# International Journal of Mathematical Archive-8(6), 2017, 265-270 MAAvailable online through www.ijma.info ISSN 2229 - 5046

# FIXED POINT RESULTS FOR EXPANSIVE MAPPINGS IN DIGITAL METRIC SPACES

# KUMARI JYOTI\*, ASHA RANI

Department of Mathematics, SRM University, Sonepat-131001, India.

Received On: 20-05-17; Revised & Accepted On: 24-06-17)

## ABSTRACT

In this paper we present fixed point results for generalized  $\alpha - \psi$  –expansive type mappings in digital metric spaces. We also provide some examples to illustrate our results.

*Keywords:* fixed point; digital metric space;  $\alpha - \psi$  –expansive mapping.

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Fixed point theory is a beautiful subject for dynamic research in non-linear analysis. In 1912, Brouwer [2] proved a result that a unit closed ball in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  has a fixed point. The most remarkable result in the fixed point theory was given by Banach [1] in 1922. He proved that each contraction in a complete metric space has a unique fixed point. Later on, many authors generalized the Banach fixed point theorem in various ways [13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 22, 24]. In 1984, Wang [23] introduced the concept of expansive mappings in complete metric spaces. Recently, Samet *et al.* [21] introduced the notion of  $\alpha$ - $\psi$  contractive mappings and proved the related fixed point theorems.

Digital topology is a developing area based on general topology and functional analysis which studies features of 2D and 3D digital images. Rosenfield [20] was the first to consider digital topology as the tool to study digital images. Kong [17], then introduced the digital fundamental group of a discrete object. The digital versions of the topological concepts were given by Boxer [3], who later studied digital continuous functions [4]. Later, he gave results of digital homology groups of 2D digital images in [6] and [7]. Ege and Karaca [9, 10] give relative and reduced Lefschetz fixed point theorem for digital images. They also calculate degree of antipodal map for the sphere like digital images using fixed point properties. Ege and Karaca [11] then defined a digital metric space and proved the famous Banach Contraction Principle for digital images.

In this paper, we generalize the concept of  $\alpha$ - $\psi$  mappings as d- $\alpha$ - $\psi$ -expansive mappings in the setting of dislocated metric spaces.

### 2. PRELIMINARIES

In 1984, Wang et al. [2] defined expansive mappings in the form of the following theorem:

**Theorem 2.1:** Let *T* be a self map on a complete metric space *X* such that

(i) T is onto,

(ii)  $d(Tx,Ty) \ge kd(x,y), k \ge 1$ .

Then *T* has a unique fixed point in *X*.

Recently, Samet et al. [3] Introduced the following concepts.

**Definition 2.2:** Let  $\psi$  be a family of functions  $\psi: [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$  satisfying the following conditions:

- (i)  $\psi$  is nondecreasing;
- (ii)  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \psi^n < \infty$  for each t > 0, where  $\psi^n$  is the nth iterate of  $\psi$ ;

**Definition 2.3:** Let  $T: X \to X$  and  $\alpha: X \times X \to [0, \infty)$ . we say that *T* is  $\alpha$ -admissible if for all  $x, y \in X$ , we have  $\alpha(x, y) \ge 1 \implies \alpha(Tx, Ty) \ge 1$ 

Corresponding Author: Kumari Jyoti\*, Asha Rani Department of Mathematics, SRM University, Sonepat-131001, India. **Definition 2.4:** Let (X, d) be a metric space and let  $T: X \to X$  be a given mapping. We say that T is an  $\alpha - \psi$ contractive mapping if there exist two functions  $\alpha: X \times X \to [0, \infty)$  and  $\psi \in \Psi$  such that

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

For all  $x, y \in X$ 

Let X be a subset of  $\mathbb{Z}^n$  for a positive integer n where  $\mathbb{Z}^n$  is the set of lattice points in the n- dimensional Euclidean space and  $\rho$  represent an adjacency relation for the members of X. A digital image consists of  $(X, \rho)$ .

**Definition 2.5[9]:** Let *l*, *n* be positive integers,  $1 \le l \le n$  and two distinct points

 $a = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n), b = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ 

a and b are  $k_l$ - adjacent if there are at most l indices i such that  $|a_i - b_i| = 1$  and for all other indices j such that  $|a_i - b_i| \neq 1, a_i = b_i.$ 

There are some statements which can be obtained from definition 2.1:

- a and b are 2- adjacent if |a b| = 1.
- a and b in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  are 8- adjacent if they are distinct and differ by at most 1 in each coordinate.
- a and b in  $\mathbb{Z}^3$  are 26- adjacent if they are distinct and differ at most 1 in each coordinate.
- a and b in  $\mathbb{Z}^3$  are 18- adjacent if are 26- adjacent and differ by at most two coordinates.
- a and b are 6- adjacent if they are 18- adjacent and differ in exactly one coordinate.

A  $\rho$ -neighbour [9] of  $a \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  is a point of  $\mathbb{Z}^n$  that is  $\rho$ - adjacent to a where  $\rho \in \{2,4,8,6,18,26\}$  and  $n \in 1,2,3$ . The set  $N_{\rho}(a) = \{b | b \text{ is } \rho - adjacent \text{ to } a\}$ 

is called the  $\rho$ - neighbourhood of a. A digital interval [9] is defined by

 $[p,q]_{\mathbb{Z}} = \{z \in \mathbb{Z} | p \le z \le q\}$ where  $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}$  and p < q.

A digital image  $X \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$  is  $\rho$ - connected [10] if and only if for every pair of different points  $u, v \in X$ , there is a set  $\{u_0, u_1, \dots, u_r\}$  of points of digital image X such that  $u = u_0, v = u_r$  and  $u_i$  and  $u_{i+1}$  are  $\rho$ -neighbours where  $i = 0, 1, \dots, r - 1.$ 

**Definition 2.6:** Let  $(X, \rho_0) \subset \mathbb{Z}^{n_0}, (Y, \rho_1) \subset \mathbb{Z}^{n_1}$  be digital images and  $T: X \to Y$  be a function.

- T is said to be  $(\rho_0, \rho_1)$  continuous[9], if for all  $\rho_0$  connected subset E of X, f(E) is a  $\rho_1$  connected subset of Y.
- For all  $\rho_0$  adjacent points  $\{u_0, u_1\}$  of X, either  $T(u_0) = T(u_1)$  or  $T(u_0)$  and  $T(u_1)$  are a  $\rho_1$  adjacent in Y if and only if *T* is  $(\rho_0, \rho_1)$ - continuous [9].
- If f is  $(\rho_0, \rho_1)$  continuous, bijective and  $T^{-1}$  is  $(\rho_1, \rho_0)$  continuous, then T is called  $(\rho_0, \rho_1)$  isomorphism • [11] and denoted by  $X \cong_{(\rho_0,\rho_1)} Y$ .

A (2,  $\rho$ )- continuous function T, is called a digital  $\rho$ - path [9] from u to v in a digital image X if T:  $[0, m]_{\mathbb{Z}} \to X$  such that T(0) = u and T(m) = v. A simple closed  $\rho$ - curve of  $m \ge 4$  points [12] in a digital image X is a sequence  $\{T(0), T(1), \dots, T(m-1)\}$  of images of the  $\rho$ - path  $T: [0, m-1]_{\mathbb{Z}} \to X$  such that T(i) and T(j) are  $\rho$ - adjacent if and only if  $j = i \pm mod m$ .

**Definition 2.7[8]:** A sequence  $\{x_n\}$  of points of a digital metric space  $(X, d, \rho)$  is a Cauchy sequence if for all  $\in > 0$ , there exists  $\delta \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $n, m > \delta$ , then

 $d(x_n, x_m) < \in$ .

**Definition 2.8[8]:** A sequence  $\{x_n\}$  of points of a digital metric space  $(X, d, \rho)$  converges to a limit  $p \in X$  if for all  $\in > 0$ , there exists  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $n > \delta$ , then

 $d(x_n, p) < \in$ .

**Definition 2.9[8]:** A digital metric space  $(X, d, \rho)$  is a digital metric space if any Cauchy sequence  $\{x_n\}$  of points of  $(X, d, \rho)$  converges to a point p of  $(X, d, \rho)$ .

**Definition 2.10[8]:** Let,  $(X, d, \rho)$  be any digital metric space and  $T: (X, d, \rho) \to (X, d, \rho)$  be a self digital map. If there exists  $\alpha \in (0,1)$  such that for all  $x, y \in X$ ,

 $d(f(x), f(y)) \le \alpha d(x, y),$ 

then T is called a digital contraction map.

**Proposition 2.11**[8]: Every digital contraction map is digitally continuous.

**Theorem 2.12[8]:** (Banach Contraction principle) Let  $(X, d, \rho)$  be a complete metric space which has a usual Euclidean metric in  $\mathbb{Z}^n$ . Let,  $T: X \to X$  be a digital contraction map. Then T has a unique fixed point, i.e. there exists a unique  $p \in X$  such that f(p) = p. © 2017, IJMA. All Rights Reserved

#### **3. MAIN RESULTS**

We introduce the concept of generalized  $\alpha$ - $\psi$ -expansive mapping in digital metric spaces as follows: **Definition 3.1:** Let  $(X, d, \rho)$  be a digital metric space and let  $T: X \to X$  be a given mapping. We say that T is a generalised  $\alpha \cdot \psi$ -expansive mapping, if there exist two functions  $\alpha : X \times X \to [0, \infty)$  and  $\psi \in \Psi$  such that for all  $x, y \in X$ , we have

$$\psi(d(Tx,Ty)) \ge \alpha(x,y)M(x,y).$$
(1)  
where  $M(x,y) = max \left\{ d(x,y), \frac{d(x,Tx) + d(y,Ty)}{2}, \frac{d(x,Ty) + d(y,Tx)}{2} \right\}$ 

**Remark 3.2:** Clearly, any expansive mapping is a generalized  $\alpha - \psi$ -expansive mapping with  $\alpha(x, y) = 1$  for all  $x, y \in X$  and  $\psi(t) = kt$ , for all  $t \ge 0$  and  $k \in (0,1)$ .

**Definition 3.3:** Let  $T: X \to X$  and  $\alpha: X \times X \to [0, \infty)$ . We say that T is  $\alpha$ -admissible if for all  $x, y \in X$ , we have  $\alpha(x, y) \ge 1 \implies \alpha(Tx, Ty) \ge 1$ 

Now, we prove our main results.

**Theorem 3.4:** Let  $(X, d, \rho)$  be a complete digital metric space and let  $T: X \to X$  is a bijective and generalised  $\alpha - \psi$ expansive mapping and satisfies the following conditions:

(i)  $T^{-1}$  is  $\alpha$ -admissible

- (ii) there exist  $x_0 \in X$  such that  $\alpha(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \ge 1$ ;
- (iii) T is digital continuous.

Then T has a fixed point.

**Proof:** Let  $x_0 \in X$  such that  $\alpha(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \ge 1$  (given by condition (ii)). Define the sequence  $\{x_n\}$  in X by  $x_n = Tx_{n+1}$ for all  $n \ge 0$ . If  $x_n = x_{n+1}$  for some n, then  $x_n$  is a fixed point of T. So, we can assume that  $x_n \ne x_{n+1}$  for all n. Since  $T^{-1}$  is  $\alpha$ -admissible, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(x_0, x_1) &= \alpha(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \ge 1 \\ \Rightarrow & \alpha(T^{-1}x_0, T^{-1}x_1) = \alpha(x_1, x_2) \ge 1. \end{aligned}$$
(2)

Inductively, we have

$$\alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \ge 1 \text{ for all } n = 0, 1, 2 \dots \dots$$
 (3)

From (1) and (3), it follows that for all  $n \ge 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi(d(x_{n-1},x_n)) &= \psi(d(Tx_n,Tx_{n+1})) \geq \alpha(x_n,x_{n+1})M(x_n,x_{n+1}) \geq M(x_n,x_{n+1}) \\
\psi(d(Tx_{n-1},Tx_n) \geq M(x_n,x_{n+1}) \\
\psi(d(Tx_{n-1},Tx_n)) &= \max\left\{d(x_n,x_{n+1}), \frac{d(x_n,Tx_n) + d(x_{n+1},Tx_{n+1})}{2}, \frac{d(x_n,Tx_{n+1}) + d(Tx_n,x_{n+1})}{2}\right\} \\
&= \max\left\{d(x_n,x_{n+1}), \frac{d(x_n,x_{n-1}) + d(x_{n+1},x_n)}{2}, \frac{d(x_{n-1},x_{n+1})}{2}\right\} \\
&\leq \max\left\{d(x_n,x_{n+1}), \frac{d(x_n,x_{n-1}) + d(x_{n+1},x_n)}{2}\right\} \\
&\leq \max\{d(x_n,x_{n+1}), d(x_n,x_{n-1})\}
\end{aligned}$$
(4)

$$\leq \max\{d(x_n, x_{n+1}), d(x_n, x_{n-1})\}$$
(5)

From (4) and taking in consideration that  $\psi$  is a non-decreasing function, we get that  $\psi(d(x_{n+1}, x_n)) \ge (max\{d(x_n, x_{n-1}), d(x_n, x_{n+1})\}).$ 

for all  $n \ge 1$ . If for some  $n \ge 1$ , we have  $d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \le d(x_n, x_{n-1})$ , from (6), we obtain that  $d(x_n, x_{n-1}) \ge \psi \big( d(x_n, x_{n-1}) \big) > d(x_n, x_{n-1}),$ (7)

a contradiction. Thus, for all  $n \ge 1$ , we have  $max\{d(x_n, x_{n-1}), d(x_n, x_{n+1})\} = d(x_n, x_{n+1}).$ (8)

Using (6) and (8), we get that  

$$d(x_{n+1}, x_n) \le \psi(d(x_n, x_{n-1})).$$
(9)

for all 
$$n \ge 1$$
. By induction, we get  

$$d(x_{n+1}, x_n) \le \psi^n (d(x_1, x_0)), \text{ for all } n \ge 1$$
(10)

From (10) and using the triangular inequality, for all  $k \ge 1$ , we have

$$d(x_n, x_{n+k}) \le d(x_n, x_{n+1}) + \dots + d(x_{n+k-1}, x_{n+k}) \le \sum_{p=n}^{n+k-1} \psi^p (d(x_1, x_0)), \le \sum_{p=n}^{\infty} \psi^p (d(x_1, x_0)) \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty$$

(6)

This implies that  $\{x_n\}$  is a Cauchy sequence in the digital metric space  $(X, d, \rho)$ . since  $(X, d, \rho)$  is complete, there exist  $u \in X$  such that  $\{x_n\}$  is digital convergent to u. since T is digital continuous, it follows that  $\{Tx_n\}$  is digital convergent to Tu. By the uniqueness of the limit, we get u = Tu, that is, u is a fixed point of T.

The next theorem does not require continuity of T.

**Theorem 3.5:** Let  $(X, d, \rho)$  be a complete digital metric space. Suppose that  $T: X \to X$  is a generalized  $\alpha$ - $\psi$ -expansive mapping and the following conditions hold:

- (i)  $T^{-1}$  is  $\alpha$ -admissible;
- (ii) there exists  $x_0 \in X$  such that  $\alpha(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \ge 1$ ;
- (iii) if  $\{x_n\}$  is a sequence in X such that  $\alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \ge 1$  for all n and  $\{x_n\}$  is digital convergent to  $x \in X$ , then  $\alpha(T^{-1}x_n, T^{-1}x) \ge 1$  for all n.

Then there exist  $u \in U$  such that Tu = u.

**Proof:** Following the proof of theorem 3.4, we know that the sequence  $\{x_n\}$  is a digital Cauchy sequence in the complete metric space  $(X, d, \rho)$  such that  $\alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \ge 1$  for all n and  $x_n \to u$  as  $n \to \infty$ .

From (iii), we have

$$\alpha(T^{-1}x_n, T^{-1}u) \ge 1 \text{ for all } n \ge 0.$$
 (11)

Using triangle inequality of digital metric space, we have

 $\begin{aligned} d(T^{-1}u, u) &\leq d(T^{-1}u, x_{n+1}) + d(x_{n+1}, u) \\ &= d(T^{-1}u, T^{-1}x_n) + d(x_{n+1}, u) \\ &\leq M(T^{-1}u, T^{-1}x_n) + d(x_{n+1}, u) \\ &\leq \alpha(T^{-1}u, T^{-1}x_n)M(T^{-1}u, x_{n+1}) + d(x_{n+1}, u) \\ &\leq \psi(d(u, x_n)) + d(x_{n+1}, u). \end{aligned}$ 

Since  $\psi$  is continuous at t = 0, implies that  $d(T^{-1}u, u) = 0$  as  $n \to \infty$ . That is,  $T^{-1}u = u$ .

consider  $Tu = T(T^{-1}u) = u$ , which implies that, u is a fixed point of T.

We now provide some examples in support of our results and show that hypotheses of Theorem 3.4 and 3.5 do not guarantees uniqueness of fixed point.

**Example 3.6:** let  $X = [0, \infty)$  be the digital metric space, where d(x, y) = |x - y| for all  $x, y \in X$ . Consider the self-mapping  $T : X \to X$  given by

$$Tx = \begin{cases} 2x - \frac{11}{6} & \text{if } x > 1, \\ \frac{x}{6} & \text{if } 0 \le x \le 1. \end{cases}$$

Define  $\alpha: X \times X \to [0, \infty)$ , as  $\alpha(x, y) = \begin{cases} 0 & if \ x, y \in [0, 1], \\ 1 & otherwise. \end{cases}$ 

Let  $\psi(t) = \frac{t}{6}$  for  $t \ge 0$ . Then we conclude that *T* is a generalised- $\alpha$ - $\psi$ -expansive mapping. In fact, for all  $x, y \in X$ , we have  $\frac{1}{6}d(Tx,Ty) \ge \alpha(x,y)M(x,y)$ .

On the other hand, there exists  $x_0 \in X$  such that  $\alpha(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \ge 1$ . Indeed, for  $x_0 = 1$ , we have  $\alpha(1, T^{-1}1) = 1$ .

Notice also that *T* is digital continuous. It is sufficient to show that  $T^{-1}$  is  $\alpha$ -admissible. For this purpose, let  $x, y \in X$  such that  $\alpha(x, y) \ge 1$ . This implies that  $x \ge 1$  and  $y \ge 1$ , and by definition of  $T^{-1}$  and  $\alpha$ , we have  $T^{-1}x = x^{x} + \frac{11}{2} \ge 1 = T^{-1}x = y^{x} + \frac{11}{2} \le 10$ 

$$T^{-1}x = \frac{x}{2} + \frac{11}{12} \ge 1, \quad T^{-1}y = \frac{y}{2} + \frac{11}{12} \in [0,1].$$

Hence,  $\alpha(T^{-1}x, T^{-1}y) \ge 1$ . Then  $T^{-1}$  is  $\alpha$ -admissible.

As a result, all the conditions of theorem 3.4 are satisfied. Consequently, T has a fixed point. In this example 0 and  $\frac{11}{6}$  are two fixed points of T.

In the following example *T* is not continuous.

**Example 3.7:** Let *X*, *G* and  $\beta$  be defined as in example 3.6. Let  $T: X \to X$ 

$$Tx = \begin{cases} 2x - \frac{5}{2} & \text{if } x > 1, \\ \frac{x}{5} & \text{if } 0 \le x \le 1. \end{cases}$$

let  $\psi(t) = \frac{t}{5}$  for  $t \ge 0$ . Then we conclude that T is a generalised  $\alpha - \psi$ -expansive mapping. In fact, for all  $x, y \in X$ , we have

$$\alpha(x, y)d(Tx, Ty) \le \frac{1}{2}M(x, y)$$

Furthermore, there exist  $x_0 \in X$  such that  $\alpha(x_0, Tx_0) \ge 1$ . For  $x_0 = 1$ , we have  $\alpha(1, T1) = \alpha(1, \frac{1}{3}) = 1$ .

Let  $\{x_n\}$  be a sequence such that  $\alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \ge 1$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and as  $x_n \to x$  as  $n \to \infty$ . By the definition of  $\alpha$ , we have  $\alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \ge 1$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then we see that  $x_n \in [0,1]$ . Thus,  $\alpha(T^{-1}x_n, T^{-1}x) \ge 1$ .

To show that T satisfies all the hypotheses of Theorem 3.5, it is sufficient to observe that T is  $\alpha$  –admissible. For this purpose let  $x, y \in X$  such that  $\alpha(x, y) \ge 1$ . It is equivalent to saying that  $x, y \in [0,1]$ . Due to the definition of  $\alpha$  and T, we have

 $Tx = \frac{x}{3} \in [0,1], \qquad Ty = \frac{y}{3} \in [0,1].$ Hence  $\alpha(Tx,Ty) \ge 1.$ 

As a result, all the conditions of the theorem 3.5 are satisfied. In this example, 0 and  $\frac{7}{4}$  are two fixed points of T.

Theorem 3.8: Adding the following condition to the hypotheses of theorem 3.5 (resp. the theorem 3.4) we obtain the uniqueness of a fixed point of T.

(iv) For all  $u, u^* \in X$ , there exist  $v \in X$  such that  $\alpha(u, v) \ge 1$  and  $\alpha(u^*, v) \ge 1$ .

**Proof:** From the theorem 3.4 and 3.5 the set of fixed points is non-empty. We shall show that if u,  $u^*$  are two fixed points of T, that is, T(u) = u and  $T(u^*) = u^*$ , then  $u = u^*$ .

From the condition (iv) we have,  $\alpha(u, v) \ge 1$  and  $\alpha(u^*, v) \ge 1$ .

We know  $\alpha$ -admissible property of  $T^{-1}$ , so we obtain from (12)  $\alpha(u, T^{-1}v) \ge 1$  and  $\alpha(u^*, T^{-1}v) \ge 1$ .

Repeatedly applying the  $\alpha$ -admissible property of  $T^{-1}$ , we get  $\alpha(u, T^{-n}v) \ge 1$  and  $\alpha(u^*, T^{-n}v) \ge 1$  for all n = 1, 2, 3, ...(13)

From (1) and (13), we have  $d(u, T^{-n}v) \le M(u, T^{-n}v) \le \alpha(u, T^{-n}v)M(u, T^{-n}, v)$  $\le \psi(d(Tu, T^{-n+1}v)) = \psi(d(u, T^{-n+1}v)).$ 

Thus, we get by induction that

 $d(u, T^{-n}v) \le \psi(d(u, v))$  for all n = 1, 2, 3, ...

Letting  $n \to \infty$ , and since  $\psi \in \Psi$ , we have  $d(u, T^{-n}v) \rightarrow 0.$ 

This implies that  $\{T^{-n}v\}$  is digital convergent to u. Similarly, we get  $\{T^{-n}v\}$  is digital convergent to  $u^*$ . By the uniqueness of the limit of  $T^{-1}$ , we get  $u = u^*$ , that is, the fixed point of T is unique.

#### REFERENCES

- 1. Banach S, "Surles operations dans les ensembles abstraites et leurs applications", Fund. Math., 3 (1922), 133-187.
- 2. Brouwer LES, "Uber Abbildungen Von Mannigfaltigkeiten", Math. Ann., 77 (1912), 97-115.
- 3. Boxer L, Digitally Continuous Functions, Pattern Recognition Letters, 15 (1994), 833-839.
- 4. Boxer L, Properties of Digital Homotopy, J. Math. Imaging V is., 22(2005), 19-26.
- 5. Boxer L, A Classical Constructions for The Digital Fundamental Group, J. Math. Imaging Vis., 10(1999), 51-62.

Boxer L, Digital Products, Wedges and Covering Spaces, J. Math. Imaging Vis., 25(2006), 159-171. 6.

#### © 2017, IJMA. All Rights Reserved

(12)

#### Kumari Jyoti\*, Asha Rani / Fixed point results for expansive mappings in digital metric spaces / IJMA- 8(6), June-2017.

- 7. Boxer L, Continuous Maps on Digital Simple Closed Curves, Appl. Math., 1(2010), 377-386.
- 8. Ege O, Karaca I, Fundamental Properties of Simplicial Homology Groups for Digital Images, American Journal of Computer Technology and Application, 1(2013), 25-42.
- 9. Ege O, Karaca I, Lefschetz Fixed Point Theorem for Digital Images, Fixed Point Theory Appl., 2013(2013), 13 pages.
- 10. Ege O, Karaca I, Applications of The Lefschetz Number to Digital Images, Bull. Belg. Math. Soc. Simon Stevin, 21(2014), 823-839.
- 11. Ege O, Karaca I, Banach Fixed Point Theorem for Digital Images, J. Nonlinear Sci. Appl., 8(2015), 237-245.
- 12. Herman GT, Oriented Surfaces in Digital Spaces, CVGIP: Graphical Models and Image Processing, 55(1993), 381-396.
- 13. Imoru C.O. and Olatinwo M.O., "On The Stability Of Picard And Mann Iteration Processes," Carpathian J. Math., 19 (2) (2003), 155-160.
- 14. Kannan R., "Some results on fixed points", Bull. Cal. Math. Soc., 60 (1968), 71-76.
- 15. Kannan R, Some results on fixed point II, Amer. Mathe. Monthly 1969, 76, 405-408.
- 16. Karaca I, Ege O, Some Results on Simplicial Homology Groups of 2D Digital Images, Int. J. Inform. Computer Sci., 1(2012), 198-203.
- 17. Kong TY, A Digital Fundamental Group, Computers and Graphics, 13(1989), 159-166.
- 18. Osilike M.O., "Stability Results For Fixed Point Iteration Procedures", J. The Nigerian Math. Society, 14 (15) (1995), 17-29.
- 19. Rhoades B.E., "A fixed point theorem for generalized metric spaces", Internat. J. Math. and Math. Sci., 19 (3) (1996), 457-460.
- 20. Rosenfeld A, Digital Topology, Amer. Math. Monthly, 86(1979), 76-87.
- 21. Samet B., Vetro C. and Vetro P., "Fixed point theorems for  $\alpha \psi$ -contractive mappings," Nonlinear Analysis, 75(2012), 2154-2165.
- 22. Schauder J., "Fixed point theorem in continuous mapping", Math. Ann., 174 (1930), 285-290.
- 23. Zamfirescu T., "Fixed Point Theorems In Metric Spaces", Arch. Math., 23 (1972), 292-298.

#### Source of support: Nil, Conflict of interest: None Declared.

[Copy right © 2017. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the International Journal of Mathematical Archive (IJMA), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.]