WORKING PAPER SERIES

WORKING PAPER NO 1, 2005



ESI

A Fixed Point Theorem for Monotone Functions equivalent to Browers theorem

by

Håkan Persson

http://www.oru.se/esi/wps

SE-701 82 Örebro SWEDEN

A Fixed Point Theorem for Monotone Functions equivalent to Browers theorem

Håkan Persson*

June 2003

Abstract

The main theorem of this paper states that if $f : R^m_+ \to R^m_+$ is increasing and continuous and the set $S = \{x \ge 0 : f(x) \le x\}$ is bounded and contains some x' > 0 then there is a non-zero fixed point of f. If in addition to this there is $x'' \in S$, x'' < x' there are multiple fixed points. The main theorem is equivalent to the Brouwer fixed point theorem.

Keywords: Increasing function, Fixed point

In this paper we study the existence of fixed points of continuous increasing functions defined on finite dimensional spaces. A function $f : A \rightarrow R^m$, where $A \subset R^m$, is increasing or monotone if for x' and x in A,

$$x' \ge x \Rightarrow f(x') \ge f(x). \tag{1}$$

The main result of this paper states that if $f : R^m_+ \to R^m_+$ is increasing and continuous and the set $S = \{x \ge 0 : f(x) \le x\}$ is bounded and contains some x' > 0 then there is a non-zero fixed point x of $f, x = f(x) \ne 0$.

The theorem was proved, using degree theory, and applied to economic models in [1]. However, in this paper the proof uses the Knaster-Koratowski-Mazurkiewicz lemma (KKM) (see e.g. [2]), which is equivalent to the Brouwer fixed point theorem. A corollary to the theorem is added in which we obtain the Brouwer fixed point theorem. Thus, our

^{*}I have benefitted from comments by Hans Keiding. The address of the author is Department of Economics, University of Örebro, S-701 82 Örebro, Sweden. hakan.persson@esi.oru.se

theorem is equivalent to Brouwer and this shows the "non-simplicity" of our theorem, and its possible use in other applications.

Furthermore, if there are x'' and x', both in *S* such that x'' < x', then there are at least two fixed points of *f*.

Theorem 1 Assume that $f : R^m_+ \to R^m_+$ is continuous and satisfies $x' \ge x \Rightarrow f(x') \ge f(x)$. Let $S = \{x \ge 0 : f(x) \le x\}$. If S is bounded, and if there is $x' > 0, x' \in S$, then there is $x \ge 0, x \ne 0$, such that x = f(x).

Proof: For each $x' \in S$, x' > 0, f takes $\{x \ge 0 : x \le x'\}$ to itself. Let $M = cl\{x \ge 0 : x' \in S, x' > 0, x \le x'\}$, then f takes M to M. To see this, assume that there is $x \in M$ such that $f(x) \in \sim M$ which implies that there is $\epsilon > 0$ such that $|f(x) - y| > \epsilon$ for all $y \in M$. For each $\delta > 0$ there is $x'' \in M$ such that $|x - x''| < \delta$, $x'' \le x'$, $x' \in M$ and thus $f(x'') \le f(x') \le x'$ and $f(x'') \in M$ which thus contradicts the continuity of f.

Let ∂M to be the boundary of M relative to R^m_+ and let $\Delta = \{x \in R^m_+ : \sum_i x_i = 1\}$ is the unit (m - 1)-simplex. For $x \in \Delta$ we have that there is $\alpha > 0$ such that $\alpha x \leq x'$ for some $x' \in S$. There is also $\bar{\alpha} = \max \alpha$ for $\alpha x \in M$ since M is compact. Furthermore, $\bar{\alpha}x \in \partial M$ and $\alpha x \notin \partial M$ for $\alpha \neq \bar{\alpha}$. Then the function $h : \Delta \to \partial M$

$$h(x) = \left\{ y \in \partial M : y\left(\sum_{i} y_{i}\right)^{-1} = x \right\}$$

is well defined.

h is also continuous. Assume that *h* is not continuous at $x \in \Delta$. At *x*, y = kx for some constant k > 0. Then, there is $\epsilon > 0$ such that for each $\delta > 0$ there is $x' \in \Delta$, x' > 0 such that $|x - x'| < \delta$ and $|y - y'| > \epsilon$. Let y' = k'x', k' > 0. Then, $|x - x'| = |y/k - y'/k'| < \delta$ and since $|y - y'| > \epsilon$ we must have $y \ge y'$ or $y \le y'$ with $y_i = y'_i$ for some *i*, only if $y_i = y'_i = 0$. Clearly, *y* and *y'* can not both be in ∂M which contradicts the definition of *h*.

The sets $C_i \subset \Delta$ defined by

$$C_i = \{x \in \Delta : f_i(h(x)) \ge h_i(x)\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m$$

is a closed covering of Δ . If $x \notin C_i$ for all *i*, then f(h(x) < h(x) contradicting the definition of ∂M . For each C_i we have that $C_i \supset \Delta^i = \{x \in \Delta : x_i = 0\}$. By the KKM lemma there is $x \in \bigcap_i C_i$, and then $f(y) \ge y, y = h(x)$. Continuity of *f* and the definition of *M* then yield y = f(y). Q.E.D.

Corollary 2 The Brouwer Fixed Point Theorem. Let $f : \Delta \to \Delta$ be continuous, where $\Delta = \{x \in R^m_+ : \sum_i x_i = 1\}$ is the unit (m-1)-simplex. Then, there is $x \in \Delta$ such that x = f(x). *Proof:* Define $g: R^m_+ \to R^m_+$ by

$$g_i(x) = \begin{cases} \inf\{f_i(x') : x' \in \Delta, x \le x'\} & \text{if } \sum_j x_j \le 1\\ \sup\{f_i(x') : x' \in \Delta, x \ge x'\} & \text{if } \sum_j x_j \ge 1 \end{cases}$$
(2)

Then, g is continuous and monotone. Finally, define $h : \mathbb{R}^m_+ \to \mathbb{R}^m_+$ by

$$h(x) = \left(\sum_{j} x_{j}\right)^{\alpha} g(x)$$

which implies that *h* satisfies the conditions of Theorem 1 for $\alpha > 1$ sufficiently large. Then there is $\bar{x} \neq 0$ such that $\bar{x} = h(\bar{x})$ or

$$\bar{x} = \left(\sum_{j} \bar{x}_{j}\right)^{\alpha} g(\bar{x})$$

Assume next that $\sum_j \bar{x}_j > 1$. From the definition of g we have that $g(\bar{x}) \ge f(x')$ for some $x' \in \Delta$ and thus $\sum_i g_i(\bar{x}) \ge 1$ and

$$\sum_{i} \bar{x}_{i} < \left(\sum_{j} \bar{x}_{j}\right)^{\alpha} \sum_{i} g_{i}(\bar{x})$$

which contradicts \bar{x} being a fixed point. Thus, $0 < \sum_j \bar{x}_j \le 1$. Due to this we find that $\bar{x} \le g(\bar{x})$. $\Delta' = \{x \ge \bar{x} : \sum_i x_i = 1\}$ is a proper subsimplex of Δ . For $x \in \Delta'$ and the monotonicity of g we have that $g(x) \ge g(\bar{x})$. Furthermore, from the definition of g we have $f(x) \ge g(x)$. Combining all inequalities we find that $f(x) \ge \bar{x}$. Thus,

$$f(\Delta') \subset \Delta'$$

Define X to be the set of vectors of all monotone sequences $\{x^n\}, x^{n+1} \ge x^n$ such that $x^0 \ge \bar{x}$ and $\sum_i x_i^n \le 1$. Specifically, the elements of the sequence defined by $x^0 = \bar{x}, x^{n+1} = g(x^n)$ is in this set, and since g is continuous, this sequence converges to some $x^* = g(x^*)$. From Zorn's lemma (see e.g. [3]) it follows that there is $y \in X$ such that y is greater than all elements of X. Clearly, $y \in \Delta'$ and thus $f(y) \in \Delta'$ and from the definition of g it follows that $x^* \le g(y) = f(y)$ and hence, $f(y) \in X$, and $f(y) \le y$ which implies that y = f(y). Q.E.D.

The following proposition deals with functions which map the whole of R^m into itself. The result is a consequence of Tarski's fixed point theorem (see e.g. [4]) and it is easy to prove directly as in [5].

Proposition 3 Assume that $f : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^m$ is continuous and satisfies $x' \ge x \Rightarrow f(x') \ge f(x)$. Let $S = \{x : f(x) \le x\}$ be non–empty and bounded from below. Then, for each $x'' \in S$, there is $\bar{x} \le x''$ such that $\bar{x} = f(\bar{x})$.

We can now combine the results of these propositions to obtain conditions for the existence of more than one fixed point.

Proposition 4 Assume that $f : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^m$ is continuous and satisfies $x' \ge x \Rightarrow f(x') \ge f(x)$. Let $S = \{x \ge 0 : f(x) \le x\}$. Assume that S is bounded and contains two points x' and x'' such that x'' < x'. Then, there are two fixed points, \bar{x} and \tilde{x} , of f for which $\bar{x} \le \tilde{x}$ ($\bar{x} \ne \tilde{x}$).

Proof: The fixed point \bar{x} is given by a direct application of Proposition 3. Next, set $z = x - \bar{x}$ which yields z' = x' - x > 0. Define $g(z) = f(x) - \bar{x}$. Due to monotonicity of f, g(z) maps R^m_+ into itself and by assumption the set $S = \{z \ge 0 : g(z) \le z\}$ contains z' > 0. Theorem 1 can now be applied and we thus have a fixed point $\tilde{z} = g(\tilde{z}) \ge 0$, $\tilde{z} \ne 0$, i.e. $\tilde{x} - \bar{x} = f(\tilde{x}) - \bar{x} \ge 0$, $\tilde{x} \ne \bar{x}$. Q.E.D.

References

- [1] Håkan Persson, *Theory and Applications of Multisectoral Growth Models*, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Gothenburg, 1983
- [2] Ross M. Starr, *General Equilibrium Theory : An Introduction*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997
- [3] J.L. Kelly, General Topology, Van Nostrand, New York, 1955
- [4] G. Birkhoff, *Lattice Theory*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1967
- [5] S. Lahiri, "Input-Output Analysis with Scale–Dependent Coefficients", *Econometrica*, **44**, 1976, 947-961.