International Journal of Current Advanced Research

ISSN: O: 2319-6475, ISSN: P: 2319-6505, Impact Factor: 6.614 Available Online at www.journalijcar.org Volume 10; Issue 06 (A); June 2021; Page No.24569-24571 DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.24327/ijcar.2021.4876.24571



Research Article

NEW APPROACH OF FIXED POINT THEOREM IN A COMPLETE METRIC SPACE

Shikha Agarwal¹ and Manoj Garg^{2*}

¹Department of Mathematics, S. C. R. I. E. T., C. C. S. University, Meerut, U P, India ²Research Centre of Mathematics, Nehru Degree College, Chhibramau, Kannauj, U. P., India

In this paper some fixed point theorems have been proved in a complete metric space

which generalized the classical Banach contraction mapping principle and many results of

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

great mathematicians.

Article History: Received 24th March, 2021 Received in revised form 19th April, 2021 Accepted 25th May, 2021 Published online 28th June, 2021

Key Words:

Fixed point theorem, Metric space, Continuous function, Complete metric space.

Copyright©2021 Shikha Agarwal1 and Manoj Garg. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

The Polish mathematician Stefan Banach¹ proved a theorem which ensures, under appropriate conditions, the existence and uniqueness of a fixed point. It is well known as a Banach fixed point theorem. The existence of a fixed point plays an important role in several areas of mathematics, physics and engineering branches. This principle has been generalized by many authors in various ways.

Kanan⁸ proved that, If T is a self mapping from a complete metric space X into itself with $d(Tx,Ty) \le \alpha[d(Tx, x) + d(Ty, y)]$ for all x, y \in X, where $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, then T has a unique fixed point in X.

Reich³ proved this result with $d(Tx,Ty) \le \alpha[d(Tx, x) + d(Ty, y) + \beta[d(Ty, x) + d(Tx, y)] + \gamma d(x, y)$, for all x, y \in X, where $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$.

Fisher⁷ in the same way proved this result with $d(Tx,Ty) \le \alpha[d(Ty, x) + d(Tx, y) \text{ for all } x, y \in X$, where $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$.

After that Chaterjee⁶ proved that the same result for $d(Tx,Ty) \le \alpha[d(Tx, x) + d(Ty, y) + \beta d(x, y) \text{ for all } x, y \in X$, where $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$.

The aim of this paper is to obtain a fixed point theorem for new rational inequality in complete metric space which satisfies the many results of great mathematicians.

Main results

Theorem: Let f be a continuous self mapping defined on complete metric space (X, d) such that

$$\begin{split} \mathsf{d}(\mathsf{fx},\mathsf{fy}) &\leq \alpha \frac{\mathsf{d}(x,\mathsf{fx}).\mathsf{d}(y,\mathsf{fy}) + \mathsf{d}(x,\mathsf{fx})\mathsf{d}(y,\mathsf{fx})}{\mathsf{d}(x,y)} \\ &+ \beta \frac{\mathsf{d}(x,\mathsf{fx})\mathsf{d}(y,\mathsf{fx}) + \mathsf{d}(y,\mathsf{fy})\mathsf{d}(x,\mathsf{fy})}{\mathsf{d}(x,\mathsf{fx}) + \mathsf{d}(y,\mathsf{fx}) + \mathsf{d}(y,\mathsf{fy}) + \mathsf{d}(x,\mathsf{fy})} + \gamma \frac{\mathsf{d}(x,\mathsf{fy})[\mathsf{d}(x,\mathsf{fx}) + \mathsf{d}(y,\mathsf{fy})]}{\mathsf{d}(x,y) + \mathsf{d}(y,\mathsf{fy}) + \mathsf{d}(y,\mathsf{fx})} + \end{split}$$

^{*}*Corresponding author:* **Manoj Garg** Research Centre of Mathematics, Nehru Degree College, Chhibramau, Kannauj, U. P., India

$$\xi \frac{d(x, fx)[d(x, fy) + d(y, fx)]}{d(x, y) + d(y, fy) + d(y, fx)} + \delta[d(x, fx) + d(y, fy)] + \eta[d(y, fx) + d(x, fy)] + \mu(x, y)$$
(1)
For all x, y \in X, x \neq y and α , β , γ , δ , η , $\mu \in [0, 1)$ with $2\alpha + 2\beta + \gamma + 4\delta + 4\eta + 2\mu < 2$. Then f has a unique fixed point in T.
Proof: Define a sequence $\{x_n\}$ by setting $T^n x_0 = x_n$, where n is a positive integer. Taking $x_n \neq x_{n+1}$, then by (1)
 $d(x_n, fx_n).d(x_{n-1}, fx_{n-1}) + d(x_n, fx_{n-1}).d(x_{n-1}, fx_n)$

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_{n+1}, x_n) &= d(fx_n, fx_{n-1}) \leq \alpha \frac{d(x_n, fx_n) \cdot d(x_{n-1}, fx_{n-1}) + d(x_n, fx_{n-1}) \cdot d(x_{n-1}, fx_n)}{d(x_n, x_{n-1})} + \beta \\ \frac{d(x_n, fx_n) \cdot d(x_{n-1}, fx_n) + d(x_{n-1}, fx_{n-1}) \cdot d(x_n, fx_{n-1})}{d(x_n, fx_n) + d(x_{n-1}, fx_n) + d(x_{n-1}, fx_{n-1})} \\ \frac{d(x_n, fx_n) \cdot d(x_{n-1}, fx_n) + d(x_{n-1}, fx_{n-1}) + d(x_n, fx_{n-1})}{d(x_n, fx_n) + d(x_{n-1}, fx_{n-1}) + d(x_n, fx_n)} \end{aligned}$$

$$+\gamma \frac{d(x_{n-1}, x_{n-1}) + d(x_{n-1}, x_{n-1}) + d(x_{n}, x_{n})}{d(x_{n}, x_{n-1}) + d(x_{n-1}, fx_{n-1}) + d(x_{n-1}, fx_{n})}$$

+
$$\xi \frac{d(x_n, fx_n)[.d(x_n, fx_{n-1}) + d(x_{n-1}, fx_n)]}{d(x_n, x_{n-1}) + d(x_{n-1}, fx_{n-1}) + d(x_{n-1}, fx_n)} + \delta[d(x_n, fx_n) + d(x_{n-1}, fx_{n-1})] + \delta[d(x_n, fx_n) + d(x_{n-1}, fx_{n-1})]$$

$$\begin{split} &\eta[d(x_{n-1}, fx_n) + d(x_n, fx_{n-1})] + \mu d(x_n, x_{n-1}) \\ & \text{or } d(fx_n, fx_{n-1}) \leq (\alpha + \beta/2 + + \delta + \eta) d(x_n, x_{n+1}) + (\delta + \eta + \mu) d(x_{n-1}, x_n) \\ & \text{i.e. } d(x_{n+1}, x_n) \leq \frac{\delta + \eta + \mu}{1 - (\alpha + \beta + \gamma/2 + \delta + \eta)} \ d(x_{n-1}, x_n) \\ & = \lambda \ d(x_{n-1}, x_n) \\ & \text{Where } \lambda = \frac{\delta + \eta + \mu}{1 - (\alpha + \beta + \gamma/2 + \delta + \eta)} \ \text{with } 0 \leq \lambda < 1. \end{split}$$

In a similar way we can show that $d(x_{n+1}, x_n) \le \lambda^n d(x_0, x_1)$.

By triangle inequality we have for $m \ge n$, $d(x_n, x_m) \le d(x_n, x_{n+1}) + d(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) + \dots + d(x_{m-1}, x_m)$ $\le (\lambda^n + \lambda^{n+1} + \dots + \lambda^{m-1}) d(x_{0, -} x_1)$ λ^n

$$\leq \frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda} d(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1)$$

Since $0 \le \lambda < 1$, as $n \to \infty$, $\lambda^n \to 0$ which implies that $d(x_n, x_m) \to 0$ i.e. $\{x_n\}$ is a cauchy sequence.

So by completeness of X this sequence must be converge to u i. e. $\{x_n\} \to x$ as $n \to \infty$. Further, continuity of T in X implies $T(x) = T(\lim_{n\to\infty} x_n) = \lim_{n\to\infty} Tx_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} x_{n+1} = x$. Therefore x is a fixed point of T.

Uniqueness: Let $y \neq x$ be another fixed point of f, where f(y) = y. Then by given condition, we have d(x, y) = d(f(x), f(y))

$$\leq \alpha \frac{d(x,fx).d(y,fy) + d(x,fx)d(y,fx)}{d(x,y)} + \beta \frac{d(x,fx)[d(x,fy) + d(y,fx)]}{d(x,y) + d(y,fy) + d(y,fx)} + \gamma \frac{d(x,fx)d(y,fx) + d(y,fy)d(x,fy)}{d(x,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(y,fy) + d(x,fy)} + \beta \frac{d(x,fx)[d(x,fy) + d(y,fx)]}{d(x,y) + d(y,fy) + d(y,fx)} + \gamma \frac{d(x,fx)d(y,fx) + d(y,fy)d(x,fy)}{d(x,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(y,fy) + d(x,fy)} + \beta \frac{d(x,fx)[d(x,fy) + d(y,fx)]}{d(x,y) + d(y,fy) + d(y,fx)} + \gamma \frac{d(x,fx)d(y,fx) + d(y,fy)d(x,fy)}{d(x,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(y,fy) + d(x,fy)} + \beta \frac{d(x,fx)[d(x,fy) + d(y,fx)]}{d(x,y) + d(y,fx)} + \gamma \frac{d(x,fx)d(y,fx) + d(y,fy)d(x,fy)}{d(x,fx) + d(y,fy) + d(x,fy)} + \beta \frac{d(x,fx)[d(x,fy) + d(y,fx)]}{d(x,y) + d(y,fx)} + \gamma \frac{d(x,fx)d(y,fx) + d(y,fy) + d(x,fy)}{d(x,fx) + d(y,fy) + d(x,fy)} + \beta \frac{d(x,fx)[d(x,fx) + d(y,fx)]}{d(x,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(x,fy)} + \beta \frac{d(x,fx)[d(x,fx) + d(y,fx)]}{d(x,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(y,fy) + d(x,fy)} + \beta \frac{d(x,fx)[d(x,fx) + d(y,fx)]}{d(x,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(x,fy)} + \beta \frac{d(x,fx)[d(x,fx) + d(y,fx)]}{d(x,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(x,fy)} + \beta \frac{d(x,fx)[d(x,fx) + d(y,fx)]}{d(x,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(x,fx)} + \beta \frac{d(x,fx)[d(x,fx) + d(y,fx)]}{d(x,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(y,fx)} + \beta \frac{d(x,fx)[d(x,fx) + d(y,fx)]}{d(x,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(y,fx)} + \beta \frac{d(x,fx)[d(x,fx) + d(y,fx)]}{d(x,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(y,fx)} + \beta \frac{d(x,fx)[d(x,fx) + d(y,fx)]}{d(x,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(y,fx)} + \beta \frac{d(x,fx)[d(x,fx) + d(y,fx)]}{d(x,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(y,fx)} + \beta \frac{d(x,fx)[d(x,fx) + d(y,fx)]}{d(x,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(y,fx)} + \beta \frac{d(x,fx)[d(x,fx) + d(y,fx)]}{d(x,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(y,fx)} + \beta \frac{d(x,fx)[d(x,fx) + d(y,fx)]}{d(x,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(y,fx)} + \beta \frac{d(x,fx)[d(x,fx) + d(y,fx)]}{d(x,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(y,fx)} + \beta \frac{d(x,fx)[d(x,fx) + d(y,fx)]}{d(x,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(y,fx)} + \beta \frac{d(x,fx)[d(x,fx) + d(y,fx)]}{d(x,fx) + d(y,fx) + d(y,fx)} + \beta \frac{d(x,fx)[d(x,fx) + d(y,fx)]}{d(x,fx) + d(y,fx)} + \beta$$

 $\mu d(x, y)$

i.e. $d(x, y) \le (\alpha + 2\eta + \mu) d(x, y).$

Since $2\alpha + 2\beta + \gamma + 4\delta + 4\eta + 2\mu < 2$, we obtained d(x, y) = 0, which implies x = y. Thus x is a unique fixed point of f.

Theorem: Let f be a self mapping defined on complete metric space (X, d) such that (1) holds. If for some positive integer m, f^m is continuous then f has a unique fixed point.

Proof: Define a sequence $\{x_n\}$ by setting $f^n x_0 = x_n$, where n is a positive integer. Then $\{x_n\}$ converges to some point x in X. So the subsequence $\{x_n\}$ of $\{x_n\}$ is also converges to x.

So $f_X^m = f^m (\lim_{k \to \infty} fx_{nk}) = (\lim_{k \to \infty} f^m x_{nk}) = (\lim_{k \to \infty} x_{nk+m}) = x$ Therefore x is a fixed point of f_x .

Now consider that p be the smallest positive integer such that $f_x^P = x$ but $f_x^q \neq x$ for $q = 1,2,3,\dots,p-1$. If p > 1, then

$$\begin{split} \mathsf{d}(f_x, x) &= \ \mathsf{d}(f_x, f_x^p) = \mathsf{d}(f_x, f(f_x^{p-1})) \\ &\leq \frac{\mathsf{d}(x, fx).\mathsf{d}(f^{m-1}x, f^mx) + \mathsf{d}(x, f^mx)\mathsf{d}(f^{m-1}x, fx)}{\mathsf{d}(x, f^{m-1}x)} + \beta \frac{\mathsf{d}(x, fx)[\mathsf{d}(x, f^px) + \mathsf{d}(f^{p-1}x, fx)]}{\mathsf{d}(x, f^{p-1}x) + \mathsf{d}(f^{p-1}x, f^px) + \mathsf{d}(f^{p-1}x, fx)} + \gamma \\ &\frac{\mathsf{d}(x, fx)\mathsf{d}(f^{p-1}x, fx) + \mathsf{d}(f^{p-1}x, fx)\mathsf{d}(x, f^mx)}{\mathsf{d}(x, fx) + \mathsf{d}(f^{p-1}x, fx) + \mathsf{d}(f^{p-1}x, f^mx) + \mathsf{d}(x, f^mx)} + \delta[\mathsf{d}(x, fx) + \mathsf{d}(f^{p-1}x, f^px)] + \mathsf{d}(f^{p-1}x, f^px)] + \\ &\frac{\mathsf{d}(x, fx) + \mathsf{d}(f^{p-1}x, fx) + \mathsf{d}(f^{p-1}x, f^mx) + \mathsf{d}(x, f^mx)}{\mathsf{d}(x, f^x) + \mathsf{d}(x, f^px)] + \mathsf{d}(x, f^{p-1}x)} + \delta[\mathsf{d}(x, fx) + \mathsf{d}(f^{p-1}x, f^px)] + \\ &\eta[\mathsf{d}(f^{p-1}x, fx) + \mathsf{d}(x, f^px)] + \mu\mathsf{d}(x, f^{p-1}x) \\ &\text{i.e. } \mathsf{d}(x, f_x) \leq \frac{\delta + \eta + \mu}{1 - (\alpha + \gamma/2 + \delta + \eta)} \ \mathsf{d}(x, f^{p-1}x) \\ &\text{or } \mathsf{d}(x, f_x) \leq \lambda \, \mathsf{d}(x, f^{p-1}x), \text{ where } \lambda = \frac{\delta + \eta + \mu}{1 - (\alpha + \gamma/2 + \delta + \eta)} \\ &\text{Thus we can write } - \mathsf{d}(x, fx) \leq \lambda^p \, \mathsf{d}(x, fx) + \mathsf{d}(x, fx) \\ &= 0 \\ &\mathsf{d}(x, fx) = 0 \\ \\ \\ &\mathsf{d}(x, fx) = 0 \\ \\ &\mathsf{d}(x, fx) = 0 \\ \\ \\ &\mathsf$$

Thus we can write, $d(x, fx) \le \lambda^p d(x, fx)$

But $\lambda^p < 1$, we get a contradiction. Thus $T_x = x$ i.e. x is a fixed point of f. Uniqueness follows as in theorem 1.

Theorem: Let f be a continuous self mapping defined on complete metric space

(X, d) such that for some positive integer p, f satisfies:

$$d(f^{p}x, f^{p}y) \leq \alpha \frac{d(x, f^{p}x).d(y, f^{p}y) + d(x, f^{p}x)d(y, f^{p}x)}{d(x, y)} + \beta \frac{d(x, f^{p}x)[d(x, f^{p}y) + d(y, f^{p}x)]}{d(x, y) + d(y, f^{p}y) + d(y, f^{p}x)} + \gamma$$

$$d(x,f^{p}x)d(y,f^{p}x)+d(y,f^{p}y)d(x,f^{p}y)$$

 $d(x,f^{p}x) + d(y,f^{p}x) + d(y,f^{p}y) + d(x,f^{p}y)$

 $\delta[d(x,\,f^{p}x)+d(y,\,f^{p}y)]+\eta[d(y,\,f^{p}x)+d(x,\,f^{p}y)]+\mu d(x,\,y)$

For all x, y \in X, x \neq y and α , β , γ , δ , η , $\mu \in [0, 1)$ with $2\alpha + 2\beta + \gamma + 4\delta + 4\eta + 2\mu < 2$. If f^p is continuous then f has a unique fixed point.

Proof: By theorem 2, f^p has a fixed point with $fx = f(f^px) = f^p(fx)$ so we get fx = x. Again fixed point of f is a fixed point of f^p and f^p has fixed point x, so x is the unique fixed point of f.

Example: Let X = [0, 1] with the usual metric and $f : X \rightarrow X$ defined by $fx = \{0, \text{ when } 0 \le x \le 1/3 = \{1/3, \text{ when } 1/3 < x \le 1.$

Obviously f is discontinuous and does not satisfy theorem 1 when x = 1/3 and y = 1. But clearly f² is continuous and satisfy theorem 3 with 0 is the unique fixed point of f² and so of f.

Remark

- 1. If we put $\alpha = \beta = \gamma = \delta = \eta = 0$ we obtained the result of Banach [1].
- 2. If we put $\alpha = \beta = \gamma = \eta = \mu = 0$ we obtained the result of Kannan [8].
- 3. If we put $\alpha = \beta = \gamma = 0$ we obtained the result of Reich [3].
- 4. If we put $\alpha = \beta = \gamma = \eta = 0$ we obtained the result of Chatterjee [6].
- 5. If we put $\alpha = \beta = \gamma = \delta = 0$ we obtained the result of Fisher [7].

References

- 1. Banach, S.: Surles operation dans les ensembles abstracts etleur application aux equations integrals, *Fund.Math.*3, (1922), 133-181.
- 2. Jaggi D. S.: Some unique fixed point theorems, Ind. Jour. Pure Appl. Math., 8, 1977, 223-230.
- 3. Reich, S: Some remarks concerning contraction mappings, Canad. Math. Bull., 14, 1971, 121-124.
- 4. Sehgal, V. M.: A fixed point theorem for mappings with a contractive iterate, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 23, 1969, 631-634.
- 5. Fisher, B. And Khan, M. S.: Fixed points, common fixed points and constant mappings, Studia Sci. Math. Hungar, 11, 1978, 467-470.
- 6. Chatterjee S. K.: Fixed point theorems, Comptes. Rend. Accad. Bulgare.Sa, 25 (1972), 727-730.
- 7. Fisher, B.: A fixed point theorem for compact metric space, Publ.Inst.Math.25(1976), 193-194.
- 8. R. Kannan: Some results on fixed points, Bull. Cal. Math. Soc., 60, 1969, 71-76.
- 9. Jaggi D. S. And Dass B. K.: An extension of Banach contraction theorem through rational expression, Bull. Cal. Math., 1980, 261-266.