

# Global Solver based on the Sperner-Lemma and Mazurkewicz- Knaster-Kuratowski-Lemma based proof of the Brouwer Fixed-Point theorem

*Thilo Moshagen* \*\*

Hochschule Wismar, Germany

## Abstract

In this paper a fixed-point solver for mappings from a Simplex into itself that is gradient-free, global and requires  $\binom{d+1}{2}$  function evaluations for halvening the error is presented. It is based on topological arguments and uses the constructive proof of the Mazurkewicz-Knaster-Kuratowski lemma when used as part of the proof for Brouwers Fixed-Point theorem.

**Keywords:** topological solver, bisection solver, root finding, Brouwers Fixed Point Theorem, Mapping Degree, Sperner Lemma, Knaster-Kuratowski-Mazurkewicz-Lemma

## 1 Overview

Let

$$F : \mathbb{R}^d \supset \mathcal{S} := \text{conv}(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_d) \longrightarrow \mathcal{S} = \text{conv}(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_d) \quad (1)$$

be a continuous mapping from  $\text{conv}(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_d)$  into itself. Brouwers Fixed Point theorem for simplices states that there is a Fixed Point

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}. \quad (2)$$

The popular proof of it (see section B) using the Knaster-Kuratowski-Mazurkewicz lemma (*KKM-lemma*, Theorem B.2) uses points' change of distance to simplex corners under the mapping - points whose distance to all corners is not reduces are fixed points. The KKM-lemmas proof contains an algorithm to find those points.

In the Appendix A.1 it is shown that most zero search problems can be transformed into the above Fixed Point shape and are in the scope of this contribution.




Fig. 1: Sets  $C_i$  of points that are mapped not closer to corner  $\mathbf{v}_i$  by some mapping. The intersection of all  $C_i$  are fixed points.

## 1.1 Synopsis

The working principle of the algorithm suggested in this paper as well as the proof of Brouwer's Fixed-Point theorem used for it can be visualized as follows: Let the  $\lambda_i(\mathbf{u})$  denote the components of the barycentric coordinates of a point  $\mathbf{u}$  with respect to the corners  $\{\mathbf{v}_j\}$ . The bigger  $\lambda_i(\mathbf{u})$ , the closer  $\mathbf{u}$  is to corner  $\mathbf{v}_i$ . Thus, the sets

$$C_i = \{\mathbf{u} \in S : \lambda_i(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{u})) \leq \lambda_i(\mathbf{u})\}$$

are the sets of points that are mapped away or equally far from corner  $\mathbf{v}_i$ , equivalently, not closer to  $\mathbf{v}_i$ . A point that is mapped not closer to any corner is a fixed point, so all points in the intersection of all  $C_i$  are fixed points.

Assume the  $C_i$  look like in Fig. 1. To find the fixed point, bisect the simplex, from the emerging simplices choose one with corners in all  $C_i$ , bisect it again and so on.

## 1.2 Usage of the Knaster-Kuratowski-Mazurkewicz-Lemma

We utilize the proof of Brouwer's Fixed Point Theorem using the Sperner-Lemma (Th. B.1) and Knaster-Kuratowski-Mazurkewicz-Lemma (KKM)(Th. B.2) [1, pp 60]. This proof is constructive: According to the KKM-Lemma, a simplex with a set of closed sets  $\{C_i\}_{i=1,\dots,d}$  with the property that each generalized face  $\text{conv}(\mathbf{v}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{i_n})$  is covered by the union of the  $C_i$  with the same indices, i.e.  $\mathbf{v}_1 \in C_1$ ,  $\text{conv}(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_3) \subset C_1 \cup C_3$ , ..., has at least one point that is in all  $C_i$ . From this follows Brouwer's Fixed Point Theorem by considering the aforementioned sets

$$C_i = \{\mathbf{u} \in S : \lambda_i(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{u})) \leq \lambda_i(\mathbf{u})\} \quad (3)$$

where the  $\lambda_i$  denote the components of the barycentric coordinates. In words,  $C_i$  are the points that are mapped further away from, precisely: not nearer to the corner

---

\*\*Corresponding author. Email: thilo.moshagen@hs-wismar.de

$v_i$ . They have a common point according to KKM, and an image point that was not mapped nearer to any corner is a fixed point.

Thus, if each corner of a simplex of a triangulation  $\mathcal{S}_j$  is in a different  $C_i$ , a fixed point must be close to it. The suggested algorithm's advantages are that it is gradient-free, global while it might miss solutions under certain circumstances, needs a low amount of function evaluations and is explorative, by which we mean that the data produced gives a good idea of the examined function and is suitable to be used for regression.

## 2 Algorithm

### 2.1 Basic Algorithm

The suggested procedure now draws from the proof of the KKM-Lemma (Theorem B.2) using the Sperner-Lemma (Theorem B.1). For any triangulation  $\{S_k\}$  of  $S$ , the first triangulation possibly being  $\mathcal{S}$  itself, index the nodes of the triangulation with the  $i$  from the  $C_i$  that contains them, possibly more than one. If a simplex' corners are indexed from 0 to  $d$ , eventually choosing one index if the corner is multiindexed, the simplex is called a *Sperner* simplex (Definition B.1) and contains or is close to the fixed point.

Now that simplex is refined by adding a new point. It again is indexed by the sets  $C_i$  it lies in. Thus an impair number (at least one) of the simplices of the refined triangulation again is Sperner, and as it is the Sperner simplex that is divided, at least one of the newly emerging simplices is Sperner. As this is true for refinement of just one of the possibly many Sperner simplices, at least one new Sperner simplex emerges for each divided one. The procedure is repeated and provides a sequence of simplices, in each step their corners are mapped less farther away from the corners of  $S$  than their preimage:

---

#### Algorithm 1 Knaster Solver in principle

---

- 1: Given: Function  $F$ , Initial Simplex  $\mathcal{S}$ . Eventually make initial triangulation  $\{\mathcal{S}_j\}$ .
  - 2: evaluate  $F$  on all nodes  $v_i$
  - 3: evaluate  $C_i$  membership on all nodes  $v_i$
  - 4: **for** *bisectionSteps* = 1, 2, ... **do**
  - 5:     **for** Subsimplices  $\mathcal{S}_j \in \{\mathcal{S}_i\}$  **do**
  - 6:         **if**  $\mathcal{S}_j$  is Sperner **then**
  - 7:             bisect  $\mathcal{S}_j$  and neighbor
  - 8:             on new Point evaluate  $F$
  - 9:             on new Point evaluate  $C_i$  membership
  - 10:         **end if**
  - 11:     **end for**
  - 12: **end for**
- 

### 2.2 Details of the Algorithm

A refinement algorithm that is consistent for arbitrary dimension is needed, which means that a node inserted on an edge should become corner of all simplices that

emerge from the refinement, often expressed as there should be no hanging nodes. Furthermore, it should not produce small angles between edges and it should reduce the maximum edge length in each step.

These requirements are met by an algorithm that places a point in the middle of

---

**Algorithm 2** Knaster Solver. For explanations see 2.2

---

```

1: Given: Function  $\mathbf{F}$ , Initial Simplex  $\mathcal{S}$ . Eventually make initial triangulation
    $\{\mathcal{S}_j\}$ .
2: vectors of edges, edge ages, memberships of simplices for each node.
3: Initialize edge age vector,  $(\mathbf{0}, e_i)$  with 0 and  $(e_i, e_j)$  with 1
4: evaluate  $\mathbf{F}$  on all nodes  $\mathbf{v}_i$ 
5: evaluate  $C_i$  membership on all nodes  $\mathbf{v}_i$  and Sperner Property on all  $\{\mathcal{S}_i\}$ 
6: for  $bisectionSteps = 1, 2, \dots$  do
7:   Increase EdgeAges by 2
8:   for Edges  $(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j)$  do
9:     if  $edgeAge > 3 + ageCount$  then
10:      if Any of Subsimplices  $\mathcal{S}_k$  with  $(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j) \in \mathcal{S}_k$  is Sperner then
11:        create  $\mathbf{u}_{new}$  in the middle of oldest edge, add it to node list,
12:        on new Point evaluate  $\mathbf{F}$  and  $C_i$  membership
13:        add  $(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_{new}), (\mathbf{u}_{new}, \mathbf{u}_j)$  to edge list, set their edge age to 0
14:        bisect all  $\mathcal{S}_j$  that shared the split edge
15:        add new simplices to simplex list,
16:        add new edges to edge list, set their edge age to 1.
17:         $refFlag = 1$ 
18:      end if
19:    end if
20:  end for
21:  if  $refFlag$  then
22:     $ageCount = ageCount + 1$ 
23:  else
24:    for Edges  $(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j)$  do
25:      if  $edgeAge > 2 + ageCount$  then
26:        bisect around edge as above
27:      end if
28:    end for
29:  end if
30: end for

```

---

the longest edge of a simplex marked for refinement, and then splits all simplices that shares this edge (2)

The edge age 0 is assigned to the bisected edge only, age one is assigned to all new edges that are shorter than those of the old Sperner simplex, but not halved. Thus, it is guaranteed that a newly halved edge is the last in the file of edges that are candidates for refinement. In this shape, the algorithm converges as described in section 2.3.

The *age count* construction establishes that the algorithm does not run idly until edges grow old enough for refinement.




Fig. 2: Left: The fixed point is inside the sperner simplex and will be in such after refinement. Middle: The fixed point is not inside the Sperner simplex, but in the non-Sperner above. Right: A simplex is non-Sperner and contains a pair number of fixed points.

### 2.2.1 Situations that make the algorithm miss Fixed Points

The algorithm detects  $\mathcal{S}_j$  with corners in all  $C_j$ . The fixed point is where all  $C_i$ 's boundaries meet (37). A pair number of fixed points is missed by the algorithm if a bounded subset of  $C_i$  is subset of a  $\mathcal{S}_j$  (Figure 2, right). In general, a fixed point might be missed in all situations where for one  $C_i$   $C_i \cap \mathcal{S}_j \neq \emptyset$  but  $C_i$  contains no corner of  $\mathcal{S}_j$ . In these two situations initial refinement of the triangulation may reveal further fixed points.

The algorithm is sure to find one fixed point and likely to find a good part of the fixed points. A fixed point may not be inside the Sperner simplex that it causes. Nevertheless, the sequence of Sperner simplices approaches the fixed point (Figure 2, middle).

## 2.3 Convergence

We denote by error the maximum distance between possible positions of the fixed point.

The algorithm yields in the best case as many sequences  $(\mathcal{S}_i)_{i=1,\dots}$  of Sperner simplices as there are fixed points. They obey  $\mathcal{S}_i \cap \mathcal{S}_{i+1} \neq \emptyset$ , as for each divided Sperner simplex a new one emerges, but not necessarily  $\mathcal{S}_i \supset \mathcal{S}_{i+1}$ . Thus it cannot be generally said that  $\mathcal{S}_{i+1}$  has half the volume as  $\mathcal{S}_i$  and a reduced maximum diameter. This makes a general convergence and computational cost estimate difficult. But remind that convergence statements for Newton-like solvers require an initial proximity of starting point and zero as well. Thus, an obvious convergence and computational effort statement is given for the situation shown in Figure 2, left image:

For simplicity, we consider the simplex with  $\mathbf{v}_0 = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\mathbf{v}_i = \mathbf{e}_i$ . Independent of the dimension, the edges containing  $\mathbf{0}$  are of length 1 and those between  $\mathbf{v}_i$  and  $\mathbf{v}_j$  are of length  $\sqrt{2}$ . The longest edges are refined first and this behavior is inherited to the child simplices by the edge age mechanisms as long as it is always a child that is the emerging sperner simplex. Furthermore, upon division, the child simplices have  $d$  new edges that contain the new point, and the remaining  $\binom{d+1}{2} - d = \frac{(d-1)d}{2}$  old edges which they inherit. All new edges are shorter than their old counterparts (those that

connected to the now replaced node), but only the half of the divided edge has half the old length. To find the number of iterations after which all edges have been refined at least once, divide  $\binom{d+1}{2} = \frac{(d+1)d}{2}$  by  $d$ , yielding  $\frac{(d+1)}{2}$ , eventually rounded upwards, refinements that are necessary to reduce the maximum diameter in all directions and halven it in  $\frac{(d+1)}{2}$  directions.

As none of the new edges is refined again before all older edges are refined, and halvened edges are always refined only after the otherwise shortened edges, after  $\binom{d+1}{2}$  - the number of edges - refinements all edge lengths have been halvened once and shortened many times by further factors.

**Theorem 2.1.** *In a sequence of Sperner simplices from Algorithm 2 with  $\mathcal{S}_i \supset \mathcal{S}_{i+1}$ , after  $\frac{(d+1)}{2}$  steps requiring  $\frac{(d+1)}{2}$  function evaluations the error is halvened in  $\frac{(d+1)}{2}$  directions and reduced in all directions.*

*After  $\binom{d+1}{2}$  refinements requiring the same number of function evaluations, the error is guaranteed to be halvened.*

The second part of the result is very pessimistic.

## 2.4 Two Examples

The mapping

$$\mathbf{F} : \mathbb{R}^2 \supset \mathcal{S} := \text{conv}(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2) \longrightarrow \mathcal{S} \quad (4)$$

$$(x, y)^\top \mapsto \frac{1}{2}(x, y)^\top \quad (5)$$

has the fixed-point  $(0, 0)^\top$ . The predicted convergence result 2.1 is fully met (figure 3).

The sets  $C_i$ , the sets of points that are mapped not farther away from corner  $i$  under the mapping, are given in the same figure. Indeed fixed-point  $(0, 0)^\top$  would be found at once if tested for its  $C_i$  memberships, anyway this is an useful example.

The mapping

$$\mathbf{F} : \mathbb{R}^2 \supset \mathcal{S} := \text{conv}(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2) \longrightarrow \mathcal{S} \quad (6)$$

$$(x, y)^\top \mapsto (y, x)^\top \quad (7)$$

has  $C_0 = \mathcal{S}$ ,  $C_1$  is the area above the diagonal, and  $C_2$  is the area below the diagonal, thus the fixed-points are the common set of them, the diagonal  $\{(x, y)^\top : y = x\}$ . It is harder to see that the convergence result is met, but it is obvious that the algorithm works efficiently (figure 4).

## 3 Exploding number of Sperner Simplices

The convergence result Th. 2.1 assumes that a Sperner simplex upon bisection produces one new Sperner simplex, either a child or a neighbor that is divided for sharing the divided edge. The following example illustrates that this is not the case once nodes are in more than one  $C_i$ , which happens if the  $C_i$  are not disjoint.




Fig. 3: Left: The  $C_i$  of example (4):  $(x, y)^\top \mapsto \frac{1}{2}(x, y)^\top$ . All  $\mathbf{x}$  are mapped farther away from  $(1, 0)^\top$ , so in  $C_1$  (orange), same with  $C_2$  (yellow). Only the origin is mapped not closer to  $(0, 0)^\top$ , so in  $C_0$  (black), and is the fixed point. Right: Knaster algorithms refinement steps 2, 4 and 5 for example (4). The coloured markers show the  $C_i$  memberships: All points are in  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ , so orange and yellow, only the origin is in  $C_0$  as well and black.

### 3.1 Two Examples for a rising number of Sperner Simplices

#### 3.1.1 Example with one fixed point

The mapping

$$\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\mathbf{x}}{2d} + \frac{1}{2d}\mathbf{1} \quad (8)$$

has one fixed point at  $\mathbf{x}_F = \frac{1}{2d-1}\mathbf{1}$ , so for  $d = 2$  :  $\mathbf{x}_F = (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3})^\top$  and for  $d = 3$   $\mathbf{u}_{FP} = (\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4})^\top$ . Let  $d = 2$ . For this mapping,  $C_1 = \{\mathbf{x} : x_1 > \frac{1}{3}\}$ ,  $C_2 = \{\mathbf{x} : x_2 > \frac{1}{3}\}$




Fig. 4: Left: The  $C_i$  of example (6):  $(x, y)^\top \mapsto (y, x)^\top$  (switching  $x$  and  $y$ ). No point moves away from the origin, so all  $\mathbf{x}$  are in  $C_0$ . Subdiagonal points move away from  $(1, 0)^\top$ , those above the diagonal away from  $(0, 1)^\top$ . Right and below: refinement produced by the algorithm applied to example (6).

and  $C_0 = \{\mathbf{x} : x_2 \leq -x_1 + \frac{2}{3}\}^1$  (Fig. 5, top left). Thus the diagonal  $x_1 = x_2$  is in  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ , the node  $(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$  is in  $C_0$  and  $C_2$  and the node  $(0, \frac{1}{2})$  is in  $C_0$  and  $C_1$ . Those nodes produce Spner simplices, which are marked for refinement and produce computational effort (Fig. 5, top right and bottom left).

As the number of simplices that a node is a corner of grows with the dimension, this effect becomes stronger with growing dimension, as the example (8) with  $d = 3$  shows (Fig. 6). The convergence becomes hardly visible due to the high number of emerging spner simplices (see Table 2).

<sup>1</sup> Mind that here  $\lambda_1 = x_1$  and  $\lambda_2 = x_2$ . Then

$$\lambda_0 = 1 - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 = 1 - x_1 - x_2 \geq 1 - \left(\frac{1}{4}x_1 + \frac{1}{4}\right) - \left(\frac{1}{4}x_2 + \frac{1}{4}\right) \quad (9)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow -3x_1 - 3x_2 \geq 2 \quad (10)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow x_2 \leq -x_1 + \frac{2}{3}. \quad (11)$$






Fig. 5: Left: The  $C_i$  of example (8):  $(x, y)^\top \mapsto \frac{1}{4}\mathbf{x} + \frac{1}{4}\mathbf{1}$ . Right: Step 2 of the algorithm applied to working example (4). below left: Step 3. The triangles with  $x \leq \frac{1}{2}$  and  $y \geq \frac{1}{2}$  should not have been refined, and it would be sufficient to work only on one side of the diagonal.. Right: Step 6. Plot shows further unnecessary extra refinements.

## 4 Overcoming Sperner Simplex Number Explosion by unifying $C_i$ Membership

### 4.1 Redefining the $C_i$

There are ways to reduce the number of  $C_i$  memberships of nodes such that the prerequisite of the KKM lemma B.2

$$i \in \{i_1, \dots, i_n\} \text{ iff } \mathbf{u}_i \in \text{conv}(\mathbf{v}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{i_n}).$$

is met. To show that the emerging new  $C_i$  may be such that fixed points are lost, a brute force algorithm for discarding  $C_i$  memberships is presented in the appendix C.

The following algorithm does not conceal fixed points. Consider the following way to define  $C_i$ :

$$\mathbf{u} \in C_i \Leftrightarrow i = \arg \max_j \lambda_j(\mathbf{u}) - \lambda_j(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{u})). \quad (12)$$

As  $\arg \max$  gives more than one number if the maximum is attained for more than one  $j$ , the  $C_i$  are again not disjoint, but the cuts of the  $C_i$  should in most situations




Fig. 6: Left: Problem (8) for  $d = 3$ . Right: refinement around the fixed point is visible, but similarly to the  $2d$  case, the problem exhibits inefficient divisions of simplices.

Nr.	x	y
11	0.50000	0.25000
12	0.25000	0.50000
...	0.37500	0.37500
	0.37500	0.25000
	0.25000	0.37500
	0.43750	0.31250
	0.31250	0.43750
	0.31250	0.31250
	0.37500	0.31250
	0.31250	0.37500
	0.34375	0.34375

Nr.	x	y	z
85	0.18750	0.37500	0.18750
86	0.18750	0.37500	0.06250
...	0.18750	0.25000	0.18750
	0.25000	0.18750	0.06250
	0.31250	0.25000	0.06250
	0.18750	0.25000	0.06250
	0.25000	0.31250	0.06250
	0.18750	0.18750	0.12500
	0.18750	0.18750	0.18750
	0.25000	0.18750	0.25000
95	0.18750	0.25000	0.25000

Tab. 1: The last points found for problems (8) for  $2d$ , ( $\mathbf{u}_{FP} = (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3})^\top$ ), (left), and 10 points of the 3d solution path ( $\mathbf{u}_{FP} = (\frac{1}{5}, \frac{1}{5}, \frac{1}{5})^\top$ ) (right). It is the high number of Sperner Simplices that makes convergence invisible for the 3d case.

be the boundaries of the  $C_i$  and of measure 0. This reduces the number of emerging sperner simplices vastly. It remains to investigate in which situations intersections are not of measure 0. This is left to future work.

We

1. state that different from Sec. C, all fixed points remain in the cut of the  $C_i$ :  $\mathbf{u}_{FP} \in C_i$ ,  $i = 0, \dots, d$ , and thus potentially can be found by the suggested algorithm, as for fixed points  $\lambda_j(\mathbf{u}) - \lambda_j(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{u})) = 0$  for all  $j$ . Thus no fixed point is lost to the algorithm.

2. show that the emerging indexing of nodes by the index of the  $C_i$  membership still has the property (28) from the Sperner lemma,

$$i \in \{i_1, \dots, i_n\} \text{ iff } \mathbf{x}_i \in \text{conv}(\mathbf{v}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{i_n}).$$

Let  $\mathbf{u} \in \text{conv}(\mathbf{v}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{i_n})$ . Let  $\mathbf{u}$  be fixed point. Then  $\mathbf{u} \in C_i$  for all  $i$ , including  $i_1, \dots, i_n$ .

Now let  $\mathbf{u} \in \text{conv}(\mathbf{v}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{i_n})$  be no fixed point. Assume that  $\mathbf{u} \notin C_i$  for all  $i = i_1, \dots, i_n$ . Then

$$\max_{j=1, \dots, d} (\lambda_j(\mathbf{u}) - \lambda_j(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{u}))) = \max_{j \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_n\}} (\lambda_j(\mathbf{u}) - \lambda_j(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{u}))). \quad (13)$$

Furthermore, as  $\mathbf{x}$  is no fixed point, there is an  $j$  such that  $\lambda_j(\mathbf{u}) > \lambda_j(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{u}))$ , and thus

$$\max_j (\lambda_j(\mathbf{u}) - \lambda_j(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{u}))) > 0. \quad (14)$$

Altogether

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \max_{j=1, \dots, d} (\lambda_j(\mathbf{u}) - \lambda_j(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{u}))) &= \max_{j \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_n\}} (\lambda_j(\mathbf{u}) - \lambda_j(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{u}))) \\ &= \max_{j \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_n\}} (0 - \lambda_j(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{u}))) \leq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

which is a contradiction. Thus  $\mathbf{u} \in C_i$  for an  $i \in \{i_1, \dots, i_n\}$ . In particular, the definition is leaving all fixed points in the cut of the  $C_i$ :  $\mathbf{x}_{FG} \in C_i$ ,  $i = 0, \dots, d$ .




Fig. 7: Left: The  $C_i$  of example (16):  $(x, y)^\top \mapsto \frac{1}{4}\mathbf{x} + \frac{1}{4}\mathbf{1} + \epsilon$ , using  $C_i$  definition (12). Right: Refinement pattern for that example. Compare to Fig. 5.

## 4.2 Examples

Consider problem (8) again. In Fig. 7, the  $C_i$  as defined by (12) are shown: Consider the boundary between  $C_2$  and  $C_0$ . There  $\lambda_2(\mathbf{x}) - \lambda_2(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})) = \lambda_0(\mathbf{x}) - \lambda_0(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}))$  holds. A short calculation<sup>2</sup> yields  $x_2 = \frac{1}{4}x_1 + \frac{1}{4}$ . The boundary between  $C_1$  and  $C_0$  is

<sup>2</sup> From

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_2(\mathbf{x}) - \lambda_2(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})) &= \lambda_0(\mathbf{x}) - \lambda_0(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})) \\ &= 1 - \lambda_2(\mathbf{x}) - \lambda_1(\mathbf{x}) - (1 - \lambda_2(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})) - \lambda_1(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}))) \\ \Leftrightarrow 2\lambda_2(\mathbf{x}) - 2\lambda_2(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})) &= -\lambda_1(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda_1(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})). \end{aligned}$$




Fig. 8: Refinement pattern for example (16):  $(x, y, z)^\top \mapsto \frac{1}{6}\mathbf{x} + \frac{1}{6}\mathbf{1} + \epsilon$ , using  $C_i$  definition (12). Points concentrate early around the Fixed Point. Compare to Fig. 6.

calculated analogously, and the one between  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  must be on the diagonal for symmetry reasons. Compare to figure 5.

Now problem (8) is a simple test problem, and its simplicity causes nodes to be in more than one  $C_i$  for both ways of defining  $C_i$ , thus hiding the advantage of Def. (12). For example,  $(0, 0.5)^\top$  and  $(0.5, 0)^\top$  are in  $C_0$  and  $C_1$  respectively  $C_2$  when using Def. (12) as well. We thus slightly modify the problem by disturbing it:

$$\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\mathbf{x}}{2d} + \frac{1}{2d}\mathbf{1} + \epsilon. \quad (16)$$

The  $C_i$  memberships do not change in a visible way, they look as in Fig. 5. As the intersections of the  $C_i$  are quite wide and this essentially unaffected by the disturbance,

Apply this to

$$\mathbf{F} = \frac{1}{4}\mathbf{x} + \frac{1}{4}\mathbf{1}$$

using  $\lambda_1 = x_1$  and  $\lambda_2 = x_2$ :

$$\begin{aligned} 2x_2 - 2\left(\frac{1}{4}x_2 + \frac{1}{4}\right) &= -x_1 - 2\left(\frac{1}{4}x_1 + \frac{1}{4}\right) \\ \Leftrightarrow 4x_2 - 2 &= -3x_1 + 1 \\ \Leftrightarrow x_2 &= -\frac{1}{2}x_1 + \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Nr	x	y	z
95	0.18750	0.25000	0.25000
...	0.25000	0.18750	0.12500
	0.18750	0.25000	0.12500
	0.21875	0.21875	0.18750
	0.31250	0.15625	0.21875
	0.15625	0.31250	0.21875
	0.18750	0.21875	0.21875
	0.28125	0.18750	0.15625
	0.34375	0.21875	0.12500
	0.18750	0.28125	0.15625
105	0.21875	0.34375	0.12500

Nr	x	y	z
16	0.12500	0.12500	0.25000
17	0.25000	0.12500	0.37500
18	0.12500	0.25000	0.37500
...	0.37500	0.25000	0.25000
	0.25000	0.37500	0.25000
	0.18750	0.18750	0.25000
	0.25000	0.25000	0.12500
	0.31250	0.25000	0.12500
	0.25000	0.31250	0.12500
	0.21875	0.21875	0.12500
26	0.21875	0.21875	0.18750

Tab. 2: Points found for problem (16) in 3d ( $\mathbf{u}_{FP} \sim (\frac{1}{5}, \frac{1}{5}, \frac{1}{5})^\top$ ) Definition of  $C_i$  according to (32) (left) and (12) (right), 9 steps of algorithm, last 10 points from 105 (left) and 26 (right).




Fig. 9: Left: The  $C_i$  of example (6):  $(x, y)^\top \mapsto \frac{1}{2}(x, y)^\top$  (switching  $x$  and  $y$ ) using  $C_i$  definition (12).  $C_0$  is the diagonal only.  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  remain as in Fig. 9. Right and below: refinements using  $C_i$  definition (12). Compare to Fig. 9

the algorithm using the old  $C_i$  Def. (32) yields an identical refinement as in Fig. 5, so is neither presented again. Application of the new  $C_i$  membership criterion (12) yields a refinement pattern that is much more sparse (Figs. 7) and approaches the fixed point using less points (Tab. 2).

As a further example, the mapping that switches  $x$  and  $y$   $(x, y)^\top \mapsto \frac{1}{2}(x, y)^\top$  (6) using  $C_i$  definition (12) is plotted in Fig. 9. As on the diagonal  $\lambda_0(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda_0(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))$  and thus  $\lambda_0(\mathbf{x}) - \lambda_0(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})) = 0$ ,  $C_0$  is the diagonal only.  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  remain as for the old  $C_i$  definition. The refinement now is restricted to simplices that actually contain a fixed point.

The new refinement pattern is much more sparse and approaches the fixed point using less points. There are situations in which a lot of Sperner Simplices will emerge, however.

## 5 Brouwer's Fixed Point Theorem on convex, compact sets: Mapping to Simplices




Fig. 10: The Mapping  $\mathbf{V} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Omega$

The algorithm 2 applies to mappings  $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$  only.

Brouwer's Fixed Point Theorem applies to general compact hole-free sets  $\Omega$ , proven by arguing that there is always a bijective mapping  $A : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ . Thus, as  $\mathbf{F} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$  has a fixed point  $\mathbf{x}$ , the mapping

$$A^{-1} \circ \mathbf{F} \circ A : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$$

has the fixed point  $\mathbf{y} = A^{-1}\mathbf{x}$ .

The injectivity can be achieved for any bounded mapping (Section A.1).

For extending the algorithm to more general domains  $\Omega$ , this arguing is the wrong way around: The algorithm relies on Th. B.3 and consequently requires evaluations at corners of simplices, which one finds in the triangulation, while the function  $\tilde{\mathbf{F}}$  whose fixed points one wants to find is from  $\Omega$  to  $\Omega$ .

Thus, a mapping  $\mathbf{V} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Omega$  is needed and the algorithm is applied on the mapping

$$\mathbf{V}^{-1} \circ \mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{V} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{S} \tag{17}$$

$$\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{V}^{-1}(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{V}\mathbf{x})). \tag{18}$$

The mapping  $\mathbf{V} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Omega$  is readily found for square domains, without loss of generality  $\Omega = [0, 1]^d$ : Then, for  $x_j$  being the maximum component of  $\mathbf{x}$ , the relation

$$\frac{x_j}{(\mathbf{V}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}))_j} = \frac{1}{\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_1}\right)_j}$$

holds, yielding

$$(\mathbf{V}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}))_j = \left(\frac{x_j \mathbf{x}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_1}\right)_j \quad (19)$$

or

$$\mathbf{V}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_1} \mathbf{x}. \quad (20)$$

## 6 Discussion

The suggested algorithm can not and is not meant to concur with Newton-type solvers in settings where one looks for one specific zero which one has an idea of or even has a good starting solution.

The suggested algorithm does not necessarily find all solutions, but by applying additional refinements more solutions can be found in a much more systematic and efficient way than by placing a grid of initial points for Newton-type solvers.

### 6.1 Usage for optimization

The algorithm has the property that the scaling by the maximum values of the function for achieving the injectivity of the mapping that is presented in Appendix A.1 can be repeated once new maximum components are found and the  $C_i$  memberships can be recalculated, which is not computationally costly. In the worst case, simplices may have been misjudged as Sperner and been refined in vain. It thus seems feasible to use the suggested algorithm for search of zeros of the gradient during optimisation. Difference quotients can be calculated from the objective function evaluated at nodes. Initially coarse approximations of the gradient, the difference quotients improve with the refinements, and as suggested above, the  $C_i$  memberships can be rejudged using a posteriori rescaling at low computational cost.

### 6.2 Explorative nature of the algorithm

The strength of the algorithm is that it explores the function globally during the solution process, while Newton-type solvers deliver function evaluations only very close to the solution path, which means that their exploration is essentially one-dimensional. The number of function evaluations for the suggested algorithm is nominally higher than for Newton-type solvers, but the evaluated points are far more useful. The exploration of the suggested algorithm, though global, becomes finer near the points of interest. So the solving process produces not only a solution, but sensibly distributed function evaluations, useful for further usage in e.g. surrogate models such as neural networks. This can be useful in settings where evaluations are costly, e.g. if acquired through experiments. The algorithm then is a valuable Design-of-Experiment tool, as it suggests which evaluation point should be next for maximum information production.

### 6.3 Usage in combination with other solvers

Once it becomes clear that a fixed point is close to a Sperner simplex, possibly by usage of smoothness information, the search can be continued by a Newton-Type solver.

### 6.4 Exploitation of Mapping Degree Theory

The suggested algorithm makes use of the Mapping Degree Theory in the discrete form used to prove Fixed Point theorems as presented in Appendix B.

## 7 Acknowledgements

The author wants to thank Luisa Aust for her listening, reasoning and comments, but also for contributing imagery.

# Appendices

## A Transformations of Zero-Search Problems to injective Fixed-Point Form

For the zero search problem

$$\text{For } \mathbf{G} : \mathbb{R}^d \supset \Omega \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \quad (21)$$

$$\text{find } \mathbf{x}_0 : \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \mathbf{0}, \quad (22)$$

$\mathbf{G}$  bounded, the solution  $\mathbf{x}_0$  is also the solution of

$$\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x} \quad (23)$$

which has fixed point form, but in general is not injective.

### A.1 Transformation to injectivity

Now, a transformation to give (21) the injective mapping shape according to Eq. (1) is presented. We consider injectivity into  $\mathcal{S}$  only, so let  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$ .

Let  $\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{G})$  be a mapping that is positive, bounded and fulfils  $\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}$ , e.g.  $\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{G}) = \mathbf{G}^2$  where the square denotes  $\mathbf{G}_i^2 = (\mathbf{G}_i)^2$ . Then with

$$c_i = \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}} \{(\mathbf{U})_i\},$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{c_1} & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \frac{1}{c_d} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{G}) \leq \mathbf{1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{G}) = \mathbf{0} \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{G} = \mathbf{0} \quad (24)$$

where inequalities are to be read componentwise. Then

$$\mathbf{0} \leq -0.9 \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{c_1} U_1(G_1) & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \frac{1}{c_d} U_d(G_d) \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}, \quad (25)$$



which is the injectivity of

$$\mathbf{F} : \mathcal{S} \longrightarrow \mathcal{S} \tag{26}$$

$$\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{F} := -0.9 \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{c_1} U_1(G_1) & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \frac{1}{c_d} U_d(G_d) \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{x}, \tag{27}$$

and  $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{0}$  if  $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{0}$  or  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ . The latter zero is unintended and needs separate treatment.

## B Proof of Brouwer's Fixed Point theorem

The presented proof follows closely the proof given in [1, Ch. 2], which again follows closely the 1929 original. Consider a simplex  $\mathcal{S} := \text{conv}(\mathbf{v}_0, \dots, \mathbf{v}_d)$  and a triangulation of it into subsimplices  $\{\mathcal{S}_j\}$ . Let the corners of all  $\{\mathcal{S}_j\}$  be indexed in the following way:

$$i \in \{i_1, \dots, i_n\} \text{ iff } \mathbf{x}_i \in \text{conv}(\mathbf{v}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{i_n}) \tag{28}$$

in words: a corner of  $\{\mathcal{S}_j\}$ s number is that of one of the corners of the edge, face, 3d-face and so on of  $\mathcal{S}$  that contains that corner. For example,  $i \in \{0, 1\}$  iff  $\mathbf{x}_i$  on the edge between  $\mathbf{v}_0$  and  $\mathbf{v}_1$ .

**Def. B.1.** A simplex  $\mathcal{S}_j$  of the triangulation is called *Sperner* iff its corners are indexed with  $1, \dots, d$ .

**Theorem B.1** (Sperner's Lemma). Any triangulation with corners indexed as above contains an *impair* number of Sperner simplices.

*Proof.* A  $d - 1$ -dimensional subsimplex is called *distinguished* iff it contains indices  $1, 2, \dots, d-1$ . Thus if any  $d$ -dimensional subsimplex contains

- exactly one distinguished  $d - 1$ -subsimplex, then it is Sperner
- or none or more than one, then it is not Sperner.

In 1d, the distinguished subsimplices are the 0-knots. One is on the boundary of  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{v}_0)$  itself, yielding (sooner or later) one Sperner simplex. Others in the interior of  $\mathcal{S}$  yield (sooner or later) two Sperner simplices. As there is only one distinguished subsimplex on the boundary, the statement follows.

In 2d, the distinguished subsimplices are the edges containing 0- and 1-knots. On  $\text{conv}(\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1)$ , they are contained in one 2-simplex, so

- yielding one Sperner simplex each
- or a pair might produce none

so an *impair* number as the number of distinguished 1-simplices is *impair*. In the interior, a distinguished simplex is contained in two simplices, so yielding two or no Sperner simplices.

For  $d = 3, 4, \dots$ , the claim follows by induction by repeating the arguing that

- on  $\text{conv}(\mathbf{v}_0, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{d-1})$  there is an *impair* number of  $d - 1$ -Sperner simplices, so an *impair* number of distinguished subsimplices
- those distinguished simplices on the  $(\mathbf{v}_0, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{d-1})$  boundary face yield an *impair* number of Sperner simplices

- and those in the interior yield a pair number of Sperner simplices.

□

**Theorem B.2** (The Lemma of Knaster, Kuratowski and Mazurkewicz).

Let  $\mathcal{S} := \text{conv}(\mathbf{v}_0, \dots, \mathbf{v}_d)$  be a simplex and  $\{C_i\}$ ,  $i = 0, \dots, d$  a set of sets with the property

$$\text{conv}(\mathbf{v}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{i_n}) \subset \bigcup_{i_1, \dots, i_n} C_{i_k}. \quad (29)$$

Then there is a point  $\mathbf{x}$  that is in all  $C_i$

$$\mathbf{v} \in C_i, \quad i = 0, \dots, d. \quad (30)$$

*Proof.* Let  $\{\mathcal{S}_j\}$  be a triangulation of  $\mathcal{S}$  and let each corner of it be indexed with the number of the  $C_i$  it is in. Such an indexing exists as each corner is in at least one  $C_i$  by (29), and also by (29), prerequisite (28) is fulfilled. Thus, one  $\mathcal{S}_j$  of the triangulation is sperner, meaning that it contains elements of all  $C_i$ .

By bisecting the triangulation, there is a sequence of Sperner simplices in which each element has half the diameter as its predecessor. Thus the diameter of this sequence of Sperner simplices converges to zero, and there is a point  $\mathbf{x}$  that is in all  $C_i$ . □

**Theorem B.3** (Brouwer's Fixed Point theorem). *Let*

$$F : \mathcal{S} \longrightarrow \mathcal{S} \quad (31)$$

*be a continuous mapping. Then there is an  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$  with*

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\lambda_i(\mathbf{x})$  denote the  $i$ -th barycentric coordinate of  $\mathbf{x}$ ,  $i = 0, \dots, d$ . Define

$$C_i := \{\mathbf{x} : \lambda_i(F(\mathbf{x})) \leq \lambda_i(\mathbf{x})\} \quad i = 0, \dots, d. \quad (32)$$

In words, these are the sets of image points lying farther away from (precisely, not closer to) corner  $\mathbf{v}_i$  than the preimage.

It holds for the corners that  $\mathbf{v}_i \in C_i$  and moreover (29),

$$\text{conv}(\mathbf{v}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{i_n}) \subset \bigcup_{i_1, \dots, i_n} C_{i_k} : \quad (33)$$

Would that not be true, then there would be no  $\lambda_{i_k}$ ,  $k = 0, \dots, n \leq d$  such that

$$\lambda_i(F(\mathbf{x})) \leq \lambda_i(\mathbf{x}) \quad (34)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \lambda_i(F(\mathbf{x})) > \lambda_i(\mathbf{x}) \text{ for all } k = 0, \dots, n \leq d \quad (35)$$

But this contradicts that for barycentric coordinates,  $\sum_{i=0}^d \lambda_i = 1$ .

As those  $C_i$  fulfil prerequisite equation (29) of the lemma of Knaster, Kuratowski and Mazurkewicz, it follows that there is a point  $\mathbf{x}$  that is in all  $C_i$ . This means that for this  $\mathbf{x}$ ,

$$\lambda_i(F(\mathbf{x})) \leq \lambda_i(\mathbf{x}) \text{ for all } i = 0, \dots, d, \quad (36)$$

and as  $\sum_{i=0}^d \lambda_i = 1$ ,

$$\lambda_i(F(\mathbf{x})) = \lambda_i(\mathbf{x}) \text{ for all } i = 0, \dots, d, \quad (37)$$

so  $\mathbf{x}$  is a fixed point.

□

## C A brute force way to overcome Sperner Simplex Number Explosion

To work around the redundant production of Sperner simplices around nodes that have multi- $C_i$  membership, it seems feasible to just discard all  $C_i$  memberships of a node except one, e.g. the one with the smallest  $i$ . Repeating eq. (32) for readability,

$$C_i := \{\mathbf{u} \in S : \lambda_j(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{u})) \leq \lambda_j(\mathbf{u})\},$$

the  $C_i$  are the sets of points whose images are not closer to corner  $\mathbf{x}_i$ . For establishing the prerequisites of the KKM lemma B.2 and thus guarantee that at least one fixed point is found, we have to show that

1. the emerging indexing of nodes by the index of the remaining membership still has the property (28) from the Sperner lemma,

$$i \in \{i_1, \dots, i_n\} \text{ iff } \mathbf{x}_i \in \text{conv}(\mathbf{v}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{i_n}).$$

2. if  $C_i$  memberships of a corner of multiple Sperner simplices are discarded, at least one of those simplices remains Sperner.

The first is given if not only (29)

$$\text{conv}(\mathbf{v}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{i_n}) \subset \bigcup_{i_1, \dots, i_n} C_{i_k},$$

meaning each face of  $\mathcal{S}$  is covered by its corners'  $C_i$ , but furthermore *consist exclusively* of those  $C_i$  (otherwise the wrong memberships may be discarded):

$$C_m \cap \text{conv}(\mathbf{v}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{i_n}) = \emptyset \text{ iff } m \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_n\}.$$

In other words,  $C_m$  shall not intersect  $\text{conv}(\mathbf{v}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{i_n})$  unless  $m \in \{i_1, \dots, i_n\}$ . This is established in the following way: Let  $\mathbf{x} \in \text{conv}(\mathbf{v}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{i_n})$ . Then for  $m \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_n\}$  obviously  $\lambda_m(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ . On the other hand, the minimum  $\lambda_m(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})) = 0$ , which means that  $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}) \in \text{conv}(\mathbf{v}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{i_n})$  as  $\mathbf{x}$ . So (28) is given once all  $C_i$  memberships yielding from  $\lambda_i(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})) = \lambda_m(\mathbf{x}) = 0$  are discarded, and is not further affected if further memberships, e.g. all remaining memberships except one, are discarded.

**Remark C.1.**  $\lambda_m(\mathbf{x}) = 0$  is a sufficient criterium for ignoring  $C_m$  membership, because then either  $\lambda_i(\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})) = 0$  or not, and in the latter case  $\mathbf{x}$  is not in  $C_m$  neither. Above arguing assumed  $\mathbf{x} \in \text{conv}(\mathbf{v}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{i_n})$ ,  $m \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_n\}$ , which is established by  $\lambda_m(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ .

Unfortunately, the second property is not given. Consider the  $C_i$  plot Fig. 4 of problem (6). The interior points of the sets  $C_2$  as well as  $C_1$  are inside  $C_0$  and so assigned to  $C_0$ . So using this reduction, there will be no Sperner simplices in the interior of  $\mathcal{S}$  and all fixed points along the diagonal will be lost.

## References

- [1] Eberhard H. Zeidler. *Applied Functional Analysis: Applications to Mathematical Physics*. Springer New York, NY, 1995.