

Fixed Point Theory for Three φ – Weak Contraction Functions

Fariet N, Abd El Ghaffar H* and Hamdy S

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt

Abstract

In 2009 Qingnian Zhang and Yisheng Song proved fixed point theory for two φ -weak contraction functions. We generalize this result by finding fixed point and coincidence point for three single-valued φ -weak contraction T_1, T_2, T_3 defined on a complete metric space.

Keywords: Complete metric space; Coincidence point; Fixed point; φ -Weak contraction function

Introduction and Preliminaries

Let metric space be E . A map $T: E \rightarrow E$ is a contraction if for each $x, y \in E$

E , with a constant $k \in (0,1)$ so that

$$d(Tx, Ty) \leq kd(x, y).$$

A map $T: E \rightarrow E$ is a φ -weak contraction, there exists a function

$$\varphi: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$$

$$\varphi(0)=0 \text{ and } d(T_x T_y) \leq d(x, y) - \varphi(d(x, y))$$

for each $\varphi(d(x, y))$ for each $x, y \in E$

Alber and Guerre-Delabriere [1] demonstrated the “concept of weak contraction” in 1997. Actually in concept of weak contraction, the authors defined such mappings for single-valued maps on Hilbert spaces and proved the existence of fixed points. Rhoades [2] showed that most results of concept of weak contraction are still true for any Banach space along with that he has proved the following very interesting fixed point theorem which is one of generalizations of the Banach contraction principle because it contains contractions as special cases ($\varphi(t)=(1-k)t$).

Theorem 1.1

Let A be a φ -weak contraction on a complete metric space (E, d) . If $\varphi: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a continuous and no decreasing function with $\varphi(t) > 0$ for all $t \in (0, \infty)$ and $\varphi(0)=0$ then A has a unique fixed point [2].

In fact, the weak contractions are also closely related to maps of Boyd and Wong type ones [3] and Reich type ones [4].

The aim of this work is to prove that there is a unique common fixed point for three single-valued φ -weak T_1, T_2, T_3 defined on a complete metric space E .

Main Results

Theorem 2.1

Let (E, d) be a complete metric space, and $T_1, T_2, T_3: E \rightarrow E$ three mappings such that for all $x, y \in E$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} d(T_1 x, T_2 y) &\leq M_1(x, y) - \varphi(M_1(x, y)), \\ d(T_2 x, T_3 y) &\leq M_2(x, y) - \varphi(M_2(x, y)) \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (2.1)$$

where $\varphi: [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ is a lower semi-continuous function with

$\varphi(t) > 0$ for $t \in (0, +\infty)$, $\varphi(0)=0$, and

$$\left. \begin{aligned} M_1(x, y) &= \max \left\{ d(x, y), d(T_1 x, x) d(T_2 y, y), \frac{1}{2} [d(y, T_1 x) + d(x, T_2 y)] \right\} \\ M_2(x, y) &= \max \left\{ d(x, y), d(T_2 x, x) d(T_1 y, y), \frac{1}{2} [d(y, T_2 x) + d(x, T_3 y)] \right\} \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (2.2)$$

then there exists a unique coincidence point $u \in E$ such that $u = T_1 u = T_2 u = T_3 u$.

Proof

First, we show that $M_1(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $x = y$ is a common fixed point of T_1 and T_2 . Clearly, if $x = y = T_1 x = T_2 x = T_1 y = T_2 y$, then

On the other hand, Let $M_1(x, y) = 0$. Then from

$$d(x, y) = d(T_1 x, x) = d(T_2 y, y) = d(y, T_1 x) = d(y, T_2 y) = 0$$

So, we get

$$x = y = T_1 x = T_2 y = T_2 x = T_1 y.$$

Similarly, $M_2(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $x = y$ is a common fixed point of T_1 and T_2 .

For $x_0 \in E$, Putting $x_1 = T_2 x_0$ and $x_2 = T_1 x_1$, then let $x_3 = T_2 x_2$ and $x_4 = T_1 x_3$. Inductively, choose a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in E so that $x_{2n+2} = T_1 x_{2n+1}$ and $x_{2n+1} = T_2 x_{2n}$ for all $n \geq 0$.

It follows from the property of the φ that if n is odd and for $x_n \neq x_{n-1}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_{n+1}, x_n) &= d(T_1 x_n, T_2 x_{n-1}) \leq M_1(x_n, x_{n-1}) - \varphi(M_1(x_n, x_{n-1})) \leq \\ &\max \left\{ d(x_n, x_{n-1}), d(T_1 x_n, x_n) d(T_2 x_{n-1}, x_{n-1}), \frac{1}{2} [d(x_{n-1}, T_1 x_n) + d(x_{n-1}, T_2 x_{n-1})] \right\} \\ &\max \left\{ d(x_n, x_{n-1}), d(x_{n+1}, x_n) d(x_n, x_{n-1}), \frac{1}{2} [d(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1}) + d(x_n, x_n)] \right\} \\ &\max \left\{ d(x_n, x_{n-1}), d(x_{n+1}, x_n), \frac{1}{2} [d(x_{n-1}, x_n) + d(x_n, x_{n+1})] \right\} \\ &\max \left\{ d(x_n, x_{n-1}), d(x_{n+1}, x_n) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

*Corresponding author: Abd El Ghaffar H, Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt, Tel: +20 2 26831474; E-mail: hanihanifos@yahoo.com

Received January 24, 2017; Accepted February 21, 2017; Published February 27, 2017

Citation: Fariet N, Abd El Ghaffar H, Hamdy S (2017) Fixed Point Theory for Three φ -Weak Contraction Functions. J Appl Computat Math 6: 338. doi: 10.4172/2168-9679.1000338

Copyright: © 2017 Fariet N, et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

We show $d(x_n, x_{n-1}) \geq d(x_{n+1}, x_n)$.

Otherwise if $d(x_n, x_{n-1}) < d(x_{n+1}, x_n)$ then from (2.1), we get, and furthermore

$$M_1(x_n, x_{n-1}) = d(x_{n+1}, x_n) \\ d(x_{n+1}, x_n) = d(T_1 x_n, T_2 x_{n-1}) \leq M_1(x_n, x_{n-1}) - \phi(M_1(x_n, x_{n-1}))$$

then

$$d(x_{n+1}, x_n) \leq d(x_{n+1}, x_n) - \phi(d(x_{n+1}, x_n)),$$

Which gives a contradiction.

Similarly, if n is even, we also obtain that

$$d(x_{n+1}, x_n) \leq M_1(x_n, x_{n-1}) \leq d(x_n, x_{n-1}).$$

Therefore, for all $n \geq 0$, $d(x_{n+1}, x_n) \leq M_1(x_n, x_{n-1}) \leq d(x_n, x_{n-1})$ and

$\{d(x_{n+1}, x_n)\}$ is monotone nonincreasing and bounded from below. So,

$\exists r \geq 0$ such that

$$\phi(r) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi(M_1(x_n, x_{n-1}))$$

Then (by the lower semi-continuity ϕ)

$$\phi(r) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi(M_1(x_n, x_{n-1}))$$

We claim that $r=0$. In fact, taking upper limits as $n \rightarrow \infty$ on either side of the following inequality:

we get

$$d(x_{n+1}, x_n) \leq M_1(x_n, x_{n-1}) - \phi(M_1(x_n, x_{n-1})) \\ r \leq r - \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi(M_1(x_n, x_{n-1})) \leq r - \phi(r)$$

i.e. $\phi(r) \leq 0$. Thus $\phi(r)=0$ by the property of the function ϕ , hence

$$r = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_{n+1}, x_n) = 0 \tag{2.3}$$

Next we show that $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Let

Then $\{c_n\}$ is decreasing. Suppose contrarily that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_n = c > 0$.

Choose $\varepsilon > \frac{c}{8}$ small enough and

$$c_n = \sup\{d(x_i, x_j); i, j \geq n\}.$$

select N such that for all $n \geq N$,

and

$$d(x_{n+1}, x_n) < \varepsilon; \quad cn < c + \varepsilon$$

By the definition of C_{N+1} , there exists $n, m \geq N+1$ such that

$$d(x_m, x_n) > c_n - \varepsilon \geq c - \varepsilon$$

Replace x_m by x_{m+1} if necessary. We may assume that m is even, n is odd, $d(x_m, x_n) > c - 2\varepsilon$. Then, and

$$d(x_m, x_n) = d(T_1 x_{m-1}, T_2 x_{n-1}) \leq M_1(x_{m-1}, x_{n-1}) - \phi(M_1(x_{m-1}, x_{n-1})) \leq \\ \max\left\{d(x_{m-1}, x_{n-1}), d(T_1 x_{m-1}, x_{n-1}), d(T_2 x_{n-1}, x_{m-1}), \frac{1}{2}[d(x_{m-1}, T_1 x_{m-1}) + d(x_{n-1}, T_2 x_{n-1})]\right\} - \phi(M_1(x_{m-1}, x_{n-1})) \\ \max\left\{d(x_{m-1}, x_{n-1}), \varepsilon, \varepsilon, \frac{1}{2}[d(x_{m-1}, x_{m-1}) + d(x_{n-1}, T_2 x_{n-1})]\right\} - \phi\left(\frac{c}{2}\right)$$

We have proved that $C_N - \phi\left(\frac{c}{2}\right) > C_{N+1}$ (if ε is small enough). This is impossible. Thus, we must have $c=0$. That is, the sequence $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. $M_1(x_n, x_{n-1})$

It follows from the completeness of E that there exists $u \in E$ such that

$X_n \rightarrow u$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$

Now we proved that $u = T_1 u = T_2 u$. Indeed, suppose $u \neq T_1 u$; then for $d(u) > 0$, $\exists N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $n > N_1$,

$$d(x_{2n+1}, u) < \frac{1}{2} d(u, T_1 u), \quad d(x_{2n}, u) < \frac{1}{2} d(u, T_1 u),$$

$$d(x_{2n}, x_{2n+1}), \frac{1}{2} d(u, T_1 u)$$

Accordingly,

$$d(u, T_1 u) = d(T_2 x_{2n}, T_1 u) \leq M_1(u, x_{2n}) \\ = \max\left\{d(u, x_{2n}), d(u, T_1 u), d(x_{2n}, x_{2n+1}), \frac{1}{2}[d(u, x_{2n+1}) + d(x_{2n}, T_1 u)]\right\} \\ \leq \max\left\{\frac{1}{2} d(u, T_1 u), d(u, T_1 u), \frac{1}{2} d(u, T_1 u), \frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{1}{2} d(u, T_1 u) + \frac{1}{2} d(u, T_1 u) + d(u, T_1 u)\right]\right\} \\ = d(u, T_1 u).$$

that is, $M_1(u, x_{2n}) = d(u, T_1 u)$.

Since,

$$d(x_{2n+1}, T_1 u) = d(T_2 x_{2n}, T_1 u) \leq M_1(u, x_{2n}) - \phi(M_1(u, x_{2n}))$$

then letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$d(u, T_1 u) \leq d(u, T_1 u) - \phi(d(u, T_1 u))$$

We obtain a contradiction. Hence $u = T_1 u$. As

$$d(u, T_2 u) = d(T_1 u, T_2 u) \leq M_1(u, u) - \phi(M_1(u, u)) \\ \leq d(u, T_2 u) - \phi(d(u, T_2 u)) \\ < d(u, T_2 u)$$

Therefore, $d(u, T_2 u) = 0$, i.e., $u = T_1 u = T_2 u$. If there exists another point $v \in E$ such that $v = T_1 v = T_2 v$, then using an argument similar to the above we get

$$d(u, v) = d(T_1 u, T_2 v) \leq M_1(u, v) - \phi(M_1(u, v)) \\ \leq d(u, v) - \phi(d(u, v))$$

Hence $u=v$.

By the same way over $M_2(x, y)$ there exists a unique point $w \in E$ such that $w = T_2 w = T_2 w$

We will show that $u=w$.

$$d(u, T_1 u, T_2 w) \leq M_1(u, w) - \phi(M_1(u, w)) \\ < \max\left\{d(u, w), 0, 0, \frac{1}{2}[d(w, T_1 u) + d(u, T_2 w)]\right\} \\ = d(u, w)$$

Then $u=w$ so $u = T_1 u = T_2 u = T_3 u$.

The proof is completed.

References

1. Ya IA, Guerre-Delabriere S (1997) Principles of weakly contractive maps in Hilbert spaces, In: Gohberg I, Yu L (Edn), New Results in Operator Theory. Advances and applications 98: 7-22.
2. Rhoades BE (2001) Some theorems on weakly contractive maps. Nonlinear Anal 47: 2683-2693.
3. Boyd DW, Wong TSW (1969) On nonlinear contractions. Proc Amer Math Soc 20: 458-464.
4. Reich S (1974) Some fixed-point problems. Atti Accad Naz Lincei 57: 194-198.