a_k < -a_k$$

$$\therefore 2a_k < P_2 < 0$$

$$\therefore P_2 < 0$$

Theorem II.6

If the polynomial $f(x) = a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2 + \dots + a_nx^n$ is maximum or minimum at $x = 0$, then $a_1 = 0$.

Proof. Suppose $a_1 \neq 0$; i.e. either $a_1 > 0$ or $a_1 < 0$

case (i) if $a_1 > 0$

$$\text{let } A_1 = a_1 + a_2\delta + a_3\delta^2 + \dots + a_n\delta^{n-1}$$

$$\text{and } A_2 = a_1 + a_2(+\delta) + a_3(-\delta)^2 + \dots + a_n(-\delta)^{n-1}$$

where $0 < \delta < 1$ and $\delta < \frac{|a_1|}{|a_2| + \dots + |a_n|}$

then by lemma II.5 A_1 and A_2 have the same sign as a_1

$$\text{i.e. } A_1 > 0 \text{ and } A_2 > 0$$

now because $f(0) = a_0$

$$\text{and } f(\delta) = a_0 + a_1\delta + a_2\delta^2 + \dots + a_n\delta^n$$

$$\text{and } f(-\delta) = a_0 + a_1(-\delta) + a_2(-\delta)^2 + \dots + a_n(-\delta)^n$$

$$\therefore f(\delta) = f(0) + \delta A_1$$

$$\text{and } f(-\delta) = f(0) + (-\delta)A_2$$

$$\therefore \text{ for } 0 < \delta < 1 \text{ and } \delta < \frac{|a_1|}{|a_2| + \dots + |a_n|}$$

$$\text{we have } f(-\delta) < f(0) < f(\delta)$$

i.e. if $a_1 > 0$, $f(x)$ cannot be maximum or minimum at $x = 0$

case (ii) if $a_1 < 0$

similar to case (i), we may prove that $f(x)$ cannot be maximum or minimum at $x = 0$

i.e. if $a_1 \neq 0$, $f(x)$ cannot be maximum or minimum at $x = 0$, which is contradictory to the hypothesis

$$\therefore a_1 = 0$$

Theorem II.7

Let $f(x) = c + a_1x + a_2x^2 + \dots + a_nx^n$ if k is an even number such that all $a_i = 0$ for $i < k$, then $f(x)$ has a maximum or minimum value at $x = 0$, according as $a_k < 0$ or $a_k > 0$.



Proof. For $0 < \partial < 1$ and $\partial < \frac{|a_k|}{|a_{k+1}| + \dots + |a_n|}$

$$f(0) = c$$

$$\begin{aligned} f(\partial) &= c + a_k \partial^k + a_{k+1} \partial^{k+1} + \dots + a_n \partial^n \\ &= f(0) + \partial^k A_1 \dots \dots \dots (1) \end{aligned}$$

where $A_1 = a_k + a_{k+1} \partial + \dots + a_n \partial^{n-k}$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{and } f(-\partial) &= c + a_k (-\partial)^k + a_{k+1} (-\partial)^{k+1} + \dots + a_n (-\partial)^n \\ &= f(0) + (-\partial)^k A_2 \dots \dots \dots (2) \end{aligned}$$

where $A_2 = a_k + a_{k+1} (-\partial) + \dots + a_n (-\partial)^{n-k}$

If $a_k < 0$, then by lemma II.5 $A_1 < 0$ and $A_2 < 0$
since k is even, ∂^k and $(-\partial)^k$ are positive.

$$\therefore \text{ from (1) } f(\partial) - f(0) = \partial^k A_1$$

$$\therefore f(\partial) - f(0) \text{ is negative}$$

$$\therefore f(0) > f(\partial) \dots \dots \dots (3)$$

$$\text{from (2) } f(-\partial) - f(0) = (-\partial)^k A_2$$

$$\therefore f(-\partial) - f(0) \text{ is negative}$$

$$\therefore f(0) > f(-\partial) \dots \dots \dots (4)$$

The inequalities (3) and (4) show that

$$f(x) \text{ is maximum at } x = 0$$

Similarly if $a_k > 0$ we may prove that $f(x)$ is minimum at

$$x = 0.$$

Corollary II.8

If k is an odd number and $a_k \neq 0$, then $f(x)$ has no maximum or minimum value at $x = 0$.

Proof. For $0 < \delta < 1$ and $\delta < \frac{|a_k|}{|a_{k+1}| + \dots + |a_n|}$

$$f(0) = c$$

$$\begin{aligned} f(\delta) &= c + a_k \delta^k + a_{k+1} \delta^{k+1} + \dots + a_n \delta^n \\ &= f(0) + \delta^k A_1 \dots \dots \dots (1) \end{aligned}$$

where $A_1 = a_k + a_{k+1} \delta + \dots + a_n \delta^{n-k}$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{and } f(-\delta) &= c + a_k (-\delta)^k + a_{k+1} (-\delta)^{k+1} + \dots + a_n (-\delta)^n \\ &= f(0) + (-\delta)^k A_2 \dots \dots \dots (2) \end{aligned}$$

where $A_2 = a_k + a_{k+1} (-\delta) + \dots + a_n (-\delta)^{n-k}$

$\therefore a_k \neq 0$, then either $a_k < 0$ or $a_k > 0$

case (i) if $a_k < 0$, then by lemma II.5

$$A_1 < 0 \text{ and } A_2 < 0$$

since k is odd, δ^k is positive and $(-\delta)^k$ is negative

$$\therefore \text{ from (1) } f(\delta) - f(0) = \delta^k A_1$$

$$\therefore f(\delta) - f(0) \text{ is negative}$$

$$\therefore f(\delta) < f(0) \dots \dots \dots (3)$$

from (2) $f(-\delta) - f(0) = (-\delta)^k A_2$

$\therefore f(-\delta) - f(0)$ is positive

$\therefore f(-\delta) < f(0)$ (4)

from (3) and (4) we have

$$f(\delta) < f(0) < f(-\delta)$$

$\therefore f(x)$ cannot have a maximum or a minimum value at $x = 0$.

case (ii) if $a_k > 0$, then by lemma II.5

$$A_1 > 0 \text{ and } A_2 > 0$$

since k is odd, δ^k is positive and $(-\delta)^k$ is negative

\therefore from (1) $f(\delta) - f(0) = \delta^k A_1$

$\therefore f(\delta) - f(0)$ is positive

$\therefore f(0) < f(\delta)$ (5)

\therefore from (2) $f(-\delta) - f(0) = (-\delta)^k A_2$

$\therefore f(-\delta) - f(0)$ is negative

$\therefore f(-\delta) < f(0)$ (6)

from (5) and (6) we have

$$f(-\delta) < f(0) < f(\delta)$$

$\therefore f(x)$ cannot have a maximum or a minimum value at $x = 0$.

from case (i) and (ii) it is seen that if $a_k \neq 0$, and k is odd, then $f(x)$ has no maximum or minimum value at $x = 0$.

II.9 Extension of lemma II.5

If the series

$$a_k + a_{k+1}x + a_{k+2}x^2 + a_{k+3}x^3 + \dots$$

is absolutely convergent for $0 \leq x \leq m$, then there exists $\mu > 0$ such that if $0 < \delta < \mu$, then the infinite polynomials

$$P_1 = a_k + a_{k+1}\delta + a_{k+2}\delta^2 + a_{k+3}\delta^3 + \dots$$

and $P_2 = a_k + a_{k+1}(-\delta) + a_{k+2}(-\delta)^2 + a_{k+3}(-\delta)^3 + \dots$ have the same sign as a_k

Proof. Choose $\mu = \frac{m|a_k|}{|a_k + m|a_{k+1}| + m^2|a_{k+2}| + m^3|a_{k+3}| + \dots}$

then obviously $\mu \leq m$ and $\mu \leq \frac{|a_k|}{|a_{k+1}| + m|a_{k+2}| + m^2|a_{k+3}| + \dots}$

$\therefore \delta < m$ and $\delta < \frac{|a_k|}{|a_{k+1}| + m|a_{k+2}| + m^2|a_{k+3}| + \dots}$

$\therefore \delta < m$ and $\delta \left[|a_{k+1}| + m|a_{k+2}| + m^2|a_{k+3}| + \dots \right] < |a_k|$

we have

$$P_1 - a_k = \delta (a_{k+1} + a_{k+2}\delta + a_{k+3}\delta^2 + \dots)$$

$\therefore |P_1 - a_k| \leq |\delta| \left[|a_{k+1}| + |a_{k+2}\delta| + |a_{k+3}\delta^2| + \dots \right]$

$$\therefore |P_1 - a_k| < \delta \left[|a_{k+1}| + m |a_{k+2}| + m^2 |a_{k+3}| + \dots \right]$$

$$\therefore |P_1 - a_k| < |a_k| \dots \dots \dots (1)$$

If $a_k > 0$, (1) implies that

$$|P_1 - a_k| < a_k$$

$$\therefore -a_k < P_1 - a_k < a_k$$

$$\therefore 0 < P_1 < 2a_k$$

i.e. $P_1 > 0$

If $a_k < 0$, (1) implies that

$$|P_1 - a_k| < -a_k$$

$$\therefore -(-a_k) < P_1 - a_k < -a_k$$

$$\therefore 2a_k < P_1 < 0$$

i.e. $P_1 < 0$

Again $P_2 - a_k = (-\delta) \left[a_{k+1} + a_{k+2}(-\delta) + a_{k+3}(-\delta)^2 + \dots \right]$

$$\therefore |P_2 - a_k| < |-\delta| \left[|a_{k+1}| + |a_{k+2}(-\delta)| + |a_{k+3}(-\delta)^2| + \dots \right]$$

$$\therefore |P_2 - a_k| < \delta \left[|a_{k+1}| + m |a_{k+2}| + m^2 |a_{k+3}| + \dots \right]$$

$$\therefore |P_2 - a_k| < |a_k| \dots \dots \dots (2)$$

If $a_k > 0$, (2) implies that

$$|P_2 - a_k| < a_k$$

$$\therefore -a_k < P_2 - a_k < a_k$$

$$\therefore 0 < P_2 < 2a_k$$

$$\text{i.e. } P_2 > 0$$

If $a_k < 0$, (2) implies that

$$|P_2 - a_k| < -a_k$$

$$\therefore -(-a_k) < P_2 - a_k < -a_k$$

$$\therefore 2a_k < P_2 < 0$$

$$\text{i.e. } P_2 < 0$$

Note By this extension the theorems II.6 and II.7 and the corollary II.8 are automatically extended to be valid even for the infinite polynomials which represent most rational functions and transcendental functions.

Example II.10

Prove that the function $f(x) = e^x - x$ is minimum at

$x = 0$.

$$e^x = 1 + x + \frac{x^2}{2!} + \frac{x^3}{3!} + \dots$$

$$\therefore f(x) = 1 + \frac{x^2}{2!} + \frac{x^3}{3!} + \dots$$

for $0 \leq x \leq 1$;

$$1 = 1$$

$$\frac{x^2}{2!} \leq \frac{1}{2!}$$

$$\frac{x^3}{3!} \leq \frac{1}{3!}$$

.....

$$\frac{x^n}{n!} \leq \frac{1}{n!}$$

.....

and the series $1 + \frac{1}{2!} + \frac{1}{3!} + \dots + \frac{1}{n!} + \dots$

converges to $e - 1$

∴ By Weierstrass M-test

the series $1 + \frac{x^2}{2!} + \frac{x^3}{3!} + \dots$

is absolutely convergent for $0 \leq x \leq 1$

∴ By (the extended) theorem II.7, since the coefficient of x^2 is positive, $f(x)$ is minimum at $x = 0$.