

# A FIXED POINT THEOREM OF THE ALTERNATIVE, FOR CONTRACTIONS ON A GENERALIZED COMPLETE METRIC SPACE

BY J. B. DIAZ AND BEATRIZ MARGOLIS<sup>1</sup>

Communicated by J. B. Diaz, October 18, 1967

1. **Summary.** The purpose of this note is to prove a "theorem of the alternative" for any "contraction mapping"  $T$  on a "generalized complete metric space"  $X$ . The conclusion of the theorem, speaking in general terms, asserts that: *either* all consecutive pairs of the sequence of successive approximations (starting from an element  $x_0$  of  $X$ ) are infinitely far apart, *or* the sequence of successive approximations, with initial element  $x_0$ , converges to a fixed point of  $T$  (what particular fixed point depends, in general, on the initial element  $x_0$ ). The present theorem contains as special cases both Banach's [1] contraction mapping theorem for complete metric spaces, and Luxemburg's [2] contraction mapping theorem for generalized metric spaces.

2. **A fixed point theorem.** Following Luxemburg [2, p. 541], the concept of a "generalized complete metric space" may be introduced as in this quotation:

"Let  $X$  be an abstract (nonempty) set, the elements of which are denoted by  $x, y, \dots$  and assume that on the Cartesian product  $X \times X$  a distance function  $d(x, y) (0 \leq d(x, y) \leq \infty)$  is defined, satisfying the following conditions

(D1)  $d(x, y) = 0$  if and only if  $x = y$ ,

(D2)  $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$  (symmetry),

(D3)  $d(x, y) \leq d(x, z) + d(z, y)$  (triangle inequality),

(D4) every  $d$ -Cauchy sequence in  $X$  is  $d$ -convergent, i.e.  $\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, x_m) = 0$  for a sequence  $x_n \in X (n = 1, 2, \dots)$  implies the existence of an element  $x \in X$  with  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x, x_n) = 0$ , ( $x$  is unique by (D1) and (D3)).

This concept differs from the usual concept of a complete metric space by the fact that not every two points in  $X$  have necessarily a finite distance. One might call such a space a generalized complete metric space."

---

<sup>1</sup> Research sponsored by Fundaci3n Bariloche, Buenos Aires, Argentina. Now at Universidad Nacional de La Plata, Argentina.

Using this notion, one has the

**THEOREM.** *Suppose that  $(X, d)$  is a generalized complete metric space, and that the function  $T: X \rightarrow X$  is a "contraction," that is,  $T$  satisfies the condition: (C1) There exists a constant  $q$ , with  $0 < q < 1$ , such that whenever  $d(x, y) < \infty$  one has*

$$d(Tx, Ty) \leq qd(x, y).$$

*Let  $x_0 \in X$ , and consider the "sequence of successive approximations with initial element  $x_0$ ":  $x_0, Tx_0, T^2x_0, \dots, T^lx_0, \dots$ . Then the following alternative holds: either*

(A) *for every integer  $l = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , one has*

$$d(T^lx_0, T^{l+1}x_0) = \infty, \text{ or}$$

(B) *the sequence of successive approximations  $x_0, Tx_0, T^2x_0, \dots, T^lx_0, \dots$ , is  $d$ -convergent to a fixed point of  $T$ .*

**PROOF.** Consider the sequence of numbers  $d(x_0, Tx_0), d(Tx_0, T^2x_0), \dots, d(T^lx_0, T^{l+1}x_0), \dots$ , the "sequence of distances between consecutive neighbors" of the sequence of successive approximations with initial element  $x_0$ . There are two mutually exclusive possibilities: *either*

(a) *for every integer  $l = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , one has*

$$d(T^lx_0, T^{l+1}x_0) = \infty,$$

(which is precisely the alternative (A) of the conclusion of the theorem), *or else*

(b) *for some integer  $l = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , one has*

$$d(T^lx_0, T^{l+1}x_0) < \infty.$$

In order to complete the proof it only remains to show that (b) implies alternative (B) of the conclusion of the theorem.

In case (b) holds, let  $N = N(x_0)$  denote a particular one (for definiteness, one could choose the smallest) of all the integers  $l = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  such that

$$d(T^lx_0, T^{l+1}x_0) < \infty.$$

Then, by (C1), since  $d(T^Nx_0, T^{N+1}x_0) < \infty$ , it follows that

$$d(T^{N+1}x_0, T^{N+2}x_0) = d(TT^Nx_0, TT^{N+1}x_0) \leq qd(T^Nx_0, T^{N+1}x_0) < \infty;$$

and, by mathematical induction, that

$$d(T^{N+l}x_0, T^{N+l+1}x_0) \leq q^l d(T^Nx_0, T^{N+1}x_0) < \infty,$$

for every integer  $l=0, 1, 2, \dots$ . In other words, it has just been proved that, if  $n$  is any integer such that  $n > N$ , then

$$d(T^n x_0, T^{n+1} x_0) \leq q^{n-N} d(T^N x_0, T^{N+1} x_0) < \infty.$$

But now, the triangle inequality (D3) implies that, whenever  $n > N$ , one has, for any  $l=1, 2, \dots$ , that

$$\begin{aligned} d(T^n x_0, T^{n+l} x_0) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^l d(T^{n+i-1} x_0, T^{n+i} x_0) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^l q^{n+i-1-N} d(T^N x_0, T^{N+1} x_0) \\ &\leq q^{n-N} \cdot \frac{1-q^l}{1-q} \cdot d(T^N x_0, T^{N+1} x_0). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, since  $0 < q < 1$ , the sequence of successive approximations  $x_0, Tx_0, T^2 x_0, \dots, T^n x_0, \dots$ , is a  $d$ -Cauchy sequence; and, by (D4), it is  $d$ -convergent. That is to say, there exists an element  $x$  in  $X$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(T^n x_0, x) = 0$ .

It will now be shown that  $x$  is a fixed point of  $T$ . For, whenever  $n > N$ , from (D3) and (C1),

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq d(x, Tx) \leq d(x, T^n x_0) + d(T^n x_0, Tx) \\ &\leq d(x, T^n x_0) + qd(T^{n-1} x_0, x); \end{aligned}$$

and thus, taking  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}$ , it follows that  $d(x, Tx) = 0$ . Using (D1), this gives  $x = Tx$ , that is,  $x$  is a fixed point of  $T$ . This completes the proof.

**3. Remarks.** 1. Banach's [1] contraction mapping theorem is a special case of the present theorem. (Banach's theorem asserts that, if  $T$  is a contraction on a complete metric space  $X$ , then  $T$  has exactly one fixed point, and the sequence of successive approximations  $x_0, Tx_0, T^2 x_0, \dots, T^l x_0, \dots$ , for any  $x_0$  in  $X$ , always converges to the unique fixed point of  $T$ .) This can be seen as follows: if  $X$  is a complete metric space, then  $d(x, y) < \infty$  for every  $x, y$  in  $X$ , and alternative (A) is excluded; since  $X$  is not empty, choosing  $x_0 \in X$  gives, from alternative (B), the existence of at least one fixed point of  $T$ ; finally, since  $T$  is a contraction, see (C1),  $T$  can have at most one fixed point, because if  $x = Tx$  and  $y = Ty$  then

$$d(x, y) = d(Tx, Ty) \leq qd(x, y),$$

which means that  $d(x, y) = 0$ , and  $x = y$  from (D1).

2. Luxemburg's [2] contraction mapping theorem for generalized metric spaces is also a special case of the present theorem. (Luxem-

burg's theorem asserts that, if  $T$  is a contraction, i.e.  $T$  satisfies (C1), on a generalized complete metric space  $X$ , and  $T$  also satisfies the two additional conditions [2, p. 541]: "(C2) For every sequence of successive approximations  $x_n = Tx_{n-1}$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , where  $x_0$  is an arbitrary element of  $X$ , there exists an index  $N(x_0)$  such that  $d(x_N, x_{N+1}) < \infty$  for all  $l = 1, 2, \dots$ . (C3) If  $x$  and  $y$  are two fixed points of  $T$ , i.e.  $Tx = x$  and  $Ty = y$ , then  $d(x, y) < \infty$ ," then  $T$  has exactly one fixed point, and the sequence of successive approximations  $x_0, Tx_0, T^2x_0, \dots, T^lx_0, \dots$ , for any  $x_0$  in  $X$ , always converges to the unique fixed point of  $T$ .) This can be seen as follows: in view of hypothesis (C2), alternative (A) is excluded; since  $X$  is not empty, choosing  $x_0 \in X$  gives, from alternative (B), the existence of at least one fixed point of  $T$ ; finally, (C3) implies that  $T$  can have at most one fixed point, because if  $x = Tx$  and  $y = Ty$ , with  $x \neq y$ , then (C3) gives that  $d(x, y) < \infty$ , while (C1) then yields

$$d(x, y) = d(Tx, Ty) \leq qd(x, y),$$

which means that  $d(x, y) = 0$ , and  $x = y$  from (D1), contradicting the initial  $x \neq y$ . (This very last bit of reasoning just amounts to saying that if  $T$  satisfies (C1), then every two of its fixed points must be infinitely far apart; incidentally, this shows that the situation illustrated in the example in Remark 3 on page 542 of [2] is, in a sense, the rule rather than the exception.)

3. The fixed point theorem of §2 applies to a "global" contraction  $T$ . When  $T$  is only "locally" a contraction (see Luxemburg [3, p. 94, condition (C1)]), slight modifications of the proof of §2 yield the following "local" theorem of the alternative, which includes Luxemburg's local theorem [3, p. 95] as a special case.

**THEOREM.** *Suppose that  $(X, d)$  is a generalized complete metric space, and that the function  $T: X \rightarrow X$  is locally a contraction, that is,  $T$  satisfies the condition*

(C1)' *There exists a constant  $q$ , with  $0 < q < 1$ , and a positive constant  $C$ , such that whenever  $d(x, y) \leq C$  one has*

$$d(Tx, Ty) \leq qd(x, y).$$

*Let  $x_0 \in X$ , and consider the sequence of successive approximations with initial element  $x_0: x_0, Tx_0, T^2x_0, \dots, T^lx_0, \dots$ . Then the following alternative holds: either*

- (A) *for every integer  $l = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , one has  $d(T^lx_0, T^{l+1}x_0) > C$ , or*
- (B) *the sequence of successive approximations  $x_0, Tx_0, T^2x_0, \dots, T^lx_0, \dots$  is  $d$ -convergent to a fixed point of  $T$ .*

4. In all the fixed point theorems under discussion, the essential idea is the proof of the convergence of a sequence of successive approximations by means of the geometric series  $1+q+q^2+\dots$ . This basic idea, of employing this geometric series as a comparison series, goes back to Banach, and to Picard  $\dots$ .

#### REFERENCES

1. S. Banach, *Sur les opérations dans les ensembles abstraits et leur application aux équations intégrales* (Thèse présentée en juin 1920 à l'Université de Léopol [= Lwów] pour obtenir le grade de docteur en philosophie), *Fund. Math.* **3** (1922), 133–181.
2. W. A. J. Luxemburg, *On the convergence of successive approximations in the theory of ordinary differential equations*. II, *Koninkl. Nederl. Akademie van Wetenschappen, Amsterdam, Proc. Ser. A* (5) **61**, and *Indag. Math.* (5) **20** (1958), 540–546.
3. W. A. J. Luxemburg, *On the convergence of successive approximations in the theory of ordinary differential equations*. III, *Nieuw Arch. Wisk.* (3) **6** (1958), 93–98.

RENSELAER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE

UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DE LA PLATA, ARGENTINA