 doi:10.20944/preprints202108.0029.v1

# $\theta^*$-WEAK CONTRACTIONS AND DISCONTINUITY AT THE FIXED POINT WITH APPLICATIONS TO MATRIX AND INTEGRAL EQUATIONS

A. PERVEEN*, W. M. ALFAQIH†, S. SESSA• AND M IMDAD*

*Department of Mathematics, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh-202002, India.
†Department of Mathematics, Hajjah University, Hajjah, Yemen.
•Universit degli Studi di Napoli Federico II, Dipartimento di Architettura, Via Toledo 402, 80134 Napoli, Italy.
Email addresses: atiyaperveen2@gmail.com, waleedmohd2016@gmail.com, sessa@unina.it, mhimdad@gmail.com

Abstract. In this paper, the notion of $\theta^*$-weak contraction is introduced, which is utilized to prove some fixed point results. These results are helpful to give a positive response to certain open question raised by Kannan [Amer. Math. Monthly 76:1969] and Rhoades [Contemp. Math. 72:1988] on the existence of contractive definition which does not force the mapping to be continuous at the fixed point. Some illustrative examples are also given to support our results. As applications of our result, we investigate the existence and uniqueness of a solution of non-linear matrix equations and integral equations of Volterra type as well.

***MSC***: 47H10, 54H25
***Keywords***: $\theta^*$-weak contraction, fixed point, discontinuity at the fixed point, property P, matrix equation, integral equation.

## 1. Introduction and Preliminaries

In order to study the existence of fixed point for discontinuous mappings, Kannan [1] introduced a weaker contraction condition and proved the following theorem:
Every self-mapping $S$ defined on a complete metric space $(M, d)$ satisfying the condition

$$d(Sz, Sw) \leq \beta[d(z, Sz) + d(w, Sw)], \text{where } \beta \in \left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right), \tag{1.1}$$

$\forall z, w \in M$, has a unique fixed point. Such type of mappings are called Kannan type mappings.

Rhoades [2] presented and compared 250 contractive definitions (including (1.1)) and showed that though most of these definitions do not force the mapping to be continuous in the entire domain but all of them force it to be continuous at the fixed point. Inspired by his perceptions, Rhoades [3] formulated a very intersting open question:

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 2 August 2021 doi:10.20944/preprints202108.0029.v1



*Open Question* 1.1. Does there exist a contractive definition which is strong enough to ensure the existence and uniqueness of a fixed point but does not force the mapping to be continuous at the underlying fixed point?

The first answer to the *Open Question* 1.1 was given by Pant [4] after more than a decade.

In other direction, Jleli and Samet [5] introduced another class of mappings and by using it, they defined $\theta$-contractions.

**Definition 1.1.** [5,6] Let $\theta : (0,\infty) \to (1,\infty)$ be a mapping satisfying the following conditions:

$\Theta 1$ : $\theta$ is non-decreasing;
$\Theta 2$ : for each sequence $\{\beta_k\} \subset (0,\infty)$, $\lim_{k\to\infty} \theta(\beta_k) = 1 \iff \lim_{k\to\infty} \beta_k = 0$;
$\Theta 3$ : $\exists\ r \in (0,1)$ and $l \in (0,\infty]$ such that

$$\lim_{\beta\to 0^+} \frac{\theta(\beta)-1}{\beta^r} = l;$$

$\Theta 4$ : $\theta$ is continuous.

We consider the following class of mappings:
$\Theta_{1,2,3}$: the class of mappings satisfying $\Theta 1$-$\Theta 3$.
$\Theta_{1,2,4}$: the class of mappings satisfying $\Theta 1$, $\Theta 2$ and $\Theta 4$.
$\Theta_{2,3}$: the class of mappings satisfying $\Theta 2$ and $\Theta 3$.
$\Theta_{2,4}$: the class of mappings satisfying $\Theta 2$ and $\Theta 4$.

Jleli and Samet [5] used the class of functions $\Theta_{1,2,3}$ and proved the following result.

**Theorem 1.1.** *[5] Let $(M,d)$ be a complete generalized metric space and $S : M \to M$ a given mapping. Suppose that there exist $\theta \in \Theta_{1,2,3}$ and $k \in (0,1)$ such that*

$$d(Sz,Sw) > 0 \implies \theta(d(Sz,Sw)) \le [\theta(d(z,w))]^k, \tag{1.2}$$

*$\forall z,w \in M$. Then $S$ has a unique fixed point.*

Later on, this contraction condition was modified by many authors. In this direction, Ahmad et al. [7] proved the same result by using class of functions $\Theta_{1,2,4}$. It was already remarked that the monotonicity of $\theta$ implies just the continuity of the mapping $S$, but continuity of $S$ can also be obtained by $\Theta 2$, without using $\Theta 1$.
Let $S$ be a self-mapping defined on a metric space $(M,d)$ satisfying condition $\Theta 2$. If $z,w \in M$ such that $d(z,w)$ tends to 0, then condition $\Theta 2$ implies that $\theta(d(z,w))$ tends to 1 and (1.2) yields that $\theta(d(Sz,Sw))$ tends to 1. Again, condition $\Theta 2$ implies that $d(Sz,Sw)$ tends to 0. Hence, $S$ is continuous mapping. Imdad et al. [8] observed that continuity of $S$ still holds even if $\Theta 1$ is removed. So they used $\theta \in \Theta_{2,3}$ (or $\theta \in \Theta_{2,4}$) and established that Theorem 1.1 still held true by considering these class of mappings, i.e., Theorem 1.1 can survive without $\Theta 1$.

In the sequel, it is substantial to state the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.1.** *[9] Let $\{z_n\}$ be a sequence in a metric space $(M,d)$. If $\{z_n\}$ is not a Cauchy sequence, then there exist an $\epsilon > 0$ and two subsequences $\{z_{n(k)}\}$ and $\{z_{m(k)}\}$ of $\{z_n\}$ such that*

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 2 August 2021 doi:10.20944/preprints202108.0029.v1



$$k \leq m(k) < n(k), \quad d(z_{m(k)}, z_{n(k)}) \geq \epsilon \text{ and } d(z_{m(k)}, z_{n(k)-1}) < \epsilon, \quad \forall\, k \in \mathbb{N}.$$
*Furthermore,* $\lim_{k\to\infty} d(z_{m(k)}, z_{n(k)}) = \epsilon$, *provided* $\lim_{n\to\infty} d(z_n, z_{n+1}) = 0$.

The aim of this paper is five-fold described as follows:

(1) to introduce the notion of $\theta^*$-weak contractions.
(2) to prove some fixed point results.
(3) to provide a new answer to the *Open Question* 1.1 via $\theta^*$-weak contractions.
(4) to investigate the existence and uniqueness of a solution of non-linear matrix equation.
(5) to investigate the existence and uniqueness of a solution of integral equation of Volterra type.

In the sequel, $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{N}$ denote the set of real and natural numbers respectively and $\mathbb{N}_0$ stands for $\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. The set of all fixed points of a self-mapping $S$ is denoted by $Fix(S)$.

## 2. Main results

Let $\Theta'$ be the set of all functions $\theta : (0,\infty) \to (1,\infty)$ satisfying the following condition:

$\Theta 2'$ : for every sequence $\{\beta_k\} \subset (0,\infty)$, $\lim_{k\to\infty} \theta(\beta_k) = 1 \Rightarrow \lim_{k\to\infty} \beta_k = 0$.
Obviously, $\Theta_{1,2,3} \subset \Theta'$. However, the converse inclusion is not true in general as substantiated by the following examples:

**Example 2.1.** [8] Let $\theta : (0,\infty) \to (1,\infty)$ be given by: $\theta(\alpha) = e^{\frac{\alpha}{2}+\sin\alpha}$. It is clear that $\theta$ satisfies $\Theta 2$ and $\Theta 4$. However, it dose not satisfy $\Theta 1$.

**Example 2.2.** Let $\theta : (0,\infty) \to (1,\infty)$ be given by: $\theta(\alpha) = e^{e^{\cos\alpha - \frac{1}{\alpha}}}$. It is clear that $\theta$ satisfies $\Theta 2$ and $\Theta 4$. However, it dose not satisfy $\Theta 1$ and $\Theta 3$.

**Example 2.3.** Let $\theta : (0,\infty) \to (1,\infty)$ be given by: $\theta(\alpha) = e^{\cos\alpha - (1+\alpha)}$. It is clear that $\theta$ satisfies $\Theta 2$ and $\Theta 4$. However, it dose not satisfy $\Theta 1$ and $\Theta 3$.

**Example 2.4.** Let $\theta : (0,\infty) \to (1,\infty)$ be given by: $\theta(\alpha) = e^{\arctan\alpha - \sin\alpha}$. It is clear that $\theta$ satisfies $\Theta 2$ and $\Theta 4$. However, it dose not satisfy $\Theta 1$ and $\Theta 3$.

Now, we are ready to define the notion of $\theta^*$-weak contractions as follows.

**Definition 2.1.** Let $(M,d)$ be a metric space. A self-mapping $S$ on $M$ is said to be *a $\theta^*$-weak contraction* if there exist $k \in (0,1)$ and $\theta \in \Theta'$ such that

$$d(Sz, Sw) > 0 \Rightarrow \theta(d(Sz, Sw)) \leq [\theta(m(z,w))]^k, \tag{2.1}$$

where $m(z,w) = \max\{d(z,w), d(z,Sz), d(w,Sw)\}$.

Now, we state and prove our main results as follows:

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let $(M,d)$ be a complete metric space and $S : M \to M$ a $\theta^*$-weak contraction. If $\theta$ is continuous, then*

*(a) $S$ has a unique fixed point (say $z^* \in M$),*
*(b) $\lim_{n\to\infty} S^n z = z^*$, $\forall z \in M$.*

*Moreover, $S$ is continuous at $z^*$ if and only if* $\lim_{z\to z^*} m(z,z^*) = 0$.

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 2 August 2021 doi:10.20944/preprints202108.0029.v1



*Proof.* Let $z_0 \in M$ be an arbitrary point. Define a Picard sequence $\{z_n\} \subseteq M$ based at $z_0$, i.e., $z_{n+1} = Sz_n$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. If there exists some $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $z_{n_0} = Sz_{n_0}$, then we are done. Assume that $z_{n+1} \neq z_n$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. On using (2.1), we have ($\forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0$)

$$\theta(d(z_{n+1}, z_n)) \leq [\theta(m(z_n, z_{n-1}))]^k,$$

where

$$m(z_n, z_{n-1}) \;=\; \max\{d(z_n, z_{n-1}), d(z_n, z_{n+1}), d(z_n, z_{n-1})\}.$$

Now, $m(z_n, z_{n-1}) \neq d(z_n, z_{n+1})$, otherwise $\theta(d(z_n, z_{n+1})) \leq [\theta(d(z_n, z_{n+1}))]^k$ a contradiction. Hence, $m(z_n, z_{n-1}) = d(z_n, z_{n-1})$. Thus, we have

$$\theta(d(z_{n+1}, z_n)) \leq [\theta(d(z_n, z_{n-1}))]^k \leq [\theta(d(z_{n-1}, z_{n-2}))]^{k^2} \leq ... \leq [\theta(d(z_1, z_0))]^{k^n}.$$

On letting $n \to \infty$, we obtain

$$1 \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \theta(d(z_{n+1}, z_n)) \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} [\theta(d(z_1, z_0))]^{k^n} = 1,$$

i.e., $\lim_{n\to\infty} \theta(d(z_{n+1}, z_n)) = 1$ which by $\Theta2'$ yields that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} d(z_{n+1}, z_n) = 0. \tag{2.2}$$

Now, we show that $\{z_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence employing a contradiction. Suppose on contrary that it is not so, then (in view of Lemma 1.1) there exist $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and two subsequences $\{z_{n(k)}\}$ and $\{z_{m(k)}\}$ of $\{z_n\}$ such that

$$k \leq m(k) < n(k), \quad d(z_{n(k)-1}, z_{m(k)}) < \epsilon_0 \leq d(z_{n(k)}, z_{m(k)}), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

We observe that

$$\epsilon_0 \leq d(z_{n(k)}, z_{m(k)}) \leq d(z_{n(k)}, z_{n(k)-1}) + d(z_{n(k)-1}, z_{m(k)}) < d(z_{n(k)}, z_{n(k)-1}) + \epsilon_0$$

so that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} d(z_{n(k)}, z_{m(k)}) = \lim_{k\to\infty} d(z_{n(k)-1}, z_{m(k)}) = \epsilon_0. \tag{2.3}$$

Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon_0 &\leq d(z_{n(k)}, z_{m(k)}) \\
&\leq d(z_{n(k)}, z_{m(k)-1}) + d(z_{m(k)-1}, z_{m(k)}) \\
&\leq d(z_{n(k)}, z_{n(k)-1}) + d(z_{n(k)-1}, z_{m(k)-1}) + d(z_{m(k)-1}, z_{m(k)}) \\
&\leq d(z_{n(k)}, z_{n(k)-1}) + d(z_{n(k)-1}, z_{m(k)}) + 2d(z_{m(k)-1}, z_{m(k)})
\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} d(z_{n(k)}, z_{m(k)-1}) = \lim_{k\to\infty} d(z_{n(k)-1}, z_{m(k)-1}) = \epsilon_0. \tag{2.4}$$

Thus, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $d(z_{n(k)-1}, z_{m(k)-1}) > 0$, $\forall k \geq N$ so that on applying (2.1) with $z = z_{n(k)-1}$ and $w = z_{m(k)-1}$, we have

$$\Theta(d(z_{n(k)}, z_{m(k)})) \leq [\theta(m(z_{n(k)-1}, z_{m(k)-1}))]^k, \tag{2.5}$$

where

$$m(z_{n(k)-1}, z_{m(k)-1}) = \max\Big\{d(z_{n(k)-1}, z_{m(k)-1}), d(z_{n(k)-1}, z_{n(k)}), d(z_{m(k)-1}, z_{m(k)})\Big\}.$$

Letting $k \to \infty$ and using (2.2) and (2.4), we obtain

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} m(z_{n(k)-1}, z_{m(k)-1}) = \epsilon_0. \tag{2.6}$$

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 2 August 2021 doi:10.20944/preprints202108.0029.v1



As $\theta$ is continuous, so on letting $k \to \infty$ in (2.5) and using (2.3) and (2.6), we obtain $\theta(\epsilon_0) \leq [\theta(\epsilon_0)]^k$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $\{z_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $(M, d)$. The completeness of $M$ implies the existence of $z^* \in M$ such that $\{z_n\} \to z^*$.

Now, we prove that $z^*$ is a fixed point of $S$. Let $P = \{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : z_n = Sz^*\}$. Then, two cases arise depending on $P$. Firstly, if $P$ is infinite set, then there exists a subsequence $\{z_{n(k)}\} \subseteq \{z_n\}$ which converges to $Sz^*$. The uniqueness of the limit gives rise $Sz^* = z^*$. Secondly, if $P$ is finite set, then $d(z_n, Sz^*) > 0$ for infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Hence, there exists a subsequence $\{z_{n(k)}\} \subseteq \{z_n\}$ such that $d(z_{n(k)}, Sz^*) > 0$, $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Using (2.1), we have ($\forall k \in \mathbb{N}_0$)

$$\theta(d(z_{n(k)}, Sz^*)) \leq [\theta(m(z_{n(k)-1}, z^*))]^k, \tag{2.7}$$

where

$$m(z_{n(k)-1}, z^*) = \max\left\{d(z_{n(k)-1}, z^*), d(z_{n(k)-1}, z_{n(k)}), d(z^*, Sz^*)\right\}.$$

If $d(Sz^*, z^*) > 0$, then $\lim_{k\to\infty} m(z_{n(k)-1}, z^*) = d(Sz^*, z^*)$. On letting $k \to \infty$ in (2.7), we obtain $\theta(d(z^*, Sz^*)) \leq [\theta(d(z^*, Sz^*))]^k$, a contradiction. Therefore, it must be $d(Sz^*, z^*) = 0$. Thus, in all we have $Sz^* = z^*$. For the uniqueness part, let $z^{**}$ be another fixed point of $S$. Then, (2.1) gives rise $\theta(d(z^*, z^{**})) \leq [\theta(d(z^*, z^{**}))]^k$, a contradiction. Hence, the fixed point of $S$ is unique.

To establish the last part of the theorem, let us assume that $S$ is continuous at its fixed point $z^*$ and $\{y_n\} \to z^*$. Then, we have $\{Sy_n\} \to Sz^* = z^*$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} d(y_n, Sy_n) = 0$. Hence, $\lim_{n\to\infty} m(y_n, z^*) = 0$.
To prove the other implication, let $\{y_n\} \to z^*$. If we assume that $\lim_{n\to\infty} m(y_n, z^*) = 0$, then $\lim_{n\to\infty} d(y_n, Sy_n) = 0$. This implies that $\lim_{n\to\infty} Sy_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} y_n = z^* = Sz^*$ so that $S$ is continuous at $z^*$. This concludes the proof. □

Combining Theorem 2.1 with Examples 2.1-2.4, we deduce the following results which remain new contractions:

**Corollary 2.1.** *Let $(M, d)$ be a complete metric space and $S$ a self-mapping on $M$. If there exists $k \in (0, 1)$ such that ($\forall z, w \in M$)*

$$d(Sz, Sw) > 0 \Rightarrow e^{2\sin(d(Sz,Sw))+d(Sz,Sw)} \leq e^{k(2\sin(m(z,w))+m(z,w))},$$

*then $S$ has a unique fixed point (say $z^* \in M$) and $\lim_{n\to\infty} S^n z = z^*$, $\forall z \in M$. Moreover, $S$ is continuous at $z^*$ if and only if $\lim_{z\to z^*} m(z, z^*) = 0$.*

**Corollary 2.2.** *Let $(M, d)$ be a complete metric space and $S$ a self-mapping on $M$. If there exists $k \in (0, 1)$ such that ($\forall z, w \in M$)*

$$d(Sz, Sw) > 0 \Rightarrow e^{e^{\cos(d(Sz,Sw)) - \frac{1}{d(Sz,Sw)}}} \leq e^{ke^{\left(\cos(m(z,w)) - \frac{1}{m(z,w)}\right)}},$$

*then $S$ has a unique fixed point (say $z^* \in M$) and $\lim_{n\to\infty} S^n z = z^*$, $\forall z \in M$. Moreover, $S$ is continuous at $z^*$ if and only if $\lim_{z\to z^*} m(z, z^*) = 0$.*

**Corollary 2.3.** *Let $(M, d)$ be a complete metric space and $S$ a self-mapping on $M$. If there exists $k \in (0, 1)$ such that ($\forall z, w \in M$)*

$$d(Sz, Sw) > 0 \Rightarrow e^{\cos(d(Sz,Sw)) - d(Sz,Sw)} \leq e^{k\left(\cos(m(z,w)) - m(z,w) - 1 + \frac{1}{k}\right)},$$

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 2 August 2021 doi:10.20944/preprints202108.0029.v1



*then $S$ has a unique fixed point (say $z^* \in M$) and $\lim_{n\to\infty} S^n z = z^*$, $\forall z \in M$. Moreover, $S$ is continuous at $z$ if and only if $\lim_{z\to z^*} m(z,z^*) = 0$.*

**Corollary 2.4.** *Let $(M,d)$ be a complete metric space and $S$ a self-mapping on $M$. If there exists $k \in (0,1)$ such that $(\forall z,w \in M)$*

$$d(Sz,Sw) > 0 \Rightarrow e^{\arctan(d(Sz,Sw))-\sin(d(Sz,Sw))} \leq e^{k(\arctan(m(Sz,Sw))-\sin(m(Sz,Sw)))},$$

*then $S$ has a unique fixed point (say $z^* \in M$) and $\lim_{n\to\infty} S^n z = z^*$, $\forall z \in M$. Moreover, $S$ is continuous at $z^*$ if and only if $\lim_{z\to z^*} m(z,z^*) = 0$.*

The following example demonstrates Theorem 2.1.

**Example 2.5.** Let $M = [0,1]$ endowed with the usual metric. Define $S : M \to M$ by

$$Sz = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{3}, & \text{for } z \in [0,1), \\ \frac{1}{6}, & \text{for } z = 1. \end{cases}$$

Now, $d(Sz,Sw) > 0$ implies that $z \in [0,1)$ and $w = 1$ (or vice versa) so that $d(Sz,S1) = d(\frac{1}{3},\frac{1}{6}) = \frac{1}{6}$ and $m(z,1) \geq d(1,S1) = \frac{5}{6}$. Consider $\theta$ as given in Example 2.2 and $k = \frac{3}{10}$, then one can show that (2.1) holds for such $\theta$ and $k$ so that $S$ is $\theta^*$-weak contraction. Hence, Theorem 2.1 (Corollary 2.2) shows that $S$ has a unique fixed point (namely $z^* = \frac{1}{3}$). Observe that $\lim_{z\to\frac{1}{3}} m(z,\frac{1}{3}) = 0$ and $S$ is continuous at its fixed point though it is discontinuous on its domain.

Now, we deduce an integral-type result via Theorem 2.1.

**Theorem 2.2.** *Let $(M,d)$ be a complete metric space and $S : M \to M$ a self mapping satisfying the following: $\forall z,w \in M$, there exists $k \in \left(0,\frac{1}{2}\right)$ and $\theta \in \Theta'$ such that*

$$\int_0^{d(Sz,Sw)} \phi(t)dt > 0 \implies \theta\Big(\int_0^{d(Sz,Sw)} \phi(t)dt\Big) \leq \Big[\theta\Big(\int_0^{m(z,w)} \phi(t)dt\Big)\Big]^k,$$

*where $\phi : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ is a Lebesgue integrable mapping satisfying $\int_0^\epsilon \phi(t)dt > 0$, $\forall \epsilon > 0$. Then $S$ has a unique fixed point.*

In next lines, we prove a result analogous to Theorem 2.1 avoiding the continuity of $\theta$.

**Theorem 2.3.** *Let $(M,d)$ be a complete metric space and $S : M \to M$ a $\theta^*$-weak contraction. Assume that $S^2$ is continuous and there exists $z_0 \in M$ such that $\{S^n z_0\}$ is bounded, then*

*(a) $S$ has a unique fixed point (say $z^* \in M$),*
*(b) $\lim_{n\to\infty} S^n z = z^*$, $\forall z \in M$, provided $S$ is bounded.*

*Moreover, $S$ is continuous at $z^*$ if and only if $\lim_{z\to z^*} m(z,z^*) = 0$.*

*Proof.* Let $z_0 \in M$ be such that $\{S^n z_0\}$ is bounded. Following the proof of Theorem 2.1, we have $(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0)$

$$\theta(d(z_{n+1},z_n)) \leq [\theta(d(z_n,z_{n-1}))]^k,$$

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 2 August 2021 doi:10.20944/preprints202108.0029.v1



so that, $\forall n, l \geq 1$, we have

$$\theta(d(z_{n+l}, z_n)) \leq [\theta(d(z_{n+l-1}, z_{n-1}))]^k \leq [\theta(d(z_{n+l-2}, z_{n-2}))]^{k^2} \leq ...$$
$$\leq [\theta(d(z_l, z_0))]^{k^n} \leq [\theta(C)]^{k^n} \to 1, \text{ as } n \to \infty,$$

where $C = \sup_{l \geq 1} d(z_0, S^l z_0)$. Now, making use of $\Theta 2'$, we obtain

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} d(z_{n+l}, z_n) = 0.$$

Hence, $\{z_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. The completeness of $M$ implies that there exists $z^* \in M$ such that $\{z_n\}$ converges to $z^*$. As $S^2$ is continuous, so $\{S^2 z_n = z_{n+2}\}$ converges to $S^2 z^*$. Owing to the uniqueness of the limit, we have $S^2 z^* = z^*$. Now, we claim that $Sz^* = z^*$. Let us assume on contrary that $Sz^* \neq z^*$. Then, we have $m(z^*, Sz^*) = d(z^*, Sz^*)$ and hence, we get

$$\theta(d(z^*, Sz^*)) = \theta(d(S^2 z^*, Sz^*)) \leq [\theta(m(z^*, Sz^*))]^k = [\theta(d(z^*, Sz^*))]^k,$$

a contradiction. Therefore, it must be the case $Sz^* = z^*$. Observe that if $S$ is bounded, then the point $z_0$ chosen in the beginning of the proof can be any arbitrary point of $M$ and hence, $(b)$ is established. Rest of the proof can be completed on the lines of the proof of Theorem 2.1. □

In the following example, we furnish a mapping which is discontinuous at its fixed point exhibiting the utility of Theorem 2.3.

**Example 2.6.** Let $M = [0, 1]$ endowed with the usual metric. Define $S : M \to M$ by

$$Sz = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}, & \text{for } z \in [0, \frac{1}{2}], \\ 0, & \text{for } z \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]. \end{cases}$$

Observe that $S$ is bounded and $S^2$ is continuous. Next, define $\theta : (0, \infty) \to (1, \infty)$ by

$$\theta(\alpha) = \begin{cases} e^{e^{cos\alpha - \frac{1}{\alpha}}}, & \text{for } \alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2}], \\ e^{\frac{\alpha}{2} + sin\alpha}, & \text{for } \alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}, \infty). \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $\theta \in \Theta'$. Now, $d(Sz, Sw) > 0$ implies that $z \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and $w \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ (or vice versa) so that $d(Sz, Sw) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $m(z, w) > \frac{1}{2}$. By a routine calculation, one can show that (2.1) holds for $\theta$ and $k = \frac{9}{20}$. Thus, all the hypotheses of Theorem 2.3 are satisfied and hence, $S$ has a unique fixed point (namely $z^* = \frac{1}{2}$). Observe that $\lim_{z \to \frac{1}{2}} m(z, \frac{1}{2})$ does not exist and $S$ is discontinuous at the fixed point $z^* = \frac{1}{2}$.

*Remark* 2.1. Observe that neither $\theta$ nor $S$ is continuous in Example 2.6 so that Theorem 1.1 as well as Theorem 2.1 of [10] is not applicable in the context of such example.

*Remark* 2.2. $\theta^*$-weak contraction offers an affirmative answer to the *Open Question* 1.1.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202108.0029.v1



Next, we consider $\Theta''$, the class of mappings $\theta : (0,\infty) \to (1,\infty)$ satisfying $\Theta 2'$ and $\Theta 3$. We recall the following notion before presenting our next result.
**Property P:** A self-mapping $S$ has property $P$ if

$$Fix(S^n) = Fix(S), \text{ for every } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

**Theorem 2.4.** *Let $(M,d)$ be a complete metric space and $S : M \to M$ a continuous mapping. If there exist $k \in (0,1)$ and $\theta \in \Theta''$ such that*

$$d(Sz, S^2 z) > 0 \implies \theta(d(Sz, S^2 z)) \leq [\theta(m(z, Sz))]^k, \tag{2.8}$$

*$\forall z \in M$, then $S$ has the property $P$.*

*Proof.* Let $z_0 \in M$ be an arbitrary point. Define a Picard sequence $\{z_n\} \subseteq M$ based at $z_0$, i.e., $z_{n+1} = Sz_n$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. If there exists some $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $z_{n_0} = z_{n_0+1}$, then we are done. Henceforth, assume that $z_n \neq z_{n+1}$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, i.e., $d(Sz_{n-1}, S^2 z_{n-1}) > 0$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus (2.8) implies that

$$\theta(d(Sz_{n-1}, S^2 z_{n-1})) \leq [\theta(m(z_{n-1}, Sz_{n-1}))]^k$$

or

$$\theta(d(z_n, z_{n+1})) \leq [\theta(m(z_{n-1}, z_n))]^k, \tag{2.9}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} m(z_{n-1}, z_n) &= \max\{d(z_{n-1}, z_n), d(z_{n-1}, Sz_{n-1}), d(z_n, Sz_n)\} \\ &= \max\{d(z_{n-1}, z_n), d(z_n, z_{n+1})\}. \end{aligned}$$

If $m(z_{n-1}, z_n) = d(z_n, z_{n+1})$, then (2.9) yields that $\theta(d(z_n, z_{n+1})) \leq [\theta(d(z_n, z_{n+1}))]^k$, $k \in (0,1)$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, $m(z_{n-1}, z_n) = d(z_{n-1}, z_n)$. Now, in view of (2.9), we have

$$\theta(d(z_n, z_{n+1})) \leq [\theta(d(z_{n-1}, z_n))]^k, \ \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } k \in (0,1).$$

Hence, we get

$$1 < \theta(d(z_n, z_{n+1})) \leq [\theta(d(z_{n-1}, z_n))]^k \leq [\theta(d(z_{n-2}, z_{n-1}))]^{k^2} \leq ... \leq [\theta(d(z_0, z_1))]^{k^n}. \tag{2.10}$$

Taking limit $n \to \infty$ in (2.10), we obtain

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \theta(d(z_n, z_{n+1})) = 1,$$

which by $\Theta 2'$ gives

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} d(z_n, z_{n+1}) = 0.$$

Now, $\Theta 3$ implies that there exist $r \in (0,1)$ and $l \in (0,\infty]$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\theta(d(z_n, z_{n+1})) - 1}{[d(z_n, z_{n+1})]^r} = l.$$

Firstly, assume that $l < \infty$. Let $C = \frac{l}{2}$. Then, by the definition of the limit, there exists $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\left| \frac{\theta(d(z_n, z_{n+1})) - 1}{[d(z_n, z_{n+1})]^r} - l \right| \leq C, \ \forall n \geq N_1$$

 doi:10.20944/preprints202108.0029.v1



implying that
$$\frac{\theta(d(z_n, z_{n+1})) - 1}{[d(z_n, z_{n+1})]^r} \geq l - C = C, \ \forall n \geq N_1.$$
So, we have
$$n[d(z_n, z_{n+1})]^r \leq nD[\theta(d(z_n, z_{n+1})) - 1], \ \forall n \geq N_1 \text{ and } D = \frac{1}{C}.$$
Secondly, suppose that $l = \infty$. Let $C > 0$ be a given real number. Then from the definition of the limit, there exists $N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that
$$\frac{\theta(d(z_n, z_{n+1})) - 1}{[d(z_n, z_{n+1})]^r} \geq C, \ \forall n \geq N_2$$
implying that
$$n[d(z_n, z_{n+1})]^r \leq nD[\theta(d(z_n, z_{n+1})) - 1], \ \forall n \geq N_2 \text{ and } D = \frac{1}{C}.$$
Thus, in all, there exist $D > 0$ and $N = \max\{N_1, N_2\}$ such that
$$n[d(z_n, z_{n+1})]^r \leq nD[\theta(d(z_n, z_{n+1})) - 1], \ \forall n \geq N.$$
From (2.10), we have
$$n[d(z_n, z_{n+1})]^r \leq nD[[\theta(d(z_0, z_1))]^{k^n} - 1], \ \forall n \geq N_2 \text{ and } D = \frac{1}{C}.$$
Taking limit $n \to \infty$, we obtain
$$n[d(z_n, z_{n+1})]^r = 0. \tag{2.11}$$
Now, (2.11) ensures the existence of $N'$ such that
$$n[d(z_n, z_{n+1})]^r \leq 1, \ \forall n \geq N',$$
which implies that
$$d(z_n, z_{n+1}) \leq \frac{1}{n^{\frac{1}{r}}}, \ \forall n \geq N'.$$
Now, for $m > n \geq N'$, we have
$$d(z_n, z_m) \leq \sum_{i=n}^{m-1} d(z_i, z_{i+1}) \leq \sum_{i=n}^{m-1} \frac{1}{i^{\frac{1}{r}}}.$$
As $0 < r < 1$, so $\left\{ \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i^{\frac{1}{r}}} \right\}$ converges and hence,
$$\lim_{m,n\to\infty} d(z_n, z_m) = 0,$$
i.e., $\{z_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Now, by the completeness of $M$, we get the ensurance of the existence of $z^* \in M$ such that $z_n \to z^*$, as $n \to \infty$.
By the continuity of $S$, we have
$$z_{n+1} = Sz_n \to Sz^*, \ \text{as } n \to \infty.$$
By the uniqueness of the limit, we have $z^* = Sz^*$, i.e., $S$ has a fixed point.
Now, we will show that
$$Fix(S^n) = Fix(S), \ \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 2 August 2021 doi:10.20944/preprints202108.0029.v1



Suppose on contrary that there exists some $z' \in Fix(S^n)$ such that $z' \notin Fix(S)$. Then, we have

$$d(z', Sz') > 0.$$

Now, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 < \theta(d(z', Sz')) =& \theta(d(S(S^{n-1}z'), S^2(S^{n-1}z')) \leq [\theta(m(S^{n-1}z', S^n z'))]^k \\ =& [\theta(d(S^{n-1}z', S^n z'))]^k \leq [\theta(d(S^{n-2}z', S^{n-1}z'))]^{k^2} \\ \leq& ... \leq [\theta(d(z', Sz'))]^{k^n}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking limit $n \to \infty$, we get $\theta(d(z', Sz')) = 1,$ i.e., $d(z', Sz') = 0$, a contradiction. This completes the proof. □

## 3. Application to nonlinear matrix equations

Throughout this section, we use the following notations:

$\mathcal{M}(n)$=the set of all $n \times n$ complex matrices

$\mathcal{H}(n)$=the set of all Hermitian matrices in $\mathcal{M}(n)$

$\mathcal{P}(n)$= the set of all positive definite matrices in $\mathcal{M}(n)$

$\mathcal{H}^+(n)$=the set of all positive semidefinite matrices in $\mathcal{M}(n)$

For $Z \in \mathcal{P}(n)$ (resp. $Z \in \mathcal{H}^+(n)$), we write $Z \succ 0$ (resp. $Z \succeq 0$). The symbol $\|.\|$ symbolizes the spectral norm of a matrix $A$ defined by $\|A\| = \sqrt{\lambda^+(A^*A)}$, where $\lambda^+(A^*A)$ is the largest eigenvalue of $A^*A$, where $A^*$ is the conjugate transpose of $A$. Also, $\|A\|_{tr} = \sum_{k=1}^n s_k(A) = tr((A^*A)^{\frac{1}{2}})$, where $s_k(A)$ $(1 \leq k \leq n)$ are the singular values of $A \in \mathcal{M}(n)$. In case if $A$ is a Hermition matrix, this definition reduces to: $\|A\|_{tr} = tr(A)$. Here, $(\mathcal{H}(n), \|.\|_{tr})$ is complete metric space (for more details see [11–13]).

In this section, we apply our result (viz. Theorem 2.1) to prove the existence and uniqueness of a solution of the nonlinear matrix equation

$$Z = P + \sum_{k=1}^{m} A_k^* \mathcal{F}(Z) A_k, \tag{3.1}$$

where $P$ is a Hermitian positive definite matrix and $\mathcal{F}$ is a continuous mapping from $\mathcal{H}(n)$ into $\mathcal{P}(n)$ such that $\mathcal{Q}(0) = 0$, $A_k$ are arbitrary $n \times n$ matrices and $A_k^*$ their conjugates.

In the sequel, we need the following lemmas:

**Lemma 3.1.** *[11] If $A \succeq 0$ and $B \succeq 0$ are $n \times n$ matrices, then $0 \leq tr(AB) \leq \|A\| tr(B)$.*

**Lemma 3.2.** *[14] If $A \in \mathcal{H}(n)$ such that $A \prec I_n$, then $\|A\| < 1$.*

**Theorem 3.1.** *Consider the matrix equation (3.1). Assume that there exist two positive real numbers $R$ and $M \geq 1$ such that:*

(i) $\sum_{k=1}^{m} A_k A_k^* \preceq R I_n$ *and*

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 2 August 2021 doi:10.20944/preprints202108.0029.v1



(ii) *for every* $Z, W \in \mathcal{H}(n)$ *with* $\sum_{k=1}^{n} A_k^* \mathcal{F}(Z) A_k \neq \sum_{k=1}^{n} A_k^* \mathcal{F}(W) A_k$, *we have*

$$d(\mathcal{F}(Z), \mathcal{F}(W)) \leq \frac{e^{-M}}{R} m(Z, W),$$

*where* $M \geq 1$ *and* $m(Z, W)$ *is as defined in Definition 2.1.*

*Then the matrix equation (3.1) has a unique solution. Moreover, the iteration* $Z_n = P + \sum_{k=1}^{n} A_k^* \mathcal{F}(Z_{n-1}) A_k$ *converges in the sense of trace norm* $\|.\|_{tr}$ *to the solution of the matrix equation (3.1), where* $Z_0 \in \mathcal{H}(n)$ *such that* $Z_0 \preceq \sum_{k=1}^{m} A_k^* \mathcal{F}(Z_0) A_k$.

*Proof.* Define a mapping $S : \mathcal{H}(n) \to \mathcal{H}(n)$ by:

$$S(Z) = P + \sum_{k=1}^{n} A_k^* \mathcal{F}(Z) A_k, \quad \forall Z \in \mathcal{H}(n). \tag{3.2}$$

Observe that $S$ is well defined and $X$ is a fixed point of $S$ if and only if it is a solution of the matrix equation (3.1). To accomplish this, we need to show that $S$ is $\theta^*$-weak contraction wherein the mapping $\theta : (0, \infty) \to (1, \infty)$ is given by: $\theta(\alpha) = e^{\sqrt{\alpha}}$, $\forall \alpha \in (0, \infty)$, which is continuous and belongs to $\Theta'$.
Let $Z, W \in \mathcal{H}(n)$ be such that $S(Z) \neq S(W)$. Consider

$$\begin{aligned}
\|S(Z) - S(W)\|_{tr} &= tr\big(S(Z) - S(W)\big) \\
&= tr\Big(\sum_{k=1}^{m} A_k^* \big(\mathcal{F}(Z) - \mathcal{F}(W)\big) A_k\Big) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{m} tr\big(A_k^* \big(\mathcal{F}(Z) - \mathcal{F}(W)\big) A_k\big) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{m} tr\big(A_k^* A_k \big(\mathcal{F}(Z) - \mathcal{F}(W)\big)\big) \\
&= tr\Bigg(\Big(\sum_{k=1}^{m} A_k^* A_k\Big) \big(\mathcal{F}(Z) - \mathcal{F}(W)\big)\Bigg) \\
&\leq \Big\|\sum_{k=1}^{m} A_k^* A_k\Big\| \|\mathcal{F}(Z) - \mathcal{F}(W)\|_{tr} \\
&\leq \frac{e^{-M}}{R} \Big\|\sum_{k=1}^{m} A_k^* A_k\Big\| m(Z, W) \\
&\leq e^{-M} m(Z, W),
\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$d(SZ, SW) \leq e^{-M} m(Z, W),$$

which implies that

$$e^{\sqrt{d(SZ,SW)}} \leq e^{\sqrt{e^{-M} m(Z,W)}}, \ M \geq 1.$$

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 2 August 2021 doi:10.20944/preprints202108.0029.v1



This yields that

$$e^{\sqrt{d(SZ,SW)}} \leq \left[e^{\sqrt{m(Z,W)}}\right]^k,$$

where $k = \sqrt{e^{-M}}$. The supposition that $M \geq 1$ implies that $k \in (0,1)$ which shows that $S$ is a $\theta^*$-weak contraction. Thus, all the hypotheses of Theorem 2.1 are satisfied. Hence, there exists a unique $Z \in \mathcal{H}(n)$ such that $SZ = Z$, i.e., the matrix equation (3.1) has a unique solution in $\mathcal{H}(n)$. This completes the proof. □

## 4. Application to integral equations

In this section, we investigate the existence and uniqueness of a solution of a Volterra type integral equation with the help of Theorem 2.1. Suppose the integral equation is given as follows:

$$z(t) = \int_0^t K(t,s,z(s))ds + h(t), \quad t \in [0,T], \tag{4.1}$$

where $T > 0$, $K : [0,T] \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, $h : [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$.
Consider the space $C([0,T],\mathbb{R})$ of all continuous functions $z : [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$ equipped with the Bielecki's norm

$$\|z\| = \sup_{t\in[0,T]} e^{-\alpha t}|z(t)|, \quad \alpha \geq 1.$$

Then, the space $(C([0,T],\mathbb{R}), d)$ is a complete metric space with

$$d(z,w) = \|z - w\|, \quad \forall z, w \in C([0,T],\mathbb{R}).$$

Now, by utilizing Theorem 2.1, we state and prove the following result.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Assume that there exists $\alpha \geq 1$ such that*

$$|K(t,s,z) - K(t,s,w)| \leq \alpha e^{-\alpha} m^*(z,w),$$

$\forall t, s \in [0,T]$ *and* $z, w \in C([0,T],\mathbb{R})$, *where*

$$m^*(z,w) = \max\{|z - w|, |z - Sz|, |w - Sw|\}.$$

*Then the integral equation* (4.1) *has a unique solution in* $C([0,T],\mathbb{R})$.

*Proof.* Define the mapping $S : C([0,T],\mathbb{R}) \to C([0,T],\mathbb{R})$ by:

$$Sz(t) = \int_0^t K(t,s,z(s))ds + h(t), \quad z \in C([0,T],\mathbb{R}).$$

Observe that $S$ is well defined and $z$ is a fixed point of $S$ if and only if it is a solution of the integral equation (3.1). Now, define $\theta : (0,\infty) \to (1,\infty)$ by

$\theta(\alpha) = e^{\alpha}$, $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$. Then $\theta$ is continuous and belongs to $\Theta'$. Now, consider

$$\begin{aligned}
|Sz(t) - Sw(t)| =& \left| \int_0^t (K(t,s,z(s)) - K(t,s,w(s)))ds \right| \\
\leq & \int_0^t |(K(t,s,z(s)) - K(t,s,w(s)))|ds \\
\leq & \int_0^t \alpha e^{-\alpha} m^*(z,w)ds \\
=& \alpha e^{-\alpha} \int_0^t e^{s\alpha} \max\{|z(s) - w(s)|e^{-s\alpha}, |z(s) - Sz(s)|e^{-s\alpha}, \\
& |w(s) - Sw(s)|e^{-s\alpha}\}ds \\
\leq & \alpha e^{-\alpha} \int_0^t e^{s\alpha} \max\{d(z,w), d(z,Sz), d(w,Sw)\}ds \\
=& \alpha e^{-\alpha} m(z,w) \int_0^t e^{s\alpha} ds \\
\leq & m(z,w)e^{-\alpha(1-t)}.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$|Sz(t) - Sw(t)|e^{-\alpha t} \leq e^{-\alpha} m(z,w).$$

Taking supremum over $t$ of both sides, we get

$$d(Sz, Sw) \leq e^{-\alpha} m(z,w),$$

which implies that

$$e^{d(Sz,Sw)} \leq e^{e^{-\alpha} m(z,w)} = [e^{m(z,w)}]^k, \ \forall z, w \in C([0,T], \mathbb{R}),$$

where $k = e^{-\alpha}$. Since $\alpha \geq 1$, so $k \in (0,1)$. Therefore, $S$ is $\theta^*$-weak contraction. By Theorem 2.1, $S$ has a unique solution of integral equation (4.1). This ends the proof.

□

**Competing interests:** The authors declare that they have no competing interests.
**Authors contributions:** All three authors contributed equally and significantly in writing this article. All the authors read and approved the final manuscript.

## References

[1] Kannan R (1968) Some results on fixed points. Bull Calcutta Math Soc 60:71–76
[2] Rhoades BE (1977) A comparison of various definitions of contractive mappings. T Am Math Soc 226:257–290
[3] Rhoades BE (1988) Contractive definitions and continuity. Contemporary Math (Amer Math Soc) 72:233–245
[4] Pant RP (1999) Discontinuity and fixed points. J Math Anal Appl 240 1:284–289
[5] Jleli M, Samet B (2014) A new generalization of the Banach contraction principle. J Inequal Appl 2014. https://doi.org/10.1186/1029-242X-2014-38

 doi:10.20944/preprints202108.0029.v1




[6] Hussain N, Parvaneh V, Samet B, Vetro C (2015) Some fixed point theorems for generalized contractive mappings in complete metric spaces. Fixed Point Theory A 2015. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13663-015-0433-z

[7] Ahmad J, Al-Mazrooei AE, Cho YJ, Yang YO (2017) Fixed point results for generalized $\theta$-contractions. J Nonlinear Sci Appl 10:2350–2358

[8] Imdad M, Alfaqih WM, Khan IA (2018) Weak $\theta$-contractions and some fixed point results with applications to fractal theory. Adv Differ Equ-Ny 2018. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13662-018-1900-8

[9] Berzig M, Karapınar E, Antonio-Francisco Roldán-López-de Hierro (2014) Discussion on generalized-$(\alpha\psi, \beta\phi)$-contractive mappings via generalized altering distance function and related fixed point theorems. Abstr Appl Anal 2014. http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2014/259768

[10] Jleli M, Karapınar E, Samet B (2014) Further generalizations of the Banach contraction principle. J Inequal Appl 2014. https://doi.org/10.1186/1029-242X-2014-439

[11] Ran ACM, Reurings MCB (2004) A fixed point theorem in partially ordered sets and some applications to matrix equations. P Am Math Soc 132 5:1435–1443

[12] Berzig M, Samet B (2011) Solving systems of nonlinear matrix equations involving lipshitzian mappings. Fixed Point Theory A 2011. https://doi.org/10.1186/1687-1812-2011-89

[13] Berzig M (2012) Solving a class of matrix equations via the Bhaskar–Lakshmikantham coupled fixed point theorem. Appl Math Lett 25 11:1638–1643

[14] Long JH, Hu XY, Zhang L (2008) On the hermitian positive defnite solution of the nonlinear matrix equation $X + A^*X^{-1}A + B^*X^{-1}B = I$. B Braz Math Soc 39 3:371–386