

A GENERAL CLASS OF CONTRACTIONS: A-CONTRACTIONS

M. Akram¹, A. A. Zafar,¹ A. A. Siddiqui²

Abstract. In this article we introduce a new class of contraction maps, called A -contractions, which includes the contractions studied by R. Bianchini, M. S. Khan, S. Reich and T. Kannan. It is shown that the class of A -contractions is proper super class of Kannan's and Khan's contractions. Several results due to B. Ahmad, F. U. Rehman, Z. Chuanyi, N. Shioji et al. are extended to the A -contractions. We also show that a metric space is complete if and only if it has a fixed point property for A -contractions.

AMS Mathematics Subject Classification (2000): 47H10, 54H25

Key words and phrases: complete metric space, contractions, fixed point

1. Introduction

Let R_+ denote the set of all non-negative real numbers and A be the set of all functions $\alpha : R_+^3 \rightarrow R_+$ satisfying

- (i) α is continuous on the set R_+^3 (with respect to the Euclidean metric on R^3).
- (ii) $a \leq kb$ for some $k \in [0, 1)$ whenever $a \leq \alpha(a, b, b)$ or $a \leq \alpha(b, a, b)$ or $a \leq \alpha(b, b, a)$ for all a, b .

Now we introduce the class of contractions called A -contraction:

Definition 1. A self-map T on a metric space X is said to be A -contraction if it satisfies the condition:

$$(A) \quad d(Tx, Ty) \leq \alpha(d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty)) \\ \text{for all } x, y \in X \text{ and some } \alpha \in A.$$

We shall show that the class of A -contractions includes the classes of contractions studied by Kannan [4], Khan[6], Bianchini [2] and Reich [7].

Definition 2. A self-map T on a metric space X is said to be

- (i) K -contraction if there exists a number $r \in [0, 1/2)$ such that,

$$(K) \quad d(Tx, Ty) \leq r \{d(Tx, x) + d(Ty, y)\} \text{ for all } x, y \in X. \text{ (see [3, p. 116.]})$$

¹Department of Mathematics, Government College University, Lahore, Pakistan, e-mail: makram71@yahoo.com

²Department of Mathematics, Prince Sultan University, Riyadh 11586, Saudi Arabia, e-mail: saakhlaq@yahoo.com

(ii) *M-contraction if there exists a number $h \in [0, 1)$ such that,*

$$(M) \quad d(Tx, Ty) \leq h\sqrt{d(Tx, x)d(Ty, y)} \text{ for all } x, y \in X \text{ (see [6])}.$$

2. Comparison of M and K-contractions with A-contraction

In this section we show that an M-contraction is a K-contraction and every K-contraction is an A-contraction; consequently every M-contraction is an A-contraction.

Theorem 1.

(i) *Every M-contraction is K-contraction.*

(ii) *Every K-contraction is A-contraction and hence every M-contraction is A-contraction.*

Proof.

(i) Let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be an M-contraction. Then there exists some $h \in [0, 1)$ satisfying the condition (M).

We know that the geometric mean of two positive real numbers v, w always precedes their arithmetic mean, that is $\sqrt{vw} \leq \frac{v+w}{2}$. So that $h\sqrt{vw} \leq h\frac{v+w}{2}$ for all $h \in [0, 1)$. Hence with $v = d(Tx, x), w = d(Ty, y)$ we have

$$h\sqrt{d(Tx, x)d(Ty, y)} \leq r\{d(Tx, x) + d(Ty, y)\}$$

for all $r \in [0, 1/2)$ and for all $x, y \in X$. This, together with inequality (M), gives that

$$d(Tx, Ty) \leq h\sqrt{d(Tx, x)d(Ty, y)} \leq r\{d(Tx, x) + d(Ty, y)\}.$$

(ii) Let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a K-contraction. Therefore there exists some $r \in [0, 1/2)$ such that (K) holds for all x, y in X . Keeping one such r fixed, we define a map $\alpha : R_+^3 \rightarrow R_+$ as $\alpha(u, v, w) = r(v + w)$ for all $u, v, w \in R_+$. Since addition and multiplication of reals are continuous, so α is continuous.

Case I: if $u \leq \alpha(u, v, v) = r(v + v)$ then $u \leq kv$ with $k = 2r \in [0, 1)$.

Case II: If $u \leq \alpha(v, u, v) = r(u + v)$ then $u \leq r(u + v)$ gives $u \leq \frac{r}{1-r}v = kv$ with $k = \frac{r}{1-r} \in [0, 1)$.

Similarly, for case III where $u \leq \alpha(v, v, u)$ we have $u \leq kv$ with $k = \frac{r}{1-r} \in [0, 1)$. So, in any case $u \leq kv$ for some $k \in [0, 1)$. Hence $\alpha \in A$.

Now, by taking $u = d(x, y), v = d(Tx, x)$ and $w = d(Ty, y)$ and using the inequality (K), we get that

$$d(Tx, Ty) \leq \alpha\{d(Tx, x) + d(Ty, y)\} = \alpha(d(x, y), d(Tx, x), d(Ty, y))$$

for all $x, y \in X$.

This shows that T is an A-contraction whenever T is K-contraction. This, together with (i), gives that every M-contraction is an A-contraction. \square

Next we show that an A-contraction may not be K-contraction; hence M and K-contractions are proper sub-classes of A-contractions. For this, we need the following result.

Theorem 2. *The self-map T on the metric space X satisfying*

$$d(Tx, Ty) \leq \beta \max \{d(Tx, x) + d(Ty, y), d(Ty, y) + d(x, y), d(Tx, x) + d(x, y)\}$$

for all x, y in X and some $\beta \in [0, 1/2)$ is an A-contraction.

Proof. Define the map $\alpha : R_+^3 \rightarrow R_+$ as

$$\alpha(u, v, w) = \beta \max \{u + v, v + w, u + w\}$$

for all u, v, w in R_+ , where β is any fixed number in $[0, 1/2)$. Then $\alpha \in A$ because,

1. Clearly α is continuous.

2. For $u \leq \alpha(u, v, v) = \beta \max \{u + v, v + u, v + v\}$, we consider the following cases.

Case I. $\max \{u + v, v + u, v + v\} = u + v$. In this case, $u \leq \frac{\beta}{1-\beta}v \leq kv$, with $k = \frac{\beta}{1-\beta} \in [0, 1)$.

Case II. $\max \{u + v, v + u, v + v\} = v + v$. In this case, $u \leq kv$, with $k = 2\beta \in [0, 1)$. Similarly, for $u \leq \alpha(v, u, v)$ or $u \leq \alpha(v, v, u)$ we have $u \leq kv$ for some $k \in [0, 1)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} d(Tx, Ty) &\leq \beta \max \{d(Tx, x) + d(Ty, y), d(Ty, y) + d(x, y), \\ &\quad d(Tx, x) + d(x, y)\} \\ &= \alpha(d(x, y), d(Tx, x), d(Ty, y)) \end{aligned}$$

by the construction of α . Thus T is an A-contraction. \square

The following example, together with Theorem 2, shows that the class of A-contraction is a proper super-class of K-contractions, and hence so is of M-contraction.

Example 1. *Consider $X = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ with usual metric relative to real line. T be a self-map on X , given by*

$$Tx = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } x = 0; \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We observe that the condition K and hence condition M are not satisfied by T because with $x = 0, y = 1$ we have

$$1 = d(Tx, Ty) \leq r \{d(Tx, x) + d(Ty, y)\} = r(2 + 0) = 2r < 1$$

for all $r \in [0, 1/2)$; a contradiction.

However, one can easily verify that T satisfies

$$d(Tx, Ty) \leq \beta \max \{d(Tx, x) + d(Ty, y), d(Ty, y) + d(x, y), d(Tx, x) + d(x, y)\}$$

for all $x, y \in X$ and some $\beta \in [0, 1/2)$. Hence, by Theorem 2, T must be an A-contraction.

3. Comparison of A -contractions with some other contractions

In this section we investigate comparison of an A -contraction with the contraction maps studied by Bianchini [2] and Reich [7].

Definition 3. A self-map T on a metric space X is said to be

(i) B -contraction if there exists a number $b \in [0, 1)$ such that

$$(B) \quad d(Tx, Ty) \leq b \max \{d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty)\} \text{ for all } x, y \in X.$$

(ii) R -contraction if there exist non-negative numbers a, b, c satisfying $a + b + c \leq 1$ such that

$$(R) \quad d(Tx, Ty) \leq ad(Tx, x) + bd(Ty, y) + cd(x, y) \text{ for all } x, y \in X \text{ (see [2], [7]).}$$

Theorem 3. Every B -contraction is an A -contraction on any metric space.

Proof. Assume that T on the metric space X is B -contraction. Define $\alpha : R_+^3 \rightarrow R_+$ by $\alpha(u, v, w) = h \max \{v, w\}$ for all $u, v, w \in R_+$ with some fixed $h \in [0, 1)$. Next we show that $\alpha \in A$.

(i) Clearly α is continuous.

(ii) If $u \leq \alpha(u, v, v)$ then $u \leq h \max \{v, v\} = kv$ with $k = h \in [0, 1)$. If $u \leq \alpha(v, u, v)$ then $u \leq h \max \{u, v\} = hv$ because $h < 1$, so that $u \leq kv$ with $k = h \in [0, 1)$. Similarly, if $u \leq \alpha(v, v, u)$ then $u \leq kv$ for some $k = h \in [0, 1)$. So we deduce that $\alpha \in A$. Further, since T is a B -contraction, we get from the construction of α that

$$d(Tx, Ty) \leq h \max \{d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty)\} = \alpha(d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty))$$

for all $x, y \in X$. We conclude that T is an A -contraction.

Next theorem establishes the fact that the class of A -contractions includes all R -contractions:

Theorem 4. Every R -contraction is an A -contraction on a metric space X .

Proof. Assume that $T : X \rightarrow X$ is an R -contraction. Then by definition, (R) holds for all x, y in X and $a + b + c \leq 1$. Let us define $\alpha : R_+^3 \rightarrow R_+$ by $\alpha(u, v, w) = au + bv + cw$ for all $u, v, w \in R_+$. Then α is continuous.

Further, $u \leq \alpha(u, v, v) = au + bv + cv$, implies $(1 - a)u \leq (b + c)v$ and so $u \leq kv$ with $k = \frac{b+c}{1-a} \in [0, 1)$.

Similarly, $u \leq \alpha(v, u, v) = av + bu + cv$ implies $(1 - b)u \leq (a + c)v$, which gives $u \leq kv$ with $k = \frac{a+c}{1-b} \in [0, 1)$, and $u \leq \alpha(v, v, u) = av + bv + cu$ gives $u \leq kv$ with $k = \frac{a+b}{1-c} \in [0, 1)$.

So, $\alpha \in A$. Moreover, by taking $u = d(Tx, x)$, $v = d(Ty, y)$ and $w = d(x, y)$ we get that

$$d(Tx, Ty) \leq ad(Tx, x) + bd(Ty, y) + cd(x, y) = \alpha(d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty), d(x, y))$$

by (R). □

Thus T is an A -contraction whenever it is R-contraction.

4. Some fixed point theorems using A -contractions

In this section we give some results on fixed points of A -contractions. These include the analogues of certain results in [1], [3] and [6].

Theorem 5. *Let T be an A -contraction on a complete metric space X . Then T has a unique fixed point in X such that the sequence $\{T^n x_0\}$ converges to the fixed point, for any $x_0 \in X$.*

Proof. Fix $x_0 \in X$ and define the iterative sequence $\{x_n\}$ by $x_n = T^n x_0$ (equivalently, $x_{n+1} = Tx_n$) where T^n stands for the map obtained by n -time composition of T with T . Since T is an A -contraction, $\exists \alpha \in A$ s.t (A) of Definition 1 holds, i.e.

$$(A) \quad d(Tx, Ty) \leq \alpha(d(x, Ty), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty))$$

for all x, y in X .

Replacing x by x_{n+1} and y by x_n in (A), we (by construction of α in A) get the existence of $k \in [0, 1)$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_n, x_{n+1}) &= d(Tx_{n-1}, Tx_n) \\ &\leq \alpha(d(x_{n-1}, x_n), d(Tx_{n-1}, x_{n-1}), d(Tx_n, x_n)) \\ &\leq \alpha(d(x_{n-1}, x_n), d(x_n, x_{n-1}), d(x_{n+1}, x_n)) \\ &\leq kd(x_{n-1}, x_n). \end{aligned}$$

Continuing this way we get

$$d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq kd(x_{n-1}, x_n) \leq k^2 d(x_{n-2}, x_{n-1}) \leq \dots \leq k^n d(x_0, x_1)$$

so that $d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq k^n d(x_0, x_1)$ for some $k \in [0, 1)$. Thus x_n is a Cauchy sequence in X . Since X is complete, there exists $x' \in X$ such that $x_n \rightarrow x'$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Again, with $x = x'$ and $y = x_n$, the inequality (A) gives

$$\begin{aligned} d(Tx, x_{n+1}) &= d(Tx', Tx_n) \\ &\leq \alpha(d(x', x_n), d(x', Tx'), d(x_n, Tx_n)) \\ &= \alpha(d(x', x_n), d(x', Tx'), d(x_n, x_{n+1})), \end{aligned}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

By allowing $n \rightarrow \infty$ and using the continuity of α and metric d , we get

$$d(Tx', x') \leq \alpha(d(x', x'), d(x', Tx'), d(x', x'))$$

and hence $d(Tx', x') \leq k0 = 0$. Thus $Tx' = x'$.

Now, if $w \in X$ satisfies, $Tw = w$, then by taking $x = w$ and $y = x'$ in (A) we get

$$\begin{aligned} d(w, x') &= d(Tw, x') \\ &\leq \alpha(d(w, x'), d(Tw, w), d(Tx', x')) \\ &\leq \alpha(d(w, x'), d(w, w), d(x', x')) \\ &\leq \alpha(d(w, x'), 0, 0) \\ &\leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

So that $w = x'$. □

Corollary 1. *A metric space (X, d) is complete if and only if every A -contraction on X has a fixed point in X .*

Proof. If the space X is complete then by the above theorem every A -contraction on X has a fixed point in X .

Conversly, if every A -contraction on a metric space X has a fixed point, then, in particular, every K -contraction on X has a fixed point (Notice that our term K -contraction is called Kannan contraction in [4]). Hence by the argument given in the proof of Theorem 2 of [3], the space X must be complete. □

Our next theorem extends Theorem 3 of [1] as follows.

Theorem 6. *Let $\alpha \in A$ and $\{T_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of self-maps on the complete metric space (X, d) such that*

$$(A') \quad d(T_i x, T_j y) \leq \alpha(d(x, y), d(T_i x, x), d(T_j y, y))$$

for all x, y in X . Then $\{T_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ has a unique common fixed point in X .

Proof. Taking any $x_0 \in X$. For each $n \in N$, we define $x_n = T_n x_{n-1}$. Since $\alpha \in A$, we get from (A') that

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad d(x_1, x_2) &= d(T_1 x_0, T_2 x_1) \\ &\leq \alpha(d(x_0, x_1), d(x_0, T_1 x_0), d(x_1, T_2 x_1)) \\ &= \alpha(d(x_0, x_1), d(x_0, x_1), d(x_1, x_2)) \\ &\leq kd(x_0, x_1) \end{aligned}$$

for some $k \in [0, 1)$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} (2) \quad d(x_2, x_3) &= d(T_2 x_1, T_3 x_2) \\ &\leq \alpha(d(x_1, x_2), d(x_1, T_2 x_1), d(x_2, T_3 x_2)) \\ &= \alpha(d(x_1, x_2), d(x_1, x_2), d(x_2, x_3)) \\ &\leq kd(x_1, x_2). \end{aligned}$$

We get from (1) and (2) that

$$d(x_1, x_2) \leq k^2 d(x_0, x_1).$$

In general, we get

$$d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq k^n d(x_0, x_1)$$

for some $k \in [0, 1)$. Therefore, $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in the complete metric space X , so it converges to x' in X . Next,

$$\begin{aligned} d(x', T_n x') &\leq d(x', x_{m+1}) + d(x_{m+1}, T_n x') \\ &= d(x', x_{m+1}) + d(T_{m+1} x_m, T_n x') \\ &\leq d(x', x_{m+1}) + \alpha(d(x_m, x') + d(T_{m+1} x_m, x_m), d(T_n x', x')) \text{ (by (A'))} \\ &\leq d(x', x_{m+1}) + \alpha(d(x_m, x'), d(x_{m+1}, x_m), d(T_n x', x')) \end{aligned}$$

for all m, n in N . If m tends to ∞ then the above inequalities give that

$$\begin{aligned} d(x', T_n x') &\leq d(x', x') + \alpha(d(x', x'), d(x', x'), d(T_n x', x')) \\ &\leq \alpha(0, 0, d(T_n x', x')) \\ &\leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

and hence $T_n x' = x', \forall n \in N$.

For uniqueness of the fixed point x' , we suppose $T_n y = y$ for some $y \in X$. Then by (A'),

$$\begin{aligned} d(x', y) &= d(T_i x', T_j y) \\ &\leq \alpha(d(x', y), d(T_i x', x'), d(y, T_j y)) \\ &= \alpha(d(x', y), 0, 0) \\ &\leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

implies $x' = y$. □

Next theorem describes common fixed point of two self-maps on X having two related metrics. This result generalizes Theorem 4 of [1].

Theorem 7. *Let X be a set with two metrics d and δ satisfying the following conditions:*

- (i) $d(x, y) \leq \delta(x, y)$ for all x, y in X ;
- (ii) X is complete with respect to d ;
- (iii) S, T are self-maps on X such that T is continuous with respect to d and

$$\delta(Tx, Sy) \leq \alpha(\delta(x, y), \delta(x, Tx), \delta(y, Ty))$$

for all x, y in X and for some $\alpha \in A$.

Then S and T have a unique common fixed point.

Proof. Take any $x_0 \in X$. For each $n \in N$, we define

$$x_n = \begin{cases} Sx_{n-1} & \text{if } n \text{ is even;} \\ Tx_{n-1} & \text{if } n \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

Then, by inequality in the above condition (iii) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(x_1, x_2) &\leq \delta(Tx_0, Sx_1) \\ &\leq \alpha(\delta(x_0, x_1), \delta(x_0, Tx_0), \delta(x_1, Sx_1)) \\ &= \alpha(\delta(x_0, x_1), \delta(x_0, x_1), \delta(x_1, x_2)) \leq k\delta(x_0, x_1) \end{aligned}$$

for some $k \in [0, 1)$ as $\alpha \in A$. In general, for any $n \in N$ we get (as in the proof of the previous theorem) that $\delta(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq k^n \delta(x_0, x_1)$ for some $k \in [0, 1)$. This, by condition (iii), gives

$$d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq \delta(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq k^n \delta(x_0, x_1)$$

for all $n \in N$ with $k \in [0, 1)$. So, x_n is a Cauchy sequence in X with respect to d and hence by condition (ii), $d(x_n, x') \rightarrow 0$ for some $x' \in X$.

Since T is given to be continuous with the respect to d we have

$$0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_{2n-1}, x') = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(Tx_{2n}, x') = d(Tx', x')$$

So that $Tx' = x'$.

Now, by condition (iii)

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(x', Sx') &= \delta(Tx', Sx') \\ &\leq \alpha(\delta(x', x'), \delta(x', Tx'), \delta(x', Sx')) \\ &\leq \alpha(0, 0, \delta(x', Sx')) \\ &\leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

since $\alpha \in A$. Hence $x' = Sx'$. Thus x' is a common fixed point of S and T .

For the uniqueness, let y be any common fixed point of S and T in X . Then by condition (iii),

$$\delta(x', y) = \delta(Tx', Sy) \leq \alpha(\delta(x', y), \delta(x', Tx'), \delta(y, Sy)) \leq \alpha(\delta(x', y), 0, 0) \leq 0,$$

so that $x = y$. □

References

- [1] Ahmad, B., Rehman, F. U., Some fixed point theorems in complete metric spaces. Math. Japonica 36 (2) (1991), 239-243.
- [2] Bianchini, R., Su un problema di S. Reich riguardante la teori dei punti fissi. Boll. Un. Math. Ital. 5 (1972), 103-108.

- [3] Chuanyi, Z., The generalized set-valued contraction and completeness of the metric space. *Math. Japonica* 35 (1) (1990), 111-118.
- [4] Kannan, T., Some results on fixed points. *Bull. Calcutta Math Soc.* 60 (1968), 71-76.
- [5] Khan, M. S., Kubiacyk, I., Fixed point theorems for point to set maps. *Math. Japonica* 33 (3) (1988), 409-415.
- [6] Khan, M. S., On fixed point theorems. *Math. Japonica* 23 (2) (1978/79), 201-204.
- [7] Reich, S., Kannan, T., Fixed point theorem. *Boll. Un. Math. Ital.* 4 (1971), 1-11.
- [8] Shioji, N., Suzuki, T., Takahashi, W., Contractive mappings, Kannan mappings and metric completeness. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 10 (1998), 3117-3124.

Received by the editors March 18, 2007