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## 1. Introduction

Let $X$ be a real Banach space; $B$ a nonempty, convex subset of $X$; and $T: B \rightarrow B$ an operator. Let $x_{0} \in B$. The following iteration is known as Krasnoselskij iteration (see [1]):

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{n+1}=(1-\lambda) x_{n}+\lambda T x_{n} . \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The map $J: X \rightarrow 2^{X^{*}}$ given by $J x:=\left\{f \in X^{*}:\langle x, f\rangle=\|x\|^{2},\|f\|=\|x\|\right\}$, for all $x \in X$, is called the normalized duality mapping. It is easy to see that we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\langle y, j(x)\rangle \leq\|x\|\|y\|, \quad \forall x, y \in X, \forall j(x) \in J(x) . \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Denote

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Psi:=\{\psi \mid \psi:[0,+\infty) \longrightarrow[0,+\infty) \text { is astrictly increasing map with } \psi(0)=0\} . \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Definition 1.1. Let $X$ be a real Banach space, and let $B$ be a nonempty subset of $X$. A map $T$ : $B \rightarrow B$ is called uniformly pseudocontractive if there exists a map $\psi \in \Psi$ and $j(x-y) \in J(x-y)$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\langle T x-T y, j(x-y)\rangle \leq\|x-y\|^{2}-\psi(\|x-y\|), \quad \forall x, y \in B . \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

A map $S: X \rightarrow X$ is called uniformly accretive if there exists a map $\psi \in \Psi$ and $j(x-y) \in$ $J(x-y)$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\langle S x-S y, j(x-y)\rangle \geq \psi(\|x-y\|), \quad \forall x, y \in X \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Taking $\psi(a):=\psi(a) \cdot a$, for all $a \in[0,+\infty),(\psi \in \Psi)$, reduces to the usual definitions of $\psi$-strongly pseudocontractive and $\psi$-strongly accretive. Taking $\psi(a):=\gamma \cdot a^{2}, \gamma \in(0,1)$, for all $a \in[0,+\infty),(\psi \in \Psi)$, we get the usual definitions of strongly pseudocontractive and strongly accretive. Therefore, the class of strongly pseudocontractive maps is included stricly in the class of $\psi$-strongly pseudocontractive maps. The example from [2] shows that this inclusion is proper. Remark, further, that the class of $\psi$-strongly pseudocontractive maps is also included strictly in the class of uniformly pseudocontractive maps (see also [3]).

We will give a characterization for the convergence of (1.1) when applied to uniformly pseudocontractive operators. For this purpose, we need the following lemma similar to [4, Lemma 1]. Next, $\mathbb{N}$ denotes the set of all natural numbers.

Lemma 1.2. Let $\left\{a_{n}\right\}$ be a positive bounded sequence and assume that there exists $n_{0} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{n+1} \leq(1-\lambda) a_{n}+\lambda a_{n+1}-\lambda \frac{\psi\left(a_{n+1}\right)}{a_{n+1}}+\lambda \varepsilon_{n}, \quad \forall n \geq n_{0} \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\lambda \in(0,1), \varepsilon_{n} \geq 0$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_{n}=0$. Then $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} a_{n}=0$.
Proof. There exists an $M>0$ such that $a_{n} \leq M$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Denote $a:=\lim \inf a_{n}$. We will prove that $a=0$. Suppose on the contrary that $a>0$. Then there exists an $N_{1} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{n} \geq \frac{a}{2}, \quad \forall n \geq N_{1} . \tag{1.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

From $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_{n}=0$, we know that there exists an $N_{2} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon_{n} \leq \frac{\psi(a / 2)}{2 M}, \quad \forall n \geq N_{2} \tag{1.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Set $N_{0}:=\max \left\{N_{1}, N_{2}\right\}$. Using the fact that $-(1 / M) \geq-\left(1 / a_{n+1}\right)$, we get the following:

$$
\begin{align*}
a_{n+1} & \leq(1-\lambda) a_{n}+\lambda a_{n+1}-\lambda \frac{\psi\left(a_{n+1}\right)}{a_{n+1}}+\lambda \varepsilon_{n} \\
& \leq(1-\lambda) a_{n}+\lambda a_{n+1}-\lambda \frac{\psi(a / 2)}{M}+\lambda \frac{\psi(a / 2)}{2 M}  \tag{1.9}\\
& \leq(1-\lambda) a_{n}+\lambda a_{n+1}-\lambda \frac{\psi(a / 2)}{2 M}
\end{align*}
$$

which implies that $(1-\lambda) a_{n+1} \leq(1-\lambda) a_{n}-\lambda((\psi(a / 2)) / 2 M)$, or

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{n+1} \leq a_{n}-\frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda} \frac{\psi(a / 2)}{2 M} \leq a_{n}-\lambda \frac{\psi(a / 2)}{2 M} \tag{1.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

since $-(\lambda /(1-\lambda)) \leq-\lambda$. Thus $\lambda(\psi(a / 2)) / 2 M \leq a_{n}-a_{n+1}$, which implies that $\sum \lambda<\infty$, in contradiction to $\sum \lambda=\infty$. Therefore, $\liminf a_{n}=0$. Hence there exists a subsequence $\left\{a_{n_{j}}\right\} \subset$ $\left\{a_{n}\right\}$ such that $\lim _{j \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_{j}}=0$. Fix $\varepsilon>0$. Then there exists an $n_{3} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{n_{j}}<\frac{\varepsilon}{4}, \quad \forall j \geq n_{3} . \tag{1.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Also there exists an $n_{4} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon_{n}<\frac{\psi(\varepsilon / 4)}{2 M}, \quad \forall n \geq n_{4} . \tag{1.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Define $n_{0}:=\max \left\{n_{3}, n_{4}, N_{0}\right\}$. We claim that $a_{n_{j}+k}<\varepsilon / 4$ for each $j>n_{0}$ and each $k>0$. Suppose not. Then there exists an $n_{0}$ and a $k>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{n_{j}+k} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{4} . \tag{1.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

For this $n_{j}$, let $k$ denote the smallest positive integer for which (1.13) is true. Then $a_{n_{i}+k-1} \leq \varepsilon / 4$. From (1.6),

$$
\begin{align*}
a_{n_{j}+k} & \leq(1-\lambda) a_{n_{j}+k-1}+\lambda a_{n_{j}+k}-\lambda \frac{\psi\left(a_{n_{j}+k}\right)}{a_{n_{j}+k}}+\lambda \varepsilon_{n_{j}+k-1} \\
& \leq(1-\lambda) a_{n_{j}+k-1}+\lambda a_{n_{j}+k}-\frac{\lambda \psi(\varepsilon / 4)}{a_{n_{j}+k}}+\lambda \frac{\psi(\varepsilon / 4)}{2 M}  \tag{1.14}\\
& \leq(1-\lambda) a_{n_{j}+k-1}+\lambda a_{n_{j}+k}-\lambda \frac{\psi(\varepsilon / 4)}{2 M},
\end{align*}
$$

which implies that $a_{n_{j}+k} \leq(\varepsilon / 4)-(\lambda /(1-\lambda))(\psi(\varepsilon / 4) / 2 M)$. This leads to the contradiction:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\varepsilon}{4} \leq a_{n_{j}+k} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}-\frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda} \frac{\psi(\varepsilon / 4)}{2 M}<\frac{\varepsilon}{4} . \tag{1.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore, $a_{n_{j}+k}<\varepsilon / 4$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and each $j>n_{0}$, hence $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} a_{n}=0$.

## 2. Main result

Theorem 2.1. Let $X$ be a real Banach space, B a nonempty, closed, convex, bounded subset of $X$. Let $T$ : $B \rightarrow B$ be a uniformly pseudocontractive and uniformly continuous operator with $F(T) \neq \varnothing$. Then for $x_{0} \in B$, the Krasnoselskij iteration (1.1) converges to the fixed point of $T$ if and only if $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \| x_{n+1}-$ $x_{n} \|=0$.

Proof. Since $T$ is a self-map of $B$, which is bounded and convex, then, from (1.1), each $x_{n} \in B$, so $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ is bounded for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Uniqueness of the fixed point follows from (1.4). If $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ converges to the fixed point of $T$, that is, $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} x_{n}=x^{*}$, then, obviously, $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left\|x_{n+1}-x_{n}\right\|=0$. Conversely, we will prove that if $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left\|x_{n+1}-x_{n}\right\|=0$, then $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} x_{n}=x^{*}$. Suppose that
$x_{n}=x^{*}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then from (1.1), it follows that $x_{m}=x^{*}$ for each $m>n$, and the theorem is proved. Now suppose that $x_{n} \neq x^{*}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Using (1.1) and (1.2),

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left\|x_{n+1}-x^{*}\right\|^{2} \\
& \quad=\left\langle x_{n+1}-x^{*}, j\left(x_{n+1}-x^{*}\right)\right\rangle \\
& \quad=\left\langle(1-\lambda)\left(x_{n}-x^{*}\right)+\lambda\left(T x_{n}-T x^{*}\right), j\left(x_{n+1}-x^{*}\right)\right\rangle \\
& \quad=(1-\lambda)\left\langle\left(x_{n}-x^{*}\right), j\left(x_{n+1}-x^{*}\right)\right\rangle+\lambda\left\langle T x_{n}-T x^{*}, j\left(x_{n+1}-x^{*}\right)\right\rangle \\
& \quad \leq(1-\lambda)\left\|x_{n}-x^{*}\right\|\left\|x_{n+1}-x^{*}\right\|+\lambda\left\langle T x_{n+1}-T x^{*}, j\left(x_{n+1}-x^{*}\right)\right\rangle+\lambda\left\langle T x_{n}-T x_{n+1}, j\left(x_{n+1}-x^{*}\right)\right\rangle \\
& \quad \leq(1-\lambda)\left\|x_{n}-x^{*}\right\|\left\|x_{n+1}-x^{*}\right\|+\lambda\left\|x_{n+1}-x^{*}\right\|^{2}-\lambda \psi\left(\left\|x_{n+1}-x^{*}\right\|\right)+\lambda\left\|T x_{n}-T x_{n+1}\right\|\left\|x_{n+1}-x^{*}\right\| \\
& \quad \leq\left\|x_{n+1}-x^{*}\right\|\left((1-\lambda)\left\|x_{n}-x^{*}\right\|+\lambda\left\|x_{n+1}-x^{*}\right\|-\lambda \frac{\psi\left(\left\|x_{n+1}-x^{*}\right\|\right)}{\left\|x_{n+1}-x^{*}\right\|}+\lambda\left\|T x_{n}-T x_{n+1}\right\|\right) . \tag{2.1}
\end{align*}
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|x_{n+1}-x^{*}\right\| \leq(1-\lambda)\left\|x_{n}-x^{*}\right\|+\lambda\left\|x_{n+1}-x^{*}\right\|-\lambda \frac{\psi\left(\left\|x_{n+1}-x^{*}\right\|\right)}{\left\|x_{n+1}-x^{*}\right\|}+\lambda\left\|T x_{n}-T x_{n+1}\right\| \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left\|x_{n+1}-x_{n}\right\|=0$ and $T$ is uniformly continuous, it follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left\|T x_{n}-T x_{n+1}\right\|=0 \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Set $a_{n}=\left\|x_{n}-x^{*}\right\|, \varepsilon_{n}=\left\|T x_{n}-T x_{n+1}\right\|$ and use Lemma 1.2 to obtain the conlcusion.
Remark 2.2. (1) If $B$ is not bounded, then Theorem 2.1 holds under the assumption that $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ is bounded.
(2) If $T(B)$ is bounded, then $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ is bounded.
(3) If $T$ is strongly pseudocontractive, then automatically $F(T) \neq \varnothing$.

## 3. Further results

Let $I$ denote the identity map. A map $T: B \rightarrow B$ is called pseudocontractive if there exists $j(x-y) \in J(x-y)$ such that $\langle T x-T y, j(x-y)\rangle \leq\|x-y\|^{2}$.

Remark 3.1. The operator $T$ is a (uniformly, strongly) pseudocontractive map if and only if ( $I-T$ ) is a (uniformly, strongly) accretive map.

Remark 3.2. (1) Let $T, S: X \rightarrow X$, and let $f \in X$ be given. A fixed point for the map $T x=$ $f+(I-S) x$, for all $x \in X$, is a solution for $S x=f$.
(2) Let $f \in X$ be a given point. If $S$ is an accretive map, then $T=f-S$ is a strongly pseudocontractive map.

Consider Krasnoselskij iteration with $T x=f+(I-S) x$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{n+1}=(1-\lambda) x_{n}+\lambda\left(f+(I-S) x_{n}\right) . \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Remarks 3.1 and 3.2 and Theorem 2.1 lead to the following result.
Corollary 3.3. Let X be a real Banach space and let $S: X \rightarrow X$ be a uniformly accretive and uniformly continuous operator, with $(I-S)(X)$ bounded. Suppose that $S x=f$ has a solution. Then for any $x_{0} \in$ $X$, the Krasnoselskij iteration (3.1) converges to the solution of $S x=f$ if and only if $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \| x_{n+1}-$ $x_{n} \|=0$.

Let $S$ be an accretive operator. The operator $T x=f-S x$ is strongly pseudocontractive for a given $f \in X$. A solution for $T x=x$ becomes a solution for $x+S x=f$. Consider Krasnoselskij iteration with $T x:=f-S x$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{n+1}=(1-\lambda) x_{n}+\lambda\left(f-S x_{n}\right) . \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Again, using Remarks 3.1 and 3.2 and Theorem 2.1, we obtain the following result.
Corollary 3.4. Let $X$ be a real Banach space and let $S: X \rightarrow X$ be an accretive and uniformly continuous operator, with $(I-S)(X)$ bounded. Suppose that $x+S x=f$ has a solution. Then for $x_{0} \in X$, the Krasnoselskij iteration (3.2) converges to the solution of $x+S x=f$ if and only if $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left\|x_{n+1}-x_{n}\right\|=0$.

Remark 3.5. If (1.4) holds for all $x \in B$ and $y:=x^{*} \in F(T)$, then such a map is called uniformly hemicontractive. It is trivial to see that our results hold for the uniformly hemicontractive maps.
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