Int. J. Nonlinear Anal. Appl. 12 (2021) No. 1, 903-911 ISSN: 2008-6822 (electronic) http://dx.doi.org/10.22075/ijnaa.2021.21318.2245



New common fixed point theorems for contractive self mappings and an application to nonlinear differential equations

Youssef Touail^{a,*}, Driss El Moutawakil^a

^aEquipe de Recherche en Mathématiques Appliquées, Technologies de l'Information et de la Communication Faculté Polydisciplinare de Khouribga, Université Sultan Moulay Slimane de Beni-Mellal, Morocco

(Communicated by Madjid Eshaghi Gordji)

Abstract

In this paper, we prove a new common fixed point in a general topological space with a τ -distance. Then we deduce two common fixed point theorems for two new classes of contractive selfmappings in complete bounded metric spaces. Moreover, an application to a system of differential equations is given.

Keywords: Common fixed point, Shrinking maps, E_{θ} -Weakly contractive maps, Metric space, Hausdorff topological space 2010 MSC: Primary 47H10; Secondary 54H25.

1. Introduction

The Study of Shrinking or contractive selfmappings on a metric space (X, d) (That is, d(Tx, Ty) < d(x, y), for all $x \neq y \in X$) was initiated by Nemytzki [12]. Moreover, as mentioned in [4], to obtain a fixed point of such mappings, it is necessary either to add the assumption that the space is compact, or else assume that there exists a point $x \in X$ for which $\{T^nx\}$ contains a convergent subsequence. In [14], the author showed that every weakly contractive mapping defined on a complete metric space (X, d) has a unique fixed point, in other words, every selfmapping $T : X \to X$ satisfying $d(Tx, Ty) \leq d(x, y) - \phi(d(x, y))$, for all $x, y \in X$, where $\phi : [0, +\infty) \to [0, +\infty)$ is a continuous nondecreasing function such that $\phi(0) = 0$. Since then, many results have appeared in the literature

^{*}Corresponding author

Email addresses: youssef9touail@gmail.com (Youssef Touail), d.elmoutawakil@gmail.com (Driss El Moutawakil)

concerning this class of mappings [5, 10, 3, 13].

The authors in [1] introduced the concept of τ -distances in general topological spaces (X, τ) which extend many known spaces in the literature. Further, they proved a version of the well-known Banach's fixed point for this general setting.

In this paper, using the concept of τ -distance, we first establish a new common fixed point theorem for weakly compatible selfmappings which yields the fixed point proved by Jungck and Rhoades [?] in a new setting. As application of this result, we get a new common fixed point theorem for shrinking selfmappings without using neither the compactness of the space nor the fact that there exists a point $x \in X$ for which $\{T^n x\}$ contains a convergent subsequence. In addition, we prove a theorem for a new class of weakly contractive selfmappings, we call it E_{θ} -weakly contractive selfmappings, where the auxiliary function ϕ satisfies $\phi(1) = 0$ and $\inf_{t \in I} \phi(t) > 0$.

Furthermore, based on one of our results, we study the existence and uniqueness of solutions for a system of differential equations.

2. Preliminaries

In this section, we recall some definitions and results needed in the sequel. Let (X, τ) be a topological space and $p: X \times X \to [0, \infty)$ be a function. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ and any $x \in X$, let $B_p(x, \varepsilon) = \{y \in X : p(x, y) < \varepsilon\}$.

Definition 2.1. (Definition 2.1 [1]) The function p is said to be τ – distance if for each $x \in X$ and any neighborhood V of x, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $B_p(x, \varepsilon) \subset V$.

Definition 2.2. A sequence in a Hausdorff topological space X is a p-Cauchy if it satisfies the usual metric condition with respect to p.

Definition 2.3. (Definition 3.1 [1])

Let (X, τ) be a topological space with a τ -distance p.

- 1. X is S-complete if for every p-Cauchy sequence (x_n) , there exists x in X with $\lim p(x, x_n) = 0$.
- 2. X is p-Cauchy complete if for every p-Cauchy sequence (x_n) , there exists x in X with $\lim x_n = x$ with respect to τ .
- 3. X is said to be p-bounded if $\sup\{p(x,y)/x, y \in X\} < \infty$.

Lemma 2.4. (Lemma 3.1[1])

Let (X, τ) be a Hausdorff topological space with a τ -distance p, then

- 1. p(x, y) = 0 implies x = y.
- 2. Let (x_n) be a sequence in X such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} p(x, x_n) = 0$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} p(y, x_n) = 0$, then x = y.

Definition 2.5. ([?]) Two selfmappings f and g of a set X are said to be weakly compatible if they commute at there coincidence points; i.e., if fu = gu for some $u \in X$, then $f \circ gu = g \circ fu$.

Definition 2.6. ([5])

 Θ is the class of all functions $\theta : [0, +\infty) \longrightarrow [0, +\infty)$ satisfying: i) θ is a monotone increasing function, ii) $\theta(t) = 0$ if and only if t = 0. **Definition 2.7.** ([5]) Ψ is the class of all functions $\psi : [0, +\infty) \longrightarrow [0, +\infty)$ satisfying: *i*) ψ is nondecreasing, *ii*) $\lim \psi^n(t) = 0$, for all $t \in [0, \infty)$.

Definition 2.8. Φ is the class of all functions $\phi : [1, +\infty) \longrightarrow [0, +\infty)$ satisfying: *i*) $\phi(t) = 0$ if and only if t = 1, *ii*) $\inf_{t>1} \phi(t) > 0$.

3. Main results

In this section, we begin by proving a new Theorem and a Lemma needed in the next.

Theorem 3.1. Let (X, τ) be a *p*-bounded Hausdorff topological space with a τ -disatnce *p*. Let *f* and *g* be two weakly compatible selfmappings of *X*, satisfying the following conditions: *i*) $q(X) \subset f(X)$,

i) $p(gx, gy) \leq \psi(p(fx, fy)),$ for all $x, y \in X$ and $\psi \in \Psi$.

If the range of f or g is S-complete subspace of X, then f and g have a unique common fixed point.

Proof. Let $x_0 \in X$. By the condition (i), it follows that there exists $x_1 \in X$ such that $g(x_0) = f(x_1)$, continuing this process, we can choose $x_n \in X$ such that $f(x_n) = g(x_{n-1})$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Using (ii), we get for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$p(fx_n, fx_{n+m}) = p(gx_{n-1}, gx_{n+m-1})$$

$$\leq \psi(p(fx_{n-1}, fx_{n+m-1}))$$

$$\vdots$$

$$\leq \psi^n(p(fx_0, fx_m))$$

$$\leq \psi^n(M),$$
(3.1)

where $M = \sup\{p(x,y)/x, y \in X\}$. Since $\lim_{n\to\infty} \psi^n(M) = 0$, we see that $\{fx_n\}$ is a *p*-Cauchy sequence.

Suppose that f(X) is S-complete, which implies that there exists $u \in X$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} p(fu, fx_n) = 0$, and therefore $\lim_{n\to\infty} p(gu, gx_n) = \lim_{n\to\infty} p(gu, fx_n) = 0$. Using Lemma 2.4, we get gu = fu. Now, the assumption that f and g are weakly compatible implies

$$f \circ gu = g \circ fu = g \circ gu = f \circ fu. \tag{3.2}$$

Suppose that $p(g \circ gu, gu) \neq 0$. From (ii), it follows

$$p(g \circ gu, gu) \le \psi(p(f \circ gu, fu)) < p(g \circ gu, gu),$$
(3.3)

this leads to a contradiction. Thus $g \circ gu = gu$. Also $f \circ gu = g \circ fu = g \circ gu = gu$, which implies that gu is a common fixed point of f and g.

Now, if the range of g is S-complete subspace of X, then $\lim_{n\to\infty} p(gv, gx_n) = 0$ for some $v \in X$. From (i), there exists $w \in X$ such that gv = fw and the proof that gw is a common fixed point of f and g is the same as that given when f(X) is S-complete. For the uniqueness, suppose that there exist $u, v \in X$ such that f(u) = u = g(u) and f(v) = v = g(v)with $u \neq v$. Then by condition (ii) and Lemma 2.4 it follows

$$p(u, v) = p(gu, gv)$$

$$\leq \psi(p(fu, fv))$$

$$= \psi(p(u, v))$$

$$< p(u, v),$$

which is a contradiction, then u = v. \Box

For $f = Id_X$ in Theorem 3.1, we get.

Corollary 3.2. (Theorem 4.1 in [1]).

Let (X, τ) be a Hausdorff topological space with a τ -distance p. Suppose that X is p-bounded and S-complete. Let f be a selfmapping of X such that

$$p(fx, fy) \le \psi(p(x, y)),$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Then f has a unique fixed point.

Now, we give an example to support our result.

Example 3.3. Let X = [1, 18] and d(x, y) = |x - y| the usual metric. Consider the function $p: X \times X \to [0,\infty)$ defined by

$$p(x,y) = |x-y|e^{|x-y|}, \quad \forall x, y \in X.$$

It is easy to see that the function p is a τ -distance on X where τ is the usual topology. Define $f, g: X \to X \ by$

$$gx = \begin{cases} 2x^2 - 1 & \text{if } x \in [1, \frac{3}{2}] \\ 1 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$
$$fx = \begin{cases} 4x^4 - 3 & \text{if } x \in [1, \frac{3}{2}] \\ 1 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

We take $\psi : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ such that $\psi(t) = \frac{2}{3}t$.

Thus all the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied and 1 is the unique common fixed point of f and q.

Lemma 3.4. Let (X, d) be a metric space and $p: X \times X \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be a function defined by

$$p(x,y) = e^{\theta(d(x,y))} - 1, \tag{3.4}$$

such that $\theta \in \Theta$. Then p is a τ_d -distance on X where τ_d is the metric topology.

Proof. Let (X, τ_d) be the topological space with the metric topology τ_d and V an arbitrary neighborhood of an arbitrary $x \in X$, then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $B_d(x,\varepsilon) \subset V$, where $B_d(x,\varepsilon) = \{y \in X, d(x,y) < \varepsilon\}$ is the open ball.

It easy to see that $B_p(x, e^{\theta(\varepsilon)} - 1) \subset B_d(x, \varepsilon)$, indeed: Let $y \in B_p(x, e^{\theta(\varepsilon)} - 1)$, then $p(x, y) < e^{\theta(\varepsilon)} - 1$, which implies that $e^{\theta(d(x,y))} < e^{\theta(\varepsilon)}$. Since θ supposed increasing, we get $d(x, y) < \varepsilon$. \Box

Using Theorem 3.1 and Lemma 3.4, we now prove the following Theorem.

Theorem 3.5. Let (X,d) be a bounded complete metric space (X,d). Let f and g be two weakly compatible selfmapping of X satisfying the following conditions:

 $i) \ g(X) \subset f(X),$ $ii) \ \inf_{x \neq y} \{\theta[d(fx, fy)] - \theta[d(gx, gy)]\} > 0,$

where $\theta \in \Theta$. Then f and g have a unique common fixed point.

Proof. We put $\alpha = \inf_{x \neq y} \{\theta[d(fx, fy)] - \theta[d(gx, gy)]\}$, this implies that

$$\theta(d(gx, gy)) \le \theta(d(fx, fy)) - \alpha, \tag{3.5}$$

for all $x \neq y \in X$. Hence

$$e^{\theta(d(gx,gy))} < k e^{\theta(d(fx,fy))}.$$
(3.6)

such that $k = e^{-\alpha} < 1$.

Let's consider the function $p: X \times X \to [0, \infty)$ defined by

$$p(x,y) = e^{\theta(d(x,y))} - 1,$$

which is a τ_d -distance on X as proved in Lemma 3.4, where τ_d is the metric topology. By taking $\psi(t) = kt$ in Theorem 3.1 for all $t \in [0, \infty)$, we get

$$p(gx, gy) \le kp(fx, fy). \tag{3.7}$$

Finally, we conclude that f and g have a unique common fixed point. \Box

The following example illustrates Theorem 3.5.

Example 3.6. Let X = [0, 1], with

$$d(x,y) = \begin{cases} 1 + \max\{x,y\} & \text{if } x \neq y \\ 0 & \text{if } x = y \end{cases}$$

Define $f, g: X \to X$ by fx = 1 - x and $gx = \frac{1}{2}$, for all $x \in X$ and $\theta: [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$, such that $\theta(t) = \ln(1+t)$, for all $t \in [0, \infty)$. It is easy to see that $g(X) \subset f(X)$ and f, g are weakly compatible. On the other hand, we have for all $x < y \in X$

$$\theta(d(fx, fy)) - \theta(d(gx, gy)) = \ln(3 - x) \ge \ln 2 > 0.$$

Then f and g satisfy all assumptions of Theorem 3.5 and have the unique fixed point which equal to $\frac{1}{2}$.

Example 3.7. Let $X = \overline{B}(0,1)$, the unit closed ball of a real Banach space, endowed with the metric

$$d(x,y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \neq y \\ 0 & \text{if } x = y \end{cases}$$

Define $f, g: X \to X$ by fx = -x and gx = 0 for all $x \in X$.

$$\theta(d(fx, fy)) - \theta(d(gx, gy)) = \theta(d(-x, -y)) = 2, \text{ for all } x \neq y \in X,$$

with $\theta = 2t$. Therefore f and g satisfy all conditions in Theorem 3.5 such that f and g have the unique fixed point which is equal to 0.

Remark 3.8. The above examples show that there is no relationship between compactness and the condition $\inf_{x \neq y} \{\theta[d(fx, fy)] - \theta[d(gx, gy)]\} > 0$. Indeed: In the first example, X = [0, 1] is compact and $\inf_{x \neq y} \{\theta[d(fx, fy)] - \theta[d(gx, gy)]\} > 0$. On the other side, for X = [0, 1], $fx = \frac{1}{2}x$ and $gx = \frac{1}{3}x$, the space X is compact and $\inf_{x \neq y} \{\theta[d(fx, fy)] - \theta[d(gx, gy)]\} = 0$ with $\theta(t) = 2t$. Moreover, in the second example, X is not compact and $\inf_{x \neq y} \{\theta[d(fx, fy)] - \theta[d(fx, fy)] - \theta[d(fx, fy)]\} = \theta[d(gx, gy)]\} > 0$.

As application of Theorem 3.5, we get a result for a new class of weakly contractive maps defined as follows.

Definition 3.9. Let (X,d) be a metric space and $f,g : X \longrightarrow X$ be a two weakly compatible selfmappings of X such that $g(X) \subset f(X)$.

f and g are said to be E_{θ} -weakly contractive if

i) For all $x \neq y \in X$ such that fx = fy, we have fx = gx,

ii) $\theta(d(gx, gy)) \leq \theta(d(fx, fy)) - \phi(\theta(d(fx, fy)) + 1))$, for all $x, y \in X$, where $\theta \in \Theta$ and $\phi \in \Phi$.

Theorem 3.10. Let (X, d) be a bounded complete metric space and f, g be two E_{θ} -weakly maps on X. Then f and g have a unique common fixed point.

Proof. Let $x \neq y \in X$, then we have the two following cases: **Case1:** If fx = fy, then Definition 3.9 implies that fx = gx = fy = gy. Since f and g are weakly compatible, we have $g \circ fx = f \circ gx = f \circ fx = g \circ gx$. Again, from Definition 3.9, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(d(g \circ fx, fx)) &= \theta(d(g \circ fx, gx)) \\ &\leq \theta(d(f \circ fx, fx)) - \phi(\theta(d(f \circ fx, fx)) + 1)) \\ &= \theta(d(g \circ fx, fx)) - \phi(\theta(d(g \circ fx, fx)) + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Then f and g have a unique common fixed point. Case2: If $fx \neq fy$, it follows from Definition 3.9,

$$0 < \inf_{t>1} \phi(t) \le \phi(\theta(d(fx, fy)) + 1) \le \theta(d(fx, fy)) - \theta(d(gx, gy)),$$

$$(3.8)$$

hence $\inf_{x \neq y} \{\theta(d(fx, fy))) - \theta(d(gx, gy))\} > 0$. According to Theorem 3.5, we conclude that f and g have a unique common fixed point. \Box

Example 3.11. Let $X = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ with the following metric

$$d(x,y) = \begin{cases} \max\{x,y\} & \text{if } x \neq y \\ 0 & \text{if } x = y \end{cases}$$

Define $f, g: X \to X$ by

$$f0 = 0, f1 = 0, f2 = 1, f3 = 2$$

and

$$g0 = 0, g1 = 0, g2 = 0, g3 = 1$$

We take $\theta(t) = 2t$, for all $t \in [0, \infty)$ and

$$\phi(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } t = 1\\ 1 & \text{if } t > 1 \end{cases}.$$

Then f and g satisfy all conditions in Theorem 3.10 and 0 is the unique common fixed point. Note that ϕ is not continuous at 1.

4. Application

In this section, we will prove the existence and uniqueness of a common solution for the tow nonlinear integral equations

$$\begin{cases} x'(t) = K(t, \int_0^t K(s, x(s))ds), \\ x(0) = 0 \end{cases}$$
(4.1)

and

$$\begin{cases} x'(t) = K(t, x(t)), \\ x(0) = 0 \end{cases} .$$
(4.2)

where, $x \in \mathcal{C}[0,T]$, the space of all continuous functions from [0,T] into \mathbb{R} , with T > 0. $K: [0,T] \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous mapping. Let $X = \mathcal{C}[0,T]$ endowed by the metric $d: X \times X \to \mathbb{R}^+$ defined by

$$-\mathbf{C}[0, T]$$
 endowed by the metric $u: X \times X \to \mathbb{R}^n$ defined b

$$d(x, y) = \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |x(t) - y(t)|,$$

it is clear that (X, d) is a complete metric space. The differential equations (4.1) and (4.2) are equivalent to the integral equations

$$x(t) = \int_0^t K(s, \int_0^s K(\xi, x(\xi)) d\xi) ds, \ t \in [0, T]$$
(4.3)

and

$$x(t) = \int_0^t K(s, x(s)) ds, \ t \in [0, T],$$
(4.4)

respectively.

Define a mappings $f, g: X \to X$ as follows

$$f(x)(t) = \int_0^t K(s, x(s)) ds, \ t \in [0, T]$$
(4.5)

and

$$g(x)(t) = \int_0^t K(s, \int_0^s K(\xi, x(\xi)) d\xi) ds, \ t \in [0, T]$$
(4.6)

for all $x \in X$.

So the problem of the common solution of the differential equations is equivalent to finding the common fixed point of the mappings f and q.

Suppose that the above assumptions hold, then we have the following Theorem:

Theorem 4.1. If there exists M > 0 such that

$$|K(s,x) - K(s,y)| \le \frac{1}{T}[|x - y| - M],$$
(4.7)

for all $s \in [0,T]$ and $x, y \in X$ such that $x \neq y$. Then the nonlinear integral equations (4.5) and (4.6) have a unique common solution.

Proof. Clearly, $g(X) \subset f(X)$ and f, g are weakly compatible, so, it remains for us to show that f and g satisfy (ii) in Theorem 3.5.

Let $x \neq y \in X$ and $t \in [0, T]$, then by (4.5), (4.6) and (4.7), we have

$$g(x)(t) - g(y)(t)| = \left| \int_{0}^{t} K(s, \int_{0}^{s} K(\xi, x(\xi)) d\xi) ds - \int_{0}^{t} K(s, \int_{0}^{s} K(\xi, y(\xi)) d\xi) ds \right|$$

$$\leq \int_{0}^{t} \frac{1}{T} \left[\left| \int_{0}^{s} K(\xi, x(\xi)) d\xi - \int_{0}^{s} K(\xi, y(\xi)) d\xi \right| - M \right] ds \qquad (4.8)$$

$$\leq \int_{0}^{t} \frac{1}{T} \left[\left| f(x)(s) - f(y)(s) \right| - M \right] ds$$

$$\leq d(fx, fy) - M,$$

hence

$$d(gx, gy) \le d(fx, fy) - M$$

for all $x \neq y \in X$. Then $\inf_{x\neq y} \{d(fx, fy) - d(gx, gy)\} \geq M > 0$, which implies by Theorem 3.5 that there exists a unique common solution of the integral equations (4.5) and (4.6). \Box

5. Some open problems

Very recently, Gordji et al.[6] introduced the concept of orthogonal sets as follows

Definition 5.1. [6]. Let $X \neq \emptyset$ and let $\bot \subset X \times X$ be a binary relation. If \bot satisfies the following hypothesis:

$$\exists x_0 : (\forall y, y \perp x_0) \text{ or } (\forall y, x_0 \perp y),$$

then it called an orthogonal set (briefly O-set). we denote this O - set by (X, \perp) .

For more details, we refer the reader to see [6]. Then, an extension of Banach's contraction principle is presented. In the same direction of research, in 2017 Baghani et al. [2] defined an extension of F-contraction on orthogonal sets namely \perp_F -contraction and proved a fixed point theorem for this contractions. In the setting of orthogonal sets we can see also ([7, 11]). Motivated by this notion, the first open problem can be introduced as follows:

Open problem I: Common fixed point theorems for contractive selfmappings on orthogonal metric spaces and their applications to nonlinear differential equations.

On the other hand, the authors in [9], start the R-metric spaces, via this idea we can state:

Open problem II: Common fixed point theorems for contractive selfmappings on R-metric spaces and their applications to nonlinear differential equations.

References

- M. Aamri and D. El Moutawakil, τ-distance in general topological spaces with application to fixed point theory, Southwest J. Pure Appl. Math. 2 (2003) 1–5.
- H. Baghani, M. Eshaghi Gordji and M. Ramezani, Orthogonal sets, the axiom of choice and proof of a fixed point theorem, J. Fixed Point Theory Appl. 18 (2016) 465–477.
- [3] L. Ćirić, Some recent results in metrical fixed point theory, University of Belgrade, Serbia, 2003.
- [4] M. Edelstein, On fixed and periodic points under contractive mappings, J. London Math. Soc., 37 (1962) 74--79.
- [5] D. Djorić, Common fixed point for generalized (ψ, ϕ) -weak contractions, Appl. Math. Lett. 22 (2009) 1896–1900.

- M. E. Gordji, M. Rameani, M. De La Sen and Y. Je Cho, On orthogonal sets and Banach fixed point theorem, Fixed Point Theory, 18(2) (2017) 569–578.
- [7] M. E. Gordji and H. Habibi, Fixed point theory in generalized orthogonal metric space, J. Linear Top. Alg. 6(3) (2017) 251-260.
- [8] G. Jungck and B. E. Rhoades, Fixed point for set valued functions without continuity, Indian J. Pure Appl. Math. 29(3) (1998) 227-238.
- S. Khalehoghli, H. Rahimi and M. Eshaghi Gordji, Fixed point theorems in R-metric spaces with applications, AIMS Mathematics, 5(4) (2020) 3125–3137.
- [10] W. Kirk and N. Shahzad, Fixed point theory in distance spaces, Springer International Publishing Switzerland, 2014.
- [11] M. Ramezani and H. Baghani, Contractive gauge functions in strongly orthogonal metric spaces, Int. J. Nonlinear Anal. Appl. 8(2) (2017) 23–28.
- [12] V. V. Nemytzki, The fixed point method in analysis, (Russian), Usp. Mat. Nauk, 1 (1936) 141–174.
- [13] S. Radenović, Z. Kadelburg, D. Jandrlić and A. Jandrlić, Some results on weak contraction maps, Bull. Iran. Math. Soc. 38 (2012) 625–645.
- [14] B. E. Rhoades, Some theorems on weakly contractive maps, Nonlinear Anal. 47 (2001) 2683–2693.