Pacific Journal of Mathematics

ON A FIXED POINT THEOREM OF KRASNOSELSKII FOR LOCALLY CONVEX SPACES

Virinda Mohan Sehgal and S. P. Singh

Vol. 62, No. 2 February 1976

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS
Vol 62, No. 2, 1976

ON A FIXED POINT THEOREM OF KRASNOSELSKII FOR LOCALLY CONVEX SPACES

V. M. SEHGAL AND S. P. SINGH

Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a neighborhood basis of the origin consisting of absolutely convex open subsets of a separated locally convex topological vector space E and S a subset of E. Let a mapping $f\colon S \to E$ satisfy the condition: for each $U \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta = \delta(\epsilon, U) > 0$ such that if $x, y \in S$ and $x - y \in (\epsilon + \delta)U$, then $f(x) - f(y) \in \epsilon U$. In the present paper, sufficient conditions are given for the mapping f to have a fixed point in S. The result is extended to the sum of two mappings of Krasnoselskii type.

In a recent paper, Meir and Keeler **[8]** gave an interesting generalization of the Banach's contraction principle. Following **[8]**, a self mapping f of a metric space (X, d) is an (ϵ, δ) contraction iff for each $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a $\delta = \delta(\epsilon) > 0$ such that for all $x, y \in X$ with $\epsilon \leqq d(x, y) \leqq \epsilon + \delta$ implies $d(f(x), f(y)) < \epsilon$. The (ϵ, δ) contraction mappings clearly contain the class of strict contractions $(d(f(x), f(y)) \leqq \lambda d(x, y), 0 < \lambda < 1)$ and the nonlinear contractions investigated by Boyd and Wong **[4]**. In this paper, we consider mappings defined on a subset S of a locally convex vector space E with values in E (not necessarily S) and satisfy a certain condition similar to (ϵ, δ) contraction. The main result here generalizes a result of Cain and Nashed **[5]** and a recent result of Assad and Kirk **[2]** and provides a further generalization of a well-known result of Krasnoselskii **[7]**.

Throughout this paper, E is a separated locally convex topological vector space and $\mathcal{U}$ is a neighborhood basis of the origin consisting of absolutely convex open subsets of E. For each $U \in \mathcal{U}$, let p_U be the Minkowski's functional of U. Further, if $x, y \in E$ let

$$(x, y) = \{z \in E\colon z = \lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y,\ 0 < \lambda < 1\}$$

and $[x, y), = \{x\} \cup (x, y)$. For a set $A \subseteq E$, $\partial(A)$ denotes the boundary of A and $\mathrm{cl}(A)$ the closure of A in E. Also for $A, B \subseteq E$, $A - B = \{x - y\colon x \in A, y \in B\}$.

Let S be a nonempty subset of E. A mapping $f\colon S \to E$ is a U-contraction ($U \in \mathcal{U}$) iff for each $\epsilon > 0$ there is a $\delta = \delta(\epsilon, U) > 0$ such that if $x, y \in S$ and if

$$(1) \qquad x - y \in (\epsilon + \delta)U, \quad \text{then} \quad f(x) - f(y) \in \epsilon U.$$

If $f\colon S \to E$ is a U-contraction for each $U \in \mathcal{U}$, then f is a $\mathcal{U}$-contraction. Note that if f is a $\mathcal{U}$-contraction, then f is continuous. (For a related definition of $\mathcal{U}$-contraction, see Taylor **[11]**.)

It may be remarked that if E is a normed space with $\mathcal{U} = \{x \in E\colon \|x\| < \epsilon, \epsilon > 0\}$ then (1) is equivalent to (ϵ, δ) contraction **[8]**.

The following lemma simplifies the proof of next theorem.

LEMMA 1. *Let $f\colon S \to E$ be a $\mathcal{U}$-contraction, then f is $\mathcal{U}$-contractive, that is for each $U \in \mathcal{U}$, $p_U(f(x) - f(y)) < p_U(x-y)$ if $p_U(x-y) \neq 0$ and 0 otherwise.*

Proof. Let $x, y \in S$ and suppose $p = p_U$, $p(x-y) = \epsilon > 0$. Then $x - y \in (\epsilon + \delta)U$ for each $\delta > 0$ and in particular $x - y \in (\epsilon + \delta_0)U$ where $\delta_0 = \delta(U, \epsilon)$. Therefore by (1) $(f(x) - f(y)) \in \epsilon U$. Since U is open, this implies that $p(f(x) - f(y)) < \epsilon = p(x-y)$. If $\epsilon = 0$, then $x - y \in \epsilon U$ for each $\epsilon > 0$ and hence by (1) $(f(x) - f(y)) \in \epsilon U$ which implies that $p(f(x) - f(y)) = 0$.

THEOREM 1. *Let S be a sequentially complete subset of E and $f\colon S \to E$ be a $\mathcal{U}$-contraction. If f satisfies the condition:*

(2) *for each $x \in S$ with $f(x) \notin S$, there is a $z \in (x, f(x)) \cap S$ such that $f(z) \in S$*

then f has a unique fixed point in S.

Proof. Let $x_0 \in S$ and choose a sequence $\{x_n\} \subseteq S$ defined inductively as follows: for each $n \in I$ (positive integers) if $f(x_n) \in S$, set $x_{n+1} = f(x_n)$ and if $f(x_n) \notin S$, let x_{n+1} be any element of $(x_n, f(x_n)) \cap S$ such that $f(x_{n+1}) \in S$ (such x_{n+1} exists by (2)). It then follows that for each $n \in I$, there is a $\lambda_n \in [0, 1)$ satisfying

$$x_{n+1} = \lambda_n x_n + (1 - \lambda_n) f(x_n). \tag{3}$$

We show that the sequence $\{x_n\}$ so constructed satisfies

$$\text{(a)}\quad x_{n+1} - x_n \to 0 \qquad \text{(b)}\quad x_n - f(x_n) \to 0 \tag{4}$$

To establish (4), note that by (3)

$$x_{n+1} - x_n = (1 - \lambda_n)(f(x_n) - x_n), \quad \text{and} \tag{5}$$

$$f(x_n) - x_{n+1} = \lambda_n (f(x_n) - x_n). \tag{6}$$

Therefore, for a $U \in \mathcal{U}$ with $p = p_U$, it follows by the above lemma that

$$\begin{aligned} p(f(x_{n+1})-x_{n+1}) &\leqq p(f(x_{n+1})-f(x_n))+p(f(x_n)-x_{n+1}) \\ &\leqq p(x_{n+1}-x_n)+\lambda_n(f(x_n)-x_n). \end{aligned}$$

Thus by (5) $p(f(x_{n+1})-x_{n+1})\leqq p(f(x_n)-x_n)$ for each $n\in I$, that is $\{p(f(x_n)-x_n)\}$ is a nonincreasing sequence of nonnegative reals and hence for each $p=p_U$, $U\in\mathcal{U}$, there is a $r(U)\geqq 0$ with

$$r(U)\leqq p(f(x_n)-x_n)\to r(U)\geqq 0. \tag{7}$$

We claim that $r(U)\equiv 0$. Suppose $r(U)>0$. Choose a $\delta=\delta(r(U),U)>0$ satisfying (1). Then by (7) there is a $n_0\in I$ such that $p(f(x_n)-x_n)<r(U)+\delta$ for all $n\geqq n_0$. Now choose an $m\in I$, $m\geqq n_0$ such that $x_{m+1}=f(x_m)$, (let $m=n_0$ if $f(x_{n_0})\in S$, otherwise let $m=n_0+1$, then $x_{m+1}=f(x_m)\in S$). Thus for this m,

$$p(x_m-x_{m+1})=p(x_m-f(x_m))<r(U)+\delta.$$

and hence by (1)

$$p(x_{m+1}-f(x_{m+1}))=p(f(x_m)-f(x_{m+1}))<r(U),$$

which contradicts (7). Thus $r(U)=0$ for each $U\in\mathcal{U}$ and this implies that the sequence $x_n-f(x_n)\to 0$. This establishes 4(b) and 4(a) now, follows by (5).

We assert that $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in E. Suppose not. Let for each $k\in I$, $A_k=\{x_n\colon n\geqq k\}$. Then by assumption there is $U\in\mathcal{U}$ such that $A_k-A_k\not\subseteq U$ for any $k\in I$. Choose an ϵ with $0<\epsilon<1$ and a δ with $0<\delta<\delta(\epsilon,U)$ satisfying $\epsilon+\delta<1$. It follows that $A_k-A_k\not\subseteq(\epsilon+\delta/2)U$ for any $k\in I$. Thus for each $k\in I$, there exist integers $n(k)$ and $m(k)$ with $k\leqq n(k)<m(k)$ such that

$$x_{n(k)}-x_{m(k)}\not\in(\epsilon+\delta/2)U. \tag{8}$$

Let $m(k)$ be the least integer exceeding $n(k)$ satisfying (8). Then by (8)

$$\begin{aligned} x_{n(k)}-x_{m(k)} &= (x_{n(k)}-x_{m(k)-1})+(x_{m(k)-1}-x_{m(k)}) \\ &\in (x_{m(k)-1}-x_{m(k)})+(\epsilon+\delta/2)U. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Now by (4) there is a $k_0\in I$ such that $x_k-f(x_k)\in(\delta/4)U$ and $x_{k-1}-x_k\in(\delta/4)U$ whenever $k\geqq k_0$, and hence by (9)

$$x_{n(k)}-x_{m(k)}\subseteq(\epsilon+\delta)U, \qquad k\geqq k_0.$$

It follows, that for all $k\geqq k_0$

$$f(x_{n(k)}) - f(x_{m(k)}) \in \epsilon U.$$

However, for $k \geqq k_0$,

$$x_{n(k)} - x_{m(k)} = (x_{n(k)} - f(x_{n(k)})) + (f(x_{n(k)}) - f(x_{m(k)})) + (f(x_{m(k)}) - x_{m(k)})$$

and therefore,

$$x_{n(k)} - x_{m(k)} \in \left(\frac{\delta}{4} U + \epsilon U + \frac{\delta}{4} U\right) \subseteq \left(\epsilon + \frac{\delta}{2}\right) U, \qquad k \geqq k_0,$$

which contradicts (8). Thus $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in S and the sequential completeness implies that there is a $u \in S$ such that $x_n \to u$. Since f is continuous, it follows by (4b) that $u = f(u)$. This proves the existence of the fixed point of f. Since E is separated, the uniquencess is an immediate consequence of the Lemma 1.

The following result was proven in **[10]** and its proof here is given for completeness.

LEMMA 2. *Let S be a closed or sequentially complete subset of E. If $x \in S$ and $y \notin S$ then there is a $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ such that $z = (1-\lambda)x + \lambda y \in \partial(S)$. Further, if $x \notin \partial(S)$ then $0 < \lambda < 1$.*

Proof. Let $A = \{\mu \geqq 0\colon (1-\alpha)x + \alpha y \in S$ for all α with $0 \leqq \alpha \leqq \mu\}$. Since $x \in S$, $A \neq \varnothing$. The hypothesis $y \notin S$ implies that $\lambda = \sup\{\mu\colon \mu \in A\} \leqq 1$. Now if S is closed or sequentially complete, it follows that $z = (1-\lambda)x + \lambda y \in S$ and hence $\lambda < 1$. To show that $z \in \partial(S)$, it suffices to show that for each $U \in \mathcal{U}$, $(z + U) \cap c(S) \neq \varnothing$, where $c(S)$ is the complement of S in E. Choose a $\beta_0 > \lambda$ with $(\beta_0 - \lambda)p(x-y) < 1$ where $p = p_U$. By definition of λ, there is a β with $\lambda < \beta \leqq \beta_0$ such that $z_1 = (1-\beta)x + \beta y \notin S$. Since $p(z - z_1) = (\beta - \lambda)p(x-y) < 1$, it follows that $z_1 \in (z + U)$ and hence $z \in \partial(S)$. If $x \notin \partial(S)$ but $x \in S$, then clearly $0 < \lambda < 1$.

The following is now an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.

THEOREM 2. *Let S be sequentially complete subset of E and $f\colon S \to E$ be a $\mathcal{U}$-contraction. If $f(S \cap \partial(S)) \subseteq S$, then f has a unique fixed point.*

It may be noted that if S is closed then $S \cap \partial(S) = \partial(S)$.

In the following, let $\mathcal{P} = \{p = p_U$ for some $U \in \mathcal{U}\}$, R^+ the nonnegative reals and Ψ a family of mappings defined as $\Psi = \{\phi\colon R^+ \to R^+\colon \phi$ is continuous and $\phi(t) < t$ if $t > 0\}$. A mapping $f\colon S \to E$ is a nonlinear $\mathcal{P}$ contraction (see also Boyd and Wong **[4]**) iff for each $p \in \mathcal{P}$, there is a $\phi_p \in \Psi$ such that $p(f(x) - f(y)) \leqq \phi_p(p(x-y))$ for all $x, y \in S$. If this inequality holds with $\phi_p(t)=\alpha_p t$, $0<\alpha_p<1$, then f is called $\mathcal{P}$-contraction (see [5]). Since a nonlinear $\mathcal{P}$ contraction is a $\mathcal{U}$-contraction, the following result immediately follows by Theorem 1 and provides an extension of a result in [5], (see also Assad [1]).

THEOREM 3. *Let S be a sequentially complete subset of E and $f\colon S\to E$ be a nonlinear $\mathcal{P}$ contraction. If f satisfies* (2) *then f has a unique fixed point in S.*

As an application of Theorem 3, we give here a generalization of a well-known result of Krasnoselskii [7] which has been extended recently to locally convex spaces in [5]. The following extension of Tychonoff's theorem [12] is due to Singball [3] (see also Himmelberg [6]) and is used in the proof of Theorem 5.

THEOREM 4. *Let S be a closed and convex subset of E and $f\colon S\to S$ be a continuous mapping such that the range $f(S)$ is contained in a compact set. Then f has fixed point.*

In the rest of this paper, a mapping $f\colon S\to E$ is completely continuous if it is continuous and $f(S)$ is contained in a compact subset of E. Further, if $A\colon S\to E$ is a nonlinear $\mathcal{P}$ contraction and $B\colon S\to E$ is completely continuous, then for each fixed $x\in S$, the mapping $f_x\colon S\to E$ is defined by $f_x(y)\Rightarrow A(y)+B(x)$. Note that since E is separated, the mapping $(I-A)\colon S\to E$ is one-to-one, where I is the identity map of S.

The following lemma follows immediately from Theorem 3.

LEMMA 3. *Let S be a sequentially complete subset of E and $A\colon S\to E$ be a nonlinear $\mathcal{P}$ contraction. Suppose for a $x\in E$, the mapping $f\colon S\to E$ defined by $f(y)=A(y)+x$ satisfies* (2), *then there exists a unique $u(x)\in S$ with $f(u(x))=u(x)$, that is $(I-A)^{-1}x=u(x)\in S$.*

THEOREM 5. *Let S be a convex and complete subset of E. Let $A\colon S\to E$ be a nonlinear $\mathcal{P}$ contraction and $B\colon S\to E$ be completely continuous. If for each $x\in S$, the mapping $f_x\colon S\to E$ satisfies* (2) *and $(I-A)^{-1}B(S)$ is a bounded subset of S, then there is a $u\in S$ satisfying $A(u)+B(u)=u$.*

Proof. For each fixed $x\in S$, the mapping f_x satisfies the conditions of Lemma 3 and hence there is a unique $u_x\in S$ with $f_x(u_x)=u_x$. Define a mapping $L\colon S\to S$ by

$$L(x)=u_x=A(L(x))+B(x),\qquad x\in S. \tag{10}$$

Then, for each $x \in S$, $L(x) = (I - A)^{-1}B(x)$. If follows by hypothesis that $L(S)$ is a bounded subset of E. We show that L in (10) is continuous. Let $\{x_\alpha : \alpha \in \Gamma\} \subseteq S$ be a net such that $x_\alpha \to x \in S$ and suppose $L(x_\alpha)$ does not converge to $L(x)$. Then there is a $p \in \mathcal{P}$ and an $\epsilon > 0$ and a subnet $\{p(L(x_\alpha) - L(x)) : \alpha \in \Gamma_1\}$ of the net $\{p(L(x_\alpha) - L(x)) : \alpha \in \Gamma\}$ such that

$$p(L(x_\alpha) - L(x)) > \epsilon \quad \text{for each} \quad \alpha \in \Gamma_1. \tag{11}$$

Since $\{p(L(x_\alpha) - L(x)) : \alpha \in \Gamma_1\}$ is a bounded subset of the reals, it has a subnet $\{p(L(x_\alpha) - L(x)) : \alpha \in \Gamma_2 \subseteq \Gamma_1\} \to r \geqq 0$. However, by (10) for any $\alpha \in \Gamma_2$

$$p(L(x_\alpha) - L(x)) \leqq p(B(x_\alpha) - B(x)) + \phi_p(p(L(x_\alpha) - L(x))),$$

which implies that $r = 0$. This contradicts (11) and consequently L is continuous. We now show that $L(S)$ is relatively compact in S. If $\{L(x_\alpha) : \alpha \in \Gamma\}$ is a net in $L(S)$, then there is a net $\{B(x_\alpha) : \alpha \in \Gamma_1\}$ which is convergent. We assert that $\{L(x_\alpha) : \alpha \in \Gamma_1\}$ is a Cauchy subnet. Suppose not. Then there is a $p \in \mathcal{P}$ and an $\epsilon > 0$ such that for each $\alpha \in \Gamma_1$ there are elements $n(\alpha)$ and $m(\alpha)$ in Γ_1 with $n(\alpha) \geqq \alpha$, $m(\alpha) \geqq \alpha$, satisfying

$$r_\alpha = p(L(x_{n(\alpha)}) - L(x_{m(\alpha)})) > \epsilon, \qquad \alpha \in \Gamma_1. \tag{12}$$

Since $\{B(x_\alpha) : \alpha \in \Gamma_1\}$ is a Cauchy net, there is an $\alpha_0 \in \Gamma_1$ such that $p(B(x_\alpha) - B(x_\beta)) < \epsilon$ for all $\alpha, \beta \geqq \alpha_0$, $\alpha, \beta \in \Gamma_1$. However, $\{r_\alpha : \alpha \in \Gamma_1\}$ being a bounded subset of reals has a convergent subnet $\{r_\alpha : \alpha \in \Gamma_2\} \to r \geqq 0$. The same argument as above implies that $r = 0$ and this contradicts (12). This proves the assertion. It now follows by Theorem 4, that $L(u) = u$ for some $u \in S$ and hence by (10) $A(u) + B(u) = u$.

The following consequence of Theorem 5 appears new and generalizes a result of Nashed and Wong (Theorem 1 **[9]**). Note that in a normed linear space E a mapping $f : S \to E$ is a nonlinear contraction (see **[4]**) if there exists a $\phi \in \Psi$ such that $\|f(x) - f(y)\| \leqq \phi(\|x - y\|)$ for all $x, y \in S$.

COROLLARY 1. *Let S be a closed, bounded and convex subset of a Banach space E. If $A : S \to E$ is a nonlinear contraction and $B : S \to E$ is completely continuous such that for each $x \in \partial(S)$, $f_x(\partial(S)) \subseteq S$, then $A(u) + B(u) = u$ for some $u \in S$.*

As another consequence, we have the following extension of a result of Cain and Nashed **[5]**.

COROLLARY 2. *Let S be a convex and complete subset of E. Let $A: S \to E$ be a $\mathcal{P}$ contraction and $B: S \to E$ be a completely continuous mapping. If for each $x \in S$, f_x satisfies* (2) *then $A(u) + B(u) = u$ for some $u \in S$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that for each $p \in \mathcal{P}$, $p((I - A)^{-1}B(S))$ is a bounded subset of reals. Now it follows by (10) that for all $x, y \in S$

$$p(L(x) - L(y)) \leqq p(B(x) - B(y)) + \alpha_p p(L(x) - L(y)),$$

which implies that $p(L(x) - L(y)) \leqq (1 - \alpha_p)^{-1} p(B(x) - B(y))$ and hence $L(S) = (I - A)^{-1}B(S)$ is bounded.

We wish to thank the referee for some useful comments.

REFERENCES

1. N. A. Assad, *A fixed point theorem for weakly uniformly strict-contractions*, Canad. Math. Bull., **16** (1973), 15–18.
2. N. A. Assad and W. A. Kirk, *Fixed point theorems for set-valued mappings of contractive type*, Pacific J. Math., **43** (1972), 553–562.
3. F. F. Bonsall, *Lectures on some fixed point theorems on functional analysis*, Tata Inst. of Fundamental Research, Bombay, India, 1962.
4. D. W. Boyd and S. W. Wong, *On nonlinear contractions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **20** (1969), 458–464.
5. G. L. Cain, Jr. and M. Z. Nashed, *Fixed points and stability for a sum of two operators in locally convex spaces*, Pacific J. Math., **39** (1971), 581–592.
6. C. J. Himmelberg, *Fixed points of compact multifunctions*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **38** (1972), 205–207.
7. M. A. Krasnoselskii, *Two remarks on the method of successive approximations*, Uspehi Mat. Nauk., **10** (1955), No. 1 (63), 123–127.
8. A. Meir and E. B. Keeler, *A theorem on contraction mappings*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **28** (1969), 326–329.
9. M. Z. Nashed and J. S. W. Wong, *Some variants of a fixed point theorem of Krasnoselskii and applications to non-linear integral equations*, J. Math. Mech., **18** (1969), 767–777.
10. C. H. Su and V. M. Sehgal, *Some fixed point theorems for non-expansive mappings in locally convex spaces*, Bollettino U.M.I., **10** (1974), 598–601.
11. W. W. Taylor, *Fixed point theorems for nonexpansive mapping in linear topological spaces*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **40** (1972), 164–173.
12. A. Tychonoff, *Ein fixpunktsatz*, Math. Ann., **111** (1935), 767–776.

Received May 21, 1975.

UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING
AND
UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be in typed form or offset-reproduced (not dittoed), double spaced with large margins. Underline Greek letters in red, German in green, and script in blue. The first paragraph or two must be capable of being used separately as a synopsis of the entire paper. Items of the bibliography should not be cited there unless absolutely necessary, in which case they must be identified by author and Journal, rather than by item number. Manuscripts, in duplicate, may be sent to any one of the four editors. Please classify according to the scheme of Math. Reviews, Index to Vol. 39. All other communications should be addressed to the managing editor, or Elaine Barth, University of California, Los Angeles, California, 90024.

100 reprints are provided free for each article, only if page charges have been substantially paid. Additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is issued monthly as of January 1966. Regular subscription rate: $ 72.00 a year (6 Vols., 12 issues). Special rate: $ 36.00 a year to individual members of supporting institutions.

Subscriptions, orders for back numbers, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 103 Highland Boulevard, Berkeley, California, 94708.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION
Printed at Jerusalem Academic Press, POB 2390, Jerusalem, Israel.

Pacific Journal of Mathematics
Vol. 62, No. 2 February, 1976