



## Geraghty's Fixed Point Theorem for Special Multi-Valued Mappings

M. Eshaghi Gordji<sup>1</sup> H. Baghani, H. Khodaei and M. Ramezani

Department of Mathematics, Semnan University  
P.O. Box 35195-363, Semnan, Iran  
e-mail : madjid.eshaghi@gmail.com (M. Eshaghi Gordji)  
h.baghani@gmail.com (H. Baghani)  
hkhodaei.math@yahoo.com (H. Khodaei)  
ramezanimaryam873@gmail.com (M. Ramezani)

**Abstract :** In this paper, we prove a generalization of Geraghty's fixed point theorem for a type of multi-valued map that called special multi-valued map.

**Keywords :** Fixed point; Multi-valued mapping.

**2010 Mathematics Subject Classification :** 54H25.

---

### 1 Introduction

Many fixed point theorems have been proved by various authors as generalizations to Banach's contraction principle (see for example [1–7]). One such generalization is due to Geraghty [8] as follows.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $(X, d)$  be a complete metric space, let  $f : X \rightarrow X$  be a mapping such that for each  $x, y \in X$ ,*

$$d(f(x), f(y)) \leq \alpha(d(x, y)) d(x, y)$$

*where  $\alpha \in S$ , that  $S$  is the families of functions from  $[0, \infty)$  into  $[0, 1)$  which satisfy the simple condition  $\alpha(t_n) \rightarrow 1 \implies t_n \rightarrow 0$ . Then  $f$  has a fixed point  $z \in X$ , and  $\{f^n(x)\}$  converges to  $z$ , for each  $x \in X$ .*

---

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding author.

Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space. Let  $CB(X)$  denotes the collection of all nonempty closed bounded subsets of  $X$ . For  $A, B \in CB(X)$  and  $x \in X$ , define  $D(x, A) := \inf\{d(x, a); a \in A\}$  and

$$H_d(A, B) := \max \left\{ \sup_{a \in A} D(a, B), \sup_{b \in B} D(b, A) \right\}.$$

It is easy to see that  $H_d$  is a metric on  $CB(X)$ .  $H_d$  is called the Hausdorff metric induced by  $d$ . Note that a point  $p \in X$  is said to be a fixed point of a multi-valued mapping  $T : X \rightarrow CB(X)$  if  $p \in T(p)$  [9].

The fixed point theory of multi-valued contractions was initiated by Nadler [9] as follows.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $(X, d)$  be a complete metric space and let  $T$  be a mapping from  $X$  into  $CB(X)$  such that for all  $x, y \in X$ ,*

$$H_d(Tx, Ty) \leq r d(x, y) \quad (1.1)$$

where  $0 \leq r < 1$ . Then  $T$  has a fixed point.

This theory was developed in different directions by many authors. See for example [10–15]. In this paper, we prove a version of Geraghty's fixed point theorem for multi-valued mappings.

Throughout this paper, we assume that  $(X, d)$  is a complete metric space and  $H_d$  is the Hausdorff metric on  $CB(X)$  induced by  $d$ .

## 2 Main Results

In this section we have attempted to generalize a fixed point theorem of Geraghty for multi-valued mappings. For this purpose we introduce a notion called special multi-valued map and for this type of multi-valued map we have obtained a fixed point theorem.

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $(X, d)$  be a a metric space, mapping  $T$  from  $X$  into  $CB(X)$  is called *special multi-valued* if

$$\inf_{y \in Tx} \{d(x, y) + d(y, z)\} = D(x, Tx) + D(z, Tx), \quad (2.1)$$

for all  $x, z \in X$ .

It is clear that every single valued mapping is special multi-valued mapping, also there exist some mappings that are special multi-valued but not single valued.

**Example 2.1.** Let  $X = \{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4}, \dots, \frac{1}{2^n}, \dots\} \cup \{0, 1\}$ ,  $d(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \neq y, \\ 0 & x = y. \end{cases}$

Define mapping  $F : X \rightarrow CB(X)$  as

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} \{\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}\} & x = \frac{1}{2^n}, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, \\ \{0\} & x = 0, \\ \{0, \frac{1}{2}\} & x = 1. \end{cases}$$

It is clear that above example is special multi-valued but not single valued. Now we prove our main result in this paper.

**Theorem 2.2.** Let  $T$  be special multi-valued mapping that

$$H_d(Tx, Ty) \leq \alpha(d(x, y))d(x, y) + \beta(d(x, y))[D(x, Tx) + D(y, Ty)] \\ + \gamma(d(x, y))[D(x, Ty) + D(y, Tx)]$$

for all  $x, y \in X$ , where  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$  are mappings from  $[0, \infty)$  into  $[0, 1)$  such that  $\frac{\alpha + \beta + \gamma}{1 - (\beta + \gamma)} \in S$  and  $\beta(t) \geq \gamma(t)$  for all  $t \in [0, \infty)$ . Then  $T$  has a fixed point.

*Proof.* Define a function  $\alpha'$  from  $[0, \infty)$  into  $[0, 1)$  by  $\alpha'(t) = \frac{\alpha(t) + 1 - 2\beta(t) - 2\gamma(t)}{2}$  for all  $t \in [0, \infty)$ . Then we have

- 1)  $\alpha(t) < \alpha'(t)$  for all  $t \in [0, \infty)$ ,
- 2)  $\frac{\alpha' + \beta + \gamma}{1 - (\beta + \gamma)} \in S$ ,
- 3) for  $x, y \in X$  and  $u \in Tx$ , there exists  $\nu \in Ty$  such that

$$d(\nu, u) \leq \alpha'(d(x, y))d(x, y) + \beta(d(x, y))[D(x, Tx) + D(y, Ty)] \\ + \gamma(d(x, y))[D(x, Ty) + D(y, Tx)].$$

Putting  $u = y$  in 3), we obtain that:

- 4) For  $x \in X$  and  $y \in Tx$  there exists  $\nu \in Ty$  such that

$$d(\nu, y) \leq \alpha'(d(x, y))d(x, y) + \beta(d(x, y))[D(x, Tx) + D(y, Ty)] \\ + \gamma(d(x, y))[D(x, Ty) + D(y, Tx)].$$

Hence, we can define a sequence  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  which satisfies  $x_{n+1} \in Tx_n, x_{n+1} \neq x_n$  and

$$d(x_{n+2}, x_{n+1}) \leq \alpha'(d(x_{n+1}, x_n))d(x_{n+1}, x_n) + \beta(d(x_{n+1}, x_n))[D(x_n, Tx_n) \\ + D(x_{n+1}, Tx_{n+1})] + \gamma(d(x_{n+1}, x_n))[D(x_n, Tx_{n+1}) \\ + D(x_{n+1}, Tx_n)]$$

for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . It follows that

$$d(x_{n+2}, x_{n+1}) \leq \frac{\alpha'(d(x_{n+1}, x_n)) + \beta(d(x_{n+1}, x_n)) + \gamma(d(x_{n+1}, x_n))}{1 - (\beta(d(x_{n+1}, x_n)) + \gamma(d(x_{n+1}, x_n)))} d(x_{n+1}, x_n)$$

for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We show that  $\{x_n\}$  is a Cauchy sequence. To this end, we break the argument into two Steps.

Step 1:  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, x_{n+1}) = 0$ .

Since  $\frac{\alpha'(t) + \beta(t) + \gamma(t)}{1 - (\beta(t) + \gamma(t))} < 1$  for all  $t$ ,  $\{d(x_n, x_{n+1})\}$  is decreasing and bounded below, so

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, x_{n+1}) = r \geq 0.$$

Assume  $r > 0$ . Then we have

$$\frac{d(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2})}{d(x_n, x_{n+1})} \leq \frac{\alpha'(d(x_n, x_{n+1})) + \beta(d(x_n, x_{n+1})) + \gamma(d(x_n, x_{n+1}))}{1 - (\beta(d(x_n, x_{n+1})) + \gamma(d(x_n, x_{n+1})))}, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

By letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we see that

$$1 \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\alpha'(d(x_n, x_{n+1})) + \beta(d(x_n, x_{n+1})) + \gamma(d(x_n, x_{n+1}))}{1 - (\beta(d(x_n, x_{n+1})) + \gamma(d(x_n, x_{n+1})))}.$$

On the other hand, we have  $\frac{\alpha' + \beta + \gamma}{1 - (\beta + \gamma)} \in S$ . Therefore  $r = 0$ . This is a contradiction, hence, we prove Step 1.

Step 2:  $\{x_n\}$  is a Cauchy sequence.

Assume  $\limsup_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, x_m) > 0$ . By triangle inequality for positive real numbers  $n, m$  and for  $y \in Tx_m$ , we obtain  $d(x_n, x_m) \leq d(x_n, y) + d(y, x_m)$ . This means that for every positive real numbers  $m, n$ , with using of relation (2.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_n, x_m) &\leq \inf_{y \in Tx_m} \{d(x_n, y) + d(y, x_m)\} = D(x_m, Tx_m) + D(x_n, Tx_m) \\ &\leq d(x_m, x_{m+1}) + D(x_{m+1}, Tx_m) + d(x_n, x_{n+1}) + D(x_{n+1}, Tx_m) \\ &\leq H_d(Tx_m, Tx_n) + d(x_n, x_{n+1}) + d(x_m, x_{m+1}) \\ &\leq \alpha(d(x_n, x_m))d(x_n, x_m) + \beta(d(x_n, x_m))[D(x_n, Tx_n) + D(x_m, Tx_m)] \\ &\quad + \gamma(d(x_n, x_m))[D(x_n, Tx_m) + D(x_m, Tx_n)] + d(x_n, x_{n+1}) + d(x_m, x_{m+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$d(x_n, x_m) \leq \frac{(\beta(d(x_n, x_m)) + \gamma(d(x_n, x_m)))(d(x_n, x_{n+1}) + d(x_m, x_{m+1})) + d(x_n, x_{n+1}) + d(x_m, x_{m+1})}{1 - (\alpha(d(x_n, x_m)) + 2\gamma(d(x_n, x_m)))}.$$

Under the assumption  $\limsup_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, x_m) > 0$ , it follows by Step 1, that

$$\limsup_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{1 - (\alpha(d(x_n, x_m)) + 2\gamma(d(x_n, x_m)))} = +\infty$$

for which

$$\limsup_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} \alpha(d(x_n, x_m)) + 2\gamma(d(x_n, x_m)) = 1. \tag{2.2}$$

On the other hand, since

$$\frac{\alpha(t) + \beta(t) + \gamma(t)}{1 - (\beta(t) + \gamma(t))} < 1, \tag{2.3}$$

then  $\beta(t) + \gamma(t) < \frac{1}{2}$ , for all  $t \in [0, \infty)$ .

Hence, since  $\beta(t) \geq \gamma(t)$ , for all  $t \in [0, \infty)$ , by using (2.2) and (2.3)

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\alpha(d(x_n, x_m)) + \beta(d(x_n, x_m)) + \gamma(d(x_n, x_m))}{1 - (\beta(d(x_n, x_m)) + \gamma(d(x_n, x_m)))} \\ \geq \limsup_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\alpha(d(x_n, x_m)) + 2\gamma(d(x_n, x_m))}{1 - (\beta(d(x_n, x_m)) + \gamma(d(x_n, x_m)))} \\ \geq \limsup_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} \alpha(d(x_n, x_m)) + 2\gamma(d(x_n, x_m)) = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

Now since,  $\frac{\alpha+\beta+\gamma}{1-(\beta+\gamma)} \in S$ , then by using (2.4), we have

$$\limsup_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\alpha(d(x_n, x_m)) + \beta(d(x_n, x_m)) + \gamma(d(x_n, x_m))}{1 - (\beta(d(x_n, x_m)) + \gamma(d(x_n, x_m)))} = 1.$$

It follows that  $\limsup_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, x_m) = 0$  which is a contradiction. Thus, Step 2 is proved.

By completeness of  $X$ , there exists  $x^* \in X$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x^*$ . Now, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D(x^*, Tx^*) &\leq d(x^*, x_{n+1}) + D(x_{n+1}, Tx^*) \\ &\leq d(x^*, x_{n+1}) + H_d(Tx_n, Tx^*) \\ &\leq d(x^*, x_{n+1}) + \alpha(d(x_n, x^*))d(x_n, x^*) \\ &\quad + \beta(d(x_n, x^*)) [D(x_n, Tx_n) + D(x^*, Tx^*)] \\ &\quad + \gamma(d(x_n, x^*)) [D(x_n, Tx^*) + D(x^*, Tx_n)] \end{aligned}$$

for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} D(x^*, Tx^*) &\leq d(x^*, x_{n+1}) + \alpha(d(x_n, x^*))d(x_n, x^*) \\ &\quad + \beta(d(x_n, x^*)) [d(x_{n+1}, x_n) + D(x^*, Tx^*)] \\ &\quad + \gamma(d(x_n, x^*)) [D(x_n, Tx^*) + d(x_{n+1}, x^*)] \end{aligned}$$

for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} D(x^*, Tx^*) &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\beta(d(x_n, x^*)) + \gamma(d(x_n, x^*))) D(x^*, Tx^*) \\ &= \liminf_{s \rightarrow 0^+} (\beta(s) + \gamma(s)) D(x^*, Tx^*) \\ &\leq \limsup_{s \rightarrow 0^+} (\beta(s) + \gamma(s)) D(x^*, Tx^*). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since  $\beta(t) + \gamma(t) < \frac{1}{2}$ , for all  $t \in [0, \infty)$ , then we have

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow 0^+} (\beta(s) + \gamma(s)) < 1$$

then  $D(x^*, Tx^*) = 0$ . We know that  $Tx^*$  is closed, then  $x^* \in Tx^*$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.3.** *Let  $T$  be a mapping from  $X$  into  $X$  such that*

$$d(Tx, Ty) \leq \alpha(d(x, y))d(x, y) + \beta(d(x, y))[d(x, Tx) + d(y, Ty)] \\ + \gamma(d(x, y))[d(x, Ty) + d(y, Tx)]$$

*for all  $x, y \in X$ , where  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$  are mappings from  $[0, \infty)$  into  $[0, 1)$  such that  $\frac{\alpha+\beta+\gamma}{1-(\beta+\gamma)} \in S$  and  $\beta(t) \geq \gamma(t)$  for all  $t \in [0, \infty)$ . Then  $T$  has a fixed point.*

By Putting  $\beta = \gamma = 0$  in Theorem 2.1, since every single valued mapping is special multi-valued mapping, we have the following result, which can be regarded as an extension of Geraghty's fixed point theorem. Indeed, the following corollary is a special multi-valued version of Geraghty's fixed point theorem.

**Corollary 2.4.** *Let  $T$  be special multi-valued mapping,  $\alpha \in S$  and let*

$$H_d(Tx, Ty) \leq \alpha(d(x, y)) d(x, y)$$

*for all  $x, y \in X$ . Then  $T$  has a fixed point.*

**Corollary 2.5.** *Let  $T$  be special multi-valued mapping and*

$$H_d(Tx, Ty) \leq \beta(d(x, y))[D(x, Tx) + D(y, Ty)]$$

*for all  $x, y \in X$ , where  $\beta$  is a mapping from  $[0, \infty)$  into  $[0, \frac{1}{2})$  such that  $\frac{\beta}{1-\beta} \in S$ . Then  $T$  has a fixed point.*

**Corollary 2.6.** *Let  $T$  be special multi-valued mapping and*

$$H_d(Tx, Ty) \leq \alpha(d(x, y))d(x, y) + \beta(d(x, y))[D(x, Tx) + D(y, Ty)]$$

*for all  $x, y \in X$ , where  $\alpha, \beta$  are mappings from  $[0, \infty)$  into  $[0, 1)$  such that  $\frac{\alpha+\beta}{1-\beta} \in S$ . Then  $T$  has a fixed point.*

**Acknowledgement :** The authors would like to thank the referees for their comments and suggestions on the manuscript.

## References

- [1] R.P. Agarwal, M. Meehan, D. O'Regan, Fixed Point Theory and Applications, Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- [2] M. Edelstein, An extension of Banach contraction principle, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 12 (1) (1961) 7–10.
- [3] M. Edelstein, On nonexpansive mappings, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 15 (5) (1964) 689–695.

- [4] M. Eshaghi Gordji, H. Baghani, Y.J. Cho, Coupled fixed point theorems for contractions in intuitionistic fuzzy normed spaces, *Mathematical and Computer Modelling* 54 (2011) 1897-1906.
- [5] B.E. Rhoades, A comparison of various definitions of contractive mappings, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 226 (1977) 257-290.
- [6] V.M. Sehgal, A fixed point theorem for mappings with a contractive iterate, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 23 (3) (1969) 631-634.
- [7] E. Zeidler, *Nonlinear Functional Analysis and Its Applications I: Fixed Point Theorems*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1986.
- [8] M. Geraghty, On contractive mappings, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 40 (1973) 604-608.
- [9] S.B. Nadler Jr., Multi-valued contraction mappings, *Pacific J. Math.* 30 (1969) 475-488.
- [10] M. Eshaghi Gordji, H. Baghani, H. Khodaei, M. Ramezani, Generalized multi-valued contraction mappings, *J. Comput. Anal. Appl.* 13 (4) (2011) 730-733.
- [11] M. Eshaghi Gordji, H. Baghani, H. Khodaei, M. Ramezani, A generalization of Nadler's fixed point theorem, *J. Nonlinear Sci. Appl.* 3 (2) (2010) 148-151.
- [12] A.A. Eldred, J. Anuradha, P. Veeramani, On equivalence of generalized multi-valued contractions and Nadler's fixed point theorem, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 336 (2) (2007) 751-757.
- [13] N. Mizoguchi, W. Takahashi, Fixed point theorems for multivalued mappings on complete metric spaces, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 141 (1989) 177-188.
- [14] I.A. Rus, *Generalized Contractions and Applications*, Cluj University Press, Cluj-Nappa, 2001.
- [15] T. Suzuki, Mizoguchi and Takahashi's fixed point theorem is a real generalization of Nadler's, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 340 (2008) 752-755.

(Received 30 May 2011)

(Accepted 9 January 2012)