

# FIXED POINT THEOREM FOR COUNTABLE FAMILY OF MAPS THAT SATISFY A GENERAL CONTRACTIVE CONDITION DEPENDENT ON ANOTHER FUNCTION

Kieu Phuong Chi and Le Anh Tu

*Department of Mathematics, Vinh University,  
Vinh City, Vietnam  
chidhv@gmail.com*

## Abstract

In this paper, we prove the fixed theorem for a countable family of maps that satisfy a general contractive condition dependent on another function.

## 1 Introduction

Let  $(X, d)$  be a complete metric space and let  $\mathcal{F} = \{T_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathcal{I}\}$  be a family of maps which map  $X$  into itself. A point  $u \in X$  is a common fixed point of  $\mathcal{F}$  iff  $u = T_\alpha(u)$  for each  $T_\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$ . In [3], Ćirić proved the following result.

**Theorem 1.1.** (Ćirić) *Let  $(X, d)$  be a complete metric space and let  $\{S_n : n = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  be a sequence of maps which map  $X$  into itself. If for some  $q \in (0, 1)$*

$$d(S_0x, S_ny) \leq q \max \left\{ d(x, y), d(x, S_0x), d(y, S_ny), \frac{1}{2}(d(x, S_ny) + d(y, S_0x)) \right\}$$

*holds for each  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  and all  $x, y \in X$ , then  $\{S_n : n = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  has a unique fixed point.*

---

**Key words:** Fixed point, contraction mapping, T-contraction mapping.  
2000 AMS Mathematics Subject Classification: 46J10, 46J15, 47H10.

Applying above theorem for  $\mathcal{F}$  is a singleton, we can get the following corollary.

**Corollary 1.2.** ([2]) Let  $S$  be a  $X$  complete space and let  $S : X \rightarrow X$  be a map. If for some  $q \in (0, 1)$

$$d(Sx, Sy) \leq q \max\{d(x, y), d(x, Sx), d(y, Sy), \frac{1}{2}(d(x, Sy) + d(Sx, y))\} \quad (1)$$

holds for every  $x, y \in X$ , then  $S$  has a unique fixed point.

Recently, A. Beiranvand, S. Moradi,... (see[1]) have provided the result on the existence of fixed points for new contractive mappings. We recall some concepts.

**Definition 1.3.** ([1]) Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric and  $T, S : X \rightarrow X$  be two functions. A mapping  $S$  is called to be a  $T$ -contraction if there exists  $q \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$d(TSx, TSy) \leq qd(Tx, Ty), \quad \forall x, y \in X.$$

Clearly, if we choose  $Tx = x$  for all  $x \in X$  then  $T$ -contraction mapping becomes to a contraction. Note that, one can give an example which states that the map  $S$  is a  $T$ -contraction but  $T$  is not a contraction (see[1]). We recall the concept of generalized contraction maps.

**Definition 1.4.** ([2],[3]) Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric and  $S : X \rightarrow X$  be a function. A mapping  $S$  is said to be a *generalized contraction* if there exists  $q \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$d(Sx, Sy) \leq q \max\{d(x, y), d(x, Sx), d(y, Sy), \frac{1}{2}(d(x, Sy) + d(Sx, y))\}, \quad \forall x, y \in X.$$

In [2], authors give an example that states that the map  $S$  is a generalized contraction, but  $S$  is not a contraction. By the ideas of combining the Definition 1.3 and Definition 1.4, we have the following concept.

**Definition 1.5.** Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric and  $T, S : X \rightarrow X$  be two functions. A mapping  $S$  is called a  $T$ -generalized contraction if there exists  $q \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$d(TSx, TSy) \leq q \max\left\{d(Tx, Ty), d(Tx, TSx), d(Ty, TSy), \frac{1}{2}(d(Tx, TSy) + d(TSx, Ty))\right\}, \quad \forall x, y \in X. \quad (2)$$

**Definition 1.6.** ([1]) Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric. A mapping  $T : X \rightarrow X$  is called *sequentially convergent* if for every sequence  $\{y_n\}$ , if  $\{Ty_n\}$  is convergent, then  $\{y_n\}$  is also convergent.

## 2 The main results

The aim of this work is to prove the following result.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $(X, d)$  be a complete metric space and  $T : X \rightarrow X$  be an one-to-one, continuous and sequentially convergent mapping. If for some  $q \in (0, 1)$*

$$d(TS_0x, TS_ny) \leq q \max \left\{ d(Tx, Ty), d(Tx, TS_0x), d(Ty, TS_ny), \right. \\ \left. \frac{1}{2}(d(Tx, TS_ny) + d(Ty, TS_0x)) \right\} \quad (3)$$

*holds for each  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  and all  $x, y \in X$ , then  $\{S_n : n = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  has a unique fixed point.*

**Remark 2.2.** By the above theorem and taking  $Tx = x, \forall x \in X$ , we obtain Theorem 1.1.

Next, applying Theorem 2.1 for the family  $\mathcal{F} = \{S_n : n = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  with  $S_n = S$  for all  $n$ , we can get the following result.

**Corollary 2.3.** *Let  $X$  a complete metric space and  $T : X \rightarrow X$  be an one-to-one, continuous and sequentially convergent mapping. Then every  $T$ -generalized contraction continuous function  $S : X \rightarrow X$ ,  $S$  has a unique fixed point.*

The following example is due to [4]. It shows that the Corollary 2.3 is stronger than Corollary 1.2.

**Example 2.4.** Let  $X = [1, +\infty)$  be a subset of reals with the usual metric. Define  $S : X \rightarrow X$  by

$$Sx = 4\sqrt{x}, \forall x \in X.$$

It is easy to see that  $a = 16$  is unique of  $S$ . If (1) holds for some  $q \in (0, 1)$  then

$$d(Sx, Sy) < \max \left\{ d(x, y), d(x, Sx), d(y, Sy), \frac{1}{2}(d(x, Sy) + d(y, Sx)) \right\},$$

for every  $x, y \in X$ . But by taking  $x = 1, y = 4$  we have

$$d(Sx, Sy) = \max \left\{ d(x, y), d(x, Sx), d(y, Sy), \frac{1}{2}(d(x, Sy) + d(y, Sx)) \right\} = 4.$$

We get a contradiction. So, we cannot apply Corollary 2.1 for the map  $S$ . However,  $S$  will satisfy Corollary 2.3 if we choose  $T(x) = \ln(ex)$ . Indeed, obviously  $T$  is one-to-one, continuous and sequentially convergent and

$$\begin{aligned} d(TSx, TSy) &= |\ln(e4\sqrt{x}) - \ln(e4\sqrt{y})| = \frac{1}{2} \left| \ln \frac{x}{y} \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{2} |\ln(ex) - \ln(ey)| = \frac{1}{2} d(Tx, Ty) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \max \left\{ d(Tx, Ty), d(Tx, TSx), d(Ty, TSy), \frac{1}{2}(d(Tx, TSy) + d(TSx, Ty)) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

for every  $x, y \in X$ .

We need following lemma for the proof of Theorem 2.1. It is a generalization of the result of [3].

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $(X, d)$  is a metric space,  $T : X \rightarrow X$ , which is one-to-one and  $S_0, S : X \rightarrow X$  be two maps on  $X$ . If*

$$d(TS_0x, TSy) \leq q \max \left\{ d(Tx, Ty), d(Tx, TS_0x), d(Ty, TSy), d(Tx, TSy), d(Ty, TS_0x) \right\} \quad (4)$$

holds for some  $q$ ,  $0 < q < 1$  and every  $x, y \in X$  and  $\{x \in X : S_0(x) = x\}$  is a non empty set, then  $\{x \in X : S_0(x) = x\}$  is a singleton and

$$\{x \in X : S_0(x) = x\} = \{x \in X : S(x) = x\}.$$

**Proof** Let  $a \in \{x \in X : S_0x = x\}$  be any fixed point. Then, by (4)

$$\begin{aligned} d(Ta, TSa) &= d(TS_0a, TSa) \leq q \max \left\{ d(Ta, Ta), d(Ta, TS_0a), d(Ta, TSa), \right. \\ &\quad \left. d(Ta, TSa), d(Ta, TS_0a) \right\} \\ &\leq q \max \{d(Ta, TSa), 0\} = qd(Ta, TSa). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $q \in (0, 1)$ , we have  $d(Ta, TSa) = 0$ . It implies that  $Ta = TSa$ . By the fact that  $T$  is one-to-one, we get that  $Sa = a$ . Hence  $a \in \{x \in X : Sx = x\}$ . Next, let  $a' \in \{x \in X : S_0x = x\}$  be arbitrary. Then  $a' \in \{x \in X : Sx = x\}$  and by (4),

$$\begin{aligned} d(Ta, Ta') &= d(TS_0a, TSa') \leq q \max \{d(Ta, Ta'), d(Ta, TS_0a), d(Ta', TSa'), \\ &\quad d(Ta, TSa'), d(Ta', TS_0a')\} \\ &= q \max \{0, d(Ta, Ta')\} = qd(Ta, Ta'). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that  $d(Ta, Ta') = 0$ . Since  $T$  is one-to-one, we have  $a = a'$ . Therefore

$$\{x \in X : S_0(x) = x\} = \{a\} = \{x \in X : S(x) = x\}.$$

□

**Proof of Theorem 2.1** Fix  $x_0 \in X$ . Consider the sequence  $\{x_n\}$  define by  $x_0, x_1 = S_0x_0, x_2 = S_1x_1, x_3 = S_0x_2, x_4 = S_2x_3, \dots, x_{2n-1} = S_0x_{2n-2}, x_{2n} = S_nx_{2n-1}, \dots$ . For each  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , we set  $y_n = Tx_n$ . We claim that  $\{y_n\}$  is

a Cauchy sequence. Indeed, for each  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
d(y_{2n}, y_{2n-1}) &= d(Tx_{2n}, Tx_{2n-1}) = d(TS_0x_{2n-2}, TS_nx_{2n-1}) \\
&\leq q \max \left\{ d(Tx_{2n-2}, Tx_{2n-1}), d(Tx_{2n-2}, TS_0x_{2n-2}), d(Tx_{2n-1}, TS_nx_{2n-1}), \right. \\
&\quad \left. \frac{1}{2}(d(Tx_{2n-2}, TS_nx_{2n-1}) + d(Tx_{2n-1}, TS_0x_{2n-2})) \right\} \\
&= q \max \left\{ d(y_{2n-2}, y_{2n-1}), d(y_{2n-2}, y_{2n-1}), d(y_{2n-1}, y_{2n}), \right. \\
&\quad \left. \frac{1}{2}(d(y_{2n-2}, y_{2n}) + d(y_{2n-1}, y_{2n-1})) \right\} \\
&= q \max \left\{ d(y_{2n-2}, y_{2n-1}), d(y_{2n-1}, y_{2n}), \frac{1}{2}d(y_{2n-2}, y_{2n}) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $q \in (0, 1)$ , we infer that

$$d(y_{2n}, y_{2n-1}) \leq q \max \left\{ d(y_{2n-2}, y_{2n-1}), \frac{1}{2}d(y_{2n-2}, y_{2n}) \right\}.$$

We now show that

$$d(y_{2n}, y_{2n-1}) \leq qd(y_{2n-2}, y_{2n-1}).$$

Suppose that  $\frac{1}{2}d(y_{2n-2}, y_{2n}) > d(y_{2n-2}, y_{2n-1})$ . Then

$$2d(y_{2n-2}, y_{2n-1}) < d(y_{2n-2}, y_{2n}) \leq d(y_{2n-2}, y_{2n-1}) + d(y_{2n-1}, y_{2n}).$$

Hence  $d(y_{2n-2}, y_{2n-1}) < d(y_{2n-1}, y_{2n})$ . We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
d(y_{2n}, y_{2n-1}) &\leq q \max \left\{ d(y_{2n-2}, y_{2n-1}), \frac{1}{2}d(y_{2n-2}, y_{2n}) \right\} \\
&\leq q \max \left\{ d(y_{2n-2}, y_{2n-1}), \frac{1}{2}(d(y_{2n-2}, y_{2n-1}) + d(y_{2n-1}, y_{2n})) \right\} \\
&< q \max \left\{ d(y_{2n-1}, y_{2n}), \frac{1}{2}(d(y_{2n-1}, y_{2n}) + d(y_{2n-1}, y_{2n})) \right\} \\
&= qd(y_{2n-1}, y_{2n}).
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $q \in (0, 1)$ , we get a contradiction. Thus  $\frac{1}{2}d(y_{2n-2}, y_{2n}) \leq d(y_{2n-2}, y_{2n-1})$ .

It follows that

$$d(y_{2n}, y_{2n-1}) \leq q \max \left\{ d(y_{2n-2}, y_{2n-1}), \frac{1}{2}d(y_{2n-2}, y_{2n}) \right\} = qd(y_{2n-2}, y_{2n-1}).$$

By the same way, we get that

$$d(y_{2n-2}, y_{2n-1}) \leq qd(y_{2n-3}, y_{2n-2}), \forall n = 1, 2, \dots$$

It implies that

$$d(y_{2n+1}, y_{2n}) \leq qd(y_{2n-2}, y_{2n-1}) \leq q^2d(y_{2n-3}, y_{2n-2}) \leq \dots \leq q^{2n-1}d(y_0, y_1).$$

By an elementary computation, we can take

$$d(y_k, y_{k+p}) \leq d(y_k, y_{k+1}) + \dots + d(y_{k+p-1}, y_{k+p}) \leq q^k \frac{d(y_0, y_1)}{1-q}, \quad \forall p \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Therefore,  $\{y_n\}$  is a Cauchy sequence. The claim is proved.

Since  $X$  is complete, we have  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n = Tx_n = u \in X$ . By the fact that  $T$  is a continuous and sequentially convergent mapping, we infer

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = a \in X \quad \text{and} \quad Ta = u.$$

We need to show that  $S_n a = a$  for all  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ . By the triangle inequality and (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(Ta, TS_0a) &\leq d(Ta, y_{2n}) + d(y_{2n}, TS_0a) = d(u, y_{2n}) + d(Tx_{2n}, TS_0a) \\ &= d(u, y_{2n}) + d(TS_n x_{2n-1}, TS_0a) \\ &\leq d(u, y_{2n}) + q \max \left\{ d(Tx_{2n-1}, Ta), d(Ta, TS_0a), d(Tx_{2n-1}, TS_n x_{2n-1}), \right. \\ &\quad \left. \frac{1}{2}(d(Ta, TS_n x_{2n-1}) + d(Tx_{2n-1}, TS_0a)) \right\} \\ &= d(u, y_{2n}) + q \max \left\{ d(y_{2n-1}, u), d(Ta, TS_0a), d(y_{2n-1}, y_{2n}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \frac{1}{2}(d(u, y_{2n}) + d(y_{2n-1}, TS_0a)) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\frac{1}{2}d(y_{2n-1}, TS_0a) \leq d(y_{2n-1}, TS_0a) \leq d(y_{2n-1}, Ta) + d(Ta, TS_0a),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(Ta, TS_0a) &= d(u, y_{2n}) + q \max \left\{ d(y_{2n-1}, u), d(Ta, TS_0a), d(y_{2n-1}, y_{2n}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \frac{1}{2}(d(u, y_{2n}) + d(y_{2n-1}, TS_0a)) \right\} \\ &\leq d(u, y_{2n}) + q(d(y_{2n-1}, u) + d(Ta, TS_0a) + d(y_{2n-1}, y_{2n}) + d(u, y_{2n})). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$d(Ta, TS_0a) \leq \frac{1}{1-q} \left( (1+q)d(u, y_{2n}) + qd(y_{2n-1}, u) + qd(y_{2n-1}, y_{2n}) \right), \quad \forall n.$$

Combining this and the fact that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n = u$ , we get  $d(Ta, TS_0a) = 0$ . Since  $T$  is one-in-one, we must have  $S_0a = a$ . By (3), it follows that  $d(TS_0x, TS_ny) \leq$

$q \max \left\{ d(Tx, Ty), d(Tx, TS_0x), d(Ty, TS_ny), d(Tx, TS_ny), d(Ty, TS_0x) \right\}$ . Applying Lemma 2.5, we can conclude that  $S_n a = a$  for all  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  and  $a$  is unique fixed point of  $\{S_n : n = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ , and our proof is now completed.  $\square$

**Acknowledgments.** The authors are greatly indebted to Professor Tran Van An for many valuable discussions.

## References

- [1] A. Beiranvand, S. Moradi, M. Omid and H. Pazandeh, *Two Fixed-Point Theorems for Special Mappings*, arXiv:0903.1504.
- [2] L.B. Ćirić, *Generalized contraction and fixed point theorems*, Publ. Inst. Math., **12**(36), (1971), 19-26.
- [3] L.B. Ćirić, *On a family of contractive maps and fixed point*, Publ. Inst. Math., **17**(31), (1974), 45-51.
- [4] S. Moradi, *Fixed-point theorems for mappings satisfying a general contractive condition of integral type depended an another function*, arXiv:0903.1574.