

On the KKM Theorem

by

Lech PASICKI

Presented by C. BESSAGA on January 5, 1995

Summary. The paper is devoted to a more thorough investigation of the theorem of Knaster-Kuratowski-Mazurkiewicz (Knaster and Kuratowski 1929, Satz p. 134) concerning the nonempty intersection property of a cover of a simplex. A simple modification of the KKM theorem (Theorem 2) leads in consequence to an extension of a fixed point theorem of Himmelberg (Theorem 7). On the other hand, a more "geometrical" interpretation of KKM theorem enables us to obtain some theorems on nonempty intersection (10, ..., 14). In conclusion we give simple proofs of two fixed point theorems (16, 17) for mappings satisfying a "boundary" condition.

Let us adopt $I = \langle 0, 1 \rangle \subset R$ and $P^n = \{(t_0, \dots, t_n) \in I^{n+1} : \sum t_i = 1\}$ (standard n -simplex in R^{n+1}).

The "open" case of the theorem to follow is a simplified version of ([7], Thm 1 p. 573) and the "closed" one was given in [6].

THEOREM 1. *Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_0, \dots, A_n\}$ be a closed or open cover of P^n . If for each $t \in P^n$ we have $t \in \bigcup \{A_i : t_i \neq 0\}$ then $\bigcap \mathcal{A}$ is nonempty.*

This theorem leads to fixed point theorems and related results. Let us present a simple proof of ([8], Thm 2.2.12 p. 34) as the original one was complicated. The final reasoning is based on Thm 4 and Lemma 5.

First let us note that if Y is a finite dimensional linear topological space then any closed (open) set $A \subset Y$ is closed (open) in Y equipped with the natural topology for which Y is homeomorphic with R^n or C^n .

This comment enables us to reformulate Theorem 1 as follows.

THEOREM 2. *Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_0, \dots, A_n\}$ be a closed or open cover of a n -simplex $\Delta = \text{conv} \{v_0, \dots, v_n\}$ in a linear topological space Y . If for each*

AMS Classification: 54H25.

Key words: fixed point, locally convex space, Hilbert space.

$t = (t_0, \dots, t_n) \in \text{Fr } P^n$ we have $\sum t_i v_i \in \bigcup \{A_i : t_i > 0\}$ then $\bigcap \mathcal{A}$ is nonempty.

The methods based on the Knaster-Kuratowski-Mazurkiewicz (KKM) theorem were investigated by Granas and his school (see e.g. [2] p. 72–78).

Let us recall some notions concerning multivalued mappings. For arbitrary sets X, Y the notation $F : X \rightarrow 2^Y$ means that $F(x) \subset Y$, $x \in X$ and $F(A) = \bigcup \{F(x) : x \in A\}$, $A \subset X$; F is a mapping if $F(x) \neq \emptyset$, $x \in X \neq \emptyset$. For $F : X \rightarrow 2^Y$ and any $B \subset Y$ we write $F^{-}(B) = \{x \in X : F(x) \cap B \neq \emptyset\}$; it can be easily checked that $F^{-} : Y \rightarrow 2^X$. If Y is a topological space then $F : X \rightarrow 2^Y$ is closed (open) if $F(x)$ is closed (open) for each $x \in X$. If $F : X \rightarrow 2^Y$ and B is a subset of Y , then $B \cap F$ is defined by $(B \cap F)(x) = B \cap F(x)$, $x \in X$.

THEOREM 3. *Let Z be a finite set in a linear topological space Y and $H : Z \rightarrow 2^Y$ such that $\text{conv } K \subset H(K)$, $K \subset Z$. If $(\text{conv } Z) \cap H$ is closed or open (in $\text{conv } Z$) then $\bigcap \{H(z) : z \in Z\} \neq \emptyset$.*

PROOF. Assume $Z = \{z_0, \dots, z_n\}$ and let $h : P^n \rightarrow \text{conv } Z$ be defined by $h(t) = \sum t_i z_i$. Let us consider $A_i = (h^{-1} \circ H)(z_i)$, $i = 0, \dots, n$ and $\mathcal{A} = \{A_0, \dots, A_n\}$. Clearly all members of \mathcal{A} are closed (open) in $\text{conv } Z$ and the other assumptions of Theorem 2 are satisfied. Therefore $\bigcap \mathcal{A} \neq \emptyset$ and we have $h(\bigcap \mathcal{A}) \subset \bigcap h(\mathcal{A}) = \bigcap \{H(z) : z \in Z\}$. \square

The result to follow is a modification of ([7], Thm 3 p. 574).

THEOREM 4. *Let Z be a finite set in a linear topological space Y and $G : Y \rightarrow 2^Y$ such that $\text{conv } Z \subset G^{-}(Z)$ and $(\text{conv } Z) \cap G^{-}$ is closed (open) in $\text{conv } Z$. Then there exist a set $K \subset Z$ and a point $x \in \text{conv } K$ such that $K \subset G(x)$; consequently $x \in \text{conv } K \subset \text{conv } G(x)$.*

PROOF. Let us consider $H : Z \rightarrow 2^Y$, $H(z) = (\text{conv } Z) \setminus G^{-}(z)$, $z \in Z$. Suppose $\text{conv } K \subset H(K)$, $K \subset Z$. In view of Theorem 3 we have $\emptyset \neq \bigcap \{H(z) : z \in Z\} = (\text{conv } Z) \setminus G^{-}(Z) = \emptyset$. Thus there exist a set $K \subset Z$ and a point $x \in K$ such that $x \in \text{conv } K$ and $x \notin H(K)$. It means $x \in G^{-}(z)$, $z \in K$ and $K \subset G(x)$. \square

Each uniform space is regular ([4], p. 180) and therefore the lemma to follow is a consequence of ([4], Thm 27 p. 155, Corol. 30 p. 198). Nevertheless, the direct proof is short and therefore it is worth of being presented.

LEMMA 5. *Let \mathcal{B} be an open cover of a compact set Y in a uniform space (X, \mathcal{V}) . Then there exists a symmetric $V \in \mathcal{V}$ such that for each $y \in Y$ there is a $B \in \mathcal{B}$ with $V(y) \subset B$.*

P r o o f. For any point $y \in Y$ let a symmetric entourage $W_y \in \mathcal{V}$ be such that $2W_y(y) := (W_y \circ W_y)(y) \subset B$ for a $B \in \mathcal{B}$. There exists a set $\{y_1, \dots, y_n\} \subset Y$ such that $\bigcup\{W_{y_i}(y_i) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ covers Y . Let us adopt $V = \bigcap W_{y_i}$. For any $y \in Y$ there is a point y_i with $y \in W_{y_i}(y_i)$ which implies $V(y) \subset 2W_{y_i}(y_i)$ and consequently $V(y) \subset B$ holds for a $B \in \mathcal{B}$. \square

Let us recall that for topological spaces $X, Y, F : X \rightarrow 2^Y$ is usc (upper semicontinuous) if for each closed set $B \subset Y, F^{-1}(B)$ is closed; $F : X \rightarrow 2^Y$ is compact (relatively compact) if it is usc and $\overline{F(X)}$ is compact ($F(X)$ is contained in a compact set). If $F(X)$ is uniformizable (in particular, if Y is a linear topological space) then each relatively compact $F : X \rightarrow 2^Y$ is compact ([4], p. 180, B(b) p. 161).

The fact to follow extends ([7], Lemma p. 576). It will enable us to prove Theorem 7 in an elegant way.

LEMMA 6. *Let (X, \mathcal{V}) be a uniform space and $F : X \rightarrow 2^X$ compact with closed values. If F has no fixed point then there exists a closed and symmetric $V \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $V \circ F \circ V$ has no fixed point.*

P r o o f. For each $y \in F(X)$ there exists a closed entourage $W_y \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $y \notin (F^{-1} \circ W_y)(y)$. In consequence, there exists a $V_y \in \mathcal{V}, (V_y \subset W_y)$ for which $V_y(y) \cap (F^{-1} \circ V_y)(y) = \emptyset$ holds as (X, \mathcal{V}) is regular. The family $\{V_y(y) : y \in \overline{F(X)}\}$ covers $Y = \overline{F(X)}$ (the space is regular) and for V as in Lemma 5 we have $V(y) \cap (F^{-1} \circ V)(y) \subset V_{z(y)}(z(y)) \cap (F^{-1} \circ V_{z(y)})(z(y)) = \emptyset, y \in Y$. Assume $(2V)(y) \cap (F^{-1} \circ (2V))(y) = \emptyset, y \in Y$ holds. Then for $x \in X \setminus (V \circ F)(X)$ we have $x \notin (V \circ F \circ V)(x) \subset (V \circ F)(X)$. If $x \in (V \circ F)(X)$ then $V(x) \subset (2V)(y)$ for a $y \in F(X)$ holds and hence $V(x) \cap (F \circ V)(x) \subset (2V)(y) \cap (F \circ 2V)(y) = \emptyset$. \square

Now we are ready to give a simple direct proof of “locally convex” version of ([8], Thm 2.2.12 p. 34), extending a theorem of Himmelberg [3].

THEOREM 7. *Let X be a convex set in a locally convex space Y (not necessarily Hausdorff) and $F : X \rightarrow 2^X$ a compact mapping with closed convex values. Then F has a fixed point.*

P r o o f. Suppose F has no fixed point. We can treat X as being a uniform space (X, \mathcal{V}) . In view of Lemma 6 $V \circ F$ has no fixed point for a closed, symmetric $V \in \mathcal{V}$. On the other hand, there exists a finite set $Z \subset F(X)$ such that $F(X) \subset V(Z)$. Let us consider $G = V \circ F$. In view of Theorem 4, G has a fixed point (we may require the values of $V \circ F$ to be convex, Y being locally convex) which is a contradiction. \square

In the sequel we derive a fixed point theorem with “sector” condition. The proof is based in a more direct way on Theorem 2.

PROPOSITION 8. Let v_0, \dots, v_n be vectors in R^n . Then the following conditions are equivalent

- (1) v_1, \dots, v_n are linearly independent and v_0 is their linear combination with negative coefficients
- (2) for each $x \in R^n$ there exist $t_0, \dots, t_n \geq 0$ such that $x = \sum t_j v_j$, and a t_i equals to zero. This representation is unique
- (3) for each $x \in R^n$, $x \neq 0$ there exists an index i such that $(v_i, x) > 0$ ((\cdot, \cdot) is inner product).

PROOF. Let us assume (1). There exists a linear homeomorphism $h : R^n \rightarrow R^n$ such that $w_1 = h(v_1) = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$, $w_2 = h(v_2) = (0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$, \dots , $w_n = h(v_n) = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$ and then for $v_0 = \sum t_j v_j$, $t_1, \dots, t_n < 0$ we have $w_0 = h(v_0) = (t_1, \dots, t_n)$. Now it is clear that (1) implies (2). Let us show that from (2) follows (3). If $0 \neq x = \sum t_j v_j$ and $t_j \geq 0$, $j = 0, \dots, n$ then we have $\sum t_j (v_j, x) = (x, x) > 0$ and consequently $(v_i, x) > 0$ for an index i .

Assume (3) is satisfied. Suppose that v_1, \dots, v_n are dependent. Then there exists an $x \in R^n$ such that $(v_i, x) = 0$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ and therefore (v_0, x) or $(v_0, -x)$ is not positive which contradicts (3). Now let $v_0 = \sum \{t_j v_j : j = 1, \dots, n\}$ and $t_1 \geq 0$. Then v_2, \dots, v_n are contained in a subspace $V = \{v \in R^n : (v, x) = 0\}$ and v_0, v_1 are on the same side of V . Therefore we have $(v_0, x) \leq 0$ and $(v_1, x) \leq 0$ or $(v_0, -x) \leq 0$ and $(v_1, -x) \leq 0$, and clearly $(v_2, x) = 0, \dots, (v_n, x) = 0$. This contradicts (3) and therefore t_1, \dots, t_n must be negative. \square

It can be noted that (1) is equivalent to

- (4) each n vectors among v_0, \dots, v_n are linearly independent and the remaining one is their combination with negative coefficients.

DEFINITION 9. Let Y be a linear n -dimensional space. If $v_0, \dots, v_n \in Y$ are such that (2) is satisfied then we say that (v_0, \dots, v_n) is a sector representation of Y ; for any $x = \sum t_i v_i$ with $t_i \geq 0$, $i = 0, \dots, n$ and a $t_i = 0$, x is sector combination of v_0, \dots, v_n while t_0, \dots, t_n are sector coefficients of x (for (v_0, \dots, v_n)). \square

The initial part of the proof of Proposition 8 shows that for v_0, \dots, v_n as in Definition 9 $\text{conv}\{v_0, \dots, v_n\}$ is a n -simplex in Y . Therefore Theorem 2 implies the following:

THEOREM 10. Let Y be a n -dimensional linear topological space, (v_0, \dots, v_n) — a sector representation of Y and $A = \text{conv}\{v_0, \dots, v_n\}$. Assume that $A = \{A_0, \dots, A_n\}$ is a closed or open cover of A (in the induced topology) satisfying

(5) for each $x \in \text{Fr } A$ in the Euclidean topology of Y if t_0, \dots, t_n are sector coefficients of x then $x \in \bigcup \{A_i : t_i > 0\}$.

Then $\bigcap \mathcal{A}$ is nonempty.

The previous theorem can be presented in the following equivalent form:

THEOREM 11. *Let A be a bounded closed convex set in a n -dimensional separated linear topological space Y and let $0 \in \text{Int } A$. Assume that $\mathcal{A} = \{A_0, \dots, A_n\}$ is a closed or open cover of A (in the induced topology). If (5) is satisfied then $\bigcap \mathcal{A}$ is nonempty.*

PROOF. Let $k_0, \dots, k_n > 0$ be such that $A \subset \Delta = \text{conv} \{k_0 v_0, \dots, k_n v_n\}$ holds. There exists a homeomorphism $h : A \rightarrow \Delta$ such that $h(x) = g(x)x$, $x \in A$, where $g : A \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is continuous. Clearly (5) holds for Δ , $h(\mathcal{A})$ in place of A , \mathcal{A} . \square

Remark 12. By using $-v_0, \dots, -v_n$ in (5) we obtain

(6) for each $x \in \text{Fr } A$ in the Euclidean topology of Y if t_0, \dots, t_n are sector coefficients of $-x$ for (v_0, \dots, v_n) then $x \in \bigcup \{A_i : t_i > 0\}$.

As a consequence of Theorem 11 and Remark 12 we obtain the following version of ([1], Lemma 3 p. 178):

THEOREM 13. *Let A be a bounded closed convex set in a n -dimensional separated linear topological space Y and $0 \in \text{Int } A$. Let (v_0, \dots, v_n) be a sector representation of Y . Assume that $\mathcal{A} = \{A_0, \dots, A_n\}$ is a closed or open cover of A such that A_i contains all points of $\text{Fr } A$ for which $t_i = 0$ (in the sector combination), $i = 0, \dots, n$. Then $\bigcap \mathcal{A}$ is nonempty.*

PROOF. If $-x = \sum t_j v_j$ (sector combination) for a $x \in \text{Fr } A$ then there exists an index i such that $x = \sum s_j v_j$ (sector combination) with $s_i = 0$ and $t_i > 0$ (on the contrary (1) would not hold). Now it is clear that (6) is satisfied and we apply Theorem 11. \square

The proofs of Theorems 11 and 13 suggest that one may assume A to be a retract of a special kind of a simplex.

Theorem 11 has an obvious geometrical interpretation, nevertheless condition (5) is not too elegant. The theorem to follow is weaker than it, but has a more convenient form.

THEOREM 14. *Let A be a bounded closed convex set in R^n , $0 \in \text{Int } A$. Assume that $\mathcal{A} = \{A_0, \dots, A_n\}$ is a closed or open cover of A and $\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_n$ are linear functionals on R^n such that*

(7) $\varphi_i(x) > 0$ for a i , and x belongs to all A_i with $\varphi_i(x) > 0$, $x \in \text{Fr } A$ holds. Then $\bigcap \mathcal{A}$ is nonempty.

P r o o f. There exist vectors v_0, \dots, v_n such that $\varphi_i(x) = (v_i, x)$, $i = 0, \dots, n$, $x \in R^n$. From (7) and Proposition 8 it follows that (v_0, \dots, v_n) is a sector representation of R^n (A is bounded). If $x \in \text{Fr } A$ and $x = \sum t_i v_i$ (sector combination) then $\sum t_i (v_i, x) = (x, x) > 0$ means that $(v_i, x) > 0$ for a $t_i > 0$. In view of (7) $x \in \bigcup \{A_i : t_i > 0\}$ and consequently we obtain (5). \square

Clearly we may assume in (7) (see (6)) that x belongs to all A_i with $\varphi_i(x) < 0$.

In the theorem to follow we require more as regards the family of functionals. The respective boundary condition becomes more elegant.

THEOREM 15. *Let A be a bounded closed convex set in R^n , $0 \in \text{Int } A$. Assume that $\mathcal{A} = \{A_0, \dots, A_n\}$ is a closed or open cover of A , and $v_0, \dots, v_n \in R^n$ are such that $(v_i, v_j) \leq 0$, $i \neq j$, $i, j = 0, \dots, n$ and*

$$(8) \quad x \in \bigcup \{A_i : (v_i, x) > 0\}, \quad x \in \text{Fr } A$$

holds. Then $\bigcap \mathcal{A}$ is nonempty.

P r o o f. We will show that under the assumption $(v_i, v_j) \leq 0$, $i \neq j$ condition (8) implies (5). If t_0, \dots, t_n are sector coefficients of a point $x \in \text{Fr } A$ and $t_i = 0$ then we have $(v_i, x) = \sum t_j (v_i, v_j) \leq 0$ as for $t_j > 0$, $i \neq j$ holds. Thus $x \in \bigcup \{A_i : t_i > 0\}$ and (5) is satisfied. \square

It is seen that Theorem 15 is weaker than Theorem 11. We may assume in (8) that $x \in \bigcup \{A_i : (v_i, x) < 0\}$ (cf. (6)). If L is a subspace of a Hilbert space H , then $P_L : H \rightarrow L$ will mean the projection on the nearest point.

Now we apply Theorem 11 to prove the following:

THEOREM 16. *Let X be a bounded closed convex set in a Hilbert space H and let $f : X \rightarrow H$ be a compact map. If for each finite dimensional subspace L of H there exists a point $q \in X$, $q \in \text{Int } X_L$ ($X_L = (q + L) \cap X$) in the induced topology and a sector representation (v_0, \dots, v_n) of L such that*

(9) *for each $x \in \text{Fr } X_L$ such that $v = P_{q+L}(f(x)) - x \neq 0$, if t_0, \dots, t_n are sector coefficients of $x - q$, and s_0, \dots, s_n are sector coefficients of v then we have $s_i t_i > 0$ for an index i holds, then f has a fixed point.*

P r o o f. Suppose f has no fixed point. Then there exists an $r > 0$ such that $K(x, 2r) \cap K(f(x), 2r) = \emptyset$, $x \in X$ (Lemma 6). There exists a finite set $Z \subset f(X)$ such that $f(X) \subset K(Z, r)$ ($f(X)$ is compact). Let L be the span of Z and $x \in X_L$ as to satisfy (9). For $w = x - q$ and $g(w) = P_{q+L}(f(w+q)) - q$ we have $g(w) - w = P_{q+L}(f(w+q)) - q - w = P_{q+L}(f(x)) - x = \sum s_j v_j$ and $w = x - q = \sum t_j v_j$. Thus (9) holds for g in place of f and 0 in place

of q . For simplicity, let us assume $q = 0$ and $f = g$. Let $A_i = \{x \in X_L : P_L(f(x)) - x = \sum s_j v_j \text{ and } s_j > 0\}$ (s_0, \dots, s_n are sector coefficients of $P_L(f(x) - x)$). From the fact that $K(x, 2r) \cap K(f(x), 2r) = \emptyset$, $x \in X$ we obtain $K(x, r) \cap K(P_L \circ f)(x), r) = \emptyset$ ($K(f(x), r) \cap L \neq \emptyset$ and consequently $d((P_L \circ f)(x), f(x)) < r$, i.e., $(P_L \circ f)(x) \cap K(f(x), 2r) \neq \emptyset$). Therefore, the family $\mathcal{A} = \{A_0, \dots, A_n\}$ covers X_L . The mapping $h : X_L \rightarrow X_L$, $h(x) = (P_L \circ f)(x) - x$ is continuous and hence $A_i = h^{-1}(\{y \in L : y = \sum s_j v_j \text{ and } s_j > 0\})$ is an open set. From (9) follows (5) and in view of Theorem 11 we obtain $\bigcap \mathcal{A} \neq \emptyset$. For any $x \in \bigcap \mathcal{A}$ we have $P_L(f(x)) - x = \sum s_j v_j$ with $s_j > 0$, $j = 0, \dots, n$ which contradicts $s_i = 0$ for an index i (s_0, \dots, s_n are sector coefficients). Thus f has a fixed point. \square

In view of Remark 12 we may write $v = x - P_{q+L}(f(x))$ in (9).

By applying Theorem 15 in place of Theorem 11 in the previous proof one obtains the following

THEOREM 17. *Let X be a bounded closed convex set in a real Hilbert space H and let $f : X \rightarrow H$ be a compact map. Assume that for each finite dimensional subspace L of $\text{Span } f(X)$, $0 \in \text{Int } X_L$ ($X_L = L \cap X$) in the induced topology and there exist $v_0, \dots, v_n \in L$ ($n = \dim L$) such that $(v_i, v_j) \leq 0$, $i \neq j$ and the following is satisfied*

(10) *for each $x \in \text{Fr } X_L$ there exists an index i such that $(v_i, x) > 0$ and $(v_i, P_L(f(x)) - x) > 0$.*

Then f has a fixed point.

PROOF. For L defined as in the previous proof, let us adopt $A_i = \{x \in X_L : (v_i, (P_L \circ f)(x) - x) > 0\}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. In view of Proposition 8 $\mathcal{A} = \{A_0, \dots, A_n\}$ covers X_L . On the other hand (10) implies (8). Therefore (Theorem 15) $\bigcap \mathcal{A}$ is nonempty. \square

Clearly one may write $(v_i, x) < 0$ in condition (10).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ACADEMY OF MINING AND METALLURGY, AL. MICKIEWICZA 30, 30-059 KRAKÓW
(INSTYTUT MATEMATYKI, AGH)

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Aleksandroff, B. Pasynkoff, *Elementary proof of the essentiality of the identical mapping of a simplex* (in Russian), *Uspiehi Mat. Nauk* **77** (1957) 175-179.
- [2] J. Dugundji, A. Granás, *Fixed point theory*, Vol. 1, PWN, Warszawa 1992.
- [3] C. J. Himmelberg, *Fixed points of compact multifunctions*, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **38** (1972) 205-207.
- [4] J. L. Kelley, *General topology*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1975.

-
- [5] J. L. Kelley, I. Namioka, *Linear topological spaces*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1976.
- [6] B. Knaster, K. Kuratowski, S. Mazurkiewicz, *Ein Beweis des Fixpunktsatzes für n -dimensionale Simplexe*, *Fund. Math.*, **14** (1929) 132–137.
- [7] M. Lassonde, *Sur le principe KKM*, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, **310** (1990) 573–576.
- [8] L. Pasicki, *A fixed point theory and some other applications of weeds*, *Opuscula Math.*, **7** (1990).