RESEARCH Open Access

Coupled fixed point theorems for generalized Mizoguchi-Takahashi contractions with applications

Ljubomir Ćirić¹, Boško Damjanović², Mohamed Jleli³ and Bessem Samet^{3*}

Full list of author information is available at the end of the article

Abstract

We derive some new coupled fixed point theorems for nonlinear contractive maps that satisfied a generalized Mizoguchi-Takahashi's condition in the setting of ordered metric spaces. Presented theorems extends and generalize many well-known results in the literature. As an application, we give an existence and uniqueness theorem for the solution to a two-point boundary value problem.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 54H25; 47H10.

Keywords: coupled fixed point, ordered metric space, mixed monotone mapping, generalized Mizoguchi-Takahashi's contraction, two-point boundary value problem

1 Introduction

Let (X, d) be a metric space. Denote by P(X) the set of all nonempty subsets of X and CB(X) the family of all nonempty closed and bounded subsets of X. A point x in X is a fixed point of a multivalued map $T: X \to P(X)$, if $x \in Tx$. Nadler [1] extended the Banach contraction principle to multivalued mappings.

Theorem 1.1 (Nadler [1]) Let (X, d) be a complete metric space and let $T: X \to CB$ (X) be a multivalued map. Assume that there exists $r \in [0,1)$ such that

$$H(Tx, Ty) \leq rd(x, y)$$

for all $x, y \in X$, where H is the Hausdorff metric with respect to d. Then T has a fixed point.

Reich [2] proved the following generalization of Nadler's fixed point theorem.

Theorem 1.2 (Reich [2]) Let (X, d) be a complete metric space and $T: X \to C(X)$ be a multi-valued map with non empty compact values. Assume that

$$H(Tx, Ty) \le \varphi(d(x, y))d(x, y)$$

for all $x, y \in X$, where ϕ is a function from $[0, \infty)$ into [0,1) satisfying $\limsup_{s \to t^+} \varphi(s) < 1$ for all t > 0. Then T has a fixed point.

Mizoguchi and Takahashi [3] proved the following generalization of Nadler's fixed point theorem for a weak contraction which is a partial answer of Problem 9 in Reich [4].



^{*} Correspondence: bessem. samet@gmail.com

³Department of Mathematics, King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

Theorem 1.3 (Mizoguchi and Takahashi [3]) Let (X, d) be a complete metric space and $T: X \to CB(X)$ be a multivalued map. Assume that

$$H(Tx, Ty) \le \varphi(d(x, y))d(x, y)$$

for all $x, y \in X$, where ϕ is a function from $[0, \infty)$ into [0,1) satisfying $\limsup_{s \to t^*} \varphi(s) < 1$ for all $t \ge 0$. Then T has a fixed point.

Suzuki [5] gave a very simple proof of Theorem 1.3.

Very recently, Amini-Harandi and O'Regan [6] obtained a nice generalization of Mizoguchi and Takahashi's fixed point theorem. Throughout the article, let Ψ be the family of all functions $\psi: [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ satisfying the following conditions:

- (a) $\psi(s) = 0 \Leftrightarrow s = 0$,
- (b) ψ is nondecreasing,
- (c) $\limsup_{s\to 0^+} \frac{s}{\psi(s)} < \infty$.

We denote by Φ the set of all functions $\phi:[0, \infty) \to [0,1)$ satisfying $\lim \sup_{r \to t^*} \varphi(r) < 1$ for all $t \ge 0$.

Theorem 1.4 (Amini-Harandi and O'Regan [6]) Let (X, d) be a complete metric space and $T: X \to CB(X)$ be a multivalued map. Assume that

$$\psi(H(Tx, Ty)) \le \varphi(\psi(d(x, y)))\psi(d(x, y))$$

for all $x, y \in X$, where $\psi \in \Psi$ is lower semicontinuous and $\phi \in \Phi$. Then T has a fixed point.

The existence of fixed point in partially ordered sets has been investigated recently in [7-27] and references therein.

Du [13] proved some coupled fixed point results for weakly contractive single-valued maps that satisfy Mizoguchi-Takahashi's condition in the setting of quasiordered metric spaces. Before recalling the main results in [13], we need some definitions.

Definition 1.1 (Bhaskar and Lakshmikantham [11]) Let X be a nonempty set and A: $X \times X \to X$ be a given map. We call an element $(x, y) \in X \times X$ a coupled fixed point of A if x = A(x, y) and y = A(y, x).

Definition 1.2 (Bhaskar and Lakshmikantham [11]) Let (X, \leq) be a quasiordered set and $A: XX \to X$ a map. We say that A has the mixed monotone property on X if A (x, y) is monotone nondecreasing in $x \in X$ and is monotone nonincreasing in $y \in X$, that is, for any $x, y \in X$,

$$x_1, x_2 \in X \text{ with } x_1 \leq x_2 \Rightarrow A(x_1, \gamma) \leq A(x_2, \gamma),$$

 $y_1, y_2 \in X \text{ with } y_1 \leq y_2 \Rightarrow A(x, y_1) \geq A(x, y_2).$

Definition 1.3 (Du [13]) Let (X, d) be a metric space with a quasi-order \leq . A nonempty subset M of X is said to be

- (i) sequentially $\leq \uparrow$ -complete if every \leq -nondecreasing Cauchy sequence in M converges;
- (ii) sequentially $\leq \downarrow$ -complete if every \leq -nonincreasing Cauchy sequence in M converges;
- (iii) sequentially $\Leftrightarrow \uparrow$ -complete if it is both $\Leftrightarrow \uparrow$ -complete and $\Leftrightarrow \downarrow$ -complete.

Theorem 1.5 (Du [13]) Let (X, d, \leq) be a sequentially ≤ 1 -complete metric space and $A: X \times X \to X$ be a continuous map having the mixed monotone property on X. Assume that there exists a function $\phi \in \Phi$ such that

$$d(A(x,y),A(u,v)) \leq \frac{1}{2}\varphi(d(x,u)+d(y,v))(d(x,u)+d(y,v))$$

for all $x \ge u$ and $y \le v$. If there exist $x_0, y_0 \in X$ such that $x_0 \le A$ (x_0, y_0) and $y_0 \ge A$ (y_0, x_0) , then A has a coupled fixed point.

Theorem 1.6 (Du [13]) Let (X, d, \leq) be a sequentially ≤ 1 -complete metric space and $A: X \times X \to X$ be a map having the mixed monotone property on X. Assume that

- (i) any \leq -nondecreasing sequence (x_n) with $x_n \to x$ implies $x_n \leq x$ for all n,
- (ii) any \leq -nonincreasing sequence (y_n) with $y_n \to y$ implies \geq for all n.

Assume also that there exists a function $\phi \in \Phi$ such that

$$d(A(x,\gamma),A(u,v)) \leq \frac{1}{2}\varphi(d(x,u)+d(\gamma,v))(d(x,u)+d(\gamma,v))$$

for all $x \ge u$ and $y \le v$. If there exist $x_0, y_0 \in X$ such that $x_0 \le A(x_0, y_0)$ and $y_0 \ge A(y_0, y_0)$, then A has a coupled fixed point.

Very recently, Gordji and Ramezani [14] established a new fixed point theorem for a self-map $T: X \to X$ satisfying a generalized Mizoguchi-Takahashi's condition in the setting of ordered metric spaces. The main result in [14] is the following.

Theorem 1.7 (Gordji and Ramezani [14]) Let (X, d, \leq) be a complete ordered metric space and $T: X \to X$ an increasing mapping such that there exists an element $x_0 \in X$ with $x_0 \leq Tx_0$. Suppose that there exists a lower semicontinuous function $\psi \in \Psi$ and $\phi \in \Phi$ such that

$$\psi(d(Tx, Ty)) \le \varphi(\psi(d(x, y))\psi(d(x, y))$$

for all $x, y \in X$ such that x and y are comparable. Assume that either T is continuous or X is such that the following holds: any \leq -nondecreasing sequence (x_n) with $x_n \to x$ implies $x_n \leq x$ for all n. Then T has a fixed point.

In this article, we present new coupled fixed point theorems for mixed monotone mappings satisfying a generalized Mizoguchi-Takahashi's condition in the setting of ordered metric spaces. Presented theorems extend and generalize Du [[13], Theorems 2.8 and 2.10], Bhaskar and Lakshmikantham [[11], Theorems 2.1 and 2.2], Harjani et al. [[15], Theorems 2 and 3], and other existing results in the literature. Moreover, some applications to ordinary differential equations are presented.

2 Main results

Through this article, we will use the following notation: if (X, \leq) is an ordered set, we endow the product set $X \times X$ with the order \leq given by

$$(x, y), (u, v) \in X \times X, \quad (x, y) \leq (u, v) \Leftrightarrow x \leq u, y \geq v.$$

Our first result is the following.

Theorem 2.1 Let (X, d, \leq) be a sequentially ≤ 1 -complete metric space and $A: X \times X \to X$ be a map having the mixed monotone property on X. Suppose that there exist

 $\psi \in \Psi$ and $\phi \in \Phi$ such that for any $(x, y), (u, v) \in X \times X$ with $(u, v) \leq (x, y), (u, v) \in X \times X$

$$\psi(d(A(x,y),A(u,v))) \le \varphi(\psi(\max\{d(x,u),d(y,v)\}))\psi(\max\{d(x,u),d(y,v)\}). \tag{1}$$

Suppose also that either A is continuous or (X, d, \leq) has the following properties:

- (i) any \leq -nondecreasing sequence (x_n) with $x_n \to x$ implies $x_n \leq x$ for each n,
- (ii) any \leq -nonincreasing sequence (y_n) with $y_n \to y$ implies $y_n \geq y$ for each n.

If there exist $x_0, y_0 \in X$ such that $x_0 \le A(x_0, y_0)$ and $y_0 \ge A(y_0, x_0)$, then there exist $a, b \in X$ such that a = A(a, b) and b = A(b, a).

Proof. Define the sequences (x_n) and (y_n) in X by

$$x_{n+1} = A(x_n, y_n), \quad y_{n+1} = A(y_n, x_n) \quad \text{for all } n \geq 0.$$

In order to make the proof more comprehensive we will divide it into several steps.

• Step 1. $x_n \le x_{n+1}$ and $y_n \ge y_{n+1}$ for all $n \ge 0$.

We use mathematical induction.

As $x_0 \le A(x_0, y_0) = x_1$ and $y_0 \ge A(y_0, x_0) = y_1$, our claim is satisfied for n = 0.

Suppose that our claim holds for some fixed $n \ge 0$. Then, since $x_n \le x_{n+1}$ and $y_n \ge y_{n+1}$, and as A has the mixed monotone property, we get

$$x_{n+1} = A(x_n, y_n) \leq A(x_{n+1}, y_n) \leq A(x_{n+1}, y_{n+1}) = x_{n+2}$$

and

$$y_{n+1} = A(y_n, x_n) \geq A(y_{n+1}, x_n) \geq A(y_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) = y_{n+2}.$$

This proves our claim.

• Step 2. $\lim_{n\to\infty} \psi(\max\{d(x_{n+1},x_n),d(y_{n+1},y_n)\}) = 0.$

Since $x_n \le x_{n+1}$ and $y_n \ge y_{n+1}$ (Step 1), we have $(x_n, y_n) \le (x_{n+1}, y_{n+1})$, and by (1), we have

$$\psi(d(A(x_{n+1}, y_{n+1}), A(x_n, y_n)))
\leq \varphi(\psi(\max\{d(x_{n+1}, x_n), d(y_{n+1}, y_n)\}))\psi(\max\{d(x_{n+1}, x_n), d(y_{n+1}, y_n)\})
\leq \psi(\max\{d(x_{n+1}, x_n), d(y_{n+1}, y_n)\}).$$
(2)

Similarly, since $(y_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) \leq (y_n, x_n)$, by (1), we have

$$\psi(d(A(y_n, x_n), A(y_{n+1}, x_{n+1})))
\leq \varphi(\psi(\max\{d(y_n, y_{n+1}), d(x_n, x_{n+1})\}))\psi(\max\{d(y_n, y_{n+1}), d(x_n, x_{n+1})\})
\leq \psi(\max\{d(y_n, y_{n+1}), d(x_n, x_{n+1})\}).$$
(3)

From (2) and (3), we get

$$\max\{\psi(d(x_{n+2},x_{n+1}),\psi(d(y_{n+2},y_{n+1}))\}\leq\psi(\max\{d(x_{n+1},x_n),d(y_{n+1},y_n)\}).$$

Since ψ is nondecreasing, this implies that

$$\psi\left(\max\left\{d(x_{n+2},x_{n+1})d(y_{n+2},y_{n+1})\right\}\right) \le \psi\left(\max\left\{d(x_{n+1},x_n),d(y_{n+1},y_n)\right\}\right) \tag{4}$$

for all $n \ge 0$. Now, (4) means that $(\psi(\max\{d(x_{n+1},x_n),d(y_{n+1},y_n)\}))$ is a non increasing sequence. On the other hand, this sequence is bounded below; thus there exists $\mu \ge 0$ such that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \psi(\max\{d(x_{n+1}, x_n), d(y_{n+1}, y_n)\}) = \mu.$$
 (5)

Since $\phi \in \Phi$, we have $\limsup_{r \to \mu^+} \varphi(r) < 1$ and $\phi(\mu) < 1$. Then, there exist $\alpha \in [0,1)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\phi(r) \le \alpha$ for all $r \in [\mu, \mu + \varepsilon)$. From (5), we can take $n_0 \ge 0$ such that $\mu \le \psi(\max\{d(x_{n+1},x_n),d(y_{n+1},y_n)\}) \le \mu + \varepsilon$ for all $n \ge n_0$. Then, from (2), for all $n \ge n_0$, we have

$$\psi(d(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}))
\leq \varphi(\psi(\max\{d(x_{n+1}, x_n), d(y_{n+1}, y_n)\}))\psi(\max\{d(x_{n+1}, x_n), d(y_{n+1}, y_n)\})
\leq \alpha\psi(\max\{d(x_{n+1}, x_n), d(y_{n+1}, y_n)\}).$$
(6)

Similarly, from (3), for all $n > n_0$, we have

$$\psi(d(\gamma_{n+1}, \gamma_{n+2}))
\leq \varphi(\psi(\max\{d(\gamma_n, \gamma_{n+1}), d(x_n, x_{n+1})\}))\psi(\max\{d(\gamma_n, \gamma_{n+1}), d(x_n, x_{n+1})\})
\leq \alpha\psi(\max\{d(\gamma_n, \gamma_{n+1}), d(x_n, x_{n+1})\}).$$
(7)

Now, from (6) and (7), we get

$$\psi\left(\max\left\{d(x_{n+1},x_{n+2})d(y_{n+1},y_{n+2})\right\}\right) \le \alpha\psi\left(\max\left\{d(y_n,y_{n+1}),d(x_n,x_{n+1})\right\}\right) \tag{8}$$

for all $n \ge n_0$. Letting $n \to \infty$ in the above inequality and using (5), we obtain that $\mu \le \alpha \mu$.

Since $\alpha \in [0,1)$, this implies that $\mu = 0$. Thus, we proved that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \psi(\max\{d(x_{n+1}, x_n), d(y_{n+1}, y_n)\}) = 0.$$
(9)

• Step 3. $\lim_{n\to\infty} \max\{d(x_{n+1},x_n),d(y_{n+1},y_n)\} = 0.$

Since $(\psi(\max\{d(x_{n+1},x_n),d(y_{n+1},y_n)\}))$ is a decreasing sequence and ψ is nondecreasing, then $(\max\{d(x_{n+1},x_n),d(y_{n+1},y_n)\})$ is a decreasing sequence of positive numbers. This implies that there exists $\theta \geq 0$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \max\{d(x_{n+1},x_n),d(y_{n+1},y_n)\}) = \theta^+.$$

Since ψ is nondecreasing, we have

$$\psi(\max\{d(x_{n+1},x_n),d(y_{n+1},y_n)\})\geq \psi(\theta).$$

Letting $n \to \infty$ in the above inequality, from (9), we obtain that $0 \ge \psi(\theta)$, which implies that $\theta = 0$. Thus, we proved that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \max \left\{ d(x_{n+1}, x_n), d(y_{n+1}, y_n) \right\} = 0. \tag{10}$$

• Step 4. (x_n) and (y_n) are Cauchy sequences in (X, d).

Suppose that $\max\{d(x_{m+1},x_m),\ d(y_{m+1},y_m)\}=0$ for some $m\geq 0$. Then, we have $d(x_{m+1},x_m)=d(y_{m+1},y_m)=0$, which implies that $(x_m,y_m)=(x_{m+1},y_{m+1})$, that is, $x_m=A(x_m,y_m)$ and $y_m=A(y_m,x_m)$. Then, (x_m,y_m) is a coupled fixed point of A.

Now, suppose that $\max\{d(x_{n+1},x_n), d(y_{n+1},y_n)\} \neq 0$ for all $n \geq 0$.

Denote

$$a_n = \psi(\max\{d(x_{n+1}, x_n), d(y_{n+1}, y_n)\})$$
 for all $n \ge 0$.

From (8), we have

$$a_{n+1} \leq \alpha a_n$$
 for all $n \geq n_0$.

Then, we have

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n \le \sum_{n=0}^{n_0} a_n + \sum_{n=n_0+1}^{\infty} \alpha^{n-n_0} a_{n0} < \infty.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\max\{d(x_{n+1},x_n),d(y_{n+1},y_n)\}}{\psi(\max\{d(x_{n+1},x_n),d(y_{n+1},y_n)\})} \leq \limsup_{s\to 0^+} \frac{s}{\psi(s)} < \infty.$$

Then $\Sigma_n \max\{d(x_m \ x_{n+1}), d(y_m \ y_{n+1})\} < \infty$. Hence, (x_n) and (y_n) are Cauchy sequences in X.

• Step 5. Existence of a coupled fixed point.

Since (X, d, \leq) is sequentially ≤ 1 -complete metric space and (x_n) is \leq -nondecreasing Cauchy sequence, there exists $a \in X$ such that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} x_n = a. \tag{11}$$

Similarly, since (X, d, \leq) is sequentially ≤ 1 -complete metric space and (y_n) is \leq -noincreasing Cauchy sequence, there exists $b \in X$ such that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \gamma_n = b. \tag{12}$$

Case 1. A is continuous.

From the continuity of A and using (11) and (12), we get

$$a = \lim_{n \to \infty} x_{n+1} = \lim_{n \to \infty} A(x_n, y_n) = A(\lim_{n \to \infty} x_n, \lim_{n \to \infty} y_n) = A(a, b)$$

and

$$b = \lim_{n \to \infty} \gamma_{n+1} = \lim_{n \to \infty} A\left(\gamma_n, x_n\right) = A\left(\lim_{n \to \infty} \gamma_n, \lim_{n \to \infty} x_n\right) = A(b, a).$$

Case 2. (X, d, \leq) satisfies (i) and (ii).

Since (x_n) is \leq -nondecreasing and $\lim_{n\to\infty} x_n = a$, then from (i), we have $x_n \leq a$ for all n. Similarly, from (ii), since (y_n) is \leq -nonincreasing and $\lim_{n\to\infty} y_n = b$, we have $y_n \geq b$ for all n. Then, we have $(x_n, y_n) \leq (a, b)$ for all n. Now, applying our contractive condition (1), we get

$$\psi(d(x_{n+1}, A(a, b))) = \psi(d(A(x_n, y_n), A(a, b)))
\leq \varphi(\psi(\max\{d(x_n, a), d(y_n, b)\}))\psi(\max\{d(x_n, a), d(y_n, b)\})
\leq \psi(\max\{d(x_n, a), d(y_n, b)\}).$$

Since ψ is nondecreasing, this implies that

$$d(x_{n+1}, A(a, b)) \leq \max\{d(x_n, a), d(y_n, b)\}.$$

letting $n \to \infty$ in the above inequality, we obtain that $d(a, A(a, b)) \le 0$, that is, a = A(a, b). Similarly, we can show that b = A(b, a).

Remark 2.1 In our presented theorems we don't need the hypothesis: ψ is lower semi-continuous. Such hypothesis is considered in Theorem 1.7 of Gordji and Ramezani [14].

In what follows, we give a sufficient condition for the uniqueness of the coupled fixed point in Theorem 2.1. We consider the following hypothesis:

(H): For all (x, y), $(u, v) \in X \times X$, there exists $(w, z) \in X \times X$ such that $(x, y) \leq (w, z)$ and $(u, v) \leq (w, z)$.

Theorem 2.2 Adding condition (H) to the hypotheses of Theorem 2.1, we obtain uniqueness of the coupled fixed point of A.

Proof. Suppose that (a, b) and (c, e) are coupled fixed points of A, that is, a = A(a, b), b = A(b, a), c = A(c, e) and e = A(e, c). From (H), there exists $(f_0, g_0) \in X \times X$ such that $(a, b) \leq (f_0, g_0)$ and $(c, e) \leq (f_0, g_0)$.

We construct the sequences (f_n) and (g_n) in X defined by

$$f_{n+1} = A(f_n, g_n), \quad g_{n+1} = A(g_n, f_n) \quad \text{for all } n \ge 0.$$

We claim that $(a, b) \leq (f_n, g_n)$ for all $n \geq 0$.

In fact, we will use mathematical induction.

Since $(a, b) \leq (f_0, g_0)$, then our claim is satisfied for n = 0.

Suppose that our claim holds for some fixed $n \ge 0$. Then, we have $(a, b) \le (f_m g_n)$, that is, $a \le f_n$ and $b \ge g_n$. Using the mixed monotone property of A, we get

$$f_{n+1} = A(f_n, g_n) \succcurlyeq A(a, g_n) \succcurlyeq A(a, b) = a$$

and

$$g_{n+1} = A(g_n, f_n) \preceq A(b, f_n) \preceq A(b, a) = b.$$

This proves that $(a, b) \leq (f_{n+1}, g_{n+1})$. Then, our claim holds.

Now, we can apply (1) with (u, v) = (a, b) and $(x, y) = (f_n, g_n)$. We get

$$\psi(d(f_{n+1}, a)) = \psi(d(A(f_n, g_n), A(a, b)))
\leq \varphi(\psi(\max\{d(f_n, a), d(g_n, b)\}))\psi(\max\{d(f_n, a)d(g_n, b)\}).$$
(13)

Similarly, we have

$$\psi(d(g_{n+1}, b)) = \psi(d(A(g_n, f_n), A(b, a)))
\leq \varphi(\psi(\max\{d(f_n, a), d(g_n, b)\}))\psi(\max\{d(f_n, a)d(g_n, b)\}).$$
(14)

Combining (13) with (14), we obtain

$$\psi(\max\{d(f_{n+1},a),d(g_{n+1},b)\}) \leq \varphi(\psi(\max\{d(f_n,a),d(g_n,b)\}))\psi(\max\{d(f_n,a),d(g_n,b)\}) \\
\leq \psi(\max\{d(f_n,a),d(g_n,b)\}).$$
(15)

Consequently, $(\psi(\max\{d(f_m\ a),\ d(g_m\ b)\}))$ is a nonnegative decreasing sequence and hence possesses a limit $\gamma \geq 0$. Following the same strategy used in the proof of Theorem 2.1, one can show that $\gamma = 0$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \max\{d(f_n\ a),d(g_n\ b)\} = 0$.

Analogously, it can be proved that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \max\{d(f_n, c), d(g_n, e)\} = 0$.

Now, we have

$$d(a,c) \le d(a,f_n) + d(f_n,c) \le \max\{d(f_n,a),d(g_n,b)\} + \max\{d(f_n,c),d(g_n,e)\}$$

and

$$d(b, e) \le d(b, g_n) + d(g_n, e) \le \max\{d(f_n, a), d(g_n, b)\} + \max\{d(f_n, c), d(g_n, e)\}.$$

Then, we have

$$\max\{d(a,c),d(b,e)\} \leq \max\{d(f_n,a),d(g_n,b)\} + \max\{d(f_n,c),d(g_n,e)\}.$$

Letting $n \to \infty$ in the above inequality, we get

$$\max\{d(a,c),d(b,e)\}=0,$$

which implies that d(a, c) = d(b, e) = 0. Then, (a, b) = (c, e). \Box

Theorem 2.3 Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1, suppose that x_0 and y_0 are comparable, then the coupled fixed point $(a, b) \in X \times X$ satisfies a = b.

Proof. Assume that $x_0 \le y_0$ (the same strategy can be used if $y_0 \le x_0$). Using the mixed monotone property of A, it is easy to show that $x_n \le y_n$ for all $n \ge 0$.

Now, using the contractive condition, as $x_n \le y_n$, we have

$$\psi(d(\gamma_{n+1}, x_{n+1})) = \psi(d(A(\gamma_n, x_n), A(x_n, \gamma_n)))$$

$$\leq \varphi(\psi(d(x_n, \gamma_n))\psi(d(x_n, \gamma_n))$$

$$\leq \psi(d(x_n, \gamma_n)).$$
(16)

Thus $\lim_{n\to\infty} \psi(d(x_n, y_n)) = \theta$ for certain $\theta \ge 0$. Since $\phi \in \Phi$, we have $\limsup_{r\to\theta^+} \varphi(r) < 1$ and $\varphi(\theta) < 1$. Then, there exist $\alpha \in [0,1)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\varphi(r) < \alpha$ for all $r \in [\theta, \theta + \varepsilon)$.

Now, we take $n_0 \ge 0$ such that $\theta \le \psi(d(x_n, y_n)) \le \theta + \varepsilon$ for all $n \ge n_0$. Then, from (16), for all $n \ge n_0$, we have

$$\psi(d(\gamma_{n+1},x_{n+1})) \leq \alpha \psi(d(x_n,\gamma_n)).$$

Letting $n \to \infty$ in the above inequality, we obtain that

$$\theta < \alpha \theta$$
.

Since $\alpha \in [0,1)$, this implies that $\theta = 0$. Thus, we proved that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\psi(d(x_n,\gamma_n))=0,$$

which implies that $\lim_{n\to\infty} d(x_n, y_n) = 0$. Now, we have

$$0 = \lim_{n \to \infty} d(x_n, \gamma_n) = d(\lim_{n \to \infty} x_n, \lim_{n \to \infty} \gamma_n) = d(a, b)$$

and thus a = b. This finishes the proof. \Box

Now, we present some consequences of our theorems.

Corollary 2.1 Let (X, d, \leq) be a sequentially ≤ 1 -complete metric space and $A: X \times X \to X$ be a map having the mixed monotone property on X. Suppose that there exist $\psi \in \Psi$ and $\tilde{\varphi}: [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ with $\lim \inf_{s \to t^+} (\tilde{\varphi}(s)/\psi(s)) > 0$ for all $t \geq 0$ such that for any $(x, y), (u, v) \in X \times X$ with $(u, v) \leq (x, y)$,

$$\psi(d(A(x,y),A(u,v))) \leq \psi(\max\{d(x,u),d(y,v)\}) - \tilde{\varphi}(\psi(\max\{d(x,u),d(y,v)\})).$$

Suppose also that either A is continuous or (X, d, \leq) has the following properties:

- (i) any \leq -nondecreasing sequence (x_n) with $x_n \to x$ implies $x_n \leq x$ for each n,
- (ii) any \leq -nonincreasing sequence (y_n) with $y_n \to y$ implies $y_n \geq y$ for each n.

If there exist x_0 , $y_0 \in X$ such that $x_0 \le A$ (x_0 , y_0) and $y_0 \ge A$ (y_0 , x_0), then there exist a, $b \in X$ such that a = A(a, b) and b = A(b, a).

Proof. It follows immediately from Theorem 2.1 by considering $\varphi(s) = 1 - \tilde{\varphi}(s)/\psi(s)$.

Remark 2.2 Corollary 2.1 is an extension of Harjani et al. [[15], Theorems 2 and 3]. **Corollary 2.2** Let (X, d, \leq) be a sequentially ≤ 1 -complete metric space and $A: X \times X \to X$ be a map having the mixed monotone property on X. Suppose that there exists a nondecreasing function $\phi: [0, \infty) \to [0, 1)$ such that for any (x, y), $(u, v) \in X \times X$ with $(u, v) \leq (x, y)$,

$$d(A(x, y), A(u, v)) \le \varphi(2 \max\{d(x, u), d(y, v)\}) \max\{d(x, u), d(y, v)\}.$$

Suppose also that either A is continuous or (X, d, \leq) has the following properties:

- (i) any \leq -nondecreasing sequence (x_n) with $x_n \to x$ implies $x_n \leq x$ for each n,
- (ii) any \leq -nonincreasing sequence (y_n) with $y_n \to y$ implies $y_n \geq y$ for each n.

If there exist x_0 , $y_0 \in X$ such that $x_0 \le A(x_0, y_0)$ and $y_0 \ge A(y_0, x_0)$, then there exist a, $b \in X$ such that a = A(a, b) and b = A(b, a).

Proof. It follows from Theorem 2.1 by considering $\psi(s) = 2s \square$

Remark 2.3 If ϕ is nondecreasing, Corollary 2.2 generalizes Du [[13], Theorems 1.5 and 1.6].

Corollary 2.3 Let (X, d, \leq) be a sequentially ≤ 1 -complete metric space and $A: X \times X \to X$ be a map having the mixed monotone property on X. Suppose that there exists $k \in [0, 1)$ such that for any $(x, y), (u, v) \in X \times X$ with $(u, v) \leq (x, y)$,

$$d(A(x, y), A(u, v)) \le k \max\{d(x, u), d(y, v)\}.$$

Suppose also that either A is continuous or (X, d, \leq) has the following properties:

- (i) any \leq -nondecreasing sequence (x_n) with $x_n \to x$ implies $x_n \leq x$ for each n,
- (ii) any \leq -nonincreasing sequence (y_n) with $y_n \to y$ implies $y_n \geq y$ for each n.

If there exist x_0 , $y_0 \in X$ such that $x_0 \le A(x_0, y_0)$ and $y_0 \ge A(y_0, x_0)$, then there exist a, $b \in X$ such that a = A(a, b) and b = A(b, a).

Proof. It follows immediately from Corollary 2.2 by considering $\phi(s) = k$

Remark 2.4 Corollary 2.3 is a generalization of Bhaskar and Lakshmikantham [[11], Theorems 2.1 and 2.2].

3 An application

In this section, we apply our main results to study the existence and uniqueness of solution to the two-point boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} -\frac{d^2x}{dt^2}(t) = f(t, x(t), x(t)), & t \in [0, 1] \\ x(0) = x(1) = 0, \end{cases}$$
 (17)

where $f: [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function.

Previously we considered the space $X = C(I, \mathbb{R})(I = [0, 1])$ of continuous functions defined on I. Obviously, this space with the metric given by

$$d(x, y) = \max\{|x(t) - y(t)| : t \in I\} \quad \text{for } x, y \in I$$

is a complete metric space. The space X can also be equipped with a partial order given by

$$x, y \in I$$
, $x \leq y \Leftrightarrow x(t) \leq y(t)$ for all $t \in I$.

Obviously, (X, \leq) satisfies condition (H) since for $x, y \in X$ the functions $\max\{x, y\}$ and $\min\{x, y\}$ are least upper and greatest lower bounds of x and y, respectively. Moreover, in [21] it is proved that (X, d, \leq) satisfies conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 2.1.

Now, we consider the following assumptions:

- (a) $f: [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous.
- (b) For all $t \in I$, $z \ge h$, $w \le r$,

$$0 \le f(t, z, w) - f(t, h, r) \le 4[\ln(z - h + 1) + \ln(r - w + 1)].$$

(c) There exists $(\alpha, \beta) \in C^2(I, \mathbb{R}) \times C^2(I, \mathbb{R})$ solution to

$$\begin{cases}
-\frac{d^{2}\alpha}{dt^{2}}(t) \leq f(t,\alpha(t),\beta(t)), & t \in [0,1] \\
-\frac{d^{2}\beta}{dt^{2}}(t) \geq f(t,\beta(t),\alpha(t)), & t \in [0,1] \\
\alpha(0) = \alpha(1) = \beta(0) = \beta(1) = 0.
\end{cases}$$
(18)

(d) $\alpha \leq \beta$ or $\beta \leq \alpha$.

Theorem 3.1 Under the assumptions (a)-(d), problem (17) has one and only one solution $x^* \in C^2(I, \mathbb{R})$.

Proof. It is well known that the solution (in $C^2(I, \mathbb{R})$) of problem (17) is equivalent to the solution (in $C(I, \mathbb{R})$) of the following Hammerstein integral equation:

$$x(t) = \int_{0}^{1} G(t,s)f(x(s)) ds, \quad t \in I,$$

where G(t, s) is the Green function of differential operator $-d^2/dt^2$ with Dirichlet boundary condition x(0) = x(1) = 0, i.e.,

$$G(t,s) = \begin{cases} s(1-t), & 0 \le s \le t \le 1, \\ t(1-s), & 0 \le t \le s \le 1. \end{cases}$$

Define $A: X \times X \to X$ by

$$A(x,\gamma)(t) = \int_0^1 G(t,s)f(s,x(s),\gamma(s)) ds, \quad t \in I,$$

for all $x, y \in X$.

From (b), it is clear that A has the mixed monotone property with respect to the partial order \leq in X.

Let x, y, u, $v \in X$ such that $x \ge u$ and $y \le v$. From (b), we have

$$d(A(x, y), A(u, v)) = \sup_{t \in I} |A(x, y)(t) - A(u, v)(t)|$$

$$= \sup_{t \in I} \int_{0}^{1} G(t, s) [f(s, x(s), y(s)) - f(s, u(s), v(s))] ds$$

$$\leq \sup_{t \in I} \int_{0}^{1} 4G(t, s) [\ln(x(s) - u(s) + 1) + \ln(v(s) - y(s) + 1)] ds$$

$$\leq (\ln(d(x, u) + 1) + \ln(d(y, v) + 1)) \sup_{t \in I} \int_{0}^{1} 4G(t, s) ds$$

$$\leq \left(\sup_{t \in I} \int_{0}^{1} 8G(t, s) ds\right) \ln(\max\{d(x, u), d(y, v)\} + 1)$$

On the other hand, for all $t \in I$, we have

$$\int_{0}^{1} G(t,s) \ ds = \frac{1}{2}t(1-t),$$

which implies that

$$\sup_{t \in I} \int_{0}^{1} G(t, s) \ ds = \frac{1}{8}.$$

Then, we get

$$d(A(x, y), A(u, v)) < \ln(\max\{d(x, u), d(y, v)\} + 1).$$

This implies that

$$\ln \left(d(A(x, y), A(u, v)) + 1 \right) \le \ln \left(\ln \left(\max\{d(x, u), d(y, v)\} + 1 \right) + 1 \right)$$

$$= \frac{\ln \left(\ln \left(\max\{d(x, u), d(y, v)\} + 1 \right) + 1 \right)}{\ln \left(\max\{d(x, u), d(y, v)\} + 1 \right)} \ln \left(\max\{d(x, u), d(y, v)\} + 1 \right).$$

Thus, the contractive condition (1) of Theorem (2.1) is satisfied with $\psi(t) = \ln(t+1)$ and $\phi(t) = \psi(t)/t$.

Now, let $(\alpha, \beta) \in C^2(I, \mathbb{R}) \times C^2(I, \mathbb{R})$ be a solution to (18). We will show that $\alpha \leq A(\alpha, \beta)$ and $\beta \geq A(\beta, \alpha)$. Indeed,

$$-\alpha''(s) \le f(s, \alpha(s), \beta(s)), \quad s \in [0, 1].$$

Multiplying by G(t, s), we get

$$\int_{0}^{1} -\alpha''(s)G(t,s) ds \leq A(\alpha,\beta)(t), \quad t \in [0,1].$$

Then, for all $t \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$-(1-t)\int_{0}^{1}s\alpha''(s)\ ds\ -t\int_{t}^{1}(1-s)\alpha''(s)\ ds\ \leq A(\alpha,\beta)(t).$$

Using an integration by parts, and since $\alpha(0) = \alpha(1) = 0$, for all $t \in [0, 1]$, we get

$$-(1-t)(t\alpha'(t)-\alpha(t))-t(-(1-t)\alpha'(t)-\alpha(t))\leq A(\alpha,\beta)(t).$$

Thus, we have

$$\alpha(t) \leq A(\alpha, \beta)(t), \quad t \in [0, 1].$$

This implies that $\alpha \leq A(\alpha, \beta)$. Similarly, one can show that $\beta \geq A(\beta, \alpha)$.

Now, applying our Theorems 2.1 and 2.2, we deduce the existence of a unique $(x, y) \in X^2$ solution to x = A(x, y) and y = A(y, x). Moreover, from (d), and using Theorem 2.3, we get x = y. Thus, we proved that $x^* = x = y \in C^2([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$ is the unique solution to (17). \square

Acknowledgements

L. Ćirić and B. Damjanović were supported by Grant No. 174025 of the Ministry of Science, Technology and Development, Republic of Serbia.

M. Jleli extends his appreciation to the Deanship of Scientific Research at King Saud University for funding the work through the research group project No RGP-VPP-087.

Author details

¹Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, University in Belgrade, Kraljice Marije 16, 11 000 Belgrade, Serbia ²Faculty of Agriculture, University in Belgrade, Nemanjina 6, Belgrade, Serbia ³Department of Mathematics, King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

Authors' contributions

All authors contributed equally and significantly in writing this article. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Received: 27 October 2011 Accepted: 26 March 2012 Published: 26 March 2012

References

- 1. Nadler, SB Jr: Multi-valued contraction mappings. Pacific J Math. 30, 475–488 (1969)
- 2. Reich, S: Fixed points of contractive functions. Boll Un Mat Ital. 5, 26-42 (1972)
- Mizoguchi, N, Takahashi, W: Fixed point theorems for multivalued mappings on complete metric spaces. J Math Anal Appl. 141, 177–188 (1989)
- Reich, S: Some problems and results in fixed point theory, in Topological Methods in Nonlinear Functional Analysis (Toronto, Ont., 1982). In Contemp Math, vol. 21, pp. 179–187. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, USA (1983)
- Suzuki, T: Mizoguchi-Takahashi's fixed point theorem is a real generalization of Nadler's. J Math Anal Appl. 340(1):752–755 (2008)
- Amini-Harandi, A, O'Regan, D: Fixed point theorems for set-valued contraction type maps in metric spaces. Fixed Point Theory Appl 2010, 7 (2010). Article ID 390183
- Agarwal, RP, El-Gebeily, MA, O'Regan, D: Generalized contractions in partially ordered metric spaces. Appl Anal. 87(1):109–116 (2008)
- Altun, I, Simsek, H: Some fixed point theorems on ordered metric spaces and application. Fixed Point Theory Appl 2010, 17 (2010). Article ID 621492
- Beg, I, Butt, AR: Fixed point for set-valued mappings satisfying an implicit relation in partially ordered metric spaces. Nonlinear Anal. 71, 3699–3704 (2009)
- Berinde, V, Borcut, M: Tripled fixed point theorems for contractive type mappings in partially ordered metric spaces. Nonlinear Anal. 74, 4889–4897 (2011)
- Bhaskar, TG, Lakshmikantham, V: Fixed point theorems in partially ordered metric spaces and applications. Nonlinear Anal. 65(7):1379–1393 (2006)
- Ćirić, LjB, Cakić, N, Rajović, M, Ume, JS: Monotone generalized nonlinear contractions in partially ordered metric spaces. Fixed Point Theory Appl 2008, 11 (2008). Article ID 131294
- Du, W-S: Coupled fixed point theorems for nonlinear contractions satisfied Mizoguchi-Takahashi's condition in quasiordered metric spaces. Fixed Point Theory Appl 2010, 9 (2010). Article ID 876372

- Gordji, ME, Ramezani, M: A generalization of Mizoguchi and Takahashi's theorem for single-valued mappings in partially ordered metric spaces. Nonlinear Anal. 74, 4544–4549 (2011)
- Harjani, J, López, B, Sadarangani, K: Fixed point theorems for mixed monotone operators and applications to integral equations. Nonlinear Anal. 74, 1749–1760 (2011)
- Harjani, J, Sadarangani, K: Generalized contractions in partially ordered metric spaces and applications to ordinary differential equations. Nonlinear Anal. 72(3-4):1188–1197 (2010)
- 17. Jachymski, J: Equivalent conditions for generalized contractions on (ordered) metric spaces. Nonlinear Anal. **74**, 768–774 (2011)
- Lakshmikantham, V, Ćirić, LjB: Coupled fixed point theorems for nonlinear contractions in partially ordered metric spaces. Nonlinear Anal. 70, 4341–4349 (2009)
- Luong, NV, Thuan, NX: Coupled fixed points in partially ordered metric spaces and application. Nonlinear Anal. 74, 983–992 (2011)
- 20. Nashine, HK, Samet, B, Kim, JK: Fixed point results for contractions involving generalized altering distances in ordered metric spaces. Fixed Point Theory Appl. 2011, 5 (2011)
- 21. Nieto, JJ, López, RR: Contractive mapping theorems in partially ordered sets and applications to ordinary differential equations. Order. 22, 223–239 (2005)
- 22. O'Regan, D, Petrusel, A: Fixed point theorems for generalized contractions in ordered metric spaces. J Math Anal Appl. 341. 1241–1252 (2008)
- 23. Ran, ACM, Reurings, MCB: A fixed point theorem in partially ordered sets and some application to matrix equations.

 Proc Am Math Soc. 132, 1435–1443 (2004)
- Samet, B: Coupled fixed point theorems for a generalized Meir-Keeler contraction in partially ordered metric spaces. Nonlinear Anal. 72, 4508–4517 (2010)
- 25. Samet, B, Vetro, C: Coupled fixed point theorems for multi-valued nonlinear contraction mappings in partially ordered metric spaces. Nonlinear Anal. 74, 4260–4268 (2011)
- Samet, B, Vetro, C, Vetro, P: Fixed point theorems for α ψ-contractive type mappings. Nonlinear Anal. 75, 2154–2165 (2012)
- Turinici, M: Abstract comparison principles and multivariable Gronwall-Bellman inequalities. J Math Anal Appl. 117, 100–127 (1986)

doi:10.1186/1687-1812-2012-51

Cite this article as: Cirić et al.: Coupled fixed point theorems for generalized Mizoguchi-Takahashi contractions with applications. Fixed Point Theory and Applications 2012 2012:51.

Submit your manuscript to a SpringerOpen journal and benefit from:

- ► Convenient online submission
- ► Rigorous peer review
- ► Immediate publication on acceptance
- ► Open access: articles freely available online
- ► High visibility within the field
- ► Retaining the copyright to your article

Submit your next manuscript at ▶ springeropen.com