

1. The first 8/12 correct were worth 1.5 each and the last 4/12 correct were worth 1 each.

- (a) True: we have $\langle 3\mathbf{x}, 2\mathbf{x} \rangle = 6\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \geq 0$ since $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \geq 0$.
 - (b) True: this is the triangle inequality.
 - (c) True: an orthonormal basis can be constructed using Gram-Schmidt.
 - (d) True: the vectors are pairwise orthogonal and nonzero, hence linearly independent hence a basis.
 - (e) True: $\|\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w}\|^2 = \langle \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w} \rangle = \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{w}\|^2$.
 - (f) False: the orthogonal complement of the row space is the complex-conjugate of the nullspace.
 - (g) False: taking adjoints reverses the order of composition, so $(ST)^* = T^*S^*$.
 - (h) True: doing the multiplication shows $A\mathbf{v} = 7\mathbf{v}$ so \mathbf{v} has eigenvalue 7.
 - (i) False: eigenvalues are 1, 2, 3 hence each eigenspace has dimension 1, so it is diagonalizable.
 - (j) True: by Cayley-Hamilton, $p(A) = 0$ so $A^3 + 2A - I_3 = 0$ so $A^3 + 2A = I_3$ as claimed.
 - (k) True: diagonal matrices are in Jordan canonical form and the Jordan canonical form is unique.
 - (l) True: if A and B are similar then the Jordan forms of A, B are also similar, but Jordan forms are similar iff they are equivalent.
-

2. Part (a) was worth 6 points, while (c) and (d) were 3 each.

- (a) We verify the three parts of the definition. Let $\mathbf{v}_1 = (a_1, b_1)$, $\mathbf{v}_2 = (a_2, b_2)$, $\mathbf{v} = (a, b)$, $\mathbf{w} = (c, d)$.
 - [I1] $\langle \mathbf{v}_1 + r\mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{w} \rangle = \langle (a_1 + ra_2, b_1 + rb_2), (c, d) \rangle = (a_1 + ra_2)c + 2(a_1 + ra_2)d + 2(b_1 + rb_2)c + 5(b_1 + rb_2)d = (a_1c + 2a_1d + 2b_1c + 5b_1d) + r(a_2c + 2a_2d + 2b_2c + 5b_2d) = \langle \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{w} \rangle + r\langle \mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{w} \rangle$.
 - [I2] $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v} \rangle = \langle (c, d), (a, b) \rangle = ca + 2cb + 2da + 5db = ac + 2ad + 2bc + 5bd = \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle$.
 - [I3] $\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} \rangle = a^2 + 4ab + 5b^2 = (a + 2b)^2 + b^2$, which is always nonnegative. Furthermore, it is only zero when $a = b = 0$.
 - (a) This is the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality applied to the inner product from (a): if $\mathbf{v} = (a, b)$ and $\mathbf{w} = (c, d)$ then $\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle^2 = (ac + 2ad + 2bc + 5bd)^2$, $\|\mathbf{v}\|^2 = a^2 + 4ab + 5b^2$, and $\|\mathbf{w}\|^2 = c^2 + 4cd + 5d^2$, so $\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle^2 \leq \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} \rangle \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w} \rangle$ reads $(ac + 2ad + 2bc + 5bd)^2 \leq (a^2 + 4ab + 5b^2)(c^2 + 4cd + 5d^2)$ as required.
 - (b) This is the triangle inequality applied to the inner product from part (a): if $\mathbf{v} = (a, b)$ and $\mathbf{w} = (c, d)$ then $\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w} = (a + c, b + d)$, so $\|\mathbf{v}\| = \sqrt{a^2 + 4ab + 5b^2}$, $\|\mathbf{w}\| = \sqrt{c^2 + 4cd + 5d^2}$, and $\|\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w}\| = \sqrt{(a + c)^2 + 4(a + c)(b + d) + 5(b + d)^2}$. The inequality $\|\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w}\| \leq \|\mathbf{v}\| + \|\mathbf{w}\|$ then reads $\sqrt{(a + c)^2 + 4(a + c)(b + d) + 5(b + d)^2} \leq \sqrt{a^2 + 4ab + 5b^2} + \sqrt{c^2 + 4cd + 5d^2}$ as required.
-

3. We show both containments: $(W_1 + W_2)^\perp \subseteq W_1^\perp \cap W_2^\perp$ and $W_1^\perp \cap W_2^\perp \subseteq (W_1 + W_2)^\perp$.

- If $\mathbf{w} \in (W_1 + W_2)^\perp$ then \mathbf{w} is in particular orthogonal to every vector in W_1 , hence is in W_1^\perp , and also is orthogonal to every vector in W_2 , hence is in W_2^\perp . Then \mathbf{w} is in $W_1^\perp \cap W_2^\perp$, as required.
 - Conversely, if $\mathbf{w} \in W_1^\perp \cap W_2^\perp$, then let $\mathbf{w}_1 + \mathbf{w}_2 \in W_1 + W_2$ be arbitrary, with $\mathbf{w}_1 \in W_1$ and $\mathbf{w}_2 \in W_2$.
 - Then $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}_1 \rangle = 0 = \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}_2 \rangle$ by the assumption that $\mathbf{w} \in W_1^\perp \cap W_2^\perp$, and so we have $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}_1 + \mathbf{w}_2 \rangle = \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}_1 \rangle + \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}_2 \rangle = 0$.
 - This means \mathbf{w} is orthogonal to $\mathbf{w}_1 + \mathbf{w}_2$, so since $\mathbf{w}_1 + \mathbf{w}_2 \in W_1 + W_2$ was arbitrary, we see $\mathbf{w} \in (W_1 + W_2)^\perp$. Thus, $W_1^\perp \cap W_2^\perp \subseteq (W_1 + W_2)^\perp$ as claimed.
-

