## Appendix A - Analysis of Mike's formulation of RFI feedback

| \# Student | Feedback text | What is being refuted <br> (Claim) | Reconstructed refutation argument (Data, Warrant) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { F3.1 } \\ \text { Adrian } \end{gathered}$ | These are critical points, but what makes you think that the maximum and minimum values of this polynomial on [0,1] are achieved at these points? The points do not even depend on the interval! Do you mean that the maximum and minimum values on every interval [a,b] are the same? But this cannot be, because the polynomial is unbounded both above and below. | C: For every closed bounded interval $I$, if $f^{\prime}(x)$ has no roots then $f(x)$ does not obtain a maximum or minimum in $I$. | D: The cubic polynomial $f$ and its critical points. W: Let $I$ be an arbitrary closed bounded interval and suppose that the maximum and minimum of $f$ are achieved at the critical points of $f$, then $f$ is bounded by its values at its critical points. Since $I$ was arbitrary it follows that $f$ is bounded which is a contradiction because non-constant polynomials are unbounded. |
| F3.2 <br> Bailey | $f(x)=x$ does not have roots of the derivative (even among real numbers!) but it does achieve its maximum and minimum values on [0,1]. | C: For every polynomial $f$, if $f^{\prime}(x)$ has no roots then $f(x)$ does not obtain a maximum or minimum in $I$ | D: $f(x)=x$. <br> W: The derivative of $f$ has no roots, but $f$ does achieve a minimum or maximum in $[0,1]$, contradiction! |
| F3.3 <br> Charlie | Apparently you see some connection between the sign of $f^{\prime \prime}(0)$ and extremal values. Here is a counterexample to this connection: Consider your function on the closed interval [0,10]. It has no local maxima, its 2nd derivative is positive on $(0,10]$, and $f(0)=0$ is not a maximum, since, say $f(2)=5 / 3>0$. Thus, according to your logic, the function does not achieve a maximum value on [0,10]. | C: The maximum of $f$ in $I$ is necessarily achieved in points where the sign of $f^{\prime \prime}$, is not positive. | D: The polynomial f, its critical points, the sign of $f^{\prime \prime}$. <br> W: Suppose the maximum of $f$ in $I$ is necessarily achieved in points where the sign of $f$ ' is not positive. Consider $f$ on the closed interval [0,10]. The second derivative of $f$ in $(0,10]$ is positive and $f$ does not achieve its maximum in $[0,10]$ at 0 because $\mathrm{f}(2)>f(0)$. Thus, $f$ does not achieve a maximum in [0,10], in contradiction to EVT. |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { F3.4 } \\ \text { Dylan } \end{gathered}$ | Note that both values of $x$ [in which $\left.f^{\prime}(x)=0\right]$ are outside the interval [0,1]. Thus, according to your logic, the range of your function does not have the $L U B$ (nor $L L B$ ) even over the reals. Contradiction? | C: If $f$ is a real-valued polynomial then the maximum and minimum of $f(x)$ in $[0,1]$ are achieved at the critical points of $f(x)$. | D: The polynomial $f$, the interval $[0,1]$, the roots of $\mathrm{f}^{\prime}(\mathrm{x})$ are both outside of the interval $[0,1]$. <br> W: Applying the attributed warrant to $f(x)$ as a realvalued function implies that the real-valued $f(x)$ does not attain a maximum or minimum in $[0,1]$, in contradiction to EVT. |

