

ON THE FREDHOLM ALTERNATIVE FOR NONLINEAR OPERATORS

BY FELIX E. BROWDER

Communicated March 4, 1970

Let X be a locally convex topological vector space, Y a real Banach space, f a mapping (in general, nonlinear) of X into Y . In several recent papers ([5], [6], [7]), Pohožaev has studied the concept of *normal solvability* or the *Fredholm alternative* for mappings f of class C^1 . If $A_x = f'_x$ is the continuous linear mapping of X into Y which is the derivative of f at the point x of X , A_x^* the adjoint mapping of Y^* into X^* , his principal results assert that if the nullspace $N(A_x^*)$ is trivial for every x in X , and if one of the two following hypotheses hold:

- (1) Y is reflexive and $f(X)$ is weakly closed in Y ;
 - (2) Y is uniformly convex and $f(X)$ is closed in Y ;
- then the image $f(X)$ of f must be all of Y .

It is our purpose in the present paper to considerably sharpen and generalize these results by use of a different and more transparent argument. In particular, we establish a corresponding theorem for an arbitrary Banach space Y and $f(X)$ closed in Y , allow exceptional points x in X at which the hypothesis on $N(A_x^*)$ may not hold, and derive this theorem from a basic theorem on general rather than differentiable mappings. The techniques which we apply below may be extended to infinite-dimensional manifolds and may be localized to prove the openness of f under stronger hypotheses (as we shall do in another more detailed paper).

To state our basic theorem, we use the following definition:

DEFINITION 1. Let X be a real vector space, f a mapping of X into the real Banach space Y , x a point of X . Then the element v of the unit sphere $S_1(Y)$ of Y is said to lie in the set $R_x(f)$ of asymptotic directions for f at x if there exists $\xi \neq 0$ in X and a sequence $\{\gamma_j\}$ of positive numbers with $\gamma_j \rightarrow \infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ such that for each j , $f(x + \gamma_j \xi) \neq f(x)$, while

$$\|f(x + \gamma_j \xi) - f(x)\|^{-1} (f(x + \gamma_j \xi) - f(x)) \rightarrow v \quad (j \rightarrow \infty).$$

Our basic general result is the following:

THEOREM 1. Let X be a real vector space, Y a real Banach space, f a

AMS subject classifications. Primary 4780, 4610; Secondary 4785.

Key words and phrases. Fredholm alternative, nonlinear operators, normal solvability, set of asymptotic directions, differentiable mappings, cone with interior, closed range, Bishop-Phelps theorem.

mapping of X into Y such that $f(X)$ is closed in Y . Suppose that there exists a finite subset N of X such that for all x in $X - N$, the set $R_x(f)$ of asymptotic directions of f at x is dense in the unit sphere of Y .

Then $f(X) = Y$.

We note that the hypothesis of Theorem 1 does not assume that f is continuous in any topology, not to speak of being differentiable. On the other hand, the following lemma indicates how we may derive hypotheses on the asymptotic set of directions at a given point from hypotheses on the derivative if it exists:

LEMMA 1. Let X be a locally convex topological vector space, Y a Banach space, and let f be a mapping of an open subset of X into Y which is differentiable in the Gateaux sense at the point x with its derivative A_x a continuous linear mapping of X into Y . Suppose that the nullspace $N(A_x^*) = \{0\}$, where A_x^* is the adjoint map of A_x carrying Y^* into X^* .

Then $R_x(f)$ is dense in the unit sphere of Y .

PROOF OF LEMMA 1. If $N(A_x^*) = \{0\}$, then the range $R(A_x)$ of A_x is dense in Y , and in particular in the unit sphere of Y . Let y be a point of the dense set $R(A_x) \cap S_1(Y)$ in $S_1(Y)$. If $y = A_x(\xi)$ for ξ in X , then $\epsilon^{-1}[f(x + \epsilon\xi) - f(x)] \rightarrow y$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. It follows obviously since $\|y\| = 1$ that

$$\|f(x + \epsilon\xi) - f(x)\|^{-1}[f(x + \epsilon\xi) - f(x)] \rightarrow y \quad (\epsilon \rightarrow 0).$$

Hence y lies in $R_x(f)$. q.e.d.

THEOREM 2. Let X be a real locally convex topological vector space, f a mapping of X into the real Banach space Y . Let N be a finite subset of X , and suppose that f is differentiable in the Gateaux sense on $X - N$ and that if A_x is the derivative of f at the point x , A_x is a continuous linear mapping of X into Y and $N(A_x^*) = \{0\}$ for each x in $X - N$. Suppose further that $f(X)$ is closed in Y .

Then $f(X) = Y$.

Theorem 2 is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1 and Lemma 1. We note that for X a Banach space, mappings f which are continuously Fréchet differentiable with the range of A_x , the derivative of f , closed for each x in X ($N = \emptyset$) and with $N(A_x^*) = \{0\}$ for all x in X , the result of Theorem 2 is a simple consequence of a generalization of the implicit function theorem given by Graves [4]. In particular, if f is a nonlinear Fredholm mapping in the sense of Smale [8], A_x will have closed range for each x . However, the need for a different argument in general is forced by the fact that we do not assume $R(A_x)$ closed in Y , nor continuous differentiability, nor that $N = \emptyset$.

1. We base the proof of Theorem 1 on the following result in the geometry of Banach spaces:

THEOREM 3. *Let Y be a Banach space, S a closed subset of Y with $S = Y$. Let s_0 be a point in the boundary of S in Y , and let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. Then there exists a point s_1 in the boundary of S in Y with $\|s_0 - s_1\| < \epsilon$, an element v_0 of $S_1(Y)$, and $\zeta > 0$ such that*

$$C = \{y \mid y \in Y, 0 < \|y - s_1\| < \zeta, \| [\|y - s_1\|^{-1}(y - s_1) - v_0]\| < \zeta\}$$

does not intersect S .

In intuitive terms, Theorem 3 states that at some point s_1 of S near s_0 , there exists a cone with interior with vertex at s_1 which intersects S only at s_1 in the neighborhood of s_1 .

PROOF OF THEOREM 1 FROM THEOREM 3. We suppose that $S = f(X) \neq Y$. Let $S_1 = \text{bdry}(S)$. Since $R_x(f)$ is dense in Y for each point x in $X - N$, it follows that S is infinite. As a result, $S_1 - f(N)$ is non-empty. Indeed, suppose $S_1 = f(N)$ so that S_1 is finite, and let y_0 be a point in $S - f(N)$. For each ray R which emanates from y_0 , R contains points of S (namely y_0 itself) and can contain points of $Y - S$ only if R intersects $\text{bdry}(S) = S_1$. If S_1 is finite, only a finite number of such rays can intersect $Y - S$. Hence, all the other rays are contained in S , S is dense in Y , and since S is closed in Y by hypothesis, it follows that $S = Y$ contrary to our assumption.

We choose a point s_0 in $S_1 - f(N)$ and $\epsilon > 0$ with $\epsilon < \text{dist}(s_0, f(N))$. By Theorem 3, we can find a point s_1 in $\text{bdry}(S)$ and a suitable cone with vertex at s_1 intersecting S only in s_1 in some neighborhood of s_1 . Since s_1 lies in $S - f(N)$, there exists x in $X - N$ such that $f(x) = s_1$. In particular, if v_0 and ζ are the data for the cone at s_1 , we can find v in $R_x(f)$ such that $\|v - v_0\| < \zeta/2$. Since v lies in $R_x(f)$, there exists an element ξ in X and a sequence ϵ_j such that $\epsilon_j \rightarrow 0$, $f(x + \epsilon_j \xi) - f(x) \neq 0$, $f(x + \epsilon_j \xi) \rightarrow f(x)$, and

$$\|f(x + \epsilon_j \xi) - s_1\|^{-1} [f(x + \epsilon_j \xi) - s_1] \rightarrow v.$$

Set $y_j = f(x + \epsilon_j \xi)$ for each j . Then y_j lies in S , is distinct from s_1 for each j , $y_j \rightarrow s_1$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Hence for j sufficiently large, $\|y_j - s_1\| < \zeta$, while

$$\| \|y_j - s_1\|^{-1}(y_j - s_1) - v_0\| \leq \|v - v_0\| + \zeta/2 < \zeta,$$

which contradicts the characteristic property of the cone given by Theorem 3. q.e.d.

2. We now give the proof of Theorem 3, thereby completing the argument as well for Theorems 1 and 2. This proof is based upon a device applied by Bishop and Phelps [1] to prove the density of sup-

port points for a bounded closed convex subset C of Y . We note that for the case in which S is convex, Theorem 3 is equivalent to the Bishop-Phelps result. The basic tool of the argument is contained in the following lemma:

LEMMA 2. *Let Y be a Banach space, S_0 a closed bounded subset of Y . Suppose that C_0 is a closed cone with vertex at the origin in Y such that for a given y^* in $S_1(Y^*)$ and a constant $M > 0$,*

$$(1) \qquad \|y\| \leq M(y^*, y)$$

for all y in S_0 . (We use the notation (w, y) for the pairing between an element w of Y^* and an element y of Y .)

Then there exists an element y_0 of S_0 such that $S_0 \cap (y_0 + C_0) = \{y_0\}$.

PROOF OF LEMMA 2. We introduce a parting ordering on S_0 by letting $y \leq y_1$ whenever $y_1 \in y + C_0$. The point y_0 of S_0 satisfies the conclusion of Lemma 2 if and only if it is maximal in this ordering. To prove the existence of a maximal element, it suffices by Zorn's Lemma to prove that every totally ordered subfamily $\{y_\alpha\}$ of S_0 has an upper bound in S_0 . Consider any finite subfamily $\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n\}$ of the subfamily. We may assume that $y_1 \leq y_2 \leq \dots \leq y_n$, i.e. $y_{j+1} \in y_j + C_0$ for each j . By the inequality (1), we have $\|y_{j+1} - y_j\| \leq M(y^*, y_{j+1} - y_j)$.

If $k = \sup_{y \in S_0} \|y\|$, it follows that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \|y_{j+1} - y_j\| \leq M(y^*, y_n - y_1) \leq 2Mk.$$

Since this inequality holds for each finite subfamily, it follows that the family $\{y_\alpha\}$ is countable and may be written as a sequence $\{y_j\}$ with $y_j \leq y_{j+1}$ for each j . Then $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|y_{j+1} - y_j\| \leq 2Mk$, and $y_j \rightarrow y$ in Y , $y \geq y_j$ for all j . Since S_0 is closed, y lies in S_0 and is the desired upper bound for $\{y_\alpha\}$. q.e.d.

PROOF OF THEOREM 3. Let s_0 be a given point of $\text{bdry}(S)$, $\epsilon > 0$. Since s_0 lies in $\text{bdry}(S)$, there exists a point y_0 of $Y - S$ such that $\|y_0 - s_0\| < \epsilon/4$. For a given y_0 , we then find a point s_2 of S such that $\|s_2 - y_0\| \leq (4/3)\text{dist}(y_0, S)$. Thus if $d = \|y_0 - s_2\|$, it follows that $d < \epsilon/3$.

Let B be the closed ball of radius $d/4$ about y_0 , and let

$$C_1 = \{y \mid y = (1 - \lambda)s_2 + \lambda z, z \in B, \lambda \in [0, 1]\},$$

$$C_2 = \{y \mid y = \xi(z - s_2), z \in B, \xi \geq 0\}.$$

Then C_1 is a closed, bounded, convex subset of Y and C_2 is a closed cone in Y . Let $S_0 = S \cap C_1$. S_0 is a closed bounded subset of Y . Let $s \in S_0$. Then $s = (1 - \lambda)s_2 + \lambda z_1$ for some z_1 in B , λ in $[0, 1]$, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} 3d/4 \leq \text{dist}(y_0, S) &\leq \|y_0 - s\| \leq (1 - \lambda)\|y_0 - s_2\| + \lambda\|z_1 - y_0\| \\ &\leq (1 - \lambda)d + \lambda d/4, \end{aligned}$$

so that $\lambda \leq 1/3$. For any point s in S_0 and any element y of C_2 with $y = \xi(z - s_2)$, for z in B and $0 \leq \xi \leq 2/3$,

$$\begin{aligned} s + y &= (1 - \lambda)s_2 + \lambda z_1 + \xi(z - s_2) \\ &= (1 - \lambda - \xi)s_2 + (\lambda + \xi)[\lambda(\lambda + \xi)^{-1}z_1 + \xi(\lambda + \xi)^{-1}z] \in C_1 \end{aligned}$$

since $\lambda + \xi \leq 1$, $[\lambda(\lambda + \xi)^{-1}z_1 + \xi(\lambda + \xi)^{-1}z] \in B$ for z, z_1 in B . Moreover, for any element of the form $s + y$, $y = \xi(z - s_2)$ with z in B , $\xi > 2/3$, we have

$$\|s - (s + y)\| = \|y\| > (2/3)\|z - s_2\| \geq (2/3)(3d/4) = d/2.$$

We choose an element y^* of Y^* with $\|y^*\| = 1$ such that $(y^*, y_0 - s_2) > 0$ and then a constant $M > 0$ such that $M(y^*, y_0 - s_2) > d$. For this constant M , we form the closed cone C_3 given by $C_3 = \{y \mid \|y\| \leq M(y^*, y)\}$. The two cones C_2 and C_3 have $(y_0 - s_2)$ in their interior. Hence, so does their intersection $C_0 = C_2 \cap C_3$.

We apply Lemma 2 to the closed bounded subset S_0 and the cone C_0 (which satisfies the inequality (1) since $C_0 \subset C_3$). We obtain a point s_1 of S_0 such that $S_0 \cap (s_1 + C_0) = \{s_1\}$. Consider any point s of $S \cap (s_1 + C_0)$ with $\|s - s_1\| \leq d/2$. Then s lies in $s_1 + C_2$ and by our preceding remarks, s lies in C_1 . Hence s lies in $S_0 = S \cap C_1$ and therefore $s = s_1$. Since C_0 is a cone with interior, we can replace it by a smaller cone of the form

$$C' = \{y \mid \|[\|y\|^{-1}y - v_0]\| < \zeta\} \cup \{0\}$$

with $\zeta < d/2$. Moreover,

$$\|s_1 - s_0\| \leq \|y_0 - s_0\| + \|s_1 - y_0\| \leq \epsilon/4 + d \leq \epsilon/4 + \epsilon/3 < \epsilon. \quad \text{q.e.d.}$$

REMARKS. (1) The condition that N be finite can obviously be replaced by the weaker condition that $f(N)$ should not be dense in $\text{bdry}(f(X))$.

(2) The argument of Pohožaev in [7] is based upon the result of Edelstein [3] that in a uniformly convex set, the set of y for a given closed subset S such that $\text{dist}(y, S)$ is assumed forms a set dense in Y .

(3) For a discussion of the general approach using local arguments like the theorem of Graves [4], see §2 of the writer's paper [2].

(4) The term "Fredholm alternative" is obviously not unambiguous in its potential uses for nonlinear operators. In particular, the present considerations have no point of contact with recent results of

Nečas concerning the solvability of homogeneous operators of the form $T + \lambda S$ with T strongly monotone and S completely continuous.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. E. Bishop and R. R. Phelps, *The support functionals of a convex set*, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., vol. 7, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R. I., 1963, pp. 27–35. MR 27 #4051.
2. F. E. Browder, *Nonlinear operators and nonlinear equations of evolution in Banach spaces*, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., vol. 18, Part 2, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R. I. (to appear).
3. M. Edelstein, *On nearest points of sets in uniformly convex Banach spaces*, J. London Math. Soc. **43** (1968), 375–377. MR 37 #1954.
4. L. M. Graves, *Some mapping theorems*, Duke Math. J. **17** (1950), 111–114. MR 11, 729.
5. S. I. Pohožaev, *Normal solvability of nonlinear operators*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **184** (1969), 40–43 = Soviet Math. Dokl. **10** (1969), 35–38. MR 39 #2031.
6. ———, *Nonlinear operators which have a weakly closed range of values and quasilinear elliptic equations*, Mat. Sb. **78** (120) (1969), 237–259. = Math. USSR Sb. **7** (1969), later MR 39 #631.
7. ———, *Normal solvability of nonlinear mappings in uniformly convex Banach spaces*, Funkcional Anal. i Priložen. **3** (1969), 80–84. (Russian)
8. S. Smale, *An infinite dimensional version of Sard's theorem*, Amer. J. Math. **87** (1965), 861–866. MR 32 #3067.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60637