

## GENERALIZED CONTRACTION PRINCIPLE

DIPAK CHATTERJEE

St. Xavier's College  
30, Park Street  
Calcutta-700016, INDIA

(Received March 23, 1982 and in revised form August 3, 1982)

ABSTRACT. Fixed point theorems are proved for contraction maps on  $M$ -convex spaces.

KEY WORDS AND PHRASES. Fixed Point Theorems, Contraction principle,  $M$ -convex spaces.

1980 MATHEMATICS SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION CODES.

### 1. INTRODUCTION.

Since Banach published his pioneering work on fixed points, various extensions in multidirections have been achieved by Brouwer, Kakutani, Browder, Edelstein, Kannan, Soardi, Rakotch, Reich, Chi Song Wong, Meir and Keeler, Hardy and Rogers, Chatterjee and many others. The ones relevant to our work are due to Edelstein [1], Kannan [2], Reich [3], Wong [4] and Hardy and Rogers [5]. In fact, Kannan [2] proved that, if  $K$  is a weakly compact convex subset of a reflexive Banach space and if for every closed convex subset  $H$  with  $T(H) \subseteq H$ ,  $\delta(H) > 0$ ,  $\inf_{y \in H} \|y - Ty\| < \delta(H)$  and if  $T$  is a self-map of  $K$  such that for every pair of points  $x, y \in K$ ,  $\|Tx - Ty\| \leq \frac{1}{2}(\|x - Tx\| + \|y - Ty\|)$ , then  $T$  has a fixed point. Reich proved that, if  $K$  is a weakly compact convex subset of a Banach space and  $T$  is a self-map of  $K$  such that there exist  $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^5$ ,  $a_i \geq 0$ ,  $\sum a_i = 1$ , and for every pair of points  $x, y \in K$ ,  $\|Tx - Ty\| \leq a_1 \|x - y\| + a_2 \|x - T\| + a_3 \|y - Ty\|$ , then  $T$  has a fixed point. Hardy and Rogers extended this result to metric spaces as follows. If  $(X, d)$  is a complete metric space and  $T$  is a self-map of  $X$  such that there exists  $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^5$ ,  $a_i \geq 0$ ,  $\sum a_i < 1$  and  $d(Tx, Ty) \leq a_1 d(x, y) + a_2 d(x, Tx) + a_3 d(y, Ty) + a_4 d(x, Ty) + a_5 d(y, Tx)$  for every pair of points  $x, y \in X$ , then  $T$  has a fixed point. The conditions that  $X$  is compact and  $T$  is continuous are sufficient if the condition  $\sum a_i < 1$  is changed to  $\sum a_i = 1$ . Wong generalized the results of Edelstein,

Kannan and Reich by way of proving that, if  $X$  is a convex subset of a normed linear space and  $T$  is a self-map of  $X$  such that there exist  $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^5$ ,  $a_i \geq 0$ ,  $\sum a_i = 1$  and for all  $x, y \in X$ ,  $\|Tx - Ty\| \leq a_1\|x - y\| + a_2\|x - Tx\| + a_3\|y - Ty\| + a_4\|x - Ty\| + a_5\|y - Tx\|$ , then  $T$  has a fixed point and this point is the limit of  $x_n$  where  $x_n = (1 - t)x_{n-1} + tTx_{n-1}$ ,  $t \in (0,1)$ . In fact, Edelstein's result follows from Reich if  $a_2 = a_3 = a_4 = a_5 = 0$ ; Kannan's result follows by putting  $a_1 = 0$ ,  $a_2 = a_3 = 1/2$ ; Reich's result can be deduced by substituting  $a_4 = a_5 = 0$ . Ours is a further generalization of all the above results from two angles, one being the liberation of the selection conditions on  $a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5$ . The other is by putting  $T_M x = x$  for every  $x$ . We have throughout the  $M$ -convexity theory assumed the minimum possible geometric condition of the existence of an intermediate point for every pair of points in a metric space. The results of Hardy and Rogers follow just by imitating our proof with the substitution  $T_M x = x$  for every  $x$ , in which case the condition of commutativity of  $T$  and  $T_M$  becomes redundant just as the existence of an  $M$ -convexity point is. The results of Chatterjee [6] and Ghosh [7] also follow immediately from our theorem.

DEFINITION. A metric space  $(X,d)$  is said to be  $M$ -convex if for every pair of points  $x,y$  in  $X$ , there exists another point  $z$  in  $X$  such that  $d(x,y) = d(x,z) + d(z,y)$ .

For strictly  $M$ -convex space and other related notions, the readers are referred to Chatterjee [8].

Let  $(X,d)$  be an  $M$ -convex metric space. Then we can make the following definition.

DEFINITION. A self-map  $T$  on  $X$  is said to be a generalized mean value contraction if, for every pair of points  $x,y \in X$ , there exist non-negative real numbers  $a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4$  and  $a_5$  such that

$$d(TT_M x, TT_M y) \leq a_1 d(x,y) + a_2 d(x, TT_M x) + a_3 d(y, TT_M y) + a_4 d(x, TT_M y) + a_5 d(y, TT_M x), \tag{1.1}$$

where  $\sum_{i=1}^5 a_i < 1$  and  $T_M x$  is the point obtained from the  $M$ -convexity as follows

$$d(x, Tx) = d(x, T_M x) + d(T_M x, Tx).$$

If the condition  $\sum_{i=1}^5 a_i < 1$  is changed to  $\sum_{i=1}^5 a_i = 1$  in the above, the said self-map  $T$  will be called a generalized mean value non-expansive mapping.

Examples of such contractions and non-expansive mappings occur abundantly. We give one example.

EXAMPLE. Let  $X = \{x \in \mathbb{Q}; 0 \leq x \leq 1\}$  where  $\mathbb{Q}$  is the set of rational numbers and let  $d(x,y) = |x - y|$ . Then  $(X,d)$  is an M-convex metric space. Now we define a self-map  $T$  on  $X$  as follows

$$\begin{aligned} Tx &= 1 - x & \text{if } 0 \leq x \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ &= x - \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} \leq x \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Then it is easy to prove, by taking  $T_M x$  to define the usual midpoint of  $x$  and  $Tx$ , that  $T$  is a generalized mean value contraction (c.f. Wong [4]).

2. MAIN THEOREMS.

THEOREM 1. If  $T$  is a generalized mean value contraction from an M-convex complete metric space  $(X,d)$  into itself and  $T$  and  $T_M$  commute on  $X$ , the derived set of  $X$ , then  $T$  has a unique fixed point.

PROOF. Let  $x_0 \in X$ . Define  $x_{n+1} = TT_M^n x_0$ ,  $n = 0,1,2,3,\dots$ . Putting  $x = x_0$  and  $y = x_1$  in (1.1), we get

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_1, x_2) &\leq a_1 d(x_0, x_1) + a_2 d(x_0, x_1) + a_3 d(x_1, x_2) + a_4 d(x_0, x_2) \\ &\text{for some } \{a_i\}_{i=1}^4, \sum_{i=1}^4 a_i < 1, a_i \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Again putting  $x = x_1$  and  $y = x_0$  in (1.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_2, x_1) &\leq a'_1 d(x_1, x_0) + a'_2 d(x_1, x_2) + a'_3 d(x_0, x_1) + a'_5 d(x_0, x_2) \\ &\text{for some } \{a'_i\}, i = 1,2,3,5, \sum_{i=1,4}^5 a'_i < 1, a'_i \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

Adding (2.1) and (2.2), we now get

$$2d(x_1, x_2) \leq (a_1 + a_2 + a'_1 + a'_3) d(x_0, x_1) + (a'_2 + a_3) d(x_1, x_2) + (a_4 + a'_5) d(x_0, x_2)$$

Or  $(2 - a'_2 - a_3) d(x_1, x_2) \leq (a_1 + a_2 + a'_1 + a'_3) d(x_0, x_1) + (a_4 + a'_5) d(x_0, x_1) + (a_4 + a'_5) d(x_1, x_2)$

Or  $(2 - a'_2 - a_3 - a_4 - a'_5) d(x_1, x_2) \leq (a_1 + a_2 + a'_1 + a'_3 + a_4 + a'_5) d(x_0, x_1)$

Or  $d(x_1, x_2) \leq \rho_1 d(x_0, x_1)$  where  $\rho_1 = \frac{a_1 + a_2 + a'_1 + a'_3 + a_4 + a'_5}{2 - a'_2 - a_3 - a_4 - a'_5}$ .

By virtue of the conditions  $\sum_{i=1}^4 a_i < 1$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^4 a'_i < 1$ , it is easy to see that  $0 < \rho_1 < 1$ .

By induction, we can prove that

$$d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq \rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3, \dots, \rho_n d(x_0, x_1),$$

where  $0 < \rho_j < 1$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ .

So  $\{x_n\}$  is a Cauchy sequence and therefore by completeness  $\{x_n\}$  converges to, say  $\zeta$ .

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 d(\zeta, TT_M \zeta) &\leq d(\zeta, x_{n+1}) + d(x_{n+1}, TT_M \zeta) \\
 &\leq d(\zeta, x_{n+1}) + d(TT_M x_n, TT_M \zeta) \\
 &\leq d(\zeta, x_{n+1}) + a_1 d(x_n, \zeta) + a_2 d(x_n, TT_M x_n) \\
 &\quad + a_3 d(\zeta, TT_M \zeta) + a_4 d(x_n, TT_M \zeta) + a_5 d(\zeta, TT_M x_n) . \\
 &\leq d(\zeta, x_{n+1}) + a_1'' d(x_n, \zeta) + a_2'' d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \\
 &\quad + a_3'' d(\zeta, TT_M \zeta) + a_4'' d(x_n, TT_M \zeta) + a_5'' d(\zeta, x_{n+1}) . \\
 &\leq (a_3'' + a_4'') d(\zeta, TT_M \zeta) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty .
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $d(\zeta, TT_M \zeta) = 0$ .

This implies  $TT_M \zeta = \zeta$ .

Now, we proceed to prove that  $\zeta$  is the fixed point as desired.

$$\begin{aligned}
 d(\zeta, \mathcal{T}\zeta) &= d(TT_M \zeta, T(TT_M \zeta)) \\
 &= d(TT_M \zeta, T(T_M \mathcal{T}\zeta)) \quad [\text{since } TT_M \zeta = T_M \mathcal{T}\zeta \text{ for } \zeta \in X'] \\
 &= d(TT_M \zeta, TT_M(\mathcal{T}\zeta)) \\
 &\leq a_1''' d(\zeta, \mathcal{T}\zeta) + a_2''' d(\zeta, TT_M(\mathcal{T}\zeta)) + a_3''' d(\mathcal{T}\zeta, TT_M \zeta) \\
 &\quad + a_4''' d(\zeta, TT_M(\mathcal{T}\zeta)) + a_5''' d(\mathcal{T}\zeta, TT_M \zeta) . \\
 &\leq a_1''' d(\zeta, \mathcal{T}\zeta) + a_2''' d(\zeta, \mathcal{T}\zeta) + a_3''' d(\zeta, \mathcal{T}\zeta) \\
 &\quad + a_4''' d(\zeta, \mathcal{T}\zeta) + a_5''' d(\zeta, \mathcal{T}\zeta) . \\
 d(\zeta, \mathcal{T}\zeta) &\leq 0 \quad \text{since } \sum_{i=1}^5 a_i''' < 1 .
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $d(\zeta, \mathcal{T}\zeta) = 0$  which implies  $\mathcal{T}\zeta = \zeta$ ; i.e.  $\zeta$  is a fixed point. The uniqueness is easy to verify.

This completes the proof.

REMARK. One should note that in the above theorem, we have used completeness only in getting the limit  $\zeta$  and we have used the commutativity of  $T$  and  $T_M$  only for  $\zeta$ .

So we have actually proved the following more general theorem.

THEOREM 2. If  $T$  is a generalized mean value contraction from an  $M$ -convex metric space  $(X, d)$  into itself and there exists a point  $x_0 \in X$  such that

$$(i) \quad x_n \text{ converges to a point } \zeta \text{ when } x_n = TT_M x_{n+1} \text{ and}$$

$$(ii) \quad TT_M \zeta = T_M T \zeta,$$

then  $T$  has a unique fixed point. The following theorem now follows from the above theorem.

THEOREM 3. Let  $(X, d)$  be a strictly  $M$ -convex compact metric space and  $T$  be a generalized mean value non-expansive mapping from  $X$  into itself such that  $T$  and  $T_M$  commutes on  $X$ , then  $T$  has a fixed point.

PROOF. Define  $f(x) = d(x, Tx)$ .

Then the continuity of  $d$  gives the continuity of  $f$ . Now  $X$  being compact,  $f$  attains its minimum at a point, say  $x_0 \in X$ .

If  $d(Tx_0, x_0) = 0$ , then  $x_0$  is the fixed point.

So suppose  $Tx_0 = x_0$ , i.e.  $d(x_0, Tx_0) > 0$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Then } f(TT_M x_0) &= d(TT_M x_0, T(TT_M x_0)) \\ &= d(TT_M x_0, TT_M(Tx_0)) \\ &< d(x_0, Tx_0), \text{ by strict } M\text{-convexity and Theorem 2.} \\ &= f(x_0), \text{ a contradiction.} \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $Tx_0 = x_0$ .

REMARK 1. We can drop the condition of strict  $M$ -convexity if we take "a generalized mean value contraction" in place of "non-expansive mapping".

REMARK 2. Our method of proof in the above theorems is a substantial modification and fusion of the methods due to Hardy and Rogers [5] and Wong [4].

### 3. APPLICATIONS.

Since the inception, the fixed point notions have found many glorious applications in the fields of Economic Stability Theory, the Theory of Differential Equations, Control Theory, the Theory of Integral Equations, and Fluid Dynamics. The existence problems which are fundamental in mathematics, have often been solved by the fixed point theorems. We feel that our theorems can be applied to more general situations than ever, since ours is applicable to  $F$ -spaces, Frechet spaces, and, more generally, to

metric spaces with the minimum geometric structure. We give below a nice application in a situation where the basic space is not linear, but a metric space with the minimum geometric structure.

EXAMPLE. Let  $X = \{e^{i\theta}, 0 \leq \theta < 2\pi\}$ . Then  $X$  is a complete  $M$ -convex metric space where the metric  $d$  is defined as  $d(e^{i\theta_1}, e^{i\theta_2}) = |\theta_1 - \theta_2|$ . We take, in particular,  $T_M$  to represent the midpoint of the arc between  $e^{i\theta}$  and  $T(e^{i\theta})$  where  $T(e^{i\theta})$  is defined as  $T(e^{i\theta}) = e^{i\theta/2}$ . Here it is easy to show that  $T$  satisfies all the conditions of our Theorem 1 and hence the existence of a fixed point of  $T$  is guaranteed. In fact, the point  $e^{i0}$ , i.e. 1, is the fixed point.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT. The author finds it a great pleasure to thank the referee for his suggestion for substantial improvement of the paper. Thanks are due to Dr. M. K. Das without whose constant inspiration this paper could not be completed.

#### REFERENCES

1. EDELSTEIN, M. On Fixed and Periodic points under contractive mappings, Pacific J. Math. 37 (1962) 74-79.
2. KANNAN, R. Some Results on Fixed Points, Bull. Cal. Math. Soc. 60 (1968) 71-76.
3. REICH, S. Fixed Points of Contractive Functions, Bull. Un. Math. Ital. 4 (1972) 26-42.
4. WONG, C.S. Fixed Points and Characterizations of Certain Maps, Pacific J. Math. 54 (1974) 305-312.
5. HARDY, G. and ROGERS, T. A Generalization of a Fixed Point Theorem of Reich, Canad. Math. Bull. 16 (1973) 201-206.
6. CHATTERJEA, S.K. Fixed Point Theorems, C.R. Acad. Bulgare Sci. 25 (1972) 727-730.
7. GHOSH, K.M. A Generalization of Contraction Principle, Int. J. Math. and Math. Sci. 4 (1981) 201-206.
8. CHATTERJEE, D.  $M$ -Convexity and Best Approximations, Pub. Inst. Math. 28(42), (1980) 43-50.

## Special Issue on Decision Support for Intermodal Transport

### Call for Papers

Intermodal transport refers to the movement of goods in a single loading unit which uses successive various modes of transport (road, rail, water) without handling the goods during mode transfers. Intermodal transport has become an important policy issue, mainly because it is considered to be one of the means to lower the congestion caused by single-mode road transport and to be more environmentally friendly than the single-mode road transport. Both considerations have been followed by an increase in attention toward intermodal freight transportation research.

Various intermodal freight transport decision problems are in demand of mathematical models of supporting them. As the intermodal transport system is more complex than a single-mode system, this fact offers interesting and challenging opportunities to modelers in applied mathematics. This special issue aims to fill in some gaps in the research agenda of decision-making in intermodal transport.

The mathematical models may be of the optimization type or of the evaluation type to gain an insight in intermodal operations. The mathematical models aim to support decisions on the strategic, tactical, and operational levels. The decision-makers belong to the various players in the intermodal transport world, namely, drayage operators, terminal operators, network operators, or intermodal operators.

Topics of relevance to this type of decision-making both in time horizon as in terms of operators are:

- Intermodal terminal design
- Infrastructure network configuration
- Location of terminals
- Cooperation between drayage companies
- Allocation of shippers/receivers to a terminal
- Pricing strategies
- Capacity levels of equipment and labour
- Operational routines and lay-out structure
- Redistribution of load units, railcars, barges, and so forth
- Scheduling of trips or jobs
- Allocation of capacity to jobs
- Loading orders
- Selection of routing and service

Before submission authors should carefully read over the journal's Author Guidelines, which are located at <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/jamds/guidelines.html>. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking System at <http://mts.hindawi.com/>, according to the following timetable:

Manuscript Due	June 1, 2009
First Round of Reviews	September 1, 2009
Publication Date	December 1, 2009

### Lead Guest Editor

**Gerrit K. Janssens**, Transportation Research Institute (IMOB), Hasselt University, Agoralaan, Building D, 3590 Diepenbeek (Hasselt), Belgium; [Gerrit.Janssens@uhasselt.be](mailto:Gerrit.Janssens@uhasselt.be)

### Guest Editor

**Cathy Macharis**, Department of Mathematics, Operational Research, Statistics and Information for Systems (MOSI), Transport and Logistics Research Group, Management School, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Pleinlaan 2, 1050 Brussel, Belgium; [Cathy.Macharis@vub.ac.be](mailto:Cathy.Macharis@vub.ac.be)