

Common Fixed Points under Strict Contractive Condition and g-reciprocal Continuity

R. U. Joshi

Department of Mathematics
D. S. B. Campus, Kumaun University, Nainital-263002, India
E-mail: joshi_ratna@rediff.com

Ravindra K. Bisht and Arvind Bhatt

Department of Mathematics-Applied Sciences and Humanities
Bipin Tripathi Kumaon Institute of Technology, Dwarahat-262553, Almora, India
E-mail: ravindra.bisht@yahoo.com ; arvindbhu@rediffmail.com

(Received January03, 2012)

Abstract: In this paper, we obtain a common fixed point theorem by employing the recently introduced notion of g-reciprocal continuity. We demonstrate that g-reciprocal continuity ensures the existence of common fixed point under strict contractive conditions, which otherwise do not ensure the existence of fixed points.

Keywords: Fixed point theorems, g-reciprocal continuity, noncompatible mappings, g-compatible

AMS Subject Classification: Primary 54H25; Secondary 47H10

1. Introduction

Fixed point theory of strict contractive conditions constitutes a very important class of mappings and includes contraction mappings as their subclass. It may be observed that strict contractive conditions do not ensure the existence of common fixed points unless some strong condition is assumed either on the space or on the mappings. In such cases either the space is taken to be compact or some sequence of iterates is assumed to be Cauchy sequence. The study of common fixed points of strict contractive conditions using noncompatibility was initiated by Pant¹. Motivated by Pant¹, researchers²⁻⁸ of this domain obtained common fixed point results for strict contractive conditions under generalized metric spaces. The significance of this paper lies in the fact that we can obtain fixed point theorems for g-reciprocally continuous mappings in generalized strict

contractive conditions without assuming any strong conditions on the space or on the mappings.

2. Preliminaries and Definition

Definition 2.1 Two self maps f and g of a metric space (X, d) are called compatible⁴ if $\lim_n d(fgx_n, gfx_n) = 0$, whenever $\{x_n\}$ is a sequence in X such that $\lim_n fx_n = \lim_n gx_n = t$ for some t in X .

The definition of compatibility implies that the mappings f and g will be noncompatible if there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X such that $\lim_n fx_n = \lim_n gx_n = t$ for some t in X but $\lim_n d(fgx_n, gfx_n)$ is either non zero or nonexistent.

Definition 2.2 Two self maps f and g of a metric space (X, d) are said to satisfy property (E. A.)² if there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X such that $\lim_n fx_n = \lim_n gx_n = t$ for some t in X

Definition 2.3 Two self maps f and g of a metric space (X, d) are called g -compatible⁹ if $\lim_n d(ffx_n, gfx_n) = 0$, whenever $\{x_n\}$ is a sequence in X such that $\lim_n fx_n = \lim_n gx_n = t$ for some t in X .

Definition 2.4 Two selfmappings f and g of a metric space (X, d) are called reciprocally continuous¹⁰ iff $fgx_n \rightarrow ft$ and $gfx_n \rightarrow gt$ whenever $\{x_n\}$ is a sequence such that $\lim_n fx_n = \lim_n gx_n = t$ for some t in X .

Definition 2.5 Two selfmappings f and g of a metric space (X, d) are called g -reciprocally continuous¹¹ iff $ffx_n \rightarrow ft$ and $gfx_n \rightarrow gt$ whenever $\{x_n\}$ is a sequence such that $\lim_n fx_n = \lim_n gx_n = t$ for some t in X .

It may be observed that if f and g are both continuous then they are obviously g -reciprocally continuous but the converse is not true (see examples on the following pages). It may also be observed that g -reciprocal continuity is independent of the notion of reciprocal continuity. The following examples illustrate this fact.

Example 2.1. Let $X = [2, 20]$ and d be the usual metric on X . Define $f, g : X \rightarrow X$ as follows

$$f2 = 2 \text{ if } x = 2 \text{ or } x > 5, fx = 4 \text{ if } 2 < x \leq 5,$$

$$g2 = 2, gx = 18 \text{ if } 2 < x \leq 5, gx = \frac{(x+1)}{3} \text{ if } x > 5.$$

Then f and g are g -reciprocally continuous but not reciprocally continuous. To see this let us consider the sequence $x_n = 5 + \frac{1}{n}$. Then $fx_n \rightarrow 2$, $gx_n \rightarrow 2$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} fgx_n \neq f2$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} gfx_n = 2 = g2$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} ffx_n = 2 = f2$. Thus f and g are g -reciprocally continuous but they are not reciprocally continuous.

Example 2.2. Let $X = [2, 20]$ and d be the usual metric on X . Define $f, g : X \rightarrow X$ as follows

$$f2 = 2, fx = 6 \text{ if } 2 < x \leq 5, fx = \frac{(x+5)}{5} \text{ if } x > 5,$$

$$gx = 2 \text{ if } x = 2 \text{ or } x > 5, gx = \frac{(x+4)}{3} \text{ if } 2 < x \leq 5.$$

Then f and g are reciprocally continuous but not g -reciprocally continuous. To see this let us consider the sequence $x_n = 5 + \frac{1}{n}$. Then

$$fx_n \rightarrow 2, gx_n \rightarrow 2, \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} fgx_n = 2 = f2, \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} gfx_n = 2 = g2$$

$$\text{and } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} ffx_n = 6 \neq f2.$$

Thus f and g are reciprocally continuous but they are not g -reciprocally continuous.

Examples 2.1 and 2.2 clearly show that reciprocal continuity and g -reciprocal continuity are independent of each other.

3. Main results

Theorem 3.1. *Let f and g be g -reciprocally continuous self mappings of a metric space (X, d) satisfying*

$$(i) \quad d(fx, fy) < \max \left\{ d(gx, gy), \frac{d(fx, gx) + d(fy, gy)}{2}, \frac{d(fx, gy) + d(fy, gx)}{2} \right\},$$

whenever the right hand side is nonzero. Suppose f and g satisfy property (E. A.). If f and g are g -compatible then f and g have a unique common fixed point.

Proof: Since f and g satisfy property (E. A.), there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X such that $fx_n \rightarrow t$ and $gx_n \rightarrow t$ for some t in X . Suppose that f and g are g -compatible. Then $\lim_n d(ffx_n, gfx_n) = 0$. g -reciprocal continuity f and g implies that $ffx_n \rightarrow ft$ and $gfx_n \rightarrow gt$. The last two limits together imply $ft = gt$. Since g -compatibility implies commutativity at coincidence points, i.e., $fgt = gft$ and, hence $fft = fgt = gft = ggt$. If $ft \neq fft$ then by using (i), we get

$$\begin{aligned} d(ft, fft) &< \max \left\{ d(gt, gft), \frac{d(ft, gt) + d(fft, gft)}{2}, \frac{d(ft, gft) + d(fft, gt)}{2} \right\} \\ &= d(ft, fft), \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. Hence $ft = fft = gft$ and ft is a common fixed point of f and g . This completes the proof of the theorem.

The next example illustrates the above theorem.

Example 3.1. Let $X = [2, 20]$ and d be the usual metric on X . Define $f, g : X \rightarrow X$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} fx &= 2 \text{ if } x = 2 \text{ or } x > 5, \quad fx = 6 \text{ if } 2 < x \leq 5, \\ g2 &= 2, gx = 12 \text{ if } 2 < x \leq 5, \quad gx = (x+1)/3 \text{ if } x > 5. \end{aligned}$$

Then f and g satisfy all the conditions of Theorem 3.1 and have a unique common fixed point at $x = 2$. It can be verified in this example that f and g satisfy the contraction condition (i). Furthermore, f and g are g -reciprocally continuous g -compatible mappings. It is also obvious that f and g are not reciprocally continuous. To see this, let $\{y_n\}$ be the sequence in X given by $y_n = 5 + \varepsilon_n$ where $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then $fy_n \rightarrow 2$, $gy_n \rightarrow 2$, $\lim_n fgy_n = f\left(2 + \frac{\varepsilon_n}{3}\right) = 6 \neq f2$ and $\lim_n gfy_n = g2 = 2$. Thus $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} gfx_n = g2$ but $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} fgx_n \neq f2$. Hence f and g are not reciprocally continuous mappings.

Remark 3.1. In the above result we have not assumed strong conditions, e.g., completeness of the space, containment of the ranges of the mappings, closedness of the range of any one of the involved mappings and continuity of any mapping.

Remark 3.2. In this paper we have proved a result using generalized strict contractive condition. It may be observed that strict contractive conditions do not ensure the existence of common fixed points unless the space is assumed compact or the strict contractive condition is replaced by some strong conditions, e.g., a Banach type contractive condition or a ϕ -contractive condition or a Meir-Keeler type contractive condition.

Remark 3.3. In the result established in this paper, we have not assumed any mapping to be continuous. Thus we provide more answers to the problem posed by Rhoades¹² regarding existence a contractive definition which is strong enough to generate a fixed point, but which does not force the map to be continuous at the fixed point.

Acknowledgement. The authors are thankful to the learned referee for his valuable suggestions, which improved the exposition of the paper.

References

1. R. P. Pant, Discontinuity and fixed points, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **240** (1999) 284-289.
2. A. Aamri and D. El Moutawakil, Some new common fixed point theorems under strict contractive conditions, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **270** (2002) 181-188.

3. Fang Jin-xuan and Gao Yang, Common fixed point theorems under strict contractive conditions in Menger spaces, *Nonlinear Analysis*, **70** (2009) 184-193.
4. I. Kubiacyk and S. Sharma, Some common fixed point theorems in Menger space under strict contractive conditions, *Southeast Asian Bull. Math.*, **32** (2008) 117-124.
5. M. Imdad, Javid Ali and Ladlay Khan, Coincidence fixed points in symmetric spaces under strict contractions, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **320** (2006) 352-360.
6. R. P. Pant and V. Pant, Common fixed points under strict contractive conditions, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **248** (2000) 327-332.
7. R. K. Bisht, Common fixed points of generalized Meir-Keeler type condition and nonexpansive mappings; *The International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, Volume 2012, Article ID 786814, 12 pages.
8. T. Kamran, Coincidence and fixed points for hybrid strict contractions, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **299** (2004) 235-283.
9. H. K. Pathak and M. S. Khan, A comparison of various types of compatible maps and common fixed points, *Indian J. Pure Appl. Math.* **28** (4) (1997) 477-485.
10. R. P. Pant, Common fixed points of four mappings, *Bull. Cal. Math. Soc.*, **90** (1998) 281-286.
11. R. P. Pant and R. K. Bisht, Common fixed points of pseudo compatible mappings, *Revista de la Real Academia de Ciencias Exactas, Físicas y Naturales. Serie A. Matemáticas*, doi: 10.1007/s13398-013-0119-5.
12. B. E. Rhoades, Contractive definitions and continuity, *Contemporary Math. (Amer. Math. Soc.)*, **72** (1988) 233-245.
13. G. Jungck, Compatible mappings and common fixed points, *Internat. J. Math. Math. Sci.*, **9** (1986) 771-779.