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#### Abstract

There is a conjecture of S. Reich which concerns with the existence of fixed points of multivalued mappings that satisfy a certain contractive condition. N. Mizoguchi and W. Takahashi has provided a positive answer to this conjecture of S. Reich. In this paper, we will give an alternative proof for the theorem of N. Mizoguchi and W. Takahashi.
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## 1. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF RESULTS

Suppose (X, d) be a metric space. Now we have the following definitions.
Definition: 1 A metric space ( $\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{d}$ ) is said to be complete if every Cauchy sequence converges to a point in X .
Definition: 2 Let $P$ be a subset of $X$. Then $P$ is said to be proximinal if for each $x \in X, \exists$ an element $p \in P$ such that

$$
d(x, p)=d(x, P)
$$

where
$d(x, P)=\inf .\{d(x, y): y \in P\}$.
The family of all bounded proximinal subsets of $X$ is denoted by $Q(X)$. Now we represent the family of all non- empty closed and bounded subsets of X by $\mathrm{CB}(\mathrm{X})$.

Definition: 3 A mapping $\mathrm{f}: \mathrm{X} \times \mathrm{X} \rightarrow[0, \infty)$ is said to be compactly positive if Inf. $\{\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}): \mathrm{a} \leq d(x, y) \leq b\}>0$ for each finite interval $\lfloor a, b\rfloor$ contained in $(0, \infty)$.

Definition: 4 A mapping $T: X \rightarrow C B(X)$ is said to be weakly contractive if $\exists$ a compactly positive mapping $f$ such that $\mathrm{H}\{\mathrm{T}(\mathrm{x}), \mathrm{T}(\mathrm{y})\} \leq d(x, y)-f(x, y)$ for each $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y} \in \mathrm{X}$, where H is a Hausdorff metric on $\mathrm{CB}(\mathrm{X})$ induced by d .

Definition: 5 A fixed point of a function $f$ from a set $S$ to itself is a point $x$ in $S$ such that

$$
f(x)=x
$$

Now we mention the following lemma of [2].
Lemma: 1.1 Let $T: X \rightarrow Q(X)$ be a mapping then the following statements are equivalent;
(a) T is weakly contractive.
(b) $\mathrm{H}\{\mathrm{T}(\mathrm{x}), \mathrm{T}(\mathrm{y})\} \leq \mathrm{h}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}) \mathrm{d}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y})$ for some non-negative function h that satisfies

Sup $\{\mathrm{h}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y})$ : a $\leq d(x, y) \leq b\}<1$ for each finite closed interval $\lfloor a, b\rfloor$ contained in $(0, \infty)$.
(c) $\mathrm{H}\{\mathrm{T}(\mathrm{x}), \mathrm{T}(\mathrm{y})\} \leq \varphi(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y})$, where $\varphi$ is such that $\mathrm{d}-\varphi$ is compactly positive.

Dugundji and Granas [1] proved that a single-valued weakly contractive mapping of a complete metric space into itself has a unique fixed point.
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By using (b) from lemma1.1 above for the weakly contractive mapping, Kaneko [2] provided a partial generalization (Theorem 1.3) of the theorem of Dugundji and Granas to the multivalued mappings. But till date, a complete generalization is not available in the literature. In [2], the below mentioned two theorems were proved.

Theorem: 1.2 Suppose ( $X, d$ ) be a complete metric space and $T: X(X)$ be a mapping. Let $\lambda$ be a monotonic increasing function with $0 \leq \lambda(\mathrm{t})<1$ for each $\mathrm{t} \epsilon(0, \infty)$ and if $\mathrm{H}\{\mathrm{T}(\mathrm{x}), \mathrm{T}(\mathrm{y})\} \leq \lambda(\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y})) \mathrm{d}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y})$ for each $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y} \in \mathrm{X}$, then T has a fixed point in X .

Theorem: 1.3 Suppose ( $X, d$ ) be a complete metric space and $T: X \rightarrow Q(X)$ be such that
$\mathrm{H}\{\mathrm{T}(\mathrm{x}), \mathrm{T}(\mathrm{y})\} \leq \mathrm{h}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}) \mathrm{d}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y})$ for each $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y} \in \mathrm{X}$ and for some non-negative function h that satisfies
Sup. $\{\mathrm{h}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}): \mathrm{a} \leq d(x, y) \leq b\}<1$ for each finite closed interval $[a, b\rfloor$ contained in $(0, \infty)$. We also assume that if $\left(x_{n}, y_{n}\right) \in \mathrm{X} \mathrm{XX}$ is such that
$\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} d\left(x_{n}, y_{n}\right)=0$, then $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} h\left(x_{n}, y_{n}\right)=\mathrm{k}$, for some $\mathrm{k} \in[0,1)$, then T has a fixed point in X .
The above two theorems i.e., 1.2 and 1.3 were investigated in response to a problem which was put forth by S. Reich. Reich [4] proposed the following problem.

Conjecture: 1.4 Suppose ( $\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{d}$ ) be a complete metric space and $\mathrm{T}: \mathrm{X} \rightarrow \mathrm{CB}(\mathrm{X})$ satisfies the condition $\mathrm{H}\{\mathrm{T}(\mathrm{x}), \mathrm{T}(\mathrm{y})$ \} $\leq k(\mathrm{~d}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y})) \mathrm{d}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y})$ for all $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y} \in \mathrm{X}, \mathrm{x} \neq \mathrm{y}$ where k : $(0, \infty) \rightarrow[0,1]$ and $\lim _{r \rightarrow t^{+}} \sup k(r)<1$ for all $0<t<\infty$. Then T a fixed point in X .

The above conjecture has been proven valid in an almost complete form by Mizoguchi and Takahashi [3]. But both of them replaced the condition on k by a stronger condition given below;

$$
\lim _{r \rightarrow t}+\sup k(r)<1 \text { for all } 0 \leq t<\infty
$$

But in this paper we reaffirm this positive response by Mizoguchi and Takahashi to the conjecture of Reich by giving an alternative proof.

## 2. MAIN RESULTS

Our main purpose in this paper is to prove Theorem 2.1onfixed points.
Theorem: 2.1 Suppose ( $X, d$ ) be a complete metric space and $T: X \rightarrow C B(X)$ be a mapping. If $\lambda$ is a function of $(0, \infty)$ to $[0,1)$ such that $\lim _{r \rightarrow t^{+}} \sup \lambda(r)<1$ for all $0 \leq t<\infty$ and if $\mathrm{H}\{\mathrm{T}(\mathrm{x}), \mathrm{T}(\mathrm{y})\} \leq \lambda(\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y})) \mathrm{d}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y})$ for all $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y} \in \mathrm{X}$, then T has a fixed point in X .

## Proof of Theorem: 2.1

We consider two points $x_{0}$ and $x_{1}$ such that $x_{0} \in \mathrm{X}$ and $x_{1} \in \mathrm{~T}\left(x_{0}\right)$. Let us take a positive integer $n_{1}$ such that

$$
\lambda^{n_{1}}\left\{\mathrm{~d}\left(x_{0}, x_{1}\right)\right\} \leq\left[1-\left\{\mathrm{d}\left(x_{0}, x_{1}\right)\right\}\right] \mathrm{d}\left(x_{0}, x_{1}\right)
$$

Again if we select $x_{2}$ in $\mathrm{T}\left(x_{1}\right)$, using the definition of Hausdorff metric so that
$\mathrm{d}\left(x_{2}, x_{1}\right) \leq \mathrm{H}\left\{\mathrm{T}\left(x_{1}\right), \mathrm{T}\left(x_{0}\right)\right\}+\lambda^{n_{1}}\left\{\mathrm{~d}\left(x_{0}, x_{1}\right)\right\}$, then we have
$\mathrm{d}\left(x_{2}, x_{1}\right) \leq \lambda\left\{\mathrm{d}\left(x_{1}, x_{0}\right)\right\} \mathrm{d}\left(x_{1}, x_{0}\right)+\lambda^{n_{1}}\left\{\mathrm{~d}\left(x_{0}, x_{1}\right)\right\}<\mathrm{d}\left(x_{1}, x_{0}\right)$.
Now let us choose a positive integer $n_{2}$ s. t. $n_{2}>n_{1}$ so that

```
\(\lambda^{n_{2}}\left\{\mathrm{~d}\left(x_{2}, x_{1}\right)\right\}<\left[1-\left\{\mathrm{d}\left(x_{2}, x_{1}\right)\right\}\right] \mathrm{d}\left(x_{2}, x_{1}\right)\)
Because \(\mathrm{T}\left(x_{2}\right) \in \mathrm{CB}(\mathrm{X})\), we select \(x_{3} \in \mathrm{~T}\left(x_{2}\right)\) so that
\(\mathrm{d}\left(x_{3}, x_{2}\right) \leq \mathrm{H}\left\{\mathrm{T}\left(x_{2}\right), \mathrm{T}\left(x_{1}\right)\right\}+\lambda^{n_{2}}\left\{\mathrm{~d}\left(x_{2}, x_{1}\right)\right\}\), then we have
\(\mathrm{d}\left(x_{3}, x_{2}\right) \leq \mathrm{H}\left\{\mathrm{T}\left(x_{2}\right), \mathrm{T}\left(x_{1}\right)\right\}+\lambda^{n_{2}}\left\{\mathrm{~d}\left(x_{2}, x_{1}\right)\right\}\)
    \(\leq \lambda\left\{\mathrm{d}\left(x_{2}, x_{1}\right)\right\} \mathrm{d}\left(x_{2}, x_{1}\right)+\lambda^{n_{2}}\left\{\mathrm{~d}\left(x_{2}, x_{1}\right)\right\}\)
    \(<\mathrm{d}\left(x_{2}, x_{1}\right)\)
```

We repeat this process, since $\mathrm{T}\left(x_{k}\right) \in \mathrm{CB}(\mathrm{X})$ for each k , we may select a positive integer $n_{k}$ such that

$$
\lambda^{n_{k}}\left\{\mathrm{~d}\left(x_{k}, x_{k-1}\right)\right\} \leq\left[1-\left\{\mathrm{d}\left(x_{k}, x_{k-1}\right)\right\}\right] \mathrm{d}\left(x_{k}, x_{k-1}\right)
$$

Let us select $x_{k+1}$ in $\mathrm{T}\left(x_{k}\right)$ so that
$\mathrm{d}\left(x_{k+1}, x_{k}\right) \leq \mathrm{H}\left\{\mathrm{T}\left(x_{k}\right), \mathrm{T}\left(x_{k-1}\right)\right\}+\lambda^{n_{k}}\left\{\mathrm{~d}\left(x_{k}, x_{k-1}\right)\right\}$ then $\mathrm{d}\left(x_{k+1}, x_{k}\right)<\mathrm{d}\left(x_{k}, x_{k-1}\right)$ so that $d_{k} \equiv \mathrm{~d}\left(x_{k}, x_{k-1}\right)$ is a monotone non-increasing sequence of non-negative numbers.

Now let us prove that the sequence $\left\langle d_{k}\right\rangle$ is a Cauchy sequence.
Suppose $\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} d_{k}=\mathrm{u} \geq 0$. But by assumption, $\lim _{t \rightarrow u^{+}} \sup \lambda(t)<1$. Therefore, $\exists$ a point $k_{0}$ such that $\mathrm{k} \geq k_{0}$ implies that $\lambda\left(d_{k}\right)<\mathrm{h}$, where $\lim _{t \rightarrow u^{+}} \sup \lambda(t)<h<1$.

Now we take $d_{k+1}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
d_{k+1}=\mathrm{d}\left(x_{k+1}, x_{k}\right) & \leq \mathrm{H}\left\{\mathrm{~T}\left(x_{k}\right), \mathrm{T}\left(x_{k+1}\right)\right\}+\lambda^{n_{k}}\left(d_{k}\right) \\
& \leq \lambda\left(d_{k}\right) d_{k}+\lambda^{n_{k}}\left(d_{k}\right) \\
& \leq \lambda\left(d_{k}\right) \lambda\left(d_{k-1}\right) d_{k-1}+\lambda\left(d_{k}\right) \lambda^{n_{k-1}}\left(d_{k-1}\right)+\lambda^{n_{k}}\left(d_{k}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

.and so on.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \leq \prod_{i=1}^{k} \lambda\left(d_{i}\right) d_{1}+\sum_{m=1}^{k-1} \prod_{i=m+1}^{k} \lambda\left(d_{i}\right) \lambda^{n_{m}}\left(d_{m}\right)+\lambda^{n_{k}}\left(d_{k}\right) \\
& \leq \prod_{i=1}^{k} \lambda\left(d_{i}\right) d_{1}+\sum_{m=1}^{k-1} \prod_{i=\max \left(k_{0}, m+1\right)}^{k} \lambda\left(d_{i}\right) \lambda^{n_{m}}\left(d_{m}\right)+\lambda^{n_{k}}\left(d_{k}\right)=\mathrm{R} \text { (say). }
\end{aligned}
$$

In the last inequality, we deleted some $\lambda$ factors from the product because of the fact that $\lambda<1$.
Now we take
$\sum_{m=1}^{k-1} \prod_{i=\max \left(k_{0}, m+1\right)}^{k} \lambda\left(d_{i}\right) \lambda^{n_{m}}\left(d_{m}\right) \leq\left(k_{0}-1\right) h^{k-k_{0}+1} \sum_{m=1}^{k_{0}-1} \lambda^{n_{m}}\left(d_{m}\right)+\sum_{m=k_{0}}^{k-1} h^{k-m} \lambda^{n_{m}}\left(d_{m}\right)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \leq\left(k_{0}-1\right) h^{k-k_{0}+1} \sum_{m=1}^{k_{0}-1} \lambda^{n_{m}}\left(d_{m}\right)+\sum_{m=k_{0}}^{k-1} h^{k-m+n_{m}} \\
& \leq \mathrm{G} h^{k}+\sum_{m=k_{0}}^{k-1} h^{k-m_{n_{m}}} \\
& \leq \mathrm{G} h^{k}+h^{k+n_{k_{0}}-k_{0}}+h^{k+n_{k_{0}-1}-\left(k_{0}-1\right)}+\ldots \ldots+h^{k+n_{k-1}-(k-1)} \\
& \leq \mathrm{G} h^{k}+\sum_{m=k+n_{k_{0}}-k_{0}}^{k+n_{k-1}-(k-1)} h^{m} \\
& =\mathrm{G} h^{k}+\frac{h^{k+n_{k_{0}}-k_{0}+1}-h^{k+n_{k-1}-k+2}}{(1-h)} \\
& =\mathrm{G} h^{k}+h^{k}\left\{\frac{h^{n_{k}-k_{0}+1}-h^{n_{k-1}-k+2}}{(1-h)}\right\} \\
& =\mathrm{G} h^{k}+h^{k}\left\{\frac{h^{n_{k_{0}}-k_{0}+1}}{(1-h)}\right\}=\mathrm{G} h^{k},
\end{aligned}
$$

Where G is a generic positive constant.
Now we have
$\mathrm{R} \leq \prod_{i=1}^{k} \lambda\left(d_{i}\right) d_{1}+\mathrm{G} h^{k}+\lambda^{n_{k}}\left(d_{k}\right)$
$<h^{k-k_{0}+1} \quad \prod_{i=1}^{k_{0}-1} \lambda\left(d_{i}\right) d_{1}+\mathrm{G} h^{k}+h^{n_{k}}$
$<\mathrm{G} h^{k}+\mathrm{G} h^{k}+h^{k}=G_{1} h^{k}$, where $G_{1}$ is again a generic constant.

Now it is very easy to prove that the sequence $\left\langle x_{k}\right\rangle$ is a Cauchy sequence.
For $\mathrm{k} \geq k_{0}, \mathrm{~m} \in \mathrm{~N}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{d}\left(x_{k}, x_{k+m}\right) & \leq \mathrm{d}\left(x_{k}, x_{k-1}\right)+\ldots . .+\mathrm{d}\left(x_{k+m-1}, x_{k+m}\right) \\
& =\sum_{i=k+1}^{k+m} d_{i}<\sum_{i=k+1}^{k+m} G h^{i-1}=\mathrm{G}\left\{\frac{h^{k+1}-h^{k+m}}{(1-h)}\right\} \leq h^{k} \rightarrow 0 \text { as } \mathrm{k} \rightarrow \infty .
\end{aligned}
$$

Suppose $x_{k} \rightarrow x \in \mathrm{X}$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{d}\{\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{~T}(\mathrm{x})\} & \leq \mathrm{d}\left(\mathrm{x}, x_{k}\right)+\mathrm{d}\left(x_{k}, \mathrm{~T}(\mathrm{x})\right) \\
& \leq \mathrm{d}\left(\mathrm{x}, x_{k}\right)+\mathrm{H}\left\{\mathrm{~T}\left(x_{k-1}\right), \mathrm{T}(\mathrm{x})\right\} \\
& \leq \mathrm{d}\left(\mathrm{x}, x_{k}\right)+\lambda\left\{\mathrm{d}\left(x_{k-1}, \mathrm{x}\right)\right\} \mathrm{d}\left(x_{k-1}, \mathrm{x}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Since both the terms in the above expression tend to zero as $\mathrm{k} \rightarrow \infty$, we get $\mathrm{T}(\mathrm{x})=\mathrm{x}$.
This shows that T has a fixed point in X , which proves the desired theorem 2.1 completely.
Corollary: Suppose ( $X, d$ ) be a complete metric space and $T: X \rightarrow C B(X)$ be a mapping.
Let be a monotonic increasing function such that $0 \leq(t)<1$ for each $t \epsilon(0, \infty)$ and if
$\mathrm{H}\{\mathrm{T}(\mathrm{x}), \mathrm{T}(\mathrm{y})\} \leq \lambda(\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y})) \mathrm{d}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y})$ for all $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y} \in \mathrm{X}$, then T has a fixed point x in X .
The above corollary generalizes theorem 1.2 by extending the range of $T$ from $Q(X)$ to $C B(X)$.
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