Contents lists available at [SciVerse ScienceDirect](http://www.ScienceDirect.com/)

# Topology and its Applications

[www.elsevier.com/locate/topol](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/topol)

# On contraction-type assumptions avoiding the Hausdorff distance

## Pavel V. Semenov<sup>1</sup>

*Department of Mathematics, Moscow City Pedagogical University, 2-nd Sel'skokhozyastvennyi pr. 4, Moscow, 129226, Russia*

#### article info abstract

*MSC:* primary 47H10, 54H25 secondary 47H09, 54E50

*Keywords:* Complete metric spaces Fixed points Multivalued contractions Hausdorff distance Distance function

In this note we introduce the contraction-type assumptions for multivalued mappings and prove some fixed points theorems without using of the Hausdorff distances between subsets of a metric space.

© 2013 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

### **1. Preliminaries**

Typically, a fixed point theorem for multivalued mappings goes back to some fixed point theorem for single-valued mappings. Such a correlation basically deals with the substitution of a given metric, say *d*, on a space *X* by the corresponding Hausdorff "metric" *Hausd* on the set of all closed subsets of *X*. It seems, S. Nadler Jr. [\[4\]](#page--1-0) was first who replaced the Banach contraction assumption

 $d(f(x), f(y)) \leq C \cdot d(x, y) < d(x, y),$ 

by its multivalued analog

*Haus*<sub>d</sub>( $F(x)$ ,  $F(y)$ )  $\leqslant C \cdot d(x, y) < d(x, y)$ 

and proved the fixed point theorem for such a mapping  $F : X \to X$  with nonempty closed values  $F(x) \subset X$  in a complete metric space *(X*;*d)*.

An analogous replacement for F. Browder type inequalities

 $Haus_d(F(x), F(y)) \leq \varphi(d(x, y)) < d(x, y)$ 

or, for E. Racotch type inequalities

 $Haus_d(F(x), F(y)) \le k(d(x, y)) \cdot d(x, y) < d(x, y)$ 

for various kinds of numerical functions  $\varphi : [0; \infty) \to [0; \infty)$ ,  $k : [0; \infty) \to [0; 1)$  one can find in a lot of papers, see e.g. [\[1–3,5\],](#page--1-0) etc.







*E-mail address:* [pavels@orc.ru](mailto:pavels@orc.ru).

<sup>1</sup> The author was supported in part by RFBR grant 11-01-00822.

<sup>0166-8641/\$ –</sup> see front matter © 2013 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.topol.2013.04.016>

Let us emphasize that one of the oldest open problems in the area is the following question, stated by S. Reich in 1974.

**Question 1.1.** Let  $k: [0; \infty) \to [0; 1]$  and  $\forall t > 0$ , lim sup<sub>s-att-0</sub>  $k(s) < 1$ . Is it true that any *k*-contraction of a complete metric space has a fixed point?

The answer is affirmative for compact-valued contractions [\[6\]](#page--1-0) and for closed-valued contractions but with the substitution  $t \ge 0$  instead of  $t > 0$  in the assumption above [\[3\].](#page--1-0)

In this note we show that the using of the Hausdorff distance is, in general, a superfluous assumption for an existence of a sequence of successful approximations tending to a fixed point of  $F: X \to X$ ,  $x \in F(x)$ . It appears, that one can directly use the *distance function*

 $d_F(x) = \text{dist}(x; F(x)), \quad x \in X$ 

rather than *Haus<sub>d</sub>*. See [\[7,8\]](#page--1-0) for somewhat similar approaches.

**Definition 1.2.** For a point  $x \in X$  of a metric space  $(X; d)$  and for  $A \subset X$  a sequence  $\{y_m\}$  of points  $y_m \in A$  is said to be *(x*; *A)*-sequence if

 $0 < d(x, y_m) \rightarrow dist(x, A) = inf{d(x, y): y \in A}, m \rightarrow \infty.$ 

Note, the following are equivalent:

(1) For *x* ∈ *X* and *A* ⊂ *X* there exists an  $(x; A)$ -sequence;

(2) The point *x* is not an isolated point of *A*.

**Definition 1.3.** For a multivalued mapping  $F: X \to X$  a sequence  $\{y_m\}$  is said to be  $(x; F)$ -sequence if it is  $(x; F(x))$ -sequence.

So, for a numerical function  $\varphi$  :  $(0; +\infty) \to (0; +\infty)$  a multivalued mapping  $F : X \to X$  of a metric space  $(X; d)$  is said to be **sequential**  $\varphi$ **-contraction** if for every  $x \in X$  there exists an  $(x; F)$ -sequence  $\{y_m\}$  such that  $d_F(y_m) < \varphi(d(x; y_m))$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ .

### **2. Statements**

**Theorem 2.1.** *For any nondecreasing function*  $\varphi$  :  $(0; +\infty) \to (0; +\infty)$  *and for any closed-valued sequential*  $\varphi$ *-contraction*  $F : X \to Y$ *X of a metric space (X*;*d) one of the following two statements is true*:

*(a) F has a fixed point*;

*(b)* for each sufficiently large  $t > 0$  there are points  $x_n \in X$  such that for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  the following are true

 $x_{n+1} \in F(x_n);$   $0 < d(x_n; x_{n+1}) < \varphi^{n}(t);$   $0 < d_F(x_{n+1}) < \varphi^{n+1}(t).$ 

**Proof.** Let us check that the negotiation of *(a)* implies *(b)*. So, suppose that a closed-valued sequential  $\varphi$ -contraction *F* : *X*  $\rightarrow$  *X* admits no fixed points, i.e.  $d_F(x) > 0$  for all  $x \in X$ . A construction of a desired sequence  $\{x_n\}$  for *(b)* follows to the natural inductive scheme.

(0) Let  $x_0$  be an arbitrary point of *X*,  $x_0 \notin F(x_0) \Leftrightarrow d_F(x_0) > 0$ .

(1) In accordance with the notion of sequential  $\varphi$ -contraction pick any  $(x_0; F)$ -sequence, say  $\{y_m\}$ , such that  $d_F(y_m)$  <  $\varphi$ (*d*(*x*<sub>0</sub>; *y<sub>m</sub>*)), *m* ∈ N. In particular, for *x*<sub>1</sub> = *y*<sub>1</sub> ∈ *F*(*x*<sub>0</sub>) we see that

 $0 < d_F(x_1) < \varphi(d(x_0; x_1))$ 

and for an arbitrary picked  $t > d(x_0; x_1)$  we obtain:

 $(i_1)$   $0 < d(x_0; x_1) < t = \varphi^0(t);$ 

(ii<sub>1</sub>) 
$$
0 < d_F(x_1) < \varphi(d(x_0; x_1)) \leq \varphi(t) = \varphi^1(t)
$$
.

*(n* + 1) Let for every  $1 \leq k \leq n$  the point  $x_k$   $F(x_{k-1})$  was chosen with the properties that

*(***i**<sub>*k*</sub>)</sub> 0 <  $d(x_{k-1}; x_k) < \varphi^{k-1}(t)$ ;

 $(iii_k)$   $0 < d_F(x_k) < \varphi^k(t)$ .

In accordance with the notion of sequential  $\varphi$ -contraction pick any  $(x_n; F)$ -sequence, say  $\{z_m\}$ , and for  $\varepsilon = \varphi^n(t)$  –  $d_F(x_n) > 0$  choose an appropriate  $x_{n+1} = z_{m(n)} \in F(x_n)$  such that  $(i_{n+1})$   $0 < d(x_n; x_{n+1}) < d_F(x_n) + \varepsilon = \varphi^n(t);$ 

$$
(ii_{n+1}) \ 0 < d_F(x_{n+1}) < \varphi(d(x_n; x_{n+1})) \leq \varphi(\varphi^n(t)) = \varphi^{n+1}(t). \quad \Box
$$

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/4659015>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/4659015>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com/)