

Lecture XI: Inverse Function Theorem Examples, Implicit Function Theorem, Contraction Mapping Ideas, and Equality of Mixed Partial

Inverse function theorem examples:

(1) polar coordinates $(r, \theta) \xrightarrow{F} (r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta)$
 $(x(r, \theta), y(r, \theta))$
matrix for $F' = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial x(r, \theta)}{\partial r} & \frac{\partial x(r, \theta)}{\partial \theta} \\ \frac{\partial y(r, \theta)}{\partial r} & \frac{\partial y(r, \theta)}{\partial \theta} \end{pmatrix}$ "Jacobian matrix"

Jacobian determinant = $\det(\text{matrix for } F')$

$$= \det \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & -r \sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & r \cos \theta \end{pmatrix} = r(\cos^2 \theta + \sin^2 \theta) = r$$

So F' is nonsingular on $\{(r, \theta) : r \neq 0\}$

So polar coordinate map is "locally smoothly invertible" in a neighborhood of every $(x_0, y_0) = F(r_0, \theta_0)$, $r_0 \neq 0$.

(2) $z \xrightarrow{F} z^2$, $z \in \mathbb{C}$. As a real map from \mathbb{R}^2 to \mathbb{R}^2
this is $(x, y) \xrightarrow{F} (x^2 - y^2, 2xy)$
Its Jacobian matrix is $\begin{pmatrix} 2x & -2y \\ 2y & 2x \end{pmatrix}$

so its Jacobian determinant is $4(x^2 + y^2)$.

This is nonzero except at $(x, y) = (0, 0)$.

This corresponds to (two) smooth "branches" of \sqrt{z} , $z \in \mathbb{C}$ defined locally except at $z = 0$: namely F is locally smoothly invertible except at $(0, 0) (= F(0, 0))$.

(3) $z \rightarrow P(z)$ P a polynomial with \mathbb{C} coefficients, $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

As a real mapping, the Jacobian of P (Jacobian determinant that is)*

$$= \left| \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} \right|^2. \text{ So if } \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} \Big|_{z_0} \neq 0, \text{ then}$$

for each w near $P(z_0)$, there is a unique z near z_0 with $P(z) = w$, and this w depends smoothly on w , w near z_0 . This is

familiar from algebra: $\frac{\partial P}{\partial z} \neq 0$ means the $z = z_0$ root of $P(z) - P(z_0) = 0$ is simple, etc.

(4) Illustration: a proof technique similar to the minimization proof for local surjectivity in the Inverse Function Theorem:

Fundamental Theorem of Algebra: If $P(z)$ is a polynomial of positive degree, then $\exists z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $P(z_0) = 0$

Proof: $\exists M$ such that $\min_{|z|=M} |P(z)| > |a_0|$
So $\min_{|z| \leq M} |P(z)|$ is "interior"

(since $|P(0)| = |a_0| < \min_{|z|=M} |P(z)|$.)

Let z_0 be such that $|z_0| < M$ and

$|P(z_0)| = \min_{|z| \leq M} |P(z)|$. Claim: $P(z_0) = 0$.

If not, write P as a polynomial

* This is from complex analysis. We take this for granted for purposes of this illustration (not used elsewhere, however)

in $z - z_0$ by $P(z - z_0 + z_0)$ expansion so
 $P(z) = Q(z - z_0)$. If P has degree $n > 0$,
 so does Q . Write

$$Q(z - z_0) = b_0 + 0 + 0 + b_k(z - z_0)^k + \dots + b_n(z - z_0)^n$$

where (the contradiction hypothesis) $b_0 \neq 0$
 and $k \geq 1$ is the first coefficient
 above b_0 which is nonzero. Choose
 $\varepsilon \neq 0$ such that ($|\varepsilon|$ is small
 and) $b_k \varepsilon^k$ is a negative real multiple
 of b_0 . Then if $z = z_0 + \varepsilon$,

$$P(z) = Q(z - z_0) = b_0 + b_k \varepsilon^k + o(\varepsilon^k)$$

By choice of ε , if $0 < |b_k \varepsilon^k| < b_0$;

$$|b_0 + b_k \varepsilon^k| = |b_0| - |b_k \varepsilon^k|$$

Hence for ε with $|\varepsilon|$ small enough (but > 0)
 (and $b_k \varepsilon^k$ so described)

$|P(z)| < |b_0|$. This contradicts $|b_0| = |P(z_0)|$
 being minimum $|P(z)|$ among z with

$|z| \leq M$, since $|z_0| < M$ and hence

$|z| < M$ for $|\varepsilon|$ small enough (along with
 the other condition) \square .

Inverse Function Theorem Example (Modified Newton's Method in Action)

$$F(x, y) = (x + xy, y). \quad \text{Solve: } F(x, y) = (a, b)$$

Exact solution: $y = b$ $x + bx = a$ or $x = a/(1+b)$
(for $|b| < 1$).

Newton's Method: $\vec{y}_1 = (a, b)$ = "x" in lecture notation

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{y}_2 &= \vec{y}_1 - F(\vec{y}_1) + \vec{x} = (a, b) - (a + ab, b) + (a, b) \\ &= (a - ab, b) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{y}_3 &= \vec{y}_2 - F(\vec{y}_2) + \vec{x} = (a - ab, b) - (a - ab + b(a - ab), b) + (a, b) \\ &= (a - ab + ab^2, b) \end{aligned}$$

Inductive proof that $y_k = (a - ab + \underbrace{\pm ab^k}_{+(-1)^k ab^k}, b)$:

k to $k+1$ step:

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{y}_{k+1} &= (a - ab \dots + (-1)^k ab^k, b) - (a - ab \dots + (-1)^k ab^k, b) \\ &\quad - b(a - ab \dots + (-1)^k ab^k, 0) + (a, b) \\ &= (a - ab + ab^2 \dots + (-1)^{k+1} ab^{k+1}, b). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \vec{y}_k &= \left(\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a - ab \dots + (-1)^k ab^k, b \right) \\ &= (a/(1 - (-b)), b) = (a/(1+b), b) \end{aligned}$$

(if $|b| < 1$) in agreement with exact solution

Contraction Mapping Idea (will be used later for, e.g. differential equations) re InvFuncTh. proof:

Recall our iteration scheme for solving $F(y) = w$ (x unknown, w given) by $y_{k+1} = y_k - F(y_k) + w$. We want to put this in a "fixed point" context. Namely, if we set $H(y) = y - F(y) + w$, then $y = H(y)$ is the same as $F(y) = w$. So solving $F(y) = w$ is the same as looking for a "fixed point" of H . Also $\|H(y') - H(y'')\| = \|y' - F(y') + w - (y'' - F(y'') + w)\| = \|y' - F(y') - (y'' - F(y''))\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|y' - y''\|$ when $\|F' - I\| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ over a ball containing all points involving (i.e. contain y', y'' in particular). This suggests using the following "Contraction Mapping Theorem" (with $X = \{x : \|x\| \leq \epsilon/2\}$ in our previous set-up).

Contraction Mapping Theorem: If X is a complete metric space and $H: X \rightarrow X$ is a function such that $d(H(x_1), H(x_2)) \leq \lambda d(x_1, x_2)$ for some $\lambda < 1$, for all $x_1, x_2 \in X$, then there is a unique point $x_0 \in X$ such that $H(x_0) = x_0$.

Uniq. Proof: $H(x_1) = x_1$ and $H(x_2) = x_2$ together imply $d(H(x_1), H(x_2)) = d(x_1, x_2)$, which contradicts $d(H(x_1), H(x_2)) \leq \lambda d(x_1, x_2)$ unless $d(x_1, x_2) = 0$.

Proof of Existence: Pick x_1 in X arbitrarily. Set $x_{i+1} = H(x_i)$, $i \geq 1$. Then $d(x_{i+1}, x_i) \leq C \lambda^{i-1}$ for $C = d(x_1, H(x_1))$. So $\{x_i\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. If $x_0 = \lim x_i$, then clearly $f(x_0) = \lim f(x_i) = x_0$. \square

Equality of Mixed Partial Derivatives Without Integration

Theorem: $f: U \xrightarrow{\text{open in } \mathbb{R}^2} \mathbb{R}$, continuous 1st & 2nd partials. Then

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right).$$

Proof: Consider, given $(x, y) \in U$ $h, k > 0$
 $\Delta(h, k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(x+h, y+k) - f(x+h, y) - f(x, y+k) + f(x, y)$
 where h, k are required to satisfy
 $\$$ closed ball radius $\sqrt{h^2 + k^2}$, center $(x, y) \subset U$.

Define $\phi(y) = f(x+h, y) - f(x, y)$

Then

$$\Delta(h, k) = \phi(y+k) - \phi(y)$$

So by MV Theorem for Derivatives

$$\Delta(h, k) = k \phi'(y+k_1) \quad 0 \leq k_1 \leq k$$

$$\text{But } \phi'(y+k_1) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \Big|_{(x+h, y+k_1)} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \Big|_{(x, y+k_1)}$$

$$= h \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \right) \Big|_{(x+h_1, y+k_1)} \quad 0 \leq h_1 \leq h$$

and hence

$$\Delta(h, k) = kh \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \right) \Big|_{(x+h_1, y+k_1)}$$

Interchanging the roles of y and x we write

$\psi(x) = f(x, y+k) - f(x, y)$ so $\Delta(h, k) = \psi(x+h) - \psi(x)$
 and as before, mutatis mutandis,

$$\Delta(h, k) = hk \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right) \Big|_{(x+h_2, y+k_2)} \quad \begin{array}{l} 0 \leq h_2 \leq h \\ 0 \leq k_2 \leq k \end{array}$$

$$\text{So } \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \right) \Big|_{(x+h_1, y+k_1)} = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right) \Big|_{(x+h_2, y+k_2)}$$

Letting $h, k \rightarrow 0^+$ so $h_1, k_1, h_2, k_2 \rightarrow 0^+$ and using continuity LHS $\rightarrow \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \right) \Big|_{(x, y)}$, RHS to $\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right) \Big|_{(x, y)}$. So mixed partials are equal at (x, y) . \square