

## ON KANNAN FIXED POINT PRINCIPLE IN GENERALIZED METRIC SPACES

DOREL MIHET<sup>1</sup>

ABSTRACT. The concept of a generalized metric space, where the triangle inequality has been replaced by a more general one involving four points, has been recently introduced by Branciari. Subsequently, some classical metric fixed point theorems have been transferred to such a space. The aim of this note is to show that Kannan's fixed point theorem in a generalized metric space is a consequence of the Banach contraction principle in a metric space.

### 1. INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARIES

The following notion of generalized metric space has been introduced by Branciari in [3]:

**Definition 1.1.** ([3]) Let  $X$  be a set and  $d : X^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a mapping. The pair  $(X, d)$  is called a *generalized metric space* (in the sense of Branciari) if, for all  $x, y \in X$  and for all distinct points  $z, w \in X$ , each of them different from  $x$  and  $y$ , one has

- (i)  $d(x, y) = 0$  if and only if  $x = y$ ,
- (ii)  $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$ ,
- (iii)  $d(x, y) \leq d(z, z) + d(z, w) + d(w, y)$ .

Any metric space is a generalized metric space, but the converse is not true ([3]). A generalized metric space is a topological space with neighborhood basis given by

$$\mathcal{B} = \{B(x, r), x \in X, r > 0\}$$

where  $B(x, r) = \{y \in X, d(x, y) < r\}$ .

---

*Date:* Received: 2 November 2008; Revised: 18 March 2009.

\* Corresponding author.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47H10; 54H25.

*Key words and phrases.* Generalized metric space; T-orbitally complete; Fixed point.

Let  $(X, d)$  be a generalized metric space. A sequence  $\{x_n\}$  in  $X$  is said to be *Cauchy* if for any  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $n_\epsilon \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq n_\epsilon$  one has  $d(x_n, x_{n+m}) < \epsilon$ . The space  $(X, d)$  is called *complete* if every Cauchy sequence in  $X$  is convergent in  $X$ . Let  $T : X \rightarrow X$  be a mapping. The space  $(X, d)$  is said to be *T-orbitally complete* if every Cauchy sequence which is contained in  $O(x, \infty) := \{T^n x, n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}\}$  for some  $x \in X$ , converges in  $X$ .

Starting with the paper of Branciari [3], some classical metric fixed point theorems have been transferred to generalized metric spaces, see e.g., [2], [1], [6], [5], [7]. Following an idea in [9], in this short note we show that Kannan's fixed point theorem [8] in such a space is a consequence of the following Banach contraction principle in a metric space:

**Theorem 1.2.** ([4]) *Let  $(X, \rho)$  be a metric space and  $T : X \rightarrow X$  be a mapping such that*

$$\rho(Tx, Ty) \leq q\rho(x, y) \forall x, y \in X$$

where  $0 \leq q < 1$ . *If  $X$  is T-orbitally complete then  $T$  has a unique fixed point in  $X$ .*

## 2. MAIN RESULTS

We begin by recalling the fixed point theorem of Kannan in a generalized metric space, as stated in [5].

**Theorem 2.1.** (*Kannan fixed point principle in a generalized metric space*) *Let  $(X, d)$  be a generalized metric space and  $T : X \rightarrow X$  be a mapping such that*

$$(K) \quad d(Tx, Ty) \leq \beta[d(x, Tx) + d(y, Ty)] \quad (x, y \in X)$$

where  $0 < \beta < \frac{1}{2}$ . *If  $X$  is T-orbitally complete then  $T$  has a unique fixed point in  $X$ .*

We note that the fact that  $T$  has at most one fixed point easily follows from (K). In the following we show that the existence of a fixed point for a Kannan contraction in a orbitally complete generalized metric space is actually a consequence of Theorem 1.4.

In our proof we use the following lemma, which can immediately be proved by induction on  $n$ , without involving the triangle inequality:

**Lemma 2.2.** *If  $(X, d)$  is a generalized metric space and  $T : X \rightarrow X$  is a mapping such that, for some  $0 < \beta < \frac{1}{2}$ ,*

$$d(Tx, Ty) \leq \beta[d(x, Tx) + d(y, Ty)] \quad \forall x, y \in X$$

then

$$d(T^n x, T^{n+1} x) \leq \left(\frac{\beta}{1-\beta}\right)^n d(x, Tx) \quad (n \in \mathbb{N})$$

for every  $x \in X$ .

*Proof.* From

$$d(Tx, T^2x) \leq \beta[d(x, Tx) + d(Tx, T^2x)]$$

it follows that

$$d(Tx, T^2x) \leq \frac{\beta}{1-\beta}d(Tx, T^2x).$$

Next, from (K),  $d(T^{n+1}x, T^{n+2}x) \leq \beta d(T^n x, T^{n+1}x) + \beta(T^{n+1}x, T^{n+2}x)$  so, from

$$(T^n x, T^{n+1}x) \leq \left(\frac{\beta}{1-\beta}\right)^n d(x, Tx)$$

we obtain

$$d(T^{n+1}x, T^{n+2}x) \leq \frac{\beta}{1-\beta}d(T^n x, T^{n+1}x) \leq \left(\frac{\beta}{1-\beta}\right)^{n+1}d(x, Tx).$$

□

Let us now suppose, with the aim to reach to a contradiction, that  $T$  has no fixed point.

We note that if  $m, n, m \neq n$  are two positive integer numbers, then  $T^m x \neq T^n x \forall x \in X$ , for if  $T^m x = T^n x$  for some  $x \in X$  then  $y = T^n x$  is a fixed point for  $T$ . Indeed, from  $T^m x = T^n x$  it follows  $T^{m-n}(T^n x) = T^n x$ , i.e.  $T^k y = y$ , where  $k = m - n \geq 1$  and therefore

$$d(y, Ty) = d(T^k y, T^{k+1}y) \leq \left(\frac{\beta}{1-\beta}\right)^k d(y, Ty).$$

Since  $0 < \frac{\beta}{1-\beta} < 1$ , we obtain that  $d(y, Ty) = 0$ , that is,  $y = Ty$ .

Define

$$\rho(x, y) = \begin{cases} d(x, Tx) + d(y, Ty), & x \neq y; \\ 0, & x = y. \end{cases}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(x, y) &= d(x, Tx) + d(y, Ty) \\ &\leq d(x, Tx) + 2d(z, Tz) + d(y, Ty) = \rho(x, z) + \rho(z, y), \end{aligned}$$

for all  $x, y \in X, x \neq y$ ,  $\rho$  is a metric on  $X$ .

Also,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(Tx, Ty) &= d(Tx, T^2x) + d(Ty, T^2y) \\ &\leq \beta[d(x, Tx) + d(Tx, T^2x)] + \beta[d(y, Ty) + d(Ty, T^2y)] \\ &= \beta[d(Tx, T^2x) + d(Ty, T^2y)] = \beta\rho(x, y) + \beta\rho(Tx, Ty), \end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$\rho(Tx, Ty) \leq q\rho(x, y) \quad \forall x, y \in X,$$

where  $q = \frac{\beta}{1-\beta} \in (0, 1)$ .

We show that

$$d(T^n x, T^m x) \leq 2\rho(T^n x, T^m x) \quad (m \geq n).$$

This inequality is obvious if  $m = n$ . It is also immediate if  $m = n + 1$ , because

$$d(T^n x, T^{n+1}x) \leq d(T^n x, T^{n+1}x) + d(T^{n+1}x, T^{n+2}x) = \rho(T^n x, T^{n+1}x).$$

If  $m > n + 1$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} d(T^n x, T^m x) &\leq d(T^n x, T^{n+1}x) + d(T^{n+1}x, T^{m+1}x) + d(T^m x, T^{m+1}x) \\ &= [d(T^n x, T^{n+1}x) + d(T^m x, T^{m+1}x)] + d(T^{n+1}x, T^{m+1}x) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq (1 + \beta)\rho(T^n x, T^m x) \leq 2\rho(T^n x, T^m x)$$

(note that if  $m > n + 1$ , then  $T^m x, T^{m+1} x, T^n x, T^{n+1} x$  are four distinct points in  $X$ ).

Next, we prove that  $(X, \rho)$  is  $T$ -orbitally complete. We know that there is  $x \in X$  such that for every  $d$ -Cauchy sequence  $\{x_n\}$  contained in  $O(x, \infty)$  there exists  $u \in X$  such that  $d(x_n, u) \rightarrow 0$ . Let  $\{x_n\}$  be a  $\rho$ -Cauchy sequence contained in  $O(x, \infty)$ . From the just proven inequality it follows that  $\{x_n\}$  is also  $d$ -Cauchy, so  $d(u, x_n) \rightarrow 0$  for some  $u \in X$ . We may assume that  $x_n \neq u$  for some  $n$ , for otherwise  $\rho(x_n)$  converges to  $u$  and we have nothing to prove. Then  $u, x_n, Tu, Tx_n$  are four distinct points of  $X$ . For otherwise,  $T^k x = Tu$  or  $T^k x = Tx_n$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , which would imply  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T^n u = u$ , and so, by letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in  $d(T^{n+1} u, Tu) \leq \beta[d(T^n u, T^{n+1} u) + d(u, Tu)]$  ( $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ), we would obtain

$$d(u, Tu) \leq \beta d(u, Tu).$$

Since  $\beta < 1$ ,  $d(u, Tu)$  must be 0, that is,  $u = Tu$ , contradicting the fact that  $T$  is a fixed point free mapping.

Now, since  $x_n \neq x_{n'}$  for some  $n' > n$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(u, x_n) &= d(u, Tu) + d(x_n, Tx_n) \\ &\leq [d(u, x_n) + d(x_n, Tx_n) + d(Tx_n, Tu)] + d(x_n, Tx_n) \\ &\leq d(u, x_n) + 2d(x_n, Tx_n) + 2d(x_{n'}, Tx_{n'}) + \beta\rho(x_n, u) \\ &= d(u, x_n) + 2\rho(x_n, x_{n'}) + \beta\rho(x_n, u). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$(1 - \beta)\rho(u, x_n) \leq d(u, x_n) + 2\rho(x_n, x_{n'}),$$

that is,  $\rho(u, x_n) \rightarrow 0$ .

Thus,  $(X, \rho)$  is  $T$ -orbitally complete. From Theorem 1.4 it follows that  $T$  has a fixed point, contradicting our assumption. This completes the proof.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Akram, A. Siddiqui, A fixed point theorem for A-contractions on a class of generalized metric spaces, Korean J. Math. Sciences 10 (2) (2003), 1-5. 1
- [2] A. Azam, M. Arshad, Kannan fixed point theorem on generalized metric spaces, J. Non-linear Sci. Appl. 1 (1) (2008), 45-48. 1
- [3] A. Branciari, A fixed point theorem of Banach-Caccioppoli type on a class of generalized metric spaces, Publ. Math. Debrecen, 57 (1-2) (2000), 31-37. 1, 1.1, 1
- [4] Lb. Ćirić, A generalization of Banach's contraction principle, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 45(2) (1974), 267-273. 1.2
- [5] P. Das, A fixed point theorem on a class of generalized metric spaces, Korean J. Math. Sc., 9 (1) (2002), 29-33. 1, 2
- [6] P. Das, L.K. Dey, A fixed point theorem in a eneralized metric space, Soochow Journal of Mathematics 33 (1) (2007), 33-39. 1
- [7] B.K. Lahiri, P. Das, Fixed point of a Ljubomir Ćirić's quasi-contraction mapping in a generalized metric space, Publ. Math. Debrecen, 61 (3-4) (2002), 589-594. 1

- [8] R. Kannan, Some results on fixed points, Bull. Cal. Math. Soc., 60 (1968),71–76. 1
- [9] D.N. Sarknel, Banach's fixed point theorem implies Kannan's, Bull. Cal. Math. Soc., 91 (2) (1999), 143-144. 1

<sup>1</sup> WEST UNIVERSITY OF TIMIȘOARA, BV. V. PARVAN 4, 300223, TIMIȘOARA, ROMANIA.  
*E-mail address:* [mihet@math.uvt.ro](mailto:mihet@math.uvt.ro)