

## Lecture 12

BFPT and Applications:

– Bellman Equation

**Banach Fixed Point Theorem (BFPT)**. Suppose that  $(X, d)$  is complete, and  $f: X \rightarrow X$ , is a  $d$ -contraction

then  $f$  has a unique fixed point (say  $x^*$ ), and  $\forall x \in X$

$$\text{for } x_n = \begin{cases} x, & n=0 \\ f(x_{n-1}), & n>0 \end{cases} = \begin{cases} x, & n=0 \\ f^{(n)}(x), & n>0 \end{cases} = \underline{f^{(n)}(x)},$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x^* \text{ (w.r.t. } d).$$

Remark: BFPT is very powerful: it asks a lot but it also gives uniqueness and approximation of the fixed point.

Proof. The proof will be based on the following lemma:

**Lemma (Uniqueness)**. If  $f$  is  $d$ -contraction and  $f$  has a fixed point then this is unique.  
(this does not use completeness).

Proof. Suppose that  $x^*, x^{**}$  with  $x^* \neq x^{**}$  are fixed points of  $f$ . Then

$$0 < d(x^*, x^{**}) = d(f(x^*), f(x^{**})) \\ \leq c_f d(x^*, x^{**}) \text{ where the last inequality}$$

17

follows due to the fact that  $f$  is a  $d$ -contraction.

Summarizing we have

$$0 < d(x^*, x^{**}) \leq c_f d(x^*, x^{**})$$

$$d(x^*, x^{**}) - c_f d(x^*, x^{**}) \leq 0 \Leftrightarrow$$

$(1 - c_f) d(x^*, x^{**}) \leq 0$ . This is impossible since

$1 - c_f > 0$  and  $d(x^*, x^{**}) > 0$ . Hence  $f$  has a unique fixed point.  $\square$

**Lemma (Fixed Points as Limits)** If  $(x_n)$  (see above for the definition) has a limit w.r.t.  $d$ , say  $y$ , then  $y$  is a fixed point of  $f$ . (Completeness is not used here)

**Proof.** We have that  $y = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f^{(n)}(x)$

$$= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(f^{(n-1)}(x)) \stackrel{\text{w.r.t. } d}{=} f(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f^{(n-1)}(x)) = f(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_{n-1})$$

$$\hookrightarrow = f(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f^{(n-1)}(x))$$

$$\stackrel{x_{n-1} \rightarrow y}{\Rightarrow} f(y) \Rightarrow y = f(y)$$

$x_{n-1} \rightarrow y$   
(why?)

$f$  is  
CONTRACTION  
 $\Downarrow$   
Lipschitz CONT.  
 $\Downarrow$   
CONT.

hence  $y = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n$  is a fixed point of  $f$ .  $\square$

**Lemma (Technical).**  $\forall n \geq 0 \quad d(x_{n+1}, x_n) \leq C_f^n d(x_1, x_0)$ .

**Proof.** By induction:

a. It is true for  $n=0$  since

$$d(x_1, x_0) = d(f(x_1), f(x_0)) = C_f^0 d(x_1, x_0).$$

b. Suppose that it is true for  $n=k$ , i.e.

$$d(x_{k+1}, x_k) \leq C_f^k d(x_1, x_0) \quad (*)$$

c. For  $n=k+1$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_{k+2}, x_{k+1}) &= d(f(x_{k+1}), f(x_k)) \leq \\ & C_f d(x_{k+1}, x_k) \leq C_f \cdot C_f^k d(x_1, x_0) \\ &= C_f^{k+1} d(x_1, x_0). \quad \Rightarrow \square \end{aligned}$$

$d(x_{k+2}, x_{k+1}) \leq C_f^{k+1} d(x_1, x_0)$  hence the property is true for  $n=k+1$ .  $\square$

## Lecture 12

**Lemma (Cauchy's).**  $(x_n)$  is  $(d)$ -Cauchy.

**Proof.** We have to examine the limiting behavior of  $d(x_n, x_m)$  as  $\min\{n, m\} \rightarrow \infty$ .

Suppose first that  $m > n$ : due to triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_m, x_n) &\leq d(x_m, x_{m-1}) + d(x_{m-1}, x_n) \\ &\leq d(x_m, x_{m-1}) + d(x_{m-1}, x_{m-2}) + d(x_{m-2}, x_n) \end{aligned}$$

$$\dots \leq d(x_m, x_{m-1}) + d(x_{m-1}, x_{m-2}) + \dots + d(x_{n+1}, x_n)$$

$$\leq C_f^{m-1} d(x_1, x_0) + C_f^{m-2} d(x_1, x_0) + \dots + C_f^n d(x_1, x_0)$$

Technical

$$= C_f^n d(x_1, x_0) (C_f^{m-1-n} + C_f^{m-2-n} + \dots + 1) =$$

$$= C_f^n d(x_1, x_0) \sum_{i=0}^{m-1-n} C_f^i \leq C_f^n d(x_1, x_0) \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} C_f^i$$

$$= \frac{C_f^n}{1-C_f} d(x_1, x_0)$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} C_f^i = \frac{1}{1-C_f}$$

geometric series

We have shown that if  $m > n$ ,  $d(x_m, x_n) \leq \frac{C_f^n}{1-C_f} d(x_1, x_0)$

It is obvious (by interchanging  $m$  with  $n$ ) that

$$\text{when } n \geq m \quad d(x_m, x_n) \leq \frac{C_f^m}{1-C_f} d(x_1, x_0).$$

Hence we generally obtain that:

$$(**) \quad d(x_m, x_n) \leq \frac{C_f^{\min(m,n)}}{1-C_f} d(x_1, x_0), \quad \forall m, n \in \mathbb{N}$$

We have that due to (\*\*\*) and that  $d(x_m, x_n) \geq 0 \quad \forall m, n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$0 \leq \lim_{\min(m,n) \rightarrow +\infty} d(x_m, x_n) \leq \lim_{\min(m,n) \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{c_f^{\min(m,n)}}{1-c_f} d(x_1, x_0)$$

$$= \frac{d(x_1, x_0)}{1-c_f} \lim_{\min(m,n) \rightarrow +\infty} c_f^{\min(m,n)} = \frac{d(x_1, x_0)}{1-c_f} \cdot 0 = 0.$$

Hence  $(x_n)$  is  $d$ -Cauchy.  $\square$

**Proof of BFPT continued:**  $\forall x \in X$ ,  $x_n = f^{(n)}(x)$ ,  $(x_n)$  is a Cauchy sequence due to Lemma Cauchy-ness. Since  $(X, d)$  is complete,  $(x_n)$  is  $(d-)$  convergent by being Cauchy. Due to Lemma Fixed points as limits, the  $(d-)$  limit of  $(x_n)$  is a fixed point of  $f$ . Due to Lemma Uniqueness  $f$  has a unique fixed point. Finally due to Lemma fixed points as limits, this unique fixed point is the limit of  $(x_n)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary.**  $(X, d)$  is complete and for some  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $f^{(\alpha)}$  is  $(d-)$  contraction. Then  $f$  has a unique fixed point.

**Proof.** By BFPT  $f^{(\alpha)}$  has a unique fixed point. Then due to **Remark**  $f$  has a unique fixed point.  $\square$

**Example.** Suppose that we want to study the equation (in  $\mathbb{R}$ )

$x = \sin(x)$ .  $x$  is a solution iff  $x$  is a fixed point of the  $\sin$  function. Hence we study the fixed point properties of this function. We know that  $\mathbb{R}, d_e$  is complete. Is  $\sin$  a  $d_e$ -contraction? Due to the results in the previous lecture  $\sin$  is a  $d_e$  contraction iff

$$C_{\sin} := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \frac{d \sin(x)}{dx} \right| < 1$$

But  $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |\cos(x)| = 1$  hence  $\sin$  is  $d_e/d_e$ -Lipschitz

continuous, but not a  $d_e$ -contraction. Consider  $\sin^{(2)}(x) := \sin(\sin(x))$ . Show that  $C_{\sin^{(2)}} = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \frac{d \sin(\sin(x))}{dx} \right| < 1$  hence  $\sin^{(2)}$  is contractive. Hence BFPT is applicable and thereb  $\sin^{(2)}$  has a unique fixed point. Hence  $\sin(x)$  has a unique fixed point, hence  $x = \sin(x)$  has a unique solution.  $\square$

## Reminder:

\* BFPT: If  $X$  admits a  $d$ , such that i.  $(X, d)$  is complete, and ii.  $f: X \rightarrow X$  is a  $d$ -contraction, then  $f$  has a unique fixed point in  $X$ , say  $x^*$ , and  $\forall y \in X$ ,  $x^* = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n$  (w.r.t.  $d$ ), where  $x_n = f^{(n)}(y)$ .

**Corollary** [Further locating  $x^*$ ]. If  $A$  is a closed and non empty subset of  $X$ , and  $\forall x \in A, f(x) \in A$ , then  $x^* \in A$ .

$\hookrightarrow f$  remains a self-map when restricted to  $A$ .

**Proof.**  $(X, d)$  is complete and  $A$  is closed (w.r.t.  $d$ ) subset of  $X$ . Hence  $(A, d)$  is a complete metric subspace of  $X$ . When  $f$  is restricted to  $A$  it remains a self-map.  $f: X \rightarrow X$  is a  $d$ -contraction, hence it is also a  $d$ -contraction when restricted to  $A$ . Hence due to BFPT  $f$  restricted to  $A$  has a unique fixed point inside  $A$ . But we also know that  $f$  has a unique fixed point,  $x^*$ , in  $X \supseteq A$ . Hence  $x^* \in A$ .  $\square$

**Corollary.** If  $A$  is closed and  $x^* \notin A$  then  $\exists x \in A: f(x) \notin A$ .



# Applications of BFPT:

## General Framework:

- $X$  will be generally a subset of  $B(Z, \mathbb{R})$  for  $Z$  some set and  $d$  will be either  $d_{\text{sup}}$  or some "modification" of  $d_{\text{sup}}$ .
- $\phi$  will denote the respective self-map on  $X$ . (i.e. if  $f$  lies in the aforementioned function space,  $\phi(f)$  will also lie there).
- We will study problems of existence and uniqueness of solutions of equations on such function spaces (functional equations)
- The crucial step will be to represent the issue of existence and uniqueness of solutions by the issue of the existence and uniqueness of fixed points of a suitable  $\phi$ . In this respect we will have to:
  - \* identify  $\phi$  as the self-map the fixed points of which are the solutions of the equations
  - \* show that  $\phi$  is well-defined (i.e. that it is a self-map)
  - \* ensure that BFPT is applicable in this framework.

- One possible difficulty is to show that  $\phi$  is a contraction.

One way to show contractivity by avoiding the definition goes through Blackwell's lemma. This runs as follows:

—  $d = d_{\text{sup}}$

—  $X \subseteq B(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R})$  contains every constant function.

Furthermore, if  $f \in X$ ,  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  then  $f + \alpha \in X$ .  
( $\alpha$  can be perceived as a constant function  $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\alpha(x) = \alpha \forall x \in \mathbb{Z}$ )  
 $(f + \alpha)(x) = f(x) + \alpha(x) = f(x) + \alpha$

(e.g.  $B(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R})$  satisfies the above)

— if  $f, g \in X$  then  $f \succeq g \Leftrightarrow f(x) \geq g(x) \forall x \in \mathbb{Z}$ . (Definition)  
(partial order on  $X$ )

Blackwell Hypotheses:

BL1. if  $f \succeq g \Rightarrow \phi(f) \succeq \phi(g)$  (Monotonicity of  $\phi$ )  
 $[\phi(f), \phi(g): \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \in X$   
 $(\phi(f))(x) \geq (\phi(g))(x), \forall x \in \mathbb{Z}]$

BL2.  $\exists \delta \in (0, 1): \forall f \in X, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$

$\phi(f) + \delta \alpha \succeq \phi(f + \alpha)$   
discounting factor?

$\downarrow \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$        $\downarrow$  constant function  
 $\downarrow \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$   
Hence  $\phi(f) + \delta \alpha \in X$

Blackwell's Lemma: Under BL1 and BL2  $\phi$  is a  $d_{\text{sup}}$ -contraction.

Proof. Let  $f, g \in X$ .  $|f(x) - g(x)| \leq \sup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} |f(x) - g(x)| = d_{\text{sup}}(f, g) \forall x \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$\Rightarrow f(x) \leq g(x) + d_{\text{sup}}(f, g) \quad \forall x \in Z \quad (*)$$

Define  $g^*: Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , by  $g^*(x) := g(x) + d_{\text{sup}}(f, g)$ ,  $\forall x \in Z$

then  $g^* \in X$ .

Due to  $(*)$   $g^* \geq f$ .

Analogously we can show that:

$$g(x) \leq f(x) + d_{\text{sup}}(f, g) \quad \forall x \in Z$$

Define  $f^*: Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , by  $f^*(x) := f(x) + d_{\text{sup}}(f, g)$ ,  $\forall x \in Z$

and  $f^* \in X$ .

Analogously  $f^* \geq g$ .

Hence by the above constructions we have:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} g^* \geq f \\ f^* \geq g \end{array} \right. \xrightarrow[\text{by BLZ}]{f, g, f^*, g^* \in X} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \phi(g^*) \geq \phi(f) \\ \phi(f^*) \geq \phi(g) \end{array} \right. \quad (*)$$

$$\phi(g^*) = \phi(g + d_{\text{sup}}(f, g)) \stackrel{\text{BLZ}}{\leq} \phi(g) + \delta d_{\text{sup}}(f, g)$$

$$\phi(f^*) = \phi(f + d_{\text{sup}}(f, g)) \stackrel{\text{BLZ}}{\leq} \phi(f) + \delta d_{\text{sup}}(f, g) \quad (**)$$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \phi(g) + \delta d_{\text{sup}}(f, g) \geq \phi(g^*) \geq \phi(f) \\ \phi(f) + \delta d_{\text{sup}}(f, g) \geq \phi(f^*) \geq \phi(g) \end{array} \right\} = \square$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \phi(g) + \delta d_{\text{sup}}(f, g) &\geq \phi(f) \\ \phi(f) + \delta d_{\text{sup}}(f, g) &\geq \phi(g) \end{aligned} \right\} \Leftrightarrow$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} (\phi(g))(x) + \delta d_{\text{sup}}(f, g) &\geq (\phi(f))(x) \\ (\phi(f))(x) + \delta d_{\text{sup}}(f, g) &\geq (\phi(g))(x) \end{aligned} \right\} \forall x \in \mathbb{Z} \Leftrightarrow$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} (\phi(f))(x) - (\phi(g))(x) &\leq \delta d_{\text{sup}}(f, g) \\ (\phi(g))(x) - (\phi(f))(x) &\leq \delta d_{\text{sup}}(f, g) \end{aligned} \right\} \forall x \in \mathbb{Z} \Rightarrow$$

$$|(\phi(f))(x) - (\phi(g))(x)| \leq \delta d_{\text{sup}}(f, g) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{Z}$$

and since  $\delta d_{\text{sup}}(f, g)$  is independent of  $x$ , we have

that

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} |(\phi(f))(x) - (\phi(g))(x)| \leq \delta d_{\text{sup}}(f, g) \Leftrightarrow$$

$$d_{\text{sup}}(\phi(f), \phi(g)) \leq \delta d_{\text{sup}}(f, g)$$

Since  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  and  $f, g$  are arbitrary the previous

shows that  $\phi$  is a  $d_{\text{sup}}$ -contraction as requested.  $\square$

## Further Structure:

- i. We will assume that  $Z$  is endowed with the metric  $d_Z$ , w.r.t. which it is totally bounded and complete ( $Z$  is then termed compact w.r.t. the topology generated by  $d_Z$ ).
- ii. It is possible to prove that if  $Z, d_Z$  is compact then  $C(Z, \mathbb{R}) := \{f: Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, f \text{ } d_Z\text{-continuous}\}$  is a closed subset of  $B(Z, \mathbb{R})$  w.r.t.  $d_{\text{sup}}$ . Since  $B(Z, \mathbb{R}), d_{\text{sup}}$  is complete, this implies that  $(C(Z, \mathbb{R}), d_{\text{sup}})$  is a complete, metric subspace.
- iii. If  $Z, d_Z$  is compact and  $f \in C(Z, \mathbb{R})$  then  $\arg \max_{x \in Z} f(x) \neq \emptyset$ .

Application: Bellman Equation End of lecture 12

$Z, d_Z$  is compact.  $w: Z \times Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is jointly continuous,  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ .

Definition: [Bellman Equation]

$$(*) \quad f(x) = \sup_{y \in Z} [w(x, y) + \delta f(y)], \quad f \in C(Z, \mathbb{R}).$$

Lemma. Bellman equation has a unique solution inside  $C(Z, \mathbb{R})$ .

Remarks:  $\omega(x,y) + \delta f(y)$  is jointly continuous due to the continuity of  $\omega, f$ . For any  $x$ ,  $\omega(x,y) + \delta f(y)$  is then continuous w.r.t.  $y$ .  $y \in Z$ , and  $Z$  is compact hence due to iii

$\arg \max_{y \in Z} [\omega(x,y) + \delta f(y)] \neq \emptyset \quad \forall x \in X$  and thereby not only the

Supremum in the equation exists and  $\sup_{y \in Z} [\omega(x,y) + \delta f(y)] = \max_{y \in Z} [\omega(x,y) + \delta f(y)] \quad \forall x \in Z$ . Since sup in this context is

Continuous (Remember our first application!)  $\max_{y \in Z} [\omega(x,y) + \delta f(y)]$  is a continuous function of  $x$ , i.e.  $\max_{y \in Z} [\omega(x,y) + \delta f(y)] \in C(Z, \mathbb{R})$ .  $\square$

Proof of Lemma.

$X = C(Z, \mathbb{R})$  and  $d = d_{\text{sup}}$ . (this makes sense due to ii).

Consider  $\phi$  defined on  $C(Z, \mathbb{R})$  as:

$$(\phi(f))(x) := \max_{y \in Z} [\omega(x,y) + \delta f(y)], \quad \begin{matrix} f \in C(Z, \mathbb{R}) \\ x \in Z. \end{matrix}$$

Due to the previous remarks  $\phi$  is well-defined as a function  $C(Z, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow C(Z, \mathbb{R})$  (i.e. it is a self map on  $C(Z, \mathbb{R})$ ).

Furthermore  $(x) \Leftrightarrow f(x) = \max_{y \in Z} [\omega(x,y) + \delta f(y)] \quad \forall x \in Z$   
 $\Leftrightarrow f(x) = (\phi(f))(x) \quad \forall x \in Z$

$$\in) f = \Phi(f)$$

Hence  $f$  satisfies Bellman Equation iff it is a fixed point of  $\Phi$ .

Hence in order to prove the Lemma it suffices to prove that  $\Phi$  has a unique fixed point. We will use the BFTT.

a. we have that  $(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}), d_{\text{sup}}$  is complete due to ii above.

b. we will use Blackwell's lemma in order to show that  $\Phi$  is a  $d_{\text{sup}}$ -contraction:

I. constant functions  $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are obviously continuous and if  $f$  continuous and  $\alpha$  constant then  $f + \alpha$  continuous  $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

II. BLL: Let  $f, g \in (C(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}))$  and  $f \geq g \Leftrightarrow$

$$f(y) \geq g(y) \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{Z} \Leftrightarrow \delta f(y) \geq \delta g(y) \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{Z}$$

$\delta > 0$

$$\Rightarrow w(x, y) + \delta f(y) \geq w(x, y) + \delta g(y) \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$$

$$\Rightarrow \sup_{y \in \mathbb{Z}} [w(x, y) + \delta f(y)] \geq \sup_{y \in \mathbb{Z}} [w(x, y) + \delta g(y)] \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{Z}$$

Monotonicity of sup

$$\Rightarrow (\Phi(f))(x) \geq (\Phi(g))(x) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{Z} \Leftrightarrow \Phi(f) \geq \Phi(g).$$

Since  $f, g$  are arbitrary,  $\Phi$  is monotone and BLH holds.

III. Bhd. For the  $\delta$  that appears in the equation,

if  $f \in (Z, R)$ ,  $\alpha \in R$  we have

$$(\Phi(f+\alpha))(x) = \sup_{y \in Z} [w(x, y) + \delta(f(x) + \alpha)] \quad \forall x \in Z$$

$$= \sup_{y \in Z} [w(x, y) + \delta f(y) + \delta \alpha] \quad \forall x \in Z$$

$$= \sup_{y \in Z} [w(x, y) + \delta f(y)] + \delta \alpha \quad \forall x \in Z$$

$\delta \alpha$  is  
independent  
of  $y$

$$= (\Phi(f))(x) + \delta \alpha \quad \forall x \in Z$$

Hence we have shown that:  $(\Phi(f+\alpha))(x) = (\Phi(f))(x) + \delta \alpha \quad \forall x \in Z$

$$\Leftrightarrow \Phi(f+\alpha) = \Phi(f) + \delta \alpha$$

Hence BLH holds as equality.

Hence Blackwell's lemma applies and thereby  $\Phi$  is a sup contraction.

Hence BFPT applies and thereby  $\Phi$  has a unique fixed point, and thereby Bellman equation has a unique solution.  $\square$



## Application: Picard - Lindelöf Theorem

-  $Z = [\alpha, \beta]$ ,  $\alpha < \beta$ ,  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ .  $Z$  is compact w.r.t.  $da$ .

-  $H: [\alpha, \beta] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is jointly continuous,  $\exists \delta > 0$ :

$\forall x \in [\alpha, \beta]$ ,  $\forall y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  we have:

$$|H(x, y_1) - H(x, y_2)| \leq \delta |y_1 - y_2|$$

( $H(x, y)$  is Lipschitz continuous w.r.t.  $y$ ,  $\forall x \in X$  and the Lipschitz coefficient  $\delta$ , does not depend on  $x$ .)

-  $x_0 \in [\alpha, \beta]$ ,  $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Consider the following Boundary Value Problem (BVP):

$$(*) \quad \begin{cases} f'(x) = H(x, \underline{f(x)}) , \quad \forall x \in [\alpha, \beta] \\ f(x_0) = y_0 \end{cases}$$

Picard - Lindelöf Theorem. There exists a unique

$f \in C([\alpha, \beta], \mathbb{R})$  that solves  $(*)$ .

—  $X = C([a, b], \mathbb{R})$

— To be continued...