



Available online at <http://scik.org>

Adv. Fixed Point Theory, 4 (2014), No. 1, 41-47

ISSN: 1927-6303

GENERALIZATION OF SOME FIXED POINT THEOREMS IN ULTRAMETRIC SPACES

S. N. MISHRA¹ AND RAJENDRA PANT^{2,*}

¹Department of Mathematics, Walter Sisulu University, Mthatha 5117, South Africa

²Department of Mathematics, Visvesvaraya National Institute of Technology, Nagpur 440010, India

Copyright © 2014 Mishra and Pant. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Abstract. In this note, we obtain a fixed point theorem for generalized contractive mappings in an ultrametric space which generalizes some known results.

2000 AMS Subject Classification: 47H10, 54H25

1. Introduction and Preliminaries

A metric space (X, d) is said to be an ultrametric space if the triangle inequality is replaced by the strong triangle inequality, i.e.,

$$d(x, y) \leq \max\{d(x, z), d(y, z)\}$$

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

Example 1. [1]. *Every discrete metric space is an ultrametric space.*

An ultrametric space (X, d) is said to be spherically complete if every descending collection of closed balls in X has a nonempty intersection. For details we refer to Khamsi and Kirk [3].

*Corresponding author

Received July 17, 2011

Definition 1. A self-mapping T of a metric (resp. an ultrametric) space X is said to be contractive (or strictly contractive) mapping if

$$d(Tx, Ty) < d(x, y)$$

for all $x, y \in X$ with $x \neq y$.

It is well-known that a contractive mapping of a complete metric space need not have a fixed point.

Example 2. [6]. Let $X = (-\infty, -\infty)$ endowed with the usual metric and $T : X \rightarrow X$ defined by

$$Tx = x + \frac{1}{1 + e^x}$$

for all $x \in X$. Notice that X is complete and T is a contractive mapping but T does not have a fixed point.

Definition 2. A self-mapping T of a metric (resp. an ultrametric) space X is said to be generalized contractive mapping if

$$(1.1) \quad d(Tx, Ty) < M(x, y)$$

for all $x, y \in X$ with $x \neq y$, where

$$M(x, y) = \max\{d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty), d(x, Ty), d(y, Tx)\}.$$

We remark that the condition (1.1) is considered as one of the most general contractive conditions listed in Rhoades [7].

In [6], Petalas and Vidalis obtained the following fixed point theorem:

Theorem 1. Let (X, d) be a spherically complete ultrametric space and $T : X \rightarrow X$ a contractive mapping. Then T has a unique fixed point.

In [1], Gajić obtained the following generalization of the above theorem:

Theorem 2. *Let (X, d) be a spherically complete ultrametric space and $T : X \rightarrow X$ a mapping such that for all $x, y \in X, x \neq y$,*

$$(1.2) \quad d(Tx, Ty) < \max\{d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty)\}.$$

Then T has a unique fixed point.

In this note we obtain a generalization of Theorem 2 and which, in turn, generalizes Theorem 1.

2. Results

Our main result, Theorem 3, is prefaced by the following Lemma.

Lemma 1. *Let X be an ultrametric space and $T : X \rightarrow X$ a generalized contractive mapping. Then for all $a, b \in X$,*

$$d(Ta, Tb) < \max\{d(a, b), d(a, Ta), d(b, Tb)\}.$$

Proof. Since T is a generalized contractive mapping, we have

$$(2.1) \quad d(Ta, Tb) < \max\{d(a, b), d(a, Ta), d(b, Tb), d(a, Tb), d(b, Ta)\}.$$

Now by the strong triangle inequality, we have

$$(2.2) \quad d(a, Tb) \leq \max\{d(a, b), d(b, Tb)\}.$$

Similarly, we have

$$(2.3) \quad d(b, Ta) \leq \max\{d(b, a), d(a, Ta)\}.$$

By (2.1)-(2.3), we conclude that

$$d(Ta, Tb) < \max\{d(a, b), d(a, Ta), d(b, Tb)\}.$$

□

Now we present our main result.

Theorem 3. *Let (X, d) be a spherically complete ultrametric space and $T : X \rightarrow X$ a generalized contractive mapping. Then T has a unique fixed point.*

Proof. Let $B_a =: B(a, d(a, Ta))$ denote the closed sphere centered at a with radius $d(a, Ta)$, and let \mathcal{A} be the collection of these spheres for all $a \in X$. Then the relation

$$B_a \leq B_b \text{ iff } B_b \subseteq B_a$$

is a partial order. Let \mathcal{A}_1 be a totally ordered subfamily of \mathcal{A} . From the spherical completeness of X , we have

$$\bigcap_{B_a \in \mathcal{A}_1} B_a =: B \neq \emptyset.$$

Let $b \in B$ and $B_a \in \mathcal{A}_1$. Then if $x \in B_b$,

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, b) \leq d(b, Tb) &\leq \max\{d(b, a), d(a, Ta), d(Ta, Tb)\} \\ &= \max\{d(a, Ta), d(Ta, Tb)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $d(a, b) \leq d(a, Ta)$, the above inequality reduces to

$$d(x, b) \leq \max\{d(a, Ta), d(Ta, Tb)\}.$$

Now two cases arise.

Case I: $d(Ta, Tb) \leq d(a, Ta)$. Then

$$d(x, b) \leq d(a, Ta).$$

Case II: $d(Ta, Tb) > d(a, Ta)$. Then

$$d(x, b) \leq d(b, Tb) \leq d(Ta, Tb).$$

By Lemma 1, the above inequality will lead to

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, b) \leq d(b, Tb) &\leq d(Ta, Tb) \\ &< \max\{d(b, a), d(a, Ta), d(b, Tb)\} \\ &= \max\{d(a, Ta), d(b, Tb)\} \\ &= d(a, Ta), \end{aligned}$$

otherwise we have the contradiction $d(b, Tb) < d(b, Tb)$. Therefore in both the cases, we have

$$(2.4) \quad d(x, b) \leq d(a, Ta).$$

Now

$$d(x, a) \leq \max\{d(a, b), d(b, x)\}.$$

By the fact that $d(b, a) \leq d(a, Ta)$ and (2.4), we get

$$d(x, a) \leq \max\{d(a, b), d(b, x)\} \leq d(a, Ta).$$

So, $x \in B_a$ and $B_b \subseteq B_a$ for every $B_a \in \mathcal{A}_1$. Thus B_b is an upper bound in \mathcal{A} for the family \mathcal{A}_1 .

By Zorn's lemma, \mathcal{A} has a maximal element, say B_z , for some $z \in X$. We claim that $z = Tz$.

Since T is a generalized contractive mapping, we have

$$d(Tz, T^2z) < \max\{d(z, Tz), d(z, Tz), d(Tz, T^2z), d(z, T^2z), d(Tz, Tz)\}.$$

Using Lemma 1, we get

$$(2.5) \quad d(Tz, T^2z) < \max\{d(z, Tz), d(Tz, T^2z)\} = d(z, Tz),$$

and

$$Tz \in B(Tz, d(Tz, T^2z)) \cap B(z, d(z, Tz)).$$

Hence B_{Tz} is not a subset of B_z . And this contradicts the maximality of B_z . Therefore T has a fixed point. Uniqueness of fixed point is obvious. \square

Example 3. Let $X = [0, 1]$ endowed with the discrete metric and $T : X \rightarrow X$ defined by $Tx = 1/2$ for all $x \in X$. Then T satisfies Theorem 3.

Example 4. (Compare Kirk and Shahzad [4]). Let $X = \{a, b, c, d\}$ with $d(a, b) = d(c, d) = 1/2$; $d(a, c) = d(a, d) = d(b, c) = d(b, d) = 1$. Then (X, d) is a spherically complete ultrametric space. Define $T : X \rightarrow X$ by $Ta = a; Tb = a; Tc = a; Td = b$. Then

$$d(Tc, Td) = d(a, b) = \frac{1}{2} = d(c, d),$$

and the mapping T does not satisfy the contractive condition of Theorem 1. However, the mapping T satisfies the conditions of Theorem 3 and a is the unique fixed point of T in X .

Corollary 1. *Theorem 2.*

Proof. It comes from Theorem 3, when $M(x, y) = \max\{d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty)\}$. □

Corollary 2. *Theorem 1.*

Proof. It comes from Theorem 3, when $M(x, y) = d(x, y)$. □

Finally, we present a multi-valued version of Theorem 3.

Let (X, d) be an ultrametric space and $C(X)$ the collection of all compact subsets of X . Then the Hausdorff metric induced by d is defined by

$$H(A, B) = \max \left\{ \sup_{x \in A} d(x, B), \sup_{y \in B} d(y, A) \right\}$$

for all $A, B \subseteq C(X)$, where $d(x, B) = \inf_{y \in B} d(x, y)$.

Theorem 4. *Let (X, d) be a spherically complete ultrametric space and $T : X \rightarrow C(X)$ a multi-valued mapping such that for all $x, y \in X$, $x \neq y$,*

$$(2.6) \quad H(Tx, Ty) < M(x, y).$$

Then T has a fixed point.

Proof. Since T satisfies (2.6), we have

$$(2.7) \quad H(Tx, Ty) < \max\{d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty), d(x, Ty), d(y, Tx)\}.$$

By the strong triangle inequality, we have

$$(2.8) \quad d(x, Ty) \leq \max\{d(x, y), d(y, Ty)\}$$

Similarly, we have

$$(2.9) \quad d(y, Tx) \leq \max\{d(y, x), d(x, Tx)\}.$$

By (2.7)-(2.9), we conclude that

$$H(Tx, Ty) < \max\{d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty)\}.$$

Now, rest of the proof can be completed as in [2] (see, also [5]). □

We remark that Theorem 2.1 [5] and the main result in [2] are the special cases of Theorem 4.

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Gajic, On ultrametric space, *Novi. Sad. J. Math.* 31 (2001), 69-71.
- [2] L. Gajic, A multi valued fixed point theorem in ultrametric spaces, *Math. Vesnik* 54 (2002), 89-91.
- [3] M.A. Khamsi, W.A. Kirk, *An introduction to metric spaces and fixed point theory*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2001.
- [4] W.A. Kirk, N. Shahzad, Some fixed point results in ultrametric spaces, *Topology Appl.* 159 (2012), 3327-3334.
- [5] J. Kubiacyk, N.M. Ali, A multivalued fixed point theorem in non-Archimedean vector spaces, *Novi Sad. J. Math.* 26 (1996) 111-116.
- [6] C. Petalas, T. Vidalis, A fixed point theorem in non-Archimedean vector spaces, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc* 118 (1993) 819-821.
- [7] B. E. Rhoades, A comparison of various definitions of contractive mappings, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 226 (1977), 257-290.