

BANACH AND SUZUKI-TYPE FIXED POINT THEOREMS IN GENERALIZED n -METRIC SPACES WITH AN APPLICATION

KAMRAN ALAM KHAN

ABSTRACT. Mustafa and Sims [12] introduced the notion of G -metric as a possible generalization of usual notion of a metric space. The author generalized the notion of G -metric to more than three variables and introduced the concept of Generalized n -metric spaces [10]. In this paper, We prove Banach fixed point theorem and a Suzuki-type fixed point theorem in Generalized n -metric spaces. We also discuss applications to certain functional equations arising in dynamic programming.

1. INTRODUCTION

There are many ways to generalize the notion of a metric space. 2-metric space ([6], [7]), D -metric space [5] and G -metric space [12] are the most familiar generalizations. The author generalized the notion of G -metric to more than three variables and introduced the concept of K -metric [9] and the generalized n -metric [10]. In this paper, we prove the Banach fixed point theorem and the Suzuki-type fixed point theorem in the framework of generalized n -metric space. We also discuss applications to certain functional equations arising in dynamic programming.

Definition 1.1. [10] Let X be a non-empty set, and \mathbb{R}^+ denote the set of non-negative real numbers. Let $G_n: X^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, ($n \geq 3$) be a function satisfying the following properties:

- [G 1] $G_n(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = 0$ if $x_1 = x_2 = \dots = x_n$,
- [G 2] $G_n(x_1, x_1, \dots, x_1, x_2) > 0$ for all $x_1, x_2 \in X$ with $x_1 \neq x_2$,
- [G 3] $G_n(x_1, x_1, \dots, x_1, x_2) \leq G_n(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ for all $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \in X$ with the condition that any two of the points x_2, \dots, x_n are distinct,
- [G 4] $G_n(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = G_n(x_{\pi(1)}, x_{\pi(2)}, \dots, x_{\pi(n)})$, for all $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \in X$ and every permutation π of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$,
- [G 5] $G_n(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \leq G_n(x_1, x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{n+1}) + G_n(x_{n+1}, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ for all $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, x_{n+1} \in X$.

Then the function G_n is called a *Generalized n -metric* on X , and the pair (X, G_n) a *Generalized n -metric space*.

From now on we always have $n \geq 3$ for (X, G_n) to be a generalized n -metric space.

Example 1.2. Define a function $\rho: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, ($n \geq 3$) by

$$\rho(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \max\{|x_r - x_s| : r, s \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}, r \neq s\}$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47H10; 54H25; 54E50; 90C39.

Key words and phrases. G -metric space, Generalized n -metric space, Banach fixed point theorem, Suzuki-type fixed point theorem, Functional equations, Dynamic programming.

for all $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \in X$. Then (\mathbb{R}, ρ) is a generalized n -metric space.

Example 1.3. For any metric space (X, d) , the following functions define generalized n -metrics on X :

- (1) $K_1^d(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \sum_r \sum_s d(x_r, x_s)$,
- (2) $K_2^d(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \max\{d(x_r, x_s) : r, s \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}, r \neq s\}$.

Definition 1.4. [10] A G_n -metric space (X, G_n) is called symmetric if

$$G_n(x, y, y, \dots, y) = G_n(x, x, x, \dots, x) \quad (1.1)$$

Proposition 1.5. [10] Let $G_n: X^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+, (n \geq 3)$ be a generalized n -metric defined on X , then for $x, y \in X$ we have

$$G_n(x, y, y, \dots, y) \leq (n-1)G_n(y, x, x, \dots, x) \quad (1.2)$$

Definition 1.6. [10] Let (X, G_n) be a generalized n -metric space, then for $x_0 \in X, r > 0$, the G_n -ball with centre x_0 and radius r is

$$B_G(x_0, r) = \{y \in X : G_n(x_0, y, y, \dots, y) < r\}$$

Proposition 1.7. [10] Let (X, G_n) be a generalized n -metric space, then the G_n -ball is open in X .

Hence the collection of all such balls in X is closed under arbitrary union and finite intersection and therefore induces a topology on X called the generalized n -metric topology $\mathfrak{S}(G_n)$ generated by the generalized n -metric on X .

From example 1.3 it is clear that for a given metric we can always define generalized n -metrics. The converse is also true for if G_n is a generalized n -metric then we can define a metric d_G as follows-

$$d_G(x, y) = G_n(x, y, y, \dots, y) + G_n(x, x, \dots, x, y) \quad (1.3)$$

Proposition 1.8. [10] Let $B_{d_G}(x, r)$ denote the open ball in the metric space (X, d_G) and $B_G(x, r)$ the G_n -ball in the corresponding generalized n -metric space (X, G_n) . Then we have

$$B_G(x, \frac{r}{n}) \subseteq B_{d_G}(x, r)$$

This indicates that the topology induced by the generalized n -metric on X coincides with the metric topology induced by the metric d_G . Thus every generalized n -metric space is topologically equivalent to a metric space.

Definition 1.9. [10] Let (X, G_n) be a generalized n -metric space. A sequence $\langle x_m \rangle$ in X is said to be G_n -convergent if it converges to a point x in the generalized n -metric topology $\mathfrak{S}(G_n)$ generated by the G_n -metric on X .

Proposition 1.10. [10] Let $G_r: X^r \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+, (r \geq 3)$ be a generalized r -metric defined on X . Then for a sequence $\langle x_n \rangle$ in X and $x \in X$ the following are equivalent:

- (1) The sequence $\langle x_n \rangle$ is G_r -convergent to x .
- (2) $d_G(x_n, x) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
- (3) $G_r(x_n, x_n, \dots, x_n, x) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
- (4) $G_r(x_n, x, \dots, x) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Definition 1.11. [10] Let (X, G_n^X) and (Y, G_n^Y) be generalized n -metric spaces. A function $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is said to be *Generalized n -continuous* or G_n -Continuous at a point $x \in X$ if $f^{-1}(B_{G_n^Y}(f(x), r)) \in \mathfrak{S}(G_n^X)$, for all $r > 0$. The function f is said to be *generalized n -continuous* if it is *generalized n -continuous* at all points of X .

Since every generalized n -metric space is topologically equivalent to a metric space, hence we have the following result:

Proposition 1.12. [10] Let (X, G_n^X) and (Y, G_n^Y) be generalized n -metric spaces. A function $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is said to be *generalized n -continuous* or G_n -Continuous at a point $x \in X$ if and only if it is *generalized n -sequentially continuous* at x ; that is, whenever the sequence $\langle x_m \rangle$ is G_n^X -convergent to x , the sequence $\langle f(x_m) \rangle$ is G_n^Y -convergent to $f(x)$.

Proposition 1.13. [10] Let (X, G_n) be a generalized n -metric space, then the function $G_n(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ is jointly continuous in the variables x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n .

Definition 1.14. [10] Let (X, G_m) be a generalized m -metric space. A sequence $\langle x_n \rangle$ in X is said to be G_m -Cauchy if for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$G_m(x_{n_1}, x_{n_2}, \dots, x_{n_m}) < \epsilon \text{ for all } n_1, n_2, \dots, n_m \geq N$$

Proposition 1.15. [10] Let (X, G_m) be a generalized m -metric space. A sequence $\langle x_n \rangle$ in X is G_m -Cauchy if and only if for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$G_m(x_{n_1}, x_{n_2}, \dots, x_{n_2}) < \epsilon \text{ for all } n_1, n_2 \geq N \quad (1.4)$$

Proposition 1.16. [10] Every G_n -convergent sequence in a generalized n -metric space is G_n -Cauchy.

Definition 1.17. [10] A generalized n -metric space (X, G_n) is said to be G_n -complete if every G_n -Cauchy sequence in (X, G_n) is G_n -convergent in (X, G_n) .

Definition 1.18. Let (X, d) be a metric space. A mapping $T: X \rightarrow X$ is called a *contraction* if there exists $r \in [0, 1)$ such that $d(Tx, Ty) \leq rd(x, y)$, for all $x, y \in X$.

Theorem 1.19. [1] (Banach Contraction Principle) If (X, d) is a complete metric space, then every contraction T on X has a unique fixed point.

Many fixed point theorems have been proved as generalizations of Banach fixed point theorem. The following remarkable generalization is due to Suzuki [15].

Theorem 1.20. (Suzuki [15]) Let (X, d) be a complete metric space and let T be a mapping on X . Define a nonincreasing function $\theta: [0, 1) \rightarrow (1/2, 1]$ by

$$\theta(r) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } 0 \leq r \leq (\sqrt{5} - 1)/2, \\ (1 - r)r^{-2} & \text{if } (\sqrt{5} - 1)/2 \leq r \leq 2^{-1/2}, \\ (1 + r)^{-1} & \text{if } 2^{-1/2} \leq r < 1. \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

Assume that there exists $r \in [0, 1)$ such that $\theta(r)d(x, Tx) \leq d(x, y)$ implies $d(Tx, Ty) \leq rd(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in X$. Then there exists a unique fixed point z of T . Moreover $\lim_n T^n x = z$ for all $x \in X$.

2. MAIN RESULTS

First we prove the Banach fixed point theorem in the framework of generalized n -metric space.

Theorem 2.1. Let (X, G_r) be a complete generalized r -metric space and let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a mapping satisfying the following condition for all $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_r \in X$

$$G_r(Tx_1, Tx_2, \dots, Tx_r) \leq kG_r(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_r) \quad (2.1)$$

where $k \in [0, 1)$. Then T has a unique fixed point.

Proof. Let y_0 be an arbitrary point in X . Consider a sequence $\langle y_n \rangle$ in X such that $y_n = T^n y_0$.

using the condition 2.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_r(Ty_{n-1}, Ty_n, \dots, Ty_n) &\leq kG_r(y_{n-1}, y_n, \dots, y_n) \\ \text{or } G_r(y_n, y_{n+1}, \dots, y_{n+1}) &\leq kG_r(y_{n-1}, y_n, \dots, y_n) \end{aligned}$$

By the repeated application of condition 2.1, we have

$$G_r(y_n, y_{n+1}, \dots, y_{n+1}) \leq k^n G_r(y_0, y_1, \dots, y_1)$$

Now we claim that the sequence $\langle y_n \rangle$ in X is G_r -Cauchy sequence in X . For all natural numbers n and $m (> n)$ we have from [G 5]

$$\begin{aligned} G_r(y_n, y_m, \dots, y_m) &\leq G_r(y_n, y_{n+1}, \dots, y_{n+1}) + G_r(y_{n+1}, y_{n+2}, \dots, y_{n+2}) + \dots \\ &\quad \dots + G_r(y_{m-1}, y_m, \dots, y_m) \\ &\leq (k^n + k^{n+1} + \dots + k^{m-1}) G_r(y_0, y_1, \dots, y_1) \\ &\leq (k^n + k^{n+1} + \dots) G_r(y_0, y_1, \dots, y_1) \\ &= \frac{k^n}{1-k} G_r(y_0, y_1, \dots, y_1) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n, m \rightarrow \infty \end{aligned}$$

Hence the sequence $\langle y_n \rangle$ is a G_r -Cauchy sequence in X . By completeness of (X, G_r) , there exists a point $u \in X$ such that $\langle y_n \rangle$ is G_r -convergent to u . Suppose that $Tu \neq u$, then

$$\begin{aligned} G_r(Tu, \dots, Tu, y_n) &= G_r(Tu, \dots, Tu, Ty_{n-1}) \\ &\leq k G_r(u, \dots, u, y_{n-1}) \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_r(Tu, \dots, Tu, u) &\leq kG_r(u, \dots, u, u) = 0 \\ \text{or } G_r(Tu, \dots, Tu, u) &\leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

But from [G 2] $G_r(Tu, \dots, Tu, u) > 0$. Thus we get a contradiction. Hence we have $u = Tu$. For uniqueness of u , suppose that $v \neq u$ is such that $Tv = v$. Then we have

$$G_r(u, v, \dots, v) = G_r(Tu, Tv, \dots, Tv) \leq kG_r(u, v, \dots, v) < G_r(u, v, \dots, v)$$

Since $k \in [0, 1)$. Thus we get a contradiction, hence we have $u = v$. □

The theorem 1.20 initiated a lot of research work in the form of various variations, refinements and generalizations. We shall now prove a similar theorem in generalized n -metric spaces.

Theorem 2.2. Let (X, G_n) be a complete G_n -metric space and let T be a mapping on X . Define a strictly decreasing function θ from $[0, 1)$ onto $(1/2, 1]$ by $\theta(r) = \frac{1}{1+r}$. Assume that there exists $r \in [0, 1)$ such that for every $u, v \in X$, the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \theta(r)G_n(u, Tu, \dots, Tu) \leq G_n(u, v, \dots, v) \\ \text{implies} \quad & G_n(Tu, Tv, \dots, Tv) \leq rG_n(u, v, \dots, v) \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

Then there exists a unique fixed point y of T , i.e. $Ty = y$. Moreover T is G_n -Continuous at y .

Proof. Let us first assume that (X, G_n) is symmetric, i.e. condition (equation) 1.1 holds. Then from relation 1.3 we have

$$d_G(x, y) = 2G_n(x, y, \dots, y) \quad (2.3)$$

condition 2.2 gives

$$\theta(r)d_G(x, Tx) \leq d_G(x, y) \text{ implies } d_G(Tx, Ty) \leq rd_G(x, y) \quad (2.4)$$

Then the metric space (X, d_G) satisfies the conditions of Theorem 1.20 with $\theta(r) = \frac{1}{1+r}$ the required decreasing function. Therefore from Theorem 1.20, T has a unique fixed point.

Now suppose that (X, G_n) is not symmetric. Since $\theta(r) \leq 1$, We have $\theta(r)G_n(x, Tx, \dots, Tx) \leq G_n(x, Tx, \dots, Tx)$ for all $x \in X$. Hence by condition 2.2 of the theorem, this implies that for all $x \in X$, we have

$$G_n(Tx, T^2x, \dots, T^2x) \leq rG_n(x, Tx, \dots, Tx) \quad (2.5)$$

Let $y_0 \in X$. Define a sequence $\langle y_m \rangle$ in X such that $y_n = T^m x_0$. Then We have

$$\begin{aligned} G_n(y_m, y_{m+1}, \dots, y_{m+1}) &= G_n(T^m y_0, T^{m+1} y_0, \dots, T^{m+1} y_0) \\ &\leq rG_n(T^{m-1} y_0, T^m y_0, \dots, T^m y_0) \\ &\vdots \\ &\leq r^m G_n(y_0, Ty_0, \dots, Ty_0) \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

Following the proof of Theorem 2.1, we can show that the sequence $\langle y_m \rangle$ in X is G_n -Cauchy in X . By completeness of (X, G_n) , there exists a point $y \in X$ such that $\langle y_m \rangle$ is G_n -convergent to y . Thus there exists a natural number k and $h > 1$ such that for all $m \geq k$, $x(\neq y) \in X$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_n(y_m, y, y, \dots, y) &\leq \frac{1}{h} G_n(x, y, \dots, y) \\ \text{and } G_n(y_m, y_m, \dots, y_m, y) &\leq \frac{1}{h} G_n(x, y, \dots, y) \end{aligned}$$

Then We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta(r)G_n(y_m, Ty_m, \dots, Ty_m) &\leq \frac{1}{h}G_n(y_m, Ty_m, \dots, Ty_m) \\
&= G_n(y_m, y_{m+1}, \dots, y_{m+1}) \\
&\leq G_n(y_m, y, \dots, y) + G_n(y, y_{m+1}, \dots, y_{m+1}) \\
&\leq G_n(y_m, y, \dots, y) + (n-1)G_n(y_{m+1}, \dots, y_{m+1}, y) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{h}G_n(x, y, \dots, y) + \frac{(n-1)}{h}G_n(x, y, \dots, y) \\
&= \frac{n}{h}G_n(x, y, \dots, y) \\
&= \frac{n}{h-1} \left[G_n(x, y, \dots, y) - \frac{1}{h}G_n(x, y, \dots, y) \right] \\
&\leq \frac{n}{h-1} \left[G_n(x, y, \dots, y) - G_n(y_m, y, \dots, y) \right] \\
&\leq \frac{n}{h-1}G_n(x, y_m, \dots, y_m) \\
&\leq \frac{n}{h-1}(n-1)G_n(y_m, x, \dots, x) \quad \text{by proposition 1.5}
\end{aligned}$$

If we choose $h > n^2 - n + 1$, then we have

$$\theta(r)G_n(y_m, Ty_m, \dots, Ty_m) < G_n(y_m, x, \dots, x)$$

Hence by hypothesis (relation 2.2), We have

$$\begin{aligned}
G_n(Ty_m, Tx, \dots, Tx) &\leq rG_n(y_m, x, \dots, x) \\
\text{or } G_n(y_{m+1}, Tx, \dots, Tx) &\leq rG_n(y_m, x, \dots, x) \text{ for all } m \geq k
\end{aligned}$$

Making $m \rightarrow \infty$, We have

$$G_n(y, Tx, \dots, Tx) \leq rG_n(y, x, \dots, x) \text{ for all } x \in X \text{ with } x \neq y$$

We now prove that y is a fixed point of T .

On the contrary, suppose that $Ty \neq y$. We claim that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{either } \theta(r)G_n(x, Tx, \dots, Tx) \leq G_n(x, z, \dots, z) \\
&\text{or } \theta(r)G_n(Tx, T^2x, \dots, T^2x) \leq G_n(Tx, z, \dots, z) \text{ for every } x, z \in X.
\end{aligned}$$

or in light of inequality 1.2 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{either } \theta(r)G_n(x, Tx, \dots, Tx) \leq G_n(x, z, \dots, z) \\
&\text{or } \theta(r)G_n(Tx, T^2x, \dots, T^2x) \leq (n-1)G_n(z, Tx, \dots, Tx) \text{ for every } x, z \in X.
\end{aligned}$$

i.e., either $\theta(r)G_n(x, Tx, \dots, Tx) \leq G_n(x, z, \dots, z)$

$$\text{or } \frac{1}{n-1}\theta(r)G_n(Tx, T^2x, \dots, T^2x) \leq G_n(z, Tx, \dots, Tx) \text{ for every } x, z \in X.$$

For if $\theta(r)G_n(x, Tx, \dots, Tx) > G_n(x, z, \dots, z)$ or $\frac{1}{n-1}\theta(r)G_n(Tx, T^2x, \dots, T^2x) > G_n(z, Tx, \dots, Tx)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 G_n(x, Tx, \dots, Tx) &\leq G_n(x, z, \dots, z) + G_n(z, Tx, \dots, Tx) \\
 &< \theta(r)G_n(x, Tx, \dots, Tx) + \frac{1}{n-1}\theta(r)G_n(Tx, T^2x, \dots, T^2x) \\
 &= \theta(r) \left[G_n(x, Tx, \dots, Tx) + \frac{1}{n-1}G_n(Tx, T^2x, \dots, T^2x) \right] \\
 &\leq \theta(r) \left[G_n(x, Tx, \dots, Tx) + \frac{1}{n-1}rG_n(x, Tx, \dots, Tx) \right] \\
 &= \theta(r)G_n(x, Tx, \dots, Tx) \left[1 + \frac{r}{n-1} \right] \\
 &= \left(\frac{1 + \frac{r}{n-1}}{1+r} \right) G_n(x, Tx, \dots, Tx)
 \end{aligned}$$

Since we have $n \geq 3$, therefore we get $G_n(x, Tx, \dots, Tx) < G_n(x, Tx, \dots, Tx)$, a contradiction. Thus our claim that for $x, z \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\text{either } \theta(r)G_n(x, Tx, \dots, Tx) \leq G_n(x, z, \dots, z) \\
 &\text{or } \theta(r)G_n(Tx, T^2x, \dots, T^2x) \leq G_n(Tx, z, \dots, z) \text{ is true.}
 \end{aligned}$$

This implies that either

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\theta(r)G_n(y_{2m}, Ty_{2m}, \dots, Ty_{2m}) \leq G_n(y_{2m}, y, \dots, y) \\
 &\text{or } \theta(r)G_n(y_{2m+1}, Ty_{2m+1}, \dots, Ty_{2m+1}) \leq G_n(y_{2m+1}, y, \dots, y) \text{ for every } m \in \mathbb{N}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the condition 2.2 of the theorem implies that either

$$\begin{aligned}
 &G_n(y_{2m+1}, Ty, \dots, Ty) \leq rG_n(y_{2m}, y, \dots, y) \\
 &\text{or } G_n(y_{2m+2}, Ty, \dots, Ty) \leq rG_n(y_{2m+1}, y, \dots, y) \text{ holds for every } m \in \mathbb{N}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Now $y_m \rightarrow y$, the above inequalities imply that there exists a subsequence of the sequence $\langle y_m \rangle$ which converges to Ty . Thus we have $Ty = y$ contradicting our initial assumption. Hence $Ty = y$.

For uniqueness of y , suppose that $u \neq y$ is such that $Tu = u$. Then we have $G_n(y, u, \dots, u) > 0$ and $\theta(r)G_n(y, Ty, \dots, Ty) = 0$ satisfying the condition $\theta(r)G_n(y, Ty, \dots, Ty) \leq G_n(y, u, \dots, u)$. By using condition 2.2, we get

$$G_n(y, u, \dots, u) = G_n(Ty, Tu, \dots, Tu) \leq rG_n(y, u, \dots, u) < G_n(y, u, \dots, u)$$

Thus we get a contradiction, hence we have $y = u$. To prove the G_n -continuity (i.e. generalized n -continuity) of T at y , We use the proposition 1.12. Consider any sequence $\langle u_m \rangle$ converging (i.e. G_n -convergent) to $y \in X$. Then we have

$$\theta(r)G_n(y, Ty, \dots, Ty) = 0 \leq G_n(y, u_m, \dots, u_m)$$

Which implies that

$$G_n(Ty, Tu_m, \dots, Tu_m) \leq rG_n(y, u_m, \dots, u_m)$$

i.e., $G_n(y, Tu_m, \dots, Tu_m) \leq rG_n(y, u_m, \dots, u_m)$.

Making $m \rightarrow \infty$, We get

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} G_n(y, Tu_m, \dots, Tu_m) = 0.$$

Hence $Tu_m \rightarrow y$, i.e. the sequence $\langle Tu_m \rangle$ is Generalized n -convergent to $y (= Ty)$. Therefore by proposition 1.12, the mapping T is G_n -Continuous at y . \square

3. APPLICATION TO FUNCTIONAL EQUATIONS

Some functional equations arise in multistage decision processes where the origin of the theory of dynamic programming lies ([2],[3]). The existence and uniqueness of the solutions of these functional equations have been studied by several authors ([4],[8],[11],[13],[14]) using fixed point theorems. In this section, we study the existence of solution of one such functional equation using theorem 2.2.

Suppose that U and V are Banach spaces. Let $S \subset U$ be the state space and $D \subset V$ be the decision space. Let us denote a state vector by x and a decision vector by y . Let $g: S \times D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $M: S \times D \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the bounded functions and $\tau: S \times D \rightarrow S$ be the transformation of decision process.

The return function $f: S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the continuous decision process is defined by the functional equation

$$f(x) = \sup_{y \in D} [g(x, y) + M(x, y, f(\tau(x, y)))], \quad x \in S \tag{3.1}$$

Let $B(S)$ be the set of all real valued bounded functions on S . For $\psi, \phi \in B(S)$, let

$$d(\psi, \phi) = \sup\{|\psi(x) - \phi(x)| : x \in S\}$$

Obviously d is a metric on $B(S)$ and $(B(S), d)$ is a complete metric space. Let us denote $B(S)$ by X . If we define $G_n: X^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ ($n \geq 3$) by

$$G_n(\psi_1, \psi_2, \dots, \psi_n) = \max\{d(\psi_p, \psi_q) : 1 \leq p < q \leq n\}$$

Then (X, G_n) is a G_n -complete generalized n -metric space. Let θ be the function as defined in theorem 2.2 and $T: X \rightarrow X$ be the mapping defined by

$$T(\psi(x)) = \sup_{y \in D} [g(x, y) + M(x, y, \psi(\tau(x, y)))], \quad x \in S, \psi \in X \tag{3.2}$$

Then the existence and uniqueness of the solution of functional equation 3.1 are established by the following result:

Theorem 3.1. Suppose that there exists $r \in [0, 1)$ such that for every $(x, y) \in S \times D$, $\psi, \phi \in X$ and $t \in S$, the inequality

$$\theta(r)G_n(\psi, T\psi, \dots, T\psi) \leq G_n(\psi, \phi, \dots, \phi) \tag{3.3}$$

implies

$$|M(x, y, \psi(t)) - M(x, y, \phi(t))| \leq r|\psi(t) - \phi(t)| \tag{3.4}$$

Then the functional equation 3.1 has a unique bounded solution in X .

Proof. Let λ be an arbitrary positive real number and $\psi, \phi \in X$. For $x \in S$, let us choose $y_1, y_2 \in D$ such that

$$T(\psi(x)) < g(x, y_1) + M(x, y_1, \psi(\tau(x, y_1))) + \lambda \tag{3.5}$$

$$T(\phi(x)) < g(x, y_2) + M(x, y_2, \phi(\tau(x, y_2))) + \lambda \tag{3.6}$$

By the definition of mapping T and equation 3.2, we have

$$T(\psi(x)) < g(x, y_2) + M(x, y_2, \psi(\tau(x, y_2))) \tag{3.7}$$

$$T(\phi(x)) < g(x, y_1) + M(x, y_1, \phi(\tau(x, y_1))) \tag{3.8}$$

If the inequality 3.3 holds, then from inequalities 3.5 and 3.8, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T(\psi(x)) - T(\phi(x)) &< M(x, y_1, \psi(\tau(x, y_1))) - M(x, y_1, \phi(\tau(x, y_1))) + \lambda \\ &\leq |M(x, y_1, \psi(\tau(x, y_1))) - M(x, y_1, \phi(\tau(x, y_1)))| + \lambda \end{aligned}$$

Let $\tau(x, y_1) = x_1 \in S$, then

$$\begin{aligned} T(\psi(x)) - T(\phi(x)) &< |M(x, y_1, \psi(x_1)) - M(x, y_1, \phi(x_1))| + \lambda \\ &\leq r|\psi(x_1) - \phi(x_1)| + \lambda \\ &\leq r G_n(\psi, \phi, \dots, \phi) + \lambda \\ \text{or } T(\psi(x)) - T(\phi(x)) &< r G_n(\psi, \phi, \dots, \phi) + \lambda \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

Similarly from inequalities 3.6 and 3.7, we have

$$T(\phi(x)) - T(\psi(x)) < r G_n(\psi, \phi, \dots, \phi) + \lambda \quad (3.10)$$

Hence from inequalities 3.9 and 3.10, we have

$$|T(\psi(x)) - T(\phi(x))| < r G_n(\psi, \phi, \dots, \phi) + \lambda \quad (3.11)$$

The inequality 3.11 is true for every $x \in S$, hence we have

$$G_n(T\psi, T\phi, \dots, T\phi) \leq r G_n(\psi, \phi, \dots, \phi) + \lambda$$

Since $\lambda > 0$ is arbitrary, hence

$$G_n(T\psi, T\phi, \dots, T\phi) \leq r G_n(\psi, \phi, \dots, \phi)$$

Therefore the inequality

$$\theta(r)G_n(\psi, T\psi, \dots, T\psi) \leq G_n(\psi, \phi, \dots, \phi)$$

implies

$$G_n(T\psi, T\phi, \dots, T\phi) \leq r G_n(\psi, \phi, \dots, \phi)$$

Thus all the conditions of the theorem 2.2 are satisfied and hence the functional equation 3.1 has a unique bounded solution. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Banach, Sur les operations dans les ensembles abstraits et leur application aux equations integrales, *Fund. Math.* 3 (1922) 133-181.
- [2] R. Bellman, *Methods of Non-Linear Analysis*, vol. 2., Academic Press, New York 1973.
- [3] R. Bellman, E. S. Lee, Functional equations arising in dynamic programming, *Aequationes Mathematicae* 17 (1978) 1-18.
- [4] P. C. Bhakta, S. Mitra, Some existence theorems for functional equations arising in dynamic programming, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 98 (1984) 348-362.
- [5] B. C. Dhage, A study of some fixed point theorem, Ph.D. Thesis, Marathwada Univ. Aungabad, 1984.
- [6] S. Gähler, 2-metrische räume und ihre topologische struktur, *Math. Nachr.* 26 (1963), 115-148.
- [7] S. Gähler, Zur geometric 2-metrische räume, *Rev. Roum. Math. Pures et Appl.* 11 (1966) 664-669.
- [8] S. B. Kaliaj, A functional equation arising in dynamic programming, *Aequationes Mathematicae* 91 (2017) 635-645.
- [9] K. A. Khan, On the possibility of N-topological spaces, *International Journal of Mathematical Archive* 3 (2012) 2520-2523.
- [10] K. A. Khan, Generalized n-metric spaces and fixed point theorems, *Journal of Nonlinear and Convex Analysis* 15 (2014) 1221-1229.
- [11] Z. Liu, S. M. Kang, Existence and uniqueness of solutions for two classes of functional equations arising in dynamic programming, *Acta Mathematicae Applicatae Sinica (English Series)* 23 (2007) 195-208.
- [12] Z. Mustafa, B. Sims, A new approach to generalized metric spaces, *Journal of Nonlinear and Convex Analysis* 7 (2006) 289-297.
- [13] N. Saleem, M. Abbas, B. Ali, Z. Raza, Fixed Points of Suzuki-Type Generalized Multivalued (f, θ, L) - Almost contractions with applications, *Filomat* 33(2019) 499-518.

- [14] D. Singh, V. Joshi, M. Imdad and P. Kumam, Fixed point theorems via generalized F-contractions with applications to functional equations occurring in dynamic programming, J. Fixed Point Theory Appl. 19 (2017) 1453-1479.
- [15] T. Suzuki, A generalized Banach contraction principle that characterizes metric completeness, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society, 136 (2008) 1861–1869.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RAM LUBHAI SAHANI GOVT. MAHILA DEGREE COLLEGE,
PILIBHIT (U.P.)-INDIA
Email address: kamran12341@yahoo.com