



planetmath.org

Math for the people, by the people.

proof of open mapping theorem

Canonical name	ProofOfOpenMappingTheorem
Date of creation	2013-03-22 16:23:31
Last modified on	2013-03-22 16:23:31
Owner	Statusx (15142)
Last modified by	Statusx (15142)
Numerical id	9
Author	Statusx (15142)
Entry type	Proof
Classification	msc 30A99
Classification	msc 46A30

We prove that if  $\Lambda : X \rightarrow Y$  is a continuous linear surjective map between Banach spaces, then  $\Lambda$  is an open map. It suffices to show that  $\Lambda$  maps the open unit ball in  $X$  to a neighborhood of the origin of  $Y$ .

Let  $U, V$  be the open unit balls in  $X, Y$  respectively. Then  $X = \cup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} kU$ , so, since  $\Lambda$  is surjective,  $Y = \Lambda(X) = \Lambda(\cup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} kU) = \cup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \Lambda(kU)$ . By the Baire category theorem,  $Y$  is not the union of countably many nowhere dense sets, so there is some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and some open set  $W \subset Y$  such that  $W$  is contained in the closure of  $\Lambda(kU)$ .

Let  $y_0 \in W$ , and pick  $\eta > 0$  so that  $y_0 + y \in W$  for all  $y$  with  $\|y\| < \eta$ . Then  $y_0$  and  $y_0 + y$  are limit points of  $\Lambda(kU)$ , so there are sequences  $x'_i$  and  $x''_i$  in  $kU$  with  $\Lambda x'_i \rightarrow y_0$  and  $\Lambda x''_i \rightarrow y_0 + y$ . Letting  $x_i = x''_i - x'_i$ , we have  $\|x_i\| < 2k$  and  $\Lambda x_i \rightarrow y$ . So for any  $y \in \eta V$  there is a sequence  $x_i$  in  $2kU$  with  $\Lambda x_i \rightarrow y$ . Then by the linearity of  $\Lambda$ , we have that for any  $\epsilon > 0$  and any  $y \in Y$ , there is an  $x \in X$  with:

$$\|x\| < \delta^{-1}\|y\| \text{ and } \|\Lambda x - y\| < \epsilon \quad (1)$$

where  $\delta = \eta/2k$ .

Now let  $y \in \delta V$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ . Then there is some  $x_1$  with  $\|x_1\| < 1$  and  $\|y - \Lambda x_1\| < \epsilon\delta$ . Define a sequence  $x_n$  inductively as follows. Assume:

$$\|y - \Lambda(x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_n)\| < \epsilon\delta 2^{-n} \quad (2)$$

Then by (1) we can pick  $x_{n+1}$  so that:

$$\|x_{n+1}\| < \epsilon 2^{-n} \quad (3)$$

and  $\|y - \Lambda(x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_n) - \Lambda(x_{n+1})\| < \epsilon\delta 2^{-(n+1)}$ , so (2) is satisfied for  $x_{n+1}$ .

Put  $s_n = x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_n$ . Then from (3),  $s_n$  is a Cauchy sequence, and so, since  $X$  is complete, it converges to some  $x \in X$ . By (2),  $\Lambda s_n \rightarrow y$ , and by the continuity of  $\Lambda$ ,  $\Lambda s_n \rightarrow \Lambda x$ , so  $\Lambda x = y$ . Also,  $\|x\| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|s_n\| \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|x_n\| < 1 + \epsilon$ . Thus  $\Lambda((1 + \epsilon)U) \supset \eta V$ , or  $\Lambda(U) \supset (1 + \epsilon)^{-1}\delta V$ . Since this is true for all  $\epsilon > 0$ , we have  $\Lambda(U) \supset \cup_{\epsilon > 0} (1 + \epsilon)^{-1}\delta V = \delta V$ .