

# A counterexample to a nonlinear version of the Kreĭn–Rutman theorem by R. Mahadevan

Ari Arapostathis

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering,  
The University of Texas at Austin, 2501 Speedway, EER 7.824,  
Austin, TX 78712, USA

---

## Abstract

In this short note we present a simple counterexample to a nonlinear version of the Kreĭn–Rutman theorem reported in [*Nonlinear Anal.* **11** (2007), 3084–3090]. Correct versions of this theorem, and related results for superadditive maps are also presented.

*Keywords:* Kreĭn–Rutman theorem, Positive operator, Principal eigenvalue, Convex cone  
*2000 MSC:* primary 47H07, 47H10, 47J10; secondary 47B65

---

## 1. Introduction

Kreĭn and Rutman in their seminal work [1] have studied linear operators which leave invariant a cone in a Banach space. Recall that an *ordered Banach space* is a real Banach space  $X$  with a cone  $K$ , a nontrivial closed subset of  $X$  satisfying

- (a)  $tK \subset K$  for all  $t \geq 0$ , where  $tK = \{tx : x \in K\}$ ;
- (b)  $K + K \subset K$ ;
- (c)  $K \cap (-K) = \{0\}$ , where  $-K = \{-x : x \in K\}$ .

As usual, we write  $x \preceq y$  if  $y - x \in K$ , and  $x \prec y$  if  $x \preceq y$  and  $x \neq y$ . When the interior of  $K$ , denoted as  $\overset{\circ}{K}$ , is nonempty, we call  $X$  a *strongly ordered* Banach space. We also write  $x \ll y$  if  $y - x \in \overset{\circ}{K}$ . A continuous map  $T: X \rightarrow X$  is

- 1. *positive* if  $T(K) \subset K$ ;
- 2. *strictly positive* if  $T(K \setminus \{0\}) \subset K \setminus \{0\}$ ;
- 3. *strongly positive* if  $T(K \setminus \{0\}) \subset \overset{\circ}{K}$ ;
- 4. *order-preserving* or *increasing* if  $x \preceq y \implies T(x) \preceq T(y)$ ;
- 5. *strictly order-preserving* if  $x \prec y \implies T(x) \prec T(y)$ ;
- 6. *strongly order-preserving* if  $x \prec y \implies T(x) \ll T(y)$ ;
- 7. *homogeneous of degree one*, or *1-homogeneous*, if  $T(tx) = tT(x)$  for all  $t \geq 0$ .

The following nonlinear extension to the Kreĭn–Rutman theorem was reported in [2]. For a 1-homogeneous map  $T: X \rightarrow X$  we say that  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  is an eigenvalue of  $T$  if there exists a nonzero  $x \in X$ , such that  $T(x) = \lambda x$ . Recall that a map  $T: X \rightarrow X$  is called *completely continuous* if it is continuous and compact.

**Theorem 1 ([2, Theorem 2]).** *Let  $T: X \rightarrow X$  be an order-preserving, 1-homogeneous, completely continuous map such that for some  $u \in K$  and  $M > 0$ ,  $MT(u) \succeq u$ . Then there exist  $\lambda > 0$  and  $\hat{x} \in K$ , with  $\|\hat{x}\| = 1$ , such that  $T(\hat{x}) = \lambda \hat{x}$ . Moreover, if  $\overset{\circ}{K} \neq \emptyset$  and  $T$  is strongly positive and strictly order-preserving, the following hold.*

---

*Email address:* ari@ece.utexas.edu (Ari Arapostathis)

- (i)  $\hat{x}$  is the unique unit eigenvector in  $K$  ;
- (ii)  $\lambda \geq |\lambda'|$  for any real eigenvalue  $\lambda'$  of  $T$  ;
- (iii)  $\lambda$  is geometrically simple.

It turns out that the assertions in (i) and (iii) are not true under the assumptions of the theorem. In Section 2 we present a counterexample to the theorem in [2] mentioned above. In Section 3 we review correct versions of this result. With the exception of Section 3.3 concerning superadditive maps, the remaining results in Section 3 are a combination of existing results in the literature, and no originality is claimed.

I also wish to thank the anonymous referee who brought to my attention the work in [3], which employs the notions of semi-strong positivity and semi-strongly increasing maps, and improves upon the results in [4]. It turns out that Theorem 3 in Section 3 is a variation of Theorem 2.3 in [3].

## 2. A Counterexample

The following is an example of a strongly positive, strictly order-preserving, 1-homogeneous, continuous map  $T$  on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  that has multiple positive unit eigenvectors.

**Example 1.** Let  $K = \{x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_i \geq 0, i = 1, 2\}$ . Define

$$K_1 = \{x \in K : x_1 > 2x_2\}, \quad K_3 = \{x \in K : x_2 > 2x_1\},$$

and  $K_2 = K \setminus (K_1 \cup K_3)$ . Let

$$T(x) := \begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} x & \text{if } x \in K_1 \\ 3x & \text{if } x \in K_2 \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 2 \end{pmatrix} x & \text{if } x \in K_3. \end{cases}$$

It is clear that  $T: K \rightarrow K$  is continuous, 1-homogeneous, and strongly positive. Also every element of  $K_2$  is an eigenvector of  $T$ .

It remains to show that  $T$  is strictly order-preserving. We examine all possible cases:

- (i) If  $x, y \in K_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , and  $x \prec y$ , then it is clear that  $T(x) \prec T(y)$ .
- (ii) Suppose  $x \in K_1$ ,  $y \in K_3$ , and  $x \prec y$ . Then we must have

$$2x_2 < x_1 \leq y_1 < \frac{y_2}{2}. \quad (1)$$

By (1) we obtain that

$$x_1 + x_2 < \frac{3x_1}{2} \leq \frac{3y_1}{2} < \frac{y_1 + y_2}{2}. \quad (2)$$

Since  $T(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} (x_1 + x_2)$  and  $T(y) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix} (y_1 + y_2)$ , it follows by (2) that  $T(x) \prec T(y)$ . Also, if  $x \succ y$ , then  $T(x) \succ T(y)$  by symmetry.

- (iii) Suppose  $x \in K_1$ ,  $y \in K_2$  and  $x \prec y$ . Then we have

$$2x_2 < x_1 \leq y_1 \leq 2y_2. \quad (3)$$

It follows by (3) that  $2(x_1 + x_2) < 3y_1$  and  $x_1 + x_2 < 3y_2$ . Therefore  $T(x) \prec T(y)$ . On the other hand, if  $x \succ y$ , then we have

$$x_1 > 2x_2 \geq 2y_2 \geq y_1, \quad (4)$$

and by (4) we obtain  $2(x_1 + x_2) > 3y_1$  and  $x_1 + x_2 > 3y_2$ . Therefore  $T(x) \succ T(y)$ . Also, by symmetry, if  $x \in K_3$  and  $y \in K_2$ , then the strictly order-preserving property holds.

It follows by (i)–(iii) that  $T$  is strictly order-preserving.

### 3. Existence and Uniqueness Results

We denote by  $K^*$  the dual cone, i.e.,  $K^* = \{x^* \in X^* : \langle x^*, x \rangle \geq 0 \text{ for all } x \in K\}$ . The dual cone  $K^*$  might not satisfy  $K^* \cap (-K^*) = \{0\}$ , so is not necessarily a cone. If  $X$  is strongly ordered, then  $x \in \overset{\circ}{K}$  if and only if  $\langle x^*, x \rangle > 0$  for all nontrivial  $x^* \in K^*$ .

A cone  $K \subset X$  is said to be *generating* if  $X = K - K$ , and it is said to be *total* if  $X$  equals the closure of  $K - K$ . A strongly ordered Banach space is always generating. A cone  $K \subset X$  is called *normal* if there exists a positive constant  $\gamma$  such that  $\|x + y\| \geq \gamma\|x\|$  for all  $x, y \in K$ .

For a 1-homogeneous, continuous map  $T: X \rightarrow X$  we define, as in [5, 6],

$$\begin{aligned} \|T\|_+ &:= \sup \{ \|Tx\| : x \in K, \|x\| \leq 1 \}, \\ \tilde{\varrho}_+(T) &:= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|T^n\|_+^{1/n}, \\ \mu(x) &:= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|T^n(x)\|^{1/n}, \\ \varrho_+(T) &:= \sup_{x \in K} \mu(x), \\ \hat{r}(T) &:= \sup \{ \lambda \geq 0 : \exists x \in K \setminus \{0\} \text{ with } T(x) = \lambda x \}. \end{aligned}$$

The quantities  $\tilde{\varrho}_+(T)$ ,  $\varrho_+(T)$ , and  $\hat{r}(T)$ , are referred to in [5] as the *Bonsall's cone spectral radius*, the *cone spectral radius*, and the *cone eigenvalue spectral radius* of  $T$ , respectively. For a 1-homogeneous, continuous map  $T: X \rightarrow X$  we always have [5, Proposition 2.1]

$$\hat{r}(T) \leq \varrho_+(T) \leq \tilde{\varrho}_+(T) < \infty.$$

Also, if  $T$  is compact, then  $\varrho_+(T) = \tilde{\varrho}_+(T)$  [5, Theorem 2.3]. The equality  $\varrho_+(T) = \tilde{\varrho}_+(T)$  also holds in the absence of compactness, provided that  $T$  is order preserving and the cone  $K$  is normal [5, Theorem 2.2].

We summarize the main hypothesis:

**(H1)**  $T: X \rightarrow X$  is an order-preserving, 1-homogeneous, completely continuous map.

#### 3.1. Existence of an eigenvector in $K$ with a positive eigenvalue

Existence of an eigenvector of  $T$  in  $K$  with a positive eigenvalue, i.e., the existence part of Theorem 1, is asserted in [7, Theorem 3.1] under the following weaker assumption.

**(A1)** There exist a non-zero  $u = v - w$  with  $v, w \in K$  and such that  $-u \notin K$ , a positive constant  $M$ , and a positive integer  $p$  such that  $MT^p(u) \succeq u$ .

On the other hand, is a direct consequence of the more general result in [8, Theorem 2.1] that if  $S: X \rightarrow X$  satisfies (H1) and

**(A2)** The orbit  $\mathcal{O}(S, x) := \{S^n(x) : n = 1, 2, \dots\}$  of some  $x \in K$  is unbounded,

then there exist a constant  $t_0 \geq 1$  and  $x_0 \in K$ , with  $\|x_0\| = 1$ , satisfying  $S(x_0) = t_0 x_0$ . It thus turns out that [7, Theorem 3.1], and hence also the existence part of [2, Theorem 2], are a direct consequence of [8, Theorem 2.1] and the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.** Suppose  $T: X \rightarrow X$  satisfies (H1) and (A1). Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be arbitrary, and define  $S = (M + \varepsilon)^{1/p} T$ . Then  $\mathcal{O}(S, v)$  is unbounded.

PROOF. We argue by contradiction. If  $\mathcal{O}(S, v)$  is bounded, then it is also relatively compact. By the order-preserving property and 1-homogeneity we obtain  $S^{kp}(v) \succeq S^{kp}(u) \succeq (1 + \varepsilon/M)^k u$ . Therefore any limit point  $y$  of  $\{S^{kp}(v) : k = 1, 2, \dots\}$  satisfies  $y \succeq (1 + \varepsilon/M)^k u$  for all  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ , and since  $-u \notin K$  this is not possible.  $\square$

It then follows by [8, Theorem 2.1] and Lemma 2 that, under Assumptions (H1) and (A1), there exists  $x_0 \in K$  with  $\|x_0\| = 1$  and  $\lambda_0 \geq M^{-1/p}$  such that  $T(x_0) = \lambda_0 x_0$ . It is also clear from the above discussion that, under (H1), a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a positive eigenvalue with eigenvector in  $K$  is that  $\tilde{\varrho}_+(T) > 0$ . We remark here, that the assumption that  $X$  is strongly ordered,  $K$  is normal, and  $\tilde{\varrho}_+(T) > 0$ , it is shown in [6, Proposition 3.1.5] that  $\tilde{\varrho}_+(T) = \hat{r}(T)$ .

### 3.2. Uniqueness and simplicity of the positive eigenvalue

We define

$$\sigma_+(T) := \{\lambda > 0 : T(x) = \lambda x, x \in K \setminus \{0\}\}.$$

Ogiwara introduced the property of *indecomposability* [6, Hypothesis A4] to obtain the following. Suppose that  $X$  is strongly ordered,  $K$  is normal, and  $T$  satisfies (H1) and is indecomposable. Then  $\sigma_+(T) = \{\lambda_0\}$ , i.e., a singleton,  $\lambda_0$  is a simple eigenvalue of  $T$ , and the corresponding eigenvector lies in  $\mathring{K}$  [6, Theorem 3.1.1, Corollary 3.1.6].

A significant improvement of the above result can be found in [3]. Chang defines *semi-strong positivity* of  $T$  in [4, Definition 4.5] by

$$\forall x \in \partial K \setminus \{0\}, \exists x^* \in K^* \text{ such that } \langle x^*, T(x) \rangle > 0 = \langle x^*, x \rangle.$$

Also  $T$  is called *semi-strongly increasing* in [3, Definition 2.1] if

$$\forall x, y \in X, \text{ with } x - y \in \partial K \setminus \{0\}, \exists x^* \in K^* \text{ such that } \langle x^*, T(x) - T(y) \rangle > 0 = \langle x^*, x - y \rangle.$$

Then normality of  $K$  is relaxed to assert the following. If  $X$  is strongly ordered, and  $T$  satisfies (H1) and is semi-strong positive, then there exists a unique positive eigenvalue with eigenvector in  $\mathring{K}$ . In addition, if  $T$  is semi-strongly increasing, then the eigenvalue is simple [3, Theorem 2.3]. It is also shown that the indecomposability hypothesis of Ogiwara is equivalent to the semi-strongly increasing property [3, Theorem 4.3].

In the sequel, we only assume that  $X$  is strongly ordered, and that  $T$  is 1-homogeneous and order preserving, and comment on the uniqueness and simplicity of the eigenvalue, provided that  $\sigma_+(T) \neq \emptyset$ .

Consider the following hypothesis:

**(B1)** If  $x \in \partial K \setminus \{0\}$ , then  $x - \beta T(x) \notin K$  for all  $\beta > 0$ .

It is clear that semi-strong positivity implies (B1). On the other hand, it is straightforward to show that if two eigenvectors  $x_0$  and  $y_0$  lie in  $\mathring{K}$ , then the associated eigenvalues are equal. In turn, it is easy to show that, under (B1), every eigenvector in  $K$  with a positive eigenvalue has to lie in  $\mathring{K}$ , and, consequently, that the positive eigenvalue is unique. Also, following for example the proof in [6, Lemma 3.1.2], we can show that (B1) implies  $T(\mathring{K}) \subset \mathring{K}$ .

Next, consider the hypothesis

**(B2)** If  $x - y \in \partial K \setminus \{0\}$ , then  $x - y - \beta (T(x) - T(y)) \notin K$  for all  $\beta > 0$ .

Clearly, (B2)  $\Rightarrow$  (B1). Also (B2) is weaker than the strong order preserving property. Under (B2), following the argument in the proof of [6, Theorem 3.1.1], one readily shows that if there exists a unit eigenvector in  $\mathring{K}$ , then it is unique.

We summarize the above assertions in the form of the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $X$  be strongly ordered, and  $T: K \rightarrow K$  be an order-preserving, 1-homogeneous map with  $\sigma_+(T) \neq \emptyset$ .*

- (i) *If (B1) holds, then  $T(\mathring{K}) \subset \mathring{K}$ ,  $\sigma_+(T)$  is a singleton, and all eigenvectors lie in  $\mathring{K}$ .*
- (ii) *If (B2) holds, then the unique eigenvalue in  $\sigma_+(T)$  is simple.*

### 3.3. Superadditive maps

We say that  $T: X \rightarrow X$  is *superadditive* (superadditive on  $K$ ) if  $T(x+y) \succeq T(x) + T(y)$  for all  $x, y \in X$  ( $x, y \in K$ ). It is clear that a (strictly, strongly) positive superadditive map is (strictly, strongly) order-preserving.

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $T: K \rightarrow K$  be a superadditive, 1-homogeneous, completely continuous map such that  $\tilde{\varrho}_+(T) > 0$ . Then there exists  $\lambda_0 > 0$  and  $x_0 \in K$  with  $\|x_0\| = 1$  such that  $T(x_0) = \lambda_0 x_0$ . Moreover, if (B1) holds, then  $x_0$  is the unique unit eigenvector of  $T$  in  $K$ .*

PROOF. Existence follows from Section 3.1. Suppose  $x_0$  and  $y_0$  are two distinct unit eigenvectors in  $K$ . As mentioned in Section 3.2, hypothesis (B1) implies that  $x_0, y_0 \in \overset{\circ}{K}$ , and therefore these eigenvectors have a common eigenvalue  $\lambda_0 > 0$ . Hence there exists  $\alpha > 0$  such that  $x_0 - \alpha y_0 \in \partial K \setminus \{0\}$ . Since  $T$  is superadditive, we obtain

$$T(x_0 - \alpha y_0) \preceq T(x_0) - \alpha T(y_0) = \lambda_0(x_0 - \alpha y_0).$$

This contradicts (B1) unless  $x_0 - \alpha y_0 = 0$ . Uniqueness of a unit eigenvector in  $K$  follows.  $\square$

**Remark 1.** For a superadditive map  $T$ , we have

$$x - y - \beta T(x - y) \succeq x - y - \beta (T(x) - T(y))$$

Therefore if  $T$  satisfies (B1) it also satisfies (B2).

Let  $K_+ := K$ ,  $K_- := -K$ , and define

$$\sigma(T) := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : T(x) = \lambda x, x \in X \setminus \{0\}\}.$$

**Corollary 5.** *Let  $T: X \rightarrow X$  be a positive, superadditive, 1-homogeneous, completely continuous map such that  $\tilde{\varrho}_+(T) > 0$ . Assuming (B1), there exist unique unit eigenvectors  $x_+ \in K_+$  and  $x_- \in K_-$  with positive eigenvalues  $\lambda_+$  and  $\lambda_-$ , respectively. Moreover,  $\lambda_- \geq \lambda_+$ . Also, if  $\lambda \in \sigma(T)$ , then  $|\lambda| \leq \lambda_+$ .*

PROOF. By Theorem 4,  $T$  has a unique eigenvector  $x_+ \in K_+$  corresponding to an eigenvalue  $\lambda_+ > 0$ , and moreover  $x_+ \in \overset{\circ}{K}_+$ . Define  $S(x) := -T(-x)$ . By superadditivity  $-T(-x) \succeq T(x)$ , which implies that  $S(x_+) \succeq T(x_+) = \lambda_+ x_+$ . Therefore (A1) holds for  $S$  which implies the existence of a unit eigenvector  $x_- \in K_-$  for  $S$  with a positive eigenvalue  $\lambda_-$ . Also property (B1) for  $T$  implies that if  $x \in \partial K \setminus \{0\}$ , then

$$x - \beta S(x) \preceq x - \beta T(x) \notin K,$$

so that property (B1) also holds for  $S$ . Thus uniqueness of  $x_-$  follows by Section 3.2. Let  $\alpha > 0$  be such that  $x_- + \alpha x_+ \in \partial K_-$ . By superadditivity,

$$T(x_- + \alpha x_+) \succeq T(x_-) + \alpha T(x_+) = \lambda_- x_- + \alpha \lambda_+ x_+.$$

By the order-preserving property, we have  $\lambda_- x_- + \alpha \lambda_+ x_+ \preceq 0$ , which implies that  $\lambda_- \geq \lambda_+$ .

Suppose  $T(x) = \lambda x$  for some  $x \in X \setminus (K_+ \cup K_-)$ , with  $x \neq 0$ . Let  $\alpha > 0$  be such that  $x_+ + \alpha x \in \partial K_+$ . Since  $T^2$  is order preserving, we have  $\lambda_+^2 x_+ + \lambda^2 \alpha x \succeq 0$ , which is possible only if  $\lambda_+ \geq |\lambda|$ .  $\square$

We would also like to mention here the stability results reported in [9] concerning strongly continuous semigroups of superadditive operators on Banach spaces.

### Acknowledgements

I wish to thank the anonymous referee whose comments helped to substantially improve this paper. This research was supported in part by the Army Research Office through grant W911NF-17-1-001, and in part by the Office of Naval Research through grant N00014-16-1-2956.

## References

- [1] M. G. Kreĭn, M. A. Rutman, Linear operators leaving invariant a cone in a Banach space, Amer. Math. Soc. Translation 1950 (26) (1950) 128.
- [2] R. Mahadevan, A note on a non-linear Krein-Rutman theorem, Nonlinear Anal. 67 (11) (2007) 3084–3090. [doi:10.1016/j.na.2006.09.062](#).
- [3] K. C. Chang, Nonlinear extensions of the Perron-Frobenius theorem and the Krein-Rutman theorem, J. Fixed Point Theory Appl. 15 (2) (2014) 433–457. [doi:10.1007/s11784-014-0191-2](#).
- [4] K. C. Chang, A nonlinear Krein Rutman theorem, J. Syst. Sci. Complex. 22 (4) (2009) 542–554. [doi:10.1007/s11424-009-9186-2](#).
- [5] J. Mallet-Paret, R. D. Nussbaum, Eigenvalues for a class of homogeneous cone maps arising from max-plus operators, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. 8 (3) (2002) 519–562. [doi:10.3934/dcds.2002.8.519](#).
- [6] T. Ogiwara, Nonlinear Perron-Frobenius problem on an ordered Banach space, Japan. J. Math. (N.S.) 21 (1) (1995) 43–103. [doi:10.4099/math1924.21.43](#).
- [7] Y. Cui, J. Sun, A generalization of Mahadevan’s version of the Krein-Rutman theorem and applications to  $p$ -Laplacian boundary value problems, Abstr. Appl. Anal. (2012) Art. ID 305279, 14.
- [8] R. D. Nussbaum, Eigenvectors of nonlinear positive operators and the linear Kreĭn-Rutman theorem, in: Fixed point theory (Sherbrooke, Que., 1980), Vol. 886 of Lecture Notes in Math., Springer, Berlin, 1981, pp. 309–330.
- [9] A. Arapostathis, V. S. Borkar, K. S. Kumar, Risk-sensitive control and an abstract Collatz-Wielandt formula, J. Theoret. Probab. 29 (4) (2016) 1458–1484. [doi:10.1007/s10959-015-0616-x](#).