

## A NOTE ON PSEUDO-CONTRACTIVE MAPPINGS

BY S. H. RHEE

## 1. Introduction.

In this paper it is shown that if  $X$  is a convex Banach space,  $K$  is a compact convex subset of  $X$ , and  $U$  is a Lipschitzian pseudo-contractive mapping of  $K$  into  $X$  such that  $U(x) \in K$  when  $x \in \partial K$ . Then  $U$  has a fixed point in  $K$ .

DEFINITION 1.1. Let  $C$  be a non-empty subset of a Banach space  $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ . A mapping  $T: C \rightarrow C$  is said to be *Lipschitzian* if there is a constant  $K > 0$  such that  $\|T(x) - T(y)\| \leq K\|x - y\|$  for all  $x$  and  $y$  in  $C$ .

DEFINITION 1.2. Let  $C$  be a non-empty subset of a Banach space  $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ . A mapping  $T: C \rightarrow C$  is said to be *non-expansive* if there is a constant  $K = 1$  such that  $\|T(x) - T(y)\| \leq K\|x - y\|$  for all  $x$  and  $y$  in  $C$ .

DEFINITION 1.3. Let  $C$  be a non-empty subset of a Banach space  $X$ . A mapping  $T: C \rightarrow C$  is said to be *contraction* if there is a constant  $0 < K < 1$  such that  $\|T(x) - T(y)\| \leq K\|x - y\|$  for all  $x$  and  $y$  in  $C$ .

Clearly, non-expansive mappings contain all contraction mappings as a proper subclass, and they form a proper subclass of the collection of all continuous mappings.

DEFINITION 1.4. [4]. Let  $X$  be a Banach space, let  $D$  be a subset of  $X$ . A mapping  $U: D \rightarrow X$  is said to be *pseudo-contractive* if for all  $u, v \in D$  and all  $r > 0$ ,  $\|u - v\| \leq \|(1+r)(u-v) - r(U(u) - U(v))\|$ .

This class of mappings is easily seen to be larger than the class of non-expansive mappings, throughout our discussion,  $X$  will denote a Banach space, and for  $K \subset X$ , we use  $\partial K$  to denote the boundary of  $K$ , and  $\lambda K = \{\lambda y : y \in K\}$ .  $\delta(K) = \sup\{\|x - y\| : x, y \in K\}$  to denote the diameter of  $K$ .

## 2. Main results.

In [2] the following Theorem has been proved.

THEOREM 2.1. [2]. Let  $X$  be a Banach space,  $H$  a closed convex subset

of  $X$ , and  $K$  a closed subset of  $H$ . If  $T: K \rightarrow H$  is a contraction mapping, and if  $T(x) \in K$  when  $x \in \partial K$ , then  $T$  has a (unique) fixed point in  $K$ . A more interesting consequence of this theorem arises from taking  $H = X$ :

**COROLLARY 2.2.** *Let  $K$  be a closed subset of convex Banach space  $X$ . If  $T: K \rightarrow X$  is a contraction mapping, and if  $T(x) \in K$  when  $x \in \partial K$ , then  $T$  has a (unique) fixed point in  $K$ .*

W. G. Dotson, JR, and W. R. Mann. have proved the following theorem.

**THEOREM 2.3.** [1]. *Let  $X$  be a Banach space, let  $C$  be compact convex subset of  $X$ . If  $T: C \rightarrow C$  is a non-expansive mapping, then  $T$  has a fixed point in  $C$ .*

**THEOREM 2.4.** *Let  $X$  be a convex Banach space, let  $K$  be a compact convex subset of  $X$ . Let  $U$  be a lipschitzian pseudo-contractive mapping of  $K$  into  $X$  such that  $U(x) \in K$  when  $x \in \partial K$ , then  $U$  has a fixed point in  $K$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $U$  is pseudo-contractive: For all  $u, v$  in  $K$  and all  $r > 0$ ,  
 $\|u - v\| \leq \|(1+r)(u-v) - r(U(u) - U(v))\| - (1)$ . Taking  $\lambda = \frac{r}{1+r}$ .

(1) equivalent to  $(1-\lambda)\|u-v\| \leq \|(u-v) - \lambda(U(u) - U(v))\|$ . Then  $\|(I - \lambda U)(u) - (I - \lambda U)(v)\| \geq (1-\lambda)\|u-v\|$ ,  $\lambda > 0$ . Put  $T_\lambda = I - \lambda U$ . Then  $\|T_\lambda(u) - T_\lambda(v)\| \geq (1-\lambda)\|u-v\|$ , for all  $u, v$  in  $K$ .

Since  $U$  is lipschitzian, there is  $C > 0$  such that  $\|U(u) - U(v)\| \leq C\|u-v\|$ . Select  $\lambda > 0$  such that  $\lambda C < 1$  and  $\lambda < 1$ , and let  $U_\lambda = \lambda U$ . Then  $\|U_\lambda(u) - U_\lambda(v)\| = \lambda\|U(u) - U(v)\| \leq \lambda C\|u-v\|$ . Therefore  $U_\lambda$  is a contractive mapping on  $K$ . By  $\|T_\lambda(u) - T_\lambda(v)\| \geq (1-\lambda)\|u-v\|$ ,  $u, v \in K$ . Hence  $(1-\lambda)T_\lambda^{-1}$  is a non-expansive on its domain. Now let  $y^* \in (1-\lambda)K = \{(1-\lambda)y : y \in K\}$  and consider  $\bar{U}_\lambda: K \rightarrow X$  defined by  $\bar{U}_\lambda(x) = U_\lambda(x) + y^*$ ,  $x \in K$ . For  $x \in \partial K$ , then  $U(x) \in K$ , Thus  $\bar{U}_\lambda(x) = U_\lambda(x) + (1-\lambda)y'$  for some  $y'$  in  $K$ . Since  $K =$  convex. Therefore  $\bar{U}_\lambda(x)$  in  $K$  whenever  $x \in \partial K$ . Since  $\|\bar{U}_\lambda(u) - \bar{U}_\lambda(v)\| = \|\lambda U(u) - \lambda U(v)\|$ , we have  $\bar{U}_\lambda$  is a contractive mapping. Thus  $\bar{U}_\lambda$  is a contraction mapping satisfying the assumptions of Corollary 2.2. Hence there exists  $x^*$  in  $K$  such that  $\bar{U}_\lambda(x^*) = x^*$ .

Hence  $U_\lambda(x^*) + y^* = x^*$ ; that is  $(I - U_\lambda)(x^*) = y^*$ . Note that  $\lambda U = I - T_\lambda$ . Thus we have proved  $T_\lambda(K) \supset (1-\lambda)K$ ;  $T_\lambda^{-1}(1-\lambda)K \subset K$ . Then  $(1-\lambda)T_\lambda^{-1}: (1-\lambda)K \rightarrow (1-\lambda)K$  is a non-expansive. Since  $(1-\lambda)K$  is closed and  $(1-\lambda)K$  is compact. By Theorem 2.3.  $(1-\lambda)T_\lambda^{-1}$  has a fixed point in  $(1-\lambda)K$ . Thus there exists  $z \in (1-\lambda)K$  such that  $(1-\lambda)T_\lambda^{-1}(z) = z$ . Then  $T_\lambda^{-1}(z) = \frac{z}{1-\lambda} = \frac{(1-\lambda)y}{1-\lambda} = y$ , for some  $y \in K$ . Hence  $(I - \lambda U)(y) = y - \lambda U(y) = z = (1-\lambda)y$ , Therefore  $y - \lambda U(y) = y - \lambda y$ . Hence  $U(y) = y$ .

Clearly, We have the following Corollary.

**COROLLARY 2.5.** *Let  $X$  be a convex Banach space. Let  $K$  be non-empty compact convex subset of  $X$ , if  $U$  is a lipschitzian pseudo-contractive mapping of  $K$  into itself. Then  $U$  have a fixed point in  $K$ .*

**LEMMA 2.6.** *Let  $X$  be a Banach space, and let  $U$  be a continuous mapping of  $X$  into itself such that  $U$  satisfies the inequalities*

- (1)  $\|U(x) - U(y)\| \leq \alpha \max \{ \|x - y\|, [\beta \|x - U(x)\| + \gamma \|y - U(y)\|], \frac{1}{2} [\|x - U(y)\| + \|y - U(x)\|] \}$ , for all  $x$  and  $y$  in  $X$ ,  $\beta + \gamma = 1$  and for some  $0 < \alpha < 1$ .  
 (2)  $\text{Inf} \{ \|x - U(x)\| : x \in X \} = 0$ . Then  $U$  has a (unique) fixed point.

*Proof.* Consider the set  $C_m$  defined by  $C_m = \{x \in X : \|x - U(x)\| \leq \frac{1}{m}\}$ .

From (2) and the continuity of  $U$ , we get  $C_m$  is closed and non-empty for each  $m=1, 2, \dots$ . Now if  $x, y \in C_m$ , then  $\|x - y\| \leq \|x - U(x)\| + \|U(x) - U(y)\| + \|y - U(y)\| \leq \|x - U(x)\| + \|y - U(y)\| + \alpha \max \{ \|x - y\|, [\beta \|x - U(x)\|$

$$+ \gamma \|y - U(y)\|], \frac{1}{2} [\|x - U(y)\| + \|y - U(x)\|] \}$$

$$\leq \frac{2}{m} + \alpha \left[ \frac{1}{2} (\|x - y\| + \|y - x\| + \|x - U(x)\| + \|y - U(y)\|) + \frac{1}{2} ((2\beta - 1) \|x - U(x)\| + (2\gamma - 1) \|y - U(y)\|) \right]$$

$$\leq \frac{2}{m} + \alpha \|x - y\| + \frac{\alpha}{m} + \frac{1}{2} \left\{ (2\beta - 1) \frac{1}{m} + (2\gamma - 1) \frac{1}{m} \right\}$$

$$= \frac{2}{m} + \alpha \|x - y\| + \frac{\alpha}{m}.$$

$$\text{Thus } (1 - \alpha) \|x - y\| \leq \frac{2 + \alpha}{m}.$$

$$\text{Therefore } \|x - y\| \leq \frac{2 + \alpha}{m(1 - \alpha)}.$$

$$\text{Hence } \delta(C_m) \leq \frac{(2 + \alpha)}{m(1 - \alpha)}.$$

Thus the family of sets  $\{C_m\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$  is nested family of closed sets for which  $\delta(C_m) \rightarrow 0$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ .

The intersection of these sets contains a single point  $x_0$ . Since  $U(C_m) \subseteq C_m$  for all  $m$ , and  $U(x_0) = U(\bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} C_m) = \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} U(C_m) \subseteq \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} C_m = \{x_0\}$ .

Hence  $x_0$  is a fixed point of  $U$ .

Next we prove the uniqueness of the fixed point. Let  $y_0$  be another fixed point of  $U$ , i.e.  $U(y_0) = y_0$ , different from  $x_0$ . From the inequality

(1) of the Lemma 2.6.

We have  $\|x_0 - y_0\| \leq \alpha \max \{ \|x_0 - y_0\|, [\beta \|x_0 - U(x_0)\| + \|y_0 - U(y_0)\|], \frac{1}{2} [\|x_0 - U(y)\| + \|y_0 - U(x_0)\|] \} \leq \alpha \|x_0 - y_0\| \leq \|x_0 - y_0\|$  which is a contradiction.  
Hence  $x_0 = y_0$ .

REMARK: If we put  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$ , the theorem (1) in [3] follows from our Lemma 2.7.

REMARK: It may be noted that the Lemma 2.6 can be proved when  $U$  satisfies the condition (1) only.

The following Lemma 2.8 follows by theorem in [5].

LEMMA 2.7. *Let  $X$  be a Banach space. Let  $U : X \rightarrow X$  a continuous pseudo-contractive mapping and suppose that for some  $\delta > 0$  the set  $\{x \in X : \|x - U(x)\| \leq \delta\}$  is non-empty and bounded. Then  $\text{Inf} \{ \|x - U(x)\| : x \in X \} = 0$ .*

By Lemma 2.6 and Lemma 2.7 we have the following Theorem 2.8.

THEOREM 2.8. *Let  $X$  be a Banach space, let  $U : X \rightarrow X$  a continuous pseudo-contractive mapping such that*

$$\|U(x) - U(y)\| \leq \alpha \max \{ \|x - y\|, [\beta \|x - U(x)\| + \gamma \|y - U(y)\|], \frac{1}{2} [\|x - U(y)\| + \|y - U(x)\|] \}$$

*for all  $x, y \in X$ .  $\beta + \gamma = 1$  and for some  $0 < \alpha < 1$  and suppose that for some  $\delta > 0$  the set  $\{x \in X : \|x - U(x)\| \leq \delta\}$  is nonempty and bounded. Then  $T$  has a unique fixed point.*

## References

- [1] W.G. Dotson, Jr, and W.R. Mann. *The Schauder fixed point theorem for non-expansive mappings*, The Amer. Math. Monthly Vol. **84**, No. 5. May (1977) 363-364.
- [2] Nadim. A. Assad and W. A. Kirk. *Fixed point theorems for set-valued mappings of contractive type*, Pacific J. Math. Vol. **43**, No. 3. (1972) 553-562.
- [3] J. Achari, *Fixed point theorems in metric spaces*. Tamkang J. of Math. **7** (1976), 71-74.
- [4] F.E. Browder, *Nonlinear mappings of nonexpansive and accretive type in Banach spaces*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **73** (1967), 875-882. MR 38 #581.
- [5] W. A. Kirk and Rainald Schoneberg, *Some results on pseudo-contractive mappings*, Pacific Journal Math. Vol. **71**, No.1 (1977), 89-100.