

Sperner's Lemma
 Brouwer's Fixed Point Theorem
 The Fundamental Theorem of Algebra

Larry Taylor
 ltaylor@csubak.edu
<http://www.cs.csubak.edu/~larry/sperner.pdf>

Notation: T denotes a triangle with vertices $\mathbf{p}^0, \mathbf{p}^1, \mathbf{p}^2$

Comments $\mathbf{x} \in T$ iff $\mathbf{x} = \sum x_i \mathbf{p}^i$ where $0 \leq x_i \leq 1, \sum x_i = 1$. The x_i are uniquely determined and are the barycentric coordinates of \mathbf{x} . The set of points where one (or more) coordinate is 0 is called a face of T .

Sperner's Lemma (two-dimensional version). Triangulate T . Give each vertex of the triangulation a label from $\{0,1,2\}$ in such a manner that a lower dimensional face of T not containing \mathbf{p}^i (i.e for which the i -th barycentric coordinate is 0) is not labelled i . (Thus, each \mathbf{p}^i is labelled i .) Then there is a completely labelled triangle, i.e with labels all of $\{0,1,2\}$.

Brouwer's Fixed Point Theorem (two-dimensional version) Assume $f: T \rightarrow T$ is continuous. Then f has a fixed point.

Sperner \rightarrow Brouwer Let $f: T \rightarrow T$ be continuous with no fixed point. Label each $\mathbf{x} \in T$ with an $i \in \{0,1,2\}$ so that $f(\mathbf{x})_i < x_i$. (loosely, f maps \mathbf{x} "away" from \mathbf{p}^i) Note that any triangulation of T will satisfy the hypotheses of Sperner's lemma.

For each $k \in \mathbf{N}$, let G_k be a triangulation with diameter of subtriangles $< 1/k$. Each triangulation must contain a completely labeled triangle. Let \mathbf{y} be an accumulation point of these completely labelled triangles. For each i , there are points \mathbf{x} arbitrarily close to \mathbf{y} where $f(\mathbf{x})_i < x_i$. By continuity, $f(\mathbf{y})_i \leq y_i$ for all i . But the coordinates of any point must sum to 1. So $f(\mathbf{y})_i = y_i$ for each i and this means $f(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{y}$. Contradiction.

Oriented Sperner's Lemma (a two-dimensional version). If T is triangulated arbitrarily then: the following are equal:

$$\begin{aligned} \#(\binom{2}{0 \ 1}) - \#(\binom{2}{1 \ 0}) &= \#(0 \ 1) - \#(1 \ 0) \\ \text{(counted over all triangles)} &\quad \text{(counted counterclockwise over boundary)} \\ N[T] &= N[\text{bd}(T)] \end{aligned}$$

(Notation to be explained later. Easy to check this does generalize the previous Sperner's lemma)

Definition. An (oriented) n-simplex is an ordered $(n+1)$ -tuple of points in \mathbf{R}^m for some m , and is denoted: $\langle \mathbf{p}^0, \mathbf{p}^1, \dots, \mathbf{p}^n \rangle$.

Definition. Two simplices are equal if they consist of the same points and one is an even permutation of the other. A k-chain is an integer linear combination of k-simplices. We identify an odd permutation of the points of a simplex with minus the simplex.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{e.g. } \langle \mathbf{p}^0, \mathbf{p}^1 \rangle &= -\langle \mathbf{p}^1, \mathbf{p}^0 \rangle \\ \langle \mathbf{p}^0, \mathbf{p}^1, \mathbf{p}^2 \rangle &= \langle \mathbf{p}^2, \mathbf{p}^0, \mathbf{p}^1 \rangle = -\langle \mathbf{p}^1, \mathbf{p}^0, \mathbf{p}^2 \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Definition. (boundary of a simplex)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{bd}(\langle \mathbf{p}^0, \mathbf{p}^1 \rangle) &= \langle \mathbf{p}^1 \rangle - \langle \mathbf{p}^0 \rangle \\ \text{bd}(\langle \mathbf{p}^0, \mathbf{p}^1, \mathbf{p}^2 \rangle) &= \langle \mathbf{p}^1, \mathbf{p}^2 \rangle - \langle \mathbf{p}^0, \mathbf{p}^2 \rangle + \langle \mathbf{p}^0, \mathbf{p}^1 \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathbf{p}^1, \mathbf{p}^2 \rangle + \langle \mathbf{p}^2, \mathbf{p}^0 \rangle + \langle \mathbf{p}^0, \mathbf{p}^1 \rangle \end{aligned}$$

(More generally, $\text{bd}(\langle \mathbf{p}^0, \dots, \mathbf{p}^k \rangle) = \sum_j (-1)^j \langle \mathbf{p}^0, \dots, \mathbf{p}^{j-1}, \mathbf{p}^{j+1}, \dots, \mathbf{p}^k \rangle$)

The boundary of a chain is defined by extending linearly:

$$\text{if } C = \sum n_i S_i, \text{ then } \text{bd}(C) = \sum n_i \text{bd}(S_i).$$

Note how the boundary respects orientation and how we can construct a chain of simplices of the same dimension getting the intuitive notion of boundary (because of cancellation of interior boundaries).

Definition. Let q_0, \dots, q_k be non-negative integers. If q_0, \dots, q_k is a permutation of $0, \dots, k$ then $N(q_0, \dots, q_k)$ is ± 1 depending on its sign. Otherwise it is zero.

$$\begin{aligned} N(0, 1, 2) &= N(2, 0, 1) = N(0, 1) = N(0) = 1 \\ N(0, 2, 1) &= N(1, 0) = -1, \quad N(0, 0, 1) = N(0, 1, 3) = N(0, 2) = N(1) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Suppose each vertex \mathbf{p} of a simplex is given a label $q(\mathbf{p})$. Define $N(\langle \mathbf{p}^0, \dots, \mathbf{p}^k \rangle) = N(q(\mathbf{p}^0), \dots, q(\mathbf{p}^k))$. Extend N linearly to chains.

Theorem (Oriented form of Sperner's Lemma) Let C be any k -chain with the vertices of simplices of C having only labels chosen from $0, \dots, k$. Then

$$N[C] = (-1)^k N[\text{bd}(C)].$$

e.g. If C is a 1-chain: $\#(0, 1) - \#(1, 0) = -N(\text{bd}(C))$

This is a generalization of Sperner's lemma in the case when C is a correctly labelled n -simplex. For, given a labelling as in the hypotheses of Sperner's lemma, let F^k be the k -face with corners labelled $0, \dots, k$. Then $N(C) = N(F^n) = \pm N(F^{n-1}) = \pm N(F^{n-2}) = \dots = \pm N(F^0) = \pm 1$.

Proof. We need only consider a k -simplex, $s^k = \langle p^0, \dots, p^k \rangle$. The result is easy to check directly by cases for $k = 1$ or 2 . In general, the claim amounts to showing: If $q_0, \dots, q_k \in \{0, \dots, k\}$

$$N(q_0, \dots, q_k) = (-1)^k \sum (-1)^j (q_0, \dots, q_{j-1}, q_{j+1}, \dots, q_k).$$

Let M be the "permutation" matrix defined by (q_0, \dots, q_k) :

$$\begin{aligned} m_{ij} &= 1 && \text{if } q_i = j \\ m_{ij} &= 0 && \text{otherwise} \end{aligned}$$

The left hand side above is $\det(M)$. Let M^* be M with the last column replaced by ones. The right hand side is $\det M^*$ (expand by last column). We can reduce M to M^* by adding all other columns of M to the last column. So $\det(M) = \det(M^*)$.

To prove the fundamental theorem of algebra, we begin by dividing the complex plane into three "tridrants" by letting

$$R_j = \{z \in \mathbf{C} \mid 2\pi j/3 \leq \arg(z) < 2\pi(j+1)/3\} \text{ for } j = 0, 1, 2.$$

A geometric argument shows:

Lemma. Suppose $z_j \in R_j$ for $j = 0, 1, 2$ and $|z_j - z_k| < \epsilon$ for $j, k = 0, 1, 2$. Then $|z_j| < 2\epsilon/\sqrt{3}$ for $j = 0, 1, 2$.

Fundamental Theorem of Algebra. Let $p(z) = z^n + a_{n-1}z^{n-1} + \dots + a_0$ be a non-constant complex polynomial. $\exists y \in \mathbf{C}$ with $p(y) = 0$.

Proof. Give any point z the label j corresponding to the region R_j in which $p(z)$ lies. If we let T be a large enough disk, then on its boundary $p(z) \sim z^n$. Thus, if we have a fine triangulation G , of T , then $N(\text{bd}(G)) = n$.

For each $k \in \mathbf{N}$, let G_k be a triangulation of G with triangles of diameter $< 1/k$. It follows from the lemma that $|p(z_j)| < 2/(\sqrt{3}k)$ for z_j a vertex of a completely labelled triangle of G_k . Thus, if y is an accumulation point of these triangles, there are points z arbitrarily close to y where $|p(z)|$ is arbitrarily small. Therefore, by continuity $|p(y)| = 0$.

(The preceding is a discrete version of the winding number proof.)