Midterm #1

Eric Tao
Math 237: Midterm #1

March 13, 2024

The Tufts University statement on academic integrity holds that: "Academic integrity is the joint responsibility of faculty, students, and staff. Each member of the community is responsible for integrity in their own behavior and for contributing to an overall environment of integrity at the university." I accept this responsibility, affirm that I am an honest person who can be trusted with to do the right thing, and certify that the work I will do on this exam is mine alone. I pledge that I have used only the reference sources I have cited in my answers.

Digital Signature: Eric Tao

Question 1. Let (X, ρ) be a compact metric space, and $f : X \to X$ a function such that:

$$\rho(f(x), f(y)) < \rho(x, y)$$

for all $x \neq y$.

Define $g : X \to \mathbb{R}$ via $g : x \mapsto \rho(x, f(x))$.

1.1)

Prove that g is Lipschitz, and that g has a minimum value, achieved at a point $x_0 \in X$. Conclude that there exists $x \in X$ such that $g(x) = 0$.

1.2)

Show that f has a unique fixed point x_0.

1.3)

Show that the assumption that X is compact may not be omitted.

Solution. 1.1)

Fix some $x \in X$, and let $y \in X$ be arbitrary. By the triangle inequality, we see that:

$$\begin{cases} \rho(x, f(x)) \leq & \rho(x, y) + \rho(y, f(x)) \\ \rho(y, f(x)) \leq & \rho(y, f(y)) + \rho(f(x), f(y)) \end{cases}$$

Combining these two equations with the property of f by hypothesis, we see that:

$$\rho(x, f(x)) - \rho(y, f(y)) \leq \rho(x, y) + \rho(f(x), f(y)) < 2\rho(x, y)$$

However, we notice that we may run the same computation in the triangle inequality, switching the labels of x, y, as $\rho(x, y) = \rho(y, x)$. Thus, we can conclude then that

$$|\rho(x, f(x)) - \rho(y, f(y))| < 2\rho(x, y)$$

and therefore, since the left side is exactly $d(g(x), g(y))$ with the metric of the real line, we may conclude that g is Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant at most 2.

Now, since g is Lipschitz continuous, it is continuous. Hence, since X is compact, g achieves its extremas. Hence, we may find $x_0 \in X$ such that g achieves its minimum value.

Suppose that $g(x_0) > 0$. Then, of course, we would have that $g(x_0) = \rho(x_0, f(x_0)) > 0$ and hence, $x_0 \neq f(x_0)$. Then, we can consider $g(f(x_0))$. We have that:

$$g(f(x_0)) = \rho(f(x_0), f(f(x_0))) < \rho(x_0, f(x_0)) = g(x_0)$$

But, this is a contradiction, as we assumed that g attained a minimum at x_0. Hence, $g(x_0) = 0$.

1.2)

From 1.1, we've shown that there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $g(x_0) = 0$. Evidently then:

$$g(x_0) = 0 \implies \rho(x_0, f(x_0)) = 0 \implies f(x_0) = x_0$$

Furthermore, this point must be unique, as suppose $f(x_1) = x_1$ as well. Assuming that $x_0 \neq x_1$, we have that:

$$\rho(x_0, x_1) = \rho(f(x_0), f(x_1)) < \rho(x_0, x_1)$$

which is absurd. Hence, $x_0 = x_1$.

1.3)

Here are some examples to show that we need X to be compact. Consider $X = \mathbb{Z}$, equipped with the standard metric $\rho(x, y) = |x - y|$. Of course, this is not compact, as the sequence $\{n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ cannot admit any convergent subsequence. If we take $f(x) = \text{round}(x/2)$, where the round function rounds to the integer closer to 0, then of course, we have that $\rho(f(x), f(y)) < \rho(x, y)$ for $x \neq y$, as it contracts all distances by at least $1/2$. On the other hand, it has multiple fixed points, $-1, 0, 1$.

Another example is to take the open interval $(0, 1)$, equipped with the standard metric $\rho(x, y)$, and consider the function $f(x) = x/2$. Evidently, in the same fashion, we still have that $\rho(f(x), f(y)) = |x/2 - y/2| = 1/2|x-y| = 1/2\rho(x, y) < \rho(x, y)$. However, g does not attain a minimum and f does not have a fixed point.

We can see g does not have a minimum as for any $\epsilon > 0$, we may choose $N \geq 1$ such that $1/N < \epsilon$. Then, $g(1/N) = \rho(1/N, f(1/N)) = |1/N - 1/2N| = 1/2N < 1/N < \epsilon$. Hence, $g(x)$ can be arbitrarily small. However, we can see that for $x = 1/2x$, this is satisfied only at $x = 0$, outside of $(0, 1)$. Hence, there is no x such that $g(x) = 0$ on $(0, 1)$, and no fixed point of f on $(0, 1)$.

$\square$

Question 2. Let X, Y be Banach spaces. Let $T \in L(X, Y)$. Show that T is surjective if and only if range(T) is not meager in Y.

Solution. One direction is trivial. Suppose T is surjective. Then, $Y = \text{range}(T)$. But, by the Baire Category Theorem (2.21, Heil), Y is nonmeager in Y, and we are done.

Now, suppose range(T) is not meager. Consider open balls in X centered on the origin, $B_n^X(0) = \{x \in X : \|x\| < n\}$, where we use the superscript to remind ourselves this is in X. Clearly, $X = \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n^X(0)$. Therefore, we have that the range of T can be expressed as:

$$\text{range}(T) = \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} T(B_n^X(0))$$

Since T is non-meager, there exists an m such that the closure $\overline{T(B_m^X(0)}$ contains an open ball, as its complement is not dense. We can consider the operator mT, and the closure $\overline{mT(B_1^X(0))}$ contains an open ball in Y, as $T(B_m^X(0) = mT(B_1^X(0))$ by linearity. Then, by Lemma 2.26 in Heil, we have that $mT(B_1^X(0))$ contains an open ball $B_r^Y(0)$ for some $r > 0$. Again, by linearity then, we have that $T(B_m^X(0)$ contains an open ball $B_{r/m}^Y(0)$.

So now, let $y \in Y$. In particular, consider $\frac{y}{\|y\|} * \frac{r}{2m}$. Evidently, the norm of this vector is $r/2m$, and hence is contained within $B_{r/m}^Y(0)$. Thus, there exists an $x \in X$ such that $T(x) = \frac{y}{\|y\|} * \frac{r}{2m}$. By linearity then, we have that:

$$T\left(\frac{2mx\|y\|}{r}\right) = \frac{2m\|y\|}{r} T(x) = \frac{2m\|y\|}{r} \frac{y}{\|y\|} \frac{r}{2m} = y$$

Hence, $Y \subseteq \text{range}(T)$, and therefore, $Y = \text{range}(T)$. Thus, T is surjective.

$\square$

Question 3. Let $C_b(\mathbb{R})$ be the space of bounded, continuous, real-valued functions. Let $C_b^1(\mathbb{R})$ be the space of functions such that $f, f' \in C_b(\mathbb{R})$. Equip both of these spaces with the uniform norm.

3.1)

Show that C_b is complete, and that C_b^1 is not complete.

3.2)

Show that the differentiation operator $D : C_b^1(\mathbb{R}) \to C_b(\mathbb{R})$ that sends $D : f \mapsto f'$ is unbounded, but has a closed graph.

Solution. 3.1)

First, consider the family of functions $f_n(x) = 2^{-n}\cos(13^n \pi x)$ for $n \geq 1$, and consider $g_m(x) = \sum_{n=1}^m f_n(x)$.

We have that the sequence of $\{g_m\}$ is uniformly Cauchy, as if we let $\epsilon > 0$, we may choose N such that $2^{-N+1} < \epsilon$, and then for $m, m' > N$ (WLOG, suppose $m > m'$), we have that:

$$|g_m(x) - g_{m'}(x)| = |\sum_{n=1}^{m} f_n(x) - \sum_{n=1}^{m'} f_n(x)| = |\sum_{n=m}^{m'} f_n(x)| \leq |\sum_{n=N}^{\infty} f_n(x)| \leq \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} |f_n(x)| \leq \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} 2^{-N} = 2^{-N+1}$$

Since this is independent of the point x, this is uniformly Cauchy. Since each g_m is continuous, being the finite sum of continuous functions, and the convergence is uniform, the pointwise limit $g(x) = \lim_{m\to\infty} g_m(x)$ is a continuous function. Moreover, we can see easily that g is bounded, as we can see that each of the partial sums are bounded above by $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-n} = 2$. However, this is a Weierstrauss function, famously known for being differentiable nowhere, as we satisfy the condition that $13/2 = 7.5 > 1 + 3/2\pi$. Since we have demonstrated a sequence of functions in C_b^1, convergent under the uniform norm to a function not in C_b^1, we may conclude that C_b^1 is not complete.

On the other hand, let $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subseteq C_b$, with $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|f_n\|_u < \infty$. Consider $f = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n$, and we will show that f is both bounded, and the uniform limit of the partial sums.

Evidently, f is bounded, as we can look at the partial sums $\sum_{n=1}^{N} f_n$. We have that $\|\sum_{n=1}^{N} f_n\|_u \leq \sum_{n=1}^{N} \|f_n\|_u < \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|f_n\|_u < \infty$, where the first inequality comes from the triangle inequality, and the second is simply our hypothesis of being absolutely convergent. Since this bound holds for all $N > 0$, it must hold in the limit as well. Hence, $\|f\|_u < \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|f_n\|_u < \infty$.

Now, we wish to show that $\sum_{n=1}^{N} f_n \to f$ uniformly. Since $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|f_n\|_u < \infty$, for $\epsilon > 0$, we may find a $M > 0$ such that for all $m > M$, $\sum_{n=M}^{\infty} \|f_n\|_u < \epsilon$. Now, let $m > M$, and consider $\|f - \sum_{n=1}^{m} f_n\|_u$. We see that:

$$\|f - \sum_{n=1}^{m} f_n\|_u = \|\sum_{n=m+1}^{\infty} f_n\|_u$$

Now, due to the positivitiy of the norm, since we have for each finite sum: $\|\sum_{n=m+1}^{p} f_n\|_u \leq \sum_{n=m+1}^{p} \|f_n\|_u \leq \sum_{n=m+1}^{\infty} \|f_n\|_u$, we may conclude that this holds in the limit as well.

Hence, we have that:

$$\|\sum_{n=m+1}^{\infty} f_n\|_u \leq \sum_{n=m+1}^{\infty} \|f_n\|_u < \epsilon$$

Thus, $f_n \to f$ uniformly, and hence, f is continuous. Therefore, $f \in C_b$, as desired, and $f_n \to f$ under the norm. Since the choice of absolutely convergent sequence was arbitrary, by 5.1 in Folland, since every absolutely convergent sequence converges, C_b must be complete.

3.2)

Evidently, D is unbounded. For example, take the family of functions $f_k = \sin(kx)$, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Clearly, this is a continuous function, bounded above by 1, and so $\|f_k\|_u = 1$. Furthermore, its derivative is $k\cos(kx)$, continuous, and for each k, bounded above by k. However, $\|D(f_k)\|_u = \|k\cos(kx)\|_u = k$. Since we may choose k arbitrarily large without affecting the norm of f_k, D is unbounded.

Now, suppose that we have $f_n \to f \in C_b^1$, and $Df_n = f_n' \to g \in C^1$, uniformly in both cases. Fix an arbitrary point $a \in \mathbb{R}$, and consider, for $x > a$, the closed interval $[a, x]$. Since we have that $f_n' \to g$ uniformly, evidently, $\|f_n'\|_u$ is bounded. Then, we can take $\sup_n \|f_n'\|_u < \infty$ as an upper bound for all $|f_n'(y)|, y \in [a, x]$. Of course also, if $f_n' \to g$ uniformly, it does so pointwise as well. Therefore, by the Lesbesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem, we have that:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_a^x f_n'(y)dy = \int_a^x g(y)dy$$

However, we know that f_n is differentiable on $[a, x]$, and f_n', its derivative is continuous. Thus, we may transform the left hand side via the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus to obtain:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} f_n(x) - f_n(a) = \int_a^x g(y)dy$$

Now, since $f_n \to f$ uniformly, it does so pointwise as well, so we have that:

$$f(x) - f(a) = \int_a^x g(y)dy$$

and finally, we can apply D to both sides of this equation, and since g is continuous, we can apply the other statement of the FTC to obtain:

$$D(f(x) - f(a)) = D\left(\int_a^x g(y)dy\right) \implies D(f)(x) = g(x)$$

Since the choice of a were arbitrary, we may repeat this argument for every x. Hence, varying across all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we obtain an equality of functions, and conclude that Df exists, and is equal to g everywhere.

Since this is true for an arbitrary $f_n \to f, f_n' \to g$, this is true for all cases where both sequences simultaneously converge, and hence D has a closed graph.

$\square$

Question 4. Let $\mathcal{H} = L^2[0,1]$, the Lebesgue measurable and square-integrable functions defined on $[0,1]$. Let K be a non-empty, closed, convex subset of $\mathcal{H}$. Define $P = P_K$ as the orthogonal projection of H onto K.

4.1)

Let $x \in \mathcal{H}$. Prove that the following are equivalent:

i) There exists a unique $z \in K$ such that $\|x - z\| = \min_{y \in K} \|x - y\|$.

ii) $z \in K$ and $\langle x - z, y - z\rangle \leq 0$ for all $y \in K$.

4.2)

Let A be a continuous bilinear mapping from $\mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that, for some $\alpha > 0$, we have:

$$A(f, f) \geq \alpha \|f\|_2^2$$

for every $f \in \mathcal{H}$. We will prove the following statement in parts:

For every $f \in \mathcal{H}$, there exists a unique $u \in K$ such that:

$$A(u, v - u) \geq \langle f, v - u\rangle$$

for all $v \in K$.

4.2.1)

Fix a $u \in \mathcal{H}$, and prove that there exists a unique $Tu \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $A(u, v) = \langle Tu, v\rangle$ for every $v \in \mathcal{H}$. Prove that T is a bounded linear mapping on $\mathcal{H}$.

4.2.2)

Fix a $\rho > 0$, $f \in \mathcal{H}$, and define a map $S_\rho : K \to K$ that sends $v \mapsto P(\rho f - \rho T v + v)$. Prove that we may choose ρ such that there exists a $0 < k < 1$ with the property that:

$$\|S_\rho(v_1) - S_\rho(v_2)\| \leq k\|v_1 - v_2\|$$

for all $v_1, v_2 \in K$.

4.2.3)

Conclude that for the value of $\rho > 0$ chosen in 4.2.2, that S_ρ is a contraction, and therefore has a unique fixed point $u \in K$.

4.2.4)

Note that we can rewrite $\rho f - \rho T u = \rho f - \rho T u + u - u$. Then, use 4.1 to show that:

$$\langle \rho f - \rho T u, v - u\rangle \leq 0$$

for every $v \in K$.

4.2.5)

Conclude that, for every $f \in \mathcal{H}$, there exists a unique $u \in K$ such that:

$$A(u, v - u) \geq \langle f, v - u\rangle$$

Solution. 4.1)

First, we show that if $\langle x - z, y - z\rangle \leq 0$, then we get that $\|x - z\| = \min \|x - y\|$.

We have the following sequence of equalities, for arbitrary y:

$$\langle x - z, y - z\rangle = \langle x - z, y + (x - x) - z\rangle = \langle x - z, x - z\rangle + \langle x - z, y - x\rangle = \|x - z\|^2 + \langle x - z, y - x\rangle$$

Then, we have that:

$$\langle x-z, y-z\rangle \leq 0 \implies \|x-z\|^2 + \langle x-z, y-x\rangle \leq 0 \implies \|x-z\|^2 \leq -\langle x-z, y-x\rangle$$

Since the norm is positive, we may harmlessly replace $\langle x-z, y-x\rangle$ with its absolute value. Then, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we retrieve:

$$\|x-z\|^2 \leq \|x-z\|\|y-x\| \implies \|x-z\| \leq \|y-x\| = \|x-y\|$$

Since this is true for all $y \in K$, including z itself, we conclude that $\|x-z\| = \min_{y\in K}\|x-y\|$.

Now, suppose that $z \in K$ is such that $\|x-z\| = \min_{y\in K}\|x-y\|$. By convexity, for any $y \in K$, we may reexpress $y = (1-t)z + tw$ for at least some fixed $w \in K, t \in [0,1]$, hence, we have that:

$$\|x-z\| \leq \|x-(1-t)z+tw\| = \|x-z-t(w-z)\|$$

We may safely square both sides and examine the inner product instead. Thus, we have that:

$$\langle x-z, x-z\rangle \leq \langle x-z-t(w-z), x-z-t(w-z)\rangle$$

Using the linearity and conjugate linearity of the inner product, we see that the RHS can be rewritten as:

$$\langle x-z-t(w-z), x-z-t(w-z)\rangle = \langle x-z, x-z\rangle - t\langle x-z, w-z\rangle - t\langle w-z, x-z\rangle + t^2\langle w-z, w-z\rangle$$

Hence, we have that:

$$\langle x-z, x-z\rangle \leq \langle x-z-t(w-z), x-z-t(w-z)\rangle \implies \langle x-z, w-z\rangle + \langle w-z, x-z\rangle \leq t\langle w-z, w-z\rangle$$

If we live in a complex Hilbert space, at most, I can conclude that the real component is non-positive.

On the other hand, assuming that $\langle x-z, w-z\rangle$ is purely real as we live in a real Hilbert space, then as we vary t, since the inner products are constants, this must hold for all $t \in (0,1]$, and hence, we have that:

$$2\langle x-z, w-z\rangle \leq 0 \implies \langle x-z, w-z\rangle \leq 0$$

as desired.

4.2.1)

Let $u \in \mathcal{H}$. By the bilinearity of A, we have that:

$$A_u : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R} \quad A_u : v \mapsto A(u,v)$$

is a linear functional on $\mathcal{H}$. Moreover, since A is continuous, it is continuous in each variable, and hence A_u is a continuous linear functional. Thus, since $\mathcal{H}, \mathbb{R}$ are normed linear spaces, and A_u is a continuous linear operators, A_u is bounded (1.63, Heil).

Since $\mathcal{H}$ is a Hilbert space, we can identify a w_u such that $A_u(v) = \langle v, w_u\rangle$ by the Riesz Representation Theorem (Folland, 5.25). Since A is real-valued, we can freely pick w_u to be in the first or second argument due to conjugate symmetry - we will from now on use $A_u(v) = \langle w_u, v\rangle$.

So now, we may define $T : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ that sends $u \mapsto w_u$. Evidently, due to the bilinearity of A, T is linear:

$$\begin{cases} \langle T(u+u'), v\rangle = A(u+u', v) = A(u,v) + A(u',v) = \langle T(u), v\rangle + \langle T(u'), v\rangle = \langle T(u)+T(u'), v\rangle \\ \langle T(ku), v\rangle = A(ku, v) = kA(u,v) = k\langle T(u), v\rangle \end{cases}$$

Now, we wish to show that T is bounded. First, restrict ourselves to $u \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $\|u\| = 1$, and consider the related family of operators as defined above A_u.

Fix any $v \in \mathcal{H}$, and consider $\sup_{\|u\|=1} \|A_u(v)\|$. By considering the related bounded linear function $\tilde{A}_v : \tilde{A}_v(u) = A(u, v)$, bounded and linear for the same reasons as A_u due to the bilinearity and continuity of A, we can see that:

$$\sup_{\|u\|=1} \|A_u(v)\| = \sup_{\|u\|=1} \|\tilde{A}_v(u)\| = \|\tilde{A}_v\| < \infty$$

Since we may repeat this argument for each fixed v, we satisfy the conditions for the uniform boundedness principle. Hence, we have that:

$$\sup \|A_u\| < \infty$$

Call this supremum N_A.

Now, for each u then, we may consider the value of $A_u(Tu)$. We have the following sequence of inequalities:

$$\|Tu\|^2 = \langle Tu, Tu\rangle = A_u(Tu) \leq \|A_u\|\|Tu\| \leq N_A\|Tu\|$$

which of course, implies that:

$$\|Tu\| \leq N_A < \infty$$

Since this is true for arbitrary unit norm u, this is true for all, and hence, T is bounded.

4.2.2)

First, we prove a lemma:

Lemma 1. *Let $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$. Then, we have that, for P the projection onto a closed, convex set K:*

$$\|P(x) - P(y)\| \leq \|x - y\|$$

Proof. First, suppose $P(x) = P(y)$. Then, for any x, y this is true, due to the non-negativity of the norm.

Let x, y be given. From the statement 4.1.ii, we have the following equations:

$$\begin{cases} \langle x - P(x), P(y) - P(x)\rangle \leq 0 \\ \langle y - P(y), P(x) - P(y)\rangle \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

where in the first equation, we let $P(y) \in K$ play the role of y in 4.1.ii, and $P(x)$ be y.

Now, summing these two equations, we have that:

$$\langle -x + P(x), P(x) - P(y)\rangle + \langle y - P(y), P(x) - P(y)\rangle \leq 0 \implies \langle(-x + y) + (P(x) - P(y)), P(x) - P(y)\rangle \leq 0$$

Hence, looking at $\|P(y) - P(x)\|^2$, we have that:

$$\|P(x)-P(y)\|^2 = \langle P(x)-P(y), P(x)-P(y)\rangle \leq \langle P(x)-P(y), P(x)-P(y)\rangle - \langle(-x+y)+(P(x)-P(y)), P(x)-P(y)\rangle$$

as the second quantity is at most 0, so subtracting it off creates a larger quantity. Now, combining these inner products, and pulling out two factors of -1 from the first term, we have that this is equal to:

$$\langle P(x) - P(y) + x - y - P(x) + P(y), P(x) - P(y)\rangle = \langle x - y, P(x) - P(y)\rangle$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz then, we have that:

$$\langle x - y, P(x) - P(y) \rangle \leq \|x - y\| \|P(x) - P(y)\|$$

where we do not worry about the absolute value, as this must be non-negative, being larger than a norm.

Hence, we have that:

$$\|P(x) - P(y)\|^2 \leq \|x - y\| \|P(x) - P(y)\| \implies \|x - y\|$$

□

Now, we apply the previous lemma on the vectors $\rho f - \rho T v_1 + v_1, \rho f - \rho T v_2 + v_2$, and their projections. We have that:

$$\|S_\rho(v_1) - S_\rho(v_2)\| = \|P(\rho f - \rho T v_1 + v_1) - P(\rho f - \rho T v_2 + v_2)\| \leq$$

$$\|\rho f - \rho T v_1 + v_1 - \rho f + \rho T v_2 - v_2\| = \|(v_1 - v_2) - \rho T(v_1 - v_2)\|$$

Now, since norms are non-negative, we may examine the square of this quantity and apply a polarization identity. We have that:

$$\|(v_1 - v_2) - \rho T(v_1 - v_2)\|^2 = \|v_1 - v_2\|^2 + \rho \|T(v_1 - v_2)\|^2 + 2\rho \langle v_1 - v_2, -T(v_1 - v_2) \rangle =$$
$$\|v_1 - v_2\|^2 + \rho \|T(v_1 - v_2)\|^2 - 2\rho A(v_1 - v_2, v_1 - v_2)$$

Using the definition of the operator norm as well as the hypothesis on A, we may conclude that this quantity is at most:

$$\|v_1 - v_2\|^2 + \rho^2 \|T\|^2 \|v_1 - v_2\|^2 - 2\rho\alpha \|v_1 - v_2\|^2 \leq \|v_1 - v_2\|^2 (1 + \rho^2 \|T\|^2 - 2\rho\alpha)$$

Looking at that coefficient, we see that to have $1 + \rho^2 \|T\|^2 - 2\rho\alpha < 1$, this implies that, since this is a parabola in ρ opening upwards:

$$\rho^2 T^2 - 2\rho\alpha < 0 \implies \rho(\rho T^2 - 2\alpha) < 0 \implies \rho \in \left(0, \frac{2\alpha}{\|T\|^2}\right)$$

Hence, for any ρ in this range, we have that:

$$\|S_\rho(v_1) - S_\rho(v_2)\|^2 \leq \|v_1 - v_2\|^2 (1 + \rho^2 \|T\|^2 - 2\rho\alpha) < \|v_1 - v_2\|^2 k$$

for some $k \in (0, 1)$. Hence, taking the square root of both sides, for this choice of ρ, k remains a bound.

4.2.3)

By definition then, since the ρ in 4.2.2 gives rise to a $k \in (0, 1)$ such that $\|S_\rho(v_1) - S_\rho(v_2)\| \leq k\|v_1 - v_2\|$, we see that S_ρ is a contraction on the metric. Hence, by the Banach fixed-point Theorem, there exists a unique fixed point $u \in K$ such that $S_\rho(u) = u$.

Alternatively, if we do not wish to appeal to the Banach fixed point Theorem for Metric spaces, we notice that that condition for ρ implies that we have satisfied the conditions for problem 1. Hence, by 1.2, there exists a unique fixed point, as we simply consider the metric induced by the norm.

4.2.4)

Identifying $\rho f - \rho T u + u$ as x, $P(\rho f - \rho T u + u) = z = S_\rho(u) = u$, and renaming y to v, we see that:

$$\langle \rho f - \rho T u + u - u, v - u \rangle \leq 0 \implies \langle \rho f - \rho T u, v - u \rangle \leq 0$$

4.2.5)

Ok, from here, consider $\rho A(u, v-u)$, where ρ is small enough such that we may find u, the unique fixed point associated to S_ρ determined by f. From 4.2.1, we have that:

$$\rho A(u, v-u) = \rho\langle Tu, v-u\rangle = \langle \rho f - \rho f + \rho Tu, v-u\rangle =$$

$$\rho\langle f, v-u\rangle + \langle -\rho f + \rho Tu, v-u\rangle$$

But, from 4.2.4, we see that:

$$\langle -\rho f + \rho Tu, v-u\rangle = -\langle \rho f - \rho Tu, v-u\rangle \geq 0$$

Hence, we conclude that:

$$\rho\langle f, v-u\rangle \leq \rho A(u, v-u) \implies \langle f, v-u\rangle \leq A(u, v-u)$$

$\square$

References

[1] Christopher Heil, *A Basis Theory Primer*, Expanded Edition Birkhäuser Boston, MA 2011.

[2] Gerald B. Folland, *Real Analysis - Modern Techniques and Their Applications*, Second Edition Wiley, New York 1999.

[3] Elias M. Stein & Rami Shakarchi *Functional Analysis - Introduction to Further Topics in Analysis* Princeton University Press, 2011

[4] Class collaborators Not all were consulted, but all were in the same room so best to be as comprehensive.