

MAT 201 FORMAL PROOF OF THE CLAIM in §4.4 #62.

Claim: $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sqrt{4x^2+1}}{x+1} = 2$

Scratch: Use what you want to find the N you need $|\frac{\sqrt{4x^2+1}}{x+1} - 2| < \epsilon$. We can always make the left hand side BIGGER & then clamp a lid on that bigger thing: First, some algebra.

$$\left| \frac{\sqrt{4x^2+1}}{x+1} - \frac{2(x+1)}{x+1} \right| = \left| \frac{\sqrt{4x^2+1} - 2(x+1)}{x+1} \right|$$

$$= \left| \frac{(\sqrt{4x^2+1} - 2(x+1))(\sqrt{4x^2+1} + 2(x+1))}{(x+1)(\sqrt{4x^2+1} + 2(x+1))} \right| \quad \text{Rationalize}$$

$$\left| \frac{4x^2+1 - (2(x+1))^2}{(x+1)(\sqrt{4x^2+1} + 2(x+1))} \right| = \left| \frac{4x^2+1 - 4x^2 - 8x - 4}{(x+1)(\sqrt{4x^2+1} + 2(x+1))} \right| \quad \text{Simplify}$$

$$\left| \frac{-8x-3}{(x+1)(\sqrt{4x^2+1} + 2(x+1))} \right| = \left| \frac{8x+3}{(x+1)(\sqrt{4x^2+1} + 2(x+1))} \right| \quad \text{Property of absolute value}$$

$$x \rightarrow +\infty \Rightarrow x > 3 \quad \text{Just to cancel with the "2"}$$

$$\left| \frac{8x+x}{(x)(\sqrt{4x^2})} \right| = \left| \frac{9x}{2x^2} \right| = \left| \frac{9}{2x} \right| < \left| \frac{10}{2x} \right| = \frac{5}{x}$$

Now $\frac{5}{x} < \epsilon \iff \frac{5}{\epsilon} < x$. So let $N = \max\{4, \frac{5}{\epsilon}\}$. Now make the proof:

PROOF: Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. Define $N = \max\{4, \frac{5}{\epsilon}\}$.
 Then if $x > N$, we have
 $\left| \frac{\sqrt{4x^2+1}}{x+1} - 2 \right| = \dots$ Algebra from scratch $\dots < \left| \frac{8x+x}{(x)(2x)} \right|$
 bigger than 3, any way.

$$\left| \frac{9x}{2x^2} \right| < \frac{10}{2x} = \frac{5}{x} \leq \frac{5}{(\frac{5}{\epsilon})} = \epsilon \quad \square$$

probably could/should drop absolute values

The interplay of the pure proof with the concrete application:

Pure proof is challenging, but once it's done, you can use that $N = \frac{\Sigma}{\epsilon}$ for ANY desired tolerance (ANY ϵ), so $\epsilon = .01$, $\epsilon = .001$ doesn't make the question any different.

People in the real world can just use $N = \frac{\Sigma}{\epsilon}$ and get something workable in seconds.

On the other hand, the N we get in the proof is probably quite a bit bigger than we need. If the real-world application entails greater \$ for greater N , we probably want an estimate on N that's as small as possible, but will still work.

So something concrete OR a formal proof that is more careful about throwing stuff away might be the ideal.