

MULTIVALUED GENERALIZATIONS OF THE KANNAN FIXED POINT THEOREM

Boško Damjanović and Dragan Đorić

Abstract

In this paper we obtain multi-valued mapping generalizations of two recent theorems of Kikkawa and Suzuki [M. Kikkawa and T. Suzuki, Some similarity between contractions and Kannan mappings, *Fixed Point Theory Appl.*, (2008), Article ID 649749, 1–8] and the main theorem of Enjouji et al. [Y. Enjouji, M. Nakanishi and T. Suzuki, A Generalization of Kannan's Fixed Point Theorem, *Fixed Point Theory and Applications*, Volume 2009, Article ID 192872, 10 pages].

1 Introduction and preliminaries

Let (X, d) be a metric space and let T be a self-mapping on X . Then T is called a Kannan mapping if there exists $a \in [0, 1/2)$ such that

$$d(Tx, Ty) \leq ad(x, Tx) + ad(y, Ty) \quad (1)$$

for all $x, y \in X$. If T is a such that

$$d(Tx, Ty) \leq r \max \{d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty)\}$$

for some $r \in [0, 1)$ and all $x, y \in X$, then T is called a generalized Kannan mapping. If X is complete, then every (generalized) Kannan mapping have a unique fixed point [6]. Subrahmanyam [12] proved that Kannan theorem characterizes the metric completeness of underlying spaces. It is known that the Banach theorem [1] cannot characterize the metric completeness [2].

In [7] authors generalized Kannan mappings.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classifications.* 47H10.

Key words and Phrases. Complete metric space, Kannan fixed point, multivalued mapping.

Received: August 30, 2010

Communicated by Vladimir Rakočević

The authors thank to the Ministry of Science and Technological Development of Republic Serbia

Theorem 1.1. (Kikkawa and Suzuki [7]) Let T be a mapping on complete metric space (X, d) and let φ be a non-increasing function from $[0, 1)$ onto $(1/2, 1]$ defined by

$$\varphi(r) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } 0 \leq r \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \\ \frac{1}{1+r} & \text{if } \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \leq r < 1. \end{cases}$$

Let $\alpha \in [0, 1/2)$ and put $r = \alpha/(1 - \alpha) \in [0, 1)$. Suppose that

$$\varphi(r)d(x, Tx) \leq d(x, y) \text{ implies } d(Tx, Ty) \leq \alpha d(x, Tx) + \alpha d(y, Ty) \quad (2)$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Then T has a unique fixed point z and $\lim_n T^n x = z$ holds for every $x \in X$.

Theorem 1.2. (Kikkawa and Suzuki [7]) Let T be a mapping on complete metric space (X, d) and let θ be a non-increasing function from $[0, 1)$ onto $(1/2, 1]$ defined by

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

Suppose that there exists $r \in [0, 1)$ such that

$$\theta(r)d(x, Tx) \leq d(x, y) \text{ implies } d(Tx, Ty) \leq r \max \{d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty)\} \quad (3)$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Then T has a unique fixed point z and $\lim_n T^n x = z$ holds for every $x \in X$.

On the other side, Nadler [10] proved multi-valued extension of the Banach contraction theorem.

Theorem 1.3. (Nadler [10]) Let (X, d) be a complete metric space and let T be a mapping from X into $CB(X)$. Assume that there exists $r \in [0, 1)$ such that

$$H(Tx, Ty) \leq rd(x, y)$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Then there exists $z \in X$ such that $z \in Tz$.

Many fixed point theorems have been proved by various authors as generalizations of the Nadler's theorem (see [9], [4], [11], [3]). The following recent result [8] is a generalization of Nadler [10].

Theorem 1.4. (Kikkawa and Suzuki [8]) Let (X, d) be a complete metric space and let T be a mapping from X into $CB(X)$. Define a strictly decreasing function η from $[0, 1)$ onto $(1/2, 1]$ by

$$\eta(r) = \frac{1}{1+r}$$

and assume that there exists $r \in [0, 1)$ such that

$$\eta(r)d(x, Tx) \leq d(x, y) \text{ implies } H(Tx, Ty) \leq rd(x, y)$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Then there exists $z \in X$ such that $z \in Tz$.

In this paper we obtain multi-valued version of Theorem 1.2 and then as a corollary we obtain multi-valued version of Theorem 1.1.

2 Main results

Let (X, d) be a metric space. We denote by $CB(X)$ the family of all non-empty closed bounded subsets of X . Let $H(\cdot, \cdot)$ be the Hausdorff metric, i.e.,

$$H(A, B) = \max\left\{\sup_{a \in A} d(a, B), \sup_{b \in B} d(A, b)\right\}$$

for $A, B \in CB(X)$, where $d(x, B) = \inf_{y \in B} d(x, y)$.

Now we prove our main result.

Theorem 2.1. Define a non-increasing function φ from $[0, 1)$ into $(0, 1]$ by

$$\varphi(r) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } 0 \leq r < \frac{\sqrt{5}-1}{2}, \\ 1-r, & \text{if } \frac{\sqrt{5}-1}{2} \leq r < 1. \end{cases}$$

Let (X, d) be a complete metric space and let T be a mapping from X into $CB(X)$. Assume that

$$\varphi(r)d(x, Tx) \leq d(x, y) \text{ implies } H(Tx, Ty) \leq r \max\{d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty)\} \quad (4)$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Then there exists $z \in X$ such that $z \in Tz$.

Proof. Let r_1 be a real number such that $0 \leq r < r_1 < 1$. Let $u_1 \in X$ and $u_2 \in Tu_1$ be arbitrary. Since $u_2 \in Tu_1$, then $d(u_2, Tu_2) \leq H(Tu_1, Tu_2)$ and $\varphi = (r)d(u_1, Tu_1) \leq d(u_1, Tu_1) \leq d(u_1, u_2)$. Thus from the assumption (4),

$$d(u_2, Tu_2) \leq H(Tu_1, Tu_2) \leq r \max\{d(u_1, Tu_1), d(u_2, Tu_2)\}.$$

Hence, as $r < 1$, we have $d(u_2, Tu_2) \leq rd(u_1, u_2)$. So, there exists $u_3 \in Tu_2$ such that $d(u_2, u_3) \leq r_1d(u_1, u_2)$. Thus, we can construct a sequence $\{u_n\}$ in X such that

$$u_{n+1} \in Tu_n \text{ and } d(u_{n+1}, u_{n+2}) \leq r_1d(u_n, u_{n+1}).$$

Hence, by induction,

$$d(u_n, u_{n+1}) \leq r_1^{n-1}d(u_1, u_2).$$

Then by the triangle inequality, we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} d(u_n, u_{n+1}) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} r_1^{n-1} d(u_1, u_2) < \infty.$$

Hence we conclude that $\{u_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Since X is complete, there is some point $z \in X$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n = z.$$

Now we shall show that

$$d(z, Tx) \leq rd(x, Tx) \text{ for all } x \in X \setminus \{z\}. \quad (5)$$

Since $u_n \rightarrow z$, there exists $n_0 \in N$ such that $d(z, u_n) \leq (1/3)d(z, x)$ for all $n \geq n_0$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(r) d(u_n, Tu_n) &\leq d(u_n, Tu_n) \\ &\leq d(u_n, u_{n+1}) \\ &\leq d(u_n, z) + d(u_{n+1}, z) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{3}d(x, z). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{3}d(x, z) &= d(x, z) - \frac{1}{3}d(x, z) \\ &\leq d(x, z) - d(u_n, z) \\ &\leq d(u_n, x), \end{aligned}$$

we get $\varphi(r) d(u_n, Tu_n) \leq d(u_n, x)$. Then from (4),

$$H(Tu_n, Tx) \leq r \max\{d(u_n, Tu_n), d(x, Tx)\}.$$

Since $u_{n+1} \in Tu_n$, then $d(u_{n+1}, Tx) \leq H(Tu_n, Tx)$. So, it follows that

$$d(u_{n+1}, Tx) \leq r \max\{d(u_n, u_{n+1}), d(x, Tx)\}$$

for all $n \in N$ with $n \geq n_0$. Letting n tends to ∞ , we obtain $d(z, Tx) \leq rd(x, Tx)$. Thus we proved (5).

Now we show that $z \in Tz$. Suppose, to the contrary, that $z \notin Tz$. Consider at first the case $0 \leq r < \frac{\sqrt{5}-1}{2}$. Let $a \in Tz$. Then $a \neq z$ and so by (5), we have $d(z, Ta) \leq rd(a, Ta)$. On the other hand, since

$$\varphi(r) d(z, Tz) = d(z, Tz) \leq d(z, a),$$

from (4) we have

$$H(Tz, Ta) \leq r \max\{d(z, Tz), d(a, Ta)\}. \quad (6)$$

Hence we have $d(a, Ta) \leq H(Tz, Ta) \leq r \max \{d(z, Tz), d(a, Ta)\}$. Hence we get $d(a, Ta) \leq rd(z, Tz)$. Therefore, by (5) and (6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d(z, Tz) &\leq d(z, Ta) + H(Ta, Tz) \\ &\leq rd(a, Ta) + r \max \{d(z, Tz), d(a, Ta)\} \\ &\leq rd(a, Ta) + rd(z, Tz) \\ &\leq r^2d(z, Tz) + rd(z, Tz) \\ &= (r^2 + r) d(z, Tz). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, as $r < \frac{\sqrt{5}-1}{2}$ implies $r^2 + r < 1$, we have

$$d(z, Tz) < d(z, Tz),$$

a contradiction. So we obtain $z \in Tz$.

Consider now the case $\frac{\sqrt{5}-1}{2} \leq r < 1$. We first prove

$$H(Tx, Tz) \leq r \max \{d(x, Tx), d(z, Tz)\} \quad \text{for all } x \in X. \quad (7)$$

If $x = z$, then (7) obviously holds. So we assume $x \neq z$. Then for every $n \in N$, there exists $y_n \in Tx$ such that $d(z, y_n) \leq d(z, Tx) + (1/n)d(x, z)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, Tx) &\leq d(x, y_n) \\ &\leq d(x, z) + d(z, y_n) \\ &\leq d(x, z) + d(z, Tx) + \frac{1}{n}d(x, z) \\ &\leq d(x, z) + rd(x, Tx) + \frac{1}{n}d(x, z) \end{aligned}$$

for $n \in N$. Hence $(1-r)d(x, Tx) \leq (1+1/n)d(x, z)$ holds. Letting n tend to ∞ , we have $(1-r)d(x, Tx) \leq d(x, z)$. Thus

$$\varphi(r)d(x, Tx) \leq d(x, z).$$

From the assumption (4), we obtain (7). Therefore, as $u_{n+1} \in Tu_n$, from (7) with $x = u_n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(z, Tz) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(u_{n+1}, Tz) \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H(Tu_n, Tz) \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r \max \{d(u_n, Tu_n), d(z, Tz)\} \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r \max \{d(u_n, u_{n+1}), d(z, Tz)\} \\ &= rd(z, Tz). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $(1-r)d(z, Tz) \leq 0$, which implies $d(z, Tz) = 0$. Since Tz is closed, we obtain $z \in Tz$. This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 2.1 is a multi-valued mapping generalization of the theorem 2.3 of Kikkawa and Suzuki [7] and therefore the Kannan fixed point theorem [6] for generalized Kannan mappings.

Corollary 2.1. *Let (X, d) be a complete metric space and let T be a mapping from X into $CB(X)$. Let $\alpha \in [0, 1/2)$ and put $r = 2\alpha$. Suppose that*

$$\varphi(r)d(x, Tx) \leq d(x, y) \text{ implies } H(Tx, Ty) \leq \alpha d(x, Tx) + \alpha d(y, Ty) \quad (8)$$

for all $x, y \in X$, where the function φ is defined as in Theorem 2.1. Then there exists $z \in X$ such that $z \in Tz$.

Corollary 2.1 is a multi-valued mapping generalization of the theorem 2.2 of Kikkawa and Suzuki [7] and therefore the well known Kannan fixed point theorem [6].

Corollary 2.1 also is a multi-valued mapping generalization of the theorem 3.1 of Y. Enjouji et al. [5], since by symmetry the inequality (3.3) in [5] implies the inequality (2) in Theorem 1.1.

References

- [1] S. Banach, *Sur les opérations dans les ensembles abstraits et leur application aux équations intégrales*, Fund. Math., 3 (1922), 133–181.
- [2] E. H. Connell, *Properties of fixed point spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 10 (1959), 974–979.
- [3] Lj. Ćirić, *Multi-valued nonlinear contraction mappings*, Nonlinear Analysis 71 (2009) 2716–2723.
- [4] P.Z. Daffer, H. Kaneko, *Fixed points of generalized contractive multi-valued mappings*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 192 (1995) 655–666.
- [5] Y. Enjouji, M. Nakanishi and T. Suzuki, *A Generalization of Kannan's Fixed Point Theorem*, Fixed Point Theory and Applications, Volume 2009, Article ID 192872, 10 pages.
- [6] R. Kannan, *Some results on fixed points – II*, Amer. Math. Monthly, 76 (1969), 405–408.
- [7] M. Kikkawa and T. Suzuki, *Some similarity between contractions and Kannan mappings*, Fixed Point Theory Appl., (2008), Article ID 649749, 1–8.
- [8] M. Kikkawa and T. Suzuki, *Three fixed point theorems for generalized contractions with constants in complete metric spaces*, Nonlinear Anal. 69 (2008), 2942–2949.
- [9] N. Mizoguchi, W. Takahashi, *Fixed point theorems for multi-valued mappings on complete metric spaces*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 141 (1989) 177–188.

- [10] S. B. Nadler, Jr., *Multi-valued contraction mappings*, Pacific J. Math., 30 (1969), 475–488.
- [11] P.V. Semenov, *Fixed points of multi-valued contractions*, Funct. Anal. Appl. 36 (2) (2002) 159–161.
- [12] P. V. Subrahmanyam, *Completeness and fixed-points*, Monatsh. Math., 80 (1975), 325–330.
- [13] T. Suzuki, *Contractive mappings are Kannan mappings, and Kannan mappings are contractive mappings in some-sense*, Commentationes Mathematicae. Prace Matematyczne, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 45–58, 2005.
- [14] T. Suzuki, *A generalized Banach contraction principle that characterizes metric completeness*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 136 (2008), 1861–1869.

BOŠKO DAMJANOVIĆ

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Belgrade, 11000
Beograd, Nemanjina 6, Serbia
E-mail: dambo@agrif.bg.ac.rs

DRAGAN ĐORIĆ

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Organizational Sciences, University of Bel-
grade, 11000 Beograd, Jove Ilića 154, Serbia
E-mail: djoricd@fon.rs