

## Comments on the Brouwer Fixed Point Theorem

The purpose of this document is twofold. First, we shall give a complete and rigorous proof of a key step in the proof of the Brouwer Fixed Point Theorem that is often treated only in an intuitive manner (*e.g.*, on page 32 of Hatcher). Second, we shall include a proof of the result on eigenvalues of matrices with positive entries that was covered in class.

### *The retraction in Brouwer's Theorem*

As indicated on page 32 of Hatcher, the idea is simple. We start with two distinct points  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  on the disk  $D^n$  and consider the ray starting with  $\mathbf{y}$  and passing through  $\mathbf{x}$ ; algebraically, this is the set of all points expressible as  $\mathbf{y} + (1-t)\mathbf{x}$ , where  $t \geq 0$ . Simple pictures strongly suggest that there is a unique scalar  $t \geq 1$  such that  $\mathbf{y} + (1-t)\mathbf{x}$  lies on  $S^{n-1}$ , if  $\mathbf{x} \in S^{n-1}$  then  $t = 1$  so that the point is equal to  $\mathbf{x}$ , and in fact the value of  $t$  is a continuous function of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ . Our purpose here is to justify these assertions.

**PROPOSITION.** *There is a continuous function  $\rho : D^n \times D^n - \text{Diagonal} \rightarrow S^{n-1}$  such that  $\rho(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{x}$  if  $\mathbf{x} \in S^{n-1}$ .*

If we have the mapping  $\rho$  and  $f$  is a continuous map from  $D^n$  to itself without fixed points, then the retraction from  $D^n$  onto  $S^{n-1}$  is given by  $\rho(\mathbf{x}, f(\mathbf{x}))$ .

**Proof of the proposition.** It follows immediately that the intersection points of the line joining  $\mathbf{y}$  to  $\mathbf{x}$  are give by the values of  $t$  which are roots of the equation

$$|\mathbf{y} + t(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})|^2 = 1$$

and the desired points on the ray are given by the roots for which  $t > 1$ . We need to show that there is always a unique root satisfying this condition, and that this root depends continuously on  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$ .

We can rewrite the displayed equation as

$$|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^2 t^2 + 2\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \rangle t + (|\mathbf{y}|^2 - 1) = 0 .$$

If try to solve this nontrivial quadratic equation for  $t$  using the quadratic formula, then we obtain the following:

$$t = \frac{-\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \rangle \pm \sqrt{\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \rangle^2 + |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^2 \cdot (1 - |\mathbf{y}|^2)}}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^2}$$

One could try to analyze these roots by brute force, but it will be more pleasant to take a more qualitative viewpoint.

(a) *There are always two distinct real roots.* We need to show that the expression inside the square root sign is always a positive real number. Since  $|\mathbf{y}| \leq 1$ , the expression is clearly nonnegative, so we need only eliminate the possibility that it might be zero. If this happens, then

each summand must be zero, and since  $|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}| > 0$  it follows that we must have both  $\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \rangle = 0$  and  $1 - |\mathbf{y}|^2 = 0$ . The second of these implies  $|\mathbf{y}| = 1$ , and the first then implies

$$\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x} \rangle = |\mathbf{y}|^2 = 1.$$

If we combine this with the Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality and the basic condition  $|\mathbf{x}| \leq 1$ , we see that  $|\mathbf{x}|$  must equal 1 and  $\mathbf{x}$  must be a positive multiple of  $\mathbf{y}$ ; these in turn imply that  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}$ , which contradicts our hypothesis that  $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}$ . Thus the expression inside the radical sign is positive and hence there are two distinct real roots.

(b) *There are no roots  $t$  such that  $0 < t < 1$ .* The Triangle Inequality implies that

$$|\mathbf{y} + t(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})| = |(1-t)\mathbf{y} + t\mathbf{x}| \leq (1-t)|\mathbf{y}| + t|\mathbf{x}| \leq 1$$

so the value of the quadratic function

$$q(t) = |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^2 t^2 + 2\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \rangle t + (|\mathbf{y}|^2 - 1)$$

lies in  $[-1, 0]$  if  $0 < t < 1$ . Suppose that the value is zero for some  $t_0$  of this type. Since there are two distinct roots for the associated quadratic polynomial, it follows that the latter does not take a maximum value at  $t_0$ , and hence there is some  $t_1$  such that  $0 < t_1 < 1$  and the value of the function at  $t_1$  is positive. This contradicts our observation about the behavior of the function, and therefore our hypothesis about the existence of a root like  $t_0$  must be false.

(d) *There is one root of  $q(t)$  such that  $t \leq 0$  and a second root such that  $t \geq 1$ .* We know that  $q(0) \leq 0$  and that the limit of  $q(t)$  as  $t \rightarrow -\infty$  is equal to  $+\infty$ . By continuity there must be some  $t_1 \leq 0$  such that  $q(t_1) = 0$ . Similarly, we know that  $q(1) \leq 0$  and that the limit of  $q(t)$  as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$  is equal to  $+\infty$ , so again by continuity there must be some  $t_2 \geq 1$  such that  $q(t_2) = 0$ .

(d) *The unique root  $t$  satisfying  $t \geq 1$  is a continuous function of  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$ .* This is true because the desired root is given by taking the positive sign in the expression obtained from the quadratic formula, and it is a routine algebraic exercise to check that this expression is a continuous function of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ .

(e) *If  $|\mathbf{x}| = 1$ , then  $t = 1$ .* This just follows because  $|\mathbf{y} + 1(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})| = 1$  in this case.

The proposition now follows by taking

$$\rho(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{y} + t(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})$$

where  $t$  is given as above by taking the positive sign in the quadratic formula. The final property shows that  $\rho(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{x}$  if  $|\mathbf{x}| = 1$ . ■

### *An eigenvector theorem for matrices with nonnegative entries*

The first step is the following elementary fact:

**LEMMA.** *Let  $X$  be a topological space which is homeomorphic to  $D^n$  for some  $n \geq 0$ . Then every continuous map  $f : X \rightarrow X$  has a fixed point.*

**Proof.** Let  $f : X \rightarrow X$  be continuous, and let  $h : X \rightarrow D^n$  be a homeomorphism. Then  $h \circ f \circ h^{-1}$  is a continuous map from  $D^n$  to itself and thus has a fixed point  $\mathbf{p}$  by Brouwer's Theorem. In other

words we have  $h \circ f \circ h^{-1}(\mathbf{p}) = \mathbf{p}$ . If we take  $\mathbf{q} = h(\mathbf{p})$ , straightforward computation shows that  $f(\mathbf{q}) = \mathbf{q}$ . ■

**THEOREM.** *Let  $n > 1$ , and let  $A$  be an  $n \times n$  matrix which is invertible and has nonnegative entries. Then  $A$  has a positive eigenvalue  $\lambda$  such that  $\lambda$  has a nonzero eigenvector with nonnegative entries.*

**Proof.** Recall that the 1-norm on  $\mathbf{R}^n$  is defined by  $|\mathbf{x}|_1 = \sum_j |x_j|$ , where the coordinates of  $\mathbf{x}$  are given by  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ . For each  $\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_{n-1}$  define

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = (|\mathbf{Ax}|_1)^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{Ax}.$$

Observe that the coordinates of  $\mathbf{Ax}$  are all nonnegative because the entries of  $A$  and the coordinates of  $\mathbf{x}$  are nonnegative, this vector is nonzero because  $A$  is invertible, and if  $\mathbf{y}$  is a nonzero vector with nonnegative entries then  $|\mathbf{y}|_1^{-1}\mathbf{y}$  must lie in  $\Delta_{n-1}$ . Therefore we indeed have a continuous map  $f$  from the simplex to itself.

By the lemma, we know that  $f$  has a fixed point; in other words, there is some  $\mathbf{v} \in \Delta_{n-1}$  such that

$$\mathbf{v} = (|\mathbf{Av}|_1)^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{Av}$$

and since the latter is equivalent to saying that  $\mathbf{Av}$  is a positive multiple of  $\mathbf{v}$ , this completes the proof. ■