Topological Methods in Nonlinear Analysis
Journal of the Juliusz Schauder University Centre
Volume 38, 2011, 45–58

NONEXPANSIVE MAPPINGS ON HILBERT'S METRIC SPACES

Bas Lemmens

Abstract. This paper deals with the iterative behavior of nonexpansive mappings on Hilbert's metric spaces (X, d_X). We show that if (X, d_X) is strictly convex and does not contain a hyperbolic plane, then for each nonexpansive mapping, with a fixed point in X, all orbits converge to periodic orbits. In addition, we prove that if X is an open 2-simplex, then the optimal upper bound for the periods of periodic points of nonexpansive mappings on (X, d_X) is 6. The results have applications in the analysis of nonlinear mappings on cones, and extend work by Nussbaum and others.

1. Introduction

In [11] Hilbert introduced the following metric spaces which generalize the Cayley–Klein model of the hyperbolic plane. Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded open convex set. For $x \neq y$ in X define the distance between x and y to be the logarithm of the *cross-ratio*,

$$[a, x, y, b] = \frac{|ay|}{|ax|}\frac{|bx|}{|by|},$$

where a and b are the points of intersection of the straight-line through x and y and the (Euclidean) boundary, ∂X, of X such that x is between a and y, and y is between b and x, see Figure 1.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 47H09, 47H07; Secondary 54H20.
Key words and phrases. Nonexpansive mappings, Hilbert's metric, periodic orbits, hyperbolic plane, simplices, nonlinear mappings on cones.



Figure 1. Hilbert's metric

So, for $x \neq y$ in X,

$$d_X(x, y) = \log[a, x, y, b].$$

The metric d_X is called *Hilbert's metric* on X. In case X is the interior of an ellipse, (X, d_X) is a model for the hyperbolic plane.

Hilbert's metric is a natural example of a projective metric, meaning that straight-line segments are geodesics, and plays a role in the solution of Hilbert's fourth problem [1]. In this paper we study the iterates of *nonexpansive mappings* $g\colon X \to X$ on Hilbert's metric spaces, so

$$d_X(g(x), g(y)) \leq d_X(x, y) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in X.$$

Motivating examples arise from nonlinear mappings on cones. More precisely, let $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a closed cone with non-empty interior C°, and let $C^* = \{\phi \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}\colon \langle x, \phi\rangle \geq 0 \text{ for all } x \in C\}$ denote the *dual cone*. The cone C induces a partial ordering $\leq_C$ on $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ by $x \leq_C y$ if $y - x \in C$. Suppose that ϕ is in the interior of C^* and let $X_\phi = \{x \in C^\circ\colon \langle x, \phi\rangle = 1\}$, which is a bounded, convex, relatively open set. Now if $f\colon C^\circ \to C^\circ$ is a monotone mapping, i.e. f preserves $\leq_C$ on C°, and f is homogeneous of degree 1, then $g\colon X_\phi \to X_\phi$ given by,

$$g(x) = \frac{f(x)}{\langle f(x), \phi\rangle} \quad \text{for all } x \in X_\phi, \tag{1.1}$$

is nonexpansive under Hilbert's metric, see [5], [22]. The original idea to use Hilbert's metric in the analysis of cone mappings is due to Garrett Birkhoff [3] and H. Samelson [26], who used it to analyze eigenvalue problems for linear operators that leave a closed cone in a Banach space invariant.

Interesting nonlinear examples arise in optimal control and game theory [7], [25], matrix scaling problems [23], and the analysis of diffusions on fractals [18], [21]. In these applications it is often important to understand the iterative behavior of $g\colon X_\phi \to X_\phi$ in (1.1).

The goal of this paper is to analyze the iterates of mappings $g\colon X \to X$ which are nonexpansive with respect to Hilbert's metric, for strictly convex domains X, meaning that ∂X does not contain any straight-line segments, and for X an open n-simplex. It is important to distinguish two cases: g has a fixed point in X, and g does not have a fixed point in X. In the second case it follows from a result by A. Calka [6] that the limit points of each orbit of g are contained in the boundary of X. In fact, Nussbaum [24] and Karlsson have conjectured independently that, in that case, there exists $\Lambda \subseteq \partial X$ convex such that the limit points of all orbits of g are contained in Λ. If X is a strictly convex, the conjecture is known to be true [2] and Λ reduces to a single point. Partial results for general domains were obtained in [2], [12], [13], [17], [24].

In this paper we shall restrict ourselves to the first case and assume that g has a fixed point in X. We prove the following result.

THEOREM 1.1. *Suppose that (X, d_X) is a strictly convex Hilbert's metric space and there exists no 2-dimensional plane P such that $X \cap P$ is the interior of an ellipse. If $g: X \to X$ is nonexpansive under Hilbert's metric and g has a fixed point, then every orbit of g converges to a periodic orbit. In fact, there exists an integer $q \geq 1$ such that $(g^{qk}(x))_k$ converges for all $x \in X$.*

In other words, each orbit of a nonexpansive mapping converges to a periodic orbit if the domain does not contain a hyperbolic plane and the mapping has a fixed point.

If the domain X is an open polytope, i.e. the intersection of finitely many open half-spaces, then it is known [22], [27] that there is convergence to periodic orbits for nonexpansive mappings $g: X \to X$ with a fixed point in X. Moreover, there exists an a priori upper bound for the possible periods in terms of the number of facets of X. The current best estimate, obtained in [16], is

$$\max_{k=1,\dots,m} 2^k \binom{m}{k},$$

where $m = N(N-1)/2$ and N is the number of facets of X. This upper bound is believed to be far from optimal. Finding a sharp upper bound appears to be a hard combinatorial geometric problem, even when X is an open n-simplex. For the 2-simplex, however, we prove the following result.

THEOREM 1.2. *If X is an open 2-simplex, then the optimal upper bound for the periods of periodic points of nonexpansive mappings on (X, d_X) is 6.*

2. Preliminaries

Let (Y, d) be a complete metric space, and $g: Y \to Y$ be a continuous map. The *orbit* of y under g is denoted by $\mathcal{O}(y) = \{g^k(y): k = 0, 1, \dots\}$. A point $y \in Y$ is called a *periodic point* if $g^p(y) = y$ for some integer $p \geq 1$, and the smallest such $p \geq 1$ is called the *period* of y. For $y \in Y$ the *ω-limit set* of y under g is given by,

$$\omega(y; g) = \left\{x \in Y: \lim_{i\to\infty} g^{k_i}(y) = x \text{ for some subsequence } k_i \to \infty\right\}.$$

Furthermore we write $\Omega_g = \bigcup_{y \in Y} \omega(y; g)$ to denote the *attractor* of g.

Clearly $\omega(y;g)$ is closed and $g(\omega(y;g)) \subseteq \omega(y;g)$. It is not hard to show that if $g: Y \to Y$ is continuous, $\mathcal{O}(y)$ is pre-compact, and $|\omega(y,g)| = q$, then $(g^{qk}(y))_k$ converges to a periodic point of g with period q. Moreover, if $g: Y \to Y$ is nonexpansive, g has a fixed point in Y, and the orbit of each point in Y is pre-compact, then each $\omega(y;g)$ is a non-empty compact set, and $g(\omega(y;g)) = \omega(y;g)$. Furthermore it was shown in [8] that $\omega(x;g) = \omega(y;g)$ for all $x \in \omega(y;g)$, and the restriction of g to $\omega(y;g)$ is an isometry, see [10].

A metric space (Y,d) is called *proper* if every closed ball is compact. Hilbert's metric spaces are separable and proper, since their topology coincides with the norm topology, see [22]. As the iterates of a nonexpansive mapping form an equicontinuous family, one can use an Arzelà–Ascoli type argument to prove the following assertion, see [4, p. 9] for details.

Lemma 2.1. *If (Y,d) is a separable proper metric space and $g: Y \to Y$ is a nonexpansive mapping with a fixed point in Y, then every subsequence of $(g^k)_k$ has a further subsequence which converges uniformly on compact subsets of Y.*

Lemma 2.1 can be used to prove the following proposition concerning the existence of a nonexpansive retraction on Ω_g. The argument is a straightforward adaptation of [15, Proposition 2.1].

Proposition 2.2. *If (Y,d) is separable proper metric space and $g: Y \to Y$ is a nonexpansive mapping with a fixed point on Y, then there exists a nonexpansive retraction $r: Y \to Y$ onto Ω_g and the restriction of g to Ω_g is an isometry.*

3. Strictly convex domains

Recall that a path $\gamma: [r,s] \to (X,d_X)$ is called a *geodesic* if

$$d_X(\gamma(t_1),\gamma(t_2)) = |t_1 - t_2| \quad \text{for all } t_1,t_2 \in [r,s].$$

A *geodesic segment* is the image of a geodesic in (X,d_X). It is a well-known fact that if X is strictly convex, then (X,d_X) is uniquely geodesic [4, p. 106]; so, the only geodesic segments are the straight-line segments. For $x,y \in (X,d_X)$ we write $[x,y]$ to denote the straight-line segment connecting x and y, and $\ell_{x,y}$ to denote the straight-line through x and y.

Lemma 3.1. *If (X,d_X) is a strictly convex Hilbert's metric space and $g: X \to X$ is a nonexpansive mapping with a fixed point in X, then Ω_g is convex.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.2 there exists a nonexpansive retraction $r: X \to X$ onto Ω_g. Thus, $r(r(x)) = r(x)$ for all $x \in X$.

Now let $x,y \in \Omega_g$ and put $s = d_X(x,y)$. Let $\gamma: [0,s] \to X$ be the unique geodesic path connecting $[x,y]$, so the image of γ is the straight-line segment between x and y. Now let $u = \gamma(t)$, so $d_X(x,u) = t$ and $d_X(u,y) = s - t$. As r is nonexpansive, we get that $d_X(x, r(u)) \leq t$ and $d_X(y, r(u)) \leq s - t$. Now using

$$d_X(x, r(u)) + d_X(r(u), y) \leq d_X(x,y) = s,$$

we find that $d_X(x, r(u)) = t$ and $d_X(y, r(u)) = s - t$. This implies that $r(u)$ lies on the unique geodesic connecting x and y, which is $[x, y]$. Thus, $r(u) = u$ and hence $u \in \Omega_g$. □

It is convenient to embed the domain X into the affine hyperplane $H = \{(x,1) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ by identifying X with $\{(x,1) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : x \in X\}$. Let $P(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ denote the real n-dimensional projective space. So, $P(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ is the set of lines through the origin in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Recall that $P(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ can be partitioned into the set of lines intersecting the hyperplane H and the set of lines parallel to H. In other words, X is contained in the open cell of $P(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$. Let $V' = \mathrm{aff}(\Omega_g)$ denote the affine span of Ω_g inside H, and put $X' = V' \cap X$. Let V be the vector space above V' in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Thus, X' lies in the open cell of the real projective space $P(V) = V' \cup P(V')$. We write

$$\mathrm{Coll}(X') = \{h \in \mathrm{PGL}(V) : h(X') = X'\}$$

to denote the *collineation group* of X'.

PROPOSITION 3.2. *If $g: X \to X$ is a nonexpansive mapping on a strictly convex Hilbert's metric space (X, d_X), and g has a fixed point, then there exists a collineation $h \in \mathrm{Coll}(X')$ such that h coincides with g on Ω_g.*

PROOF. Let $k = \dim V' \geq 1$. (The case $k = 0$ is trivial.) By Lemma 3.1 Ω_g is convex, and hence there exist $x^0, \ldots, x^k$ in Ω_g such that $\mathrm{conv}(x^0, \ldots, x^k)$ is a k-simplex in Ω_g Let $y \in \Omega_g$ be in the relative interior of $\mathrm{conv}(x^0, \ldots, x^k)$. So, $y, x^0, \ldots, x^k$ forms a projective basis for $P(V)$.

As g is an isometry on Ω_g and g maps Ω_g onto itself, $g_{|\Omega_g}$ and $g^{-1}_{|\Omega_g}$ map straight-line segments to straight-line segments in Ω_g. We now use a simple induction argument to prove the following claim.

Claim 1. For $0 \leq k_0 < \ldots < k_s \leq k$ we have that $z \in \mathrm{conv}(x^{k_0}, \ldots, x^{k_s})$ if and only if $g(z) \in \mathrm{conv}(g(x^{k_0}), \ldots, g(x^{k_s}))$.

If $s = 1$, then the assertion is clear as g maps the straight-line segment $[x^{k_0}, x^{k_1}]$ onto the straight-line segment $[g(x^{k_0}), g(x^{k_1})]$. Now suppose the assertion is true for all integers r with $1 \leq r < s \leq k$. Let $z \in \mathrm{conv}(x^{k_1}, \ldots, x^{k_s})$. The assertion is clearly true for $z = x^{k_s}$. So, suppose that $z \neq x^{k_s}$ and let ℓ be the straight-line through z and x^{k_s}. Note that ℓ intersects $\mathrm{conv}(x^{k_1}, \ldots, x^{k_{s-1}})$ in a point u. By the induction hypothesis $g(u) \in \mathrm{conv}(g(x^{k_1}), \ldots, g(x^{k_{s-1}}))$. As g maps $[u, x^{k_s}]$ onto $[g(u), g(x^{k_s})]$, we conclude that $g(z)$ is in $\mathrm{conv}(g(x^{k_0}), \ldots,$

$g(x^{k_s}))$. The opposite implication is obtained by applying the same argument to $g^{-1}_{|\Omega_g}$.

Claim 1 implies that $\operatorname{conv}(g(x^0), \dots, g(x^k))$ is a k-dimensional simplex in Ω_g and $g(y)$ is in its relative interior. Thus, $g(y), g(x^0), \dots, g(x^k)$ is a projective basis for $P(V)$. Let $h \in \mathrm{PGL}(V)$ be the unique collineation that coincides with g on $y, x^0, \dots, x^k$. We will show that $h \in \mathrm{Coll}(X')$ and h coincides with g on the whole of Ω_g. We need the following claim.

Claim 2. If g coincides with h on 3 distinct collinear points $x, w, z \in \Omega_g$, then g coincides with h on the straight-line segment $\ell_{x,z} \cap \Omega_g$.

To prove the claim let $a, b \in \partial X'$ be the points of intersection of the straight-line through x and z such that x is between a and z, and z is between b and x. Likewise let $a', b' \in \partial X'$ be the points of intersection of the straight-line through $g(x)$ and $g(z)$ such that $g(x)$ is between a' and $g(z)$, and $g(z)$ is between b' and $g(x)$. There exists a collineation f on the projective line containing $\ell_{x,z}$ that maps a to a', b to b', and x to $g(x)$. We show that f coincides with g on $\ell_{x,z} \cap \Omega_g$. For $u \in \ell_{x,z} \cap \Omega_g$, with u between x and b,

$$[a', g(x), g(u), b'] = [a, x, u, b] = [a', f(x), f(u), b'].$$

As $f(x) = g(x)$, this equality uniquely determines $g(u)$, so that $g(u) = f(u)$. The case where u is between z and a is similar. Now note that, as x, w and z form a projective basis for the projective line containing $\ell_{x,z}$, and h and f coincides on these 3 points, f and h are identical on $\ell_{x,z}$. This implies that g and h are identical on $\ell_{x,z} \cap \Omega_g$.

Note that for each $0 \leq l \leq k$ there exists y^l in the relative interior of $\operatorname{conv}(\{x^1, \dots, x^k\} \setminus \{x^l\})$ such that $h(y^l) = g(y^l)$. Simply let y^l be the point of intersection of $\ell_{x^l,y}$ and $\operatorname{conv}(\{x^1, \dots, x^k\} \setminus \{x^l\})$. It follows from Claim 1 that $g(y^l)$ is in the relative interior of $\operatorname{conv}(\{g(x^0), \dots, g(x^k)\} \setminus \{g(x^l)\})$. As g maps straight-line segments to straight-line segments. $g(y^l)$ is the unique point of intersection of $\ell_{g(x^l),g(y)}$ and $\operatorname{conv}(\{g(x^0), \dots, g(x^k)\} \setminus \{g(x^l)\})$. Thus, $h(y^l) = g(y^l)$. Repeating this argument shows that for each $0 \leq k_0 < k_1 < \dots < k_s \leq k$ there exists w in the relative interior of $\operatorname{conv}(x^{k_0}, \dots, x^{k_s})$ such that $h(w) = g(w)$.

We shall now show by induction on $s \geq 1$ that g and h coincide on $\operatorname{conv}(x^{k_0}, \dots, x^{k_s})$. The induction basis is true by Claim 2. Suppose the assertion is true for all $m < s$. Let v and w be points in the relative interior of $\operatorname{conv}(x^{k_0}, \dots, x^{k_s})$ with $v \neq w$ and $h(w) = g(w)$. Then the straight-line $\ell_{w,v}$ intersects the relative boundary of $\operatorname{conv}(x^{k_0}, \dots, x^{k_s})$ in two distinct points p and q. By the induction hypothesis g and h coincide on p and q. As $h(w) = g(w)$, we can apply Claim 2 to deduce that $g(v) = h(v)$.

To see that g coincides with h on the whole of Ω_g we remark that for $v \in \Omega_g$ the straight-line $\ell_{y,v}$ contains at least 3 points of $\mathrm{conv}(x^0, \dots, x^k)$, as y is in the relative interior of $\mathrm{conv}(x^0, \dots, x^k)$. Thus, by Claim 2 g coincides with h on Ω_g.

It remains to show that $h(X') = X'$. Let $z_1 \neq z_2$ in the relative interior of $\mathrm{conv}(x^0, \dots, x^k)$, and let $a, b \in \partial X' \cap \ell_{z_1,z_2}$ such that z_1 is between z_2 and a, and z_2 is between z_1 and b. Then $[a, z_1, z_2, b] = [a', g(z_1), g(z_2), b']$, where $a', b' \in \partial X' \cap \ell_{g(z_1),g(z_2)}$, and $g(z_1)$ is between a' and $g(z_2)$. There exists a collineation f that maps a to a', b to b', and z_1 to $g(z_1)$. As in the proof of Claim 2 g coincides with f on $[z_1, z_2]$. This implies that h coincides with f on $\ell_{z_1,z_2} \cap X'$, and hence $h(a) = a'$ and $h(b) = b'$, which completes the proof. □

Ideas similar to the ones behind Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 3.2 were used by Edelstein in [9] to analyze nonexpansive mappings on strictly convex Banach spaces.

A key ingredient in the proof of Theorem 1.1 is a result by Y. I. Lyubich and A. I. Veitsblit [20]. To state it we need to recall a few definitions. Let C be a closed cone with non-empty interior in a finite dimensional real vector space W, so C is convex, $\lambda C \subseteq C$ for all $\lambda > 0$, and $C \cap (-C) = \{0\}$. A linear map $A: W \to W$ is said to be *positive* if $A(C) \subseteq C$. We denote the *automorphism group* of C by

$$\mathrm{Aut}(C) = \{A \in \mathrm{GL}(W) : A(C) = C\}.$$

A linear subspace U of W is called *C-complemented* if there exists a positive linear projection $P: W \to W$ with range U. Note that if U is a subspace of W, then $U \cap C$ is a closed sub-cone of C.

A closed cone C with non-empty interior in W, where $\dim W = n + 1$, is called a *Lorentz cone* if there exists a system of coordinates $x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}$ such that

$$C = \{(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}) \in W : x_{n+1}^2 - x_1^2 - \dots - x_n^2 \geq 0 \text{ and } x_{n+1} \geq 0\}.$$

Theorem 2.3 (Lyubich–Veitsblit [20]). *If $C \subseteq W$ is a closed cone with non-empty interior, and $\mathrm{Aut}(C)$ contains an infinite compact subgroup, then there exists a 3-dimensional C-complemented subspace U of W such that $K = C \cap U$ is a Lorentz cone in U.*

We will now prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. As before identify X with $\{(x, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}: x \in X\}$ and let $V' = \mathrm{aff}(\Omega_g)$ be the affine span of Ω_g in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Put $X' = V' \cap X$ and let V be the subspace above V' in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$.

Furthermore let C_X denote the closure of the open cone generated by X in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, so

$$C_X = \{\lambda(x, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : x \in \overline{X} \text{ and } \lambda \geq 0\}.$$

Likewise let $C_{X'}$ denote the closure of the open cone generated by X' in V. Let $x^* \in \Omega_g$ be a fixed point of g, and note that x^* is in the interior of $C_{X'}$ in V.

By Proposition 2.2 there exists an $h \in \mathrm{Coll}(X')$ such that h coincides with g on Ω_g. Thus, there exists $A \in \mathrm{Aut}(C_{X'})$ such that $pA = h$, where p denotes the projection. Remark that, as $h(x^*) = g(x^*) = x^*$, we have that $A(x^*) = \sigma x^*$ for some $\sigma > 0$. Putting $B = \frac{1}{\sigma}A$ we see that $B \in \mathrm{Aut}(C_{X'})$, $pB = h$ and $B(x^*) = x^*$.

As x^* in the interior of $C_{X'}$ in V, we know that $(B^k)_{k=0}^{\infty}$ is bounded. Indeed, let $\|x\| = \inf\{\mu > 0 \colon -\mu x^* \leq_C x \leq_C \mu x^*\}$ be the order unit norm on V, see [22, p.14]. Now let $x \in V$ and $\|x\| = \tau$. Then $-\tau x^* \leq_C x \leq_C \tau x^*$, so that

$$-\tau x^* = -\tau B(x^*) \leq_C B(x) \leq_C \tau B(x^*) = \tau x^*.$$

This implies that $\|B\| = 1$, and hence $(B^k)_{k=0}^{\infty}$ is bounded. In the same way it can be shown that $\|B^{-1}\| = 1$, and hence the closure of the group generated by $(B^k)_{k=0}^{\infty}$ is a compact subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(C_{X'})$.

As there exists no 2-dimensional plane P in $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $P \cap X$ is the interior of an ellipse, there exists no 3-dimensional subspace U of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ such that $U \cap C_{X'}$ is a Lorentz cone. Hence by the Lyubich–Veitsblit Theorem 2.3 we know that there exists an integer $q \geq 1$ such that $B^q = I$.

Now to prove the convergence to periodic orbits, it suffices to show that $|\omega(x; g)|$ divides q for each $x \in X$, since g is nonexpansive. So, let $x \in X$ and $y \in \omega(y; g)$. By [8] we know that $\omega(x; g) = \omega(y; g)$. As $y \in \Omega_g$, $g^q(y) = h^q(y) = pB^q(y) = y$. Therefore y is a periodic point of g whose period divides q. Thus, $|\omega(x; g)| = |\omega(y; g)|$ divides q, and we are done. □

The proof of Theorem 1.1 does not use the full strength of the Lyubich–Veitsblit Theorem 2.3. In fact, I believe that the hypothesis in Theorem 1.1 can be weakened to the assumption: there exists no 3-dimensional C_X-complemented subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ such that $C_X \cap U$ is a Lorentz cone. For instance, if $C_X = \{(x_1, \ldots, x_4) \in \mathbb{R}^4 : x_4^4 - x_1^4 - x_2^4 - x_3^4 \geq 0 \text{ and } x_4 \geq 0\}$, which corresponds to X being the interior of the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with the ℓ_4-norm, then it is known [19] that there exists a 3-dimensional subspace U such that $C_X \cap U$ is a Lorentz cone, but U is not C_X-complemented, see [20, Theorem 3]. A more daring speculation would be to conjecture that there is convergence to periodic orbits for general Hilbert's metric spaces not containing a hyperbolic plane.

It must be noted that there exists an analogous result for finite dimensional strictly convex normed spaces, see [15]. In that case one assumes that there exists no 1-complemented Euclidean plane to ensure convergence to periodic orbits.

4. The simplex

It is known [22] that if X is an open n-simplex, then (X, d_X) is isometric to a normed space $(\mathbb{R}^n, \|\cdot\|_H)$, where $\|\cdot\|_H$ has a polyhedral unit ball. As (X, d_X) and (Y, d_Y) are isometric if X and Y are open n-simplices, we can restrict ourselves to analyzing Hilbert's metric on the *standard n-simplex*,

$$\Delta_n = \left\{(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \sum_i x_i = 1 \text{ and } x_i > 0 \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, n+1\right\}.$$

In that case it is easy to describe the isometry. Let $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be equipped with an equivalence relation $\sim$ given by, $x \sim y$ if $x = y + \lambda(1, \ldots, 1)$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}/\sim$ is an n-dimensional vector space that can be endowed with the *variation norm*,

$$\|x\|_{\text{var}} = \max_{1 \le i \le n+1} x_i - \min_{1 \le j \le n+1} x_j \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}/\sim.$$

There exists an isometry of (Δ_n, d_{Δ_n}) onto $(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}/\sim, \|\cdot\|_{\text{var}})$ which is given by,

$$\text{Log}(x) = (\log x_1, \ldots, \log x_{n+1}) \quad \text{for } x \in \Delta_n.$$

By taking the representative $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with $x_{n+1} = 0$ in the equivalence class of x in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}/\sim$, and projecting out the $(n+1)$-th coordinate, we see that (Δ_n, d_{Δ_n}) is isometric to $(\mathbb{R}^n, \|\cdot\|_H)$, where

$$\|z\|_H = \left(0 \vee \max_{1 \le i \le n} z_i\right) - \left(0 \wedge \min_{1 \le j \le n} z_j\right) \quad \text{for } z \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Here $a \vee b = \max\{a, b\}$ and $a \wedge b = \min\{a, b\}$. In dimension $n = 2$ the unit ball is a hexagon, as shown in Figure 2. For $n = 3$ the unit ball is a rhombic-dodecahedron.



FIGURE 2. The unit ball of $\|\cdot\|_H$

It is clear that there exists an isometry A on $(\mathbb{R}^n, \|\cdot\|_H)$ with period 6. Simply take

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus, on (Δ_2, d_{Δ_2}) there exists a nonexpansive mapping that has a period 6 point. In this section it is shown that 6 is the maximal possible period. The proof uses similar methods as the ones developed in [14].

Let $(\mathbb{R}^n, \|\cdot\|)$ be a polyhedral normed space, i.e. it unit ball is a polyhedron. A sequence $x^1, \dots, x^k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is called an *additive chain* if

$$\|x^1 - x^k\| = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \|x^i - x^{i+1}\|.$$

As $\|\cdot\|$ is a polyhedral norm, $x^1, x^2, \dots, x^k$ need not lie on a straight-line in order to be an additive chain. For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ define

$$W(x,y) = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n \colon x, y, z \text{ is an additive chain}\}$$

and denote its interior by $W^\circ(x,y)$. Given a polyhedral norm on $\mathbb{R}^n$ whose unit ball has m facets, i.e. m faces of dimension $n-1$, there exist m linear functionals $\phi_i, \dots, \phi_m$ such that

$$\|x\| = \max_{i=1,\dots,m} \langle \phi_i, x\rangle \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Let $I(x,y) = \{i \colon \|x-y\| = \phi_i(x-y)\}$.

Lemma 4.1. *If $x^1, \dots, x^k$ is a sequence in a polyhedral normed vector space $(\mathbb{R}^n, \|\cdot\|)$ and $\|x^1 - x^k\| = \phi_i(x^1 - x^k)$, then $x^1, \dots, x^k$ is an additive chain if and only if $\|x^j - x^{j+1}\| = \phi_i(x^j - x^{j+1})$ for all $j = 1, \dots, k-1$.*

Proof. Clearly

$$\|x^1 - x^k\| = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \|x^j - x^{j+1}\| \geq \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \phi_i(x^j - x^{j+1}) = \phi_i(x^1 - x^k) = \|x^1 - x^k\|.$$

Thus, $\phi_i(x^j - x^{j+1}) = \|x^j - x^{j+1}\|$ for all $j = 1, \dots, k-1$. Conversely,

$$\|x^1 - x^k\| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \|x^j - x^{j+1}\| = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \phi_i(x^j - x^{j+1}) = \phi_i(x^1 - x^k) \leq \|x^1 - x^k\|. \ \square$$

It follows from Lemma 4.1 that $x^1, x^2, \dots, x^k$ is an additive chain if and only if $\bigcap_{j=1}^{k-1} I(x^j, x^{j+1}) \neq \emptyset$.

Lemma 4.2. *For $x \neq y$ in a polyhedral normed vector $(\mathbb{R}^n, \|\cdot\|)$ we have that*

$$W^\circ(x,y) = \{z \in W(x,y) \colon I(y,z) \subseteq I(x,y)\}.$$

Proof. Suppose that x, y, z is an additive chain and $I(y,z) \not\subseteq I(x,y)$. Let $i \in I(y,z) \setminus I(x,y)$. For $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $z' \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $I(y,z') = \{i\}$ and $\|z'-z\| \leq \varepsilon$. Note that x, y, z' is not an additive chain, as $I(x,y) \cap I(y,z') = \emptyset$. Hence $z \in \partial W(x,y)$, which shows that

$$W^\circ(x,y) \subseteq \{z \in W(x,y) \colon I(y,z) \subseteq I(x,y)\}.$$

On the other hand, given an additive chain x, y, z, we let

$$\varepsilon = \min_{i,j} \phi_i(y-z) - \phi_j(y-z) > 0,$$

where the minimum is taken over all $i \in I(y,z)$ and $j \notin I(y,z)$.

For each $z' \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\|z-z'\| < \varepsilon/2$, we have that $I(y,z') \subseteq I(y,z)$. Indeed, if $j \notin I(y,z)$ and $i \in I(y,z)$, then

$$\phi_j(y-z') = \phi_j(y-z) + \phi_j(z-z') \leq \phi_i(y-z) + \phi_j(z-z') - \varepsilon < \phi_i(y-z) - \varepsilon/2$$
$$\leq \phi_i(y-z') + \phi_i(z'-z) - \varepsilon/2 < \phi_i(y-z'),$$

and hence $j \notin I(y,z')$.

As $I(y,z) \subseteq I(x,y)$, we know that $I(y,z') \subseteq I(x,y)$. This implies that $I(y,z') \cap I(x,y)$ is non-empty, and hence x, y, z' is an additive chain. □

Recall that if $\mathcal{O} = \{\xi, g(\xi), \ldots, g^{p-1}(\xi)\}$ is a periodic orbit of a nonexpansive mapping g on a metric space (Y,d), then the iterates $\Gamma = \{g^k \colon k = 0, \ldots p-1\}$ form a cyclic group of isometries on $\mathcal{O}$ that acts transitively on $\mathcal{O}$, i.e. for each $x, y \in \mathcal{O}$ there exists $g^k \in \Gamma$ such that $g^k(x) = y$. The following lemma generalizes [14, Lemma 2.2].

Lemma 4.3. *If S is a compact set in a polyhedral normed space $(\mathbb{R}^n, \|\cdot\|)$ and S has a transitive commutative group of isometries, then*

$$W^\circ(x,y) \cap S = \emptyset \quad \textit{for all } x \neq y \in S.$$

Proof. Let $x, y, z \in S$ be such that $x \neq y$ and $z \in W^\circ(x,y)$. Put $\varepsilon = \min\{\|x-y\|, \|y-z\|\} > 0$. Denote the collection of all additive chains in S starting with x, y, z and which are such that the distance between consecutive points in the chain is at least ε by $\mathcal{F}$.

Note that, since S is compact, there exists an upper bound on the length of the additive chains in $\mathcal{F}$. Let $x^1 = x, x^2 = y, x^3 = z, \ldots, x^r$ be an additive chain in $\mathcal{F}$ of maximal length.

For $1 \leq k, l \leq r$ let $g_{k,l}$ be an isometry on S in the commutative group that acts transitively on S such that $g_{k,l}(x^k) = x^l$. Denote $x^{r+1} = g_{1,2}(x^r)$. We now show that $x^2, x^3, \dots, x^{r+1}$ is also an additive chain in S in which the distance between consecutive points is at least ε. Indeed, as the group is commutative,

$$\|x^r - x^{r+1}\| = \|g_{1,r}(x^1) - g_{1,r}(g_{1,2}(x^1))\| = \|x^1 - x^2\| \geq \varepsilon.$$

This equality implies,

$$\|x^2 - x^{r+1}\| = \|g_{1,2}(x^1) - g_{1,2}(x^r)\| = \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \|x^j - x^{j+1}\| = \sum_{j=2}^{r} \|x^j - x^{j+1}\|,$$

and hence $\bigcap_{j=2}^r I(x^j, x^{j+1}) \neq \emptyset$. As $z \in W^\circ(x, y)$, we know that $I(x^2, x^3) \subseteq I(x^1, x^2)$, and hence $\bigcap_{j=1}^r I(x^j, x^{j+1}) \neq \emptyset$. But this implies that $x^1, \dots, x^{r+1}$ is an additive chain in $\mathcal{F}$, which contradicts the maximality of r. □

We can now prove Theorem 1.2.

PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2. If g is a nonexpansive mapping on $(\mathbb{R}^2, \|\cdot\|_H)$ with a periodic orbit $\mathcal{O}$ and fixed point x^*, then $\mathcal{O}$ is contained in the boundary of the ball $B(x^*) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \|x - x^*\|_H \leq R\}$ for some $R \geq 0$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $x^* = 0$.

Partition $\partial B(x^*)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
A_1 &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_1 = R \text{ and } 0 \leq x_2 < R\},\\
A_2 &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_2 = R \text{ and } 0 < x_1 \leq R\},\\
A_3 &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_2 - x_1 = R \text{ and } 0 < x_2 < R\},\\
A_4 &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_1 = -R \text{ and } -R < x_2 \leq 0\},\\
A_5 &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_2 = -R \text{ and } -R \leq x_1 < 0\},\\
A_6 &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_1 - x_2 = R \text{ and } -R \leq x_2 < 0\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Each A_i corresponds to a facet of $\partial B(x^*)$ with one of its vertices removed.

By Lemma 4.3 each A_i can contain at most two points of $\mathcal{O}$, see also Figure 2. Moreover, if A_i contains 2 points of $\mathcal{O}$, then $A_{i+1} \cap \mathcal{O}$ is empty. (Here we are counting modulo 6.) Indeed, if ϕ_i denotes the facet defining functional of $\partial B(x^*)$ corresponding to A_i, then it is easy to verify that if $x \neq y$ in A_i, then $I(x, y) = \{i+1, i+2\}$, so that $W^\circ(x, y) \supseteq A_{i+1}$. Thus, $A_{i+1} \cap \mathcal{O}$ is empty, if $x \neq y$ in $A_i \cap \mathcal{O}$, and hence $\mathcal{O}$ has at most 6 points. □

The example of a period 6 orbit of a nonexpansive mapping on Δ_2 can be generalized to Δ_n. To do this it is convenient to work in $(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}/\sim, \|\cdot\|_{\text{var}})$. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be the subset of all points $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}/\sim$ such that $x_i = 1$ or $x_i = 0$ for each i. Note that $(0, \dots, 0) = (1, \dots, 1)$ and that for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$ we have $-x = (1, \dots, 1) - x \in \mathcal{X}$. If $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is such that there exists no $x \neq y$ in $\mathcal{S}$ with $x \leq y$, where the inequality holds coordinate-wise, then $\|x - y\|_{\text{var}} = 2$ for all $x \neq y$ in S. For such sets $\mathcal{S}$ it is known [16, p. 867] that there exists a nonexpansive mapping $g_{\mathcal{S}}$ on $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}/\sim$ which has $\mathcal{S}$ as a periodic orbit. Now suppose that n is even and let $\mathcal{S}_n \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be the set of points with exactly $n/2$ coordinates equal to 1. Then $-\mathcal{S}_n$ is the set of points with exactly $n/2+1$ coordinates equal to 1 in $\mathcal{X}$. Clearly the reflection in the origin, $R(x) = -x$, is an isometry on $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}/\sim$. Now if $|\mathcal{S}_n| = \binom{n+1}{n/2}$ is odd, the nonexpansive mapping $R \circ g_{\mathcal{S}_n}$ has a periodic orbit of length $2\binom{n+1}{n/2}$. For $n = 2$, this gives a period 6 orbit Δ_2. On the other hand, if $\binom{n+1}{n/2}$ is even, we can drop one point of $\mathcal{S}_n$ and obtain a periodic orbit of length $2\binom{n+1}{n/2} - 2$. A similar construction exists for n odd. This shows, for general n, that there exists a nonexpansive mapping on (Δ_n, d_{Δ_n}) that has a periodic point with period

$$2\binom{n+1}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} - 2\delta_n,$$

where $\delta_n = 1$ if $\binom{n+1}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$ is even and $\delta_n = 0$ otherwise. It seems unlikely that this lower bound is optimal, but no better examples are known.

References

[1] J. C. Álvarez Paiva, *Hilbert's fourth problem in two dimensions*, MASS selecta: teaching and learning advanced undergraduate mathematics (Svetlana Katok et al., eds.), Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2003, pp. 165–183.

[2] A. F. Beardon, *The dynamics of contractions*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **17** (1997), 1257–1266.

[3] G. Birkhoff, *Extensions of Jentzsch's theorems*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **85** (1957), 219–277.

[4] H. Busemann, *The Geometry of Geodesics Pure and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 6, Academic Press, New York, 1955.

[5] P. Bushell, *Hilbert's metric and positive contraction mappings in Banach space*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **52** (1973), 330–338.

[6] A. Calka, *On conditions under which isometries have bounded orbits*, Colloq. Math. **48** (1984), 219–227.

[7] J. Cochet-Terrasson and S. Gaubert, *A policy iteration algorithm for zero-sum stochastic games with mean payoff*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **343** (2006), 377–382.

[8] C. M. Dafermos and M. Slemrod, *Asymptotic behavior of nonlinear contraction semigroups*, J. Funct. Anal. **13** (1973), 97–106.

[9] M. Edelstein, *On non-expansive mappings of Banach spaces*, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **60** (1964), 439–447.

[10] H. Freundenthal and W. Hurewicz, *Dehnungen, verkürzungen und isometrien*, Fundamenta Math. **26** (1936), 120–122.

[11] D. Hilbert, *Über die gerade linie als kürzeste verbindung zweier punkte*, Math. Ann. **46** (1895), 91–96.

[12] A. Karlsson, *Non-expanding maps and Busemann functions*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **21** (2001), 1447–1457.

[13] A. Karlsson and G. A. Noskov, *The Hilbert metric and Gromov hyperbolicity*, Enseign. Math. **48** (2002), 73–89.

[14] B. Lemmens, R. D. Nussbaum and S. M. Verduyn Lunel, *Lower and upper bounds for ω-limit sets of nonexpansive maps*, Indag. Math. New Ser. **12** (2001), 191–211.

[15] B. Lemmens and O. van Gaans, *Dynamics of non-expansive maps on strictly convex Banach spaces*, Israel J. Math. **171** (2009), 425–442.

[16] B. Lemmens and M. Scheutzow, *On the dynamics of sup-norm nonexpansive maps*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Syst. **25** (2005), 861–871.

[17] B. Lins, *A Denjoy–Wolff theorem for Hilbert metric nonexpansive maps on polyhedral domains*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **143** (2007), 157–164.

[18] B. Lins and R. Nussbaum, *Denjoy–Wolff theorems, Hilbert metric nonexpansive maps and reproduction-decimation operators*, J. Funct. Anal. **254** (2008), 2365–2386.

[19] Y. I. Lyubich and L. N. Vaserstein, *Isometric embeddings between classical Banach spaces, cubature formulas, and spherical designs*, Geom. Dedicata **47** (1993), 327–362.

[20] Yu. I. Lyubich and A. I. Veitsblit, *Boundary spectrum of nonnegative operators*, Siberian Math. J. **26** (1985), 798–802.

[21] V. Metz, *Hilbert's projective metric on cones of Dirichlet forms*, J. Funct. Anal. **127** (1995), 438–455.

[22] R. D. Nussbaum, *Hilbert's projective metric and iterated nonlinear maps*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **75** (1988), 1–137.

[22] ______, *Omega limit sets of nonexpansive maps: finiteness and cardinality estimates*, Differential Integral Equations **3** (1990), 523–540.

[23] ______, *Entropy minimization, Hilbert's projective metric, and scaling integral kernels,*, J. Funct. Anal. **115** (1993), 45–99.

[24] ______, *Fixed point theorems and Denjoy–Wolff theorems for Hilbert's projective metric in infinite dimensions*, Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal. **29** (2007), 199–249.

[25] D. Rosenberg and S. Sorin, *An operator approach to zero-sum repeated games*, Israel J. Math. **121** (2001), 221–246.

[26] H. Samelson, *On the Perron–Frobenius theorem*, Michigan Math. J. **4** (1957), 57–59.

[27] D. Weller, *Hilbert's metric, part metric and selfmappings of a cone*, Ph.D. dissertation (1987), Univ. of Bremen, Germany, December.

Manuscript received August 4, 2010

Bas Lemmens
SMSAS
University of Kent
Canterbury, CT2 7NF, UNITED KINGDOM

E-mail address: B.Lemmens@kent.ac.uk