ISSN 1607-2510

On Nonunique Fixed Point Theorems^{*}

Zeqing Liu[†], Li Wang[‡], Shin Min Kang[§], Yong Soo Kim[§]

Received 9 April 2007

Abstract

Several fixed point theorems for four classes of mappings in complete metric spaces are given. The results presented in this paper extend properly the Banach contraction principle.

1 Introduction and Preliminaries

Let (X, d) be a metric space, $T: X \to X$ be a mapping, and $r \in [0, 1)$ be a constant. Let \mathbb{N} denote the set of all positive integers. A point $x_0 \in X$ is called an *n*-periodic point of T, if there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x_0 = T^n x_0$ but $x_0 \neq T^k x_0$ for k = 1, 2, 3, ..., n - 1. For $x \in X$, the set $O_T(x) = \{T^n x : n \ge 0\}$ is said to be the *orbit* of T at x. Let Φ be the set of $\phi : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ which is nondecreasing and $\phi(t) < t$ and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \phi^n(t) < \infty$ for all t > 0.

It is easy to see that $\phi(t) = rt \in \Phi$ for any constant $r \in (0, 1)$. Rhoades [1] provided some fixed point theorems for various contractive mappings.

In this paper, we will discuss the existence of fixed points for mappings T that satisfy

$$d(Tx, Ty) + d(Ty, Tz) \le \phi(d(x, y) + d(y, z)) \tag{1}$$

for all $x, y, z \in X$ with $x \neq y \neq z \neq x$, where $\phi \in \Phi$; or

$$d(Tx, Ty) + d(Ty, Tz) + d(Tz, Tx) \le \phi(d(x, y) + d(y, z) + d(z, x))$$
(2)

for all $x, y, z \in X$ with $x \neq y \neq z \neq x$, where $\phi \in \Phi$; or

$$\max\{d(Tx, Ty), d(Ty, Tz)\} \le \phi(\max\{d(x, y), d(y, z)\})$$
(3)

for all $x, y, z \in X$ with $x \neq y \neq z \neq x$, where $\phi \in \Phi$; or

$$\max\{d(Tx, Ty), d(Ty, Tz), d(Tz, Tx)\} \le \phi(\max\{d(x, y), d(y, z), d(z, x)\})$$
(4)

^{*}Mathematics Subject Classifications: 54H25

[†]Department of Mathematics, Liaoning Normal University, P. O. Box 200, Dalian, Liaoning 116029, P. R. China

 $^{^{\}ddagger} \text{Department}$ of Science, Shenyang Institute of Aeronautical Engineering, Shenyang, Liaoning 110034, P. R. China

[§]Department of Mathematics and the Research Institute of Natural Science, Gyeongsang National University, Jinju 660-701, Korea

for all $x, y, z \in X$ with $x \neq y \neq z \neq x$, where $\phi \in \Phi$.

It follows from the definition of n-periodic point that

LEMMA 1. Let T be a mapping from a metric space (X, d) into itself. If $x_0 \in X$ is an n-periodic point of T, then $T^i x_0 \neq T^j x_0$ for all $0 \leq i < j \leq n-1$.

2 Main Results

Our first main result is the following.

THEOREM 1. Let (X, d) be a complete metric space and $T: X \to X$ satisfy (1). Then

(a) T has at most two distinct fixed points in X;

(b) if T has 2-periodic points in X, then they are exactly two;

(c) T has no any n-periodic points in X for $n \ge 3$;

(d) T has a fixed point in X provided that T has an orbit without 2-periodic points.

PROOF. First, we assert that T has at most two distinct fixed points in X. Otherwise T has (at least) three different fixed points a, b, c in X. In the light of (1), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} d(a,c) + d(c,b) &= d(Ta,Tc) + d(Tc,Tb) \\ &\leq \phi(d(a,c) + d(c,b)) \\ &< d(a,c) + d(c,b), \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction.

Suppose that there exists a point $b \in X$ which is a 2-periodic point of T. Then Tb is also a 2-periodic point of T different from b. Now we claim that T has the only two 2-periodic points b and Tb. Otherwise there is a point $c \in X$ which is also a 2-periodic point of T with $b \neq c \neq Tb$. It is easy to show that $Tb \neq Tc \neq T^2b \neq Tb$. By (3) we have

$$\begin{split} d(b,c) + d(c,Tb) &= d(T^2b,T^2c) + d(T^2c,T^3b) \\ &\leq \phi(d(Tb,Tc) + d(Tc,T^2b)) \\ &= \phi(d(T^3b,T^3c) + d(T^3c,T^2b)) \\ &\leq \phi^2(d(T^2b,T^2c) + d(T^2c,Tb)) \\ &< d(b,c) + d(c,Tb), \end{split}$$

which is a contradiction. Thus T has only 2-periodic points b and Tb.

Now we exclude the presence of *n*-periodic point for $n \ge 3$. Suppose that $a_0 \in X$ is an *n*-periodic point of *T* for $n \ge 3$. Let $a_k = T^k a_0$, $d_k = d(a_k, a_{k+1}) + d(a_{k+1}, a_{k+2})$ for all $0 \le k \le n$. From Lemma 1 and (1), we have

$$d_{k} = d(Ta_{k-1}, Ta_{k}) + d(Ta_{k}, Ta_{k+1})$$

$$\leq \phi(d(a_{k-1}, a_{k}) + d(a_{k}, a_{k+1}))$$

$$= \phi(d_{k-1}) < d_{k-1}$$
(5)

Liu et al.

for all $1 \le k \le n$. In view of (3) and (5), we get that

$$d_0 = d_n \le \phi(d_{n-1}) < d_{n-1} \le \dots < d_0,$$

which is a contradiction.

Suppose that there exists a point $x_0 \in X$ such that T has no 2-periodic points in $O_T(x_0)$. Set $x_n = T^n x_0$, $d_n = d(x_n, x_{n+1}) + d(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2})$ for any $n \ge 0$. If there exists some $n \ge 0$ with $x_n = x_{n+1}$, then x_n is a fixed point of T; if $x_n \ne x_{n+1}$ for any $n \ge 0$, from (1) we have

$$d_n \le \phi(d_{n-1}) \le \phi^2(d_{n-2}) \le \dots \le \phi^n(d_0).$$
(6)

For each $r, s, m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r > s \ge m$, by the triangular inequality and (6), we get that

$$d(x_r, x_s) \le \sum_{n=m}^{r-1} d_n \le \sum_{n=m}^{r-1} \phi^n(d_0).$$
(7)

Since $\phi \in \Phi$, (7) ensures that $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ is a Cauchy sequence in X. It follows from completeness of (X, d) that there exists a point $a \in X$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} x_n = a$. Obviously, there exists some integer $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $x_n \neq a$ for all $n \geq k$. From (c) and (5) we obtain that

$$d(x_{n+1}, Ta) + d(Ta, Tx_{n+2}) \le \phi(d(x_n, a) + d(a, x_{n+2}))$$

< $d(x_n, a) + d(a, x_{n+2})$
 $\rightarrow 0$

as $n \to \infty$, which implies that $\lim_{n\to\infty} x_n = Ta$. Hence Ta = a. This completes the proof.

The proof of the next result is similar to that of Theorem 1 and is omitted.

THEOREM 2. Let (X, d) be a complete metric space and $T : X \to X$ satisfy (2). Then the conclusions of Theorem 1 hold.

THEOREM 3. Let (X, d) be a complete metric space and $T : X \to X$ satisfy (3). Then the conclusions of Theorem 1 hold.

PROOF. We first assert that T has at most two distinct fixed points in X. Otherwise T has three different fixed points a, b, c in X. From (3), we obtain that

$$\max\{d(a, b), d(b, c)\} = \max\{d(Ta, Tb), d(Tb, Tc)\} \\ \leq \phi(\max\{d(a, b), d(b, c)\}) \\ < \max\{d(a, b), d(b, c)\},\$$

which is a contradiction.

Suppose that T has a 2-periodic point $b \in X$. Then Tb is also a 2-periodic point of T different from b. We point out that b and Tb are the only two 2-periodic points of T in X. Otherwise there exists c in X which is also a 2-periodic point of T and

 $b \neq c \neq Tb$. By (3) we get that

$$\max\{d(Tb, Tc), d(Tc, b)\} = \max\{d(Tb, Tc), d(Tc, T^{2}b)\}$$

$$\leq \phi(\max\{d(b, c), d(c, Tb)\})$$

$$= \phi(\max\{d(T^{2}b, T^{2}c), d(T^{2}c, T^{3}b)\})$$

$$\leq \phi^{2}(\max\{d(Tb, Tc), d(Tc, b)\})$$

$$< \max\{d(Tb, Tc), d(Tc, b)\},$$

which is impossible.

We next conclude that T has no n-periodic point for $n \ge 3$. Suppose that T has an n-periodic point a_0 for $n \ge 3$. Set $a_k = T^k a_0$, $d_k = d(a_k, a_{k+1})$ for all $0 \le k \le n$. According to Lemma 1 and (3), we get that

$$\max\{d_0, d_1\} = \max\{d_n, d_{n+1}\}$$

= $\max\{d(Ta_{n-1}, Ta_n), d(Ta_n, Ta_{n+1})\}$
 $\leq \phi(\max\{d(a_{n-1}, a_n), d(a_n, a_{n+1})\})$
= $\phi(\max\{d_{n-1}, d_n\}) \leq \phi^n(\max\{d_0, d_1\})$
 $< \max\{d_0, d_1\},$

which is a contradiction.

Lastly, we prove that T has a fixed point in X provided that T has an orbit without 2-periodic points in X. Assume that there exists a point $x_0 \in X$ such that T has no 2-periodic points in $O_T(x_0)$. Let $x_n = T^n x_0$, $d_n = d(x_n, x_{n+1})$ for all $n \ge 0$. We consider two cases:

Case 1. There exists some $n \ge 0$ with $x_n = x_{n+1}$. Then x_n is a fixed point of T in X.

Case 2. For all $n \ge 0$, $x_n \ne x_{n+1}$. It follows that $x_n \ne x_m$ for $n > m \ge 0$. In view of (3) we have

$$\max\{d_n, d_{n+1}\} = \max\{d(Tx_{n-1}, Tx_n), d(Tx_n, Tx_{n+1})\}$$

$$\leq \phi(\max\{d(x_{n-1}, x_n), d(x_n, x_{n+1})\})$$

$$= \phi(\max\{d_{n-1}, d_n\}) \leq \phi^2(\max\{d_{n-2}, d_{n-1}\})$$

$$\leq \cdots \leq \phi^n(\max\{d_0, d_1\}).$$

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}$, using the triangular inequality and (3), we obtain that

$$d(x_n, x_{n+p}) \le \sum_{i=n}^{n+p-1} d_i \le \sum_{i=n}^{n+p-1} \phi^i(\max\{d_0, d_1\}),$$

which yields that $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ is a Cauchy sequence. It follows from the completeness of (X, d) that $\lim_{n\to\infty} x_n = a$ for some point $a \in X$. It is easy to check that there exists some integer $k \geq 1$ with $x_n \neq a$ for all $n \geq k$. Using again (3) we have

$$\max\{d(x_{n+1}, Ta), d(Ta, x_{n+2})\} \le \phi(\max\{d(x_n, a), d(a, x_{n+1})\})$$
$$< \max\{d(x_n, a), d(a, x_{n+1})\}$$
$$\to 0$$

234

as $n \to \infty$, that is, Ta = a. This completes the proof.

REMARK 1. In Theorem 3, the presence of 2-periodic points excludes the presence of fixed points and vice verse. Otherwise there exist two points $a, b \in X$ such that $a = Ta, b = T^2b$ with $a \neq Tb \neq b$. In view of (3), we obtain that

$$\max\{d(a, b), d(b, Tb)\} = \max\{d(T^2a, T^2b), d(T^2b, T^3b)\}$$

$$\leq \phi(\max\{d(Ta, Tb), d(Tb, T^2b)\})$$

$$\leq \phi^2(\max\{d(a, b), d(b, Tb)\})$$

$$< \max\{d(a, b), d(b, Tb)\},$$

which is a contradiction.

REMARK 2. Theorem 3 extends properly the Banach contraction principle.

Now we give the following examples for Remarks 1 and 2.

EXAMPLE 1. Let $X = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, T : X \to X$ be a mapping defined by T1 = 1, T2 = 2, T3 = 4, T4 = 2 and $d : X \times X \to [0, \infty)$ be a function defined by d(1, 2) = 1, d(2, 3) = 3, d(1, 3) = 4, d(2, 4) = 2, d(1, 4) = 2.5, d(3, 4) = 3.5, d(x, x) = 0 and d(x, y) = d(y, x) for all $x, y \in X$. Take $\phi(t) = \frac{3}{4}t$ for $t \ge 0$. It is easy to check that the conditions of Theorem 3 are satisfied, and T has two fixed points 1 and 2 in X. But the Banach contraction principle is not available and T has no 2-periodic points in X.

EXAMPLE 2. Let $X = \{1, 2, 3\}, T : X \to X$ be a mapping defined by T1 = 2, T2 = 1, T3 = 2 and $d : X \times X \to [0, \infty)$ be a function defined by d(1, 2) = 3, d(1, 3) = 4, d(2, 3) = 5, d(x, x) = 0 and d(x, y) = d(y, x) for all $x, y \in X$. Put $\phi(t) = \frac{4}{5}t$ for $t \ge 0$. Clearly, the conditions of Theorem 3 are satisfied and T has two 2-periodic points 1 and 2 in X, but T has no fixed points in X.

THEOREM 4. Let (X, d) be a complete metric space and $T : X \to X$ satisfy (4). Then the conclusions of Theorem 1 hold.

PROOF. First we claim that T has at most two distinct fixed points in X. Otherwise there are three different points a, b, c in X, which are all fixed points of T. By (4) we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{d(a,b), d(b,c), d(c,a)\} &= \max\{d(Ta,Tb), d(Tb,Tc), d(Tc,Ta)\} \\ &\leq \phi(\max\{d(a,b), d(b,c), d(c,a)\}) \\ &< \max\{d(a,b), d(b,c), d(c,a)\}, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction.

We next assert that if T has 2-periodic point $b \in X$, then b and Tb are all 2-periodic points of T. Otherwise, there exists a point c in X which is a 2-periodic point with $b \neq c \neq Tb$. By (4) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{d(b,Tb), d(Tb,c), d(c,b)\} &= \max\{d(T^2b,T^3b), d(T^3b,T^2c), d(T^2c,T^2b)\} \\ &\leq \phi(\max\{d(Tb,T^2b), d(T^2b,Tc), d(Tc,Tb)\}) \\ &\leq \phi^2(\max\{d(b,Tb), d(Tb,c), d(c,b)\}), \\ &< \max\{d(b,Tb), d(Tb,c), d(c,b)\}, \end{aligned}$$

which is impossible.

We now exclude the presence of *n*-periodic point for $n \ge 3$. Suppose that *T* has an *n*-periodic point $a_0 \in X$ for $n \ge 3$. Set $a_k = T^k a$ for all $0 \le k \le n$. According to (4), we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{d(a_0, a_1), d(a_1, a_2), d(a_2, d_0)\} \\ &= \phi(\max\{d(Ta_{n-1}, Ta_n), d(Ta_n, Ta_{n+1}), d(Ta_{n+1}, Ta_{n-1})\}) \\ &\leq \phi(\max\{d(a_{n-1}, a_n), d(a_n, a_{n+1}), d(a_{n+1}, a_{n-1})\}) \\ &\leq \phi^2(\max\{d(a_{n-2}, a_{n-1}), d(a_{n-1}, a_n), d(a_n, a_{n-2})\}) \\ &\leq \cdots \\ &\leq \phi^n(\max\{d(a_0, a_1), d(a_1, a_2), d(a_2, a_0)\}) \\ &< \max\{d(a_0, a_1), d(a_1, a_2), d(a_2, a_0)\}, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction.

Finally we assert that T has a fixed point in X provided that T has an orbit without 2-periodic points. Suppose that there exists a point $x_0 \in X$ and $O_T(x_0)$ is such an orbit that T has no 2-periodic points in it. Let $x_n = T^n x_0$ for all $n \ge 0$. We have to consider the following two cases:

Case 1. There exists some $n \ge 0$ with $x_n = x_{n+1}$. Then x_n is a fixed point of T in X.

Case 2. For all $n \ge 0$, $x_n \ne x_{n+1}$. Then $x_n \ne x_m$ for all $n > m \ge 0$. In view of (4), we have

$$\max\{d(x_n, x_{n+1}), d(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}), d(x_{n+2}, x_n)\} \\ = \max\{d(Tx_{n-1}, Tx_n), d(Tx_n, Tx_{n+1}), d(Tx_{n+1}, Tx_{n-1})\} \\ \le \phi(\max\{d(x_{n-1}, x_n), d(x_n, x_{n+1}), d(x_{n+1}, x_{n-1})\}) \\ \le \phi^2(\max\{d(x_{n-2}, x_{n-1}), d(x_{n-1}, x_n), d(x_n, x_{n-2})\}) \\ \le \cdots \\ \le \phi^n(\max\{d(x_0, x_1), d(x_1, x_2), d(x_2, x_0)\}),$$

which implies that

$$d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \le \phi^n(\max\{d(x_0, x_1), d(x_1, x_2), d(x_2, x_0)\}).$$

By the triangular inequality and (4), we obtain that

$$d(x_n, x_{n+p}) \le \sum_{i=n}^{n+p-1} d(x_i, x_{i+1})$$

$$\le \sum_{i=n}^{n+p-1} \phi^i(\max\{d(x_0, x_1), d(x_1, x_2), d(x_2, x_0)\})$$

for all $n, p \in \mathbb{N}$. Clearly, $\{x_n\}_{n \ge 0}$ is a Cauchy sequence and hence $\lim_{n \to \infty} x_n = a$ for some $a \in X$ since (X, d) is complete. Obviously, there exists some integer $k \ge 1$ with

236

 $x_n \neq a$ for all $n \geq k$. Hence we have

$$\max\{d(Ta, x_{n+1}), d(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}), d(x_{n+2}, Ta)\} \le \phi(\max\{d(a, x_n), d(x_n, x_{n+1}), d(x_{n+1}, a)\}) < \max\{d(a, x_n), d(x_n, x_{n+1}), d(x_{n+1}, a)\} \to 0$$

as $n \to \infty$. That is, $\lim_{n \to \infty} x_n = Ta$. Thus Ta = a. This completes the proof.

REMARK 3. The following example reveals that Theorem 4 extends indeed the Banach contraction principle.

EXAMPLE 3. Let X, T and d be as in Example 1. Put $\phi(t) = \frac{2}{3}t$. Then it is easy to verify that the conditions of Theorem 4 are fulfilled, and T has two fixed points 1 and 2. But the Banach contraction principle is not applicable.

References

 B. E. Rhoades, A comparison of various definitions of contraction mappings, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 226(1997), 257–289.