

On a Fixed Point Theorem of Contractive Type

by

Cheng Chun CHANG

(Received November 25, 1981; revised January, 8, 1982)

The main purpose of this paper is to extend a fixed point theorem of Jungck [3] to a great general form.

In 1976, Jungck [3] proved a stronger form of the Banach contraction principle (motivated by a geometrical consideration).

His result is:

THEOREM 1. *Let (X, d) be a complete metric space. Let f and g be commuting continuous self-maps on X such that $g(X) \subset f(X)$. Suppose that there exists a constant $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that for all x, y in X ,*

$$d(g(x), g(y)) \leq \alpha d(f(x), f(y)).$$

Then f and g have a unique common fixed point.

The following theorem is an extension of Theorem 1.

THEOREM 2. *Let (X, d) be a complete metric space. Let f, g and h be three self-maps on X such that*

(A) *f is continuous;*

(B) *f and g, f and h are commutative, $g(X) \subset f(X)$ and $h(X) \subset f(X)$;*

(C) *there exists a real-valued function $\phi: [0, \infty)^5 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$*

such that

$$\begin{aligned} d(gx, hy) &\leq \phi(d(fx, fy), d(fx, gx), \\ &\quad d(fx, hy), d(fy, gx), d(fy, hy)) \end{aligned}$$

for all $x, y \in X$, where ϕ is upper semi-continuous from the right and non-decreasing in each coordinate variable such that $\phi(t, t, at, bt, t) < t$ for each $t > 0$ and $a \geq 0, b \geq 0$ with $a + b \leq 2$.

Then f, g and h have a unique common fixed point in X .

To prove Theorem 2 we need the following result [4].

LEMMA 1. *Suppose $\psi: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is upper semi-continuous from right and non-decreasing. If for every $t > 0, \psi(t) < t$ then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi^n(t) = 0$, where $\psi^n(t)$ denotes the*

composition of $\psi(t)$ with itself n times.

Proof of Theorem 2. Let $x_0 \in X$ be given. Construct a sequence $\{x_n\}$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} gx_{2n} &= fx_{2n+1}, \\ hx_{2n+1} &= fx_{2n+2}, \quad n=0, 1, \dots \end{aligned}$$

By (B), the iterates are well-defined. For simplicity of the notation, let

$$\alpha_n = d(fx_n, fx_{n+1}), \quad n=0, 1, \dots$$

we claim that

$$\alpha_{2n+1} \leq \alpha_{2n} \quad \text{for } n=0, 1, \dots$$

Indeed, assuming that for some non-negative integer n ,

$$\alpha_{2n+1} > \alpha_{2n}$$

Then by (C), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{2n+1} &= d(fx_{2n+1}, fx_{2n+2}) \\ &= d(gx_{2n}, hx_{2n+1}) \\ &\leq \phi(d(fx_{2n}, fx_{2n+1}), d(fx_{2n}, gx_{2n}), \\ &\quad d(fx_{2n}, hx_{2n+1}), d(fx_{2n+1}, gx_{2n}), d(fx_{2n+1}, hx_{2n+1})) \\ &\leq \phi(d(fx_{2n}, fx_{2n+1}), d(fx_{2n}, fx_{2n+1}), \\ &\quad d(fx_{2n}, fx_{2n+1}) + d(fx_{2n+1}, fx_{2n+2}), \\ &\quad d(fx_{2n+1}, fx_{2n+1}), d(fx_{2n+1}, fx_{2n+2})) \\ &\leq \phi(\alpha_{2n}, \alpha_{2n}, \alpha_{2n} + \alpha_{2n+1}, 0, \alpha_{2n+1}) \\ &\leq \phi(\alpha_{2n+1}, \alpha_{2n+1}, 2\alpha_{2n+1}, 0, \alpha_{2n+1}) \\ &< \alpha_{2n+1} \end{aligned}$$

yielding a contradiction. A similar argument shows that $\alpha_{2n+2} \leq \alpha_{2n}$ for $n=0, 1, \dots$. Thus $\{\alpha_n\}$ is decreasing. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 &= d(fx_1, fx_2) \\ &= d(gx_0, hx_1) \\ &\leq \phi(d(fx_0, fx_1), d(fx_0, gx_0), d(fx_0, hx_1), \\ &\quad d(fx_1, gx_0), d(fx_1, hx_1)) \\ &\leq \phi(\alpha_0, \alpha_0, 2\alpha_0, 0, \alpha_0), \end{aligned}$$

it follows by induction that $\alpha_n \leq \psi^n(\alpha_0)$, where

$$\psi(t) = \text{Max} \{ \phi(t, t, 2t, 0, t), \phi(t, t, 0, 2t, t) \}$$

Thus by Lemma 1, we have

$$(1) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n = 0$$

We show next that $\{fx_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. To show that $\{fx_n\}$ is Cauchy, in view of (1), it suffices to show that $\{fx_{2n}\}$ is Cauchy. Suppose that $\{fx_{2n}\}$ is not a Cauchy sequence. There is an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for each even integer $2k$, there are even integers $2m(k)$, $2n(k)$ such that

$$(2) \quad d(fx_{2m(k)}, fx_{2n(k)}) > \varepsilon \quad \text{for } 2m(k) > 2n(k) > 2k.$$

By well-ordering principle, for each even integer $2k$, let $2m(k)$ be the least even integer exceeding $2n(k)$ satisfying (2), that is,

$$(3) \quad d(fx_{2n(k)}, fx_{2m(k)-2}) \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{and (2) holds.}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &< d(fx_{2n(k)}, fx_{2m(k)}) \\ &\leq d(fx_{2n(k)}, fx_{2m(k)-2}) + \alpha_{2m(k)-2} + \alpha_{2m(k)-1}, \end{aligned}$$

we have by (2) and (3) that

$$(4) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d(fx_{2n(k)}, fx_{2m(k)}) = \varepsilon$$

By the triangle inequality, we have

$$|d(fx_{2n(k)}, fx_{2m(k)-1}) - d(fx_{2n(k)}, fx_{2m(k)})| \leq \alpha_{2m(k)-1}$$

and

$$|d(fx_{2n(k)+1}, fx_{2m(k)-1}) - d(fx_{2n(k)}, fx_{2m(k)})| \leq \alpha_{2m(k)-1} + \alpha_{2n(k)}.$$

Thus by (4),

$$d(fx_{2n(k)}, fx_{2m(k)-1}) \rightarrow \varepsilon$$

and

$$d(fx_{2n(k)+1}, fx_{2m(k)-1}) \rightarrow \varepsilon$$

By hypothesis (C), we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(fx_{2n(k)}, fx_{2m(k)}) &\leq d(fx_{2n(k)}, fx_{2n(k)+1}) + d(fx_{2n(k)+1}, fx_{2m(k)}) \\ &\leq \alpha_{2n(k)} + \phi(d(fx_{2n(k)}, fx_{2m(k)-1}), \alpha_{2n(k)}, \\ &\quad \phi(d(fx_{2n(k)}, fx_{2m(k)}), d(fx_{2m(k)-1}, fx_{2n(k)+1}), \alpha_{2m(k)-1}), \end{aligned}$$

by upper semi-continuity of ϕ ,

$$\varepsilon \leq \phi(\varepsilon, 0, \varepsilon, \varepsilon, 0) \leq \phi(\varepsilon, \varepsilon, \varepsilon, \varepsilon, \varepsilon) < \varepsilon \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

yielding a contradiction. Thus $\{fx_n\}$ is Cauchy. By completeness of X , $\{fx_n\}$ converges to a point $\zeta \in X$. Thus

$$\{gx_{2n}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{hx_{2n+1}\}$$

also converge to ζ .

By the continuity of f ,

$$f(fx_n) \rightarrow f\zeta,$$

$$f(gx_{2n}) \rightarrow f(\zeta) \quad \text{and} \quad f(hx_{2n+1}) \rightarrow f(\zeta).$$

It follows that

$$f(f\zeta) = f(g\zeta) = g(f\zeta) = g(g\zeta) = f(h\zeta) = h(f\zeta) = h(g\zeta) = g(h\zeta) = h(h\zeta).$$

If

$$g\zeta \neq h(g\zeta),$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} d(g\zeta, h(g\zeta)) &\leq \phi(d(f\zeta, f(g\zeta)), d(f\zeta, g\zeta), d(f\zeta, h(g\zeta)), \\ d(f(g\zeta), g\zeta), d(f(g\zeta), h(g\zeta))) &\leq \phi(d(g\zeta, h(g\zeta)), 0, d(g\zeta, h(g\zeta)), \\ d(g\zeta, h(g\zeta)), 0) &< d(g\zeta, h(g\zeta)), \quad \text{a contradiction.} \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$g\zeta = h(g\zeta).$$

Thus $g\zeta$ is a common fixed point of f , g and h .

Let u and v with $u \neq v$ such that u, v are common fixed points of f, g and h . Then by (C).

$$\begin{aligned} d(u, v) &= d(gu, hv) \\ &\leq \phi(d(fu, fv), d(fu, gu), d(fu, hv), \\ d(fv, gu), d(fv, hv)) &\leq \phi(d(u, v), d(u, v), \\ d(u, v), d(u, v), d(u, v)) &< d(u, v), \quad \text{a contradiction.} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the proof is completed.

Remark. Theorem 2 extends an earlier result of [2]. Theorem 2 also extends an important fixed point theorem of Boyd and Wong [1]. In fact, our argument is motivated by Boyd and Wong's paper.

References

- [1] BOYD, D. W. and WONG, J. S. W.; On nonlinear contractions, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **20** (1969), 458–464.
- [2] CHANG, C. C.; Common fixed points of maps, *Chung Yuan Journal*, **5** (1976), 43–45.
- [3] JUNGCK, G.; Commuting mappings and fixed points, *Amer. Math. Monthly*, **83** (1976), 261–263.
- [4] MATKOWSKI, J.; Fixed point theorems for mappings with contractive iterate at a point, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **62** (1977), 344–348.

Department of Mechanical Engineering
National Central University
Chung Li
Taiwan, R.O.C.