

proof for second derivative test:

Recall that Taylor thm for two variables

$$f(a+h, b+k) - f(a, b)$$

$$= f_x(a, b)h + f_y(a, b)k + \frac{1}{2}(h^2 f_{xx}(a, b) + 2hk f_{xy}(a, b) + k^2 f_{yy}(a, b)) + \varepsilon p^2$$

where  $p^2 = h^2 + k^2$ ,  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  as  $p \rightarrow 0$ )

Remainder

Now from assumption:  $\nabla f(a, b) = 0$

$$\therefore f(a+h, b+k) - f(a, b) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}(h^2 A + 2hkB + k^2 C)}_{\text{quadratic form}} + \varepsilon p^2$$

$$\text{Denote } Q(h, k) = Ah^2 + 2kBhk + ck^2$$

(i)  $Q$  is definite i.e.  $Q$  is of one sign only  
if  $h, k$  and vanishes only for  $h=0=k$ .

We say it's positive definite or negative  
definite according to this sign

e.g.:  $Q = h^2 + k^2$  is positive definite b/c  
 $Q > 0 \quad \forall h, k \neq 0$ , and  $= 0$  if  $h=0=k$

eq :  $Q = -h^2 + 2hk - 2k^2 = -(h-k)^2 - k^2$  is negative definite b/c  $Q < 0$   $\nabla h, k \neq 0$  and  $=0$  if  $h=k=0$

(ii)  $Q$  is indefinite i.e.  $Q$  can have different sign according to different  $h, k$

eq :  $Q = 2hk$ , then  $Q > 0$  if  $h, k$  same sign,  $Q < 0$  if opposite sign

(iii)  $Q$  is called semi-definite if  $Q=0$  for pts other than  $(0,0)$ , but for any  $(Q \neq 0)$ , it's of one sign.

eq :  $Q = (h+k)^2$ , then  $Q=0 \nabla h=-k$   
 $Q > 0$  otherwise

(i) Clearly, this can happen ( $\therefore Q$  is of one sign)  
if and only if  $AC-B^2 > 0$

and is positive def if  $A > 0$

negative def if  $A < 0$

$$\therefore Q = A \left[ \underbrace{\left( h + \frac{B}{A}k \right)^2}_{\geq 0} + \underbrace{\frac{AC-B^2}{A^2} k^2}_{\geq 0} \right] \quad (*)$$

$\therefore$  if  $AC-B^2 > 0$  then  $Q$  is of one sign

and also  $A > 0 \Rightarrow Q > 0$   
 $A < 0 \Rightarrow Q < 0$

(ii) In order to have indefinite, we see that we need  $AC - B^2 < 0$  (from look at (\*) above)

(iii) In order to have semi-definite, if  $AC - B^2 = 0$ , then  $h = -\frac{B}{A}k$  will give us  $Q = 0$  and for any other  $h, k$   $Q$  will be of one sign (depending solely on  $A$ ).

We will show (i)  $\Rightarrow$  local min, max

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  saddle pt

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  Not known

(i) if  $Q$  is positive definite, then

$\exists m > 0$  (indep. of  $h & k$ ) s.t.

$$Q \geq 2m(h^2 + k^2)$$

b/c, if we consider the fun  $\bar{Q}(u, v) = \frac{Q(h, k)}{h^2 + k^2}$

with  $u = \frac{h}{\sqrt{h^2 + k^2}}$ ,  $v = \frac{k}{\sqrt{h^2 + k^2}}$ , Then  $u^2 + v^2 = 1$

and  $\bar{Q}(u,v) = Au^2 + 2BuV + CV^2$ , and on the set  $u^2 + v^2 = 1$ ,  $\bar{Q}$  must have a min b/c  $u^2 + v^2 = 1$  is a closed set, call it  $z_m$ , then  $\bar{Q} \geq z_m$ . Moreover  $z_m \neq 0$  b/c if  $z_m = 0 \Rightarrow \bar{Q} = 0 \Rightarrow u = 0 = v$  but  $u^2 + v^2 = 1$  so impossible. Thus  $\bar{Q} \geq z_m > 0 \Leftrightarrow Q \geq z_m(h^2 + k^2) > 0$

Therefore  $f(a+h, b+k) - f(a, b)$

$$= \frac{1}{2} Q(h, k) + \varepsilon p^2 \geq (m + \varepsilon) p^2$$

and since  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  as  $p^2 \rightarrow 0$  we can choose  $p$  small enough s.t.  $|\varepsilon| < \frac{1}{2}m$

$$\Rightarrow f(a+h, b+k) - f(a, b) \geq \frac{1}{2}m p^2 > 0$$

$\Rightarrow f(a, b)$  local min in a small nbd of  $(a, b)$  if  $Q$  positive def.

Similarly,  $f(a, b)$  local max in a small nbd if  $Q$  is negative definite.

(ii) if the form is indefinite, then there's a pair  $(h_1, k_1)$  for which  $Q < 0$  and a pair  $(h_2, k_2)$  for which  $Q > 0$

$\therefore$  we can find  $m > 0$  s.t.

$$Q(h_1, k_1) < -2m \rho_1^2 = -2m(h_1^2 + k_1^2)$$

$$Q(h_2, k_2) > 2m \rho_2^2 = 2m(h_2^2 + k_2^2)$$

$$\text{let } h = th_1, k = tk_1, \rho = h^2 + k^2,$$

$$\text{then } Q(h, k) = t^2(Q_1, k_1), \rho^2 = t^2 \rho_1^2$$

i.e. we consider the line segment from  $(a, b)$  to  $(a+th_1, b+tk_1)$

( $\because$  any pts in between is  $(a+th_1, b+tk_1)$ )

so clearly  $Q(h, k) < -2m \rho^2$   
for such  $(h, k)$

so as before, we get

$$f(a+th_1, b+tk_1) - f(a, b) < -m \frac{\rho^2}{2}$$

for  $(h, k)$  small enough on the line segment ( $\because$  choose  $t$  small enough, as the  $\epsilon$  in (i))

$\therefore f(a+th_1, b+tk_1) < f(a, b)$  for those  $h, k$

Similarly, we do this for

$$h = th_2, k = tk_2 \text{ and show}$$

that  $f(ath, b+k) > f(a, b)$  for those  
h, k small enough on the line

segment

$\Rightarrow$  In a small nbhd of  $(a, b)$  we have

$$f(x, y) > f(a, b) \quad \& \quad f(x, y) < f(a, b)$$

$\Rightarrow (a, b, f(a, b))$  is a saddle pt!