

# A BROUWER TYPE COINCIDENCE THEOREM

Helga Schirmer

(received March 21, 1966)

1. Introduction. Brouwer's celebrated fixed point theorem states that every map of a closed  $n$ -cell into itself has a fixed point.

A similar theorem is here proved for coincidences between a pair of maps  $(f, g): I^n \rightarrow I^n$ , where  $I^n$  denotes a closed  $n$ -cell (i. e. a homeomorph of the  $n$ -ball) and a coincidence is a point  $x \in I^n$  for which  $f(x) = g(x)$ . That two arbitrary maps  $(f, g): I^n \rightarrow I^n$  need not have a coincidence is shown by the pair  $f: I^n \rightarrow y_0$ ,  $g: I^n \rightarrow y_1$ , where  $y_0, y_1 \in I^n$  and  $y_0 \neq y_1$ . More generally, one can immediately construct a map  $g$  so that  $(f, g)$  is coincidence free if  $f$  is not surjective.

Therefore some restriction has to be imposed on the pair  $(f, g)$  for a 'Brouwer type' coincidence theorem. We prove

**THEOREM 1.** If  $f: I^n \rightarrow I^n$  maps the boundary of  $I^n$  essentially onto itself, then every pair  $(f, g): I^n \rightarrow I^n$  has a coincidence.

It includes Brouwer's fixed point theorem as the special case where  $f$  is the identity. A standard proof of Brouwer's result can be adapted to yield Theorem 1, but we use a different demonstration which renders in the fixed point case a probably new - although not a simpler - proof of Brouwer's theorem.

Holsztyński [1] has recently called a map  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  'universal for all maps of  $X$  into  $Y$ ' if for all  $g: X \rightarrow Y$  there

Canad. Math. Bull. vol. 9, no. 4, 1966

exists an  $x \in X$  such that  $f(x) = g(x)$ . Using his terminology, our theorem can be formulated as

**THEOREM 1'.** If  $f: I^n \rightarrow I^n$  maps the boundary of  $I^n$  essentially onto itself, then  $f$  is universal for all maps of  $I^n$  into itself. The condition that  $f$  maps the boundary  $\dot{I}^n$  of  $I^n$  essentially onto itself is sufficient, but not necessary for  $f$  to be universal, as is shown by the following example: Let  $I^n = \{x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in R^n; -1 \leq x_i \leq 1 \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , and define  $f: I^n \rightarrow I^n$  by

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) &= (1 + 2x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \text{ if } -1 \leq x_1 \leq 0, \\ &= (1 - 2x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \text{ if } 0 \leq x_1 \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Then  $f$  maps  $\dot{I}^n$  onto itself with degree zero, but is universal for all maps of  $I^n$  into itself in consequence of Brouwer's fixed point theorem.

2. A Lemma. A pair of maps  $(f, g): I^n \rightarrow I^n$  determines a product map  $f \times g: I^n \rightarrow I^n \times I^n$ , and a coincidence of  $(f, g)$  is a point  $x \in I^n$  for which  $(f \times g)(x) \in \Delta$ , where  $\Delta$  denotes the diagonal of  $I^n \times I^n$ . We establish first some results about the homotopy of the deleted product  $I^n \times I^n - \Delta$  needed in the proof of Theorem 1. The symbol  $X - A$  is used for the difference  $X - (A \cap X)$ , where not necessarily  $A \subseteq X$ . The  $n$ -cell  $I^n$  is described in terms of a homeomorphic  $n$ -ball

$$\{x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in R^n; x_1^2 + x_2^2 + \dots + x_n^2 \leq 1\},$$

and  $c = (0, 0, \dots, 0)$  is its centre.

Consider the commutative diagram

$$(1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & & k_* \\ & & \pi_{n-1}(I^n \times I^n - \Delta) \\ & \swarrow i_* & \searrow j_* \\ & \pi_{n-1}(I^n \times I^n - \Delta) & \end{array}$$

in which  $i_*$ ,  $j_*$ , and  $k_*$  are induced by injections.

LEMMA. The homomorphisms in (1) are isomorphisms for all  $n > 1$ .

Proof. i) Consider the homotopy

$$p_t: I^n \times I^n - \Delta \rightarrow I^n \times I^n - \Delta$$

given by

$$p_t(y_1, \lambda c + (1 - \lambda)y_2) = (y_1, (t + \lambda - \lambda t)c + (1-t)(1-\lambda)y_2),$$

where

$y_1, y_2 \in I^n$ ,  $y_1 \neq y_2$ ,  $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ . Then  $p_0$  is the identity and  $p = p_1$  is a deformation retraction of  $I^n \times I^n - \Delta$  onto  $I^n \times c$ .

Hence  $i_*$  is the inverse of the isomorphism

$$(2) \quad p_*: \pi_{n-1}(I^n \times I^n - \Delta) \rightarrow \pi_{n-1}(I^n \times c).$$

ii) Consider the homotopy

$$q_t: I^n \times I^n - \Delta \rightarrow I^n \times I^n - \Delta$$

given by

$$q_t(\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y, x) = (\lambda(1 - t)x + (1 - \lambda + \lambda t)y, x),$$

where

$x \in I^n$ ,  $y \in I^n$ ,  $y \neq x$ ,  $0 \leq \lambda < 1$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ . Then  $q_0$  is the identity and  $q = q_1$  is a deformation retraction of  $I^n \times I^n - \Delta$  onto  $I^n \times I^n - \Delta$ . Hence  $j_*$  is the inverse of the isomorphism

$$q_*: \pi_{n-1}(I^n \times I^n - \Delta) \rightarrow \pi_{n-1}(I^n \times I^n - \Delta).$$

iii) As  $i_*$  and  $j_*$  are isomorphisms, so is  $k_*$ .

3. Proof of Theorem 1. If  $n = 1$ , the theorem follows

quickly from a direct argument using the graph of  $f \times g$ .

Assume now that  $n > 1$ , and let  $(f, g): I^n \rightarrow I^n$  be a pair of maps such that  $f|_{I^n}$  is an essential map onto  $I^n$ . We prove that it cannot be coincidence free.

If  $(f, g)$  has a coincidence on  $I^n$ , then there is nothing left to show. Otherwise  $(f, g)$  determines a map

$$f \times g: I^n, I^n \rightarrow I^n \times I^n, I^n \times I^n - \Delta,$$

and the restriction  $f \times g|_{I^n}$  defines an element  $\alpha \in \pi_{n-1}(I^n \times I^n - \Delta)$ .

Assume by way of contradiction that  $(f, g)$  is coincidence free, so that  $f \times g$  is in fact a map

$$f \times g: I^n, I^n \rightarrow I^n \times I^n - \Delta, I^n \times I^n - \Delta.$$

Then  $j_* \alpha \in \pi_{n-1}(I^n \times I^n - \Delta)$  is the zero element, as the map  $j \circ (f \times g|_{I^n})$  has an extension over  $I^n$ .

But it follows from the construction of  $p_*$  in (2) that  $p_* \alpha \in \pi_{n-1}(I^n \times c)$  is the element determined by  $f|_{I^n}: I^n \rightarrow I^n$ , and hence non-zero as  $f|_{I^n}$  is essential. The lemma asserts that  $k_* p_* \alpha = k_* i_*^{-1} \alpha = j_* \alpha$  and that  $k_*$  is an isomorphism. This yields a contradiction, and therefore  $(f, g)$  must have a coincidence.

## REFERENCE

1. W. Holsztyński, Une généralisation du théorème de Brouwer sur les points invariants. Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Sér. Sci. Math. Astronom. Phys. 12, (1964), pages 603-606.

University of New Brunswick