FIXED POINT THEOREMS FOR A SEQUENCE OF MAPPINGS WITH CONTRACTIVE ITERATES

S. K. Chatterjea

(Received March 30, 1972)

1. Introduction: Let (X, d) be a metric space, $T: X \rightarrow X$ a mapping and $0 < \alpha < 1$. Then T is said to be α -contractive endomorphism if

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

for all $x, y \in X$. It is well-known [1] that for X complete, each continuous endomorphism T satisfying the condition that T^n is α -contractive for some n, has a unique fixed point. The object of this paper is to consider some fixed point theorems for a sequence of mappings with contractive iterates and to show that particular cases of our theorems are those discussed by B. Ray [2]. Our theorems are stated in $\S 2 - \S 4$.

2. First we shall prove the following fixed point theorem for a sequence of mappings with contractive iterates:

The ore m I. If there exists a sequence of continuous mappings $\{T_n\}$ of a complete metric space (X, d) into itself such that for some m and $0 < \alpha < 1$

(i) for any two mappings T_i and T_j , we have

$$d(T_i^m x, T_j^m y) \leq \alpha d(x, y), \quad x, y \in X,$$

(ii) T_i commutes with T_j , $i \neq j$,

then $\{T_n\}$ has a unique common fixed point.

Proof: Let x_0 be any point X, and

$$x_1 = T_1^m x_0, \quad x_2 = T_2^m x_1, \dots, x_n = T_n^m x_{n-1}, \dots$$

Now

$$d(x_1, x_2) = d(T_1^m x_0, T_2^m x_1) \le \alpha d(x_0, x_1)$$

$$d(x_2, x_3) = d(T_2^m x_1, T_3^m x_2) \le \alpha d(x_1, x_2) \le \alpha^2 d(x_0, x_1)$$

and so on. Generally we have

$$d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \le \alpha^n d(x_0, x_1).$$

For p > 0, we have

$$d(x_{n}, x_{n+p}) \leq d(x_{n}, x_{n+1}) + d(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) + \cdots + d(x_{n+p-1}, x_{n+p})$$

$$\leq (\alpha^{n} + \alpha^{n+1} + \cdots + \alpha^{n+p-1}) d(x_{0}, x_{1})$$

$$< \frac{\alpha^{n}}{1 - \alpha} d(x_{0}, x_{1}).$$

Since $0 < \alpha < 1$, $d(x_n, x_{n+p}) \to 0$, as $n \to \infty$. Thus $\{x_n\}$ is fundamental in X. Again (X, d) being a complete metric space, $\lim_{n \to \infty} x_n = \bar{x} \in X$.

Now for any fixed k, we shall show that $T_k \overline{x} = \overline{x}$.

If possible, suppose $T_k \bar{x} \neq \bar{x}$. Then there exists a pair of disjoint close dneighbourhoods U and V such that $\bar{x} \in U$, $T_k \bar{x} \in V$ and also

$$\rho = \inf \{d(x, y) : x \in U, y \in V\} > 0.$$

Since T_k is continuous, $x_n \in U$ and $T_k x_n \in V$ for sufficiently large n.

However we notice that

$$d(T_k x_n, x_n) = d(T_n^m T_k x_{n-1}, T_n^m x_{n-1})$$

$$\leq \alpha d(T_k x_{n-1}, x_{n-1})$$

$$\leq \cdots \cdots \cdots$$

$$\leq \alpha^n d(T_k x_0, x_0) \rightarrow 0, \quad as \quad n \rightarrow \infty,$$

which contradicts (*). Thus $T_k \bar{x} = \bar{x}$.

Lastly we show that \bar{x} is unique. If possible, let \bar{y} be a fixed point common to $T_n (n=1, 2, \cdots)$ such that $\bar{y} \neq \bar{x}$.

Then we have

$$d(\bar{x}, \ \bar{y}) = d(T_i^m \bar{x}, \ T_j^m \bar{y})$$

$$\leq \alpha \ d(\bar{x}, \ \bar{y}),$$

which is impossible, since $0 < \alpha < 1$. Hence $\vec{x} = \vec{y}$.

It may be noted that if $T_1 = T_2 = \cdots = T$ (say), then theorem I reduces to the well-known theorem as mentioned in the introduction.

3. In this section we investigate a theorem similar to theorem I, without assuming the continuity of the sequence of maps $\{T_n\}$. Actually we prove the following theorem:

Theorem II. If there exists a sequence of mappings $\{T_n\}$ of a complete metric space (X, d) into itself such that

(i) for any two mappings T_i , T_j , we have

1)
$$d(T_i^m x, T_j^m y) \leq \alpha d(x, y)$$

2)
$$d(T_i^m x, T_j y) \leq \alpha d(x, y)$$

for some m and $0 < \alpha < 1$; $x, y \in X$,

then $\{T_n\}$ has a unique common fixed point.

Proof: Taking an arbitrary point $x_0 \in X$, we can construct the same sequence $\{x_n\}$ as in theorem I. It follows therefore that $\{x_n\}$ is fundamental in the complete metric space (X,d). Thus $\lim x_n = \bar{x} \in X$.

Now for a fixed k, we shall show that $T_k \bar{x} = \bar{x}$

Indeed, we have

$$d(\bar{x}, T_k \bar{x}) \leq d(\bar{x}, x_n) + d(x_n, T_k \bar{x})$$

$$= d(\bar{x}, x_n) + d(T_n^m x_{n-1}, T_k \bar{x})$$

$$\leq d(\bar{x}, x_n) + \alpha d(x_{n-1}, \bar{x}).$$

Since $x_n \to \bar{x}$, it follows that $\bar{x} = T_k \bar{x}$.

The uniqueness of \bar{x} follows similarly as in theorem I.

It is interesting to note that theorem II reduces to theorem 1.1 of Ray [2, p. 7], when m=1.

4. Lastly we consider another extension of a theorem of Ray. Let us prove the following theorem:

The ore m III. If there exists a sequence of mappings $\{T_n\}$, each mapping a complete metric space (X, d) into itself such that

(i) for any two mappings T_i , T_i , we have

1)
$$d(T_i^m x, T_j^m y) \le \alpha_{i,j} d(x, y)$$

2)
$$d(T_i^m x, T_j y) \leq \alpha_{i,j} d(x, y)$$

for some m and $0 < \alpha_{i,j} < 1$; $x, y \in X$, and $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \alpha_{i,i+1}$ is (C, I) — summable, then $\{T_n\}$ has a unique common fixed point.

Proof: As in theorem II, we construct the sequence $\{x_n\}$. Now we shall show that $\{x_n\}$ is also fundamental in the complete metric space (X, d). By routine calculation we have

$$d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i, i+1}\right) d(x_0, x_1).$$

Thus for p > 0, we have

$$\begin{split} d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+p}\right) & \leqslant \left(\sum_{k=n}^{n+p-1} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_{i, i+1}\right) d\left(x_{0}, x_{1}\right) \\ & \leqslant \sum_{k=n}^{n+p-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_{i, i+1}\right)^{k} d\left(x_{0}, x_{1}\right) \end{split}$$

Now by (C, 1) — summability of $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \alpha_{i, i+1}$, we have $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S_k < +\infty$, where

$$S_k = \left(\sum_{v=1}^k s_v\right) / k$$
 and $S_k = \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_{i, i+1}$.

Since $0 < \alpha_{i,j} < 1$, $(s_k/k)^k \le \frac{s_k}{k} \le S_k$. Thus the series $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{s_k}{k}$ is convergent.

$$\therefore d(x_n, x_{n+p}) \to 0, \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Hence $\{x_n\}$ is fundamental. Thus $\lim_{n\to\infty} x_n = \bar{x} \in X$.

The existence of the common fixed point \bar{x} and its uniqueness follow in exactly the same way as in theorem II.

It may be noted that theorem III reduces to theorem 3.1 of Ray [2, p. 9], when m = 1.

The author wishes to record his deep gratitude to Dr. M. Dutta for his valuable suggestions.

REFERENCES

[1] A. N. Kolmogorov and S. V. Fomin, Elements of the theory of functions and functional analysis, vol. I, Graylock Press (1957), N. Y., p. 50.

[2] Baidyanath Ray, On a paper of Kannan, Bull. Cal. Math. Soc., vol. 63(1971), pp. 7-10.

Dept. of Pure Mathematics, Calcutta University, Calcutta, India.