

Ismat Beg

An iteration process for nonlinear mappings in uniformly convex linear metric spaces

Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, Vol. 53 (2003), No. 2, 405–412

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/127809>

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>

AN ITERATION PROCESS FOR NONLINEAR MAPPINGS
IN UNIFORMLY CONVEX LINEAR METRIC SPACES

ISMAT BEG, Lahore

(Received May 30, 2000)

Abstract. We obtain necessary conditions for convergence of the Cauchy Picard sequence of iterations for Tricomi mappings defined on a uniformly convex linear complete metric space.

Keywords: linear metric space, fixed point, uniformly convex

MSC 2000: 47H10, 54H25

1. INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARIES

An interesting class of nonexpansive mappings for which the Cauchy Picard sequence of iterations converges was discovered by Moreau [11]. Subsequently Beauzamy [1] extended Moreau's results from Hilbert spaces to uniformly convex Banach spaces. Kirk [10] and Ding [7] also constructed an iteration process for nonexpansive mappings in metric spaces. Recently Shimizu and Takahashi [15] and Beg [2, 3] have started the study of the fixed points of nonexpansive mappings on uniformly convex complete metric spaces. The aim of this paper is to study convergence of the Cauchy Picard type sequence of iterations for a more general class of mappings, namely the Tricomi mappings (first introduced and studied by Tricomi [16]) defined on a linear metric space. Our result generalizes the known results of Moreau [11], Beauzamy [1] and several other authors.

Definition 1.1. Let (X, d) be a metric space and \mathbb{R} the set of real numbers. A mapping $W: X \times X \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow X$ is said to be a *linear structure* on X if for each

$(x, y, \lambda) \in X \times X \times \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in X$,

$$d(u, W(x, y, \lambda)) \leq |\lambda|d(u, x) + |1 - \lambda|d(u, y).$$

A metric space X together with the linear structure W is called a *linear metric space*. Obviously, $W(x, x, \lambda) = x$. The convex metric space of Takahashi [15] is a special case of our Definition 1.1. Takahashi [15] has used the unit interval $[0, 1]$ instead of \mathbb{R} . All normed spaces are convex metric spaces. However, there are many examples of convex metric spaces which are not embedded in any normed space (see Takahashi [15]). Guay, Singh and Whitfield [9], Nainpally, Singh and Whitfield [12], Beg et al [2, 3, 4, 5], Shimizu and Takahashi [14], Ciric [6], Gajic and Stojakavic [8] and many other authors have studied fixed point theorems on convex metric spaces.

Definition 1.2. A linear metric space X is said to have *property (B)*, if it satisfies

- (i) $W(x_1, x_2, t) = W(x_2, x_1, 1 - t)$,
- (ii) $d(W(x_1, x_2, t_1), W(x_1, x_2, t_2)) = |t_1 - t_2|d(x_1, x_2)$

and

$$(iii) \quad d(v, W(x_1, x_2, \frac{t}{2})) = d(W(W(v, x_1, 1 + t), W(v, x_2, 1 - t), \frac{1}{2}), x_2).$$

Each normed space has property (B), if we define $W(x_1, x_2, t) = tx_1 + (1 - t)x_2$.

Definition 1.3 (Beg [3]). A linear complete metric space X is said to be *uniformly convex* if for all $x, y, a \in X$,

$$\left[d\left(a, W\left(x, y, \frac{1}{2}\right)\right) \right]^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \alpha\left(\frac{d(x, y)}{\max\{d(a, x), d(a, y)\}}\right) \right) ([d(a, x)]^2 + [d(a, y)]^2),$$

where the function α is an increasing function on the set of strictly positive numbers and $\alpha(0) = 0$.

Uniformly convex Banach spaces are uniformly convex linear metric spaces.

Definition 1.4. Let X be a metric space. A mapping $T: X \rightarrow X$ is said to be *nonexpansive* if $d(T(x), T(y)) \leq d(x, y)$ for every $x, y \in X$. A point $x \in X$ is called a *fixed point* of T if $T(x) = x$.

Definition 1.5. A continuous mapping T defined on a subset of a linear complete metric space X is called a *Tricomi mapping* if:

- (i) $F(T)$, the set of fixed points of T , is the nonempty set;
- (ii) for any x in the set on which T is defined and any $u \in F(T)$, $d(f(x), u) \leq d(x, u)$.

For examples and other details about the Tricomi mappings we refer to Tricomi [16] and Moreau [11]. From the definition of Tricomi mappings it is clear that this class of mappings is larger than the class of nonexpansive mappings.

Remark 1.6. Let $x, y, z \in X$, then

$$d(x, z) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, z).$$

This implies that

$$[d(x, z)]^2 \leq [d(x, y)]^2 + [d(y, z)]^2 + 2d(x, y)d(y, z) \leq 2[d(x, y)]^2 + 2[d(y, z)]^2.$$

It further implies that

$$(1) \quad \frac{1}{2}[d(x, z)]^2 \leq [d(x, y)]^2 + [d(y, z)]^2.$$

2. CONVERGENCE OF ITERATES OF TRICOMI MAPPINGS

Let X be a uniformly convex linear complete metric space having property (B). Let C be a subset of X and $T: C \rightarrow C$ a Tricomi mapping. Suppose that $F(T)$ contains a nonempty open set. For any $x \in C$, define $m = d(v, x)$ where v is the centre of an open sphere $S(v, r)$ which is contained in $F(T)$. Consider another element p defined by $d(v, p) = \inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}} d(v, W(x, T(x), t))$, i.e., p is the best approximation of v on the set $Y = \{y: y = W(x, T(x), t) \text{ and } t \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Clearly, for any $z \in Y$,

$$(2) \quad [d(v, p)]^2 \leq \left[d\left(v, W\left(z, p, \frac{1}{2}\right)\right) \right]^2.$$

Theorem 2.1. Let $z \in Y$ be such that $d(z, v) < 2m$. Then

$$[d(v, p)]^2 + \frac{1}{2}[d(p, z)]^2 \alpha\left(\frac{d(p, z)}{2m}\right) \leq [d(v, z)]^2.$$

Proof. Since X is a uniformly convex metric space, using inequality (2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} [d(v, p)]^2 &\leq \left[d\left(v, W\left(z, p, \frac{1}{2}\right)\right) \right]^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \alpha\left(\frac{d(z, p)}{\max\{d(v, z), d(v, p)\}}\right) \right) ([d(v, z)]^2 + [d(v, p)]^2). \end{aligned}$$

It implies that

$$\frac{1}{2}[d(v, p)]^2 + \frac{1}{2}\alpha\left(\frac{d(z, p)}{2m}\right)([d(v, z)]^2 + [d(v, p)]^2) \leq \frac{1}{2}[d(v, z)]^2.$$

Inequality (1) further implies

$$\frac{1}{2}[d(v, p)]^2 + \frac{1}{2}\alpha\left(\frac{d(z, p)}{2m}\right)\frac{1}{2}[d(p, z)]^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}[d(v, z)]^2.$$

Hence,

$$[d(v, p)]^2 + \frac{1}{2}[d(p, z)]^2\alpha\left(\frac{d(p, z)}{2m}\right) \leq [d(v, z)]^2.$$

□

Remark 2.2. Let $x \in C$ be fixed, then the function f defined by

$$f(t) = [d(v, W(x, T(x), t))]^2$$

is a convex function.

Remark 2.3. Let t_0 be a real number such that $p = W(x, T(x), t_0)$.

Lemma 2.4. Let t_1 and t_2 be two points such that $t_0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2$. If $f(t_1) \leq 4m^2$ and $f(t_2) \leq 4m^2$ then

$$\frac{1}{2}(t_2 - t_1)^2[d(x, T(x))]^2\alpha\left(\frac{(t_2 - t_1)d(x, T(x))}{2m}\right) \leq f(t_2) - f(t_1).$$

Proof. Since f is a convex function, therefore

$$f(t_2) - f(t_1) \geq f(t_0 + t_2 - t_1) - f(t_0)$$

and

$$f(t_0 + (t_2 - t_1)) \leq 4m^2.$$

Using Theorem 2.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(t_2) - f(t_1) &\geq f(t_0 + t_2 - t_1) - f(t_0) \\ &= [d(v, W(x, T(x), t_0 + t_2 - t_1))]^2 - [d(v, W(x, T(x), t_0))]^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}[d(W(x, T(x), t_0 + t_2 - t_1), W(x, T(x), t_0))]^2 \\ &\quad \times \alpha\left(\frac{d(W(x, T(x), t_0 + t_2 - t_1), W(x, T(x), t_0))}{2m}\right) \end{aligned}$$

(using property (B))

$$= \frac{1}{2}(t_2 - t_1)^2[d(x, T(x))]^2\alpha\left(\frac{(t_2 - t_1)d(x, T(x))}{2m}\right).$$

□

Similarly, we can prove the following lemma.

Lemma 2.5. *Let t_1 and t_2 be two points such that $t_2 \leq t_1 \leq t_0$. If $f(t_1) \leq 4m^2$ and $f(t_2) \leq 4m^2$ then*

$$\frac{1}{2}(t_1 - t_2)^2 [d(x, T(x))]^2 \alpha \left(\frac{(t_1 - t_2)d(x, T(x))}{2m} \right) \leq f(t_1) - f(t_2).$$

Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 2.5 imply the following theorem.

Theorem 2.6. *Let t_1 and t_2 be two points such that $t_0 \leq t_1, t_2$ or $t_2, t_1 \leq t_0$. If $f(t_1) \leq 4m^2$ and $f(t_2) \leq 4m^2$ then*

$$\frac{1}{2}(t_1 - t_2)^2 [d(x, T(x))]^2 \alpha \left(\frac{|t_1 - t_2|d(x, T(x))}{2m} \right) \leq |f(t_1) - f(t_2)|.$$

Theorem 2.7. *Let $T: C \rightarrow C$ be a Tricomi mapping, then*

$$\frac{r^2}{8m^2} [d(x, T(x))]^2 \alpha \left(\frac{r}{4m^2} d(x, T(x)) \right) \leq [d(v, x)]^2 - [d(v, T(x))]^2 = f(1) - f(0),$$

where r is the radius of an open sphere $S(v, r) \subset F(T)$.

Proof. Case I ($[t_0 \leq 0]$). Choose $t_1 = 0, t_2 = 1$. Since T is a Tricomi mapping, we obtain

$$f(0) = [d(v, W(x, T(x), 0))]^2 \leq [d(v, T(x))]^2 \leq [d(v, x)]^2 = m^2 \leq 4m^2$$

and

$$f(1) = [d(v, W(x, T(x), 1))]^2 \leq [d(v, x)]^2 = m^2 \leq 4m^2.$$

Thus Lemma 2.4 implies that

$$(3) \quad \frac{1}{2} [d(x, T(x))]^2 \alpha \left(\frac{d(x, T(x))}{2m} \right) \leq f(1) - f(0).$$

Case II ($[t_0 \in (0, 1)]$). Let

$$w = W \left(W \left(v, x, 1 - \frac{r}{m} \right), W \left(v, T(x), 1 + \frac{r}{m} \right), \frac{1}{2} \right),$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} d(v, w) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left[d\left(v, W\left(v, x, 1 - \frac{r}{m}\right)\right) + d\left(v, W\left(v, T(x), 1 + \frac{r}{m}\right)\right) \right] \\ &\leq \frac{r}{2m} [d(v, x) + d(v, T(x))] \end{aligned}$$

(T is a Tricomi mapping)

$$\leq \frac{r}{2m} [d(v, x) + d(v, x)] = r.$$

Therefore $w \in S(v, r) \subset F(T)$. This further implies that

$$\begin{aligned} d\left(v, W\left(x, T(x), -\frac{r}{2m}\right)\right) &= d(w, T(x)) \quad (\text{by property B(iii)}) \\ &\leq d(w, x) \quad (\text{since } T \text{ is a Tricomi mapping}) \\ &= d\left(v, W\left(x, T(x), 1 - \frac{r}{2m}\right)\right) \quad (\text{by property B(iii)}). \end{aligned}$$

It further gives

$$f\left(-\frac{r}{2m}\right) \leq f\left(1 - \frac{r}{2m}\right).$$

Since the minimum of the convex function f is attained at t_0 (see the definition of t_0), $t_0 \in (0, 1)$, therefore,

$$f\left(-\frac{r}{2m}\right) \geq f(0) \geq f(t_0)$$

and

$$f(1) \geq f\left(1 - \frac{r}{2m}\right).$$

However, $1 - r/(2m) \geq 0$. Thus $t_0 \leq 1 - r/(2m)$. Choosing $t_1 = 1 - r/(2m)$ and $t_2 = 1$, Theorem 2.6 implies

$$f(1) - f(0) \geq f(1) - f\left(1 - \frac{r}{2m}\right) \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{r}{2m}\right)^2 [d(x, T(x))]^2 \alpha \left(\frac{r}{4m^2} d(x, T(x))\right).$$

Since the estimate in inequality (3) is optimal, we have

$$\frac{r^2}{8m^2} [d(x, T(x))]^2 \alpha \left(\frac{r}{4m^2} d(x, T(x))\right) \leq [d(v, x)]^2 - [d(v, T(x))]^2 = f(1) - f(0).$$

□

Theorem 2.8. Let X be a uniformly convex linear complete metric space having property (B) and let C be a subset of X . Let $T: C \rightarrow C$ be a Tricomi mapping and let $F(T)$ contain a nonempty open set. Then for any $x \in C$, the sequence $\{T^n(x)\}$ converges to a fixed point of T .

Proof. Let v be a fixed point of T and x an arbitrary point in C , then $d(v, T^{n+1}(x)) \leq d(v, T^n(x))$. Thus the sequence $\{d(v, T^n(x))\}$ is a monotonic decreasing sequence of positive numbers. Therefore $\{d(v, T^n(x))\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Theorem 2.7 further implies that $\{T^n(x)\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in X . Hence it is convergent to a fixed point of T . \square

Remark 2.9. Theorem 2.8 generalizes the results of Moreau [11] and Beauzamy [1].

Remark 2.10. It is of great interest to observe that if T is a Tricomi mapping and $F(T)$ reduces to a singleton, then $\{T^n(x)\}$ need not be convergent. E.g., let $X = \mathbb{R}^2$ with the usual metric $d((x_1, x_2), (y_1, y_2)) = \sqrt{(x_1 - y_1)^2 + (x_2 - y_2)^2}$ and $C = \{(x, y) : \sqrt{x^2 + y^2} \leq 1\}$. Let $T: C \rightarrow C$ be given by $T(x_1, x_2) = (-x_1, -\frac{x_2}{2})$. Clearly T is a Tricomi mapping and $(0, 0)$ is the unique fixed point of T . For any $(x_1, x_2) \in C$ we have $d(T^n(x_1, x_2), T^{n+1}(x_1, x_2)) = (2x_1)^2 + (3x_2/2^{n+1})^2$, which does not converge to zero unless $x_1 = 0$.

References

- [1] *B. Beauzamy*: Un cas de convergence des itérées d'une contraction dans un espace uniformément convexe. Unpublished.
- [2] *I. Beg*: Structure of the set of fixed points of nonexpansive mappings on convex metric spaces. *Annales Univ. Marie Curie-Sklodowska (Sec. A)—Mathematica LII(2)(1)*. 1998, pp. 7–14.
- [3] *I. Beg*: Inequalities in metric spaces with applications. *Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal.* 17 (2001), 183–190.
- [4] *I. Beg, A. Azam, F. Ali and T. Minhas*: Some fixed point theorems in convex metric spaces. *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo XL* (1991), 307–315.
- [5] *I. Beg, N. Shahzad and M. Iqbal*: Fixed point theorems and best approximation in convex metric spaces. *J. Approx. Theory* 8 (1992), 97–105.
- [6] *L. Ćirić*: On some discontinuous fixed point theorems in convex metric spaces. *Czechoslovak Math. J.* 43(188) (1993), 319–326.
- [7] *X. P. Ding*: Iteration processes for nonlinear mappings in convex metric spaces. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 132 (1988), 114–122.
- [8] *L. Gajić and M. Stojaković*: A remark on Kaneko report on general contractive type conditions for multivalued mappings in Takahashi convex metric spaces. *Zb. Rad. Prirod. Mat. Fak. Ser. Mat.* 23 (1993), 61–66.
- [9] *M. D. Guay, K. L. Singh and J. H. M. Whitfield*: Fixed point theorems for nonexpansive mappings in convex metric spaces. *Nonlinear analysis and application, Proc. int. Conf. Lecture Notes Pure Appl. Math.* 80 (S. P. Singh, J. H. Barry, eds.). Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, 1982, pp. 179–189.

- [10] *W. A. Kirk*: Krasnoselskii's iteration process in hyperbolic spaces. *Numer. Funct. Anal. Optim.* *4* (1982), 371–381.
- [10] *J. Moreau*: Un cos des convergence des iterees d'une contraction d'une espace Hilbertien. *C. R. Acad. Paris* *286* (1978), 143–144.
- [11] *S. A. Naimpally, K. L. Singh and J. H. M. Whitfield*: Fixed points in convex metric spaces. *Math. Japon.* *29* (1984), 585–597.
- [12] *T. Shimizu and W. Takahashi*: Fixed point theorems in certain convex metric spaces. *Math. Japon.* *37* (1992), 855–859.
- [13] *T. Shimizu and W. Takahashi*: Fixed points of multivalued mappings in certain convex metric spaces. *Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal.* *8* (1996), 197–203.
- [14] *W. Takahashi*: A convexity in metric spaces and nonexpansive mapping I. *Kodai Math. Sem. Rep.* *22* (1970), 142–149.
- [15] *F. Tricomi*: Una teorema sulla convergenza delle successioni formate delle successive iterate di una funzione di una variabile reale. *Giorn. Mat. Bataglini* *54* (1916), 1–9.

Author's address: Department of Mathematics, Lahore University of Management Sciences (LUMS), 54792-Lahore, Pakistan, e-mail: ibeg@lums.edu.pk.