

## Endpoints of generalized $\phi$ -contractive multivalued mappings of integral type

Babak Mohammadi<sup>1</sup>, Esmail Alizadeh<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> Department of Mathematics, Marand Branch, Islamic Azad University, Marand, Iran

**ABSTRACT.** Recently, some researchers have established some results on existence of endpoints for multivalued mappings. In particular, Mohammadi and Rezapour's [Endpoints of Suzuki type quasi-contractive multifunctions, U.P.B. Sci. Bull., Series A, 2015] used the technique of  $\alpha$ - $\psi$ -contractive mappings, due to Samet et al. (2012), to give some results about endpoints of Suzuki type quasi-contractive multifunctions satisfying property (BS). In this paper, we prove existence and uniqueness of endpoint for multivalued mappings satisfying the weaker conditions generalized  $\phi$ -contractivity of integral type and property (HS). This result generalize and improve Mohammadi and Rezapour's result. Also, we give an example to illustrate the usability of the result.

**Keywords:** endpoint,  $\phi$ -contractions, multivalued mappings, property (HS), integral type.

*2010 Mathematics subject classification:* Primary 46T30; Secondary 46C60.

### 1. INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARIES

Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space,  $2^X$  the set of all nonempty subsets of  $X$  and  $CB(X)$  the set of all nonempty closed bounded subsets of  $X$ .

---

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding author: [bmohammadi@marandiau.ac.ir](mailto:bmohammadi@marandiau.ac.ir)  
Received: 09 January 2016  
Revised: 05 March 2016  
Accepted: 29 July 2018

Assume that  $H$  be the Hausdorff metric on  $CB(X)$  defined by

$$H(A, B) = \max\{\sup_{x \in A} d(x, B), \sup_{y \in B} d(y, A)\},$$

for all  $A, B \in CB(X)$  where  $d(x, B) = \inf_{y \in B} d(x, y)$ . An element  $x \in X$  is said to be an endpoint of  $T$  whenever  $Tx = \{x\}$ . It is said that  $T$  has the approximate endpoint property whenever  $\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Tx} d(x, y) = 0$  (see [1]). In 2010, Amini-Harandi [1] proved that some multifunctions have unique endpoint if and only if have approximate endpoint property. Then, Moradi and Khojasteh [7] generalized Amini-Harandi's result for generalized contractive multivalued mappings. Denote by  $\Psi$  the family of nondecreasing functions  $\psi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  such that  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \psi^n(t) < \infty$  for all  $t > 0$  ([9]). The technique of  $\alpha$ - $\psi$ -contractive mappings introduced by Samet, Vetro and Vetro in 2012 (see [9]). Then, some authors generalized it in different subjects (see, for example, [3, 5, 8]). It is said that a multifunction  $T : X \rightarrow CB(X)$  has the property (BS) whenever for each  $x \in X$  there exists  $y \in Tx$  such that  $H(Tx, Ty) = \sup_{b \in Ty} d(y, b)$ . Recently, Mohammadi and Rezapour [6] used this technique to give some results about endpoints of Suzuki type quasi-contractive multifunctions satisfying property (BS) without using the approximate endpoint property.

**Theorem 1.1.** ([6]) *Let  $(X, d)$  be a complete metric space,  $\psi \in \Psi$ ,  $\alpha : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  a mapping and  $T : X \rightarrow CB(X)$  an  $\alpha$ -admissible such that  $T$  has the property (BS) and  $\alpha(x, y)H(Tx, Ty) \leq \psi(M(x, y))$  for all  $x, y \in X$ , where*

$$M(x, y) = \max\{d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty), \frac{d(x, Ty) + d(y, Tx)}{2}\}.$$

*Suppose that there exist  $x_0 \in X$  and  $x_1 \in Tx_0$  such that  $\alpha(x_0, x_1) \geq 1$ . Let either  $T$  is continuous or  $\psi$  is right upper semi-continuous and for each sequence  $\{x_n\}$  in  $X$  with  $\alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 1$  for all  $n$  and  $x_n \rightarrow x$ , there exists a subsequence  $\{x_{n_k}\}$  of  $\{x_n\}$  such that  $\alpha(x_{n_k}, x) \geq 1$  for all  $k$ . Then  $T$  has an endpoint.*

On the other hand, in 2001, Branciari's [2] generalized the Banach contraction principle to integral type contractive self-mappings by using an Lebesgue integrable mapping  $\varphi : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ , which is summable on each compact subset of  $[0, +\infty)$ , such that  $\int_0^\epsilon \varphi(t)dt > 0$  for any  $\epsilon > 0$ . Throughout this paper, we denote by  $\Phi_1$  the family of all this functions which is bounded on  $[0, +\infty)$ . Denote by  $\Phi_2$  the collection of all continuous nondecreasing functions  $\phi : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  such that  $\phi(t) < t$  for all  $t > 0$ . It is well known that  $\phi(0) = 0$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi^n(t) = 0$  for all  $t > 0$ . Also it is known that for any  $\phi \in \Psi$  we have  $\phi \in \Phi_2$  but the reverse is not true. We say that a multivalued

mapping  $T : X \rightarrow CB(X)$  has the property (HS) whenever for each  $x \in X$  there exists  $y \in Tx$  such that  $H(Tx, Ty) \geq \sup_{b \in Ty} d(y, b)$ . Note that the property (HS) is weaker than the property (BS). Also, we say that  $T$  is a generalized  $\phi$ -contractive multivalued mapping of integral type whenever there exist  $\varphi \in \Phi_1$  and  $\phi \in \Phi_2$  such that

$$\int_0^{H(Tx, Ty)} \varphi(t) dt \leq \phi \left( \int_0^{M(x, y)} \varphi(t) dt \right),$$

for all  $x, y \in X$ , where

$$M(x, y) = \max\{d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty), \frac{1}{2}[d(x, Ty) + d(y, Tx)]\}.$$

In this paper, we prove existence and uniqueness of endpoint for such mappings having the conditions  $\phi$ -contractivity and property (HS) which are weaker conditions with respect to Mohammadi and Rezapour's [6].

## 2. MAIN RESULTS

The following theorem is the main result of this study.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $(X, d)$  be a complete metric space and  $T : X \rightarrow CB(X)$  be a generalized  $\phi$ -contractive multivalued mapping of integral type which has the property (HS). Then  $T$  has a unique endpoint.*

*Proof.* Choose a fixe element  $x_0 \in X$ . Since  $T$  has the property (HS), there exists  $x_1 \in Tx_0$  such that  $H(Tx_0, Tx_1) \geq \sup_{b \in Tx_1} d(x_1, b)$ . Continuing this process, we obtain a sequence  $\{x_n\}$  such that  $x_{n+1} \in Tx_n$  and  $H(Tx_n, Tx_{n+1}) \geq \sup_{b \in Tx_{n+1}} d(x_{n+1}, b)$  for all  $n \geq 0$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{d(x_n, x_{n+1})} \varphi(t) dt &\leq \int_0^{\sup_{b \in Tx_n} d(x_n, b)} \varphi(t) dt \\ &\leq \int_0^{H(Tx_{n-1}, Tx_n)} \varphi(t) dt \\ &\leq \phi \left( \int_0^{M(x_{n-1}, x_n)} \varphi(t) dt \right), \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

for all  $n \geq 1$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} M(x_{n-1}, x_n) &= \max\{d(x_{n-1}, x_n), d(x_{n-1}, Tx_{n-1}), \\ &\quad d(x_n, Tx_n), \frac{1}{2}[d(x_{n-1}, Tx_n) + d(x_n, Tx_{n-1})]\} \\ &\leq \max\{d(x_{n-1}, x_n), d(x_n, x_{n+1}), \frac{1}{2}[d(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1})]\} \\ &\leq \max\{d(x_{n-1}, x_n), d(x_n, x_{n+1})\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

for all  $n \geq 1$ . If  $d(x_n, x_{n+1}) > d(x_{n-1}, x_n)$ , then, from (2.1) and (2.2), we have

$$\int_0^{d(x_n, x_{n+1})} \varphi(t) dt \leq \phi \left( \int_0^{d(x_n, x_{n+1})} \varphi(t) dt \right),$$

which is a contradiction. Hence,  $d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq d(x_{n-1}, x_n)$  and so from (2.1) and (2.2),

$$\int_0^{d(x_n, x_{n+1})} \varphi(t) dt \leq \phi \left( \int_0^{d(x_{n-1}, x_n)} \varphi(t) dt \right), \quad (2.3)$$

for all  $n \geq 1$ . From (2.3), we get  $\int_0^{d(x_n, x_{n+1})} \varphi(t) dt \leq \phi^n \left( \int_0^{d(x_0, x_1)} \varphi(t) dt \right) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . From this, we conclude that  $d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . We claim that  $\{x_n\}$  is a Cauchy sequence. Suppose to the contrary,  $\{x_n\}$  is not a Cauchy sequence. Then, there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that for any  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  there exist natural numbers  $m_i, n_i$  with  $m_i > n_i$  and  $d(x_{n_i}, x_{m_i}) \geq \varepsilon$ . Put

$$k_i = \min\{m_i \mid m_i > n_i, d(x_{n_i}, x_{m_i}) \geq \varepsilon\}.$$

Hence, for any  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have  $d(x_{n_i}, x_{k_i}) \geq \varepsilon$  and  $d(x_{n_i}, x_{k_i-1}) < \varepsilon$ . Now

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &\leq d(x_{n_i}, x_{k_i}) \\ &\leq d(x_{n_i}, Tx_{n_i}) + H(Tx_{n_i}, \{x_{k_i}\}) \\ &\leq d(x_{n_i}, Tx_{n_i}) + H(Tx_{n_i}, Tx_{k_i-1}) + H(Tx_{k_i-1}, \{x_{k_i-1}\}) + d(x_{k_i-1}, x_{k_i}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

But we have  $d(x_{n_i}, Tx_{n_i}) \leq d(x_{n_i}, x_{n_i+1}) \rightarrow 0$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{H(Tx_{k_i-1}, \{x_{k_i-1}\})} \varphi(t) dt &= \int_0^{\sup_{b \in Tx_{k_i-1}} d(x_{k_i-1}, b)} \varphi(t) dt \\ &\leq \int_0^{H(Tx_{k_i-2}, Tx_{k_i-1})} \varphi(t) dt \\ &\leq \phi \left( \int_0^{M(x_{k_i-2}, x_{k_i-1})} \varphi(t) dt \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

From inequality (2.2), we conclude that  $M(x_{k_i-2}, x_{k_i-1}) \rightarrow 0$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence, from (2.5),  $H(Tx_{k_i-1}, \{x_{k_i-1}\}) \rightarrow 0$ . Now from (2.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\varepsilon \varphi(t) dt &\leq \int_0^{d(x_{n_i}, Tx_{n_i}) + H(Tx_{n_i}, Tx_{k_i-1}) + H(Tx_{k_i-1}, \{x_{k_i-1}\}) + d(x_{k_i-1}, x_{k_i})} \varphi(t) dt \\ &= \int_0^{H(Tx_{n_i}, Tx_{k_i-1})} \varphi(t) dt \\ &\quad + \int_0^{d(x_{n_i}, Tx_{n_i}) + H(Tx_{n_i}, Tx_{k_i-1}) + H(Tx_{k_i-1}, \{x_{k_i-1}\}) + d(x_{k_i-1}, x_{k_i})} \varphi(t) dt \\ &\leq \phi \left( \int_0^{M(x_{n_i}, x_{k_i-1})} \varphi(t) dt \right) \\ &\quad + M[d(x_{n_i}, Tx_{n_i}) + H(Tx_{k_i-1}, \{x_{k_i-1}\}) + d(x_{k_i-1}, x_{k_i})] \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

where  $M$  is a positive number such that  $\varphi(t) \leq M$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . Taking  $\limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty}$  we obtain

$$\int_0^\varepsilon \varphi(t) dt \leq \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} \phi \left( \int_0^{M(x_{n_i}, x_{k_i-1})} \varphi(t) dt \right), \quad (2.7)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} M(x_{n_i}, x_{k_i-1}) &= \max\{d(x_{n_i}, x_{k_i-1}), d(x_{n_i}, Tx_{n_i}), \\ &\quad d(x_{k_i-1}, Tx_{k_i-1}), \frac{1}{2}[d(x_{n_i}, Tx_{k_i-1}) + d(x_{k_i-1}, Tx_{n_i})]\} \\ &\leq \max\{d(x_{n_i}, x_{k_i-1}), d(x_{n_i}, x_{n_i+1}), d(x_{k_i-1}, x_{k_i}), \\ &\quad \frac{1}{2}[d(x_{n_i}, x_{k_i-1}) + d(x_{k_i-1}, x_{k_i}) + d(x_{k_i-1}, x_{n_i}) + d(x_{n_i}, x_{n_i+1})]\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

Taking  $\limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty}$  in (2.8), we get  $\limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} M(x_{n_i}, x_{k_i-1}) \leq \max\{\varepsilon, 0, 0, \varepsilon\} = \varepsilon$ . Therefore, from (2.7), we obtain  $\int_0^\varepsilon \varphi(t) dt \leq \phi(\int_0^\varepsilon \varphi(t) dt)$ , which is a contradiction. Hence  $\{x_n\}$  is a Cauchy sequence. Since  $X$  is complete, there exists  $x \in X$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, x) = 0$ . Next, we shall show that  $x$  is an endpoint of  $T$ . To see this, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{H(\{x\}, Tx)} \varphi(t) dt &\leq \int_0^{d(x, x_n) + H(\{x_n\}, Tx_n) + H(Tx_n, Tx)} \varphi(t) dt \\ &= \int_0^{H(Tx_n, Tx)} \varphi(t) dt + \int_{H(Tx_n, Tx)}^{d(x, x_n) + H(\{x_n\}, Tx_n) + H(Tx_n, Tx)} \varphi(t) dt \\ &\leq \phi(\int_0^{M(x_n, x)} \varphi(t) dt) + M(d(x, x_n) + H(\{x_n\}, Tx_n)). \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

Similar to way in (2.5), it is easy to check that  $H(\{x_n\}, Tx_n) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Taking  $\limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty}$  in (2.9), we have

$$\int_0^{H(\{x\}, Tx)} \varphi(t) dt \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi(\int_0^{M(x_n, x)} \varphi(t) dt), \quad (2.10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} M(x_n, x) &= \max\{d(x_n, x), d(x_n, Tx_n), d(x, Tx), \frac{1}{2}[d(x_n, Tx) + d(x, Tx_n)]\} \\ &\leq \max\{d(x_n, x), d(x_n, x_{n+1}), d(x, Tx), \frac{1}{2}[d(x_n, x) + d(x, Tx) + d(x, x_{n+1})]\}. \end{aligned}$$

Tending  $n$  to  $\infty$ , we obtain  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M(x_n, x) = d(x, Tx)$ . Consequently, we obtain from (2.10),

$$\int_0^{H(\{x\}, Tx)} \varphi(t) dt \leq \phi(\int_0^{d(x, Tx)} \varphi(t) dt) \leq \phi(\int_0^{H(\{x\}, Tx)} \varphi(t) dt).$$

From the above inequality, we conclude that  $H(\{x\}, Tx) = 0$  which implies  $Tx = \{x\}$ . To show the uniqueness of endpoint of  $T$  assume that  $x, y$  are two endpoints of  $T$  such that  $x \neq y$ . Then

$$\int_0^{d(x, y)} \varphi(t) dt = \int_0^{H(Tx, Ty)} \varphi(t) dt \leq \phi(\int_0^{M(x, y)} \varphi(t) dt) = \phi(\int_0^{d(x, y)} \varphi(t) dt),$$

which is a contradiction.  $\square$

**Example 2.1.** Let  $X = \{\frac{1}{n} | n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{0\}$  with the usual metric  $d(x, y) = |x - y|$ . Obviously  $(X, d)$  is complete. Define  $\varphi : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  by  $\varphi(t) = t^{\frac{1}{e}} [\frac{1 - \ln t}{t^2}]$  for  $0 < t < e$  and  $0$  otherwise. Then, for any  $0 \leq \tau < e$ ,

we have  $\int_0^\tau \varphi(t)dt = \tau^{\frac{1}{\tau}}$  (because if we define  $\Phi(t) = \begin{cases} t^{\frac{1}{\tau}} & 0 < t < e \\ 0 & t = 0 \end{cases}$ , it is easy to check that  $\Phi'(t) = \varphi(t)$  for all  $0 \leq t < e$ ). Also, define  $T : X \rightarrow CB(X)$  by

$$Tx = \begin{cases} \{0\} & x = 0, \\ [0, \frac{1}{n+1}] \cap X & x = \frac{1}{n}, n \in \mathbb{N}. \end{cases}$$

If  $x = 0$  and  $y = \frac{1}{n}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{H(Tx, Ty)} \varphi(t)dt &= \int_0^{\frac{1}{n+1}} \varphi(t)dt \\ &= \frac{1}{n+1} \int_0^{n+1} \varphi(t)dt \\ &= \frac{1}{n+1} \left(\frac{1}{n+1}\right)^n \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^n \\ &= \phi\left(\int_0^{d(x,y)} \varphi(t)dt\right) \\ &\leq \phi\left(\int_0^{M(x,y)} \varphi(t)dt\right) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\phi(t) = \frac{1}{2}t$ .

If  $x, y \in \{\frac{1}{n} | n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ , then assume that  $x = \frac{1}{n}$  and  $y = \frac{1}{m}$ . In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{H(Tx, Ty)} \varphi(t)dt &= \int_0^{|\frac{1}{n+1} - \frac{1}{m+1}|} \varphi(t)dt \\ &= \left(\frac{|m-n|}{(n+1)(m+1)}\right)^{\frac{(n+1)(m+1)}{|m-n|}} \\ &= \left(\frac{|m-n|}{(n+1)(m+1)}\right)^{\frac{n+m+1}{|m-n|}} \left(\frac{|m-n|}{nm}\right)^{\frac{nm}{|m-n|}} \left(\frac{mn}{(n+1)(m+1)}\right)^{\frac{nm}{|m-n|}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \left(\frac{|m-n|}{nm}\right)^{\frac{nm}{|m-n|}}\right) \\ &= \phi\left(\int_0^{d(x,y)} \varphi(t)dt\right) \\ &\leq \phi\left(\int_0^{M(x,y)} \varphi(t)dt\right). \end{aligned}$$

We see that

$$\int_0^{H(Tx, Ty)} \varphi(t)dt \leq \phi\left(\int_0^{M(x,y)} \varphi(t)dt\right) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in X.$$

It is easy to see that  $T$  has the property (HS). Therefore, the mapping  $T$  defined in this example satisfies conditions of Theorem 2.1, and so by this theorem,  $T$  has a unique endpoint in  $X$ . Here,  $T0 = \{0\}$ .

Also, by using [10], we can give some equivalent results for Theorem 2.1. Here, we give only two results in this way as follows.

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $(X, d)$  be a complete metric space and  $T : X \rightarrow CB(X)$  be a multivalued mapping which has the property (HS). Suppose there exist  $\varphi \in \Phi_1$ ,  $\psi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  a lower semicontinuous function*

and  $\eta : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  satisfying  $\eta^{-1}\{0\} = \{0\}$  and  $\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \eta(t) > 0$  such that

$$\psi\left(\int_0^{H(Tx, Ty)} \varphi(t) dt\right) \leq \psi\left(\int_0^{M(x, y)} \varphi(t) dt\right) - \eta\left(\int_0^{M(x, y)} \varphi(t) dt\right),$$

for all  $x, y \in X$ . Then  $T$  has a unique endpoint.

**Proposition 2.3.** Let  $(X, d)$  be a complete metric space and  $T : X \rightarrow CB(X)$  be a multivalued mapping which has the property (HS). Suppose there exist  $\varphi \in \Phi_1$ ,  $\psi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  a nondecreasing function such that  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \psi^n(t) < \infty$  for all  $t > 0$  and  $\phi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  a right continuous and nondecreasing function satisfying  $\phi(t) < t$  for all  $t > 0$  such that

$$\psi\left(\int_0^{H(Tx, Ty)} \varphi(t) dt\right) \leq \phi\left(\psi\left(\int_0^{M(x, y)} \varphi(t) dt\right)\right),$$

for all  $x, y \in X$ . Then  $T$  has a unique endpoint.

In 2007, Zhang [11] defined a new generalized contractive type condition for a pair of mappings in metric spaces. Let  $A \in (0, +\infty]$  and  $\mathbb{R}_A^+ = [0, A)$ . Denote by  $\mathfrak{S}[0, A)$  the collection of all functions  $F : \mathbb{R}_A^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying the following conditions:

- (i)  $F(0) = 0$  and  $F(t) > 0$  for each  $t \in (0, A)$ ,
- (ii)  $F$  is nondecreasing on  $\mathbb{R}_A^+$ ,
- (iii)  $F$  is continuous.

From [11], we know that for any  $F \in \mathfrak{S}[0, A)$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} F(\varepsilon_n) = 0$  ( $\varepsilon_n \in \mathbb{R}_A^+$ ) implies  $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \varepsilon_n = 0$ . Denote by  $\Psi[0, A)$  the family of all functions  $\psi : \mathbb{R}_A^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  which is nondecreasing and right upper semi-continuous such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \psi^n(t) = 0$  for each  $t \in (0, A)$ . It is easy to see that for any  $\psi \in \Psi[0, A)$  we have  $\psi(0) = 0$  and  $\psi(t) < t$  for each  $t \in (0, A)$ .

Regarding the above notations Zhang [11] proved the following theorem about existing of common fixed point for a pair of mappings.

**Theorem 2.4.** Let  $(X, d)$  be a complete metric space and let  $D = \sup\{d(x, y) | x, y \in X\}$ . Set  $A > D$  if  $D < \infty$  and  $A = D$  if  $D = \infty$ . Suppose that  $T, S : X \rightarrow X$  are two mappings,  $F \in \mathfrak{S}[0, A)$  and  $\psi \in \Psi[0, F(A^-))$  satisfying

$$F(d(Tx, Sy)) \leq \psi(F(M(x, y))) \quad \text{for each } x, y \in X,$$

where

$$M(x, y) = \max\{d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Sy), \frac{1}{2}(d(Tx, y) + d(x, Sy))\}.$$

Then  $T$  and  $S$  have a unique common fixed point in  $X$ . Moreover, for each  $x_0 \in X$ , the iterated sequence  $\{x_n\}$  with  $x_{2n+1} = Tx_{2n}$  and  $x_{2n+2} = Sx_{2n+1}$  converges to the common fixed point of  $T$  and  $S$ .

Similar to the proof of Theorem 2.1, one can easily prove the following endpoint result for multivalued mappings, which is a multivalued endpoint version of Theorem 2.4.

**Theorem 2.5.** *Let  $(X, d)$  be a complete metric space and  $T : X \rightarrow CB(X)$  be a multivalued mapping satisfying property (HS),  $F \in \mathfrak{S}[0, A]$  and  $\psi \in \Psi[0, F(A^-))$  such that*

$$F(H(Tx, Ty)) \leq \psi(F(M(x, y))) \quad \text{for each } x, y \in X.$$

*Then  $T$  has a unique endpoint.*

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This study was supported by Marand Branch, Islamic Azad University, Marand, Iran.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] A. Amini-Harandi, *Endpoints of set-valued contractions in metric spaces*, Nonlinear Anal. **72** (2010) 132-134.
- [2] A. Branciari, *A Fixed point theorem for mappings satisfying a general contractive condition of integral type*, Int. J. Math. Sci. **29** (2002), 531-536.
- [3] J. Hasanzade Asl, Sh. Rezapour, N. Shahzad, *On fixed points of  $\alpha$ - $\psi$ -contractive multifunctions*, Fixed Point Theory Appl. (2012) **2012**:212, 8 pages.
- [4] M. A. Miandaragh, M. Postolache, Sh. Rezapour, *Some approximate fixed point results for generalized  $\alpha$ -contractive mappings*, Univ. Politech. Bucharest Sci. Bull. Ser. A (2013).
- [5] B. Mohammadi, Sh. Rezapour, N. Shahzad, *Some results on fixed points of  $\alpha$ - $\psi$ -Ciric generalized multifunctions*, Fixed Point Theory and Applications (2013) **2013**:24.
- [6] B. Mohammadi, Sh. Rezapour, *Endpoints of Suzuki type quasi-contractive multifunctions*, U.P.B. Sci. Bull., Series A, Vol. **77**, Iss. 1, 2015.
- [7] S. Moradi, F. Khojasteh, *Endpoints of multi-valued generalized weak contraction mappings*, Nonlinear Anal. **74** (2011), 2170-2174.
- [8] Sh. Rezapour, J. Hasanzade Asl, *A simple method for obtaining coupled fixed points of  $\alpha$ - $\psi$ -contractive type mappings*, International J. Analysis (2013), 7 pages.
- [9] B. Samet, C. Vetro, P. Vetro, *Fixed point theorems for  $\alpha$ - $\psi$ -contractive type mappings*, Nonlinear Anal. **75** (2012), 2154-2165.
- [10] J. Jachymski, *Equivalent conditions for generalized contractions on (ordered) metric spaces*, Nonlinear Anal. **74** (2011), 768-774 .
- [11] X. Zhang, *Common fixed point theorems for some new generalized contractive type mappings*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **333** (2007), 780-786.