

Topology of \mathbb{R} Examples

Jason Sass

May 19, 2023

Topology of \mathbb{R}

Example 1. every nonempty open interval is the ϵ neighborhood of some point

Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$.

If $a < b$, then $N(\frac{a+b}{2}; \frac{b-a}{2}) = (a, b)$.

Proof. Suppose $a < b$.

Then $b - a > 0$, so $\frac{b-a}{2} > 0$.

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} N\left(\frac{a+b}{2}; \frac{b-a}{2}\right) &= \left(\frac{a+b}{2} - \frac{b-a}{2}, \frac{a+b}{2} + \frac{b-a}{2}\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{a+b-b+a}{2}, \frac{a+b+b-a}{2}\right) \\ &= (a, b). \end{aligned}$$

□

Example 2. deleted ϵ neighborhood is a subset of the ϵ neighborhood of a point

Let $\epsilon > 0$.

Let $p \in \mathbb{R}$.

Then $N'(p; \epsilon) \subset N(p; \epsilon)$ and $N'(p; \epsilon) = (p - \epsilon, p) \cup (p, p + \epsilon)$.

Proof. We prove $N'(p; \epsilon) \subset N(p; \epsilon)$.

For every set A and B , we have $A - B = A \cap \overline{B} \subset A$, so $A - B \subset A$.

In particular, $N'(p; \epsilon) = N(p; \epsilon) - \{p\} \subset N(p; \epsilon)$. □

Proof. We prove $N'(p; \epsilon) = (p - \epsilon, p) \cup (p, p + \epsilon)$.

We first prove $N'(p; \epsilon) \neq \emptyset$.

Since $\epsilon > 0$, then $\frac{\epsilon}{2} > 0$, so $d(p + \frac{\epsilon}{2}, p) = |(p + \frac{\epsilon}{2}) - p| = |\frac{\epsilon}{2}| = \frac{\epsilon}{2} < \epsilon$.

Thus, $p + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \in N(p; \epsilon)$.

Since $\frac{\epsilon}{2} > 0$, then $p + \frac{\epsilon}{2} > p$, so $p + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \neq p$.

Hence, $p + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \in N'(p; \epsilon)$, so $N'(p; \epsilon) \neq \emptyset$.

We prove $N'(p; \epsilon) \subset (p - \epsilon, p) \cup (p, p + \epsilon)$.
 Let $x \in N'(p; \epsilon)$.
 Then $x \in N(p; \epsilon)$ and $x \neq p$.
 Since $x \in N(p; \epsilon) = (p - \epsilon, p + \epsilon)$, then $p - \epsilon < x < p + \epsilon$, so $p - \epsilon < x$ and $x < p + \epsilon$.
 Since $x \neq p$, then either $x < p$ or $x > p$.
 We consider these cases separately.
Case 1: Suppose $x < p$.
 Since $p - \epsilon < x$ and $x < p$, then $p - \epsilon < x < p$, so $x \in (p - \epsilon, p)$.
Case 2: Suppose $x > p$.
 Since $p < x$ and $x < p + \epsilon$, then $p < x < p + \epsilon$, so $x \in (p, p + \epsilon)$.
 Thus, either $x \in (p - \epsilon, p)$ or $x \in (p, p + \epsilon)$, so $x \in (p - \epsilon, p) \cup (p, p + \epsilon)$.
 Hence, $N'(p; \epsilon) \subset (p - \epsilon, p) \cup (p, p + \epsilon)$.

We prove $(p - \epsilon, p) \cup (p, p + \epsilon) \subset N'(p; \epsilon)$.
 Let $y \in (p - \epsilon, p) \cup (p, p + \epsilon)$.
 Then either $y \in (p - \epsilon, p)$ or $y \in (p, p + \epsilon)$.
 We consider these cases separately.
Case 1: Suppose $y \in (p - \epsilon, p)$.
 Then $p - \epsilon < y < p$, so $p - \epsilon < y$ and $y < p$.
 Thus, $p - y < \epsilon$ and $0 < p - y$.
 Hence, $d(y, p) = d(p, y) = |p - y| = p - y < \epsilon$, so $y \in N(p; \epsilon)$.
 Since $y < p$, then $y \neq p$, so $y \in N'(p; \epsilon)$.
Case 2: Suppose $y \in (p, p + \epsilon)$.
 Then $p < y < p + \epsilon$, so $p < y$ and $y < p + \epsilon$.
 Thus, $0 < y - p$ and $y - p < \epsilon$.
 Hence, $d(y, p) = |y - p| = y - p < \epsilon$, so $y \in N(p; \epsilon)$.
 Since $y > p$, then $y \neq p$, so $y \in N'(p; \epsilon)$.
 Thus, in all cases, $y \in N'(p; \epsilon)$, so $(p - \epsilon, p) \cup (p, p + \epsilon) \subset N'(p; \epsilon)$.

Since $N'(p; \epsilon) \subset (p - \epsilon, p) \cup (p, p + \epsilon)$ and $(p - \epsilon, p) \cup (p, p + \epsilon) \subset N'(p; \epsilon)$, then $N'(p; \epsilon) = (p - \epsilon, p) \cup (p, p + \epsilon)$, as desired. \square

Example 3. \emptyset has no interior points.

There is no interior point of the empty set.

Proof. Let x be an arbitrary real number.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given.

Since $x \in N(x; \epsilon)$ and $x \notin \emptyset$, then x is not an interior point of \emptyset .

Thus, every real number is not an interior point of \emptyset , so there is no real number that is an interior point of \emptyset .

Therefore, there is no interior point of the empty set. \square

Example 4. A singleton set has no interior points.

Let $p \in \mathbb{R}$.

Then p is not an interior point of the set $\{p\}$.

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given.

Let x be the midpoint of p and $p + \epsilon$.

Then $x = \frac{p+p+\epsilon}{2} = p + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, so $x - p = \frac{\epsilon}{2}$.

Since $\epsilon > 0$, then $\frac{\epsilon}{2} > 0$, so $x - p > 0$.

Since $\frac{1}{2} < 1$ and $\epsilon > 0$, then $\frac{\epsilon}{2} < \epsilon$.

Since $d(x, p) = |x - p| = x - p = \frac{\epsilon}{2} < \epsilon$, then $d(x, p) < \epsilon$, so $x \in N(p; \epsilon)$.

Since $x - p > 0$, then $x > p$, so $x \neq p$.

Thus, $x \notin \{p\}$.

Hence, there exists $x \in N(p; \epsilon)$ such that $x \notin \{p\}$.

Therefore, p is not an interior point of $\{p\}$. \square

Example 5. Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ with $a < b$.

Every point in the open interval (a, b) is an interior point of the open interval (a, b) .

Proof. Since $a < b$, then $(a, b) \neq \emptyset$.

Let $p \in (a, b)$.

Then $p \in \mathbb{R}$ and $a < p < b$, so $a < p$ and $p < b$.

Hence, $p - a > 0$ and $b - p > 0$.

Let $\epsilon = \min\{d(p, a), d(p, b)\}$.

Then $\epsilon \leq d(p, a)$ and $\epsilon \leq d(p, b)$.

Since $d(p, a) = |p - a| = p - a > 0$, then $d(p, a) > 0$.

Since $d(p, b) = d(b, p) = |b - p| = b - p > 0$, then $d(p, b) > 0$.

Therefore, $\epsilon > 0$.

Let $x \in N(p; \epsilon)$.

Then $x \in (p - \epsilon, p + \epsilon)$, so $p - \epsilon < x < p + \epsilon$.

Hence, $p - \epsilon < x$ and $x < p + \epsilon$.

Since $\epsilon \leq d(p, a)$ and $d(p, a) = p - a$, then $\epsilon \leq p - a$, so $a \leq p - \epsilon$.

Since $\epsilon \leq d(p, b)$ and $d(p, b) = b - p$, then $\epsilon \leq b - p$, so $p + \epsilon \leq b$.

Since $a \leq p - \epsilon$ and $p - \epsilon < x$, then $a < x$.

Since $x < p + \epsilon$ and $p + \epsilon \leq b$, then $x < b$.

Thus, $a < x < b$, so $x \in (a, b)$.

Hence, $N(p; \epsilon) \subset (a, b)$.

Thus, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $N(p; \epsilon) \subset (a, b)$, so p is an interior point of (a, b) .

Therefore, every element of (a, b) is an interior point of (a, b) . \square

Example 6. Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ with $a < b$.

Every point in the closed interval $[a, b]$ except the end points a and b is an interior point of the closed interval $[a, b]$.

Proof. Since $a < b$, then $[a, b] \neq \emptyset$.

Let $p \in [a, b]$.

Since $[a, b] = \{a\} \cup (a, b) \cup \{b\}$, then either $p = a$ or $p \in (a, b)$ or $p = b$.

We consider these cases separately.

Case 1: Suppose $p \in (a, b)$.

Since every element of (a, b) is an interior point of (a, b) , then p is an interior point of (a, b) .

Since $(a, b) \subset [a, b]$, then p is an interior point of $[a, b]$.

Case 2: Suppose $p = a$.

We prove a is not an interior point of $[a, b]$.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given.

Let x be the midpoint of $a - \epsilon$ and a .

Then $x = \frac{a - \epsilon + a}{2} = a - \frac{\epsilon}{2}$.

Thus, $a - x = \frac{\epsilon}{2} > 0$, so $a - x > 0$.

Hence, $x < a$, so $x \notin [a, b]$.

Since $d(a, x) = |a - x| = a - x = \frac{\epsilon}{2} < \epsilon$, then $d(a, x) < \epsilon$, so $x \in N(a; \epsilon)$.

Thus, there exists $x \in N(a; \epsilon)$ such that $x \notin [a, b]$.

Therefore, a is not an interior point of $[a, b]$.

Case 3: Suppose $p = b$.

We prove b is not an interior point of $[a, b]$.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given.

Let x be the midpoint of b and $b + \epsilon$.

Then $x = \frac{b + b + \epsilon}{2} = b + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$.

Thus, $x - b = \frac{\epsilon}{2} > 0$, so $x - b > 0$.

Hence, $x > b$, so $x \notin [a, b]$.

Since $d(x, b) = |x - b| = x - b = \frac{\epsilon}{2} < \epsilon$, then $d(x, b) < \epsilon$, so $x \in N(b; \epsilon)$.

Thus, there exists $x \in N(b; \epsilon)$ such that $x \notin [a, b]$.

Therefore, b is not an interior point of $[a, b]$. □

Example 7. No natural number is an interior point of \mathbb{N} .

Proof. We prove by contradiction.

Suppose some natural number is an interior point of \mathbb{N} .

Then there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that n is an interior point of \mathbb{N} .

Hence, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $N(n; \epsilon) \subset \mathbb{N}$.

Either $\epsilon < 1$ or $\epsilon = 1$ or $\epsilon > 1$.

We consider these cases separately.

Case 1: Suppose $\epsilon < 1$.

Then $0 < \epsilon < 1$, so $0 < \frac{\epsilon}{2} < \frac{1}{2} < 1$.

Hence, $n < n + \frac{\epsilon}{2} < n + \frac{1}{2} < n + 1$.

Let $p = n + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$.

Since $n < n + \frac{\epsilon}{2} < n + 1$ and $n, n + 1 \in \mathbb{N}$, then $n + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \notin \mathbb{N}$, so $p \notin \mathbb{N}$.

Since $n < n + \frac{\epsilon}{2} < n + \epsilon$, then $n + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \in (n, n + \epsilon)$, so $p \in (n, n + \epsilon)$.

Since $(n, n + \epsilon) \subset (n - \epsilon, n + \epsilon)$, then $p \in (n - \epsilon, n + \epsilon)$.

Thus, $p \in N(n; \epsilon)$.

Therefore, there exists p such that $p \in N(n; \epsilon)$ and $p \notin \mathbb{N}$.

This contradicts the fact that $N(n; \epsilon) \subset \mathbb{N}$.

Case 2: Suppose $\epsilon = 1$.

Since $0 < \frac{1}{2} < 1$, then $n < n + \frac{1}{2} < n + 1$.

Since $n, n + 1 \in \mathbb{N}$, then $n + \frac{1}{2} \notin \mathbb{N}$.

Let $p = n + \frac{1}{2}$.

Then $p \notin \mathbb{N}$.

Since $n < n + \frac{1}{2} < n + 1$, then $n + \frac{1}{2} \in (n, n + 1)$, so $p \in (n, n + 1)$.

Since $(n, n + 1) \subset (n - 1, n + 1)$, then $p \in (n - 1, n + 1)$, so $p \in N(n; 1)$.

Hence, there exists p such that $p \in N(n; \epsilon)$ and $p \notin \mathbb{N}$.

This contradicts the fact that $N(n; \epsilon) \subset \mathbb{N}$.

Case 3: Suppose $\epsilon > 1$.

Then $n + \epsilon > n + 1$.

Let p be the midpoint of n and $n + 1$.

Then $p = n + \frac{1}{2}$.

Since $0 < \frac{1}{2} < 1$, then $n < n + \frac{1}{2} < n + 1$.

Since $n, n + 1 \in \mathbb{N}$, then $n + \frac{1}{2} \notin \mathbb{N}$, so $p \notin \mathbb{N}$.

Since $n < n + \frac{1}{2} < n + 1$, then $n < p < n + 1$, so $n < p$ and $p < n + 1$.

Since $p < n + 1$ and $n + 1 < n + \epsilon$, then $p < n + \epsilon$.

Since $n < p$ and $p < n + \epsilon$, then $p \in (n, n + \epsilon)$.

Since $(n, n + \epsilon) \subset (n - \epsilon, n + \epsilon)$, then $p \in (n - \epsilon, n + \epsilon)$, so $p \in N(n; \epsilon)$.

Hence, there exists p such that $p \in N(n; \epsilon)$ and $p \notin \mathbb{N}$.

This contradicts the fact that $N(n; \epsilon) \subset \mathbb{N}$.

Thus, in all cases, a contradiction is reached.

Therefore, no natural number is an interior point of \mathbb{N} . □

Example 8. No rational number is an interior point of \mathbb{Q} .

Proof. We prove by contradiction.

Suppose some rational number is an interior point of \mathbb{Q} .

Then there exists $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that q is an interior point of \mathbb{Q} .

Hence, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $N(q; \delta) \subset \mathbb{Q}$, so $(q - \delta, q + \delta) \subset \mathbb{Q}$.

Since $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}$, then $q \in \mathbb{R}$, so $q - \delta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $q + \delta \in \mathbb{R}$.

Since $\delta > 0$ and $\delta > 0 \Rightarrow \delta + \delta > 0 \Rightarrow \delta + \delta > q - q \Rightarrow q + \delta > q - \delta$, then $q + \delta > q - \delta$.

Thus, $q - \delta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $q + \delta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $q - \delta < q + \delta$.

Between any two distinct real numbers is an irrational number, so there exists $r \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $r \notin \mathbb{Q}$ and $q - \delta < r < q + \delta$.

Hence, $r \in (q - \delta, q + \delta)$, so $r \in N(q; \delta)$.

Thus, there exists $r \in N(q; \delta)$ such that $r \notin \mathbb{Q}$, which contradicts the fact that $N(q; \delta) \subset \mathbb{Q}$.

Therefore, no rational number is an interior point of \mathbb{Q} . □

Example 9. Every real number is an interior point of \mathbb{R} .

Proof. Let x be an arbitrary real number.

Let $\delta = 1$.

Since $1 > 0$, then $\delta > 0$.

Since $N(x; \delta) = N(x; 1) = (x - 1, x + 1) \subset \mathbb{R}$, then $N(x; \delta) \subset \mathbb{R}$.

Hence, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $N(x; \delta) \subset \mathbb{R}$.

Therefore, x is an interior point of \mathbb{R} . □

Example 10. accumulation point of a set need not lie in the set

Let $S = (0, 1)$.

Then 1 is an accumulation point of S , but $1 \notin S$.

Proof. Since $1 < 1$ is false, then $1 \notin (0, 1)$.

To prove 1 is an accumulation point of S , let $\delta > 0$ be given.

We must prove there exists $x \in (0, 1)$ such that $x \in N'(1; \delta)$.

Let $M = \max\{1 - \delta, 0\}$.

Then $M \in \mathbb{R}$ and either $M = 1 - \delta$ or $M = 0$, and $1 - \delta \leq M$ and $0 \leq M$.

Since $\delta > 0$, then $\delta > 1 - 1$, so $1 > 1 - \delta$.

Since either $M = 1 - \delta$ or $M = 0$, and $1 - \delta < 1$ and $0 < 1$, then $M < 1$.

Let $x = \frac{M+1}{2}$.

Since $M + 1 > M$ and $M \geq 0$, then $M + 1 > 0$, so $\frac{M+1}{2} > 0$.

Hence, $x > 0$.

Since $M < 1$, then $M + 1 < 2$, so $\frac{M+1}{2} < 1$.

Thus, $x < 1$.

Therefore, $0 < x < 1$, so $x \in (0, 1)$.

Since $\delta > 0$, then $\delta + M > M$.

Since $1 - \delta \leq M$ and $M < \delta + M$, then $1 - \delta < \delta + M$, so $1 - M < 2\delta$.

Since $M < 1$, then $M - 1 < 0$, so $|M - 1| = 1 - M < 2\delta$.

Hence, $|M - 1| < 2\delta$, so $\frac{|M-1|}{2} < \delta$.

Thus, $|\frac{M-1}{2}| < \delta$, so $|\frac{M+1}{2} - 1| < \delta$.

Therefore, $|x - 1| < \delta$, so $x \in N(1; \delta)$.

Since $x < 1$, then $x \neq 1$, so $x \in N'(1; \delta)$, as desired. \square

Example 11. point of a set need not be an accumulation point

Let $S = (0, 1) \cup \{2\}$.

Then $2 \in S$, but 2 is not an accumulation point of S .

Proof. Clearly, $2 \in S$.

To prove 2 is not an accumulation point of S , we must prove there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $N'(2; \delta) \cap S = \emptyset$.

Let $\delta = 1$.

We prove $N'(2; 1) \cap S = \emptyset$ by contradiction.

Suppose $N'(2; 1) \cap S \neq \emptyset$.

Then there exists $x \in N'(2; 1) \cap S$, so $x \in N'(2; 1)$ and $x \in S$.

Since $x \in N'(2; 1)$, then $x \in N(2; 1)$ and $x \neq 2$.

Since $x \in N(2; 1)$, then $x \in (1, 3)$, so $1 < x < 3$.

Hence, $1 < x$.

Since $x \in S$, then either $x \in (0, 1)$ or $x = 2$.

Since $x \neq 2$, then $x \in (0, 1)$, so $0 < x < 1$.

Hence, $x < 1$.

Thus, we have $x > 1$ and $x < 1$, a violation of trichotomy.

Therefore, $N'(2; 1) \cap S = \emptyset$, so 2 is not an accumulation point of S , as desired. \square

Example 12. Let $S = \{\frac{1}{n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

Then 0 is an accumulation point of S and 1 is not an accumulation point of S .

Proof. To prove 0 is an accumulation point of S , let $\delta > 0$ be given.

We must prove there exists $x \in S$ such that $x \in N'(0; \delta)$.

Since $\delta > 0$, then $\frac{1}{\delta} > 0$, so by the Archimedean property of \mathbb{R} , there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n > \frac{1}{\delta}$.

Since $n > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, then $\delta > \frac{1}{n}$.

Let $x = \frac{1}{n}$.

Since $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\frac{1}{n} \in S$, so $x \in S$.

Since $|\frac{1}{n} - 0| = \frac{1}{n} < \delta$, then $\frac{1}{n} \in N(0; \delta)$.

Since $n > 0$, then $\frac{1}{n} > 0$, so $\frac{1}{n} \neq 0$.

Thus, $\frac{1}{n} \in N'(0; \delta)$, as desired. \square

Proof. To prove 1 is not an accumulation point of S , we must prove there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $N'(1; \delta) \cap S = \emptyset$.

Let $\delta = \frac{1}{2}$. (Any $\delta \leq \frac{1}{2}$ will work).

We prove $N'(1; \frac{1}{2}) \cap S = \emptyset$ by contradiction.

Suppose $N'(1; \frac{1}{2}) \cap S \neq \emptyset$.

Then there exists $x \in N'(1; \frac{1}{2}) \cap S$, so $x \in N'(1; \frac{1}{2})$ and $x \in S$.

Since $x \in N'(1; \frac{1}{2})$, then $x \in N(1; \frac{1}{2}) - \{1\}$, so $x \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2})$ and $x \neq 1$.

Hence, $\frac{1}{2} < x < \frac{3}{2}$ and $x \neq 1$.

Since $x \in S$, then there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x = \frac{1}{n}$, so $\frac{1}{2} < \frac{1}{n} < \frac{3}{2}$.

Hence, $\frac{1}{2} < \frac{1}{n}$.

Since $n > 0$, then $\frac{n}{2} < 1$, so $n < 2$.

Since $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n < 2$, then $n = 1$, so $x = \frac{1}{1} = 1$.

Thus, we have $x = 1$ and $x \neq 1$, a contradiction.

Therefore, $N'(1; \frac{1}{2}) \cap S = \emptyset$, so 1 is not an accumulation point of S , as desired. \square

Example 13. \emptyset has no accumulation points.

There is no accumulation point of the empty set.

Proof. To prove there is no accumulation point of \emptyset , let p be an arbitrary real number.

To prove p is not an accumulation point of \emptyset , we must prove there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $N'(p; \delta) \cap \emptyset = \emptyset$.

Let $\delta = 1$.

Then $\delta > 0$ and $N'(p; 1) \cap \emptyset = \emptyset$.

Therefore, p is not an accumulation point of \emptyset , as desired. \square

Example 14. A singleton set has no accumulation points.

Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

There is no accumulation point of the set $\{x\}$.

Proof. To prove there is no accumulation point of $\{x\}$, let p be an arbitrary real number.

To prove p is not an accumulation point of $\{x\}$, we must prove there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $N'(p; \delta) \cap \{x\} = \emptyset$.

Either $p = x$ or $p \neq x$.

We consider these cases separately.

Case 1: Suppose $p = x$.

Let $\delta = 1$.

Then $\delta > 0$.

Suppose $N'(p; 1) \cap \{x\} \neq \emptyset$.

Then there exists $t \in N'(p; 1) \cap \{x\}$, so $t \in N'(p; 1)$ and $t \in \{x\}$.

Hence, $t = x$, so $x \in N'(p; 1)$.

Thus, $p \in N'(p; 1)$.

But, $p \notin N'(p; 1)$, so $N'(p; 1) \cap \{x\} = \emptyset$.

Therefore, p is not an accumulation point of $\{x\}$.

Case 2: Suppose $p \neq x$.

Then $x \neq p$, so $d(x, p) > 0$.

Let $\delta = d(x, p)$.

Then $\delta > 0$.

Suppose $N'(p; \delta) \cap \{x\} \neq \emptyset$.

Then there exists $t \in N'(p; \delta) \cap \{x\}$, so $t \in N'(p; \delta)$ and $t \in \{x\}$.

Hence, $t = x$, so $x \in N'(p; \delta)$.

Thus, $x \in N(p; \delta)$, so $d(x, p) < \delta$.

But, this contradicts the fact that $d(x, p) = \delta$.

Hence, $N'(p; \delta) \cap \{x\} = \emptyset$.

Therefore, p is not an accumulation point of $\{x\}$.

Thus, in all cases, p is not an accumulation point of $\{x\}$, as desired. \square

Example 15. A finite set has no accumulation points.

There is no accumulation point of a finite set.

Proof. This statement is equivalent to : If S is a finite set, then there is no accumulation point of S .

We prove by contrapositive.

Let S be a set.

Suppose there is an accumulation point of S .

Then there exists p such that p is an accumulation point of S .

Thus, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $x \in S$ such that $x \in N'(p; \epsilon)$.

Let $\epsilon = \frac{1}{n}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Then $\epsilon > 0$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, so there exists $x \in S$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Thus, there exists a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow S$ such that $f(n) \in S$.

Hence, there exists an infinite sequence (s_n) such that $s_n \in S$.

Therefore, $\{s_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset S$.

Since a subset of a finite set is finite, then if $\{s_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset S$ and S is finite, then $\{s_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is finite.

Thus, if $\{s_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset S$ and $\{s_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is infinite, then S is infinite.

Since $\{s_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset S$ and $\{s_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is infinite, then we conclude S is infinite, as desired. \square

Example 16. Every point in $[a, b]$ is an accumulation point of (a, b) .

Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$.

If $a < b$, then every point in the closed interval $[a, b]$ is an accumulation point of the open interval (a, b) .

Proof. Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $a < b$.

Then $[a, b] \neq \emptyset$, so there is at least one point in the closed interval $[a, b]$.

We prove every point in $[a, b]$ is an accumulation point of (a, b) .

Let $x \in [a, b]$.

To prove x is an accumulation point of (a, b) , let $\delta > 0$ be given.

We must prove there exists $p \in (a, b)$ such that $p \in N'(x; \delta)$.

Let $M = \max\{a, x - \delta\}$.

Then either $M = a$ or $M = x - \delta$, and $a \leq M$ and $x - \delta \leq M$.

Since $x \in [a, b]$, then $a \leq x \leq b$, so either $a \leq x < b$ or $x = b$.

We consider these cases separately.

Case 1: Suppose $a \leq x < b$.

Then $a \leq x$ and $x < b$.

Let $m = \min\{b, x + \delta\}$.

Then either $m = b$ or $m = x + \delta$, and $m \leq b$ and $m \leq x + \delta$.

Since either $m = b$ or $m = x + \delta$ and $x < b$ and $x < x + \delta$, then $x < m$.

Let p be the midpoint of x and m .

Then $p = \frac{x+m}{2}$ and $x < p < m$, so $x < p$ and $p < m$.

Since either $M = a$ or $M = x - \delta$ and $a \leq x$ and $x - \delta < x$, then $M \leq x$.

Thus, $x - \delta < x < p < m \leq x + \delta$, so $x - \delta < p < x + \delta$.

Hence, $p \in (x - \delta, x + \delta)$, so $p \in N(x; \delta)$.

Since $p > x$, then $p \neq x$, so $p \in N'(x; \delta)$.

Since $a \leq x < p < m \leq b$, then $a < p < b$, so $p \in (a, b)$.

Thus, there exists $p \in (a, b)$ such that $p \in N'(x; \delta)$.

Case 2: Suppose $x = b$.

Since either $M = a$ or $M = x - \delta$, and $a < b = x$ and $x - \delta < x$, then $M < x$.

Let p be the midpoint of M and x .

Then $p = \frac{M+x}{2}$ and $M < p < x$, so $M < p$ and $p < x$.

Since $x - \delta \leq M < p < x < x + \delta$, then $x - \delta < p < x + \delta$, so $p \in (x - \delta, x + \delta)$.

Hence, $p \in N(x; \delta)$.

Since $p < x$, then $p \neq x$, so $p \in N'(x; \delta)$.

Since $a \leq M < p < x = b$, then $a < p < b$, so $p \in (a, b)$.

Thus, there exists $p \in (a, b)$ such that $p \in N'(x; \delta)$.

Hence, in all cases, there exists $p \in (a, b)$ such that $p \in N'(x; \delta)$, so x is an accumulation point of (a, b) . \square

Example 17. Every point in $[a, b]$ is an accumulation point of $[a, b]$.

Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$.

If $a < b$, then every point in the closed interval $[a, b]$ is an accumulation point of the closed interval $[a, b]$.

Proof. Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $a < b$.

Then $[a, b] \neq \emptyset$, so there is at least one point in the closed interval $[a, b]$.

Let $x \in [a, b]$.

Since every point in $[a, b]$ is an accumulation point of the open interval (a, b) , then x is an accumulation point of (a, b) .

Since $(a, b) \subset [a, b]$, then x is an accumulation point of $[a, b]$.

Therefore, every point in $[a, b]$ is an accumulation point of $[a, b]$. \square

Example 18. \mathbb{N} has no accumulation points.

No integer is an accumulation point of \mathbb{N} .

No point in \mathbb{R} is an accumulation point of \mathbb{N} .

Proof. We prove the statement ‘no integer is an accumulation point of \mathbb{N} ’ by contradiction.

Suppose some integer is an accumulation point of \mathbb{N} .

Then there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that n is an accumulation point of \mathbb{N} .

Thus, for every $\delta > 0$ there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k \in N'(n; \delta)$.

Let $\delta = \frac{1}{2}$.

Then there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k \in N'(n; \frac{1}{2})$.

Since $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{N} \subset \mathbb{Z}$, then $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Since $N'(n; \frac{1}{2}) = N(n; \frac{1}{2}) - \{n\} = (n - \frac{1}{2}, n + \frac{1}{2}) - \{n\} = (n - \frac{1}{2}, n) \cup (n, n + \frac{1}{2})$, then $k \in (n - \frac{1}{2}, n) \cup (n, n + \frac{1}{2})$.

Thus, either $k \in (n - \frac{1}{2}, n)$ or $k \in (n, n + \frac{1}{2})$.

We consider these cases separately.

Case 1: Suppose $k \in (n - \frac{1}{2}, n)$.

Then $n - \frac{1}{2} < k < n$.

Since $n - 1 < n - \frac{1}{2} < k < n$, then $n - 1 < k < n$, so k is an integer between two consecutive integers, a contradiction.

(WE NEED TO PROVE THIS!)

Case 2: Suppose $k \in (n, n + \frac{1}{2})$.

Then $n < k < n + \frac{1}{2}$.

Since $n < k < n + \frac{1}{2} < n + 1$, then $n < k < n + 1$, so k is an integer between two consecutive integers, a contradiction.

Thus, in all cases, a contradiction is reached.

Therefore, no integer is an accumulation point of \mathbb{N} . \square

Proof. We prove the statement ‘no point in \mathbb{R} is an accumulation point of \mathbb{N} ’ by contradiction.

Suppose some point in \mathbb{R} is an accumulation point of \mathbb{N} .

Then there exists $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that x is an accumulation point of \mathbb{N} .

Since each real number lies between two consecutive integers, then there is a unique integer n such that $n \leq x < n + 1$.

Thus, $n \leq x$ and $x < n + 1$, so either $n < x$ or $n = x$.

We consider these cases separately.

Case 1: Suppose $n = x$.

Then $x \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Since no integer is an accumulation point of \mathbb{N} , then every integer is not an accumulation point of \mathbb{N} .

In particular, x is not an accumulation point of \mathbb{N} .

But, this contradicts the fact that x is an accumulation point of \mathbb{N} .

Case 2: Suppose $n < x$.

Then $x - n > 0$.

Since $x < n + 1$, then $n + 1 - x > 0$.

Let $\delta = \min\{d(x, n), d(x, n + 1)\}$.

Then $\delta \leq d(x, n)$ and $\delta \leq d(x, n + 1)$.

Since $d(x, n) = |x - n| = x - n > 0$ and $d(x, n + 1) = |x - (n + 1)| = |(n + 1) - x| = n + 1 - x > 0$, then $\delta > 0$.

Since x is an accumulation point of \mathbb{N} and $\delta > 0$, then there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k \in N'(x; \delta)$.

Since $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{N} \subset \mathbb{Z}$, then $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Since $k \in N'(x; \delta)$, then $k \in N(x; \delta)$, so $k \in (x - \delta, x + \delta)$.

Hence, $x - \delta < k < x + \delta$, so $x - \delta < k$ and $k < x + \delta$.

Since $\delta \leq d(x, n) = x - n$, then $\delta \leq x - n$, so $n \leq x - \delta$.

Since $n \leq x - \delta$ and $x - \delta < k$, then $n < k$.

Since $\delta \leq d(x, n + 1) = n + 1 - x$, then $\delta \leq n + 1 - x$, so $x + \delta \leq n + 1$.

Since $k < x + \delta$ and $x + \delta \leq n + 1$, then $k < n + 1$.

Thus, $n < k < n + 1$, so k is an integer between two consecutive integers.

But, this contradicts the fact that there is no integer between two consecutive integers. (WE NEED TO PROVE THIS!)

Therefore, in all cases, a contradiction is reached, so no point in \mathbb{R} is an accumulation point of \mathbb{N} . \square

Example 19. Every real number is an accumulation point of \mathbb{Q} .

Proof. Let x be an arbitrary real number.

Let $\delta > 0$.

Then $\delta > x - x$, so $x + \delta > x$ and $x > x - \delta$.

Since $x < x + \delta$ and \mathbb{Q} is dense in \mathbb{R} , then there exists $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $x < q < x + \delta$.

Since $x - \delta < x < q < x + \delta$, then $x - \delta < q < x + \delta$ and $x < q$.

Since $x - \delta < q < x + \delta$, then $q \in (x - \delta, x + \delta)$, so $q \in N(x; \delta)$.

Since $q > x$, then $q \neq x$, so $q \in N'(x; \delta)$.

Therefore, x is an accumulation point of \mathbb{Q} , as desired. \square

Example 20. Every real number is an accumulation point of \mathbb{R} .

Proof. Let x be an arbitrary real number.

Let $\delta > 0$.

Then $\delta > x - x$, so $x + \delta > x$ and $x > x - \delta$.

Let r be the midpoint of x and $x + \delta$.

Then $r = x + \frac{\delta}{2}$ and $x < r < x + \delta$.

Since $x - \delta < x < r < x + \delta$, then $x - \delta < r < x + \delta$ and $x < r$.

Since $x - \delta < r < x + \delta$, then $r \in (x - \delta, x + \delta)$, so $r \in N(x; \delta)$.

Since $r > x$, then $r \neq x$, so $r \in N'(x; \delta)$.

Therefore, x is an accumulation point of \mathbb{R} , as desired. \square

Example 21. Let $S = \{\frac{1}{n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

Then each element of S is an isolated point of S .

Proof. Let $x \in S$.

Then $x = \frac{1}{n}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Since $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $n \geq 1$, so either $n > 1$ or $n = 1$.

We consider these cases separately.

Case 1: Suppose $n = 1$.

Then $x = \frac{1}{1} = 1$.

Let $\delta = \frac{1}{2}$.

To prove 1 is an isolated point of S , we must prove $N'(1; \frac{1}{2}) \cap S = \emptyset$.

We prove $N'(1; \frac{1}{2}) \cap S = \emptyset$ by contradiction.

Suppose $N'(1; \frac{1}{2}) \cap S \neq \emptyset$.

Then there exists s such that $s \in N'(1; \frac{1}{2}) \cap S$, so $s \in N'(1; \frac{1}{2})$ and $s \in S$.

Since $s \in N'(1; \frac{1}{2})$, then $s \in N(1; \frac{1}{2}) - \{1\}$, so $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}) - \{1\}$.

Hence, $\frac{1}{2} < s < \frac{3}{2}$ and $s \neq 1$.

Since $s \in S$, then $s = \frac{1}{m}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Thus, $\frac{1}{2} < \frac{1}{m} < \frac{3}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{m} \neq 1$.

Since $\frac{1}{m} = 1$ iff $m = 1$ and $\frac{1}{m} \neq 1$, then $m \neq 1$.

Since $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m \neq 1$, then $m > 1$, so $m \geq 2$.

Since $m > 0$, then $1 \geq \frac{2}{m}$, so $\frac{1}{2} \geq \frac{1}{m}$.

Since $\frac{1}{2} < \frac{1}{m} < \frac{3}{2}$, then $\frac{1}{2} < \frac{1}{m}$.

Thus, we have $\frac{1}{m} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{m} > \frac{1}{2}$, a violation of trichotomy.

Therefore, $N'(1; \frac{1}{2}) \cap S = \emptyset$.

Hence, 1 is an isolated point of S .

Case 2: Suppose $n > 1$.

Then $n - 1 > 0$.

To prove $\frac{1}{n}$ is an isolated point of S , we must prove there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $N'(\frac{1}{n}; \delta) \cap S = \emptyset$.

Let $\delta = \min\{d(\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n-1}), d(\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n+1})\}$.

Then $\delta = \min\{|\frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{n-1}|, |\frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{n+1}|\}$, so $\delta = \min\{\frac{1}{n(n-1)}, \frac{1}{n(n+1)}\}$.

Since $n + 1 > n - 1 > 0$ and $n > 0$, then $n(n + 1) > n(n - 1) > 0$, so $0 < \frac{1}{n(n+1)} < \frac{1}{n(n-1)}$.

Thus, $\delta = \frac{1}{n(n+1)}$ and $\delta > 0$.

We prove $N'(\frac{1}{n}; \frac{1}{n(n+1)}) \cap S = \emptyset$ by contradiction.

Suppose $N'(\frac{1}{n}; \frac{1}{n(n+1)}) \cap S \neq \emptyset$.

Then there exists $t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $t \in N'(\frac{1}{n}; \frac{1}{n(n+1)}) \cap S$, so $t \in N'(\frac{1}{n}; \frac{1}{n(n+1)})$ and $t \in S$.

Since $t \in N'(\frac{1}{n}; \frac{1}{n(n+1)})$ and $N'(\frac{1}{n}; \frac{1}{n(n+1)}) = N(\frac{1}{n}; \frac{1}{n(n+1)}) - \{\frac{1}{n}\} = (\frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{n(n+1)}, \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n(n+1)}) - \{\frac{1}{n}\}$, then $\frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{n(n+1)} < t < \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n(n+1)}$ and $t \neq \frac{1}{n}$.

Since $t \in S$, then there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $t = \frac{1}{m}$.

Therefore, $\frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{n(n+1)} < \frac{1}{m} < \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n(n+1)}$ and $\frac{1}{m} \neq \frac{1}{n}$.

Since $\frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{n(n+1)} < \frac{1}{m} < \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n(n+1)}$, then $\frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{n(n+1)} - \frac{1}{m} < 0 < \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n(n+1)} - \frac{1}{m}$.

Hence, $\frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{n(n+1)} - \frac{1}{m} < 0$ and $0 < \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n(n+1)} - \frac{1}{m}$.

Since $\frac{1}{m} = \frac{1}{n}$ iff $m = n$ and $\frac{1}{m} \neq \frac{1}{n}$, then $m \neq n$.

Thus, either $m < n$ or $m > n$.

We consider these cases separately.

Case 2a: Suppose $m < n$.

Then $n - m > 0$, so $n - m \geq 1$.

Since $0 < m < n$, then $0 < \frac{m}{n} < 1$.

Since $n + 1 > n > 0$, then $0 < \frac{1}{n+1} < \frac{1}{n}$.

Since $m > 0$, then $0 < \frac{m}{n+1} < \frac{m}{n}$.

Thus, $0 < \frac{m}{n+1} < \frac{m}{n} < 1 \leq n - m$, so $\frac{m}{n+1} < n - m$.

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{m}{n+1} < n - m &\Rightarrow \frac{1}{n+1} < \frac{n-m}{m} \\ &\Rightarrow \frac{1}{n(n+1)} < \frac{n-m}{mn} \\ &\Rightarrow \frac{1}{n(n+1)} < \frac{1}{m} - \frac{1}{n} \\ &\Rightarrow \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n(n+1)} - \frac{1}{m} < 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have $\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n(n+1)} - \frac{1}{m} < 0$ and $\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n(n+1)} - \frac{1}{m} > 0$, a contradiction.

Case 2b: Suppose $m > n$.

Since $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m > n$, then $m \geq n + 1$.

Since $m > n > 0$, then $m > 0$, so $1 \geq \frac{n+1}{m}$.

Since $n + 1 > n > 0$, then $n + 1 > 0$, so $\frac{1}{n+1} \geq \frac{1}{m}$.

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n+1} \geq \frac{1}{m} &\Rightarrow \frac{n}{n(n+1)} \geq \frac{1}{m} \\ &\Rightarrow \frac{(n+1) - 1}{n(n+1)} \geq \frac{1}{m} \\ &\Rightarrow \frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{n(n+1)} \geq \frac{1}{m} \\ &\Rightarrow \frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{n(n+1)} - \frac{1}{m} \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have $\frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{n(n+1)} - \frac{1}{m} \geq 0$ and $\frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{n(n+1)} - \frac{1}{m} < 0$, a contradiction.

Hence, in either case, a contradiction is reached, so $N'(\frac{1}{n}; \frac{1}{n(n+1)}) \cap S = \emptyset$.

Therefore, $\frac{1}{n}$ is an isolated point of S . \square

Example 22. No point is an isolated point of \emptyset .

Proof. We prove by contradiction.

Suppose some point is an isolated point of \emptyset .

Then there exists x such that x is an isolated point of \emptyset , so $x \in \emptyset$.

But, this contradicts the fact that \emptyset has no elements.

Therefore, no point is an isolated point of \emptyset . \square

Example 23. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Then x is an isolated point of the singleton set $\{x\}$.

Proof. Let $\delta = 1$.

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} N'(x; 1) \cap \{x\} &= (N(x; 1) - \{x\}) \cap \{x\} \\ &= (N(x; 1) \cap \overline{\{x\}}) \cap \{x\} \\ &= N(x; 1) \cap (\overline{\{x\}} \cap \{x\}) \\ &= N(x; 1) \cap \emptyset \\ &= \emptyset \end{aligned}$$

and $x \in \{x\}$.

Therefore, x is an isolated point of the set $\{x\}$. \square

Example 24. Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$.

No point in the open interval (a, b) is an isolated point of (a, b) .

Proof. Either $a < b$ or $a = b$ or $a > b$.

We consider these cases separately.

Case 1: Suppose $a \geq b$.

Then $(a, b) = \emptyset$.

Since the empty set has no isolated points, then (a, b) has no isolated points.

Therefore, there is no isolated point in (a, b) .

Case 2: Suppose $a < b$.

Then $(a, b) \neq \emptyset$.

Let $x \in (a, b)$.

Since $(a, b) \subset [a, b]$, then $x \in [a, b]$.

Since every point in the closed interval $[a, b]$ is an accumulation point of (a, b) , then x is an accumulation point of (a, b) .

Hence, x is not an isolated point of (a, b) , so every point in (a, b) is not an isolated point of (a, b) .

Therefore, there is no point in (a, b) that is an isolated point of (a, b) . \square

Example 25. Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$.

If $a \neq b$, then no point in the closed interval $[a, b]$ is an isolated point of $[a, b]$.

Proof. Suppose $a \neq b$.

Then either $a < b$ or $a > b$.

We consider these cases separately.

Case 1: Suppose $a > b$.

Then $[a, b] = \emptyset$.

Since the empty set has no isolated points, then $[a, b]$ has no isolated points.

Therefore, there is no isolated point in $[a, b]$.

Case 2: Suppose $a < b$.

Then $[a, b] \neq \emptyset$.

Let $x \in [a, b]$.

Since $a < b$, then every point in the closed interval $[a, b]$ is an accumulation point of $[a, b]$.

Thus, x is an accumulation point of $[a, b]$.

Hence, x is not an isolated point of $[a, b]$, so every point in $[a, b]$ is not an isolated point of $[a, b]$.

Therefore, there is no point in $[a, b]$ that is an isolated point of $[a, b]$. \square

Example 26. Every natural number is an isolated point of \mathbb{N} .

Proof. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Since $\mathbb{N} \subset \mathbb{Z}$, then $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Since no integer is an accumulation point of \mathbb{N} , then every integer is not an accumulation point of \mathbb{N} .

In particular, n is not an accumulation point of \mathbb{N} .

Since $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and n is not an accumulation point of \mathbb{N} , then n is an isolated point of \mathbb{N} , as desired. \square

Example 27. No rational number is an isolated point of \mathbb{Q} .

Proof. Let $q \in \mathbb{Q}$.

Since $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}$, then $q \in \mathbb{R}$.

Since every real number is an accumulation point of \mathbb{Q} , then q is an accumulation point of \mathbb{Q} .

Hence, q is not an isolated point of \mathbb{Q} , so every rational number is not an isolated point of \mathbb{Q} .

Therefore, there is no rational number that is an isolated point of \mathbb{Q} . \square

Example 28. No real number is an isolated point of \mathbb{R} .

Proof. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Since every real number is an accumulation point of \mathbb{R} , then x is an accumulation point of \mathbb{R} .

Hence, x is not an isolated point of \mathbb{R} , so every real number is not an isolated point of \mathbb{R} .

Therefore, there is no real number that is an isolated point of \mathbb{R} . \square

Example 29. An unbounded open interval is open.

Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$.

Then the interval (a, ∞) is open and the interval $(-\infty, b)$ is open.

Proof. We prove the interval (a, ∞) is open.

Let $x \in (a, \infty)$.

Then $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x > a$, so $x - a > 0$.

Let $\delta = x - a$.

Then $\delta > 0$.

Let $p \in N(x; \delta)$.

Since $N(x; x-a) = (x-(x-a), x+(x-a)) = (a, 2x-a)$, then $a < p < 2x-a$, so $a < p$.

Since $p > a$, then $p \in (a, \infty)$.

Hence, $N(x; \delta) \subset (a, \infty)$.

Therefore, x is an interior point of (a, ∞) , so (a, ∞) is open. \square

Proof. We prove the interval $(-\infty, b)$ is open.

Let $x \in (-\infty, b)$.

Then $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x < b$, so $b - x > 0$.

Let $\delta = b - x$.

Then $\delta > 0$.

Let $p \in N(x; \delta)$.

Since $N(x; b-x) = (x-(b-x), x+(b-x)) = (2x-b, b)$, then $2x-b < p < b$.

Thus, $p < b$, so $p \in (-\infty, b)$.

Hence, $N(x; \delta) \subset (-\infty, b)$.

Therefore, x is an interior point of $(-\infty, b)$, so $(-\infty, b)$ is open. \square

Example 30. intersection of an infinite collection of open sets is not necessarily open

Let $\{(\frac{-1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a family of open intervals of \mathbb{R} indexed by \mathbb{N} .

Then $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} (\frac{-1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}) = \{0\}$ is not open.

Therefore, at least one collection of open sets in \mathbb{R} is not closed under arbitrary intersection.

Solution. Let $A_n = (\frac{-1}{n}, \frac{1}{n})$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

We must determine $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$.

We sketch out the intervals and intuitively see that the intersection contains zero and conjecture that the intersection contains zero only.

The collection of intervals $\{A_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a decreasing family of intervals indexed by \mathbb{N} .

We formally prove $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} (\frac{-1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}) = \{0\}$. \square

Proof. We prove $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} (\frac{-1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}) = \{0\}$.

We first prove $\{0\} \subset \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} (\frac{-1}{n}, \frac{1}{n})$.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be given.

Then $n > 0$.

Hence, $\frac{1}{n} > 0$, so $\frac{-1}{n} < 0$.

Since $\frac{-1}{n} < 0$ and $0 < \frac{1}{n}$, then $0 \in (\frac{-1}{n}, \frac{1}{n})$.

Thus, $0 \in (\frac{-1}{n}, \frac{1}{n})$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, so $0 \in \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} (\frac{-1}{n}, \frac{1}{n})$.

Therefore, $\{0\} \subset \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} (\frac{-1}{n}, \frac{1}{n})$.

We prove $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{-1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}\right) \subset \{0\}$.

Since $0 \in \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{-1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}\right)$, then $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{-1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}\right) \neq \emptyset$, so there is at least one element in $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{-1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}\right)$.

Let $x \in \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{-1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}\right)$.

Then $x \in \left(\frac{-1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}\right)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, so $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\frac{-1}{n} < x < \frac{1}{n}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Either $x < 0$ or $x = 0$ or $x > 0$.

We consider these cases separately.

Case 1: Suppose $x > 0$.

Then $x \neq 0$.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be given.

Then $\frac{-1}{n} < x < \frac{1}{n}$, so $x < \frac{1}{n}$.

Since $n > 0$, then $nx < 1$.

Since $x > 0$, then $n < \frac{1}{x}$.

Thus, $n < \frac{1}{x}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Since $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \neq 0$, then $\frac{1}{x} \in \mathbb{R}$.

Hence, $\frac{1}{x} \in \mathbb{R}$ is an upper bound of \mathbb{N} , so \mathbb{N} has an upper bound in \mathbb{R} .

But, this contradicts the fact that \mathbb{N} has no upper bound in \mathbb{R} , by the Archimedean property of \mathbb{R} .

Case 2: Suppose $x < 0$.

Then $x \neq 0$.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be given.

Then $\frac{-1}{n} < x < \frac{1}{n}$, so $\frac{-1}{n} < x$.

Since $n > 0$, then $-1 < nx$.

Since $x < 0$, then $\frac{-1}{x} > n$, so $n < \frac{-1}{x}$.

Thus, $n < \frac{-1}{x}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Since $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \neq 0$, then $\frac{-1}{x} \in \mathbb{R}$.

Therefore, $\frac{-1}{x} \in \mathbb{R}$ is an upper bound of \mathbb{N} , so \mathbb{N} has an upper bound in \mathbb{R} .

But, this contradicts the fact that \mathbb{N} has no upper bound in \mathbb{R} , by the Archimedean property of \mathbb{R} .

Thus, $x = 0$, so $x \in \{0\}$.

Hence, $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{-1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}\right) \subset \{0\}$.

Since $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{-1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}\right) \subset \{0\}$ and $\{0\} \subset \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{-1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}\right)$, then $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{-1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}\right) = \{0\}$, as desired. \square

Proof. Since the singleton set $\{a\}$ is not open for every $a \in \mathbb{R}$, then in particular, the singleton set $\{0\}$ is not open.

Since $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{-1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}\right) = \{0\}$, then $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{-1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}\right)$ is not open.

Since every bounded open interval is open, then the bounded open interval $\left(\frac{-1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}\right)$ is open for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, so the family $\left\{\left(\frac{-1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}\right) : n \in \mathbb{N}\right\}$ of open intervals is a collection of open sets in \mathbb{R} .

Therefore, at least one collection of open sets in \mathbb{R} is not closed under arbitrary intersection. \square

Example 31. Every bounded closed interval is closed.

Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$.

Then the closed interval $[a, b]$ is closed.

Proof. Either $a < b$ or $a = b$ or $a > b$.

We consider these cases separately.

Case 1: Suppose $a > b$.

Then $[a, b] = \emptyset$.

Since the empty set is closed, then $[a, b]$ is closed.

Case 2: Suppose $a = b$.

Then $[a, b] = [a, a] = \{a\}$.

Since the singleton set $\{a\}$ has no accumulation points, then $\{a\}$ is closed.

Therefore, $[a, b]$ is closed.

Case 3: Suppose $a < b$.

Then $[a, b] \neq \emptyset$ and every point in $[a, b]$ is an accumulation point of $[a, b]$.

Let $p \in [a, b]$.

Then p is an accumulation point of $[a, b]$, so there is at least one accumulation point of $[a, b]$.

Let x be an arbitrary accumulation point of $[a, b]$.

To prove $[a, b]$ is closed, we must prove $x \in [a, b]$, so we must prove $a \leq x \leq b$.

We prove $a \leq x$ by contradiction.

Suppose $a > x$.

Then $a - x > 0$.

Since x is an accumulation point of $[a, b]$, then $N'(x; a - x) \cap [a, b] \neq \emptyset$.

Hence, there exists s such that $s \in N'(x; a - x) \cap [a, b]$, so $s \in N'(x; a - x)$ and $s \in [a, b]$.

Since $s \in N'(x; a - x)$, then $s \in N(x; a - x)$, so $s \in (2x - a, a)$.

Thus, $2x - a < s < a$, so $s < a$.

Since $s \in [a, b]$, then $a \leq s \leq b$, so $a \leq s$.

Hence, we have $s < a$ and $s \geq a$, a violation of trichotomy.

Therefore, $a \leq x$.

We prove $x \leq b$ by contradiction.

Suppose $x > b$.

Then $x - b > 0$.

Since x is an accumulation point of $[a, b]$, then $N'(x; x - b) \cap [a, b] \neq \emptyset$.

Hence, there exists t such that $t \in N'(x; x - b) \cap [a, b]$, so $t \in N'(x; x - b)$ and $t \in [a, b]$.

Since $t \in N'(x; x - b)$, then $t \in N(x; x - b)$, so $t \in (b, 2x - b)$.

Thus, $b < t < 2x - b$, so $b < t$.

Since $t \in [a, b]$, then $a \leq t \leq b$, so $t \leq b$.

Hence, we have $t \leq b$ and $t > b$, a violation of trichotomy.

Therefore, $x \leq b$.

Since $a \leq x$ and $x \leq b$, then $a \leq x \leq b$, so $x \in [a, b]$.

Therefore, the closed interval $[a, b]$ is closed. \square

Example 32. An unbounded closed interval is closed.

Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$.

Then the interval $[a, \infty)$ is closed and the interval $(-\infty, b]$ is closed.

Proof. We prove $[a, \infty)$ is closed.

We first prove a is an accumulation point of $[a, \infty)$.

Let $\delta > 0$ be given.

Let p be the midpoint of a and $a + \delta$.

Then $p = a + \frac{\delta}{2}$, so $p - a = \frac{\delta}{2}$.

Since $\delta > 0$, then $\frac{\delta}{2} > 0$, so $p - a > 0$.

Since $\frac{1}{2} < 1$ and $\delta > 0$, then $\frac{\delta}{2} < \delta$.

Since $d(p, a) = |p - a| = p - a = \frac{\delta}{2} < \delta$, then $d(p, a) < \delta$, so $p \in N(a; \delta)$.

Since $p - a > 0$, then $p > a$, so $p \neq a$.

Hence, $p \in N'(a; \delta)$.

Since $p > a$, then $p \in [a, \infty)$, so $p \in N'(a; \delta) \cap [a, \infty)$.

Therefore, $N'(a; \delta) \cap [a, \infty) \neq \emptyset$, so a is an accumulation point of $[a, \infty)$. \square

Proof. We prove if x is an accumulation point of $[a, \infty)$, then $x \in [a, \infty)$.

Since there is at least one accumulation point of $[a, \infty)$, let x be an arbitrary accumulation point of $[a, \infty)$.

To prove $x \in [a, \infty)$, we must prove $x \geq a$.

We prove $x \geq a$ by contradiction.

Suppose $x < a$.

Then $a - x > 0$.

Since x is an accumulation point of $[a, \infty)$, then $N'(x; a - x) \cap [a, \infty) \neq \emptyset$, so there exists p such that $p \in N'(x; a - x) \cap [a, \infty)$.

Hence, $p \in N'(x; a - x)$ and $p \in [a, \infty)$.

Since $p \in N'(x; a - x)$ and $N'(x; a - x) \subset N(x; a - x)$, then $p \in N(x; a - x)$, so $p \in (2x - a, a)$.

Thus, $2x - a < p < a$, so $p < a$.

Since $p \in [a, \infty)$, then $p \geq a$.

Therefore, we have $p < a$ and $p \geq a$, a violation of trichotomy.

Hence $x \geq a$, so $x \in [a, \infty)$.

Therefore, $[a, \infty)$ is closed. \square

Proof. We prove $(-\infty, b]$ is closed.

We first prove b is an accumulation point of $(-\infty, b]$.

Let $\delta > 0$ be given.

Let p be the midpoint of b and $b - \delta$.

Then $p = b - \delta + \frac{\delta}{2} = b - \frac{\delta}{2}$, so $\frac{\delta}{2} = b - p$.

Since $\delta > 0$, then $\frac{\delta}{2} > 0$, so $b - p > 0$.

Since $\frac{1}{2} < 1$ and $\delta > 0$, then $\frac{\delta}{2} < \delta$.

Since $d(p, b) = |p - b| = |b - p| = b - p = \frac{\delta}{2} < \delta$, then $d(p, b) < \delta$, so $p \in N(b; \delta)$.

Since $b - p > 0$, then $b > p$, so $p < b$.

Thus, $p \neq b$, so $p \in N'(b; \delta)$.

Since $p < b$, then $p \in (-\infty, b]$, so $p \in N'(b; \delta) \cap (-\infty, b]$.

Therefore, $N'(b; \delta) \cap (-\infty, b] \neq \emptyset$, so b is an accumulation point of $(-\infty, b]$. \square

Proof. We prove if x is an accumulation point of $(-\infty, b]$, then $x \in (-\infty, b]$.

Since there is at least one accumulation point of $(-\infty, b]$, let x be an arbitrary accumulation point of $(-\infty, b]$.

To prove $x \in (-\infty, b]$, we must prove $x \leq b$.

We prove $x \leq b$ by contradiction.

Suppose $x > b$.

Then $x - b > 0$.

Since x is an accumulation point of $(-\infty, b]$, then $N'(x; x - b) \cap (-\infty, b] \neq \emptyset$, so there exists p such that $p \in N'(x; x - b) \cap (-\infty, b]$.

Hence, $p \in N'(x; x - b)$ and $p \in (-\infty, b]$.

Since $p \in N'(x; x - b)$ and $N'(x; x - b) \subset N(x; x - b)$, then $p \in N(x; x - b)$, so $p \in (b, 2x - b)$.

Thus, $b < p < 2x - b$, so $b < p$.

Since $p \in (-\infty, b]$, then $p \leq b$.

Therefore, we have $p \leq b$ and $p > b$, a violation of trichotomy.

Hence $x \leq b$, so $x \in (-\infty, b]$.

Therefore, $(-\infty, b]$ is closed. \square

Example 33. Let $S = [1, \infty)$.

Let $\mathcal{F}_1 = \{(0, 1), (1, \infty)\}$.

Let $\mathcal{F}_2 = \{(0, 1], (1, \infty)\}$.

Then \mathcal{F}_1 is not a covering of S , but \mathcal{F}_2 is a covering of S .

Proof. We prove \mathcal{F}_1 is not a covering of S .

Since $1 \in [1, \infty)$, then $1 \in S$.

Since $1 \notin (0, 1)$ and $1 \notin (1, \infty)$, then $1 \notin \cup \mathcal{F}_1$.

Thus, $1 \in S$, but $1 \notin \cup \mathcal{F}_1$, so \mathcal{F}_1 is not a covering for S . \square

Proof. We prove \mathcal{F}_2 is a covering of S .

Since $1 \in S$, then $S \neq \emptyset$.

Let $x \in S$.

Then $x \geq 1$, so either $x > 1$ or $x = 1$.

We consider these cases separately.

Case 1: Suppose $x = 1$.

Let $A = (0, 1]$.

Since $1 \in (0, 1]$ and $(0, 1] \in \mathcal{F}_2$, then $1 \in A$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}_2$.

Thus, there exists $A \in \mathcal{F}_2$ such that $x \in A$.

Case 2: Suppose $x > 1$.

Then $x \in (1, \infty)$.

Let $A = (1, \infty)$.
 Then $x \in A$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}_2$.
 Thus, there exists $A \in \mathcal{F}_2$ such that $x \in A$.
 Hence, in all cases, there exists $A \in \mathcal{F}_2$ such that $x \in A$, so $x \in \cup \mathcal{F}_2$.
 Therefore, $S \subset \cup \mathcal{F}_2$, so \mathcal{F}_2 is a covering for S . □

Example 34. a covering of a set is not unique

Let $S = [1, \infty)$.
 Let $\mathcal{F}_1 = \{(0, \infty)\}$.
 Let $\mathcal{F}_2 = \{(n-1, n+1) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$.
 Then \mathcal{F}_1 is a finite covering of S and \mathcal{F}_2 is an infinite covering of S .

Proof. We prove \mathcal{F}_1 is a covering of S .

Since $1 \in S$, then $S \neq \emptyset$.
 Let $x \in S$.
 Then $x \geq 1$.
 Let $A = (0, \infty)$.
 Then $A \in \mathcal{F}_1$.
 Since $x \geq 1$ and $1 > 0$, then $x > 0$, so $x \in (0, \infty)$.
 Hence, $x \in A$.
 Since there exists $A \in \mathcal{F}_1$ such that $x \in A$, then \mathcal{F}_1 is a covering of S .
 Since the set \mathcal{F}_1 contains exactly one element, then \mathcal{F}_1 is a finite set.
 Therefore, \mathcal{F}_1 is a finite covering of S . □

Proof. We prove \mathcal{F}_2 is a covering of S .

Let $x \in S$.
 Then $x \geq 1$.
 Since $x \in \mathbb{R}$, then there is a unique integer n such that $n \leq x < n+1$.
 Since $n-1 < n$, then $n-1 < n \leq x < n+1$, so $n-1 < x < n+1$.
 Hence, $x < n+1$.
 Suppose $n \leq 0$.
 Then $n+1 \leq 1$.
 Since $x < n+1$ and $n+1 \leq 1$, then $x < 1$.
 But, this contradicts the fact that $x \geq 1$.
 Hence, $n > 0$.
 Since $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $n > 0$, then $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
 Since $n-1 < x < n+1$, then $x \in (n-1, n+1)$.
 Let $A = (n-1, n+1)$.
 Then $x \in A$.
 Since $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $A = (n-1, n+1)$, then $A \in \mathcal{F}_2$.
 Hence, there exists $A \in \mathcal{F}_2$ such that $x \in A$, so $x \in \cup \mathcal{F}_2$.
 Thus, $S \subset \cup \mathcal{F}_2$, so \mathcal{F}_2 is a covering of S .
 Since the set \mathcal{F}_2 is infinite, then \mathcal{F}_2 is an infinite covering of S . □

Example 35. Let $S = [1, \infty)$.

Let $\mathcal{F} = \{(0, n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$.
 Let $\mathcal{G} = \{(0, n) : n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq 23\}$.

Then \mathcal{F} is an open covering of S and \mathcal{G} is a subcovering of \mathcal{F} .

Proof. We prove \mathcal{F} is a covering of S .

Since $1 \in S$, then $S \neq \emptyset$.

Let $x \in S$.

Then $x \geq 1$.

Since $x \geq 1 > 0$, then $x > 0$.

Since $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and \mathbb{N} is unbounded above in \mathbb{R} , then there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n > x$.

Thus, $n > x > 0$, so $0 < x < n$.

Hence, $x \in (0, n)$.

Let $A = (0, n)$.

Then $x \in A$.

Since $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $A = (0, n)$, then $A \in \mathcal{F}$.

Thus, there exists $A \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $x \in A$, so $x \in \cup \mathcal{F}$.

Hence, $S \subset \cup \mathcal{F}$, so \mathcal{F} is a covering of S .

Since the open interval $(0, n)$ is an open set for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then each set in \mathcal{F} is an open set.

Therefore, \mathcal{F} is an open covering of S . □

Proof. We prove \mathcal{G} is a subcovering of \mathcal{F} .

We prove \mathcal{G} is a covering of S .

Since $1 \in S$, then $S \neq \emptyset$.

Let $x \in S$.

Then $x \geq 1$, so $x \geq 1 > 0$.

Let $M = \max\{x, 23\}$.

Then either $M = x$ or $M = 23$, and $x \leq M$ and $23 \leq M$.

Since either $M = x$ or $M = 23$, then $M \in \mathbb{R}$.

Since \mathbb{N} is unbounded above in \mathbb{R} , then there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n > M$.

Since $x \leq M$ and $M < n$, then $x \leq M < n$.

Thus, $0 < 1 \leq x \leq M < n$, so $0 < x < n$.

Hence, $x \in (0, n)$.

Let $A = (0, n)$.

Then $x \in A$.

Since $n > M$ and $M \geq 23$, then $n > 23$.

Since $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n > 23$ and $A = (0, n)$, then $A \in \mathcal{G}$.

Thus, there exists $A \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $x \in A$, so $x \in \cup \mathcal{G}$.

Therefore, $S \subset \cup \mathcal{G}$, so \mathcal{G} is a covering of S . □

Proof. We prove $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$.

Since $(0, 23) \in \mathcal{G}$, then $\mathcal{G} \neq \emptyset$.

Let $x \in \mathcal{G}$.

Then there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n \geq 23$ and $x = (0, n)$.

Since $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x = (0, n)$, then $x \in \mathcal{F}$.

Therefore, $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$.

Since \mathcal{G} is a covering of S such that $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$, then \mathcal{G} is a subcovering of \mathcal{F} . □

Example 36. A finite set is compact.

Proof. Let S be a finite set.

Let \mathcal{F} be an arbitrary open covering of S .

Either $S = \emptyset$ or $S \neq \emptyset$.

We consider these cases separately.

Case 1: Suppose $S = \emptyset$.

Since \mathcal{F} is a covering of S , then \mathcal{F} is a covering of \emptyset , so $\emptyset \subset \cup \mathcal{F}$.

Since $\emptyset \subset \emptyset$ and $\cup \emptyset = \emptyset$, then $\emptyset \subset \cup \emptyset$, so \emptyset is a covering of \emptyset .

Since the empty set is a subset of every set, then in particular, $\emptyset \subset \mathcal{F}$.

Since $\emptyset \subset \mathcal{F}$ and \emptyset is finite, then \emptyset is a finite subcovering of \emptyset .

Therefore, \emptyset is compact, so S is compact.

Case 2: Suppose $S \neq \emptyset$.

Since S is finite and not empty, then there exists a positive integer n such that $S = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n\}$.

Since \mathcal{F} is a covering of S , then $S \subset \cup \mathcal{F}$.

Hence, for each $s_k \in S$, there exists $F_k \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $s_k \in F_k$ for each $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

Thus, $\{F_1, F_2, \dots, F_n\}$ is a subset of \mathcal{F} .

Let $\mathcal{G} = \{F_1, F_2, \dots, F_n\}$.

Then $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$ and \mathcal{G} is finite.

Since $S \neq \emptyset$, then there is at least one element of S .

Let $x \in S$.

Then there exists $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that $x = s_k$.

Thus, there exists $F_k \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $x \in F_k$.

Since $F_k \in \mathcal{G}$ and $x \in F_k$, then $x \in \cup \mathcal{G}$.

Hence, $S \subset \cup \mathcal{G}$, so \mathcal{G} is a covering of S .

Since $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$ and \mathcal{G} is finite, then \mathcal{G} is a finite subcovering of S .

Therefore, S is compact.

Thus, in all cases, S is compact, as desired. \square

Example 37. \mathbb{N} is not compact

Define $I_n = (n - \frac{1}{2}, n + \frac{1}{2})$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $\mathcal{F} = \{I_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

Then \mathcal{F} is an open covering of \mathbb{N} , but \mathcal{F} contains no finite subcovering of \mathbb{N} .

Therefore, \mathbb{N} is not compact.

Proof. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be given.

Since $n - \frac{1}{2} < n < n + \frac{1}{2}$, then $n \in (n - \frac{1}{2}, n + \frac{1}{2})$.

Hence, $n \in I_n$, so $I_n \in \mathcal{F}$.

Thus, there exists $I_n \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $n \in I_n$, so $n \in \cup \mathcal{F}$.

Therefore, $\mathbb{N} \subset \cup \mathcal{F}$, so \mathcal{F} is a covering of \mathbb{N} .

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, I_n is an open interval, so I_n is an open set.

Thus, each set in \mathcal{F} is an open set, so \mathcal{F} is an open covering of \mathbb{N} . \square

Proof. We prove \mathbb{N} is not compact by contradiction.

Suppose \mathbb{N} is compact.

Then every open covering of \mathbb{N} contains a finite subcovering of \mathbb{N} .

In particular, since \mathcal{F} is an open covering of \mathbb{N} , then \mathcal{F} contains a finite subcovering of \mathbb{N} .

Thus, there exists \mathcal{G} such that \mathcal{G} is a finite subcover of \mathcal{F} .

Since \mathcal{G} is a finite subcover of \mathcal{F} , then \mathcal{G} is a covering of \mathbb{N} and $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$ and \mathcal{G} is finite.

Since \mathcal{G} is a covering of \mathbb{N} , then $\mathbb{N} \subset \cup \mathcal{G}$.

Since a subset of a finite set is finite, then if $A \subset B$ and B is finite, then A is finite.

Hence, if $A \subset B$ and A is infinite, then B is infinite.

Since $\mathbb{N} \subset \cup \mathcal{G}$ and \mathbb{N} is infinite, then $\cup \mathcal{G}$ is infinite, so $\cup \mathcal{G}$ contains at least one element.

Thus, there exists x such that $x \in X$ for some $X \in \mathcal{G}$.

Since $X \in \mathcal{G}$, then $\mathcal{G} \neq \emptyset$.

Since \mathcal{G} is finite and $\mathcal{G} \neq \emptyset$, then there exists a positive integer k such that $\mathcal{G} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k\}$ and $A_i \in \mathcal{F}$ for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$.

Let $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$.

Then $A_i \in \mathcal{F}$, so there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $A_i = I_n = (n - \frac{1}{2}, n + \frac{1}{2})$.

Since $n - \frac{1}{2} < n < n + \frac{1}{2}$, then $n \in (n - \frac{1}{2}, n + \frac{1}{2})$, so $n \in I_n$.

Hence, $n \in A_i$.

Suppose there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m \in A_i$.

Then $m \in (n - \frac{1}{2}, n + \frac{1}{2})$, so $n - \frac{1}{2} < m < n + \frac{1}{2}$.

Since $n - 1 < n - \frac{1}{2} < m < n + \frac{1}{2} < n + 1$, then $n - 1 < m < n + 1$.

Between any integer $n - 1$ and $n + 1$ is the unique integer n .

Hence, $m = n$, so there exists a unique $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n \in A_i$ for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$.

Define a function $f : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ by $f(i)$ is the unique natural number such that $f(i) \in A_i$ for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$.

Let S be the range of f .

Then $S = \{f(i) \in \mathbb{N} : f(i) \in A_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, k\}$, so S is a finite set of natural numbers.

Since $A_1 \in \mathcal{G}$, then $f(1) \in A_1$ and $f(1) \in \mathbb{N}$, so $f(1) \in S$.

Hence, S is not empty.

Since $\mathbb{N} \subset \mathbb{R}$, then S is a nonempty finite set of real numbers.

Therefore, $\max S$ exists and $\max S \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $s = \max S + 1$.

Then $s \in \mathbb{N}$.

Since $\max S + 1 > \max S$, then $s > \max S$, so $s \notin S$.

Since $s \in S$ iff there exists $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ such that $s \in A_i$, then $s \notin S$ iff for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, $s \notin A_i$.

Thus, $s \notin A_i$ for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$.

Hence, $s \notin A_1 \cup A_2 \cup \dots \cup A_k$, so $s \notin \cup \mathcal{G}$.

Therefore, there exists $s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $s \notin \cup \mathcal{G}$.
This contradicts the fact that $\mathbb{N} \subset \cup \mathcal{G}$.
Therefore, \mathbb{N} is not compact.

□