

# Closed and bounded sets, Heine-Borel Theorem, Bolzano-Weierstrass Theorem, Uniform Continuity and Riemann Integrability

Ng Tze Beng

The aim of this note is to establish that any function that is continuously defined on a closed and bounded interval is also uniformly continuous. This is actually a consequence of the notion of compactness. We shall give explanation of some of the less familiar concepts involved.

**Definition 1.** A metric space  $(M, d)$  is a set  $M$  together with a metric function  $d : M \times M \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  satisfying the following: For all  $x, y$  and  $z$  in  $M$ ,

1.  $d(x, y) \geq 0$ ,
2.  $d(x, y) = 0$  if and only if  $x = y$ ,
3.  $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$  and
4.  $d(x, y) \leq d(x, z) + d(z, y)$ .

Then for each  $r > 0$ , and each  $x$  in  $M$ , the open balls  $B(x, r) = \{y \in M : d(y, x) < r\}$  are crucial in defining a new object. Any subset of  $M$  is said to be open if and only if it is a union of a family of open balls or if it is empty. We can easily show that this collection of all open sets form a topology on  $M$ , called the metric topology in the following sense.

**Definition 2.** A topology on a set  $X$  is a family  $\mathcal{T}$  of subsets of  $X$  satisfying

1.  $\emptyset, X \in \mathcal{T}$ ,
2. If  $\mathcal{S}$  is any subfamily of  $\mathcal{T}$ , then the union  $\cup \mathcal{S} = \cup \{U : U \in \mathcal{S}\} \in \mathcal{T}$ ,
3. If  $U_1, U_2, \dots, U_n \in \mathcal{T}$ , then the finite intersection  $U_1 \cap U_2 \cap \dots \cap U_n \in \mathcal{T}$ .

**Example.** 1.  $(\mathbf{R}, d)$  with  $d(x, y) = |x - y|$ .  
2. For integer  $n > 1$ ,  $(\mathbf{R}^n, d)$  with the Euclidean metric  
$$d(x, y) = \sqrt{(\sum_{i=1, \dots, n} (x_i - y_i)^2)}$$

**Definition 3.** An open cover of a set  $A$  in  $\mathbf{R}$  (topological space), is a family  $\mathcal{U}$  of open intervals (open sets) such that the union  $\cup \mathcal{U} = \cup \{U : U \in \mathcal{U}\} \supseteq A$ .

**Example.** For each  $x$  in the closed interval  $[a, b]$  and for each natural number  $n$ , let  $B(x, 1/n) = (x - 1/n, x + 1/n)$ . Then  $B(x, 1/n)$  is open. Then the family or collection of open sets  $\mathcal{U} = \{B(x, 1/2) : x \in [a, b]\}$  is an open cover for  $[a, b]$ . This collection is most effective when we can select a finite subset of  $\mathcal{U}$  which also covers  $[a, b]$ . It is indeed the case that we can do this but not for any other subsets of  $\mathbf{R}$  and for any open cover. Hence the following definition.

**Definition 4.** A subspace  $A$  of a topological space  $X$  is compact, if and only if, any open cover  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $A$  have a finite subcover, that is, a finite subfamily (subset)  $\mathcal{B}$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  such that  $A \subseteq \cup \{U : U \in \mathcal{B}\}$ .

A subset  $A$  of  $\mathbf{R}$  is compact if and only if any open cover  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $A$  by open intervals has a finite subcover, that is a finite subfamily (subset)  $\mathcal{B}$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  such that  $A \subseteq \cup \{ U : U \in \mathcal{B} \}$ .

**Example.**

1.  $\mathbf{R}$  (with usual metric topology) is not compact. Take for example  $\mathcal{C} = \{(n, n+2) : n \in \mathbf{Z}\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{C}$  covers  $\mathbf{R}$  but does not have a finite subcover.
2.  $A = \{1, 1/2, 1/3, 1/n, \dots\} \subseteq \mathbf{R}$  is not compact. Take  $\mathcal{C} = \{(1/(n+1), 1/(n-1)) : n \in \mathbf{Z}\} \cup (1/2, 3/2)$ .  $\mathcal{C}$  covers  $A$  but does not have a finite subcover.
3.  $A = \{0, 1, 1/2, 1/3, 1/n, \dots\} \subseteq \mathbf{R}$  is compact.

**Proof.** Suppose  $\mathcal{C}$  is an open cover covering  $A$ . Then  $0 \in U$  for some  $U$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then since  $1/n$  converges to 0 as  $n$  tends to infinity, there exists an integer  $N$  such that for all  $n > N$ ,  $1/n \in U$ . Now for  $n = 1, \dots, N$ ,  $1/n \in U_n$ . Hence  $\{U_1, \dots, U_N, U\}$  is a finite subfamily that covers  $A$  too.

The next notion is the notion of boundedness. A subset  $A$  of a metric space  $(M, d)$  is said to be *bounded*, if and only if, there exists a real positive number  $k$  such that  $d(x, y) < k$  for all  $x, y$  in  $A$ .

**Theorem 5 (Heine-Borel).** A subset  $A$  of  $\mathbf{R}$  is compact if and only if  $A$  is closed and bounded.

Before we proceed with the proof. The following results will contribute to it and are important and useful on their own merits

**Theorem 6.** A compact subset  $A$  of a metric space  $(M, d)$  is bounded.

**Proof.** We are going to use an open cover of  $A$  by open balls. A typical open ball centred at  $x$  in  $A$  and of radius  $\delta > 0$  is the set  $B(x, \delta) = \{y \in M : d(y, x) < \delta\}$ . For each  $a$  in  $A$ , let  $U(a) = B(a, 1)$  be the unit ball centred at  $a$ . Then  $\mathcal{C} = \{U(a) : a \in A\}$  is an open cover for  $A$ . Since  $A$  is compact,  $\mathcal{C}$  has a finite subcover, say  $\{U(a_i) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ . Let  $k = \max \{d(a_i, a_j) : 1 \leq i, j \leq n\}$ . Therefore, for any  $x, y$  in  $A$ ,  $x \in a_i$  and  $y \in a_j$  for some  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ ,  $d(x, y) \leq d(x, a_i) + d(a_i, a_j) + d(a_j, y) < 2 + k$  and so  $A$  is bounded.

**Theorem 7.** Any compact subset  $A$  of a metric (*Hausdorff*) space is closed.

**Proof.** The proof uses the fact that any two distinct points  $x, y$  in a metric space can be separated in the sense that there are two disjoint open sets  $U$  and  $V$  with  $x \in U$  and  $y \in V$ . We can take for instance,  $U = B(x, d(x, y)/2)$  and  $V = B(y, d(x, y)/2)$ . This is the concept of a *Hausdorff space*. Let us fix an element  $y$  not in  $A$ . Then for each  $a$  in  $A$ , we have an open set  $U(a)$  and an open set  $V(a)$  such that  $a \in U(a)$ ,  $y \in V(a)$  and  $U(a) \cap V(a) = \emptyset$ . Then  $\mathcal{C} = \{U(a) : a \in A\}$  is an open cover for  $A$ . Since  $A$  is compact  $\mathcal{C}$  has a finite subcover, say  $\{U(a_i) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ . Then if we let  $U = \cup \{U(a_i) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$  and  $V = \cap \{V(a_i) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ . Then  $U$  is a finite union of open sets and is therefore open and  $V$  is a finite intersection of open sets and is also open. Also  $A \subseteq U$  and  $U \cap V = \emptyset$ . This is because  $U \cap V \subseteq \cup \{U(a_i) \cap V : i = 1, \dots, n\} \subseteq \cup$

$\{U(a_i) \cap V(a_i) : i = 1, \dots, n\} = \emptyset$ . Hence  $V$  is an open set containing  $y$  and  $V \subseteq$  complement of  $A$  since  $V \cap A \subseteq U \cap V = \emptyset$ . Hence each point  $y$  in the complement of  $A$  has an open set contained entirely in the complement of  $A$ , therefore the complement of  $A$  is a union of open sets and so is open. Therefore,  $A$  is closed. This completes the proof.

**Proof of Theorem 5.**

( $\Rightarrow$ ) Suppose  $A$  is a compact subset of  $\mathbf{R}$ . Then by Theorem 6,  $A$  is bounded and is closed by Theorem 7.

( $\Leftarrow$ ) Suppose  $A$  is a closed and bounded subset of  $\mathbf{R}$ . Then  $A \subseteq [a, b]$  for some closed and bounded interval  $[a, b]$ . If we can show that  $[a, b]$  is compact, then  $A$  being a closed subspace of a compact space is therefore compact. (This is because any open cover for  $A$  together with the complement of  $A$  constitute an open cover for  $[a, b]$  and if  $[a, b]$  is compact there will be a finite subcover for  $A$ .) Now let  $\mathcal{C}$  be open cover for  $[a, b]$ . Define  $c = \sup \{x \in [a, b] : \text{a finite subfamily of } \mathcal{C} \text{ covers } [a, x]\}$ .

Obviously the set  $\{x \in [a, b] : \text{a finite subfamily of } \mathcal{C} \text{ covers } [a, x]\}$  is not empty since  $a$  belongs to it and is clearly bounded above by  $b$ . Therefore, by the completeness property of  $\mathbf{R}$ ,  $c$  exists. Then  $c > a$ . Why?  $a \in$  open set  $U$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  since  $\mathcal{C}$  is an open cover for  $[a, b]$ . Therefore, there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that  $(a - \delta, a + \delta) \subseteq U$ . Thus for any  $a < y < a + \delta$ ,  $[a, y] \subseteq U$  and so  $y \in \{x \in [a, b] : \text{a finite subfamily of } \mathcal{C} \text{ covers } [a, x]\}$ . Therefore, by the definition of supremum  $c \geq y > a$ .

We shall show next that  $c = b$ . Now we have  $a < c \leq b$ . Thus there exists an open set  $U$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  such that  $c \in$  open set  $U$ . Then there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $(c - \delta, c + \delta) \subseteq U$ . Take any  $d$  such that  $c - \delta < d < c$ . Then  $[d, c] \subseteq U$ . Now since  $d < c$ , by the definition of supremum, there exists a point  $z$  in  $\{x \in [a, b] : \text{a finite subfamily of } \mathcal{C} \text{ covers } [a, x]\}$  such that  $d < z \leq c$ . Hence there is a finite subfamily of  $\mathcal{C}$  covering  $[a, z]$  and since  $[a, z] \cup [d, c] = [a, c]$  and  $[d, c] \subseteq U$ , this subfamily together with  $U$  constitute a finite subfamily covering  $[a, c]$ . Hence,  $c \in \{x \in [a, b] : \text{a finite subfamily of } \mathcal{C} \text{ covers } [a, x]\}$ . Hence,  $c = b$ . This is because if  $c < b$ , then as above we can take a point  $e$  this time in  $(c, b) \cap (c - \delta, c + \delta) \subseteq U$ . Thus  $c < e < b$  and  $[c, e] \subseteq U$ , and so since there is a finite subfamily of  $\mathcal{C}$  covering  $[a, c]$  and  $U \in \mathcal{C}$ , this subfamily and  $U$  constitute a finite subfamily covering  $[a, e]$ . Thus  $e \in \{x \in [a, b] : \text{a finite subfamily of } \mathcal{C} \text{ covers } [a, x]\}$ . Therefore,  $c = \sup\{x \in [a, b] : \text{a finite subfamily of } \mathcal{C} \text{ covers } [a, x]\} \geq e$  contradicting  $c < e$ . Hence  $c = b$  and so there is a finite subfamily covering  $[a, b]$  (Why? Reason as above.) and so  $[a, b]$  is compact. This completes the proof.

**Theorem 8 (Bolzano-Weierstrass).** Any bounded sequence in  $\mathbf{R}$  has a convergent subsequence.

We shall give a proof of this theorem that can be adapted to a proof for a bounded sequence in  $\mathbf{R}^n$ .

*Proof.* By the Heine-Borel Theorem (Theorem 5), A bounded sequence  $\{a_n\}$  in  $\mathbf{R}$  lies inside a compact set, a large closed interval  $[c, d]$  Let us use the following

notation for the sequence. Consider  $\{a_n\}$  as the image of a function  $a : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ , where  $a(n) = a_n$ .

If the image  $A = a(\mathbf{N})$  is finite, then there must exist an element  $y$  in  $a(\mathbf{N})$  such that  $a^{-1}(y)$  is infinite. Therefore  $\{a_j : j \in a^{-1}(y)\}$  is a convergent constant subsequence.

We now consider the case  $A$  is infinite. Then of course  $A$  is contained in  $[c, d]$ .

Consider now the set of *accumulation* point  $A'$  of  $A$  in  $\mathbf{R}$ . A point  $x$  in  $\mathbf{R}$ , is an *accumulation* point of  $A$ , if any open set containing  $x$  contains a point of  $A$  distinct from  $x$ . Claim that  $A' \neq \emptyset$ . Suppose  $A' = \emptyset$ . That means each point  $x$  in  $[c, d]$  has an open set  $U_x$  such that  $U_x \cap A$  is finite. Then the family of open sets  $\{U_x : x \in [c, d]\}$  covers  $[c, d]$ . Since  $[c, d]$  is compact by the Heine-Borel Theorem, this family has a finite sub family  $\{U_n, i = 1, \dots, n\}$  such that  $[c, d] \subseteq U_1 \cup U_2 \cup \dots \cup U_n$ .

Therefore,  $A \subseteq A \cap [c, d] \subseteq (U_1 \cap A) \cup (U_2 \cap A) \cup \dots \cup (U_n \cap A)$ . But  $(U_1 \cap A) \cup (U_2 \cap A) \cup \dots \cup (U_n \cap A)$  is a union of finite set and so is finite. Hence  $A$  being a subset of a finite set must be finite. We have thus arrived at a contradiction since we have started with an infinite  $A$ . Take a point  $x$  in  $A'$ . Then we shall construct a sequence  $\{x_j\}$  in  $A$  such that  $x_i \neq x_j$  for  $i \neq j$  and  $\{x_j\}$  converges to  $x$  as  $j$  tends to infinity. A consequence of this is that  $x$  is in  $[c, d]$ . Take  $x_1$  in  $B(x, 1)$  such that  $x_1 \neq x$  and so  $d(x_1, x) > 0$ . This point  $x_1$  exists by definition of accumulation point. As we shrink the Ball  $B(x, 1/n)$ , we shall exclude the point  $x_1$ . For instance there exists an integer  $n_2$  such that  $1/n_2 < d(x_1, x)$ , then by virtue of  $x$  being an accumulation point of  $A$ , there exists  $x_2$  in  $B(x, 1/n_2)$  such that  $x_2 \neq x$  and so  $d(x_2, x) > 0$ . Obviously  $x_2 \neq x_1$  for otherwise if  $x_2 = x_1$  then  $d(x_2, x_1) = 0$  and we have  $d(x_1, x) \leq d(x_1, x_2) + d(x_2, x) < 0 + 1/n_2 = 1/n_2$  contradicting  $1/n_2 < d(x_1, x)$ . In this way, there exists  $n_3$  such that  $1/n_3 < d(x_2, x)$ ,  $x_2, x_1 \notin B(x, 1/n_3)$  and there exists  $x_3$  in  $B(x, 1/n_3)$  such that  $x_3 \neq x$ . So inductively, we find integers  $1 < n_2 < n_3 \dots$  and points  $x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots$  such that  $x_j \in B(x, 1/n_j)$ ,  $x_i \neq x_j$  for  $i \neq j$ . Then obviously  $\{x_j\}$  converges to  $x$  as  $j$  tends to infinity since for any open set  $U$  containing  $x$  there exists an integer  $J$  such that  $x \in B(x, 1/n_j) \subseteq U$ . Therefore, for all  $j > J$ ,  $x_j \in B(x, 1/n_j) \subseteq B(x, 1/n_j) \subseteq U$ .

Now based on this sequence we are going to construct a subsequence of  $\{a_n\}$  converging to  $x$ . Start with  $x_1$ , consider  $a^{-1}(x_1)$ . Choose  $i_1$  in  $a^{-1}(x_1)$ . Then  $a(i_1) = x_1$ . Next observe that since not all  $a^{-1}(x_j)$  for  $j > 1$  can be bounded above by  $i_1$  because otherwise  $a^{-1}(\{x_j : j > 1\})$  would be finite which implies that  $\{x_j : j > 1\}$  is finite contradicting that  $\{x_j : j > 1\}$  is infinite since the sequence  $\{x_j\}$  is a sequence of distinct terms. Thus there is a  $j_2 > 1$  such that  $a^{-1}(x_{j_2})$  is not bounded by  $i_1$ . There exists  $i_2$  in  $a^{-1}(x_{j_2})$  such that  $i_2 > i_1$  and  $a(i_2) = x_{j_2}$ . Next not all  $a^{-1}(x_j)$  for  $j > j_2$  can be bounded above by  $i_2$ . So there exists  $j_3 > j_2$  such that  $a^{-1}(x_{j_3})$  is not bounded by  $i_2$ . So there exists  $i_3$  in  $a^{-1}(x_{j_3})$  such that  $i_3 > i_2$  and  $a(i_3) = x_{j_3}$ . In this way we obtain a subsequence  $\{x_{j_n} : n = 1, \dots, \infty\}$  of  $\{x_j\}$  and this subsequence is equal to the subsequence  $\{a_{i_n} : n = 1, \dots, \infty\}$  of  $\{a_n\}$ . That means  $a_{i_n} = x_{j_n}$  for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ . Since  $\{x_j\}$  converges to  $x$ , any subsequence of it also converges to  $x$ . Hence,  $\{x_{j_n}\}$  converges to  $x$ . Therefore,  $\{a_{i_n}\}$  also converges to  $x$ . This completes the proof.

Now based on this sequence we are going to construct a subsequence of  $\{a_n\}$

converging to  $x$ . Start with  $x_1$ , consider  $a^{-1}(x_1)$ . Choose  $i_1$  in  $a^{-1}(x_1)$ . Then  $a(i_1) = x_1$ . Next observe that since not all  $a^{-1}(x_j)$  for  $j > 1$  can be bounded above by  $i_1$  because otherwise  $a^{-1}(\{x_j : j > 1\})$  would be finite which implies that  $\{x_j : j > 1\}$  is finite contradicting that  $\{x_j : j > 1\}$  is infinite since the sequence  $\{x_j\}$  is a sequence of distinct terms. Thus there is a  $j_2 > 1$  such that  $a^{-1}(x_{j_2})$  is not bounded by  $i_1$ . There exists  $i_2$  in  $a^{-1}(x_{j_2})$  such that  $i_2 > i_1$  and  $a(i_2) = x_{j_2}$ . Next not all  $a^{-1}(x_j)$  for  $j > j_2$  can be bounded above by  $i_2$ . So there exists  $j_3 > j_2$  such that  $a^{-1}(x_{j_3})$  is not bounded by  $i_2$ . So there exists  $i_3$  in  $a^{-1}(x_{j_3})$  such that  $i_3 > i_2$  and  $a(i_3) = x_{j_3}$ . In this way we obtain a subsequence  $\{x_{j_n} : n = 1, \dots, \infty\}$  of  $\{x_j\}$  and this subsequence is equal to the subsequence  $\{a_{i_n} : n = 1, \dots, \infty\}$  of  $\{a_n\}$ . That means  $a_{i_n} = x_{j_n}$  for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ . Since  $\{x_j\}$  converges to  $x$ , any subsequence of it also converges to  $x$ . Hence,  $\{x_{j_n}\}$  converges to  $x$ . Therefore,  $\{a_{i_n}\}$  also converges to  $x$ . This completes the proof.

**Remark.** The Bolzano-Weierstrass Theorem for bounded sequence in  $\mathbf{R}^n$  follows the same proof above by replacing  $\mathbf{R}$  by  $\mathbf{R}^n$ ,  $[c, d]$  by a large closed disk or ball and using the Heine-Borel Theorem for  $\mathbf{R}^n$ .

2. We can use the Bolzano-Weierstrass Theorem to prove the Extreme Value Theorem.

A consequence of the compactness of the domain on continuity.

### Uniform Continuity

We shall stick to the one variable case. Let  $D$  be a subset of  $\mathbf{R}$ .

**Definition 9.** A function  $f: D \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  is said to be *uniformly continuous* if given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that for any  $x, y$  in  $D$ ,  $|x - y| < \delta \Rightarrow |f(x) - f(y)| < \varepsilon$ .

The next result is a consequence of the closed and bounded interval being a compact set of  $\mathbf{R}$ .

Notice that uniform continuity implies continuity.

**Theorem 9.** If the function  $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  is continuous, then it is also uniformly continuous.

**Proof.** The most important result we use here is the compactness of  $[a, b]$ . That means we are going to produce a family of open cover of  $[a, b]$ . Since  $f$  is continuous at each  $x$  in  $[a, b]$ , given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a  $\delta(x) > 0$  ( $\delta$  here may depend on  $x$ ) such that for any  $y$  in  $[a, b]$ ,  $|y - x| < \delta(x) \Rightarrow |f(y) - f(x)| < \varepsilon/2$ . This means whenever  $y$  is in the open set  $B(x, \delta(x)) = \{z: |z - x| < \delta(x)\} \cap [a, b]$  then  $|f(y) - f(x)| < \varepsilon/2$ . Therefore the collection  $\mathcal{C} = \{B(x, \delta(x)/2): x \in [a, b]\}$  is an open cover for  $[a, b]$ . Since  $[a, b]$  is compact by the Heine-Borel Theorem (Theorem 5),  $\mathcal{C}$  has a finite subcover say  $\mathcal{B} = \{B(x_1, \delta(x_1)/2), B(x_2, \delta(x_2)/2), \dots, B(x_n, \delta(x_n)/2)\}$ , where  $n$  is some positive integer. Now let  $\delta = \min \{\delta(x_1)/2, \delta(x_2)/2, \dots, \delta(x_n)/2\}$ . Take any  $x, y$  in  $[a, b]$  such that  $|y - x| < \delta$ . Since  $\mathcal{B}$  covers  $[a, b]$ ,  $x \in B(x_k, \delta(x_k)/2)$  for some  $1 \leq k \leq n$ .

Therefore,  $|f(x_k) - f(x)| < \varepsilon/2$  (1)

Now, let us see how far away from  $x_k$  is  $y$ .

$|y - x_k| = |y - x + x - x_k| \leq |y - x| + |x - x_k| < \delta + \delta(x_k)/2 \leq \delta(x_k)/2 + \delta(x_k)/2 = \delta(x_k)$ .

Hence  $y \in B(x_k, \delta(x_k))$  and we have

$$|f(y) - f(x_k)| < \varepsilon/2. \quad \text{----- (2)}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} |f(y) - f(x)| &= |f(y) - f(x_k) + f(x_k) - f(x)| \\ &\leq |f(y) - f(x_k)| + |f(x_k) - f(x)| \text{ by the triangle inequality} \\ &< \varepsilon/2 + \varepsilon/2 = \varepsilon \text{ by (1) and (2) above.} \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $f$  is uniformly continuous.

This notion of uniform continuity proves useful to tell us that any continuous function on a closed and bounded interval is Riemann integrable.

**Theorem 10.** If the function  $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  is continuous, then it is Riemann integrable on  $[a, b]$ .

**Proof.** If  $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  is continuous, then it is also uniformly continuous.

Therefore given any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for all  $x, y$  in  $[a, b]$ ,

$$|x - y| < \delta \Rightarrow |f(x) - f(y)| < \varepsilon/(b-a). \quad \text{----- (3)}$$

Let  $P : a = x_0 < x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_n = b$  be a partition with norm  $\|P\| < \delta$  that is,  $\|P\| = \max\{|x_i - x_{i-1}| : i = 1, \dots, n\} < \delta$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , let  $M_i = \sup\{f(x) : x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]\}$ . Then since  $f$  is continuous on  $[x_{i-1}, x_i]$ , for each  $i$ , by the Extreme Value Theorem,  $M_i = f(c_i)$  for some  $c_i$  in  $[x_{i-1}, x_i]$ . Similarly, for each  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , let  $m_i = \inf\{f(x) : x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]\}$ . Then again by the Extreme Value Theorem, for each  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , there exists  $d_i$  in  $[x_{i-1}, x_i]$  such that  $m_i = f(d_i)$ . Then the upper Riemann sum with respect to  $P$  is

$$U(P) = \sum_{i=1}^n M_i(x_i - x_{i-1}) = \sum_{i=1}^n f(c_i)(x_i - x_{i-1})$$

and the lower Riemann sum with respect to  $P$  is

$$L(P) = \sum_{i=1}^n m_i(x_i - x_{i-1}) = \sum_{i=1}^n f(d_i)(x_i - x_{i-1}).$$

Then the difference,

$$\begin{aligned} U(P) - L(P) &= \sum_{i=1}^n (f(c_i) - f(d_i))(x_i - x_{i-1}) = \sum_{i=1}^n |f(c_i) - f(d_i)|(x_i - x_{i-1}) \\ &< \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\varepsilon}{b-a}(x_i - x_{i-1}). \text{ by (3) since } |c_i - d_i| \leq \|P\| < \delta, 1 \leq i \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $U(P) - L(P) < \frac{\varepsilon}{b-a} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - x_{i-1}) = \frac{\varepsilon}{b-a} (x_n - x_0) = \varepsilon$ .

Hence, Riemann's condition holds and so by Theorem 1 in *Riemann Integral and Bounded function*,  $f$  is Riemann integrable. This completes the proof.