Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal

S. V. R. Naidu

Some fixed point theorems in metric spaces by altering distances

Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, Vol. 53 (2003), No. 1, 205–212

Persistent URL: http://dml.cz/dmlcz/127791

Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 2003

Institute of Mathematics of the Czech Academy of Sciences provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.

This document has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* http://dml.cz

Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, 53 (128) (2003), 205–212

SOME FIXED POINT THEOREMS IN METRIC SPACES BY ALTERING DISTANCES

S. V. R. Naidu, Visakhapatnam

(Received March 16, 2000)

Abstract. A generalization is obtained for some of the fixed point theorems of Khan, Swaleh and Sessa, Pathak and Rekha Sharma, and Sastry and Babu for a self-map on a metric space, which involve the idea of alteration of distances between points.

Keywords: fixed point, alteration of distances

MSC 2000: 47H10, 54H25

The famous Banach contraction principle has been generalized by several authors in several ways. A comprehensive literature on the generalizations of the same for self-maps on a metric space can be found in Rhoades [4] and Tasković [9]. Khan, Swaleh and Sessa [1] obtained generalizations of the same for a self-map on a metric space by altering distances between points through the use of certain control functions. Sastry and Babu [5], [6] and [7] continued the study in this direction. It was further pursued by Naidu [2]. In an attempt to unify Theorem 2 of Khan, Swaleh and Sessa [1] and that of Pathak and Rekha Sharma [3], Sastry and Babu obtained a partial generalization (Theorem 2.1 of [5]). Here our aim is to unify all the three results.

Throughout this paper, unless otherwise stated, (X, d) is a metric space, f is a self-map on X, $\mathbb{N}$ is the set of all positive integers, $\mathbb{R}^+$ is the set of all nonnegative real numbers, $\varphi\colon \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is a monotonically increasing function with $\varphi(t+) < t$ $\forall t \in (0, \infty)$, $\theta\colon \mathbb{R}^+ \to [0, 1]$ is a monotonically decreasing function with $\theta(t) < 1$ $\forall t \in (0, \infty)$, $\zeta\colon \mathbb{R}^+ \to [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ is continuous at zero, ϱ is a nonnegative real valued function on $X \times X$ with the following two properties:

(i) $\{\varrho(x_n, y_n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is convergent whenever $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ are sequences in X such that $\{d(x_n, y_n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is convergent,

(ii) for any sequences $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} in X$, the sequence $\{\varrho(x_n, y_n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to zero iff the sequence $\{d(x_n, y_n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to zero;

K is a nonnegative real number, and for $x, y \in X$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha(x,y) &= (\max\{\varrho(x,y), \varrho(x,fx), \varrho(y,fy)\}) + K[\varrho(x,fy)\varrho(fx,y)]^{1/2},\\
\beta(x,y) &= (\max\{\varrho(x,y), [\varrho(x,fy)\varrho(fx,y)]^{1/2}\}) + \max\{\varrho(x,fx), \varrho(y,fy)\},\\
\beta_0(x,y) &= (\max\{\varrho(x,y), [\varrho(x,fy)\varrho(fx,y)]^{1/2}\})\\
&\quad + (\min\{\max\{\varrho(x,fx), \varrho(y,fy)\}, \zeta(d(x,y))[\varrho(x,fx) + \varrho(y,fy)]\}),\\
\gamma(x,y) &= \min\{\alpha(x,y), \beta(x,y)\} \text{ and}\\
\gamma_0(x,y) &= \min\{\alpha(x,y), \beta_0(x,y)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

From property (i) of ϱ we note that ϱ is symmetric and that $\{\varrho(x_n, y_n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to $\varrho(x,y)$ whenever $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ are sequences in X such that $\{d(x_n, y_n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to $d(x,y)$. From property (ii) of ϱ we note that $\varrho(x,y) = 0$ iff $x = y$.

Theorem 1. *Suppose that*

$$\varrho(fx, fy) \leqslant \max\{\varphi(\gamma(x,y)), \theta(d(x,y))\gamma(x,y)\} \tag{1}$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Then f has at most one fixed point in X and for any $x \in X$, $\{f^n x\}$ is Cauchy.

Proof. From inequality (1) we have

$$\varrho(fx, fy) \leqslant \max\{\varphi(\alpha(x,y)), \theta(d(x,y))\alpha(x,y)\}$$

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

$$\begin{aligned}
\varrho(fx, f^2x) \leqslant\ & \max\{\varphi(\max\{\varrho(x,fx), \varrho(fx,f^2x)\}),\\
& \theta(d(x,fx)) \max\{\varrho(x,fx), \varrho(fx,f^2x)\}\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Suppose that $fx \neq x$. Then $\theta(d(x,fx)) < 1$ and $\varrho(x,fx) > 0$. Hence from inequality (2) and the fact that $\varphi(t) \leqslant \varphi(t+) < t\ \forall t \in (0,\infty)$ it follows that

$$\varrho(fx, f^2x) \leqslant \max\{\varphi(\varrho(x,fx)), \theta(d(x,fx))\varrho(x,fx)\}. \tag{3}$$

We note that inequality (3) remains valid even if $fx = x$. Replacing x with $f^{n-1}x$ in inequality (3) we obtain

$$\varrho(f^n x, f^{n+1}x) \leqslant \max\{\varphi(\varrho(f^{n-1}x, f^n x)), \theta(d(f^{n-1}x, f^n x))\varrho(f^{n-1}x, f^n x)\} \tag{4}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\varphi(t) \leqslant t$ and $\theta(t) \leqslant 1$ $\forall t \in \mathbb{R}^+$, from inequality (4) we have

$$\varrho(f^n x, f^{n+1}x) \leqslant \varrho(f^{n-1}x, f^n x)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Consequently, $\{\varrho(f^n x, f^{n+1}x)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a monotonically decreasing sequence of nonnegative real numbers. Hence it converges to a nonnegative real number s. First, suppose that $s > 0$. Then from property (ii) of ϱ it follows that $\{d(f^n x, f^{n+1}x)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of positive real numbers bounded below by a positive real number δ. Since θ is a monotonically decreasing function on $\mathbb{R}^+$, it follows that $\theta(d(f^{n-1}x, f^n x)) \leqslant \theta(\delta)$ $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence from inequality (4) we have

$$\varrho(f^n x, f^{n+1}x) \leqslant \max\{\varphi(\varrho(f^{n-1}x, f^n x)), \theta(\delta)\varrho(f^{n-1}x, f^n x)\}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Taking limit superiors on both sides of the above inequality as $n \to +\infty$, we obtain

$$s \leqslant \max\{\varphi(s+), \theta(\delta)s\}.$$

Since $\varphi(t+) < t$ $\forall t \in (0, \infty)$, $s > 0$ and $\theta(\delta) < 1$, from the above inequality we have $s < s$, which is absurd. Hence $s = 0$. Hence property (ii) of ϱ yields that $\{d(f^n x, f^{n+1}x)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ converges to zero.

Now, suppose that $\{f^n x\}$ is not Cauchy. Then there exists a positive real number ε such that for given $N \in \mathbb{N}$ $\exists$ $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m > n > N$ and $d(f^n x, f^m x) \geqslant \varepsilon$. Since $\{d(f^n x, f^{n+1}x)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ converges to zero, it follows that there exist strictly increasing sequences $\{n_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ and $\{m_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ of positive integers such that $1 < n_k < m_k$, $d(f^{n_k}x, f^{m_k-1}x) < \varepsilon$ and $d(f^{n_k}x, f^{m_k}x) \geqslant \varepsilon$ $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}$. Using the triangle inequality and the fact that $\{d(f^n x, f^{n+1}x)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ converges to zero it can be shown that $\{d(f^{n_k}x, f^{m_k}x)\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$, $\{d(f^{n_k}x, f^{m_k-1}x)\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$, $\{d(f^{n_k-1}x, f^{m_k}x)\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ and $\{d(f^{n_k-1}x, f^{m_k-1}x)\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ all converge to ε. Hence from property (i) of ϱ it follows that the sequences $\{\varrho(f^{n_k}x, f^{m_k}x)\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$, $\{\varrho(f^{n_k}x, f^{m_k-1}x)\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$, $\{\varrho(f^{n_k-1}x, f^{m_k}x)\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ and $\{\varrho(f^{n_k-1}x, f^{m_k-1}x)\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ all converge to the same limit b for some nonnegative real number b. Since $\varepsilon > 0$, from property (ii) of ϱ it follows that $b > 0$. We note that $\{\beta(f^{n_k-1}x, f^{m_k-1}x)\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ converges to b. Since φ is monotonically increasing on $\mathbb{R}^+$, we have $\limsup\limits_{k\to+\infty} \varphi(\beta(f^{n_k-1}x, f^{m_k-1}x)) \leqslant \varphi(b+)$. Since θ is monotonically decreasing on $\mathbb{R}^+$ and $\{d(f^{n_k-1}x, f^{m_k-1}x)\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ converges to ε, $\limsup\limits_{k\to+\infty} \theta(d(f^{n_k-1}x, f^{m_k-1}x)) \leqslant \theta(\varepsilon-)$. Since θ is monotonically decreasing on $\mathbb{R}^+$ and $\theta(t) < 1$ $\forall t \in (0, \infty)$, it follows that $\theta(t-) < 1$ $\forall t \in (0, \infty)$. From inequality (1) we have

$$\varrho(fx, fy) \leqslant \max\{\varphi(\beta(x, y)), \theta(d(x, y))\beta(x, y)\} \tag{5}$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Taking $f^{n_k-1}x$ and $f^{m_k-1}x$ istead of x and y in the above inequality and then taking limit superiors on both sides as $k \to +\infty$ we obtain

$$b \leqslant \max\{\varphi(b+), \theta(\varepsilon-)b\}.$$

Since $\varphi(t+) < t$ and $\theta(t-) < 1$ $\forall t \in (0, \infty)$, $b > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, from the above inequality we obtain $b < b$ which is a contradiction. Hence $\{f^n x\}$ is Cauchy.

If x, y are fixed points of f in X, then $\beta(x, y) = \varrho(x, y)$ and hence from inequality (5) we obtain

$$\varrho(x, y) \leqslant \max\{\varphi(\varrho(x, y), \theta(d(x, y))\varrho(x, y)\}.$$

Since $\varphi(t) < t$ and $\theta(t) < 1$ $\forall t \in (0, \infty)$, from the above inequality we have $\varrho(x, y) = 0$. Hence $x = y$. Hence f has at most one fixed point in X. $\square$

Remark 1. Theorem 1 remains valid if inequality (1) is replaced with inequalities (3) and (5).

Theorem 2. *Suppose that*

$$\varrho(fx, fy) \leqslant \max\{\varphi(\gamma(x, y)), \theta(d(x, y))\gamma_0(x, y)\} \tag{6}$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Then for any $x \in X$, $\{f^n x\}$ is Cauchy. For any $x_0 \in X$, the limit of $\{f^n x_0\}$, if it exists, is the unique fixed point of f.

Proof. Since the validity of inequality (6) implies that of inequality (1), it follows from Theorem 1 that f has at most one fixed point in X and that for any $x \in X$, $\{f^n x\}$ is Cauchy. Let $x_0 \in X$. Suppose that $\{f^n x_0\}$ converges to an element z of X. Since ζ is continuous at zero, $\{\zeta(d(f^n x_0, z))\}$ converges to $\zeta(0)$. From the properties of ϱ we note that the sequences $\{\varrho(f^n x_0, fz)\}$, $\{\varrho(f^{n+1}x_0, fz)\}$ converge to $\varrho(z, fz)$ and that the sequences $\{\varrho(f^n x_0, z)\}$, $\{\varrho(f^{n+1}x_0, z)\}$ and $\{\varrho(f^n x_0, f^{n+1}x_0)\}$ converge to zero. Hence $\{\beta(f^n x_0, z)\}$ converges to $\varrho(z, fz)$ and $\{\beta_0(f^n x_0, z)\}$ converges to $\zeta(0)\varrho(z, fz)$. From inequality (6) we have

$$\varrho(fx, fy) \leqslant \max\{\varphi(\beta(x, y)), \theta(d(x, y))\beta_0(x, y)\} \tag{7}$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Taking $x = f^n x_0$ and $y = z$ in inequality (7) and then taking limit superiors on both sides as $n \to +\infty$ we obtain

$$\varrho(z, fz) \leqslant \max\{\varphi(\varrho(z, fz)+), \theta(0)\zeta(0)\varrho(z, fz)\}.$$

Since $\varphi(t+) < t$ $\forall t \in (0, \infty)$, $\theta(0) \leqslant 1$ and $\zeta(0) < 1$, from the above inequality we have $\varrho(z, fz) = 0$. Hence $fz = z$. $\square$

Remark 2. Theorem 2 remains valid if inequality (6) is replaced with inequalities (3) and (7).

From Theorem 2 we have the following

Corollary 1. *Suppose that*

$$\varrho(fx, fy) \leqslant \theta(d(x,y))\gamma_0(x,y)$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Then for any $x \in X$, $\{f^n x\}$ is Cauchy. For any $x_0 \in X$, the limit of $\{f^n x_0\}$, if it exists, is the unique fixed point of f.

From Corollary 1 we have

Corollary 2. *Suppose that*

$$\varrho(fx, fy) \leqslant \theta(d(x,y)) \max\big\{\varrho(x,y), \tfrac{1}{2}[\varrho(x,fx) + \varrho(y,fy)], [\varrho(x,fy)\varrho(fx,y)]^{\frac{1}{2}}\big\}$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Then for any $x \in X$, $\{f^n x\}$ is Cauchy. For any $x_0 \in X$, the limit of $\{f^n x_0\}$, if it exists, is the unique fixed point of f.

Remark 3. In Corollary 2 the conclusion about the existence of a fixed point fails if the expression $\frac{1}{2}[\varrho(x,fx) + \varrho(y,fy)]$ in its governing inequality is replaced with $\max\{\varrho(x,fx), \varrho(y,fy)\}$. Example 1 shows that this is so even when (X,d) is a finite metric space and $\varrho = d$. In particular, the hypothesis of Theorem 1 does not ensure the existence of a fixed point for f.

Example 1 (Example 4 of [8])**.** Let $X = [0,1]$ with the usual metric. Define $f\colon X \to X$ as $f(x) = x/2$ if $0 < x \leqslant 1$ and $f(0) = 1$. Define $\theta\colon \mathbb{R}^+ \to [0,1]$ as $\theta(t) = 1 - t/2$ if $0 \leqslant t \leqslant 1$ and $\theta(t) = \frac{1}{2}$ if $1 < t < +\infty$. Then θ is a monotonically decreasing continuous function on $\mathbb{R}^+$, $\theta(t) < 1$ $\forall t \in (0,\infty)$ and

$$|fx - fy| \leqslant \theta|x-y| \max\{|x-y|, |x-fx|, |y-fy|\}$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Nonetheless, f has no fixed point in X.

Corollary 3 (Theorem 2 of [1])**.** *Suppose that (X,d) is complete, $\psi\colon \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is a monotonically increasing continuous function with $\psi(t) = 0$ iff $t = 0$, a, b, c are monotonically decreasing functions from $(0,\infty)$ into $[0,1)$ with $a(t) + b(t) + c(t) < 1$ $\forall t \in (0,\infty)$, and*

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(d(fx,fy)) \leqslant a(d(x,y))\psi(d(x,y)) + \tfrac{1}{2}b(d(x,y))[\psi(d(x,fx)) + \psi(d(y,fy))]\\ + c(d(x,y)) \min\{\psi(d(x,fy)), \psi(d(fx,y))\}\end{aligned}$$

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

P r o o f. Let $\varrho = \psi \circ d$. Define $\theta\colon \mathbb{R}^+ \to [0,1]$ as $\theta(t) = a(t) + b(t) + c(t)$ if $t \neq 0$ and $\theta(0) = 1$. Then ϱ is a nonnegative real valued function on $X \times X$ having properties (i) and (ii), θ is a monotonically decreasing function on $\mathbb{R}^+$ with $\theta(t) < 1$ $\forall t \in (0,\infty)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\varrho(fx,fy) &\leqslant \theta(d(x,y)) \max\big\{\varrho(x,y), \tfrac{1}{2}[\varrho(x,fx) + \varrho(y,fy)], \min\{\varrho(x,fy), \varrho(fx,y)\}\big\}\\ &\leqslant \theta(d(x,y)) \max\big\{\varrho(x,y), \tfrac{1}{2}[\varrho(x,fx) + \varrho(y,fy)], [\varrho(x,fy)\varrho(fx,y)]^{\frac{1}{2}}\big\}\end{aligned}$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Hence Corollary 3 follows from Corollary 2. □

Corollary 4 (Theorem 2 of [3]). *Suppose that (X,d) is complete, $\psi\colon \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is a monotonically increasing continuous function with $\psi(t) = 0$ iff $t = 0$, a, b are monotonically decreasing functions from $(0,\infty)$ into $[0,1)$ with $a(t) + b(t) < \frac{1}{2}$ $\forall t \in (0,\infty)$, c is a constant in $[0,1]$ such that $a(t)(1+c) < 1$ $\forall t \in (0,\infty)$, and*

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(d(fx,fy)) \leqslant\ & a(d(x,y))[\psi(d(x,y)) + c[\psi(d(x,fy))\psi(d(fx,y))]^{\frac{1}{2}}]\\ &+ b(d(x,y))[\psi(d(x,fx)) + \psi(d(y,fy))]\end{aligned}$$

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

P r o o f. Let $\varrho = \psi \circ d$. Define $\theta\colon \mathbb{R}^+ \to [0,1]$ as $\theta(t) = 2[a(t) + b(t)]$ if $t \neq 0$ and $\theta(0) = 1$. Then ϱ is a nonnegative real valued function on $X \times X$ having properties (i) and (ii), θ is a monotonically decreasing function on $\mathbb{R}^+$ with $\theta(t) < 1$ $\forall t \in (0,\infty)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\varrho(fx,fy) &\leqslant \theta(d(x,y)) \max\big\{\tfrac{1}{2}[\varrho(x,y) + c[\varrho(x,fy)\varrho(fx,y)]^{\frac{1}{2}}], \tfrac{1}{2}[\varrho(x,fx) + \varrho(y,fy)]\big\}\\ &\leqslant \theta(d(x,y)) \max\big\{\varrho(x,y), c[\varrho(x,fy)\varrho(fx,y)]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tfrac{1}{2}[\varrho(x,fx) + \varrho(y,fy)]\big\}\\ &\leqslant \theta(d(x,y)) \max\big\{\varrho(x,y), \tfrac{1}{2}[\varrho(x,fx) + \varrho(y,fy)], [\varrho(x,fy)\varrho(fx,y)]^{\frac{1}{2}}\big\}\end{aligned}$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Hence Corollary 4 follows from Corollary 2. □

Remark 4. As observed by Sastry and Babu [5], in Theorem 2 of Pathak and Rekha Sharma [3] the condition '$a(t)(1+c) < 1$ $\forall t \in (0,\infty)$' is redundant in view of the hypothesis on the functions a and b, and the condition '$c \leqslant 1$'.

From Theorem 2 we have

Corollary 5. *Suppose that*

$$\varrho(fx,fy) \leqslant \varphi(\gamma(x,y))$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Then for any $x \in X$, $\{f^n x\}$ is Cauchy. For any $x_0 \in X$, the limit of $\{f^n x_0\}$, if it exists, is the unique fixed point of f.

Corollary 6 (Theorem 2.1 of [5])**.** *Suppose that (X, d) is complete, $\psi\colon \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is a monotonically increasing continuous function with $\psi(t) = 0$ iff $t = 0$, a, b, c are nonnegative constants with $a + b < 1$ and $a + c < 1$, and*

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(d(fx, fy)) \leqslant a\psi(d(x, y)) + \tfrac{1}{2}b[\psi(d(x, fx)) + \psi(d(y, fy))]\\ + c[\psi(d(x, fy))\psi(d(fx, y))]^{\frac{1}{2}}\end{aligned}$$

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

Proof. Let $\varrho = \psi \circ d$. Define $\varphi\colon \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ as $\varphi(t) = \mu t$, where $\mu = \max\{a + b, a+c\}$. Then ϱ is a nonnegative real valued function on $X \times X$ having properties (i) and (ii), φ is a monotonically increasing function on $\mathbb{R}^+$ with $\varphi(t+) < t$ $\forall t \in (0, \infty)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varrho(fx, fy)\\
&\quad\leqslant a\varrho(x, y) + \tfrac{1}{2}b[\varrho(x, fx) + \varrho(y, fy)] + c[\varrho(x, fy)\varrho(fx, y)]^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
&\quad\leqslant \min\{(a + b)(\max\{\varrho(x, y), \varrho(x, fx), \varrho(y, fy)\}) + c[\varrho(x, fy)\varrho(fx, y)]^{\frac{1}{2}},\\
&\qquad (a + c)(\max\{\varrho(x, y), [\varrho(x, fy)\varrho(fx, y)]^{\frac{1}{2}}\}) + \tfrac{1}{2}b[\varrho(x, fx) + \varrho(y, fy)]\}\\
&\quad\leqslant \min\{(\max\{a + b, c\})[(\max\{\varrho(x, y), \varrho(x, fx), \varrho(y, fy)\}) + [\varrho(x, fy)\varrho(fx, y)]^{\frac{1}{2}}],\\
&\qquad (\max\{a + c, b\})[(\max\{\varrho(x, y), [\varrho(x, fy)\varrho(fx, y)]^{\frac{1}{2}}\}) + \tfrac{1}{2}[\varrho(x, fx) + \varrho(y, fy)]]\}\\
&\quad\leqslant \min\{(\max\{a + b, c\})\alpha(x, y), (\max\{a + c, b\})\beta_0(x, y)\}\\
&\quad\leqslant \min\{\mu\alpha(x, y), \mu\beta_0(x, y)\}\\
&\quad= \mu\gamma_0(x, y) \leqslant \mu\gamma(x, y) = \varphi(\gamma(x, y))
\end{aligned}$$

for all $x, y \in X$, where we have taken $K = 1$ in the definition of $\alpha(x, y)$. Hence Corollary 6 follows from Corollary 5. □

Corollary 7. *Suppose that a, b, c are nonnegative monotonically decreasing functions on $(0, \infty)$ with $a(t) + b(t) < 1$ and $a(t) + c(t) < 1$ $\forall t \in (0, \infty)$, and*

$$\begin{aligned}\varrho(fx, fy) \leqslant a(d(x, y))\varrho(x, y) + \tfrac{1}{2}b(d(x, y))[\varrho(x, fx) + \varrho(y, fy)]\\ + c\,(d(x, y))[\varrho(x, fy)\varrho(fx, y)]^{\frac{1}{2}}\end{aligned}$$

for all distinct $x, y \in X$. Then for any $x \in X$, $\{f^n x\}$ is Cauchy. For any $x_0 \in X$, the limit of $\{f^n x_0\}$, if it exists, is the unique fixed point of f.

P r o o f. Define $\theta\colon \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ as $\theta(t) = \max\{a(t) + b(t), a(t) + c(t)\}$ if $t \neq 0$ and $\theta(0) = 1$. Then θ is a monotonically decreasing function on $\mathbb{R}^+$ with $\theta(t) < 1$ $\forall t \in (0, \infty)$. Proceeding as in the proof of Corollary 6 it can be shown that

$$\varrho(fx, fy) \leqslant \theta(d(x, y))\gamma_0(x, y)$$

for all $x, y \in X$, with $K = 1$ in the definition of $\alpha(x, y)$. Hence Corollary 7 follows from Corollary 1. $\square$

Remark. Corollary 7 is also a generalization of Corollaries 3, 4 and 6. Corollary 7 shows that in Theorem 2 of Pathak and Rekha Sharma [3] the condition '$a(t) + b(t) < \frac{1}{2}$ $\forall t \in (0, \infty)$' can be replaced by the weaker conditions '$2a(t) < 1$ and $a(t) + 2b(t) < 1$ $\forall t \in (0, \infty)$'.

References

[1] *M. S. Khan, M. Swaleh and S. Sessa*: Fixed point theorems by altering distances between the points. Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. *30* (1984), 1–9.

[2] *S. V. R. Naidu*: Fixed point theorems by altering distances. Adv. Math. Sci. Appl. *11* (2001), 1–16.

[3] *H. K. Pathak and Rekha Sharma*: A note on fixed point theorems of Khan, Swaleh and Sessa. Math. Edn. *28* (1994), 151–157.

[4] *B. E. Rhoades*: A comparison of various definitions of contractive mappings. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. *226* (1977), 257–290.

[5] *K. P. R. Sastry and G. V. R. Babu*: Fixed point theorems in metric spaces by altering distances. Bull. Calcutta Math. Soc. *90* (1998), 175–182.

[6] *K. P. R. Sastry and G. V. R. Babu*: Some fixed point theorems by altering distances between the points. Indian J. Pure Appl. Math. *30* (1999), 641–647.

[7] *K. P. R. Sastry and G. V. R. Babu*: Some fixed point theorems in complete metric spaces by altering distances. Preprint.

[8] *K. P. R. Sastry and S. V. R. Naidu*: Fixed point theorems for generalised contraction mappings. Yokohama Math. J. *28* (1980), 15–29.

[9] *M. R. Tasković*: Some new principles in fixed point theory. Math. Japon. *35* (1990), 645–666.

Author's address: Department of Applied Mathematics, Andhora University, Visakhapatnam, 530 003, India, `svrnaidu@hotmail.com`.