Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae

Holger Alex

On local and global injectivity of noncompact vector fields in non necessarily locally convex vector spaces

Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae, Vol. 35 (1994), No. 2, 239--248

Persistent URL: http://dml.cz/dmlcz/118662

On local and global injectivity of noncompact vector fields in non necessarily locally convex vector spaces

Holger Alex

Abstract. We give in this paper conditions for a mapping to be globally injective in a topological vector space.

Keywords: fixed point index, locally injective mappings, (φ, γ)-condensing mappings

Classification: 47H10

Introduction

Using the relative fixed point index of compact reducible mappings in [1], we give in this paper conditions for a mapping to be globally injective whenever the mapping is locally injective.

Our results do not follow from the well-known theorem of Banach-Mazur [3], because our assumptions on the range of the mapping are more simple.

Furthermore, we prove a uniqueness theorem for the fixed point in the Schauder fixed point theorem for (φ, γ)-condensing mappings in topological vector spaces. This result generalizes a theorem of Talmann [16] and a theorem of Alex/Hahn [2] for a special case. In [2] we proved the following

Theorem A. *Let E be an admissible topological vector space, $a \in E$, W an open and connected neighbourhood of a and $F : \overline{W} \to E$ a compact mapping. Suppose*

(a) $Fx \neq \beta x + (1 - \beta) \cdot a \quad (x \in W,\ \beta \geq 1)$,
(b) *$f = I - F$ is locally injective on W.*

Then F has a unique fixed point.

Our uniqueness theorem implies the following

Proposition. *Let E be a complete, locally convex and metrizable vector space, $K \subseteq E$ nonempty, closed and convex. $M \subseteq E$ nonempty, open and $M_K := M \cap K$ connected, $a \in M_K$. Let $F : \mathrm{cl}_K\, M_K \to K$ be a condensing mapping with respect to a measure of noncompactness γ (e.g. γ can be the measure of noncompactness of Kuratowski). Suppose*

(a)′ $Fx \neq \beta x + (1 - \beta) \cdot a \quad (x \in \partial_K M_K,\ \beta \geq 1)$,
(b)′ *$f = I - F$ is locally injective on M_K,*
(c)′ $F(\mathrm{cl}_K\, M_K) + f(\mathrm{cl}_K\, M_K) \subseteq K$.

Then F has a unique fixed point.

In the following example, we give a mapping for which the assumptions of the proposition hold, but not the assumptions of Theorem A.

Example. Let $E = R^2$, $M = \{(x,y) : x^2 + y^2 < 1\}$, $F : \overline{M} \to E$ with $F(x,y) = (xy, \frac{1}{2}xy)$ $((x,y) \in \overline{M})$.

Obviously F has the unique fixed point $(0,0)$, however we cannot apply Theorem A:

With $f = I - F$ we obtain $f(x,y) = (x - xy, y - \frac{1}{2}xy)$ $((x,y) \in \overline{M})$.

Using the derivative of f, it is easy to show that f is locally injective on $M \setminus \{(x,y) \in M : y = -\frac{x}{2} + 1,\ 0 < x < \frac{4}{5}\}$.
However, we have $f(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4}+\varepsilon) = f(\frac{1}{2} - 2\varepsilon, \frac{3}{4})$ for each $\varepsilon \in R$ and hence f is not locally injective in $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4}) \in M$. The assumption (b) of Theorem A does not hold for F.

Now we set $K = \{(x,y) : 0 \leq 2y \leq x\}$ and $M_K := M \cap K$. With $F \mid \mathrm{cl}_K M_K$ and $f \mid \mathrm{cl}_K M_K$ we denote the restriction on $\mathrm{cl}_K M_K$ of F and f, respectively. Clearly, the assumptions of the proposition for M, K and M_K hold.

Since K is a cone, we have $K + K \subseteq K$.

Furthermore $M_K \cap \{(x,y) : y = -\frac{x}{2}+1,\ 0 < x < \frac{4}{5}\} = \emptyset$ and we have f is locally injective on M_K. Obviously we have $F(\mathrm{cl}_K M_K) \subseteq M_K$ and $f(\mathrm{cl}_K M_K) \subseteq K$. Hence the assumptions of the proposition hold for $F \mid \mathrm{cl}_K M_K$ and the uniqueness of the fixed point follows from the proposition.

1. Notations and definitions

We use all notations and definitions of the paper of Alex, Hahn, Kaniok [1] in this journal in the same kind.

Furthermore we need the following notations. Let X be a real, separated topological space; X is called connected if and only if $X = X_1 \cup X_2$, $X_1 \neq \emptyset$, $X_2 \neq \emptyset$ and X_1, X_2 open in X implies $X_1 \cap X_2 \neq \emptyset$.

X is called pathwise connected, if for each $x_1, x_2 \in X$ there exists a continuous mapping $s = [0,1] \to X$ with $s(0) = x_1$, $s(1) = x_2$.

X is called locally (pathwise) connected, if for each $x \in X$ there exists a (pathwise) connected neighbourhood U of x with $U \subseteq X$. It is well known that if X is connected and locally pathwise connected, then X is pathwise connected (see [14, p. 162]). This implies

Lemma 1. *Let E be a topological vector space, $K \subseteq E$ nonempty, convex. If $M \subseteq K$ is connected and open in K, then M is pathwise connected.*

Proof: With the relative topology M is a topological space. We must show, that M is locally pathwise connected. Let $a \in M$. Then there exists a neighbourhood V of a, which is starshaped relative a, with $V \cap K \subseteq M$, because M is open in K. Since K is convex, $U := V \cap K$ is a starshaped neighbourhood of a in K. Hence U is pathwise connected and M locally pathwise connected. □

It is also well known that the continuous image of a (pathwise) connected set is also (pathwise) connected.

Let X, Y be topological spaces, $M \subseteq X$ nonempty, open. A continuous mapping $f : M \to Y$ is called

(1) locally injective, if for each $x \in M$ there exists a neighbourhood $U \subseteq M$ of x such that f is injective on U,
(2) locally topological, if for each $x \in M$ there exist neighbourhoods $U \subseteq M$ of x and $V \subseteq Y$ of $f(x)$ such that f is a homeomorphism of U onto V,
(3) open, if $N \subseteq M$ open in M implies $f(N)$ is open in $f(M)$,
(4) proper, if $K \subseteq Y$ compact implies $f^{-1}(K)$ is compact.

Remark. If f is a locally injective and open mapping, then f is locally topological.

The local index of (φ, γ)-condensing vector fields.

The notions φ-measure of noncompactness γ on K and (φ, γ)-condensing mapping are defined such as in [1]. The partially ordered set A and the system $\mathcal{M}$ of subsets of $\overline{\text{co}}\, K$ we use in the same kind. Furthermore we need the following properties of γ and φ.

(N4) If $0 \in A$, $0 \leq a$ $(a \in A)$, then $\gamma(M) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \overline{M}$ is compact $(M \in \mathcal{M})$.
(N5) If $M, N \in \mathcal{M}$ implies $M + N \in \mathcal{M}$, then $\gamma(M + N) \leq \gamma(M)$ whenever N is compact.
(N6) If $a_1, a_2 \in A$, $a_1 \leq a_2$, then $a_1 \leq \varphi(a_1) \leq \varphi(a_2)$.

Now we give an example of a nontrivial φ-measure of noncompactness γ with the properties (N1)–(N6).

Let E be a complete metric space, $M \subseteq E$ a bounded subset of E. The Kuratowski measure of noncompactness $\mathcal{L}(M)$ of the set M is defined by

$$\mathcal{L}(M) := \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : \text{there exists a finite cover } \{B_j\}_{j \in J} \text{ of } M \text{ such that } \operatorname{diam}(B_j) < \varepsilon \ (j \in J)\}.$$

It is well known that $\mathcal{L}$ has the properties (N1), (N3), (N4) and (N5). If E is a complete metrizable and locally convex vector space, then $\mathcal{L}$ has also the property (N2) with $\varphi(t) = t$ $(t \in A = [0, \infty))$. If E is non locally convex, $\mathcal{L}$ does not have this property with $\varphi(t) = t$.

Hadzic proved that $\mathcal{L}$ is a φ-measure of noncompactness on special subsets of a paranormed space [6].

Proposition. *Let $(E, \|\cdot\|^*)$ be a complete paranormed space, $\varphi : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ a continuous monotone nondecreasing mapping with $f(t) \geq t$ $(t \in [0, \infty))$, $K \subseteq E$ a nonempty, bounded and convex subset of E which is of $Z\varphi$-type, e.g. for each neighbourhood of zero $V_r = \{x \in E : \|x\|^* < r\}$ is $\operatorname{co}(V_r \cap (K - K)) \subseteq V_{\varphi(r)}$.*

Then $\mathcal{L}$ is a $\widetilde{\varphi} = \varphi \circ \varphi$-measure of noncompactness with the properties (N1)–(N6).

Remark. 1. Obviously the properties (N1), (N3), (N4) and (N5) hold for $\mathcal{L}$ and the assumptions for φ imply (N6) also for $\widetilde{\varphi}$. Property (N2) is proved by Hadzic in [6, Lemma 2].

2. If K is a convex set of $Z\varphi$-type and $\inf_{t>0} \varphi(t) = 0$, then K is a locally convex set. (This follows from the remarks following Definition 2 in [6] and Proposition 3 in [5, p. 30].)

3. We can find a subset of $Z\varphi$-type in the paranormed space $S[0,1]$ of finite real measurable functions on $[0,1]$ by Hadzic [6].

In this paper the φ-measure of noncompactness γ has always the properties (N1)–(N6). Let E be a topological vector space, $K \subseteq E$ nonempty, convex, closed and locally convex, $M \subseteq E$ nonempty, open and $M_K := M \cap K$.

Let $F : \mathrm{cl}_K M_K \to K$ be a (φ,γ)-condensing mapping with respect to a φ-measure of noncompactness γ on K:

The mapping $f := I - F$ is called a (φ,γ)-condensing vector field.

If $x \neq Fx$ $(x \in \partial_K M_K)$, then the relative fixed point index of F, $i(F, M_K)$, is defined [1].

A point $x_0 \in M_K$ is called an isolated point of zero of the (φ,γ)-condensing vector field $f := I - F$, if there exists a neighbourhood U of x_0 with $U \subseteq M$ such that $f(x) = \underline{o}$ $(x \in \mathrm{cl}_K U_K,\ U_K := U \cap K)$ implies $x = x_0$. (x_0 is an isolated fixed point of F.) In this case, the relative fixed point index $i(F, U_K)$ is independent of the choice of U.

We define the local index of the isolated point of zero x_0 of f, $i(x_0, f, \underline{o})$, with

$$i(x_0, f, \underline{o}) := i(F, U_K).$$

Now let $F(\mathrm{cl}_K M_K) + f(\mathrm{cl}_K M_K) \subseteq K$, $y \in f(M_K)$. A point $x_0 \in M_K$ is called an isolated y-point of f, if there exists a neighbourhood U of x_0 such that $f(x) = y$ $(x \in \mathrm{cl}_K U_K)$ implies $x = x_0$. Then x_0 is an isolated point of zero of f_y with $f_y(x) = f(x) - y$ $(x \in \mathrm{cl}_K M_K)$. Since $y + Fx \in K$ $(x \in \mathrm{cl}_K M_K)$, the local index of the isolated y-point of f is well defined with

$$i(x_0, f, y) := i(x_0, f_y, \underline{o}).$$

If the set $Y = \{x \in \mathrm{cl}_K M_K : f(x) = y\} = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \subseteq M_K$ is finite, then by [1, Theorem 3 (I6)] we obtain

$$\text{(I7)} \qquad i(F_y, M_K) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} i(x_j, f, y)$$

with $F_y(x) = F(x) + y$ $(x \in \mathrm{cl}_K M_K)$.

2. Local and global injectivity of (φ,γ)-condensing vector fields

In this chapter we give conditions for the global injectivity of a (φ,γ)-condensing vector field, whenever the vector field is locally injective. Then, with a simple additional assumption, the vector field is a homeomorphism.

A well-known theorem of Banach-Mazur [3], [13] implies the following

Theorem 1. *Let E be a topological vector space, $f : E \to E$ a locally topological and proper mapping of E onto E. Then f is a homeomorphism of E onto E.*

The assumption $f(E) = E$ in this theorem is essential. Plastock proved a theorem which guarantees that f is a homeomorphism of D onto $f(D)$ where D is a connected open subset of a Banach space. However, Plastock needed a complicated assumption on the range $f(D)$ (see [12]). Plastock investigated the question of the global injectivity of f when we have not exact informations about $f(D)$. Our results are an answer to this question for a special class of mappings.

Theorem 2. *Let E be a topological vector space, $K \subseteq E$ nonempty, closed, $M \subseteq K$ nonempty, closed.*

Let $F : M \to K$ be a (φ, γ)-condensing mapping with respect to a φ-measure of noncompactness γ on K, $f := I - F$. Then f is a proper mapping.

Proof: Let $A \subseteq E$ be compact. $f^{-1}(A) := N$ is closed, because f is continuous. $(I - F)(N) = A$ implies $N \subseteq F(N) + A$. Hence, by the properties of φ and γ, $\gamma(N) \le \gamma(F(N) + A) \le \gamma(F(N)) \le \varphi(\gamma(F(N)))$.

Since F is (φ, γ)-condensing, $\overline{F(N)}$ is compact and hence $N = \overline{N}$ is compact. □

Now we prove the following

Lemma 2. *Let E be a topological vector space, $K \subseteq E$ nonempty, closed and convex, $M \subseteq E$ nonempty, open and $M_K := M \cap K$. Let $f : M_K \to E$ be a locally injective mapping. Then for each $x \in M_K$ there exists an open neighbourhood $U \subseteq E$ of x, $U_K := U \cap K$, such that we have*

(1) *$\overline{U} \subseteq M$ and $f \mid \mathrm{cl}_K U_K$ is injective,*
(2) *$f(U_K)$ is pathwise connected,*
(3) *$f(U_K) \cap f(\partial_K U_K) = \emptyset$.*

Proof: Let $x \in M_K$. Then there exists an open neighbourhood $B \subseteq M$ of x such that $f \mid B \cap K$ is injective.

Let U be an open starshaped neigbourhood of x with $\overline{U} \subseteq B$.

Then $U_K := U \cap K$ is starshaped with respect to x and hence $f(U_K)$ is pathwise connected. Furthermore $f \mid \mathrm{cl}_K U_K$ is injective, because $\mathrm{cl}_K U_K \subseteq B \cap K$. Since U_K is open in K, we obtain $U_K \cap \partial_K U_K = \emptyset$. $(*)$

Suppose that $f(U_K) \cap f(\partial_K U_K) \neq \emptyset$. Then there exists $z \in f(U_K) \cap f(\partial_K U_K)$ and $x_1 \in U_K$, $x_2 \in \partial_K U_K$ with $z = f(x_1) = f(x_2)$. This implies $x_1 = x_2$, because $f \mid \mathrm{cl}_K U_K$ is injective. This is a contradiction to $(*)$.

Hence U has the properties (1)–(3). □

We denote by $S(x)$ the system of all neighbourhoods of x for which (1)–(3) from Lemma 2 hold.

Lemma 3. *Let E be a topological vector space, $K \subseteq E$ nonempty, convex, closed and locally convex, $M \subseteq E$ nonempty, open and $M_K := M \cap K$ be connected. Let*

$F : \mathrm{cl}_K M_K \to K$ be a (φ,γ)-condensing mapping with respect to a φ-measure of noncompactness γ on K, $f := I - F$. Suppose that

(1) *f is locally injective on M_K,*
(2) *$F(\mathrm{cl}_K M_K) + f(\mathrm{cl}_K M_K) \subseteq K$.*

Then for each $x_1, x_2 \in M_K$ is $i(x_1, f, f(x_1)) = i(x_2, f, f(x_2))$.

Proof: By the assumptions, $i(x, f, f(x))$ is well defined for each $x \in M_K$.

(1) Let $x_0 \in M_K$, $U \in S(x_0)$, $y \in U_K := U \cap K$.

We show that $i(x_0, f, f(x_0)) = i(x_0, f, f(y)) := i(F(\cdot) + f(y), U_K)$.

We define a mapping $H : [0,1] \times \mathrm{cl}_K U_K \to K$ with $H(t,x) = Fx + s(t)$ $(t \in [0,1],\ x \in \mathrm{cl}_K U_K)$, where $s : [0,1] \to f(U_K)$ is pathwise connected.

There is $H([0,1] \times \mathrm{cl}_K U_K) \subseteq K$, by the assumption (2), $H(0,\cdot) = F(\cdot) + f(x_0)$ and $H(1,\cdot) = F(\cdot) + f(y)$.

Now we show that H is a (φ,γ)-condensing mapping. We have for $N \subseteq \mathrm{cl}_K U_K$ $H([0,1] \times N) \subseteq F(N) + s([0,1])$ and, hence, $\gamma(H([0,1] \times N)) \leq \gamma(F(N))$, because $s([0,1])$ is compact. If $\gamma(N) \leq \varphi(\gamma(H([0,1] \times N)))$, then we obtain by the properties of φ and γ

$$\gamma(N) \leq \varphi(\gamma(F(N))).$$

Since F is (φ,γ)-condensing, $\overline{F(N)}$ is compact and this implies $\overline{H([0,1] \times N)}$ is compact. Furthermore $f(\partial_K U_K) \cap f(U_K) = \emptyset$ implies $z \neq H(t,z) \Leftrightarrow f(z) \neq s(t)$ for each $z \in \partial_K U_K$, $t \in [0,1]$, because $s(t) \in f(U_K)$ $(t \in [0,1])$. Hence the assumptions of (I3) (see [1, Theorem 3]) hold for H and we have

$$i(x_0, f, f(x_0)) = i(F(\cdot) + f(x_0), U_K) = \\ = i(F(\cdot) + f(y), U_K) = i(x_0, f, f(y)). \tag{1}$$

(2) Now, let $x_0 \in M_K$, $U \in S(x_0)$, $y \in U_K$, $W \in S(y)$ and $W_K := W \cap K$. We define $B_1 := \mathrm{cl}_K(U_K \setminus (U_K \cap W_K))$ and $B_2 := \mathrm{cl}_K(W_K \setminus (U_K \cap W_K))$. Then we have $U_K \setminus B_1 = W_K \setminus B_2$. The injectivity of f on U_K and W_K implies $x \neq \widetilde{F}(x)$ $(x \in B_1 \cup B_2)$ with $\widetilde{F}(x) = Fx + f(y)$ $(x \in \mathrm{cl}_K M_K)$. From (I6) ([1, Theorem 3]) we obtain

$$i(x_0, f, f(y)) = i(\widetilde{F}, U_K) = i(\widetilde{F}, (U_K \setminus B_1)) = \\ = i(\widetilde{F}, (W_K \setminus B_2)) = i(\widetilde{F}, W_K) = i(y, f, f(y)). \tag{2}$$

(1) and (2) imply

$$i(x_0, f, f(x_0)) = i(y, f, f(y)) \tag{3}$$

for $x_0 \in M_K$, $U \in S(x_0)$, $y \in U_K$.

(3) Suppose there are $x, y \in M_K$ with

$$i(x, f, f(x)) \neq i(y, f, f(y)). \tag{4}$$

We define $A_1 := \{z \in M_K : i(z, f, f(z)) = i(x, f, f(x))\}$ and $A_2 := M_K \setminus A_1$. Since $x \in A_1$, $y \in A_2$, we have $A_1 \neq \emptyset$, $A_2 \neq \emptyset$. If $z_i \in A_i$, $U_i \in S(z_i)$ and $U_{iK} := U_i \cap K$ $(i = 1, 2)$, then (3) implies $U_{1K} \cap U_{2K} = \emptyset$.

Now we choose for each $x \in M_K$ a $U \in S(x)$, $U_K := U \cap K$, and define $M_1 := \bigcup_{x \in A_1} U_K$, $M_2 := \bigcup_{x \in A_2} U_K$.

We obtain $M_1 \neq \emptyset$, $M_2 \neq \emptyset$, $M_1 \cap M_2 = \emptyset$ and $M_1 \cup M_2 = M_K$. M_1, M_2 are open in K and also in M_K. This contradicts our assumption that M_K is connected. This implies that $i(x, f, f(x)) = i(y, f, f(y))$ for each $x, y \in M_K$. □

Now we prove the following

Theorem 3. *Let E be a topological vector space, $K \subseteq E$ nonempty, closed, convex and locally convex, $M \subseteq E$ nonempty, open and $M_K = M \cap K$ be connected.*

Let $F : \mathrm{cl}_K M_K \to K$ be a (φ, γ)-condensing mapping with respect to a φ-measure of noncompactness γ on K, $f := I - F$. Suppose that

(1) *f is locally injective on M_K,*
(2) *$F(\mathrm{cl}_K M_K) + f(\mathrm{cl}_K M_K) \subseteq K$.*

Then the equation $f(x) = y$ $(x \in M_K)$ has for all $y \in f(M_K)$ with $y \notin f(\partial_K M_K)$ and $i(F(\cdot) + y, M_K) = \pm 1$ exactly one solution.

Proof: Let $y \in f(M_K) \setminus f(\partial_K M_K)$ and $i(F(\cdot) + y, M_K) = \pm 1$. By Theorem 2, f is a proper mapping and this implies that $N := f^{-1}(y)$ is compact.

Applying this fact and the condition that f is locally injective on M_K and $N \cap \partial_K M_K = \emptyset$, we can easily show that N is finite.

Let $N := \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ $(n \in N^*)$. Using (I7), we obtain

$$i(F(\cdot) + y, M_K) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} (x_j, f, y).$$

Lemma 3 implies $i(x_j, f, y) = c$ $(j = 1, \dots, n;\ c \in Z)$.

Then $\pm 1 = i(F(\cdot) + y, M_K) = n \cdot c$ and we obtain $n = 1$. Hence the equation $f(x) = y$ has exactly one solution $x \in M_K$. □

Using Theorem 3, we give conditions for a mapping to be a homeomorphism whenever the mapping is locally injective.

Theorem 4. *Let E, K, M, F, f be such as in Theorem 3. Suppose that*

(1) *$f(M_K) \cap f(\partial_K M_K) = \emptyset$,*
(2) *$i(F(\cdot) + y, M_K) = \pm 1$ $(y \in f(M_K))$.*

Then the restriction of f on M_K, $\widetilde{f} := f \mid M_K$, is an injective mapping. If f is additionally an open mapping, then f is a homeomorphism of M_K onto $f(M_K)$.

Proof: (1), (2) and Theorem 3 imply that the equation $f(x) = y$ has exactly one solution $x \in M_K$ for each $y \in f(M_K)$. Hence f is injective. If f is an open mapping, then the inverse mapping f^{-1} of f is continuous. Hence, f is a homeomorphism. □

Remark. The assumption (1) $f(M_K) \cap f(\partial_K M_K) = \emptyset$ is essential. It is easy to show that if f is an open mapping, then $\partial_K f(M_K) \subseteq f(\partial_K M_K)$. A simple example for an open locally injective mapping with $f(\partial_K M_K) \nsubseteq \partial_K f(M_K)$, and hence $f(\partial_K M_K) \cap f(M_K) \neq \emptyset$, can be found in [2].

Corollary 1. *Let E, K, M, F, f be such as in Theorem* 3. *Suppose that*

(1) $f(M_K) \cap f(\partial_K M_K) = \emptyset$,
(2) *there exists a $y \in K$ with $y \notin f(\partial_K M_K)$ and $i(F(\cdot) + y, M_K) = \pm 1$.*

Then $\widetilde{f} := f \mid M_K$ is injective. If f is additionally an open mapping, then f is a homeomorphism on M_K onto $f(M_K)$.

PROOF: We must only show that the assumption (2) of Theorem 3 holds.

Let $y \in K$ with $y \notin f(\partial_K M_K)$ and $i(F(\cdot) + y, M_K) = \pm 1$. Then $y \in f(M_K)$. Since K is convex and M_K is connected and open in K, M_K is pathwise connected (see Lemma 1). Hence $f(M_K)$ is pathwise connected. Let $z \in f(M_K)$. Then there exists a continuous mapping $s : [0,1] \to f(M_K)$ with $s(0) = y$, $s_1 = z$. We define

$$H(t,x) := Fx + s(t) \quad (t \in [0,1],\ x \in \operatorname{cl}_K M_K).$$

H is a (φ,γ)-condensing mapping with $H([0,1] \times \operatorname{cl}_K M_K) \subseteq K$, $H(0,\cdot) = F(\cdot) + y$, $H(1,\cdot) = F(\cdot) + z$.

Furthermore $s([0,1]) \subseteq f(M_K)$ and (1) implies $x \neq H(t,x)$ $(t \in [0,1]$, $x \in \partial_K M_K)$. Using (I3) ([1, Theorem 3]) and (2), we obtain $\pm 1 = i(F(\cdot) + y, M_K) = i(F(\cdot) + z, M_K)$ for each $z \in f(M_K)$. This is the assumption (2) of Theorem 3. □

Corollary 2. *Let E be a topological vector space, $K \subseteq E$ nonempty, closed, convex and locally convex. Let $F : K \to K$ be a (φ,γ)-condensing mapping with respect to a φ-measure of noncompactness γ. Suppose that*

(1) *$f := I - F$ is a locally injective and open mapping on K,*
(2) *$F(K) + f(K) \subseteq K$.*

Then f is a homeomorphism of K onto $f(K)$.

PROOF: Setting $M := E$, we obtain $\partial_K M_K = \partial_K K = \emptyset$ and, by (I4) ([1, Theorem 3]), $i(F, M_K) = 1$.

It is easy to see that the assumptions of Corollary 1 hold for E, K, M, F, f with $y = \underline{o}$. □

Remark. (1) The proof of Corollary 2 implies $\underline{o} \in K$.

(2) If $f(K) = K$ in Corollary 2, then Corollary 2 follows from the theorem of Banach-Mazur (see [13, Theorem 4.39, p. 147]), because f is a proper mapping (Theorem 2) and locally topological. Since K is convex, it is easy to show that the assumptions for the domain and the range of f in the theorem of Banach-Mazur hold for K.

(3) If $f(K) \neq K$ and $f(\mathrm{cl}_K M_K) \neq K$ in Theorem 4, respectively, then our results do not follow from the theorem of Banach-Mazur. The identity on the set $\{x \in E : 1 \leq \|x\| \leq 2\}$, where E is a normed space, is a simple example.

(4) Let E be a locally convex vector space. Let $K = E$, then K is convex, closed and locally convex. The assumption $f(K) + F(K) \subseteq K$ holds always in this case.

(5) Let E be a complete locally convex and metrizable vector space, $F : \overline{M} \to E$ a k-set contraction with $0 \leq k < 1$ ($M \subseteq E$ nonempty, open). If $f := I - F$ is locally injective, then f is an open mapping (see [7]).

3. Fixed point theorems

Now we prove a uniqueness theorem for a fixed point of a (φ, γ)-condensing mapping F, whenever a Leray-Schauder-boundary condition holds for the mapping.

Theorem 5. *Let E be a topological vector space, $K \subseteq E$ nonempty, closed, convex and locally convex, $M \subseteq E$ nonempty, open and $M_K := M \cap K$ be connected, $a \in M_K$.*

Let $F : \mathrm{cl}_K M_K \to K$ be a (φ, γ)-condensing mapping with respect to a φ-measure of noncompactness γ on K. Suppose

(a) $Fx \neq x + (1 - \beta)a \quad (x \in \partial_K M_K,\ \beta \geq 1)$,
(b) *$f := I - F$ is locally injective on M_K,*
(c) $F(\mathrm{cl}_K M_K) + f(\mathrm{cl}_K M_K) \subseteq K$.

Then F has a unique fixed point.

Proof: We set $H(t, x) := t \cdot Fx + (1-t) \cdot a$ ($t \in [0, 1],\ x \in \mathrm{cl}_K M_K$). H is a (φ, γ)-condensing mapping with $H([0, 1] \times \mathrm{cl}_K M_K) \subseteq K$, $H(0, \cdot) = a$, $H(1, \cdot) = F$. Furthermore, from (a), we obtain $x \neq H(t, x)$ ($t \in [0, 1],\ x \in \partial_K M_K$). Applying (I3) and (15) from [1, Theorem 3], we have $i(F, M_K) = 1$, because $a \in M_K$. Therefore $\underline{o} \in f(M_K)$ and we can apply Theorem 3 for $y = \underline{o}$. Hence the equation $f(x) = \underline{o}$ has exactly one solution $x \in M_K$ and F has a unique fixed point. $\square$

Now the proposition from the introduction follows from Theorem 5.

Proposition. *Let E be a complete, locally convex and metrizable vector space, $K \subseteq E$ nonempty, closed and convex, $M \subseteq E$ nonempty, open and $M_K := M \cap K$ be connected, $a \in M_K$.*

Let $F : \mathrm{cl}_K M_K \to K$ be a condensing mapping with respect to a measure of noncompactness γ. (This means $[N \subseteq M_K \wedge \gamma(F(N)) \geq \gamma(N)] \Rightarrow \overline{F(N)}$ is compact.) Suppose

(a) $Fx \neq \beta x + (1 - \beta) \cdot a$ $(x \in \partial_K M_K,\ \beta \geq 1)$.
(b) *$f := I - F$ is locally injective on M_K.*
(c) $F(\mathrm{cl}_K M_K) + f(\mathrm{cl}_K M_K) \subseteq K$.

Then F has a unique fixed point.

Proof: Since E is locally convex, K is also locally convex. Furthermore F is a (φ, γ)-condensing mapping with $\varphi(t) = t$ $(t \in A)$. Hence all assumptions from Theorem 5 hold. □

Remark. Setting in the proposition $K = E$, then we obtain a generalization of a theorem of Talmann [16] for continuously Fréchet-differentiable k-set contractions in Banach spaces. The assumption "For each $x \in M$ 1 is not an eigen-value of $F'(x)$" by Talmann implies our assumption (b) of Theorem 5.

References

[1] Alex H., Hahn S.,Kaniok L., *The fixed point index for noncompact mappings in non locally convex topological vector spaces*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae **35** (1994), 249–257.

[2] Alex H., Hahn S., *On the uniqueness of the fixed point in the Schauder fixed point theorem*, Radovi Mathematicki **6** (1990), 265–271.

[3] Banach S., Mazur S., *Über mehrdeutige stetige Abbildungen*, Studia Math. **5** (1934), 174–178.

[4] Deimling K., *Nonlinear Functional Analysis*, Springer Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York-Tokyo, 1985.

[5] Hadzic O., *Fixed Point Theory in Topological Vector Spaces*, Novi Sad, 1984.

[6] ———, *Some properties of measures of noncompactness in paranormed spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **102** (1988), 843–849.

[7] Hahn S., *Gebietsinvarianzsatz und Eigenwertaussagen für konzentrierende Abbildungen*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae **18** (1977), 697–713.

[8] ———, *Homöomorphieaussagen für k-verdichtende Vektorfelder*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae **21** (1980), 563–572.

[9] ———, *Fixpunktsätze für limeskompakte Abbildungen in nicht notwendig lokalkonvexen topologischen Vektorräumen*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae **27** (1986), 189–204.

[10] Kaniok L., *On measures of noncompactness in general topological vector spaces*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae **31** (1990), 479–487.

[11] Kellogg R.B, *Uniqueness in the Schauder fixed point theorem*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **60** (1976), 207–210.

[12] Plastock R., *Homeomorphisms between Banach spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **200** (1974), 169–183.

[13] Riedrich T., *Vorlesungen über nichtlineare Operatorengleichungen*, Teubner-Texte zur Mathematik, Leipzig, 1976.

[14] Rinow W., *Lehrbuch der Topologie*, Berlin, 1975.

[15] Smith H.L., Stuart C.A., *A uniqueness theorem for fixed points*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **79** (1980), 237–240.

[16] Talmann L.A., *A note on Kellogg's uniqueness theorem for fixed points*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **69** (1978), 248–250.

Abteilung Mathematik, Technische Universität Dresden, 01062 Dresden, Germany

(*Received* March 9, 1992)