

FIXED POINT THEOREM FOR MULTIVALUED MAPPINGS UNDER THE CARISTI - KIRK TYPE CONDITION

By

Raghvendra Singh Chandel

Department of Mathematics, G. S. Institute of Technology and Science,
Indore - 45203, M. P., India

(Received : January 5, 1987 ; Revised : February 8, 1988)

ABSTRACT

In this paper we prove a fixed point theorem for a pair of multi-valued mappings under the Caristi-Kirk type condition. We also give the condition for the existence of such a fixed point.

1. INTRODUCTION

S. B. Nadler [2] proved a fixed point theorem for multivalued contraction mappings. We use the following notations and definitions as given by him in [2] for our work.

Definitions 1. Let (X, d) be a metric space, then

(i) $CB(X) = \{C : C \text{ is a nonempty closed and bounded subset of } X\}$

(ii) $N(\epsilon, A) = \{x \in X \mid d(x, y) < \epsilon \text{ for some } y \in A\}$,

$\epsilon > 0$ and $A \in CB(X)$.

(iii) $H(A, B) = \inf \{A \subset N(\epsilon, B) \text{ and } B \subset N(\epsilon, A)\}$,

$\epsilon > 0$ and $A, B \in CB(X)$.

The function H is a metric for $CB(X)$ called the Hausdorff metric for $CB(X)$.

Let (X, d_1) and (Y, d_2) be two metric spaces. A function $F: X \rightarrow CB(Y)$ is said to be a multivalued contraction mapping of X into Y if

$$H(F(x), F(y)) \leq a d_1(x, y) \quad \forall x, y \in X,$$

$$0 \leq a < 1$$

A point x is said to be a fixed point of a multivalued mapping F if $x \in F(x)$.

We shall also make use of the following lemmas, which are noted implicitly in Nadler [2]

Lemma 1. *If $A, B \in CB(X)$ and $\bar{x} \in A$, then, for each positive number η , there exists a $y \in B$ such that*

$$d(\bar{x}, y) \leq H(A, B) + \eta.$$

Lemma 2. *Let $\{A_n\}$ be a sequence of sets in $CB(X)$, and suppose $\lim H(A_n, A_0) = 0$, where $A_0 \in CB(X)$. Then, if $x_n \in A_n$, $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, and $\lim x_n = x_0$, it follows that $x_0 \in A_0$*

Recently, Caristi ([1], Theorem 2.1) presented a generalization of the contraction mapping principle which is now known as Caristi-Kirk fixed point theorem. The following proposition is observed by Felix Browder (See Caristi and Kirk [2]) as the modified version of the famous Caristi-Kirk theorem:

Proposition. *Let (X, d) be a complete metric space and $g: X \rightarrow X$ continuous. Suppose that there exists a lower semicontinuous function $\phi: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ such that*

$$d(x, gx) \leq \phi(x) - \phi(g(x)), x \in X.$$

Then, for any $x \in X$, the sequence $\{g^n(x)\}$ converges to a fixed point at g .

We prove

Theorem 1. Let (X, d) be a complete metric space and F_1, F_2 be two continuous multivalued mappings on X . Let there be two mappings ϕ and Ψ on $CB(x) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that

$$(1.1) \quad H(F_1(x), F_2(y)) \leq \phi(x) - \phi(F_1(x)) + \Psi(y) - \Psi(F_2(y))$$

for all $x, y \in X$.

$$(1.2) \quad \phi(A) \leq \phi(B) \text{ and } \Psi(A) \leq \Psi(B), A, B \text{ in } CB(x), \text{ and } A \subset B.$$

Then F_1 and F_2 have a common fixed point. Further, if any of the multivalued mappings is one-one, then this common fixed point is a unique common fixed point of the one-one mapping :

Remark 1. We will use $\phi(x)$ instead of $\phi(\{x\})$ for the singleton set $\{x\}$, $x \in X$.

Proof. Let $x_0, y_0 \in X$ and $x_1 \in F_1(x_0)$. By Lemma 1, \exists

a $y_1 \in F_2(y_0)$ such that

$$d(x_1, y_1) < H(F_1(x_0), F_2(y_0)) + \frac{1}{2}$$

$$\leq \phi(x_0) - \phi(F_1(x_0)) + \Psi(y_0) - \Psi(F_2(y_0)) + \frac{1}{2} \text{ by (1.1)}$$

Since $x_1 \in F_1(x_0)$. i. e., $\{x_1\} \subset F_1(x_0)$ by (1.2), we have

$$\phi(x_1) \leq \phi(F_1(x_0)), \text{ Similarly, } \Psi(y_1) \leq \phi(F_2(y_0))$$

Hence

$$d(x_1, y_1) < \phi(x_0) - \phi(x_1) + \Psi(y_0) - \Psi(y_1) + \frac{1}{2}$$

Since $y_1 \in F_2(y_0)$, \exists an $x_2 \in F_1(x_1)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_2, y_1) &< H(F_1(x_1), F_2(y_0)) + \frac{1}{2} \\ &\leq \phi(x_1) - \phi(F_1(x_1)) + \Psi(y_0) - \Psi(F_2(y_0)) + \frac{1}{2} \\ &\leq \phi(x_1) - \phi(x_2) + \Psi(y_0) - \Psi(y_1) + \frac{1}{2} \end{aligned}$$

Since $x_2 \in F_1(x_1)$, \exists a $y_2 \in F_2(y_1)$ such that

$$d(x_2, y_2) < \phi(x_1) - \phi(x_2) + \Psi(y_1) - \Psi(y_2) + \frac{1}{2^2}$$

and, since $y_2 \in F_2(y_1)$, \exists an $x_3 \in F_1(x_2)$ such that

$$d(x_3, y_3) < \phi(x_2) - \phi(x_3) + \Psi(y_1) - \Psi(y_2) + \frac{1}{2^2}$$

proceeding in this manner, we obtain $\{x_n\}$ and $\{y_n\}$ such that

$$x_n \in F_1(x_{n-1}), y_n \in F_2(y_{n-1}) \text{ and}$$

$$d(x_{n+1}, y_n) < \phi(x_n) - \phi(x_{n+1}) + \Psi(y_{n-1}) - \Psi(y_n) + \frac{1}{2^n}$$

So, for any positive integer n , we have

$$\begin{aligned} (1.3) \quad \sum_{r=1}^n d(x_r, y_r) &< \sum_{r=1}^n \{ \phi(x_{r-1}) - \phi(x_r) + \Psi(y_{r-1}) - \Psi(y_r) \} \\ &\quad + \sum_{r=1}^n \frac{1}{2^r} \\ &< \phi(x_0) - \phi(x_n) + \Psi(y_0) - \Psi(y_n) + 1 \\ &\leq \phi(x_0) + \Psi(y_0) + 1, \text{ since } \phi(x_n) \geq 0, \\ &\quad \Psi(y_n) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$(1.4) \quad \sum_{r=1}^n d(x_r, x_{r+1}) \leq \sum_{r=1}^n [d(x_r, y_r) + d(x_{r+1}, y_r)]$$

$$< \phi(x_0) + \phi(x_1) + 2\Psi(y_0) + 2, \text{ and}$$

$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} d(x_n, x_{n+1})$ is convergent. So $d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \rightarrow 0$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence and converges to $z_1 \in X$. Since F_1 is continuous and $x_n \in F_1(x_{n-1})$ for $n=1, 2, 3, \dots$, by Lemma 2, z_1 is a fixed point of F_1 .

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{r=1}^n d(y_r, y_{r+1}) &\leq \sum_{r=1}^n [(d(x_{r+1}, y_r) + d(x_{r+1}, y_{r+1}))] \\ &< 2\phi(x_1) + \Psi(y_0) + \Psi(y_1) + 2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\{y_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence and converges to $z_2 \in X$, so that, by Lemma 2, z_2 is a fixed point of F_2 . By (1.3),

$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} d(x_n, y_n)$ is convergent and $\rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$\text{Now } d(z_1, z_2) \leq d(z_1, x_n) + d(x_n, y_n) + d(y_n, z_2).$$

Taking limit of both sides as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$d(z_1, z_2) = 0 \text{ and } z_1 = z_2.$$

Let F_1 be one-one and w be any fixed point of F_1 . Suppose $z_1 = z_2 = z$. Then

$$H(F_1(w), F_2(z)) \leq \phi(w) - \phi(F_1(w)) + \Psi(z) - \Psi(F_2(z)).$$

Since $w \in F_1(w)$ and $z \in F_2(z)$, by (1.2)

$$\phi(w) \leq \phi(F_1(w)) \text{ and } \Psi(z) \leq \Psi(F_2(z)). \quad \text{Hence}$$

$H(F_1(w), F_2(z)) = 0$, so that $F_1(w) = F_2(z)$. Since this is true for any fixed point w of F_1 , and z is a fixed point of F_1 , we have

$$F_1(z) = F_2(z).$$

Thus $F_1(w) = F_1(z)$ and since F_1 is one-one, $w = z$. This completes the proof.

If both F_1 and F_2 are one-one, this common fixed point would be a unique common fixed point of both F_1 and F_2 .

Corollary. Let (X, d) be a complete metric space and $T = \{F_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ be a family of continuous multivalued mappings on X . Suppose that for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$ there exists ϕ_λ on $CB(X) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfying

$$(1.5) \quad \phi_\lambda(A) \leq \phi_\lambda(B) \quad \forall A, B \text{ in } CB(X) \text{ with } A \subset B.$$

(1.6) Let \exists a mapping $F_\alpha \in T$ which is one-one and for any other $F_\beta \in T$ ($\beta \neq \alpha$) we have

$$H(F_\alpha(x), F_\beta(y)) \leq \phi_\alpha(x) - \phi_\alpha(F_\alpha(x)) + \phi_\beta(y) - \phi_\beta(F_\beta(y))$$

for all x, y in X .

Then the mapping of T has a common fixed point which is the unique fixed point of F_α .

Remark 2. Theorem 1 is a generalization of the above proposition due to Felix Browder. In fact, by putting $F_1 = I$, $F_2 = g$, $x=y$ in Theorem 1, we obtain the above proposition.

2. A FURTHER RESULT

Now we present a result giving the condition for the existence of such a fixed point, considering a multivalued mapping.

Theorem 2. Let (X, d) be a metric space, F be a multivalued mapping on X and ϕ be a mapping on $CB(X) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that
 (2.1) $\phi(A) \leq \phi(B) \forall A, B$ in $CB(X)$ with $A \subset B$.

Suppose $z \in X$ be such that

$$(2.2) \quad H(F(x), z) \leq \phi(x) - \phi(F(x)) \forall x \text{ in } X$$

then z is a fixed point of F . If F is one-one, then z is the unique fixed point of F .

Proof. Let $x_0 \in X$, then by Lemma 2, there exists an $x_1 \in F(x_0)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_1, z) &< H(F(x_0), z) + \frac{1}{2} \\ &\leq \phi(x_0) - \phi(F(x_0)) + \frac{1}{2}, \text{ by (2.2).} \\ &\leq \phi(x_0) - \phi(x_1) + \frac{1}{2}, \text{ by (2.1)} \end{aligned}$$

Again, there exists an $x_2 \in F(x_1)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_2, z) &\leq H(F(x_1), z) + \frac{1}{2} \\ &\leq \phi(x_1) - \phi(x_2) + \frac{1}{2} \end{aligned}$$

proceeding in this manner, we construct a sequence $\{x_n\}$ such that $x_n \in F(x_{n-1})$, and

$$d(x_n, z) \leq \phi(x_{n-1}) - \phi(x_n) + \frac{1}{2^n}, n = 1, 2, 3 \dots$$

Then

$$\sum_{r=1}^n d(x_r, z) \leq \sum_{r=1}^n \left\{ \phi(x_{r-1}) - \phi(x_r) + \frac{1}{2^r} \right\} \leq \phi(x_0) + 1$$

Hence the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} d(x_n, z)$ is convergent so that

$d(x_n, z) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence $x_n \rightarrow z$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since

F is continuous and $x_n \in F(x_{n-1})$, $n=1, 2, 3, \dots$, by Lemma 2, z is a fixed point of F .

Let F be one-one and z be any fixed point of F . Then

$$H(F(z_1), z) \leq \phi(z_1) - \phi(F(z_1)) \leq 0, \text{ so that}$$

$F(z_1) = \{z\}$. This being these of any fixed point of F , we have

$F(z) = \{z\} = F(z_1)$, F being one-one, $z = z_1$. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.

Acknowledgements

The author is extremely grateful to Dr. Ashok Ganguly for his Kind help and valuable guidance in the preparation of this paper, He is indebted to prof. H. M. Srivastava also for his valuable suggestions for this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Caristi, Fixed point theorem for mappings satisfying inwardness conditions, *Tras. Amer. Math. Soc.* 215(1976), 241-251.
- [2] J. Caristi and W. A. Kirk, Geometric fixed point theory and inwardness condition, in proc. of the Conference on the *Geometry of metric and Linear Spaces*, Michigan State Univ., 1974.
- [3] S. B. Nadler, Jr., Multivalued contraction mappings, *Pacific J. Math.* 30 (1969), 475-488.