

A REMARK ON NONLINEAR CONTRACTIONS

Marian Kwapisz

Let (X, d) be a complete metric space and $F : X \rightarrow X$ be a map which p -th iteration F^p is a nonlinear contraction, i.e. there is an increasing and continuous function $a : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, $\mathbb{R}_+ = [0, +\infty)$, such that $a(t) < t$, $t > 0$, $a(0) = 0$, and

$$(1) \quad d(F^p x, F^p y) \leq a(d(x, y)), \quad x, y \in X.$$

Here $F^p = F(F^{p-1})$, $F^0 = I$, I - the identity map in X .

It is well known that these assumptions guarantee that there is a unique fixed point of the map F , say x^* , and that the sequence $\{F^n x_0\}$, $n = 0, 1, \dots$, converges to x^* for every $x_0 \in X$.

Our question is whether the map F itself is a nonlinear contraction with respect to some metric in X .

Observe first: if F is continuous, and nondecreasing, continuous function $b : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ has the properties:

$$b(0) = 0, \quad b(t_1 + t_2) \leq b(t_1) + b(t_2)$$

then

$$(2) \quad d_b(x, y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d(x, y) + b(d(Fx, Fy)) + \dots + b^{p-1}(d(F^{p-1}x, F^{p-1}y))$$

is a metric in X and (X, d_b) is a complete metric space. It is clear that the metric d_b is stronger than d and that they define the same topology if there is a continuous function $h : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, $h(0) = 0$ such that

$$d(Fx, Fy) \leq h(d(x, y)).$$

We see that there is plenty of metrics in X (at least as much as functions b

with the properties mentioned). This gives us a chance to find one with respect to which F will be nonlinear contraction.

Indeed, assume that there is an increasing and continuous solution $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ of the equation

$$(3) \quad \varphi^p(t) = a(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+$$

which has the properties:

$$(i) \quad \varphi(t) < t, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+,$$

$$(ii) \quad \varphi(t_1) + \varphi(t_2) \leq \varphi(t_1 + t_2), \quad t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Here as before φ^p denotes the p -th iteration of the function φ .

Having this assumed we use the metric d_b for $b(t) = \varphi^{-1}(t)$ (φ^{-1} - means the inverse function to φ).

Now we are in the position to show that the map F is a nonlinear contraction with respect to the metric d_b with the contraction function φ . Indeed we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_b(Fx, Fy) &= d(Fx, Fy) + b(d(F^2x, F^2y)) + \dots + b^{p-2}(d(F^{p-1}x, F^{p-1}y)) \\ &\quad + b^{p-1}(d(F^p x, F^p y)) \leq \\ &\leq d(Fx, Fy) + b(d(F^2x, F^2y)) + \dots + b^{p-2}(d(F^{p-1}x, F^{p-1}y)) + \\ &\quad + b^{p-1}(a(d(x, y))) = \\ &= \varphi[b(d(Fx, Fy) + b(d(F^2x, F^2y)) + \dots + b^{p-2}(d(F^{p-1}x, F^{p-1}y)) + b^{p-1}(a(d(x, y))))] \\ &\leq \varphi[b(d(Fx, Fy)) + b^2(d(F^2x, F^2y)) + \dots + b^{p-1}(d(F^{p-1}x, F^{p-1}y)) + b^p(a(d(s, y)))] = \\ &= \varphi[d(x, y) + b(d(Fx, Fy)) + \dots + b^{p-1}(d(F^{p-1}x, F^{p-1}y))] = \\ &= \varphi(d_b(x, y)), \end{aligned}$$

what means that our claim holds true.

Finally we may conclude

Theorem. If (1) holds and there is a solution φ of (3) with the properties (i), (ii) then each iteration of F is a nonlinear contraction with respect to the metric d_b , $b(t) = \varphi^{-1}(t)$, defined by (2) and it has an unique fixed point x^* .

This result and the theorem of Bessaga [1] guarantee that there is a metric ρ in X such that F is also a classical contraction with respect to ρ .

However the proof of Bessaga's result is non constructive, the choice axiom is used.

There is an example when the solution φ can be found immediately, it is the case when $a(t) = \alpha \cdot t$ for some $\alpha \in [0,1)$. In this case $\varphi(t) = \sqrt[\alpha]{\alpha \cdot t}$ is a solution of (3) with the properties required.

In the general case there is the question whether for a given function a with the properties mentioned there is a solution φ of (3) with the properties required. (see [2]).

References:

- [1] C. Bessaga, On the converse of the Banach fixed point principle, Colloq. Math. 7, 1959, pp. 41-43.
- [2] M. Kwapisz, Problem 187, Aequationes Mathematicae, vol. 19, 1979, p. 299.

Note. This research has been carried out during the Academic Year 1988/89, while the author held a visiting position with the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Thanks are due to Professor Gary Meisters for the arrangement.