## 33. SOLVING LINEAR INEQUALITIES IN ONE VARIABLE

*linear inequalities* The only difference between a linear *equation* in one variable and a linear *in*in one variable equality in one variable is the verb: instead of an '=' sign, there is an inequality symbol  $(\langle , \rangle, \leq, \text{ or } \geq)$ . One new idea is needed to solve linear inequalities: if you multiply or divide by a negative number, then the direction of the inequality symbol must be changed. This idea is explored in the current section. We begin with a definition: DEFINITION A linear inequality in one variable is a sentence of the form *linear inequality* ax + b < 0,  $a \neq 0$ .  $in \ one \ variable$ The inequality symbol can be any of the following:  $\langle , \rangle, \leq, \text{ or } \geq$ . EXERCISES What does the restriction  $a \neq 0$  tell you in this definition? 1. Decide if each sentence is a linear inequality in one variable. If not, give a 2. reason why. (a)  $2x - 5 \le 0$ (b)  $1+2x > 6x + \frac{1}{2}$ (c)  $x^2 - x \ge 3$ (d) 0.4t - 7 < 2t(e)  $\frac{1}{t} + t \ge 0$ (f)  $5.4(x - \frac{1}{3}) \le x - 0.2(1 + 8x)$ (g) 3x < 2y + 1

Here is a precise statement of the tools for solving inequalities. Try translating them yourself, before reading the discussion that follows. Think: "What do these *facts* tell me that I can do?"

THEOREM	For all real numbers $a, b$ , and $c$ ,	
tools for solving inequalities	$a < b \iff a + c < b + c$ .	
	If $c > 0$ , then $a < b \iff ac < bc$ .	
	If $c < 0$ , then $a < b \iff ac > bc$ .	
	The inequality symbol may be $<, >, \le$ , or $\ge$ , with appropriate changes made to the equivalence statements.	

The first sentence, ' $a < b \iff a + c < b + c$ ', holds for all real numbers  $a, b, b \ll b$ translating the theorem: and c. This says that you can add (or subtract) the same number to (or from) both sides of an inequality, and it won't change the truth of the inequality. you can add (or subtract) Here's the idea: if a lies to the left of b on a number line, and both numbers the same number are translated by the same amount c, then a + c still lies to the left of b + c. to (or from) both sides of an inequality, b+caa + cand this won't change its truth EXERCISES 3. Numbers a and b are shown on the number line below. (You may assume that 1 unit is about  $\frac{1}{4}$  inch.) ba(a) Write an inequality that is true for a and b. (b) Clearly label the numbers a + 1 and b + 1 on the number line. Write an inequality that is true for a + 1 and b + 1. (c) Clearly label the numbers a - 1 and b - 1 on the number line. Write an inequality that is true for a - 1 and b - 1. translatingThe second sentence, ' $a < b \iff ac < bc$ ', only holds for c > 0. This the theorem: says that you can multiply (or divide) both sides of an inequality by the same positive number, and it won't change the truth of the inequality. you can multiply (or divide) Here's the idea. Think about the situation when c = 2. If a lies to the left of b both sides of on a number line, and we double both number's distance from 0, then 2a still an inequality lies to the left of 2b. by the same positive number, and this won't change 0 2a2bh its truth EXERCISES Numbers a and b are shown on the number line below. 4. 0 b a(a) Write an inequality that is true for a and b. (b) Clearly label the numbers  $\frac{1}{2}a$  and  $\frac{1}{2}b$  on the number line. Write an inequality that is true for  $\frac{1}{2}\tilde{a}$  and  $\frac{1}{2}\tilde{b}$ . (c) Clearly label the numbers 1.5a and 1.5b on the number line. Write an inequality that is true for 1.5a and 1.5b.

translating the theorem: if you multiply (or divide) both sides of an inequality by the same negative number, you must change the direction of the inequality symbol

It's the third sentence where something interesting is happening.

The third sentence, ' $a < b \iff ac > bc$ ', holds for c < 0. Notice the '<' symbol in the sentence 'a < b', but the '>' symbol in the sentence 'ac > bc'. This says that if you multiply (or divide) both sides of an inequality by the same *negative* number, then the direction of the inequality symbol must be changed in order to preserve the truth of the inequality.

Let's look at two examples, to begin to understand this situation.

The sentence '1 < 2' is true. Multiplying both sides by -1 and changing the direction of the inequality gives the new sentence '-1 > -2', which is still true. The number 1 lies to the left of 2, and the opposite of 1 lies to the right of the opposite of 2. The process of 'taking the opposite' of two numbers changes their positions relative to each other on the number line.



Here's a second example. In the sketch below, 'a < b' is true, because a lies to the left of b. Multiplying both sides by -1 sends a to its opposite (-a) and sends b to its opposite (-b). Now, the opposite of a is to the right of the opposite of b. That is, -a > -b.



This simple idea is the reason why you must flip the inequality symbol when multiplying or dividing by a negative number.

EXERCISES	5.	Numbers $a$ and $b$ are shown on the number line below.				
			0		b	
		(a) Write an inequality that is true for	a and $b$	).		
		(b) Clearly label the numbers $-2a$ and an inequality that is true for $-2a$ a	d $-2b$ or and $-2b$	n the nu	umber line.	Write
		(c) Clearly label the numbers $-\frac{1}{2}a$ and an inequality that is true for $-\frac{1}{2}a$	d $-\frac{1}{2}b$ o and $-\frac{1}{2}b$	n the n	umber line.	Write

the theorem holds for other inequality symbols Although the theorem is stated using the inequality symbol ' < ', it also holds for all other inequality symbols.

Here's the statement using the ' $\geq$ ' symbol:

For all real numbers a, b and c,

 $a \ge b \iff a+c \ge b+c$ .

 $a \ge b \iff ac \ge bc$ .

If c > 0, then

If c < 0, then

	$a \ge b \iff ac \le bc$ .
6.	Give the statement of the theorem using the ' $\leq$ ' symbol.
7.	Let $a, b$ and $c$ be real numbers. What does the fact
	$a < b \iff a + c < b + c$
	tell you that you can DO? Do not use any variable (like $c$ ) when giving
	vour answer.

8. Let a, b and c be real numbers, with c < 0. What does the fact  $a > b \iff ac < bc$ 

tell you that you can DO? Do not use any variable (like c) when giving your answer.

steps for solving a linear inequality

EXERCISES

The basic steps for solving a linear inequality in one variable are outlined next. They are identical to the thought process for solving linear equations, with the new idea of changing the direction of the inequality if you multiply or divide by a negative number.

- Simplify both sides of the inequality as much as possible. In particular, combine like terms.
- Get all the *x* terms on one side (usually the left side).
- Get all the constant terms on the other side (usually the right side).
- Get x all by itself, by multiplying or dividing by an appropriate number. Change the direction of the inequality if you multiply or divide by a negative number.

### EXAMPLE

solving a linear inequality

the solution set of

the solution set of

an inequality

an equation spot-checking

a spot-check

previous example

of the

versus

Solve: -3x + 1 < 4x - 5 + 2x. Shade the solution set on a number line.

-3x + 1 < 4x - 5 + 2x	(original inequality)
-3x + 1 < 6x - 5	(simplify)
-9x + 1 < -5	(subtract $6x$ from both sides)
-9x < -6	(subtract 1 from both sides)
$x > \frac{-6}{-9}$	(divide both sides by $-9$ ; change direction of inequality)
$x > \frac{2}{3}$	(simplify)

The solution set is shaded below:

Notice that there are an infinite number of solutions to a linear inequality in one variable, which is very different from the unique solution to a linear equation in one variable. Therefore, you certainly can't check every solution to a linear inequality!

However, there is a way to gain confidence in your answer and catch mistakes, called 'spot-checking'. Here's the general procedure, followed by a 'spot-check' of the previous example:

- Choose a simple number that makes the final inequality true. Substitute it into the original inequality, which should also be true.
- Choose a simple number that makes the final inequality false. Substitute it into the original inequality, which should also be false.

In the previous example, the inequality

-3x + 1 < 4x - 5 + 2x (the 'original' inequality)

was transformed to

 $x > \frac{2}{3}$  (the 'final' inequality).

Here's a 'spot-check' for this example:

• Choose a simple number that makes the final inequality ' $x > \frac{2}{3}$ ' true: choose, say, x = 1. Substitution into the original inequality gives:

$$-3(1) + 1 \stackrel{?}{<} 4(1) - 5 + 2(1)$$
  
-2 < 1 is true; it checks

• Choose a simple number that makes the final inequality ' $x > \frac{2}{3}$ ' false: choose, say, x = 0. Substitution into the original inequality gives:

$$-3(0) + 1 \stackrel{?}{<} 4(0) - 5 + 2(0)$$
  
1 < -5 is false; it checks

EXERCISE	<ul> <li>9. Do a spot-check for the senter from the one done above. T that makes 'x &gt; <sup>2</sup>/<sub>3</sub>' true, ar Then, choose a number (different substitute it into the original 10. Solve the inequality, show the check: 5 - 2x + x ≥ 4x - 1.</li> </ul>	nce ' $-3x + 1 < 4x - 5 + 2x$ ' that is different l'hat is, choose a number (different from 1) ad substitute it into the original inequality. Frent from 0) that makes ' $x > \frac{2}{3}$ ' false, and inequality. The solution set on a number line, and spot-	
solving inequalities involving fractions or decimals	If an inequality involves fractions or decimals, it is usually easiest to clear them in the first step, and then proceed as usual. The spot-check for the next example is left as an exercise.		
EXAMPLE	Solve: $\frac{1}{2}(1-5x) \leq \frac{2}{3}x+1$ . Shade the solution set on a number line. Spot-check		
a linear inequality	your answer.		
involving fractions	Solution: Note that 6 is the least co	mmon multiple of 2 and 3.	
	$\frac{1}{2}(1-5x) \le \frac{2}{3}x + 1$	(original inequality)	
	$6(\frac{1}{2}(1-5x)) \le 6(\frac{2}{3}x+1)$	(multiply both sides by 6)	
	$3(1-5x) \le 4x + 6$	(multiply out)	
	$3 - 15x \le 4x + 6$	(simplify)	
	$3 - 19x \le 6$	(subtract $4x$ from both sides)	
	$-19x \leq 3$	(subtract 3 from both sides)	
	$x \ge \frac{3}{-19}$	(divide both sides by $-19$ ; change direction of inequality)	
	$x \ge -\frac{3}{19}$	(simplify)	
	Here's the solution set:		
	-1	$-\frac{3}{19} 0$	
EXERCISE	11. Do a spot-check for the previo	ous example.	
	12. Solve the inequality: $\frac{1}{3}x - 5$ number line. Spot-check your	$> 3 - \frac{2}{5}(x-1)$ . Shade the solution set on a answer.	
	13. Solve the inequality: $0.1x - x$	5.3 < 1.04 + x. Shade the solution set on a	

number line. Spot-check your answer.

a common phrase: 'x is between a and b' A common situation that arises in mathematics is the need to talk about values of x between a and b:



In this case, two things are true: x is greater than a, and x is less than b.

There is a common shorthand to talk about the values of x between a and b, which is 'a < x < b'. The sentence 'a < x < b' is called a *compound inequality*: the word 'compound' means 'to combine so as to form a whole'. Indeed, the compound inequality 'a < x < b' is equivalent to two inequalities, put together with the mathematical word 'and':

DEFINITION	For all real numbers $a, x$ , and $b$ ,
the compound inequality 'a $< x < b$ '	$a < x < b \iff (a < x \text{ and } x < b).$
	Rewriting ' $a < x$ ' as ' $x > a$ ' gives the equivalent statement
	$a < x < b \iff (x > a \text{ and } x < b).$

`a < x < b' represents a whole family of sentences Recall that normal mathematical conventions dictate that letters near the beginning of the alphabet represent constants, and letters near the end of the alphabet represent real number variables. Thus, the single sentence 'a < x < b' represents an entire family of sentences, where x varies within the sentence; a and b are held constant within a given sentence, but vary from sentence to sentence. Here are some members of the family represented by 'a < x < b':

$$-1 < x < 3$$
  
$$\frac{1}{2} < x < \frac{2}{3}$$
  
$$-0.7 < x < \sqrt{2}$$

Here are other compound inequalities of the same type, with the values of x shaded that make them true (assuming that a < b):

other compound inequalities of the same type



When is a compound inequality true?

Be careful!

Don't put

the inequalities

in this direction!

In order for the mathematical sentence 'A and B' to be true, both A and B must be true. That is, an 'and' sentence is true only when both subsentences are true.

Thus, in order for 'a < x < b' to be true, both 'a < x' and 'x < b' must be true. This happens only when a is less than b.

Be careful about this! It is common for beginning students of mathematics to write down sentences of this type that are always false!

For example, ' 3 < x < 2 ' is a compound inequality that is false for all values of x :

 $3 < x < 2 \iff (x > 3 \text{ and } x < 2)$ 

There are no values of x that are greater than 3, and at the same time less than 2.

Similarly, you must avoid situations like this:

 $\begin{array}{rcl} 2 > x > 3 & \Longleftrightarrow & \left( 2 > x \ \text{and} \ x > 3 \right) \\ & \Leftrightarrow & \left( x < 2 \ \text{and} \ x > 3 \right) \end{array}$ 

There are no values of x that are simultaneously less than  $2\,,$  and greater than  $3\,.$ 

when working with a < x < b': make sure that a is less than b; only use the symbols  $a < and an \leq a$ 

But what about the sentence (3 > x > 2)?

Answer: It is very unconventional! Avoid it! When you work with sentences of the form 'a < x < b', you usually want them to be *true* for certain values of x. Thus, always make sure that a is less than b, and only use the inequality symbols '<' and ' $\leq$ '.

But what about the sentence 3 > x > 2?

 $3 > x > 2 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad (3 > x \text{ and } x > 2)$  $\Leftrightarrow \quad (x < 3 \text{ and } x > 2)$  $\Leftrightarrow \quad (x < 3 \text{ and } x > 2)$  $\Leftrightarrow \quad (x > 2 \text{ and } x < 3)$  $\Leftrightarrow \quad (2 < x \text{ and } x < 3)$  $\Leftrightarrow \quad 2 < x < 3$ 

As the sequence of equivalences shows, reading the sentence 3 > x > 2 from right-to-left instead of left-to-right gives the equivalent sentence 2 < x < 3, which is true for values of x between 2 and 3. However, it is very unconventional to write the sentence in the form 3 > x > 2. It will cause mathematicians to look at you with a squinted eye, thinking 'Why did you write it this way?' So—stick to the normal conventions, and write the sentence as 2 < x < 3.

Here's a situation that is even worse. NEVER write something like ' 2 < x > 3 ', mixing the directions is where the directions of the inequality symbols are mixed. even worse: Why not? Well, here's what this means: 2 < x > 3 $2 < x > 3 \iff (2 < x \text{ and } x > 3)$ Yuck!!  $\iff (x > 2 \text{ and } x > 3)$  $\iff x > 3$ The sentence 2 < x > 3 is equivalent to the simple inequality x > 3. There is absolutely no reason to write it in the more complicated way, and it would be extremely poor mathematical style to do so. EXERCISES 14. On a number line, shade the value(s) of x that make each inequality true. If the sentence is always false, so state.

If the sentence is written in an unconventional way, then shade the values of x that make it true, but also rewrite the sentence in the more conventional way. (a) -1 < x < 2(b)  $-1 \le x < 2$ (c)  $-1 \le x \le 2$ (d)  $-1 < x \le 2$ (e) -1 > x > 2(f) 2 > x > -1(g)  $2 \ge x > -1$ (h) 2 < x < -1EXERCISES Go to my homepage http://onemathematicalcat.org and navigate to my web practice Algebra I course, which has about 170 sequenced lessons. It can be used as a complete year-long high school course, or one semester in college. You're currently looking at the pdf version—you'll see that the HTML version has

# SOLUTION TO EXERCISES: SOLVING LINEAR INEQUALITIES IN ONE VARIABLE

- 1. A linear inequality in x must have an x term.
- 2. (a)  $2x 5 \le 0$  is a linear inequality in x; it is in standard form
- (b)  $1+2x > 6x + \frac{1}{2}$  is a linear inequality in x
- (c)  $x^2 x \ge 3$  is **not** a linear inequality in one variable; no  $x^2$  term is allowed

all totally free. Enjoy!

- (d) 0.4t 7 < 2t is a linear inequality in t
- (e)  $\frac{1}{t} + t \ge 0$  is **not** a linear inequality in one variable; no  $\frac{1}{t}$  term is allowed
- (f)  $5.4(x-\frac{1}{3}) \le x 0.2(1+8x)$  is a linear inequality in x
- (g) 3x < 2y + 1 is **not** a linear inequality in one variable; it uses two variables

unlimited, randomly-generated, online and offline practice in every section. It's



	$a \le b \iff a+c \le b+c$
If $c > 0$ , then	
	$a \le b \iff ac \le bc$ .
If $c < 0$ , then	
	$a \le b \iff ac \ge bc$ .

7. You can add (or subtract) the same number to (or from) both sides of an inequality, and this won't change the truth of the inequality.

8. If you multiply (or divide) both sides of an inequality by the same *negative* number, then you must change the direction of the inequality symbol in order to preserve the truth of the inequality.

9. Choose a simple number that makes ' $x > \frac{2}{3}$ ' true: choose, say, x = 2. Substitution into the original inequality gives:

$$-3(2) + 1 \stackrel{?}{<} 4(2) - 5 + 2(2)$$
  
-5 < 7 is true; it checks

Next, choose a simple number that makes '  $x > \frac{2}{3}$  ' false: choose, say, x = -1. Substitution into the original inequality gives:

$$-3(-1) + 1 \stackrel{?}{<} 4(-1) - 5 + 2(-1)$$
  
 $4 < -11$  is false; it checks

10.

$$5 - 2x + x \ge 4x - 1$$
 (original inequality)  

$$5 - x \ge 4x - 1$$
 (simplify)  

$$5 - 5x \ge -1$$
 (subtract 4x from both sides)  

$$-5x \ge -6$$
 (subtract 5 from both sides)  

$$x \le \frac{-6}{-5}$$
 (divide both sides by -5;  
change direction of inequality)  

$$x \le \frac{6}{5}$$
 (simplify)

 $1 \frac{6}{5}$ 

2

Here's the solution set:

Here's the spot-check: Choose x = 1:

$$5 - 2(1) + 1 \stackrel{?}{\geq} 4(1) - 1$$
  
$$4 \ge 3 \quad \text{is true; it checks}$$

 $\dot{0}$ 

Choose x = 2:

$$5 - 2(2) + 2 \stackrel{?}{\geq} 4(2) - 1$$
  
3 \ge 7 is false; it checks

11. original inequality:  $\frac{1}{2}(1-5x) \le \frac{2}{3}x+1$ final inequality:  $x \ge \frac{3}{-19}$ Choose x = 0:

$$\frac{1}{2}(1-5(0)) \stackrel{?}{\leq} \frac{2}{3}(0) + 1$$
  
$$\frac{1}{2} \leq 1 \text{ is true; it checks}$$

Choose x = -1:

$$\frac{1}{2}(1 - 5(-1)) \stackrel{?}{\leq} \frac{2}{3}(-1) + 1$$
  
3 \le \frac{1}{3} \text{ is false; it checks}

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{3}x - 5 > 3 - \frac{2}{5}(x - 1) & \text{(original inequality)} \\ &15(\frac{1}{3}x - 5) > 15(3 - \frac{2}{5}(x - 1)) & \text{(multiply both sides by 15)} \\ &5x - 75 > 45 - 6(x - 1) & \text{(simplify)} \\ &5x - 75 > 45 - 6x + 6 & \text{(simplify)} \\ &5x - 75 > 51 - 6x & \text{(simplify)} \\ &11x - 75 > 51 & \text{(add } 6x \text{ to both sides)} \\ &11x > 126 & \text{(add } 75 \text{ to both sides)} \\ &x > \frac{126}{11} & \text{(divide both sides by 11)} \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\frac{126}{11}\approx 11.5\,.$  Here's the solution set:

$$\begin{array}{c|c} & & & \\ \hline 11 & \frac{126}{11} & 12 \end{array} >$$

Here's the spot-check:

Choose x = 12; use your calculator:

$$\frac{1}{3}(12) - 5 \stackrel{?}{>} 3 - \frac{2}{5}(12 - 1)$$
  
-1 > -1.4 is true; it checks

Choose x = 11; use your calculator:

$$\frac{1}{3}(11) - 5 \stackrel{?}{>} 3 - \frac{2}{5}(11 - 1)$$
  
-1.3 > -1 is false; it checks

13.

$$\begin{array}{ll} 0.1x-5.3 < 1.04 + x & ({\rm original inequality}) \\ 100(0.1x-5.3) < 100(1.04 + x) & ({\rm multiply both sides by 100}) \\ 10x-530 < 104 + 100x & ({\rm simplify}) \\ - 90x-530 < 104 & ({\rm subtract } 100x {\rm ~from both sides}) \\ - 90x < 634 & ({\rm add } 530 {\rm ~to both sides}) \\ x > \frac{634}{-90} & ({\rm divide ~both ~sides ~by -90}\,; \\ {\rm change ~direction~of~inequality}) \\ x > -\frac{317}{45} & ({\rm simplify}) \end{array}$$

Note that  $-\frac{317}{45} \approx -7.04$ . Here's the solution set:



Here's the spot-check: Choose x = -7; use your calculator:

$$0.1(-7) - 5.3 \stackrel{?}{<} 1.04 + (-7)$$
  
-6 < -5.96 is true; it checks

Choose x = -8; use your calculator:

$$0.1(-8) - 5.3 \stackrel{?}{<} 1.04 + (-8)$$
  
-6.1 < -6.96 is false; it checks



(h) 2 < x < -1: always false