

This is Banach's fixed-point theorem—the following is an expansion and rearrangement of Sutherland's proof of such [1].

Let  $\langle x_n \rangle$  be a sequence such that  $x_1 \in S$  is an arbitrary element, and  $x_n = f(x_{n-1})$  for  $n \in \mathbf{N}^+$  such that  $n > 1$ . We first establish that  $\langle x_n \rangle$  converges to some  $p \in S$ .

**Lemma 1.** For  $m, n \in \mathbf{N}^+$  such that  $m > n$ , we have

$$d(x_m, x_n) \leq \sum_{j=n}^{m-1} d(x_{j+1}, x_j)$$

*Proof.* Fix  $n \in \mathbf{N}^+$ . For  $\ell \in \mathbf{N}^+$ , let  $P(\ell)$  be the proposition

$$d(x_{n+\ell}, x_n) \leq \sum_{j=n}^{n+\ell-1} d(x_{j+1}, x_j)$$

We proceed inductively.

Base Case Let  $\ell = 1$ . Then,

$$d(x_{n+1}, x_n) = \sum_{j=n}^n d(x_{j+1}, x_j)$$

Hence, we have that  $P(1)$  holds.

## February 2025 Problem Submission

Angel

---

Inductive Step Suppose there exists  $k \in \mathbf{N}^+$  such that

$$d(x_{n+k}, x_n) \leq \sum_{j=n}^{n+k-1} d(x_{j+1}, x_j)$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_{n+k+1}, x_n) &\leq d(x_{n+k+1}, x_{n+k}) + d(x_{n+k}, x_n) \\ &\leq d(x_{n+k+1}, x_{n+k}) + \sum_{j=n}^{n+k-1} d(x_{j+1}, x_j) \\ &= \sum_{j=n}^{n+k} d(x_{j+1}, x_j) \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have that  $P(k)$  implies  $P(k+1)$ .

By the principle of mathematical induction, it's clear that  $P(\ell)$  holds for all  $\ell \in \mathbf{N}^+$ ; further, since  $n$  was arbitrary, by universal introduction<sup>1</sup>, the inequality holds for all  $n \in \mathbf{N}^+$  as well.

We arrive at the formulation in the lemma by substituting  $m$  for  $n + \ell$ .  $\square$

---

<sup>1</sup>See [2], [3, Section 10.2], and [4, Section 3].

**Lemma 2.** For  $n \in \mathbf{N}^+$  such that  $n > 1$ , we have

$$d(x_{n+1}, x_n) \leq \mu^{n-1} d(x_2, x_1)$$

*Proof.* For  $n \in \mathbf{N}^+$  such that  $n > 1$ , let  $P(n)$  be the proposition

$$d(x_{n+1}, x_n) \leq \mu^{n-1} d(x_2, x_1)$$

We proceed inductively.

Base Case Let  $n = 2$ . Then,

$$d(x_3, x_2) = d(f(x_2), f(x_1)) \leq \mu d(x_2, x_1) = \mu^{2-1} d(x_2, x_1)$$

Hence, we have that  $P(2)$  holds.

Inductive Step Suppose there exists  $k \in \mathbf{N}^+$ ,  $k > 1$ , such that

$$d(x_{k+1}, x_k) \leq \mu^{k-1} d(x_2, x_1)$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_{k+2}, x_{k+1}) &= d(f(x_{k+1}), f(x_k)) \\ &\leq \mu d(x_{k+1}, x_k) \\ &\leq \mu[\mu^{k-1} d(x_2, x_1)] \\ &= \mu^k d(x_2, x_1) \end{aligned}$$

## February 2025 Problem Submission

*Angel*

---

Hence, we have that  $P(k)$  implies  $P(k+1)$ .

By the principle of mathematical induction, it's clear that  $P(n)$  holds for all  $n \in \mathbf{N}^+$  such that  $n > 1$ .  $\square$

Let  $m, n \in \mathbf{N}^+$  such that  $m > n$ . Using **Lemma 1**, **Lemma 2**, and the closed-form formula for the sum of a geometric series, see that

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_m, x_n) &\leq \sum_{j=n}^{m-1} d(x_{j+1}, x_j) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=n}^{m-1} \mu^{j-1} d(x_2, x_1) \\ &= \left( \sum_{j=n}^{m-1} \mu^{n-1} \mu^{j-n} \right) d(x_2, x_1) \\ &= \mu^{n-1} \left( \sum_{q=0}^{m-n-1} \mu^q \right) d(x_2, x_1) \\ &= \mu^{n-1} \left( \frac{1 - \mu^{m-n}}{1 - \mu} \right) d(x_2, x_1) \\ &< \frac{\mu^{n-1}}{1 - \mu} d(x_2, x_1) \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $0 \leq \mu < 1$  means  $\frac{\mu^{n-1}}{1-\mu}d(x_2, x_1)$  is a geometric sequence which converges to 0 as  $n$  approaches infinity. I.e., there exists  $N \in \mathbf{N}^+$  such that for all  $\epsilon \in \mathbf{R}^+$ , if  $n > N$  then  $\frac{\mu^{n-1}}{1-\mu}d(x_2, x_1) < \epsilon$ . Take said  $N$ . Given  $\epsilon \in \mathbf{R}^+$ , we can choose  $m, n \in \mathbf{N}^+$  such that  $m > n$  and  $n > N$ , yielding

$$d(x_m, x_n) < \frac{\mu^{n-1}}{1-\mu}d(x_2, x_1) < \epsilon$$

Hence,  $\langle x_n \rangle$  is Cauchy.

Since  $(S, d)$  is complete and  $\langle x_n \rangle$  is Cauchy, we have that  $\langle x_n \rangle$  converges to some  $p \in S$ .

As a penultimate result, see that  $f$  is uniformly continuous; for if we're given  $\epsilon \in \mathbf{R}^+$ , we can simply set  $\delta = \frac{\epsilon}{\mu}$ . Take  $a, b \in S$ . Then,

$$d(a, b) < \delta \implies d(f(a), f(b)) \leq \mu d(a, b) < \mu \left( \frac{\epsilon}{\mu} \right) = \epsilon$$

Synthesizing  $\langle x_n \rangle$ 's converging to some  $p \in S$  with  $f$ 's being uniformly continuous, we have

$$f(p) = f\left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n\right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(x_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_{n+1} = p$$

Thus, there exists  $p \in S$  such that  $f(p) = p$ . □

## February 2025 Problem Submission

*Angel*

---

### References

- [1] Sutherland, W. A. (2009b). Introduction to metric and topological spaces. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [2] Shapiro, S., & Kouri Kissel, T. (2022, June 29). Classical logic. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Stanford University. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/logic-classical/>. Accessed 4 February 2025
- [3] (N.d.). Introduction to logic. Stanford University. [http://intrologic.stanford.edu/chapters/chapter\\\_10.html](http://intrologic.stanford.edu/chapters/chapter\_10.html). Accessed 4 February 2025
- [4] Biderman, S. (2018, August 23). Proof by induction involving two variables. Mathematics Stack Exchange. <https://math.stackexchange.com/questions/2891651/proof-by-induction-involving-two-variables>. Accessed 4 February 2025