Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae

Shih-sen Chang; Yu-Qing Chen; Yeol Je Cho; Byung-Soo Lee

Fixed point theorems for nonexpansive operators with dissipative perturbations in cones

Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae, Vol. 39 (1998), No. 1, 49--54

Persistent URL: http://dml.cz/dmlcz/118983

Terms of use:

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, 1998

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.

This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* http://project.dml.cz

Fixed point theorems for nonexpansive operators with dissipative perturbations in cones

S.S. Chang, Y.Q. Chen, Y.J. Cho, B.S. Lee

Abstract. Let P be a cone in a Hilbert space H, $A : P \to 2^P$ be an accretive mapping (equivalently, $-A$ be a dissipative mapping) and $T : P \to P$ be a nonexpansive mapping. In this paper, some fixed point theorems for mappings of the type $-A+T$ are established. As an application, we utilize the results presented in this paper to study the existence problem of solutions for some kind of nonlinear integral equations in $L^2(\Omega)$.

Keywords: nonexpansive mapping, accretive mapping, fixed point theorem, nonlinear integral equations

Classification: 45H10, 47H06, 47H09, 47H15

1. Introduction

The study of fixed point problem for nonexpansive mapping for a closed convex subset of a Banach space into itself was started by F.E. Browder, D. Göhde and W.A. Kirk. Since then, whether a nonexpansive mapping from a bounded closed convex subset of a Banach space into itself has a fixed point, has become an interesting problem. As we know, the answer to this problem is negative in general Banach spaces ([2]). But this problem is still open for reflexive Banach spaces. Recently, some existence theorems for fixed points of nonexpansive type mappings related to accretive mappings have been considered by some authors ([8], [10], [11], [12]).

The purpose of this paper is to establish some existence theorems for mappings of the type $-A+T$ in a cone P of a real Hilbert space H, where the mapping $A : D(A) \subseteq P \to 2^P$ is accretive and $T : P \to P$ is nonexpansive. As an application, we utilize the results presented in this paper to study the existence problem of solutions for some kind of nonlinear integral equations in $L^2(\Omega)$.

2. Main results

Throughout this paper, suppose that H is a real Hilbert space with an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, P is a cone in H and there is an order " $\leq$ " induced by P in H, i.e., for any given $x, y \in H$, define $x \leq y \Longleftrightarrow y - x \in P$.

This paper was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China and the Present Studies were also supported by the Basic Science Research Institute Program, Ministry of Education, Korea, 1997, Project No. BSRI-97-1405.

A mapping $A : D(A) \subseteq H \to 2^H$ is said to be *accretive* (or *monotone*) if

$$\langle u - v, x - y \rangle \geq 0$$

for all $x, y \in D(A)$, $u \in Ax$ and $v \in Ay$. If A is accretive, then $-A$ is said to be *dissipative*. In this paper, we always assume that

$$(A + I)(D(A)) = P. \tag{2.1}$$

For further details on accretive mappings which satisfy the condition (2.1), we may refer to [5], [6], [7].

Theorem 2.1. *Let $A : D(A) \subseteq P \to 2^P$ be an accretive mapping satisfying the condition (2.1), Ω be an open bounded subset of H with $\theta \in \Omega$ and $T : P \to P$ be a nonexpansive mapping. If the condition $Tx \ngeq x$ for all $x \in \partial\Omega \cap D(A)$ is satisfied, then $-A + T$ has a fixed point in $D(A)$.*

PROOF: For each $0 \leq k_n < 1$, $k_n T : \bar{\Omega} \cap P \to P$ is a k_n-set contraction. Since $Tx \ngeq x$ for all $x \in \partial\Omega \cap D(A)$, $k_n Tx \ngeq x$ for all $x \in \partial\Omega \cap D(A)$. By Lemma 1 in [5], we have

$$i(-A + k_n T, \Omega \cap D(A)) = 1$$

and so $-A + k_n T$ has a fixed point $x_n \in \Omega \cap D(A)$, i.e.,

$$x_n = (I + A)^{-1} k_n T x_n.$$

Letting $k_n \to 1$, $\{x_n\}$ has a subsequence (for simplicity, we still denote it by $\{x_n\}$) such that $\{x_n\}$ converges weakly to x^*. Let $x_\lambda = (1 - \lambda)x^* + \lambda(I + A)^{-1}Tx^*$ for all $\lambda \in (0, 1)$. Since $(I + A)^{-1}$ is nonexpansive, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle x_\lambda - (I + A)^{-1}Tx_\lambda - [x_n - (I + A)^{-1}Tx_n,\ x_\lambda - x_n\rangle \\ &\geq \|x_\lambda - x_n\|^2 - \langle (I + A)^{-1}Tx_\lambda - (I + A)^{-1}Tx_n,\ x_\lambda - x_n\rangle \end{aligned}$$

and, as $n \to \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_n - (I + A)^{-1}Tx_n\| &= \|(I + A)^{-1}k_n T x_n - (I + A)^{-1}Tx_n\| \\ &\leq (1 - k_n) \cdot \|Tx_n\| \longrightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$\langle x_\lambda - (I + A)^{-1}Tx_\lambda, \quad x_\lambda - x^*\rangle \geq 0$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (1 - \lambda)x^* + \lambda(I+A)^{-1}Tx^* - (I + A)^{-1}T((1 - \lambda)x^* + \lambda(I + A)^{-1}Tx^*), \\ \lambda(I + A)^{-1}Tx^* - \lambda x^*\rangle \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

Dividing (2.2) by λ and letting $\lambda \to 0^+$, we have

$$\langle x^* - (I + A)^{-1}Tx^*, (I + A)^{-1}Tx^* - x^*\rangle \geq 0.$$

This implies that $x^* = (I + A)^{-1}Tx^*$, i.e., x^* is a fixed point of $-A + T$ in $D(A)$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Corollary 2.2. *Let A, Ω and T be the same as in Theorem 2.1. If the condition $Tx < x$ for all $x \in \partial\Omega \cap D(A)$ is satisfied, then $-A+T$ has a fixed point in $D(A)$.*

PROOF: It is obvious that $Tx \not\geq x$ for all $x \in \partial\Omega \cap D(A)$. Hence the conclusion can be obtained from Theorem 2.1 immediately. □

Theorem 2.3. *Let $A : D(A) \subseteq P \to 2^P$ be an accretive mapping satisfying the condition (2.1), Ω be an open bounded subset of H with $\theta \in \Omega$ and $T : P \to P$ be a nonexpansive mapping. If $\|Tx\| \leq \|x\|$ for all $x \in \partial\Omega \cap D(A)$, then $-A+T$ has a fixed point in $D(A)$.*

PROOF: For each $0 \leq k_n < 1$, k_nT is a k_n-set contraction and we have

$$\|k_nTx\| \leq \|Tx\| \leq \|x\|$$

for all $x \in D(A) \cap \partial\Omega$. By Theorem 3 in [5], $-A + k_nT$ has a fixed point x_n in $\Omega \cap D(A)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\{x_n\}$ converges weakly to x^* as $k_n \to 1$. Thus, by the same proof as given in Theorem 2.1, we can prove that x^* is a fixed point of $-A+T$ in $D(A)$. This completes the proof. □

Theorem 2.4. *Let $A : D(A) \subseteq P \to 2^P$ be an accretive mapping satisfying the condition (2.1), Ω be an open bounded subset of H with $\theta \in \Omega$ and $T : P \to P$ be a nonexpansive mapping. If $\langle u - Tx, x\rangle \geq 0$ for all $x \in \partial\Omega \cap D(A)$ and $u \in Ax$, then $-A+T$ has a fixed point in $D(A)$.*

PROOF: For each $0 \leq k_n < 1$, k_nT is a k_n-set contraction. Let

$$H(t,x) = tk_nTx$$

for all $(t,x) \in [0,1] \times (\bar{\Omega} \cap P)$.

Now, we prove that

$$x \notin -Ax + H(t,x)$$

for all $(t,x) \in [0,1] \times (\partial\Omega \cap D(A))$. Suppose that this is not true. Then there exist $t_0 \in [0,1]$, $x_0 \in \partial\Omega \cap D(A)$ and $u_0 \in Ax_0$ such that $x_0 = -u_0 + t_0k_nTx_0$. Thus we have

$$\|x_0\|^2 = -t_0k_n\langle u_0 - Tx_0, x_0\rangle + (-1 + t_0k_n) \cdot \langle u_0, x_0\rangle. \tag{2.3}$$

Since $(I + A)(D(A)) = P$, we have $\theta \in A\theta$. In view of the assumption, it follows from (2.3) that $\|x_0\|^2 \leq 0$, which implies that $x_0 = \theta$. This contradicts $\theta \in \Omega$. Thus, by using Theorem 1(c) in [5], we have

$$i(-A + k_nT, \Omega \cap D(A)) = i(-A + 0, \Omega \cap D(A)).$$

By virtue of Theorem 1(a) in [5] again, we have $i(-A + 0, \Omega \cap D(A)) = 1$ and so $-A + k_nT$ has a fixed point x_n in $\Omega \cap D(A)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\{x_n\}$ converges weakly to x^* as $k_n \to 1$. Therefore, by the same proof as given in Theorem 2.1, we can prove that x^* is a fixed point of $-A+T$ in $D(A)$. This completes the proof. □

3. Application

In this section, we shall use the results presented in Section 2 to study the existence problem of solutions for some kind of nonlinear integral equations.

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a nonempty measurable subset with $m(\Omega) = 1$, where $m(\Omega)$ denotes the measure of Ω, and let $f(x,y) : \Omega \times [0,+\infty) \to [0,+\infty)$ be a function satisfying the Carathéodory condition, i.e.,

(i) for each $y \in [0,+\infty)$, $f(x,y)$ is measurable in x,

(ii) for almost all $x \in \Omega$, $f(x,y)$ is continuous in y.

In addition, if f satisfies the following conditions:

(a) $(f(x,y) - f(x,z))(y-z) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \Omega$ and $y,z \in [0,+\infty)$,

(b) for each $x \in \Omega$, there exists $N(y) > 0$ such that

$$f(x,y) \leq N(y) \cdot y$$

for all $y \in [0,+\infty)$, where $N(y)$ depends on y, then, by the condition (a), for $x \in \Omega$ such that $f(x,y)$ is continuous in y, $f(x,y) : [0,+\infty) \to [0,+\infty)$ is accretive. Therefore, it follows from the assumption (b) and Proposition 1 in [5] that

$$(I + f(x,\cdot))([0,+\infty)) = [0,+\infty)$$

for almost all $x \in \Omega$. Now let $P = \{u(\cdot) \in L^2(\Omega) \mid u(x) \geq 0 \text{ for almost all } x \in \Omega\}$. Then P is a cone in $L^2(\Omega)$. Denote

$$D(A) = \{u(\cdot) \in P | f(x,u(x)) \in L^2(\Omega)\}$$

and define the mapping $A : D(A) \subseteq P \to P$ by

$$Au(x) = f(x,u(x))$$

for all $x \in \Omega$ and $u(\cdot) \in D(A)$. By the condition (a), we know that $A : D(A) \subseteq P \to P$ is accretive. For $v(\cdot) \in P$, we have $(I + f(x,\cdot))^{-1}v(x) \in L^2(\Omega)$ since $(I + f(x,\cdot))[0,+\infty) = [0,+\infty)$ and $(I + f(x,\cdot))^{-1}$ is nonexpansive for almost all $x \in \Omega$. Therefore, we have

$$(I + A)(D(A)) = P.$$

Suppose that $k(x,y) : \Omega \times [0,+\infty) \to [0,+\infty)$ is a function satisfying the following conditions:

$$k(x,0) \in L^2(\Omega)$$

and

$$|k(x,y) - k(x,z)| \leq |y - z|$$

for all $x \in \Omega$ and $y,z \in [0,+\infty)$. Let $T : P \to P$ be a mapping defined by

$$Tu(x) = \int_\Omega k(x,u(y))\,dy$$

for all $u(\cdot) \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $x \in \Omega$. Since $k(x, y) \leq y + k(x, 0)$, T is well defined on P and it is easy to see that T is nonexpansive.

Now, we consider the following nonlinear integral equation:

$$u(x) = -f(x, u(x)) + \int_\Omega k(x, u(y))\, dy \tag{E3.1}$$

for all $x \in \Omega$. We make a further assumption on $k(\cdot, \cdot)$ as follows:

$$k(x, y) \leq M \cdot y + g(x)$$

for all $(x, y) \in \Omega \times [0, +\infty)$, where $0 < M < 1$ and $g(\cdot) \in P$. Choose $r > 0$ such that

$$M + r^{-1} \left(\int_\Omega g^2(x)\, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq 1.$$

Then, for each $u(\cdot) \in P$ with $(\int_\Omega u^2(x)\, dx)^{\frac{1}{2}} = r$, we have

$$\|Tu(x)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|u(x)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

By Theorem 2.3, (E3.1) has a solution $u(\cdot) \in P$.

References

[1] Alspach D.E., *A fixed point free nonexpansive map*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **82** (1981), 423–424.

[2] F. E. Browder F.E., *Nonlinear nonexpansive operators in Banach spaces*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A **54** (1965), 1041–1044.

[3] Browder F.E., *Nonlinear Operators and Nonlinear Equations of Evolution in Banach Spaces*, Proc. Symp. Pure Math. Vol. 18, Part 2, 1976.

[4] Chang S.S., *Fixed Point Theory with Applications*, Chongqing Publishing House, Chongqing, 1984.

[5] Chen Y.Q., *The fixed point index for accretive mappings with k-set contraction perturbation in cones*, Internat. J. Math. and Math. Sci. **2** (1996), 287–290.

[6] Chen Y.Q., *On accretive operators in cones of Banach spaces*, Nonlinear Anal. TMA **27** (1996), 1125–1135.

[7] Chen Y.Q., Cho Y.J., *On 1-set contraction perturbations of accretive operators in cones of Banach spaces*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **201** (1996), 966–980.

[8] Gatica J.A., Kirk W.A., *Fixed point theorems for contraction mappings with applications to nonexpansive and pseudo-contractive mappings*, Rocky Mountain J. Math. **4** (1994), 69–79.

[9] Isac G., *On an Altman type fixed point theorem on convex cones*, Rocky Mountain J. Math. **2** (1995), 701–714.

[10] Kirk W.A., Schonberg R., *Some results on pseudo-contractive mappings*, Pacific J. Math. **71** (1977), 89–100.

[11] Morales C., *Pseudo-contractive mappings and the Leray-Schauder boundary condition*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae **20** (1979), 745–756.
[12] Reinermann J., Schonberg R., *Some results and problems in the fixed point theory for non-expansive and pseudo-contractive mappings in Hilbert spaces*, Academic Press, S. Swaminathan ed., 1976.

Department of Mathematics, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan 610064, P.R. China

Department of Mathematics, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio 45701-2979, USA

Department of Mathematics, Gyeongsang National University, Chinju 660-701, South Korea

Department of Mathematics, Kyungsung University, Pusan 608-736, South Korea

(*Received* May 26, 1997)