

BANACH'S MAPPINGS AND SOME GENERALIZATIONS

M. R. Tasković

(Communicated October 27, 1972)

Introduction

Applications having all characteristic properties mentioned in the well-known Banach's fixed-point theorem [1] are usually called Banach's applications. Here we shall consider applications of the form $T: X^k \rightarrow X (k \in N)$. We shall say that $\xi \in X$ is a fixed point of T if it is such a point for the application $\mathcal{T}(x) = T(x, x, \dots, x)$

Definition. Let X be a metric space and ρ its metric. We say that the application $T: X^k \rightarrow X (k \in N)$ is a F_λ -contraction in X if for all $x, y \in X^k$ there exist nonnegative numbers $\alpha(x, y)$, $\beta(x, y)$, $\gamma(x, y)$, $\delta(x, y)$ and $q_i(x, y) (i = 1, \dots, k)$ such that

$$(1) \quad \sup_{x, y \in X^k} k \left\{ \alpha(x, y) + \left(1 + \frac{1}{k}\right) (\beta(x, y) + \gamma(x, y)) + \delta(x, y) + \sum_{i=1}^k q_i(x, y) \right\} = \lambda k < 1$$

and

$$(F_\lambda) \quad \rho [Tx, Ty] \leq \alpha(x, y) \rho [u_1, Tx] + \beta(x, y) \rho [v_1, Ty] + \gamma(x, y) \rho [u_1, Ty] + \\ + \delta(x, y) \rho [v_1, Tx] + \sum_{i=1}^k q_i(x, y) \rho [u_i, v_i]$$

where $x = (u_1, \dots, u_k)$, $y = (v_1, \dots, v_k)$.

Main results

Theorem 1: *Let the application $T: X^k \rightarrow X (k \in N)$ be a F_λ -contraction in the complete metric space X . Then;*

(I) *The application $\mathcal{T}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} T(x, \dots, x)$ has a unique fixed point $\xi \in X$.*

(II) *ξ is the limit of the sequence*

$$(2) \quad x_{n+k} = T(x_n, x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{n+k-1}), \quad (n \in N),$$

independently of the choice of $x_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) \in X^k$

(III) *The convergence rapidity of the sequence $\{x_{n+k}\}$ to the point ξ can be appreciated by*

$$\rho[x_{n+k}, \xi] \leq \frac{\theta^n}{1-\theta} \max_{i=1,2,\dots,k} \left\{ \frac{\rho(x_i, x_{i+1})}{\theta^i} \right\}, \quad \theta \in (0, 1); \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

Proof. We show firstly that (2) is a Cauchy sequence. Since $T: X^k \rightarrow X (k \in N)$ is a F_λ -contraction, we have by definition

$$\begin{aligned} \rho[x_{n+k}, x_{n+k+1}] &= \rho[T(x_n, \dots, x_{n+k-1}), T(x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{n+k})] \leq \\ &\leq \alpha(\bar{x}_n, \bar{x}_{n+1}) \rho[x_n, x_{n+k}] + \beta(\bar{x}_n, \bar{x}_{n+1}) \rho[x_{n+1}, x_{n+k+1}] + \\ &+ \gamma(\bar{x}_n, \bar{x}_{n+1}) \rho[x_n, x_{n+k+1}] + \delta(\bar{x}_n, \bar{x}_{n+1}) \rho[x_{n+1}, x_{n+k}] + \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^k q_i(\bar{x}_n, \bar{x}_{n+1}) \rho[x_{n+i-1}, x_{n+i}] \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{x}_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (x_n, \dots, x_{n+k-1})$ and this inequality implies

$$(3) \quad (1 - \beta - \gamma) \rho[x_{n+k}, x_{n+k+1}] \leq (q_1 + \alpha + \gamma) \rho[x_n, x_{n+1}] + \\ + (\max_{i=2, \dots, k} q_i + \alpha + \beta + \gamma + \delta) \{ \rho[x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}] + \dots + \rho[x_{n+k-1}, x_{n+k}] \}$$

for $n \in N$.

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho[x_{n+k}, x_{n+k+1}] &\leq \frac{1}{1 - \beta - \gamma} \left\{ (q_1 + \alpha + \gamma) \rho(x_n, x_{n+1}) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. (\max_{i=2, \dots, k} q_i + \alpha + \beta + \gamma + \delta) \sum_{i=2}^k \rho(x_{n+i-1}, x_{n+i}) \right\} \leq \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha + \beta + \gamma + \delta + \sum_{i=1}^k q_i}{1 - (\beta + \gamma)} \sum_{i=1}^k \rho[x_{n+i-1}, x_{n+i}] \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \rho[x_{n+i-1}, x_{n+i}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Sigma \right) \leq \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda - \frac{1}{k} (\beta + \gamma)}{1 - (\beta + \gamma)} \Sigma = \frac{\lambda - \frac{1}{k} + \frac{1}{k} [1 - (\beta + \gamma)]}{1 - (\beta + \gamma)} \Sigma = \left[\frac{\lambda - \frac{1}{k}}{1 - (\beta + \gamma)} + \frac{1}{k} \right] \Sigma \leq \\ &\leq \left(\frac{\lambda - \frac{1}{k}}{1 - \lambda} + \frac{1}{k} \right) \Sigma = \left(\lambda + \frac{\lambda - \frac{1}{k}}{1 - \lambda} + \frac{1}{k} - \lambda \right) \Sigma = \\ &= \left[\lambda + \frac{\lambda k - 1 + 1 - \lambda - \lambda k + \lambda^2 k}{k(1 - \lambda)} \right] \Sigma = \left[\lambda + \frac{\lambda(\lambda k - 1)}{k(1 - \lambda)} \right] \Sigma \leq \lambda \Sigma \end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$(4) \quad \rho[x_{n+k}, x_{n+k+1}] \leq \lambda \{ \rho[x_n, x_{n+1}] + \dots + \rho[x_{n+k-1}, x_{n+k}] \}$$

Now we use the following lemma, proved in [9]

L e m m a. 1°. *Let the application $f: R^k \rightarrow R$ ($k \in N$ and fixed) be homogeneous and increasing with respect to every its real argument, and let (x_n) be a sequence of nonnegative numbers satisfying the condition*

$$x_{n+k} \leq f(a_1 x_n, \dots, a_k x_{n+k-1}) \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots),$$

where a_1, \dots, a_k are nonnegative constants. Then exists a positive number θ such that

$$(5) \quad x_n \leq \mathcal{L} \theta^n \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots), \quad \mathcal{L} = \max_{i=1, \dots, k} \left\{ \frac{x_i}{\theta^i} \right\}$$

2°. *Especially, if f is continuous and*

$$f(a_1, \dots, a_k) < 1$$

then we have (5) with $\theta \in (0, 1)$.

A remark. This lemma was proved in [9], and it is based upon a lemma of S. B. Prešić [2].

Applying this lemma with $f = \lambda \sum_{i=1}^k x_i$ to the sequence $(\rho[x_n, x_{n+1}])$, we obtain, according to (5)

$$\rho[x_n, x_{n+1}] \leq \theta^n \max_{i=1, 2, \dots, k} \left\{ \frac{\rho[x_i, x_{i+1}]}{\theta^i} \right\} \quad (n \in N; \theta \in (0, 1))$$

Hence, for $n, s \in N$

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho[x_n, x_{n+s}] &\leq \sum_{j=1}^s \rho[x_{n+j-1}, x_{n+j}] \leq \max_{i=1, 2, \dots, k} \left\{ \frac{\rho[x_i, x_{i+1}]}{\theta^i} \right\} \sum_{j=1}^k \theta^{n+j-1} \leq \\ &\leq \frac{\theta^n}{1-\theta} \max_{i=1, \dots, k} \left\{ \frac{\rho[x_i, x_{i+1}]}{\theta^i} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that (x_n) is a Cauchy's sequence. Hence, the metric space X being complete, there exists

$$\xi = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n.$$

Let us prove that ξ is a fixed point of T (in the sense precised above). We get, according to our hypotheses on T ,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho[x_{n+k}, T(\xi, \dots, \xi)] &= \rho[T(x_n, \dots, x_{n+k-1}), T(\xi, \dots, \xi)] \leq \\ &\leq \alpha(\bar{x}_n, \bar{\xi}) \rho[x_n, x_{n+k}] + \beta(\bar{x}_n, \bar{\xi}) \rho[\xi, T(\xi, \dots, \xi)] + \\ &+ \gamma(\bar{x}_n, \bar{\xi}) \rho[x_n, T(\xi, \dots, \xi)] + \delta(\bar{x}_n, \bar{\xi}) \rho[\xi, x_{n+k}] + \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^k q_i(\bar{x}_n, \bar{\xi}) \rho[x_{n+i-1}, \xi] \leq \\ &\leq \alpha \rho[x_n, x_{n+k}] + \beta \{ \rho[\xi, x_{n+k}] + \rho[x_{n+k}, T(\xi, \dots, \xi)] \} + \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \gamma \{ \rho [x_n, x_{n+k}] + \rho [x_{n+k}, T(\xi, \dots, \xi)] \} + \delta \rho [\xi, x_{n+k}] + \\
& \quad + \sum_{i=1}^k q_i \rho [x_{n+i-1}, \xi]
\end{aligned}$$

and further, similarly as in the above considerations,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \rho [x_{n+k}, T(\xi, \dots, \xi)] \leq \\
& \leq \lambda \left\{ 2 \rho [x_n, x_{n+1}] + 2 \rho [\xi, x_{n+k}] + \sum_{i=1}^k \rho [x_{n+i-1}, \xi] \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\xi = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_{n+k} = T(\xi, \dots, \xi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{T}(\xi)$$

which was to be proved.

We will prove, finally, that the fixed point ξ is unique. Let us suppose that $\xi^* \neq \xi$ is a fixed point too. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho [\xi, \xi^*] &= \rho [T(\xi, \dots, \xi), T(\xi^*, \dots, \xi^*)] \leq \alpha \rho [\xi, T(\xi, \dots, \xi)] + \\
& \quad + \beta \rho [\xi^*, T(\xi^*, \dots, \xi^*)] + \gamma \rho [\xi, T(\xi^*, \dots, \xi^*)] + \\
& \quad + \delta \rho [\xi^*, T(\xi, \dots, \xi)] + \sum_{i=1}^k q_i \rho [\xi, \xi^*]
\end{aligned}$$

and consequently

$$(1 - \gamma - \delta) \rho [\xi, \xi^*] \leq \rho [\xi, \xi^*] \sum_{i=1}^k q_i$$

i.e. since $\rho (\xi, \xi^*) > 0$

$$1 \leq \gamma + \delta + \sum_{i=1}^k q_i$$

which contradicts (1). This contradiction proves our assertion.

Making $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (6), one gets (III).

COROLLARIES. If we specify the dimension $k (= 1)$ and the parameters α, β, γ and q_i in the previous theorem, we can obtain two reciprocally incomparable results, due to Banach [1] and to Kannan [3] characterized by the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho [Tx, Ty] &\leq \alpha \rho [y, x] \quad (x, y \in X; \alpha \in [0, 1)) \\
\rho [Tx, Ty] &\leq \alpha \{ \rho [x, Tx] + \rho [y, Ty] \} \quad (x, y \in X, \alpha \in [0, 1/2))
\end{aligned}$$

respectively.

In the same manner we get the following

COROLLARY. ([6], p. 29). Let (X, ρ) be a complete metric space and $T: X \rightarrow X$ an application with the property

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho [Tx, Ty] &\leq \alpha (\rho [x, y]) \rho [x, Tx] + \beta (\rho [x, y]) \rho [y, Ty] + \\
& \quad + \gamma (\rho [x, y]) \rho [x, y]
\end{aligned}$$

α, β, γ being nonnegative functions defined on $[0, +\infty)$ and satisfying

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} [\alpha(t) + \beta(t) + \gamma(t)] < 1$$

then T has the unique fixed point.

This corollary comprises a result of *D. W. Boyd* and *S. W. Wang* [6] and also some results of *M. Edelstein* [7], *R. Rakotch* [8] and *Lj. Ćirić* [4].

Some remarks

1. ([4]) For $k=1$, if (1) is replaced by the condition

$$\gamma = \delta, \sup_{x, y \in X} (\alpha + \beta + 2\gamma + q) = \lambda < 1$$

the assertions (I) and (II) are valid too, and the (III) is then estimated by

$$\rho[x_n, \xi] \leq \frac{\lambda^n}{1-\lambda} \rho[x_1, x_2] \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}).$$

2. The following example shows that for $k=1$ our theorem is effectively more general than other theorems concerning this case.

Example. Let the application $T: X \rightarrow X$, where $X = [0, 10]$ be given by $T(x) = \frac{1}{9}x$ ($0 \leq x < 1$), $T(x) = \frac{3}{5}x$ ($1 \leq x \leq 10$). Then the conditions of theorems of *Banach* [1], *R. Kannan* [3] and *S. Reich* [5] are not satisfied, since:

$$(B) \quad \text{for } x = \frac{999}{1000}, \quad y = \frac{1001}{1000}$$

$$\rho[Tx, Ty] = \frac{2448}{5000} > 5 \cdot \frac{180}{90.000} = 5 \rho[x, y]$$

(K) for $x=0, y=1$ we have

$$\rho[Tx, Ty] = 6 > \alpha(0+4) = \alpha\{\rho[x, Tx] + \rho[y, Ty]\}, \alpha \in [0, 1/2)$$

(R) for the same points as in (B),

$$\rho[Tx, Ty] = \frac{2448}{5.000} > \frac{888}{1.000} \alpha + \frac{2002}{5.000} \beta + \frac{180}{90.000} q_1$$

$$= \alpha \rho[x, Tx] + \beta \rho[y, Ty] + q_1 \rho[x, y]; \quad \alpha + \beta + q_1 \in [0, 1),$$

while our condition of F_λ -contraction is satisfied with

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{9}, \quad \beta = \gamma = \frac{1}{20}, \quad \delta = q_1 = \frac{1}{3}$$

3. In Theorem 1 the condition (F_λ) of F_λ -contractivity can be replaced by the weaker one:

$$\begin{aligned} & \rho(T(x_1, \dots, x_k), T(x_2, \dots, x_{k+1})) \leq \alpha \rho[x_1, T(x_1, \dots, x_k)] + \\ & + \beta \rho[x_2, T(x_2, \dots, x_{k+1})] + \gamma \rho[x_1, T(x_2, \dots, x_{k+1})] + \\ (F_\lambda^*) & + \delta \rho[x_1, T(x_1, \dots, x_k)] + \sum_{i=1}^k q_i \rho[x_i, x_{i+1}] \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\sup \left\{ \alpha + \left(1 + \frac{1}{k} \right) (\beta + \gamma) + \delta + \sum_{i=1}^k q_i \right\} = \lambda < 1$$

This alteration does not effect essentially the proof of Theorem 1. Theorem 1, under this weaker hypothesis, contains the following two results:

1° (S. Prešić [2]). *Let (X, ρ) be a complete metric space and $T: X^k \rightarrow X$ ($k \in \mathbb{N}$) an application satisfying the condition*

$$\begin{aligned} & \rho[T(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k), T(u_2, \dots, u_{k+1})] \leq q_1 \rho[u_1, u_2] + \dots + q_k \rho[u_k, u_{k+1}] \\ & (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k, u_{k+1} \in X; \sum_{i=1}^k q_i < 1; q_i \geq 0 (1 \leq i \leq k)). \end{aligned}$$

Then every sequence (x_n) satisfying the condition

$$x_{n+k} = T(x_n, \dots, x_{n+k-1}), \quad (n \in \mathbb{N})$$

is convergent, and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n$ is the unique solution of the equation $x = T(x, x, \dots, x)$.

2° *Let $f: \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfy the following condition:*

$$\begin{aligned} & |f(u_1, \dots, u_k) - f(u_2, \dots, u_{k+1})| \leq \alpha |u_1 - f(u_1, \dots, u_k)| \\ & + \beta |u_2 - f(u_2, \dots, u_{k+1})| + \gamma |u_1 - f(u_2, \dots, u_{k+1})| + \\ & + \delta |u_2 - f(u_1, \dots, u_k)| + \sum_{i=1}^k q_i |u_i - u_{i+1}| \quad (u_1, \dots, u_k, u_{k+1} \in \mathbb{R}) \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha + \left(1 + \frac{1}{k} \right) (\beta + \gamma) + \delta + \sum_{i=1}^k q_i \leq \lambda < 1$. Then every sequence (x_n) satisfying the condition

$$x_{n+k} = f(x_n, \dots, x_{n+k-1}) \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}; x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{R})$$

is convergent and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n$ is the unique solution of the equation $x = f(x, x, \dots, x, x)$.

A particular example: the sequence (x_n) of real numbers defined by

$$6x_{n+2} = \frac{1}{1+x_{n+1}} + \frac{1}{1+x_n} \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots; x_1, x_2, \geq 0).$$

REFERENCES

- [1] Banach, S., *Sur les opérations dans les ensembles abstraits et leur applications aux équations intégrales*, Fund. Math. 3 (1922), 133—181-
- [2] Prešić S. B., *Sur une classe d'inéquations aux différences finies et sur la convergence de certaines suites*, Publ. Inst. Math. 5 (19), (1965), 75—78.
- [3] Kannan, R., *On certain sets and fixed points theorem*, Roum. Math. pure appl. 14 (1969), 51—54. *Some results of fixed points, II*, Amer. Math. Monthly, 76 (1963), p. 406.
- [4] Ćirić, LJ., *Generalized contractions and fixed-point theorem*, Publ. Inst. Math. Beograd, 12 (26), (1971) 19—16.
- [5] Reich S., *Fixed points of contractive functions*, Bull. Un. Mat. Ital., S. IV, 5 (1972), 26—42.
- [6] Boyd, D. W., Wong, J. S. W., *On nonlinear contractions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 20 (1969) pp. 458—464.
- [7] Edelstein, M., *On fixed and periodic points under constructive mappings*. J. London Math. Soc., 37 (1962), pp. 74—79.
- [8] Rakotch, E., *On epsilon-contractive mappings*, Bull. Res. Council Israel, 10 F (1962), pp. 53—58.
- [9] Tasković, M., *Monotone mappings on ordered sets, a class of inequalities with finite differences and fixed points* (to appear).