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#### Abstract

The aim of this paper is to generalize a fixed point result given by Popescu[17]. Our results complement and extend very recent results proved by Suzuki [T. Suzuki, A generalized Banach contraction principle that characterizes metric completeness, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 136 (2008) 1861-1869]. To validate our result an example is given.
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## 1. Introduction

Let ( $\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{d}$ ) be a metric space, T a self-mapping on X and $k$ a nonnegative real number such that the inequality $d(T x, T y) \leq k d(x, y)$ holds for any $x, y \in X$. If $k<1$ then $T$ is said to be a contractive mapping and if $\mathrm{k}=1$, then T is said to be a nonexpansive mapping. The Banach theorem states that if X is complete, then every contractive mapping has a unique fixed point. There exists a vast literature about contractive and nonexpansive type mappings, where the contractive and nonexpansive conditions are substituted with more general conditions (see, for instance [1-10]).
Bogin[1] proved the following result.
Theorem 1.1. Let ( $\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{d}$ ) be a nonempty complete metric space and $T: X \rightarrow X$ a mapping satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
d(T x, T y) \leq a d(x, y)+b[d(x, T x)+d(y, T y)]+c[d(x, T y)+d(y, T x)], \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

here $a \geq 0, b>0, c>0$ and $a+2 b+2 c=1$. Then T has a unique fixed point.
This result was generalized by Li[15] and Gregus[11] considered a class of self-mapping T on X which satisfy (1) with $c=0$. He proved the following theorem.
Theorem 1.2 Let $(\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{d})$ be a complete metric space and $S: X \rightarrow X$. Define a non-increasing function $\theta$ from $[0,1)$ onto $(1 / 2,1]$ by

$$
\theta(r)=\left\{\begin{array}{lll}
1, & \text { if } & 0 \leq r \leq \frac{\sqrt{ } 5-1}{2} \\
\frac{r-1}{r^{2}}, & \text { if } & \frac{\sqrt{ } 5-1}{2} \leq r \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\
\frac{1}{1+r}, & \text { if } & \frac{1}{\sqrt{ } 2} \leq r \leq 1
\end{array}\right.
$$

Assume that there exists $r \in[0,1)$ such that $\theta(r) d(x, S x) \leq d(x, y)$ implies
$d(S x, S y) \leq r d(x, y)$, for all $x, y \in X$. Then $S$ has a unique fixed point. Also, Kikkawa and Suzuki[14] proved Kannan, Meir and Keeler [13] versions of Theorem 1.2. Moreover, Suzuki studied a class of operators satisfying the following condition.

[^0]Theorem 1.3 Let $T$ be a mapping on a subset $C$ of a Banach space $E$. Then $T$ is said to satisfy condition ( $C$ ) if for all $x, y \in C$
(C) $1 / 2\|T x-T y\| \leq\|x-y\|$.

In 2010, Tiwari et al. [18] proved a common fixed point theorem for weakly compatible mapping in symmetric spaces satisfying an integral type contractive condition. Recently Popescu [17] proved the following theorem.
Theorem 1.4 Let ( $\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{d}$ ) be a nonempty complete metric space and $T: X \rightarrow X$ be a mapping satisfying $1 / 2 d(x, T x) \leq d(x, y)$ implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
d(T x, T y) \leq a d(x, y)+b[d(x, T x)+d(y, T y)]+c[d(x, T y)+d(y, T x)] \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $a \geq 0, b>0, c>0$ and $a+2 b+2 c=1$. Then T has a unique fixed point.
Inspired by this theorem, we present a common fixed point result of Suzuki type in complete metric space in this paper.

## 2. Main results

The following theorem generalizes result of Popescu[17].
Theorem 2.1. Let ( $\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{d}$ ) be a nonempty complete metric space and $T: X \rightarrow X$ be a mapping satisfying $\frac{1}{2} d(x, T x) \leq d(x, y)$ implies

$$
\begin{align*}
& d(T x, T y)+p \max [d(x, y), d(x, T x)+d(y, T y), d(x, T y)+d(y, T x)] \\
& \leq a d(x, y)+b[d(x, T x)+d(y, T y)]+c[d(x, T y)+d(y, T x)] \tag{3}
\end{align*}
$$

where $a \geq 0, b>0, c>0, p \geq 0$ and $a+2 b+2 c-2 p=1$. Then T has a unique fixed point.
Proof. Let $x \in X$ be arbitrary. we have

$$
\begin{gathered}
d\left(T x, T^{2} x\right)+p \max \left\{d(x, T x),\left[d(x, T x)+d\left(T x, T^{2} x\right)\right],\left[d\left(x, T^{2} x\right)+d(T x, T x)\right]\right\} \\
\leq a d(x, T x)+b\left[d(x, T x)+d\left(T x, T^{2} x\right)\right]+c\left[d\left(x, T^{2} x\right)+d(T x, T x)\right] .
\end{gathered}
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{gathered}
d\left(T x, T^{2} x\right)+p \max \left\{d(x, T x), d(x, T x)+d\left(T x, T^{2} x\right), d(x, T x)+d\left(T x, T^{2} x\right)\right\} \\
\leq(a+b) d(x, T x)+b d\left(T x, T^{2} x\right)+c\left[d(x, T x)+d\left(T x, T^{2} x\right)\right] .
\end{gathered}
$$

Therefore we obtain,

$$
\begin{aligned}
d\left(T x, T^{2} x\right) & \leq(\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{b}+\mathrm{c}-\mathrm{p}) /(1-\mathrm{b}-\mathrm{c}-\mathrm{p}) \mathrm{d}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{Tx}) \\
& =d(x, T x) .
\end{aligned}
$$

This implies that the sequence $\left\{d_{n}\right\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a decreasing one, where

$$
d_{n}:=d\left(T^{n} x, T^{n+1} x\right) \text { and } T^{0} x=x
$$

Next, we will show that there exists a nonnegative number $m<2$ such that $d\left(T x, T^{3} x\right) \leq m d_{0}$. First, we suppose that $d\left(x, T^{2} x\right) \geq d(x, T x)$. Then $1 / 2 d(x, T x) \leq d\left(x, T^{2} x\right)$ and we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
d\left(T x, T^{3} x\right)+ & p \max \left\{d\left(x, T^{2} x\right), d(x, T x)+d\left(T^{2} x, T^{3} x\right), d\left(x, T^{3} x\right)+d(T x, T x)\right\} \\
& \leq a d\left(x, T^{2} x\right)+b d(x, T x)+b d\left(T^{2} x, T^{3} x\right)+c d\left(x, T^{3} x\right)+c d\left(T x, T^{2} x\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus,
$d\left(T x, T^{3} x\right)+\mathrm{p} \max \left\{\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{Tx}), d\left(T x, T^{3} x\right)\right\} \leq \mathrm{a}(\mathrm{d} 0+\mathrm{d} 1)+\mathrm{bd} 0+\mathrm{bd} 2+\mathrm{c}\left[\mathrm{d} 0+d\left(T x, T^{3} x\right)\right] \mathrm{d} 1$.
Setting $\mathrm{m}=(1+\mathrm{a}) /(1-\mathrm{c}-\mathrm{p})$, we have $m_{1}<2$ and $d\left(T x, T^{3} x\right) \leq m_{1} d_{0}$. Now, we assume that $d\left(x, T^{2} x\right)<d(x, T x)$. Since
$d\left(T x, T^{2} x\right)+p \max \left\{d(x, T x), d(x, T x)+d\left(T x, T^{2} x\right), d\left(x, T^{2} x\right)+d(T x, T x)\right\}$

$$
\leq a d(x, T x)+b d(x, T x)+b d\left(T x, T^{2} x\right)+c d\left(x, T^{2} x\right)+c d(T x, T x)
$$

we get $d_{1}<(a+b) d_{0}+b d_{1}+c d_{0}+p\left(d_{0}+d_{1}\right)$. Hence, $\mathrm{d}_{1}<(\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{b}+\mathrm{c}-\mathrm{p}) /(1-\mathrm{b}-\mathrm{p})$ and then
$d\left(T x, T^{3} x\right) \leq d\left(T x, T^{2} x\right)+d\left(T^{2} x, T^{3} x\right) \leq 2 d\left(T x, T^{2} x\right) \leq(2 \mathrm{a}+2 \mathrm{~b}+2 \mathrm{c}-2 \mathrm{p}) /(1-\mathrm{b}+\mathrm{c}) . \mathrm{d}_{0}=(1+\mathrm{a}) /(1-\mathrm{b}+\mathrm{p})$.
Setting $\mathrm{m}_{2}=(1+\mathrm{a}) /(1-\mathrm{b}-\mathrm{p})$, we have, $m_{2}<2$ and $d\left(T x, T^{3} x\right) \leq m_{2} d_{0}$.
Taking $m=\max \left\{m_{1}, m_{2}\right\}$, we get $0<m<2$ and $d\left(T x, T^{3} x\right) \leq m d(x, T x)$, for all $x \in X$.
Since $1 / 2 d\left(T x, T^{2} x\right) \leq d\left(T x, T^{2} x\right)$ we have,
$\mathrm{d}\left(T^{2} x, T^{3} x\right)+\mathrm{p} \max \left\{\mathrm{d}\left(\mathrm{Tx}, T^{2} x\right),\left[\mathrm{d}\left(\operatorname{Tx}, T^{2} x\right)+\mathrm{d}\left(T^{2} x, T^{3} x\right)\right], \mathrm{d}\left(\operatorname{Tx}, T^{3} x\right)\right\}$

$$
\left.\leq \operatorname{ad}\left(\mathrm{Tx}, T^{2} x\right)+\mathrm{b}\left[\mathrm{~d}\left(\mathrm{Tx}, T^{2} x\right)+\mathrm{d}\left(T^{2} x, T^{3} x\right)\right]+\mathrm{cd}\left(\mathrm{Tx}, T^{3} x\right)\right)
$$

Thus,

$$
d_{2} \leq(a+2 b-2 p) d_{0}+m c d_{0}=(a+2 b+2 p+\mathrm{m} c) d_{0}
$$

Setting $k=a+2 b-2 p+m c$, we have $k<1$ and $d_{2} \leq k d_{0}$ for all $x \in X$.
Let $x_{0} \in X$ and $u_{n}=T^{n} x_{0}$. Then $d_{n+2} \leq k d_{n}$ for all $n \geq 0$, where $d_{n}=d\left(u_{n}, u_{n+1}\right)$. Therefore, for any even integer $n \geq 0$ we have by induction $d_{n} \leq k^{n / 2} d_{0} \leq k^{(n-1) / 2} d_{0}$ and for every odd integer $n$ $\geq 1$ we have also by induction $d_{n} \leq k^{(n-1) / 2} d_{1} \leq k^{(n-1) / 2} d_{0}$. Hence, for all $n \geq 0$ we get $d_{n} \leq k^{(n-1) / 2} d_{0}$. Since $k \in(0,1)$ we obtain that $u_{n}$ is a Cauchy sequence and by completeness of $X$ there exists $z \in$ $X$ such that the sequence $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ converges to z as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Next, we will show that $z$ is a fixed point of T. Assuming that there exists $n$ such that
$d\left(z, u_{n}\right)<1 / 2 d\left(u_{n}, u_{n+1}\right)$ and $d\left(z, u_{n+1}\right)<1 / 2 d\left(u_{n+1}, u_{n+2}\right)$ we obtain

$$
d_{n}=d\left(u_{n}, u_{n+1}\right) \leq d\left(z, u_{n}\right)+d\left(z, u_{n+1}\right)<1 / 2\left(d_{n}+d_{n+1}\right) \leq d_{n} .
$$

This is a contradiction, so for all $n \geq 0$ we have either $d\left(z, u_{n}\right) \geq 1 / 2 d\left(u_{n}, u_{n+1}\right)$ or
$d\left(z, u_{n+1}\right) \geq 1 / 2 d\left(u_{n+1}, u_{n+2}\right)$. Thus, there exists a subsequence $\left\{n_{j}\right\}$ of $n$ such that $d\left(u_{n_{j}}, z\right) \leq$ $1 / 2 d\left(u_{n_{j+1}}, u_{n_{j}}\right)$ for every integer $j \geq 0$. Then, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{d}\left(\mathrm{Tz}, \mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{n}+1}\right)+\mathrm{p} \max \left\{\mathrm{~d}\left(\mathrm{z}, \mathrm{unn}_{\mathrm{j}}\right), \mathrm{d}(\mathrm{z}, \mathrm{Tz})+\mathrm{d}\left(\mathrm{un}_{\mathrm{n}}, \mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{nj}+1}\right), \mathrm{d}\left(\mathrm{z}, \mathrm{unj}_{\mathrm{n}+1}\right)+\mathrm{d}\left(\mathrm{Tz}, \mathrm{unn}_{\mathrm{j}}\right)\right\} \\
& \leq \operatorname{ad}\left(z, u_{n j}\right)+b d(z, T z)+b d\left(u_{n j}, u_{n j+1}\right)+c d\left(z, u_{n j+1}\right)+c d\left(T z, u_{n j}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Taking $\mathrm{j} \rightarrow \infty$ we get $\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{Tz}, \mathrm{z}) \leq(\mathrm{b}+\mathrm{c}) \mathrm{d}(\mathrm{Tz}, \mathrm{z})$. This implies $\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{Tz}, \mathrm{z})=0$ and $\mathrm{so}, \mathrm{Tz}=\mathrm{z}$. If $\mathrm{Z}^{\prime}$ is another fixed point T then $\mathrm{d}\left(z^{\prime}, \mathrm{z}\right) \leq 1 / 2 \mathrm{~d}(\mathrm{z}, \mathrm{Tz})=0$ and then

$$
\begin{aligned}
d\left(z^{\prime}, z\right) & =d\left(T z^{\prime}, T z\right)+p \max \left\{d\left(z^{\prime}, z\right),\left[d\left(z^{\prime}, z^{\prime}\right)+d(z, z)\right],\left[d\left(z^{\prime}, z\right)+d\left(z^{\prime}, z\right)\right]\right\} \\
& \leq a d\left(z^{\prime}, z\right)+b\left[d\left(z^{\prime}, z^{\prime}\right)+d(z, z)\right]+c\left[d\left(z^{\prime}, z\right)+d\left(z^{\prime}, z\right)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence,

$$
d\left(z^{\prime}, z\right) \leq(a+2 c-2 p) d\left(z^{\prime}, z\right)
$$

This implies $d\left(z^{\prime}, z\right)=0$, which is a contradiction. So, $T$ has a unique fixed point.
Remark 2.2 2 If we put $p=0$ in above, we get Theorem 1.4 of Popescu[17].

Now we present the following example to validate our result.
Example 2.3. Let $X=[-1,1]$ with the usual metric and let $T: X \rightarrow X$ be given as

$$
T x=\left\{\begin{array}{lll}
-x, & \text { if } & x \in[0,1 / 2) \bigcup(1 / 2,1]=U \\
\frac{x}{4}, & \text { if } & x \in[-1,0)=V \\
0, & \text { if } & x=\frac{1}{2}
\end{array}\right.
$$

We will prove that:

1. T has a unique fixed point.
2. T satisfies condition (3) with $\mathrm{a}=1 / 3, \mathrm{~b}=\mathrm{c}=1 / 4, \mathrm{p}=1 / 6$
i.e. $1 / 2 d(x, T x) \leq d(x, y) \Rightarrow d(T x, T y) \leq m(x, y)$ where
$m(x, y)=1 / 3 d(x, y)+1 / 4[d(x, T x)+d(y, T y)+d(x, T y)+d(y, T x)]-p \max \{d(x, y), d(x, T x)+d(y, T y)$, $d(x, T y)+d(y, T x)\}$.
3. T does not satisfy Suzuki condition of Theorem 1.2.
4. T does not satisfy Popescu condition of Theorem 1.4 with $a=1 / 3, b=c=1 / 4$ and $p=1 / 6$.

Proof. 1 is obvious. Secondly we consider the following.
(i) For $x, y \in U$ then
$m(x, y)=1 / 3|y-x|+(1 / 4+1 / 4)|2 y+2 x|-1 / 6|2 y+2 x|=1 / 3|y-x|+1 / 2|2 y+2 x|-1 / 6|2 y+2 x|$, or
$m(x, y)=(1 / 3|y-x|+2 / 3|y+x| \geq|y-x|=d(T x, T y)$ and (2) holds.
(ii) If $x$, $y \in V$, then $m(x, y)=(1 / 3+3 / 4(1 / 4+1 / 4+1 / 6))|y-x|=5 / 6|y-x| \geq 1 / 4|y-x|=d(T x$, Ty) so (2) holds.
(iii) If $x \in U, y \in V$, then $m(x, y)=1 / 3|(x-y)|+(1 / 4+1 / 4+1 / 6|2 x-3 y / 4|)=13 x / 12-5 y / 24+1 / 4|y+x| \geq x+$ $y / 4=d(T x, T y)$ so (2) holds.
(iv) If $x \in V$, $y \in U$, then $m(x, y) \geq d(T x$, Ty) like in (iii).
(v) For $x \in U, y=1 / 2$, then $m(x, y)=1 / 3|x-1 / 2|+(1 / 4|4 x+1|-1 / 6|2 x|=x+1 / 12 \geq x=d(T x, T y)$ and (2) holds.
(vi) For $x \in V, y=1 / 2$, then $m(x, y)=1 / 3|x-1 / 2|+1 / 4|3 x / 2+1|-1 / 6|3 x / 4+1 / 2|=7 x / 12 \geq x / 4=d(T x$, Ty) and (2) holds.
(vii) If $x=1 / 2, y \in U$, then $m(x, y)=1 / 3|y-1 / 2|+1 / 4|1+4 y|-1 / 6|2 y+1 / 2|=y+5 / 6 \geq d(T x$, Ty) and (2) holds.
(viii) If $x=1 / 2, y \in V$, then
$m(x, y)=1 / 3|1 / 2-y|+1 / 4|3 y / 2+1|-1 / 12-y / 8=1 / 3+y / 6 \geq 1 / 2$ and $d(T x, T y)=0-y / 4,-y / 4 \leq 1 / 4(y / 4 \in$ $[-1 / 4,0)$ ) Hence (2) holds.
(xi) If $x=y$ then (2) is obvious.
(3) If $x=0, y=1$, then $\theta(r) d(x, T x)=0<1=d(x, y)$ and $d(T x, T y)=1$, so condition from Theorem 1.2. does not hold.
(4) If $x=1 / 2, y=1$ we have $d(T x, T y)=1$ and $m(x, y)=1 / 3|1|+1 / 4|1 / 2-0|+1 / 4|1|=1 / 3+1 / 8+1 / 4+1 / 4=$ $23 / 24$ so $d(T x, T y)>m(x, y)$. Therefore Popescu's condition Theorem 1.4 does not hold.

## References

[1] J. Bogin, A generalization of a fixed point theorem of Goebel, Kirk and Shimi, Canad.Math. Bull. 19 (1976) 7-12.
[2] Lj.B. Ciric, On some nonexpansive type mappings and fixed point, Indian J. Pure Appl.Math. 24 (3) (1993) 145-149.
[3] Lj.B. Ciric, On a common fixed point theorem of a Gregus type, Publ. Inst. Math. 49 (1991) 174-178.
[4] Lj.B. Ciric, Diviccaro, Fisher and Sessa Open questions, Arch. Math. 29 (1993) 145-152.
[5] Lj.B. Ciric, On a generalization of a Gregus fixed point theorem, Czechoslovak Math. J. 50(2000) 449-458.
[6] Lj.B.Ciric, A new class of nonexpansive type mappings and fixed points, Czechoslovak Math. J. 49 (124) (1999) 891-899.
[7] D. Delbosco, O. Ferrero, F. Rossati, Teoremi di punto fisso per applicazioni negli spazi di Banach, Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. Sez. A (6) 2 (1993) 297-303.
[8] S. Dhompongsa and H. Yingtaweesittikul, Fixed points for multivalued mappings and the metric completeness, Fixed Point Theory Appl. (2009) 1-15. Article ID 972395.
[9] M.L. Diviccaro, B. Fisher, S. Sessa, A common fixed point theorem of Gregu type, Publ. Math. Debrecen 34 (1997) 83-89.
[10] B. Fisher, Common fixed points on a Banach space, Chung Yuan J. 11 (1982) 19-26.
[11] M. Gregus, A fixed point theorem in Banach spaces, Boll. Unione Mat. Ital. Sez. A (5) 17(1980) 193 - 198.
[12] G. Jungck, On a fixed point theorem of Fisher and Sessa, Int. J. Math. Math. Sci. 13 (1990) 497-500.
[13] R. Kannan, Some results on fixed point theory-II, Amer. Math. Monthly 76 (1969) 405 - 408.
[14] M. Kikkawa, T. Suzuki, Three fixed point theorems for generalized contractions with constants in complete metric spaces, Nonlinear Anal. 69 (2008) 2942-2949.
[15] B.I. Li, Fixed point theorems of nonexpansive mappings in convex metric spaces, Appl.Math. Mech. 10 (1989) 183-188.
[16] O. Popescu, Two fixed point theorems for generalized contractions with constants in complete metric space, Cent. Eur. J. Math. 7 (3) (2009) 529-538.
[17] O. Popescu, Two generalizations of some fixed point theorems, Computer and mathematics with applications 62(2011) 3912-3919.
[18] Rakesh Tiwari, S. KShrivastava, V. K. Pathak, A common fixed point theorem for weakcompatible mappings in symmetric spaces satisfying an integral type contractive condition, Hecettepe Journal of mathematics and statistics 39(2), (2010) 151-158.

## K. C. Deshmukh,

Department Of Mathematics
R. T. M. Nagpur University Nagpur
(Maharashtra), 440013 India.

## Rakesh Tiwari,

Department Of Mathematics
Govt. V.Y.T. PG. Autonomous College Durg
(C.G.),491001. India.

## Savita Gupta,

Department Of Mathematics
Shri Shankaracharya Institute Of Technology And Management Bhilai(C.G.),492001, India.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Corresponding author

