## Lecture 27 - UM 102 (Spring 2021)

Vamsi Pritham Pingali

IISc

# Recap

▲御▶ ▲ 臣▶ ▲ 臣▶

• Proved a theorem

#### • Proved a theorem about limits

∃ → ∢

#### • Proved a theorem about limits that implied that

#### Proved a theorem about limits that implied that it is enough to

 Proved a theorem about limits that implied that it is enough to "test" a limit • Proved a theorem about limits that implied that it is enough to "test" a limit against sequences (

• Proved a theorem about limits that implied that it is enough to "test" a limit against sequences (just as in one-variable calculus).

- Proved a theorem about limits that implied that it is enough to "test" a limit against sequences (just as in one-variable calculus).
- Proved a

- Proved a theorem about limits that implied that it is enough to "test" a limit against sequences (just as in one-variable calculus).
- Proved a *sufficient* condition

- Proved a theorem about limits that implied that it is enough to "test" a limit against sequences (just as in one-variable calculus).
- Proved a sufficient condition for differentiability,

- Proved a theorem about limits that implied that it is enough to "test" a limit against sequences (just as in one-variable calculus).
- Proved a *sufficient* condition for differentiability, i.e., continuous partials

2/9

- Proved a theorem about limits that implied that it is enough to "test" a limit against sequences (just as in one-variable calculus).
- Proved a *sufficient* condition for differentiability, i.e., continuous partials implies differentiability.

2/9

- Proved a theorem about limits that implied that it is enough to "test" a limit against sequences (just as in one-variable calculus).
- Proved a *sufficient* condition for differentiability, i.e., continuous partials implies differentiability. Saw that rational functions

- Proved a theorem about limits that implied that it is enough to "test" a limit against sequences (just as in one-variable calculus).
- Proved a *sufficient* condition for differentiability, i.e., continuous partials implies differentiability. Saw that rational functions are differentiable

- Proved a theorem about limits that implied that it is enough to "test" a limit against sequences (just as in one-variable calculus).
- Proved a *sufficient* condition for differentiability, i.e., continuous partials implies differentiability. Saw that rational functions are differentiable on their domain (

- Proved a theorem about limits that implied that it is enough to "test" a limit against sequences (just as in one-variable calculus).
- Proved a *sufficient* condition for differentiability, i.e., continuous partials implies differentiability. Saw that rational functions are differentiable on their domain (when the

- Proved a theorem about limits that implied that it is enough to "test" a limit against sequences (just as in one-variable calculus).
- Proved a *sufficient* condition for differentiability, i.e., continuous partials implies differentiability. Saw that rational functions are differentiable on their domain (when the denominator is non-zero).

• Recall that

• Recall that if  $h(x) = \sin(x^2)$  then  $f'(x) = \cos(x^2)2x$ .

( )

• Recall that if  $h(x) = \sin(x^2)$  then  $f'(x) = \cos(x^2)2x$ . That is,

∃ → ∢

• Recall that if  $h(x) = \sin(x^2)$  then  $f'(x) = \cos(x^2)2x$ . That is, if  $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$  is differentiable and

• Recall that if  $h(x) = \sin(x^2)$  then  $f'(x) = \cos(x^2)2x$ . That is, if  $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$  is differentiable and  $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$  is differentiable, then

Recall that if h(x) = sin(x<sup>2</sup>) then f'(x) = cos(x<sup>2</sup>)2x. That is, if f : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable and g : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable, then f ∘ g : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable and

Recall that if h(x) = sin(x<sup>2</sup>) then f'(x) = cos(x<sup>2</sup>)2x. That is, if f : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable and g : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable, then f ∘ g : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable and (f ∘ g)'(x) = f'(g(x))g'(x).

- Recall that if h(x) = sin(x<sup>2</sup>) then f'(x) = cos(x<sup>2</sup>)2x. That is, if f : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable and g : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable, then f ∘ g : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable and (f ∘ g)'(x) = f'(g(x))g'(x).
- The rough idea

- Recall that if h(x) = sin(x<sup>2</sup>) then f'(x) = cos(x<sup>2</sup>)2x. That is, if f : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable and g : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable, then f ∘ g : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable and (f ∘ g)'(x) = f'(g(x))g'(x).
- The rough idea of the proof is as follows.

- Recall that if h(x) = sin(x<sup>2</sup>) then f'(x) = cos(x<sup>2</sup>)2x. That is, if f : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable and g : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable, then f ∘ g : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable and (f ∘ g)'(x) = f'(g(x))g'(x).
- The rough idea of the proof is as follows.  $g(x+h) \approx g(x) + hg'(x)$  when h is small.

- Recall that if h(x) = sin(x<sup>2</sup>) then f'(x) = cos(x<sup>2</sup>)2x. That is, if f : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable and g : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable, then f ∘ g : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable and (f ∘ g)'(x) = f'(g(x))g'(x).
- The rough idea of the proof is as follows.  $g(x + h) \approx g(x) + hg'(x)$  when h is small.  $f(y + k) \approx f(y) + kf'(y)$  when k is small.

- Recall that if h(x) = sin(x<sup>2</sup>) then f'(x) = cos(x<sup>2</sup>)2x. That is, if f : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable and g : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable, then f ∘ g : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable and (f ∘ g)'(x) = f'(g(x))g'(x).
- The rough idea of the proof is as follows.  $g(x+h) \approx g(x) + hg'(x)$  when h is small.  $f(y+k) \approx f(y) + kf'(y)$  when k is small. So  $f(g(x+h)) \approx f(g(x) + hg'(x))$  which is

- Recall that if h(x) = sin(x<sup>2</sup>) then f'(x) = cos(x<sup>2</sup>)2x. That is, if f : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable and g : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable, then f ∘ g : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable and (f ∘ g)'(x) = f'(g(x))g'(x).
- The rough idea of the proof is as follows.  $g(x+h) \approx g(x) + hg'(x)$  when h is small.  $f(y+k) \approx f(y) + kf'(y)$  when k is small. So  $f(g(x+h)) \approx f(g(x) + hg'(x))$  which is f(g(x)) + hg'(x)f'(g(x)) when h is small.

- Recall that if h(x) = sin(x<sup>2</sup>) then f'(x) = cos(x<sup>2</sup>)2x. That is, if f : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable and g : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable, then f ∘ g : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable and (f ∘ g)'(x) = f'(g(x))g'(x).
- The rough idea of the proof is as follows.  $g(x + h) \approx g(x) + hg'(x)$  when h is small.  $f(y + k) \approx f(y) + kf'(y)$  when k is small. So  $f(g(x + h)) \approx f(g(x) + hg'(x))$  which is f(g(x)) + hg'(x)f'(g(x)) when h is small. Thus  $\frac{f(g(x+h)) - f(g(x))}{h} \approx g'(x)f'(g(x))$  when h is small.

- Recall that if h(x) = sin(x<sup>2</sup>) then f'(x) = cos(x<sup>2</sup>)2x. That is, if f : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable and g : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable, then f ∘ g : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable and (f ∘ g)'(x) = f'(g(x))g'(x).
- The rough idea of the proof is as follows.  $g(x+h) \approx g(x) + hg'(x)$  when h is small.  $f(y+k) \approx f(y) + kf'(y)$  when k is small. So  $f(g(x+h)) \approx f(g(x) + hg'(x))$  which is f(g(x)) + hg'(x)f'(g(x)) when h is small. Thus  $\frac{f(g(x+h)) - f(g(x))}{h} \approx g'(x)f'(g(x))$  when h is small.

Of course,

- Recall that if h(x) = sin(x<sup>2</sup>) then f'(x) = cos(x<sup>2</sup>)2x. That is, if f : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable and g : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable, then f ∘ g : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable and (f ∘ g)'(x) = f'(g(x))g'(x).
- The rough idea of the proof is as follows.  $g(x + h) \approx g(x) + hg'(x)$  when h is small.  $f(y + k) \approx f(y) + kf'(y)$  when k is small. So  $f(g(x + h)) \approx f(g(x) + hg'(x))$  which is f(g(x)) + hg'(x)f'(g(x)) when h is small. Thus  $\frac{f(g(x+h)) - f(g(x))}{h} \approx g'(x)f'(g(x))$  when h is small.
- Of course, one has to make

3/9
#### One-variable chain rule

- Recall that if h(x) = sin(x<sup>2</sup>) then f'(x) = cos(x<sup>2</sup>)2x. That is, if f : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable and g : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable, then f ∘ g : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable and (f ∘ g)'(x) = f'(g(x))g'(x).
- The rough idea of the proof is as follows.  $g(x+h) \approx g(x) + hg'(x)$  when h is small.  $f(y+k) \approx f(y) + kf'(y)$  when k is small. So  $f(g(x+h)) \approx f(g(x) + hg'(x))$  which is f(g(x)) + hg'(x)f'(g(x)) when h is small. Thus  $\frac{f(g(x+h)) - f(g(x))}{h} \approx g'(x)f'(g(x))$  when h is small.
- Of course, one has to make the above rigorous

3/9

#### One-variable chain rule

- Recall that if h(x) = sin(x<sup>2</sup>) then f'(x) = cos(x<sup>2</sup>)2x. That is, if f : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable and g : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable, then f ∘ g : ℝ → ℝ is differentiable and (f ∘ g)'(x) = f'(g(x))g'(x).
- The rough idea of the proof is as follows.  $g(x + h) \approx g(x) + hg'(x)$  when h is small.  $f(y + k) \approx f(y) + kf'(y)$  when k is small. So  $f(g(x + h)) \approx f(g(x) + hg'(x))$  which is f(g(x)) + hg'(x)f'(g(x)) when h is small. Thus  $\frac{f(g(x+h)) - f(g(x))}{h} \approx g'(x)f'(g(x))$  when h is small.
- Of course, one has to make the above rigorous using  $\delta$ s and  $\epsilon$ s.

æ

• There is a

æ

• There is a genuine need

• There is a genuine need for a higher-variable

• There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule.

• There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples

• There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule

• There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule might help.

- There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule might help.
- Suppose a particle

- There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule might help.
- Suppose a particle is moving along a path  $\vec{r}(t)$

- There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule might help.
- Suppose a particle is moving along a path  $\vec{r}(t)$  in a room.

- There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule might help.
- Suppose a particle is moving along a path r(t) in a room.
   One question is

- There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule might help.

- There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule might help.
- Suppose a particle is moving along a path r
   *(t)* in a room.
   One question is what rate of temperature rise

- There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule might help.

- There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule might help.
- Suppose a particle is moving along a path r
  (t) in a room.
   One question is what rate of temperature rise will the particle experience? That is,

- There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule might help.
- Suppose a particle is moving along a path r
  (t) in a room.
   One question is what rate of temperature rise will the particle experience? That is, suppose T(x, y, z) is the temperature (

- There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule might help.
- Suppose a particle is moving along a path r
   (t) in a room.
   One question is what rate of temperature rise will the particle
   experience? That is, suppose T(x, y, z) is the temperature
   (presumably an infinitely differentiable function)

- There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule might help.
- Suppose a particle is moving along a path r(t) in a room. One question is what rate of temperature rise will the particle experience? That is, suppose T(x, y, z) is the temperature (presumably an infinitely differentiable function) and r(t) = (x(t), y(t), z(t)) is the trajectory (

- There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule might help.
- Suppose a particle is moving along a path  $\vec{r}(t)$  in a room. One question is what rate of temperature rise will the particle experience? That is, suppose T(x, y, z) is the temperature (presumably an infinitely differentiable function) and  $\vec{r}(t) = (x(t), y(t), z(t))$  is the trajectory (again presumably highly differentiable),

4/9

- There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule might help.
- Suppose a particle is moving along a path  $\vec{r}(t)$  in a room. One question is what rate of temperature rise will the particle experience? That is, suppose T(x, y, z) is the temperature (presumably an infinitely differentiable function) and  $\vec{r}(t) = (x(t), y(t), z(t))$  is the trajectory (again presumably highly differentiable), then what is  $\frac{dT(x(t), y(t), z(t))}{dt}$ ?

- There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule might help.
- Suppose a particle is moving along a path  $\vec{r}(t)$  in a room. One question is what rate of temperature rise will the particle experience? That is, suppose T(x, y, z) is the temperature (presumably an infinitely differentiable function) and  $\vec{r}(t) = (x(t), y(t), z(t))$  is the trajectory (again presumably highly differentiable), then what is  $\frac{dT(x(t), y(t), z(t))}{dt}$ ?

• Consider the polar coordinates

- There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule might help.
- Suppose a particle is moving along a path  $\vec{r}(t)$  in a room. One question is what rate of temperature rise will the particle experience? That is, suppose T(x, y, z) is the temperature (presumably an infinitely differentiable function) and  $\vec{r}(t) = (x(t), y(t), z(t))$  is the trajectory (again presumably highly differentiable), then what is  $\frac{dT(x(t), y(t), z(t))}{dt}$ ?

• Consider the polar coordinates  $x = r \cos(\theta), y = r \sin(\theta)$ , i.e.,

- There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule might help.
- Suppose a particle is moving along a path  $\vec{r}(t)$  in a room. One question is what rate of temperature rise will the particle experience? That is, suppose T(x, y, z) is the temperature (presumably an infinitely differentiable function) and  $\vec{r}(t) = (x(t), y(t), z(t))$  is the trajectory (again presumably highly differentiable), then what is  $\frac{dT(x(t), y(t), z(t))}{dt}$ ?
- Consider the polar coordinates  $x = r \cos(\theta)$ ,  $y = r \sin(\theta)$ , i.e.,  $r^2 = x^2 + y^2$  and  $\tan(\theta) = \frac{y}{x}$ . (

- There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule might help.
- Suppose a particle is moving along a path  $\vec{r}(t)$  in a room. One question is what rate of temperature rise will the particle experience? That is, suppose T(x, y, z) is the temperature (presumably an infinitely differentiable function) and  $\vec{r}(t) = (x(t), y(t), z(t))$  is the trajectory (again presumably highly differentiable), then what is  $\frac{dT(x(t), y(t), z(t))}{dt}$ ?
- Consider the polar coordinates  $x = r \cos(\theta)$ ,  $y = r \sin(\theta)$ , i.e.,  $r^2 = x^2 + y^2$  and  $\tan(\theta) = \frac{y}{x}$ . (By the way,

- There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule might help.
- Suppose a particle is moving along a path  $\vec{r}(t)$  in a room. One question is what rate of temperature rise will the particle experience? That is, suppose T(x, y, z) is the temperature (presumably an infinitely differentiable function) and  $\vec{r}(t) = (x(t), y(t), z(t))$  is the trajectory (again presumably highly differentiable), then what is  $\frac{dT(x(t), y(t), z(t))}{dt}$ ?
- Consider the polar coordinates  $x = r \cos(\theta)$ ,  $y = r \sin(\theta)$ , i.e.,  $r^2 = x^2 + y^2$  and  $\tan(\theta) = \frac{y}{x}$ . (By the way, they make sense only

- There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule might help.
- Suppose a particle is moving along a path  $\vec{r}(t)$  in a room. One question is what rate of temperature rise will the particle experience? That is, suppose T(x, y, z) is the temperature (presumably an infinitely differentiable function) and  $\vec{r}(t) = (x(t), y(t), z(t))$  is the trajectory (again presumably highly differentiable), then what is  $\frac{dT(x(t), y(t), z(t))}{dt}$ ?
- Consider the polar coordinates x = r cos(θ), y = r sin(θ), i.e., r<sup>2</sup> = x<sup>2</sup> + y<sup>2</sup> and tan(θ) = <sup>y</sup>/<sub>x</sub>. (By the way, they make sense only away from the positive x-axis and the origin.)

- There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule might help.
- Suppose a particle is moving along a path  $\vec{r}(t)$  in a room. One question is what rate of temperature rise will the particle experience? That is, suppose T(x, y, z) is the temperature (presumably an infinitely differentiable function) and  $\vec{r}(t) = (x(t), y(t), z(t))$  is the trajectory (again presumably highly differentiable), then what is  $\frac{dT(x(t), y(t), z(t))}{dt}$ ?
- Consider the polar coordinates  $x = r \cos(\theta)$ ,  $y = r \sin(\theta)$ , i.e.,  $r^2 = x^2 + y^2$  and  $\tan(\theta) = \frac{y}{x}$ . (By the way, they make sense only away from the positive x-axis and the origin.) Again, let's assume

- There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule might help.
- Suppose a particle is moving along a path  $\vec{r}(t)$  in a room. One question is what rate of temperature rise will the particle experience? That is, suppose T(x, y, z) is the temperature (presumably an infinitely differentiable function) and  $\vec{r}(t) = (x(t), y(t), z(t))$  is the trajectory (again presumably highly differentiable), then what is  $\frac{dT(x(t), y(t), z(t))}{dt}$ ?
- Consider the polar coordinates  $x = r \cos(\theta)$ ,  $y = r \sin(\theta)$ , i.e.,  $r^2 = x^2 + y^2$  and  $\tan(\theta) = \frac{y}{x}$ . (By the way, they make sense only away from the positive x-axis and the origin.) Again, let's assume T(x, y) is the temperature

- There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule might help.
- Suppose a particle is moving along a path  $\vec{r}(t)$  in a room. One question is what rate of temperature rise will the particle experience? That is, suppose T(x, y, z) is the temperature (presumably an infinitely differentiable function) and  $\vec{r}(t) = (x(t), y(t), z(t))$  is the trajectory (again presumably highly differentiable), then what is  $\frac{dT(x(t), y(t), z(t))}{dt}$ ?
- Consider the polar coordinates x = r cos(θ), y = r sin(θ), i.e., r<sup>2</sup> = x<sup>2</sup> + y<sup>2</sup> and tan(θ) = <sup>y</sup>/<sub>x</sub>. (By the way, they make sense only away from the positive x-axis and the origin.) Again, let's assume T(x, y) is the temperature of a hot circular plate.

- There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule might help.
- Suppose a particle is moving along a path  $\vec{r}(t)$  in a room. One question is what rate of temperature rise will the particle experience? That is, suppose T(x, y, z) is the temperature (presumably an infinitely differentiable function) and  $\vec{r}(t) = (x(t), y(t), z(t))$  is the trajectory (again presumably highly differentiable), then what is  $\frac{dT(x(t), y(t), z(t))}{dt}$ ?
- Consider the polar coordinates x = r cos(θ), y = r sin(θ), i.e., r<sup>2</sup> = x<sup>2</sup> + y<sup>2</sup> and tan(θ) = <sup>y</sup>/<sub>x</sub>. (By the way, they make sense only away from the positive x-axis and the origin.) Again, let's assume T(x, y) is the temperature of a hot circular plate. So T̃(r, θ) = T(x(r, θ), y(r, θ)) is a function.

- There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule might help.
- Suppose a particle is moving along a path  $\vec{r}(t)$  in a room. One question is what rate of temperature rise will the particle experience? That is, suppose T(x, y, z) is the temperature (presumably an infinitely differentiable function) and  $\vec{r}(t) = (x(t), y(t), z(t))$  is the trajectory (again presumably highly differentiable), then what is  $\frac{dT(x(t), y(t), z(t))}{dt}$ ?
- Consider the polar coordinates x = r cos(θ), y = r sin(θ), i.e., r<sup>2</sup> = x<sup>2</sup> + y<sup>2</sup> and tan(θ) = <sup>y</sup>/<sub>x</sub>. (By the way, they make sense only away from the positive x-axis and the origin.) Again, let's assume T(x, y) is the temperature of a hot circular plate. So T̃(r, θ) = T(x(r, θ), y(r, θ)) is a function. We want <u>∂T̃</u>, <u>∂T̃</u> in terms of

- There is a genuine need for a higher-variable chain rule. Here are two examples where such a rule might help.
- Suppose a particle is moving along a path  $\vec{r}(t)$  in a room. One question is what rate of temperature rise will the particle experience? That is, suppose T(x, y, z) is the temperature (presumably an infinitely differentiable function) and  $\vec{r}(t) = (x(t), y(t), z(t))$  is the trajectory (again presumably highly differentiable), then what is  $\frac{dT(x(t), y(t), z(t))}{dt}$ ?
- Consider the polar coordinates x = r cos(θ), y = r sin(θ), i.e., r<sup>2</sup> = x<sup>2</sup> + y<sup>2</sup> and tan(θ) = <sup>y</sup>/<sub>x</sub>. (By the way, they make sense only away from the positive x-axis and the origin.) Again, let's assume T(x, y) is the temperature of a hot circular plate. So T̃(r, θ) = T(x(r, θ), y(r, θ)) is a function. We want <u>∂T̃</u>, <u>∂T̃</u> in terms of <u>∂T</u>/<sub>∂x</sub>, <u>∂T</u>/<sub>∂y</sub>.

#### A rough idea for the first example

æ
• What we want is

• What we want is 
$$\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{T(\vec{r}(t+h)) - T(\vec{r}(t))}{h}$$
. Note that

æ

• What we want is  $\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{T(\vec{r}(t+h)) - T(\vec{r}(t))}{h}$ . Note that  $x(t+h) \approx x(t) + hx'(t)$  when h is small.

• What we want is  $\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{T(\vec{r}(t+h)) - T(\vec{r}(t))}{h}$ . Note that  $x(t+h) \approx x(t) + hx'(t)$  when h is small. Likewise for y(t), z(t), i.e.,

• What we want is  $\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{T(\vec{r}(t+h)) - T(\vec{r}(t))}{h}$ . Note that  $x(t+h) \approx x(t) + hx'(t)$  when h is small. Likewise for y(t), z(t), i.e.,  $\vec{r}(t+h) \approx \vec{r}(t) + h\vec{r}'(t)$ .

- What we want is  $\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{T(\vec{r}(t+h)) T(\vec{r}(t))}{h}$ . Note that  $x(t+h) \approx x(t) + hx'(t)$  when h is small. Likewise for y(t), z(t), i.e.,  $\vec{r}(t+h) \approx \vec{r}(t) + h\vec{r}'(t)$ .
- Now

$$T(x+\Delta x, y+\Delta y, z+\Delta z) \approx T(x, y, z) + \Delta x T_x + \Delta y T_y + \Delta z T_z$$

- What we want is  $\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{T(\vec{r}(t+h)) T(\vec{r}(t))}{h}$ . Note that  $x(t+h) \approx x(t) + hx'(t)$  when h is small. Likewise for y(t), z(t), i.e.,  $\vec{r}(t+h) \approx \vec{r}(t) + h\vec{r}'(t)$ .
- Now

 $T(x+\Delta x, y+\Delta y, z+\Delta z) \approx T(x, y, z)+\Delta xT_x+\Delta yT_y+\Delta zT_z$ (by definition of differentiability).

- What we want is  $\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{T(\vec{r}(t+h)) T(\vec{r}(t))}{h}$ . Note that  $x(t+h) \approx x(t) + hx'(t)$  when h is small. Likewise for y(t), z(t), i.e.,  $\vec{r}(t+h) \approx \vec{r}(t) + h\vec{r}'(t)$ .
- Now

 $T(x+\Delta x, y+\Delta y, z+\Delta z) \approx T(x, y, z)+\Delta xT_x+\Delta yT_y+\Delta zT_z$ (by definition of differentiability).

• Taking  $\Delta x = x'(t)h$  and

- What we want is  $\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{T(\vec{r}(t+h)) T(\vec{r}(t))}{h}$ . Note that  $x(t+h) \approx x(t) + hx'(t)$  when h is small. Likewise for y(t), z(t), i.e.,  $\vec{r}(t+h) \approx \vec{r}(t) + h\vec{r}'(t)$ .
- Now

 $T(x+\Delta x, y+\Delta y, z+\Delta z) \approx T(x, y, z)+\Delta xT_x+\Delta yT_y+\Delta zT_z$ (by definition of differentiability).

• Taking  $\Delta x = x'(t)h$  and likewise for y, z, we see that

- What we want is  $\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{T(\vec{r}(t+h)) T(\vec{r}(t))}{h}$ . Note that  $x(t+h) \approx x(t) + hx'(t)$  when h is small. Likewise for y(t), z(t), i.e.,  $\vec{r}(t+h) \approx \vec{r}(t) + h\vec{r}'(t)$ .
- Now

 $T(x+\Delta x, y+\Delta y, z+\Delta z) \approx T(x, y, z)+\Delta xT_x+\Delta yT_y+\Delta zT_z$ (by definition of differentiability).

• Taking  $\Delta x = x'(t)h$  and likewise for y, z, we see that  $T(\vec{r}(t+h)) \approx T(\vec{r}(t)) + h(x'(t)T_x + y'(t)T_y + z'(t)T_z)$ , i.e.,

• What we want is  $\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{T(\vec{r}(t+h)) - T(\vec{r}(t))}{h}$ . Note that  $x(t+h) \approx x(t) + hx'(t)$  when h is small. Likewise for y(t), z(t), i.e.,  $\vec{r}(t+h) \approx \vec{r}(t) + h\vec{r}'(t)$ .

Now

 $T(x+\Delta x, y+\Delta y, z+\Delta z) \approx T(x, y, z)+\Delta xT_x+\Delta yT_y+\Delta zT_z$ (by definition of differentiability).

• Taking  $\Delta x = x'(t)h$  and likewise for y, z, we see that  $T(\vec{r}(t+h)) \approx T(\vec{r}(t)) + h(x'(t)T_x + y'(t)T_y + z'(t)T_z)$ , i.e.,  $\frac{T(\vec{r}(t+h)) - T(\vec{r}(t))}{h} \approx x'(t)T_x + y'(t)T_y + z'(t)T_z =$  $\langle \nabla T, \vec{r}'(t) \rangle = \nabla_{\vec{r}'(t)}T$ .

5/9

æ

#### • Let $f(\vec{r}): S \subset \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be a

#### • Let $f(\vec{r}) : S \subset \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be a scalar field.

# • Let $f(\vec{r}) : S \subset \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be a scalar field. Let $\vec{r}(t) : (a, b) \in \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a vector-valued function.

• Let  $f(\vec{r}) : S \subset \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$  be a scalar field. Let  $\vec{r}(t) : (a, b) \in \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^n$  be a vector-valued function. Define the composition  $h(t) : (a, b) \to \mathbb{R}$  as

• Let  $f(\vec{r}) : S \subset \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$  be a scalar field. Let  $\vec{r}(t) : (a, b) \in \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^n$  be a vector-valued function. Define the composition  $h(t) : (a, b) \to \mathbb{R}$  as  $h(t) = f(\vec{r}(t))$ .

• Let  $f(\vec{r}) : S \subset \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$  be a scalar field. Let  $\vec{r}(t) : (a, b) \in \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^n$  be a vector-valued function. Define the composition  $h(t) : (a, b) \to \mathbb{R}$  as  $h(t) = f(\vec{r}(t))$ .

• Suppose 
$$t_0 \in (a, b)$$
 is a point

- Let  $f(\vec{r}) : S \subset \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$  be a scalar field. Let  $\vec{r}(t) : (a, b) \in \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^n$  be a vector-valued function. Define the composition  $h(t) : (a, b) \to \mathbb{R}$  as  $h(t) = f(\vec{r}(t))$ .
- Suppose t<sub>0</sub> ∈ (a, b) is a point where x<sub>1</sub>(t), x<sub>2</sub>(t), ... are differentiable functions

6/9

- Let  $f(\vec{r}) : S \subset \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$  be a scalar field. Let  $\vec{r}(t) : (a, b) \in \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^n$  be a vector-valued function. Define the composition  $h(t) : (a, b) \to \mathbb{R}$  as  $h(t) = f(\vec{r}(t))$ .
- Suppose t<sub>0</sub> ∈ (a, b) is a point where x<sub>1</sub>(t), x<sub>2</sub>(t),... are differentiable functions and f is differentiable at r(t<sub>0</sub>).

6/9

- Let  $f(\vec{r}): S \subset \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$  be a scalar field. Let  $\vec{r}(t): (a, b) \in \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^n$  be a vector-valued function. Define the composition  $h(t): (a, b) \to \mathbb{R}$  as  $h(t) = f(\vec{r}(t))$ .
- Suppose t<sub>0</sub> ∈ (a, b) is a point where x<sub>1</sub>(t), x<sub>2</sub>(t), ... are differentiable functions and f is differentiable at r(t<sub>0</sub>).
- Then h(t) is differentiable at  $t_0$

- Let  $f(\vec{r}) : S \subset \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$  be a scalar field. Let  $\vec{r}(t) : (a, b) \in \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^n$  be a vector-valued function. Define the composition  $h(t) : (a, b) \to \mathbb{R}$  as  $h(t) = f(\vec{r}(t))$ .
- Suppose t<sub>0</sub> ∈ (a, b) is a point where x<sub>1</sub>(t), x<sub>2</sub>(t), ... are differentiable functions and f is differentiable at r(t<sub>0</sub>).
- Then h(t) is differentiable at  $t_0$  and  $h'(t_0) = \langle \nabla f(\vec{r}(t_0)), \vec{r}'(t_0) \rangle = \nabla_{\vec{r}'(t_0)} f(\vec{r}(t)).$

æ

#### • If a path

æ

• If a path is a *regular* path, i.e.,

• If a path is a *regular* path, i.e.,  $\vec{r}'(t) \neq 0 \forall t$ ,

æ

• If a path is a *regular* path, i.e.,  $\vec{r}'(t) \neq 0 \forall t$ , then  $\frac{1}{\|\vec{r}'(t)\|} \langle \nabla f(\vec{r}(t_0)), \vec{r}'(t_0) \rangle \text{ is called}$ 

• If a path is a *regular* path, i.e.,  $\vec{r}'(t) \neq 0 \forall t$ , then  $\frac{1}{\|\vec{r}'(t)\|} \langle \nabla f(\vec{r}(t_0)), \vec{r}'(t_0) \rangle$  is called the *directional derivative along the curve* 

• If a path is a *regular* path, i.e.,  $\vec{r}'(t) \neq 0 \forall t$ , then  $\frac{1}{\|\vec{r}'(t)\|} \langle \nabla f(\vec{r}(t_0)), \vec{r}'(t_0) \rangle$  is called the *directional derivative along the curve* and denoted as  $\frac{df}{ds}$  (the change in f per metre of the curve).

If a path is a *regular* path, i.e., r'(t) ≠ 0 ∀ t, then
<sup>1</sup>/<sub>||r'(t)||</sub> ⟨∇f(r(t<sub>0</sub>)), r'(t<sub>0</sub>)⟩ is called the *directional derivative along the curve* and denoted as df/ds (the change in f per metre
of the curve). For instance, if

• If a path is a *regular* path, i.e.,  $\vec{r}'(t) \neq 0 \forall t$ , then  $\frac{1}{\|\vec{r}'(t)\|} \langle \nabla f(\vec{r}(t_0)), \vec{r}'(t_0) \rangle$  is called the *directional derivative along the curve* and denoted as  $\frac{df}{ds}$  (the change in f per metre of the curve). For instance, if  $f(x, y) = x^2 - 3xy$  and the path is  $(t, t^2 - t + 2)$ ,

• If a path is a *regular* path, i.e.,  $\vec{r}'(t) \neq 0 \forall t$ , then  $\frac{1}{\|\vec{r}'(t)\|} \langle \nabla f(\vec{r}(t_0)), \vec{r}'(t_0) \rangle$  is called the *directional derivative along the curve* and denoted as  $\frac{df}{ds}$  (the change in f per metre of the curve). For instance, if  $f(x, y) = x^2 - 3xy$  and the path is  $(t, t^2 - t + 2)$ , and we want to find

• If a path is a *regular* path, i.e.,  $\vec{r}'(t) \neq 0 \forall t$ , then  $\frac{1}{\|\vec{r}'(t)\|} \langle \nabla f(\vec{r}(t_0)), \vec{r}'(t_0) \rangle$  is called the *directional derivative along the curve* and denoted as  $\frac{df}{ds}$  (the change in f per metre of the curve). For instance, if  $f(x, y) = x^2 - 3xy$  and the path is  $(t, t^2 - t + 2)$ , and we want to find  $\frac{df}{ds}|_{t=1}$ ,

• If a path is a *regular* path, i.e.,  $\vec{r}'(t) \neq 0 \forall t$ , then  $\frac{1}{\|\vec{r}'(t)\|} \langle \nabla f(\vec{r}(t_0)), \vec{r}'(t_0) \rangle$  is called the *directional derivative along the curve* and denoted as  $\frac{df}{ds}$  (the change in f per metre of the curve). For instance, if  $f(x, y) = x^2 - 3xy$  and the path is  $(t, t^2 - t + 2)$ , and we want to find  $\frac{df}{ds}|_{t=1}$ , then we calculate as follows.

• If a path is a *regular* path, i.e.,  $\vec{r}'(t) \neq 0 \forall t$ , then  $\frac{1}{\|\vec{r}'(t)\|} \langle \nabla f(\vec{r}(t_0)), \vec{r}'(t_0) \rangle$  is called the *directional derivative along the curve* and denoted as  $\frac{df}{ds}$  (the change in f per metre of the curve). For instance, if  $f(x, y) = x^2 - 3xy$  and the path is  $(t, t^2 - t + 2)$ , and we want to find  $\frac{df}{ds}|_{t=1}$ , then we calculate as follows.  $\nabla f = (f_x, f_y) = (2x - 3y, -3x)$  which at t = 1 is

• If a path is a *regular* path, i.e.,  $\vec{r}'(t) \neq 0 \forall t$ , then  $\frac{1}{\|\vec{r}'(t)\|} \langle \nabla f(\vec{r}(t_0)), \vec{r}'(t_0) \rangle$  is called the *directional derivative along the curve* and denoted as  $\frac{df}{ds}$  (the change in f per metre of the curve). For instance, if  $f(x, y) = x^2 - 3xy$  and the path is  $(t, t^2 - t + 2)$ , and we want to find  $\frac{df}{ds}|_{t=1}$ , then we calculate as follows.  $\nabla f = (f_x, f_y) = (2x - 3y, -3x)$  which at t = 1 is  $\nabla f(\vec{r}(1)) = (-4, -3)$  and
• If a path is a *regular* path, i.e.,  $\vec{r}'(t) \neq 0 \forall t$ , then  $\frac{1}{\|\vec{r}'(t)\|} \langle \nabla f(\vec{r}(t_0)), \vec{r}'(t_0) \rangle$  is called the *directional derivative along the curve* and denoted as  $\frac{df}{ds}$  (the change in f per metre of the curve). For instance, if  $f(x, y) = x^2 - 3xy$  and the path is  $(t, t^2 - t + 2)$ , and we want to find  $\frac{df}{ds}|_{t=1}$ , then we calculate as follows.  $\nabla f = (f_x, f_y) = (2x - 3y, -3x)$  which at t = 1 is  $\nabla f(\vec{r}(1)) = (-4, -3)$  and  $\vec{r}'(t) = (1, 2t - 1)$  which leads to  $\vec{r}'(1) = (1, 1)$ . Thus

• If a path is a *regular* path, i.e.,  $\vec{r}'(t) \neq 0 \forall t$ , then  $\frac{1}{\|\vec{r}'(t)\|} \langle \nabla f(\vec{r}(t_0)), \vec{r}'(t_0) \rangle \text{ is called the$ *directional derivative* $}$  *along the curve* and denoted as  $\frac{df}{ds}$  (the change in f per metre of the curve). For instance, if  $f(x, y) = x^2 - 3xy$  and the path is  $(t, t^2 - t + 2)$ , and we want to find  $\frac{df}{ds}|_{t=1}$ , then we calculate as follows.  $\nabla f = (f_x, f_y) = (2x - 3y, -3x)$  which at t = 1 is  $\nabla f(\vec{r}(1)) = (-4, -3)$  and  $\vec{r}'(t) = (1, 2t - 1)$  which leads to  $\vec{r}'(1) = (1, 1)$ . Thus  $\frac{df}{ds}|_{t=1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \langle \nabla f, \vec{r}'(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (-4, -3) \cdot (1, 1) = \frac{-7}{\sqrt{2}}$ .

• If a path is a *regular* path, i.e.,  $\vec{r}'(t) \neq 0 \forall t$ , then  $\frac{1}{\|\vec{r}'(t)\|}\langle \nabla f(\vec{r}(t_0)), \vec{r}'(t_0) \rangle$  is called the *directional derivative* along the curve and denoted as  $\frac{df}{ds}$  (the change in f per metre of the curve). For instance, if  $f(x, y) = x^2 - 3xy$  and the path is  $(t, t^2 - t + 2)$ , and we want to find  $\frac{df}{dc}|_{t=1}$ , then we calculate as follows.  $\nabla f = (f_x, f_y) = (2x - 3y, -3x)$  which at t = 1 is  $\nabla f(\vec{r}(1)) = (-4, -3)$  and  $\vec{r}'(t) = (1, 2t - 1)$  which leads to  $\vec{r}'(1) = (1, 1)$ . Thus  $\frac{df}{ds}|_{t=1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \langle \nabla f, \vec{r}'(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (-4, -3) \cdot (1, 1) = \frac{-7}{\sqrt{2}}.$ • Suppose  $f(x, y) = x^2 - y^2$  and  $\vec{r_1}(t) = (t, 2t)$  and  $\vec{r}_2(t) = (2t, 4t).$ 

• If a path is a *regular* path, i.e.,  $\vec{r}'(t) \neq 0 \forall t$ , then  $\frac{1}{\|\vec{r}'(t)\|}\langle \nabla f(\vec{r}(t_0)), \vec{r}'(t_0) \rangle$  is called the *directional derivative* along the curve and denoted as  $\frac{df}{ds}$  (the change in f per metre of the curve). For instance, if  $f(x, y) = x^2 - 3xy$  and the path is  $(t, t^2 - t + 2)$ , and we want to find  $\frac{df}{dc}|_{t=1}$ , then we calculate as follows.  $\nabla f = (f_x, f_y) = (2x - 3y, -3x)$  which at t = 1 is  $\nabla f(\vec{r}(1)) = (-4, -3)$  and  $\vec{r}'(t) = (1, 2t - 1)$  which leads to  $\vec{r}'(1) = (1, 1)$ . Thus  $\frac{df}{ds}|_{t=1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \langle \nabla f, \vec{r}'(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (-4, -3) \cdot (1, 1) = \frac{-7}{\sqrt{2}}.$ • Suppose  $f(x, y) = x^2 - y^2$  and  $\vec{r_1}(t) = (t, 2t)$  and  $\vec{r}_2(t) = (2t, 4t)$ . Then  $\nabla f = (2x, -2y)$  and  $\vec{r}_1 = (1, 2)$ ,  $\vec{r}_2 = (2, 4).$ 

• If a path is a *regular* path, i.e.,  $\vec{r}'(t) \neq 0 \forall t$ , then  $\frac{1}{\|\vec{r}'(t)\|}\langle \nabla f(\vec{r}(t_0)), \vec{r}'(t_0) \rangle$  is called the *directional derivative* along the curve and denoted as  $\frac{df}{ds}$  (the change in f per metre of the curve). For instance, if  $f(x, y) = x^2 - 3xy$  and the path is  $(t, t^2 - t + 2)$ , and we want to find  $\frac{df}{dc}|_{t=1}$ , then we calculate as follows.  $\nabla f = (f_x, f_y) = (2x - 3y, -3x)$  which at t = 1 is  $\nabla f(\vec{r}(1)) = (-4, -3)$  and  $\vec{r}'(t) = (1, 2t - 1)$  which leads to  $\vec{r}'(1) = (1, 1)$ . Thus  $\frac{df}{ds}|_{t=1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \langle \nabla f, \vec{r}'(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (-4, -3) \cdot (1, 1) = \frac{-7}{\sqrt{2}}.$ • Suppose  $f(x, y) = x^2 - y^2$  and  $\vec{r_1}(t) = (t, 2t)$  and  $\vec{r}_2(t) = (2t, 4t)$ . Then  $\nabla f = (2x, -2y)$  and  $\vec{r}_1' = (1, 2)$ ,  $\vec{r}_2 = (2, 4)$ . Thus  $\frac{df(x_1(t), y_2(t))}{dt} = -6t$  and  $\frac{df(x_1(t), y_2(t))}{dt} = -24t$ 

• If a path is a *regular* path, i.e.,  $\vec{r}'(t) \neq 0 \forall t$ , then  $\frac{1}{\|\vec{r}'(t)\|}\langle \nabla f(\vec{r}(t_0)), \vec{r}'(t_0) \rangle$  is called the *directional derivative* along the curve and denoted as  $\frac{df}{ds}$  (the change in f per metre of the curve). For instance, if  $f(x, y) = x^2 - 3xy$  and the path is  $(t, t^2 - t + 2)$ , and we want to find  $\frac{df}{dc}|_{t=1}$ , then we calculate as follows.  $\nabla f = (f_x, f_y) = (2x - 3y, -3x)$  which at t = 1 is  $\nabla f(\vec{r}(1)) = (-4, -3)$  and  $\vec{r}'(t) = (1, 2t - 1)$  which leads to  $\vec{r}'(1) = (1, 1)$ . Thus  $\frac{df}{ds}|_{t=1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \langle \nabla f, \vec{r}'(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (-4, -3) \cdot (1, 1) = \frac{-7}{\sqrt{2}}.$ • Suppose  $f(x, y) = x^2 - y^2$  and  $\vec{r_1}(t) = (t, 2t)$  and  $\vec{r}_2(t) = (2t, 4t)$ . Then  $\nabla f = (2x, -2y)$  and  $\vec{r}_1' = (1, 2)$ ,  $\vec{r}_2 = (2, 4)$ . Thus  $\frac{df(x_1(t), y_2(t))}{dt} = -6t$  and  $\frac{df(x_1(t),y_2(t))}{dt} = -24t$ . In other words,

• If a path is a *regular* path, i.e.,  $\vec{r}'(t) \neq 0 \forall t$ , then  $\frac{1}{\|\vec{r}'(t)\|}\langle \nabla f(\vec{r}(t_0)), \vec{r}'(t_0) \rangle$  is called the *directional derivative* along the curve and denoted as  $\frac{df}{ds}$  (the change in f per metre of the curve). For instance, if  $f(x, y) = x^2 - 3xy$  and the path is  $(t, t^2 - t + 2)$ , and we want to find  $\frac{df}{dc}|_{t=1}$ , then we calculate as follows.  $\nabla f = (f_x, f_y) = (2x - 3y, -3x)$  which at t = 1 is  $\nabla f(\vec{r}(1)) = (-4, -3)$  and  $\vec{r}'(t) = (1, 2t - 1)$  which leads to  $\vec{r}'(1) = (1, 1)$ . Thus  $\frac{df}{ds}|_{t=1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \langle \nabla f, \vec{r}'(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (-4, -3) \cdot (1, 1) = \frac{-7}{\sqrt{2}}.$ • Suppose  $f(x, y) = x^2 - y^2$  and  $\vec{r_1}(t) = (t, 2t)$  and  $\vec{r}_2(t) = (2t, 4t)$ . Then  $\nabla f = (2x, -2y)$  and  $\vec{r}_1' = (1, 2)$ ,  $\vec{r}_2 = (2, 4)$ . Thus  $\frac{df(x_1(t), y_2(t))}{dt} = -6t$  and  $\frac{df(x_1(t),y_2(t))}{dt} = -24t$ . In other words, the choice of parameterisation

• If a path is a *regular* path, i.e.,  $\vec{r}'(t) \neq 0 \forall t$ , then  $\frac{1}{\|\vec{r}'(t)\|}\langle \nabla f(\vec{r}(t_0)), \vec{r}'(t_0) \rangle$  is called the *directional derivative* along the curve and denoted as  $\frac{df}{ds}$  (the change in f per metre of the curve). For instance, if  $f(x, y) = x^2 - 3xy$  and the path is  $(t, t^2 - t + 2)$ , and we want to find  $\frac{df}{dc}|_{t=1}$ , then we calculate as follows.  $\nabla f = (f_x, f_y) = (2x - 3y, -3x)$  which at t = 1 is  $\nabla f(\vec{r}(1)) = (-4, -3)$  and  $\vec{r}'(t) = (1, 2t - 1)$  which leads to  $\vec{r}'(1) = (1, 1)$ . Thus  $\frac{df}{ds}|_{t=1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \langle \nabla f, \vec{r}'(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (-4, -3) \cdot (1, 1) = \frac{-7}{\sqrt{2}}.$ • Suppose  $f(x, y) = x^2 - y^2$  and  $\vec{r_1}(t) = (t, 2t)$  and  $\vec{r}_2(t) = (2t, 4t)$ . Then  $\nabla f = (2x, -2y)$  and  $\vec{r}_1' = (1, 2)$ ,  $\vec{r}_2 = (2, 4)$ . Thus  $\frac{df(x_1(t), y_2(t))}{dt} = -6t$  and  $\frac{df(x_1(t),y_2(t))}{dt} = -24t$ . In other words, the choice of parameterisation can *affect* the result. (

• If a path is a *regular* path, i.e.,  $\vec{r}'(t) \neq 0 \forall t$ , then  $\frac{1}{\|\vec{r}'(t)\|}\langle \nabla f(\vec{r}(t_0)), \vec{r}'(t_0) \rangle$  is called the *directional derivative* along the curve and denoted as  $\frac{df}{ds}$  (the change in f per metre of the curve). For instance, if  $f(x, y) = x^2 - 3xy$  and the path is  $(t, t^2 - t + 2)$ , and we want to find  $\frac{df}{dc}|_{t=1}$ , then we calculate as follows.  $\nabla f = (f_x, f_y) = (2x - 3y, -3x)$  which at t = 1 is  $\nabla f(\vec{r}(1)) = (-4, -3)$  and  $\vec{r}'(t) = (1, 2t - 1)$  which leads to  $\vec{r}'(1) = (1, 1)$ . Thus  $\frac{df}{ds}|_{t=1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \langle \nabla f, \vec{r}'(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (-4, -3) \cdot (1, 1) = \frac{-7}{\sqrt{2}}.$ • Suppose  $f(x, y) = x^2 - y^2$  and  $\vec{r_1}(t) = (t, 2t)$  and  $\vec{r}_2(t) = (2t, 4t)$ . Then  $\nabla f = (2x, -2y)$  and  $\vec{r}_1' = (1, 2)$ ,  $\vec{r}_2 = (2, 4)$ . Thus  $\frac{df(x_1(t), y_2(t))}{dt} = -6t$  and  $\frac{df(x_1(t),y_2(t))}{dt} = -24t$ . In other words, the choice of parameterisation can affect the result. (Warning: At a point say (1, 2), for  $\vec{r_1}$ , t = 1 and for  $\vec{r_2}$ ,  $t = \frac{1}{2}$ . Thus the derivatives of f are -6, -12 respectively. On the other hand,  $\frac{df}{ds}$  is the same for both paths Vamsi Pritham Pingali Lecture 27 7/9

≣ ⊁

æ

#### • Let $f: \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ be a

∃ → ∢

æ

### • Let $f: \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ be a differentiable scalar field



• Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$  be a differentiable scalar field such that  $\nabla f \neq \vec{0}$  anywhere.

• Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$  be a differentiable scalar field such that  $\nabla f \neq \vec{0}$  anywhere. Let  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  a constant

• Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$  be a differentiable scalar field such that  $\nabla f \neq \vec{0}$  anywhere. Let  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  a constant such that f(x, y) = c describes

• Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$  be a differentiable scalar field such that  $\nabla f \neq \vec{0}$  anywhere. Let  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  a constant such that f(x, y) = c describes a differentiable curve C having a

• Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$  be a differentiable scalar field such that  $\nabla f \neq \vec{0}$  anywhere. Let  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  a constant such that f(x, y) = c describes a differentiable curve C having a well-defined unit tangent vector

 Let f : ℝ<sup>2</sup> → ℝ be a differentiable scalar field such that ∇f ≠ 0 anywhere. Let c ∈ ℝ a constant such that f(x, y) = c describes a differentiable curve C having a well-defined unit tangent vector at each point.  Let f : ℝ<sup>2</sup> → ℝ be a differentiable scalar field such that ∇f ≠ 0 anywhere. Let c ∈ ℝ a constant such that f(x, y) = c describes a differentiable curve C having a well-defined unit tangent vector at each point. Prove that the following hold.

- Let f : ℝ<sup>2</sup> → ℝ be a differentiable scalar field such that ∇f ≠ 0 anywhere. Let c ∈ ℝ a constant such that f(x, y) = c describes a differentiable curve C having a well-defined unit tangent vector at each point. Prove that the following hold.
- The gradient vector  $\nabla f$

- Let f : ℝ<sup>2</sup> → ℝ be a differentiable scalar field such that
  ∇f ≠ 0 anywhere. Let c ∈ ℝ a constant such that f(x, y) = c describes a differentiable curve C having a well-defined unit tangent vector at each point. Prove that the following hold.
- The gradient vector  $\nabla f$  is *normal* to *C*.

- Let f : ℝ<sup>2</sup> → ℝ be a differentiable scalar field such that ∇f ≠ 0 anywhere. Let c ∈ ℝ a constant such that f(x, y) = c describes a differentiable curve C having a well-defined unit tangent vector at each point. Prove that the following hold.
- The gradient vector  $\nabla f$  is *normal* to *C*.
- The directional derivative  $\frac{df}{ds}$  along C

- Let f : ℝ<sup>2</sup> → ℝ be a differentiable scalar field such that ∇f ≠ 0 anywhere. Let c ∈ ℝ a constant such that f(x, y) = c describes a differentiable curve C having a well-defined unit tangent vector at each point. Prove that the following hold.
- The gradient vector  $\nabla f$  is *normal* to *C*.
- The directional derivative  $\frac{df}{ds}$  along C is 0.

- Let f : ℝ<sup>2</sup> → ℝ be a differentiable scalar field such that ∇f ≠ 0 anywhere. Let c ∈ ℝ a constant such that f(x, y) = c describes a differentiable curve C having a well-defined unit tangent vector at each point. Prove that the following hold.
- The gradient vector  $\nabla f$  is *normal* to *C*.
- The directional derivative  $\frac{df}{ds}$  along C is 0.
- The directional derivative of f

- Let f : ℝ<sup>2</sup> → ℝ be a differentiable scalar field such that ∇f ≠ 0 anywhere. Let c ∈ ℝ a constant such that f(x, y) = c describes a differentiable curve C having a well-defined unit tangent vector at each point. Prove that the following hold.
- The gradient vector  $\nabla f$  is *normal* to *C*.
- The directional derivative  $\frac{df}{ds}$  along C is 0.
- The directional derivative of f at any point on C

- Let f : ℝ<sup>2</sup> → ℝ be a differentiable scalar field such that ∇f ≠ 0 anywhere. Let c ∈ ℝ a constant such that f(x, y) = c describes a differentiable curve C having a well-defined unit tangent vector at each point. Prove that the following hold.
- The gradient vector  $\nabla f$  is *normal* to *C*.
- The directional derivative  $\frac{df}{ds}$  along C is 0.
- The directional derivative of *f* at any point on *C* is highest in the

- Let f : ℝ<sup>2</sup> → ℝ be a differentiable scalar field such that ∇f ≠ 0 anywhere. Let c ∈ ℝ a constant such that f(x, y) = c describes a differentiable curve C having a well-defined unit tangent vector at each point. Prove that the following hold.
- The gradient vector  $\nabla f$  is *normal* to *C*.
- The directional derivative  $\frac{df}{ds}$  along C is 0.
- The directional derivative of f at any point on C is highest in the normal direction to C.

≣ ⊁

æ



• Let  $\vec{v}$  be

≣ ⊁

æ

• Let  $\vec{v}$  be the unit tangent vector

• Let  $\vec{v}$  be the unit tangent vector at a point  $(x_0, y_0)$  on C,

э

• Let  $\vec{v}$  be the unit tangent vector at a point  $(x_0, y_0)$  on C, i.e.,  $f(x_0, y_0) = c$ .

∃ ► < ∃ ►</p>

- Let  $\vec{v}$  be the unit tangent vector at a point  $(x_0, y_0)$  on C, i.e.,  $f(x_0, y_0) = c$ .
- By the assumption of

- Let  $\vec{v}$  be the unit tangent vector at a point  $(x_0, y_0)$  on C, i.e.,  $f(x_0, y_0) = c$ .
- By the assumption of a well-defined unit tangent

- Let  $\vec{v}$  be the unit tangent vector at a point  $(x_0, y_0)$  on C, i.e.,  $f(x_0, y_0) = c$ .
- By the assumption of a well-defined unit tangent , the curve C can be parameterised

- Let  $\vec{v}$  be the unit tangent vector at a point  $(x_0, y_0)$  on C, i.e.,  $f(x_0, y_0) = c$ .
- By the assumption of a well-defined unit tangent , the curve C can be parameterised as  $\vec{r}(t) = (x(t), y(t))$  where
- Let  $\vec{v}$  be the unit tangent vector at a point  $(x_0, y_0)$  on C, i.e.,  $f(x_0, y_0) = c$ .
- By the assumption of a well-defined unit tangent, the curve C can be parameterised as r(t) = (x(t), y(t)) where the tangent vector at (x<sub>0</sub>, y<sub>0</sub>) = (x(0), y(0)) is

- Let  $\vec{v}$  be the unit tangent vector at a point  $(x_0, y_0)$  on C, i.e.,  $f(x_0, y_0) = c$ .
- By the assumption of a well-defined unit tangent, the curve C can be parameterised as r(t) = (x(t), y(t)) where the tangent vector at (x<sub>0</sub>, y<sub>0</sub>) = (x(0), y(0)) is v, i.e., (x'(t), y'(t)) = v.

- Let  $\vec{v}$  be the unit tangent vector at a point  $(x_0, y_0)$  on C, i.e.,  $f(x_0, y_0) = c$ .
- By the assumption of a well-defined unit tangent, the curve C can be parameterised as r(t) = (x(t), y(t)) where the tangent vector at (x<sub>0</sub>, y<sub>0</sub>) = (x(0), y(0)) is v, i.e., (x'(t), y'(t)) = v. Thus df/ds at t = 0, i.e.,

- Let  $\vec{v}$  be the unit tangent vector at a point  $(x_0, y_0)$  on C, i.e.,  $f(x_0, y_0) = c$ .
- By the assumption of a well-defined unit tangent, the curve C can be parameterised as r(t) = (x(t), y(t)) where the tangent vector at (x<sub>0</sub>, y<sub>0</sub>) = (x(0), y(0)) is v, i.e., (x'(t), y'(t)) = v. Thus df/ds at t = 0, i.e., at (x<sub>0</sub>, y<sub>0</sub>) is

- Let  $\vec{v}$  be the unit tangent vector at a point  $(x_0, y_0)$  on C, i.e.,  $f(x_0, y_0) = c$ .
- By the assumption of a well-defined unit tangent, the curve C can be parameterised as r(t) = (x(t), y(t)) where the tangent vector at (x<sub>0</sub>, y<sub>0</sub>) = (x(0), y(0)) is v, i.e., (x'(t), y'(t)) = v. Thus df/ds at t = 0, i.e., at (x<sub>0</sub>, y<sub>0</sub>) is df(x(t),y(t))/dt = 0 because

- Let  $\vec{v}$  be the unit tangent vector at a point  $(x_0, y_0)$  on C, i.e.,  $f(x_0, y_0) = c$ .
- By the assumption of a well-defined unit tangent , the curve C can be parameterised as  $\vec{r}(t) = (x(t), y(t))$  where the tangent vector at  $(x_0, y_0) = (x(0), y(0))$  is  $\vec{v}$ , i.e.,  $(x'(t), y'(t)) = \vec{v}$ . Thus  $\frac{df}{ds}$  at t = 0, i.e., at  $(x_0, y_0)$  is  $\frac{df(x(t), y(t))}{dt} = 0$  because f(x(t), y(t)) = c for all t.

- Let  $\vec{v}$  be the unit tangent vector at a point  $(x_0, y_0)$  on C, i.e.,  $f(x_0, y_0) = c$ .
- By the assumption of a well-defined unit tangent , the curve C can be parameterised as  $\vec{r}(t) = (x(t), y(t))$  where the tangent vector at  $(x_0, y_0) = (x(0), y(0))$  is  $\vec{v}$ , i.e.,  $(x'(t), y'(t)) = \vec{v}$ . Thus  $\frac{df}{ds}$  at t = 0, i.e., at  $(x_0, y_0)$  is  $\frac{df(x(t), y(t))}{dt} = 0$  because f(x(t), y(t)) = c for all t. This proves the

- Let  $\vec{v}$  be the unit tangent vector at a point  $(x_0, y_0)$  on C, i.e.,  $f(x_0, y_0) = c$ .
- By the assumption of a well-defined unit tangent , the curve C can be parameterised as  $\vec{r}(t) = (x(t), y(t))$  where the tangent vector at  $(x_0, y_0) = (x(0), y(0))$  is  $\vec{v}$ , i.e.,  $(x'(t), y'(t)) = \vec{v}$ . Thus  $\frac{df}{ds}$  at t = 0, i.e., at  $(x_0, y_0)$  is  $\frac{df(x(t), y(t))}{dt} = 0$  because f(x(t), y(t)) = c for all t. This proves the second part.

9/9

- Let  $\vec{v}$  be the unit tangent vector at a point  $(x_0, y_0)$  on C, i.e.,  $f(x_0, y_0) = c$ .
- By the assumption of a well-defined unit tangent, the curve C can be parameterised as r(t) = (x(t), y(t)) where the tangent vector at (x<sub>0</sub>, y<sub>0</sub>) = (x(0), y(0)) is v, i.e., (x'(t), y'(t)) = v. Thus df/ds at t = 0, i.e., at (x<sub>0</sub>, y<sub>0</sub>) is df(x(t),y(t))/dt = 0 because f(x(t), y(t)) = c for all t. This proves the second part.
- Moreover,

- Let  $\vec{v}$  be the unit tangent vector at a point  $(x_0, y_0)$  on C, i.e.,  $f(x_0, y_0) = c$ .
- By the assumption of a well-defined unit tangent , the curve C can be parameterised as r(t) = (x(t), y(t)) where the tangent vector at (x<sub>0</sub>, y<sub>0</sub>) = (x(0), y(0)) is v, i.e., (x'(t), y'(t)) = v. Thus df/ds at t = 0, i.e., at (x<sub>0</sub>, y<sub>0</sub>) is df(x(t),y(t))/dt = 0 because f(x(t), y(t)) = c for all t. This proves the second part.
  Moreover, df(x(t),y(t))/dt = (∇f, v) = 0 and hence

- Let  $\vec{v}$  be the unit tangent vector at a point  $(x_0, y_0)$  on C, i.e.,  $f(x_0, y_0) = c$ .
- By the assumption of a well-defined unit tangent , the curve C can be parameterised as  $\vec{r}(t) = (x(t), y(t))$  where the tangent vector at  $(x_0, y_0) = (x(0), y(0))$  is  $\vec{v}$ , i.e.,  $(x'(t), y'(t)) = \vec{v}$ . Thus  $\frac{df}{ds}$  at t = 0, i.e., at  $(x_0, y_0)$  is  $\frac{df(x(t), y(t))}{dt} = 0$  because f(x(t), y(t)) = c for all t. This proves the second part.
- Moreover,  $\frac{df(x(t),y(t))}{dt} = \langle \nabla f, \vec{v} \rangle = 0$  and hence  $\nabla f(x_0, y_0)$  is perpendicular to the tangent, i.e.,

- Let  $\vec{v}$  be the unit tangent vector at a point  $(x_0, y_0)$  on C, i.e.,  $f(x_0, y_0) = c$ .
- By the assumption of a well-defined unit tangent , the curve C can be parameterised as  $\vec{r}(t) = (x(t), y(t))$  where the tangent vector at  $(x_0, y_0) = (x(0), y(0))$  is  $\vec{v}$ , i.e.,  $(x'(t), y'(t)) = \vec{v}$ . Thus  $\frac{df}{ds}$  at t = 0, i.e., at  $(x_0, y_0)$  is  $\frac{df(x(t), y(t))}{dt} = 0$  because f(x(t), y(t)) = c for all t. This proves the second part.
- Moreover,  $\frac{df(x(t),y(t))}{dt} = \langle \nabla f, \vec{v} \rangle = 0$  and hence  $\nabla f(x_0, y_0)$  is perpendicular to the tangent, i.e., it is normal to C.

- Let  $\vec{v}$  be the unit tangent vector at a point  $(x_0, y_0)$  on C, i.e.,  $f(x_0, y_0) = c$ .
- By the assumption of a well-defined unit tangent, the curve C can be parameterised as r(t) = (x(t), y(t)) where the tangent vector at (x<sub>0</sub>, y<sub>0</sub>) = (x(0), y(0)) is v, i.e., (x'(t), y'(t)) = v. Thus df/ds at t = 0, i.e., at (x<sub>0</sub>, y<sub>0</sub>) is df(x(t),y(t))/dt = 0 because f(x(t), y(t)) = c for all t. This proves the second part.
- Moreover,  $\frac{df(x(t),y(t))}{dt} = \langle \nabla f, \vec{v} \rangle = 0$  and hence  $\nabla f(x_0, y_0)$  is perpendicular to the tangent, i.e., it is normal to C.
- Lastly, by Cauchy-Schwarz,

- Let  $\vec{v}$  be the unit tangent vector at a point  $(x_0, y_0)$  on C, i.e.,  $f(x_0, y_0) = c$ .
- By the assumption of a well-defined unit tangent, the curve C can be parameterised as r(t) = (x(t), y(t)) where the tangent vector at (x<sub>0</sub>, y<sub>0</sub>) = (x(0), y(0)) is v, i.e., (x'(t), y'(t)) = v. Thus df/ds at t = 0, i.e., at (x<sub>0</sub>, y<sub>0</sub>) is df(x(t),y(t))/dt = 0 because f(x(t), y(t)) = c for all t. This proves the second part.
- Moreover,  $\frac{df(x(t),y(t))}{dt} = \langle \nabla f, \vec{v} \rangle = 0$  and hence  $\nabla f(x_0, y_0)$  is perpendicular to the tangent, i.e., it is normal to *C*.
- Lastly, by Cauchy-Schwarz, the directional derivative at (x<sub>0</sub>, y<sub>0</sub>) is highest

- Let  $\vec{v}$  be the unit tangent vector at a point  $(x_0, y_0)$  on C, i.e.,  $f(x_0, y_0) = c$ .
- By the assumption of a well-defined unit tangent, the curve C can be parameterised as r(t) = (x(t), y(t)) where the tangent vector at (x<sub>0</sub>, y<sub>0</sub>) = (x(0), y(0)) is v, i.e., (x'(t), y'(t)) = v. Thus df/ds at t = 0, i.e., at (x<sub>0</sub>, y<sub>0</sub>) is df(x(t),y(t))/dt = 0 because f(x(t), y(t)) = c for all t. This proves the second part.
- Moreover,  $\frac{df(x(t),y(t))}{dt} = \langle \nabla f, \vec{v} \rangle = 0$  and hence  $\nabla f(x_0, y_0)$  is perpendicular to the tangent, i.e., it is normal to *C*.
- Lastly, by Cauchy-Schwarz, the directional derivative at (x<sub>0</sub>, y<sub>0</sub>) is highest along ∇f(x<sub>0</sub>, y<sub>0</sub>) which

- Let  $\vec{v}$  be the unit tangent vector at a point  $(x_0, y_0)$  on C, i.e.,  $f(x_0, y_0) = c$ .
- By the assumption of a well-defined unit tangent , the curve C can be parameterised as  $\vec{r}(t) = (x(t), y(t))$  where the tangent vector at  $(x_0, y_0) = (x(0), y(0))$  is  $\vec{v}$ , i.e.,  $(x'(t), y'(t)) = \vec{v}$ . Thus  $\frac{df}{ds}$  at t = 0, i.e., at  $(x_0, y_0)$  is  $\frac{df(x(t), y(t))}{dt} = 0$  because f(x(t), y(t)) = c for all t. This proves the second part.
- Moreover,  $\frac{df(x(t),y(t))}{dt} = \langle \nabla f, \vec{v} \rangle = 0$  and hence  $\nabla f(x_0, y_0)$  is perpendicular to the tangent, i.e., it is normal to *C*.
- Lastly, by Cauchy-Schwarz, the directional derivative at (x<sub>0</sub>, y<sub>0</sub>) is highest along ∇f(x<sub>0</sub>, y<sub>0</sub>) which we just proved is normal to C.