

FIXED POINTS OF LOCALLY CONTRACTIVE AND NONEXPANSIVE SET-VALUED MAPPINGS

PETER K. F. KUHFITTING

Let (M, d) be a complete metric space and $S(M)$ the set of all nonempty bounded closed subsets of M . A set-valued mapping $f: M \rightarrow S(M)$ will be called (uniformly) *locally contractive* if there exist ε and λ ($\varepsilon > 0, 0 < \lambda < 1$) such that $D(f(x), f(y)) \leq \lambda d(x, y)$ whenever $d(x, y) < \varepsilon$ and where $D(f(x), f(y))$ is the distance between $f(x)$ and $f(y)$ in the Hausdorff metric induced by d on $S(M)$. It is shown in the first theorem that if M is "well-chained," then f has a fixed point is, that is, a point $x \in M$ such that $x \in f(x)$. This fact, in turn, yields a fixed-point theorem for locally nonexpansive set-valued mappings on a compact star-shaped subset of a Banach space. Both theorems are extensions of earlier results.

1. **Locally contractive set-valued mappings.** Following Assad and Kirk [1] we shall define D as follows: if $r > 0$ and $Y \in S(M)$, let

$$Z(r, Y) = \{x \in M: \text{dist}(x, Y) < r\}.$$

Then for $A, B \in S(M)$ we define

$$D(A, B) = \inf \{r: A \subset Z(r, B) \text{ and } B \subset Z(r, A)\}.$$

Also noted in [1] are two lemmas:

LEMMA 1. *If $A, B \in S(M)$ and $x \in A$, then for each positive number α there exists $y \in B$ such that*

$$d(x, y) \leq D(A, B) + \alpha.$$

LEMMA 2. *Let $\{X_n\}$ be a sequence of sets in $S(M)$, and assume that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} D(X_n, X_0) = 0$ ($X_0 \in S(M)$). Then if $x_n \in X_n$ ($n = 1, 2, \dots$) and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x_0$, it follows that $x_0 \in X_0$.*

Finally, suppose M is well-chained in the sense that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $x, y \in M$ there exists an ε -chain, that is, a finite set of points

$$x = y_0, y_1, \dots, y_n = z$$

(n may depend on both x and z) such that $d(y_i, y_{i+1}) < \varepsilon$ ($i = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1$).

THEOREM 1. *Suppose (M, d) is a complete well-chained metric space and $S(M)$ the set of all nonempty bounded closed subsets of M . If $f: M \rightarrow S(M)$ is locally contractive, then f has a fixed point.*

Proof. Assume that $\varepsilon < 1$ and let $x_0, y_0 \in M$ such that $d(x_0, y_0) < \varepsilon$. Then

$$D(f(x_0), f(y_0)) \leq \lambda d(x_0, y_0).$$

Now choose a positive number $\eta < \varepsilon - \lambda\varepsilon < 1$. Let x_1 be any element in $f(x_0)$; then there exists by Lemma 1 an element $y_1 \in f(y_0)$ such that

$$d(x_1, y_1) \leq D(f(x_0), f(y_0)) + \eta.$$

Hence

$$d(x_1, y_1) < \lambda\varepsilon + \eta < \lambda\varepsilon + \varepsilon - \lambda\varepsilon = \varepsilon.$$

Next, let $x_2 \in f(x_1)$; then there exists $y_2 \in f(y_1)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_2, y_2) &\leq D(f(x_1), f(y_1)) + \eta^2 \\ &\leq \lambda d(x_1, y_1) + \eta^2. \end{aligned}$$

In general, for $n > 0$

$$d(x_n, y_n) \leq D(f(x_{n-1}), f(y_{n-1})) + \eta^n,$$

and we can show by induction that

$$(1) \quad d(x_n, y_n) < \lambda^n \varepsilon + \lambda^{n-1} \eta + \lambda^{n-2} \eta^2 + \cdots + \eta^n.$$

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda^n \varepsilon + \lambda^{n-1} \eta + \lambda^{n-2} \eta^2 + \cdots + \eta^n \\ &< \lambda^n \varepsilon + \lambda^{n-1} (\varepsilon - \lambda\varepsilon) + \lambda^{n-2} (\varepsilon - \lambda\varepsilon)^2 + \cdots + (\varepsilon - \lambda\varepsilon)^n \\ &\leq \lambda^n \varepsilon + \lambda^{n-1} (\varepsilon - \lambda\varepsilon) + \lambda^{n-2} (\varepsilon - \lambda\varepsilon) + \cdots + (\varepsilon - \lambda\varepsilon) \\ &= \lambda^n \varepsilon + (\lambda^{n-1} \varepsilon - \lambda^n \varepsilon) + (\lambda^{n-2} \varepsilon - \lambda^{n-1} \varepsilon) + \cdots + (\varepsilon - \lambda\varepsilon) \\ &= \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

So if (1) is valid for $n = N > 0$, let $x_{N+1} \in f(x_N)$; then there exists $y_{N+1} \in f(y_N)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_{N+1}, y_{N+1}) &\leq D(f(y_N), f(y_N)) + \eta^{N+1} \leq \lambda d(x_N, y_N) + \eta^{N+1} \\ &< \lambda (\lambda^N \varepsilon + \lambda^{N-1} \eta + \lambda^{N-2} \eta^2 + \cdots + \eta^N) + \eta^{N+1} \\ &= \lambda^{N+1} \varepsilon + \lambda^N \eta + \lambda^{N-1} \eta^2 + \cdots + \lambda \eta^N + \eta^{N+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Using this information we now construct a sequence in M as follows: let $y_{0,0}$ be an arbitrary element in M and let $y_{1,0} \in f(y_{0,0})$.

Consider the ε -chain

$$y_{0,0}, y_{0,1}, \dots, y_{0,n} = y_{1,0} \in f(y_{0,0}),$$

so that $d(y_{0,i}, y_{0,i+1}) < \varepsilon$ ($i = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1$). Since $y_{1,0} \in f(y_{0,0})$, we may choose $y_{1,1} \in f(y_{0,1})$ such that

$$(2) \quad d(y_{1,0}, y_{1,1}) \leq D(f(y_{0,0}), f(y_{0,1})) + \eta.$$

Similarly, since $y_{1,1} \in f(y_{0,1})$, choose $y_{1,2} \in f(y_{0,2})$ such that

$$d(y_{1,1}, y_{1,2}) \leq D(f(y_{0,1}), f(y_{0,2})) + \eta.$$

Continuing along the ε -chain, since $y_{1,n-1} \in f(y_{0,n-1})$, there exists $y_{1,n} = y_{2,0} \in f(y_{0,n})$ (i.e., $y_{2,0} \in f(y_{1,0})$) such that

$$d(y_{1,n-1}, y_{1,n}) \leq D(f(y_{0,n-1}), f(y_{0,n})) + \eta.$$

Consequently,

$$d(y_{1,0}, y_{2,0}) = d(y_{1,0}, y_{1,n}) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} d(y_{1,i}, y_{1,i+1}) < n(\lambda\varepsilon + \eta).$$

Next, referring to (2), since $y_{2,0} \in f(y_{1,0})$, there exists $y_{2,1} \in f(y_{1,1})$ for which

$$d(y_{2,0}, y_{2,1}) \leq D(f(y_{1,0}), f(y_{1,1})) + \eta^2,$$

and for $y_{2,n-1} \in f(y_{1,n-1})$, we have $y_{2,n} = y_{3,0} \in f(y_{1,n})$ (i.e., $y_{3,0} \in f(y_{2,0})$) such that

$$d(y_{2,n-1}, y_{2,n}) \leq D(f(y_{1,n-1}), f(y_{1,n})) + \eta^2.$$

Proceeding in this manner, and making use of (1), we get (for $m > 0$)

$$d(y_{m,l}, y_{m,l+1}) < \lambda^m\varepsilon + \lambda^{m-1}\eta + \lambda^{m-2}\eta^2 + \dots + \eta^m$$

($l = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1$). Now let $z_m = y_{m,0}$, so that $z_m \in f(z_{m-1})$, $m = 1, 2, \dots$, and $z_{m+1} = y_{m+1,0} = y_{m,n}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} d(z_m, z_{m+1}) &\leq \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} d(y_{m,l}, y_{m,l+1}) \\ &< n(\lambda^m\varepsilon + \lambda^{m-1}\eta + \lambda^{m-2}\eta^2 + \dots + \eta^m). \end{aligned}$$

To show that $\{z_m\}$ is a Cauchy sequence, let $\beta = \max(\lambda, \eta)$. Then

$$d(z_m, z_{m+1}) < n(m + 1)\beta^m,$$

and for $0 < i < j$

$$\begin{aligned} d(z_i, z_j) &\leq \sum_{k=i}^{j-1} d(z_k, z_{k+1}) \\ &< n \sum_{k=i}^{j-1} (k+1)\beta^k \\ &\leq n \sum_{k=i}^{\infty} (k+1)\beta^k . \end{aligned}$$

It is easily checked that $d(z_i, z_j) \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, implying that $\{z_m\}$ is a Cauchy sequence, which converges to some $z \in M$ by the completeness of M .

Finally, since $z_m \in f(z_{m-1})$ and $z_m \rightarrow z$, $f(z_{m-1}) \rightarrow f(z)$ and, by Lemma 2, $z \in f(z)$.

REMARK 1. Nadler [4] proved a similar theorem by a different method under the additional assumption that each $f(x)$ is compact.

2. **Locally nonexpansive set-valued mappings.** Let X be a Banach space and C a subset of X . A mapping $T: C \rightarrow S(C)$ will be called *locally nonexpansive* if there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$D(Tx, Ty) \leq \|x - y\| ,$$

whenever $\|x - y\| < \varepsilon$ and where D is again the distance in the Hausdorff metric induced by d on $S(M)$ (as usual, $d(x, y) = \|x - y\|$ for all $x, y \in X$).

THEOREM 2. *Let X be a Banach space and C a compact star-shaped subset of X . If $T: C \rightarrow S(C)$ is locally nonexpansive, then there exists a point $x \in C$ such that $x \in Tx$.*

Proof. Let c be the star-center of C and let $\{k_n\}$ be an increasing sequence of real numbers converging to 1. Define $U_n: C \rightarrow S(C)$ by

$$U_n x = (1 - k_n)c + k_n T x ,$$

where $k_n T x = \{k_n y: y \in T x\}$. Let $z, y \in C$ such that $\|z - y\| < \varepsilon$. Then $D(Tz, Ty) \leq \|z - y\|$. Now for any two elements $z' \in Tz$ and $y' \in Ty$

$$\|(1 - k_n)c + k_n z' - (1 - k_n)c - k_n y'\| = k_n \|z' - y'\| .$$

Hence

$$D(U_n z, U_n y) \leq k_n \|z - y\| .$$

Consequently, U_n has a fixed point $x_n \in C$ by Theorem 1. Since C is

compact, there exists a subsequence $\{x_{n_i}\}$ of $\{x_n\}$ converging to some $x \in C$, and because T is continuous,

$$Tx_{n_i} \longrightarrow Tx .$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(x_{n_i}, Tx_{n_i}) &\leq D(U_{n_i}x_{n_i}, Tx_{n_i}) \\ &= D((1 - k_{n_i})c + k_{n_i}Tx_{n_i}, Tx_{n_i}) \longrightarrow D(Tx, Tx) \text{ as } i \longrightarrow \infty . \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\text{dist}(x, Tx) = 0 ,$$

which implies that $x \in Tx$, Tx being closed.

Theorem 2 and its point-to-point analogue generalize an earlier theorem due to Dotson [2]:

COROLLARY. *A nonexpansive self-mapping of a compact star-shaped subset of a Banach space has a fixed point.*

REMARK 2. Edelstein [3] has shown that a locally contractive (nonexpansive) point-to-point mapping need not be globally contractive (nonexpansive). On convex sets, however, a locally nonexpansive mapping is nonexpansive.

REFERENCES

1. N. A. Assad and W. A. Kirk, *Fixed point theorems for set-valued mappings of contractive type*, Pacific J. Math., **43** (1972), 553-562.
2. W. G. Dotson, Jr., *Fixed point theorems for nonexpansive mappings on star-shaped subsets of Banach spaces*, J. London Math. Soc., (2) **4** (1972), 408-410.
3. M. Edelstein, *An extension of Banach's contraction principle*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **12** (1961), 7-10.
4. S. B. Nadler, Jr., *Multi-valued contraction mappings*, Pacific J. Math., **30** (1969), 475-488.

Received August 12, 1975.

MILWAUKEE SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

