

## VARIANTS OF THE NONCONVEX MINIMIZATION THEOREM AND THE CARISTI'S FIXED POINT THEOREM

MARYAM A. ALGHAMDI<sup>2</sup>, HADEEL Z. ALZUMI<sup>1,2</sup>, NASEER SHAHZAD<sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Sciences, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Mathematics, College of Science, University of Jeddah, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia*

**Abstract.** The aim of this paper is to obtain variants of the nonconvex minimization theorem and the Caristi's fixed point theorem in quasi-metric spaces. We also prove a generalized Ekeland's variational principle.

**Keywords.** Caristi's fixed point theorem; Ekeland's variational principle; Nonconvex minimization theorem; Quasi-metric space.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

In 1996, Kada, Suzuki and Takahashi [9] introduced the notion of the  $w$ -distance metric space and proved extended versions of Takahashi's minimization theorem (see [16]), Caristi's fixed point theorem and Ekeland's variational principle.

A nonnegative real-valued function  $p$  on a metric space  $(X, d)$  is called a  $w$ -distance if the following conditions are satisfied:

- (i): for each  $x, y, z \in X$ ,  $p(x, z) \leq p(x, y) + p(y, z)$ ;
- (ii): for any  $x \in X$ , a mapping  $p(x, \cdot) : X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is lower semicontinuous;
- (iii): for any  $\delta > 0$ , there exists  $\mu > 0$  such that  $p(z, x) \leq \mu$  and  $p(z, y) \leq \mu$  imply  $d(x, y) \leq \delta$ .

The metric  $d$  is a classical example of the  $w$ -distance. For more details on the properties and examples of  $w$ -distance, we refer to [9].

In 1997, Suzuki [13] proved several fixed point theorems via  $w$ -distance and gave the characterization of the metric completeness. Since then, various results appeared as the generalizations of his results in many directions; see, e.g., [12, 14, 17]. One of those generalizations of the  $w$ -distance on a metric space was introduced again by Suzuki [15] and it is called  $\tau$ -distance. Park [10] extended this concept to quasi-metric spaces. He proved equivalent formulations to the Ekeland's Variational Principle (see Theorems 1, 1' and 2 in [15]). Inspired by Park's work, Al-Homidan, Ansari and Yao [1] suggested a generalization of the  $w$ -distance on a quasi-metric space, which is called the  $Q$ -function. In 2010, Ume [18] introduced the  $u$ -distance, which is

---

\*Corresponding author.

Email addresses: [maalghamdi@uj.edu.sa](mailto:maalghamdi@uj.edu.sa) (M.A. Alghamdi), [hzalzumi@uj.edu.sa](mailto:hzalzumi@uj.edu.sa) (Alzumi), [nshahzad@kau.edu.sa](mailto:nshahzad@kau.edu.sa) (N. Shahzad).

Received July 9, 2020; Accepted September 1, 2020.

a generalization of the  $w$ -distance, the  $\tau$ -distance and the Tataru's distance, and gave a minimization theorem, the Ekeland's variational principle, the Caristi's fixed point theorem using the  $u$ -distance on a metric space.

A nonnegative real-valued function  $\rho$  on a nonempty set  $X$  is called *quasi-metric* (see [5, 6]) if

- (i):  $\rho(x, z) \leq \rho(x, y) + \rho(y, z)$  ;
- (ii):  $\rho(x, y) = \rho(y, x) = 0 \Leftrightarrow x = y$ , for all  $x, y, z \in X$ .

The pair  $(X, \rho)$  is called a *quasi-metric space*. The *conjugate* of a quasi-metric  $\rho$  is a quasi-metric  $\bar{\rho}$  defined by  $\bar{\rho}(x, y) = \rho(y, x)$ ,  $x, y \in X$ . If  $\rho$  is a quasi-metric on  $X$ , a mapping  $\rho^s : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  defined by  $\rho^s(x, y) = \max\{\rho(x, y), \bar{\rho}(x, y)\}$  is a metric on  $X$ .

Let  $(X, \rho)$  be a quasi-metric space. Then, the open balls and closed balls are defined as follows: for  $x \in X$  and  $r > 0$ ,

$$B_\rho(x, r) = \{y \in X : \rho(x, y) < r\} \text{ ( open ball),}$$

$$B_\rho[x, r] = \{y \in X : \rho(x, y) \leq r\} \text{ ( closed ball).}$$

The topology  $\tau_\rho$  generated by a quasi-metric  $\rho$  on  $X$  is  $T_0$  and it is  $T_1$  if and only if  $\rho(x, y) > 0$  for any two distinct points  $x$  and  $y$  in  $X$ .

Since the quasi-metric space  $X$  is equipped with two topologies  $\tau_\rho$  and  $\tau_{\bar{\rho}}$ , the quasi-metric space  $(X, \tau_\rho, \tau_{\bar{\rho}})$  is considered as a bitopological space with respect to Kelly [7]. For more details on bitopological spaces, the reader can refer to [6, 7].

A sequence  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in a quasi-metric space  $(X, \rho)$  is  $\rho$ -convergent (resp.  $\bar{\rho}$ -convergent) to some  $x \in X$  if  $\rho(x, x_n) \rightarrow 0$  (resp.  $\bar{\rho}(x, x_n) \rightarrow 0 \Leftrightarrow \rho(x_n, x) \rightarrow 0$ ).

Lack of the symmetry condition in the definition of quasi-metric spaces makes various notions of Cauchy sequences, completeness and compactness. For instance, we refer to [8, 11]. Our basic structure can be found in [6, 11].

A sequence  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in a quasi-metric space  $(X, \rho)$  is called

- (i): *left (right)  $\rho$ -Cauchy* if, for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $x \in X$  and  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that, for all  $n \geq n_0$ ,

$$\rho(x, x_n) < \varepsilon, \text{ (resp. } \rho(x_n, x) < \varepsilon).$$

- (ii):  $\rho^s$ -Cauchy if, for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that, for all  $n, m \geq n_0$ ,

$$\rho^s(x_m, x_n) < \varepsilon,$$

that is, a sequence  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a Cauchy in a metric space  $(X, \rho^s)$ .

The quasi-metric space  $(X, \rho)$  is said to be  $\rho$ -sequentially (resp.  $\bar{\rho}$ -sequentially) complete if every  $\rho^s$ -Cauchy sequence in  $X$  is  $\rho$ -convergent (resp.  $\bar{\rho}$ -convergent) to  $x \in X$ .

Note that the notion of the left  $\rho$ -Cauchy sequence is equivalent to the notion of the right  $\bar{\rho}$ -Cauchy sequence, but for the completeness, the two notions are distinct. By the right  $\bar{\rho}$ -completeness, we mean that every left  $\rho$ -Cauchy sequence in  $X$  is  $\bar{\rho}$ -convergent while by the left  $\rho$ -completeness, we mean the convergence of such sequence with respect to  $\tau_\rho$ . For more details and examples, see [11].

In this paper, by using the notion of the  $w$ -distance, we aim to obtain variants of the nonconvex minimization theorem and the Caristi's fixed point theorem in quasi-metric spaces. Furthermore, we prove a general version of the Ekeland's variational principle.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

In a quasi-metric space  $(X, \rho)$ , a nonnegative real-valued function  $p$  on  $X$  is called a  $w$ -distance if the following conditions are satisfied [1, 10]:

- (w<sub>1</sub>)  $p(x, z) \leq p(x, y) + p(y, z)$  for all  $x, y, z \in X$ ;
- (w<sub>2</sub>) a mapping  $p(x, \cdot) : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  is  $\bar{\rho}$ -lower semicontinuous for any  $x \in X$ ;
- (w<sub>3</sub>) for any  $\delta > 0$ , there exists  $\mu > 0$  such that  $p(z, x) \leq \mu$  and  $p(z, y) \leq \mu$  imply  $\rho(x, y) \leq \delta$ .

Clearly, a quasi-metric  $\rho$  is not necessary to be a  $w$ -distance on  $(X, \rho)$ . The following example illustrates this case [8].

Let  $X = \mathbb{R}$  and  $\rho$  be a quasi-metric defined by

$$\rho(x, y) = \begin{cases} y - x, & \text{if } x \leq y, \\ 1, & \text{if } x > y. \end{cases}$$

Then,  $\rho$  satisfies (w<sub>1</sub>) and (w<sub>2</sub>), however, (w<sub>3</sub>) does not hold.

The following two lemmas play an important role in our theorems. Note that the following lemma is a general form of Lemma 1 in [13] in the case of the quasi-metric.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $(X, \rho)$  be a quasi-metric space. Let  $(x_n), (y_n)$  and  $(z_n)$  be sequences in  $X$  and let  $x, y, z \in X$ . Assume that  $p$  is a  $w$ -distance on  $X$ . Then the following hold:*

- (i): If  $p(y_n, x_n) \rightarrow 0$  and  $p(y_n, z_n) \rightarrow 0$ , then  $\rho(x_n, z_n) \rightarrow 0$ .
- (ii): If  $p(y_n, x_n) \rightarrow 0$  and  $p(y_n, z) \rightarrow 0$ , then  $(x_n)$  is  $\bar{\rho}$ -convergent to  $z$ .
- (iii): If  $p(y_n, x) \rightarrow 0$  and  $p(y_n, z) \rightarrow 0$ , then  $x = z$ . In particular, if  $p(y, x) = 0$  and  $p(y, z) = 0$ , then  $x = z$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** [2, Lemma 1] *Let  $(X, \rho)$  be a quasi-metric space and  $p$  a  $w$ -distance on  $X$ . Then, for any  $\delta > 0$ , there exists  $\mu > 0$  such that  $p(z, x) \leq \mu$  and  $p(z, y) \leq \mu$  imply  $\rho^s(x, y) \leq \delta$ .*

Throughout this paper,  $\mathbb{R}$  denotes the set of real numbers and  $\mathbb{R}^+ := [0, \infty)$  denotes the set of nonnegative real numbers.

## 3. THE MINIMIZATION THEOREM

In this section, we prove a nonconvex minimization theorem on a sequentially complete quasi-metric space  $(X, \rho)$ . Our results generalize the results of Kada et.al [1] and Park [8]. We set the following hypotheses.

*Hypothesis:*

1. Let  $\gamma : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  be subadditive, i.e.  $\gamma(u + v) \leq \gamma(u) + \gamma(v)$ ,  $\forall u, v \in \mathbb{R}^+$ , amenable, i.e.,  $\gamma^{-1}(\{0\}) = \{0\}$  and an increasing continuous map. For example,  $\gamma(u) = t^\alpha$ ,  $(0 < \alpha \leq 1)$ , for  $u \in \mathbb{R}^+$ . Let  $\Gamma$  be the family of all such functions  $\gamma$ .
2. Let  $\eta : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  be a map for which there exist  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  such that if  $\eta(u) \leq \varepsilon \implies \eta(u) \geq \gamma(u)$ . The family of all such functions  $\eta$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{A}$ .
3. Let  $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function such that  $F(0) = 0$ ,  $F^{-1}[0, \infty) \subset [0, \infty)$  and for  $u \in \mathbb{R}^+$ ,  $F$  is increasing upper semicontinuous. Also, we suppose that  $F$  is superadditive, i.e.,  $F(u) + F(v) \leq F(u + v)$  for  $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^+$ . The family of all such functions  $F$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{F}$ . For more details, see [19].

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $(X, \rho)$  be a  $\bar{\rho}$ -sequentially complete quasi-metric space and  $\varphi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  a  $\bar{\rho}$ -lower semicontinuous and bounded below function. Assume that there exists a  $w$ -distance  $p$  on  $X$  such that for any  $x \in X$  with*

$$\varphi(x) > \inf \{ \varphi(t) : t \in X \},$$

*there exists  $y \in X$  with  $y \neq x$  and*

$$\eta(p(x, y)) \leq F(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)),$$

*where  $\eta \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ . Then there exists  $z \in X$  such that*

$$\varphi(z) = \inf_{t \in X} \varphi(t).$$

*Proof.* Set  $\varphi_0 = \inf_{t \in X} \varphi(t)$ . Assume, to the contrary, that  $\varphi_0 < \varphi(y)$  for all  $y \in X$ . By use of the upper semicontinuity of  $F$  on  $\mathbb{R}^+$ , we have

$$\limsup_{u \rightarrow 0^+} F(u) \leq F(0) = 0.$$

Then, for  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  such that  $F(u) < \varepsilon$  for  $0 \leq u \leq \varepsilon_0$ . Let

$$X_0 = \{x \in X : \varphi(x) \leq \varphi_0 + \varepsilon_0\}.$$

Clearly,  $X_0 \neq \emptyset$ . We show that  $(X_0, \rho)$  is  $\bar{\rho}$ -sequentially complete. To show this, let  $(x_n)$  be a  $\rho^s$ -Cauchy sequence in  $X_0$ . Then  $(x_n) \subset X$  and

$$\varphi(x_n) \leq \varphi_0 + \varepsilon_0. \quad (3.1)$$

By use of the  $\bar{\rho}$ -sequential completeness of  $X$ , there exists  $z \in X$  such that  $x_n \xrightarrow{\bar{\rho}} z \in X$ , that is, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $n_\varepsilon > 0$  such that

$$\bar{\rho}(z, x_n) < \varepsilon, \quad (3.2)$$

for all  $n \geq n_\varepsilon$ . Since  $\varphi$  is  $\bar{\rho}$ -lower semicontinuous, it follows from (3.1) that

$$\varphi(z) \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x_i) \leq \varphi_0 + \varepsilon_0,$$

which implies that  $z \in X_0$ . It then follows from (3.2) that  $x_n \xrightarrow{\bar{\rho}} z \in X_0$ . Hence  $(X_0, \rho)$  is  $\bar{\rho}$ -sequentially complete. For  $x, y \in X_0$  with  $0 \leq \eta(p(x, y)) \leq F(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y))$ , we find from  $F^{-1}([0, \infty)) \subset [0, \infty)$  that  $\varphi(x) - \varphi(y) \geq 0$ . Also, for any  $x, y \in X_0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_0 &\leq \varphi(x) \leq \varphi_0 + \varepsilon_0, \\ \varphi_0 &\leq \varphi(y) \leq \varphi_0 + \varepsilon_0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Thus

$$0 \leq \varphi(x) - \varphi(y) \leq \varepsilon_0,$$

and

$$\eta(p(x, y)) \leq F(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Since  $\eta \in \mathcal{A}$ , we have

$$\gamma(p(x, y)) \leq \eta(p(x, y)) \leq F(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)).$$

For each  $x \in X_0$ , we define

$$S(x) = \{y \in X_0 : \gamma(p(x, y)) \leq F(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y))\}. \quad (3.4)$$

By the assumptions, we have, for each  $x \in X_0$ , there exists  $s \in X_0$  with  $s \neq x$  such that  $s \in S(x)$  and  $S(y) \subseteq S(x)$  for each  $y \in S(x)$ . Now, for each  $x \in X_0$ , let

$$I(x) = \inf \{ \varphi(y) : y \in S(x) \}. \quad (3.5)$$

Choose  $x \in X_0$ . Then define a sequence  $(x_n)$  in  $S(x)$  when  $x_1 = x$ ,  $x_i, i = 2, 3, \dots, n$ , have been chosen, and choose  $x_{n+1} \in S(x_n)$  such that

$$\varphi(x_{n+1}) < I(x_n) + \frac{1}{n} \quad (3.6)$$

for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus we have constructed a sequence  $(x_n)$  such that

$$\gamma(p(x_n, x_{n+1})) \leq F(\varphi(x_n) - \varphi(x_{n+1})), \quad (3.7)$$

$$\varphi(x_{n+1}) - \frac{1}{n} < I(x_n) \leq \varphi(x_{n+1}). \quad (3.8)$$

Since  $F^{-1}([0, \infty)) \subset [0, \infty)$ , we conclude from (3.7) that  $\varphi(x_{n+1}) \leq \varphi(x_n)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus  $(\varphi(x_n))$  is a decreasing sequence of reals and bounded below. Therefore, it converges, that is, there is  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\alpha = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x_n) = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \varphi(x_n).$$

In view of (3.8), we have

$$\alpha = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} I(x_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x_n) = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \varphi(x_n). \quad (3.9)$$

Then  $(x_n)$  is a  $p^s$ -Cauchy sequence. Indeed, if  $m > n$ , then it follows from  $(w_1)$  and the subadditivity of  $\gamma$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(p(x_n, x_m)) &\leq \gamma\left(\sum_{i=n}^{m-1} p(x_i, x_{i+1})\right) \leq \sum_{i=n}^{m-1} \gamma(p(x_i, x_{i+1})) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=n}^{m-1} (F(\varphi(x_i) - \varphi(x_{i+1}))). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $F(u) + F(v) \leq F(u+v)$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(p(x_n, x_m)) &\leq F\left(\sum_{i=n}^{m-1} (\varphi(x_i) - \varphi(x_{i+1}))\right) \\ &= F(\varphi(x_n) - \varphi(x_m)). \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

It then follows from the upper semicontinuity of  $F$  on  $\mathbb{R}^+$  that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \limsup_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \gamma(p(x_n, x_m)) \\ &\leq \limsup_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} F(\varphi(x_n) - \varphi(x_m)) \\ &\leq F(0) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

and so  $\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \gamma(p(x_n, x_m)) = 0$ , which implies that

$$\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} p(x_n, x_m) = 0.$$

Thus for any  $\delta > 0$ , there exists  $\mu > 0$  and  $n_\mu > 0$  such that  $p(x_n, x_m) < \mu$  whenever  $m > n \geq n_\mu$ . In particular,  $p(x_{n_\mu}, x_n) \leq \mu$  and  $p(x_{n_\mu}, x_m) \leq \mu$  whenever  $m, n \geq n_\mu$ . Hence, by use of Lemma 2.2, we have  $\rho^s(x_n, x_m) \leq \delta$  whenever  $m, n \geq n_\mu$ . It follows that  $(x_n)$  is  $\rho^s$ -Cauchy sequence in  $X_0$ . By use of the  $\bar{\rho}$ -sequential completeness of  $X_0$ , there exists  $z \in X_0$  such that

$$x_n \xrightarrow{\bar{\rho}} z. \quad (3.11)$$

Since  $\varphi$  is  $\bar{\rho}$ -lower semicontinuous, we have

$$\varphi(z) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x_n) = \alpha. \quad (3.12)$$

By using  $(w_2)$ , we have

$$p(x_n, z) \leq \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} p(x_n, x_m). \quad (3.13)$$

Since  $F$  is increasing, upper semicontinuous on  $\mathbb{R}^+$  and  $\gamma$  is continuous, we find from (3.10), (3.12) and (3.13) that

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(p(x_n, z)) &\leq \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \gamma(p(x_n, x_m)) \\ &\leq \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} F(\varphi(x_n) - \varphi(x_m)) \\ &\leq F(\varphi(x_n) - \alpha) \\ &\leq F(\varphi(x_n) - \varphi(z)). \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

It follows from (3.4), (3.5) and (3.14) that  $z \in S(x_n)$  and therefore

$$I(x_n) \leq \varphi(z) \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.15)$$

Taking the limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in (3.15), we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} I(x_n) \leq \varphi(z). \quad (3.16)$$

This together with (3.9) and (3.12) implies that

$$\varphi(z) = \alpha. \quad (3.17)$$

Since  $z \in S(x_n)$  and  $x_n \in S(x)$ , we have  $z \in S(x)$ . Suppose that  $s_1 \in S(z)$  and  $s_1 \neq z$ . Then  $\varphi(s_1) < \varphi(z) = \alpha$ . Again, since  $s_1 \in S(z)$ ,  $z \in S(x_n)$  and  $x_n \in S(x)$ , we have that  $S(z) \subseteq S(x_n) \subseteq S(x)$ . So  $s_1 \in S(x_n)$  and  $s_1 \in S(x)$ , which gives  $I(x_n) \leq \varphi(s_1)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . It further implies that

$$\alpha = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} I(x_n) \leq \varphi(s_1).$$

This contradicts the fact that  $\varphi(s_1) < \alpha$ . Thus  $S(z) = \{z\}$ . However, we can find  $y \in X$  with  $y \neq z$  and  $y \in S(z)$ , which is a contradiction. Hence, there exists  $z \in X$  such that  $\varphi(z) = \inf_{x \in X} \varphi(x)$ .  $\square$

#### 4. THE CARISTI'S FIXED POINT THEOREM

In this section, we use the notion of the  $w$ -distance to generalize the well-known Caristi's fixed point theorem [3, 9].

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $(X, \rho)$  be a  $\bar{\rho}$ -sequentially complete quasi-metric space and  $\varphi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  a  $\bar{\rho}$ -lower semicontinuous and bounded below function. Let  $T : X \rightarrow X$  be a mapping. Assume that there exists a  $w$ -distance  $p$  on  $X$  such that*

$$\eta(p(x, Tx)) \leq F(\varphi(x) - \varphi(Tx)) \quad (4.1)$$

for all  $x \in X$ , where  $\eta \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ . Then there is  $z_0 \in X$  such that  $z_0 = Tz_0$  and  $p(z_0, z_0) = 0$ .

*Proof.* Choose  $x \in X$  and let

$$Y = \{y \in X : \varphi(y) \leq \varphi(x)\}.$$

Then  $Y \neq \emptyset$ . We show that  $Y$  is  $\bar{\rho}$ -sequentially complete. Let  $(y_n) \subset Y$  be a  $\rho^s$ -Cauchy sequence such that  $y_n \xrightarrow{\bar{\rho}} y$ . We show that  $y \in Y$ . Since  $y_n \in Y$ , then  $\varphi(y_n) \leq \varphi(x)$ . By use of the lower semicontinuity of  $\varphi$  with respect to  $\bar{\rho}$ , we have

$$\varphi(y) \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(y_i) \leq \varphi(x),$$

which shows that  $y \in Y$ . Now, let  $y \in Y$ . Since  $F^{-1}([0, \infty)) \subset [0, \infty)$ , we have from (4.1) that

$$\varphi(Ty) \leq \varphi(y) \leq \varphi(x),$$

which implies that  $Ty \in Y$  and so  $Y$  is invariant under  $T$ . Suppose that  $Ty \neq y$  for all  $y \in Y$ . Then, by Theorem 3.1, there exists  $z \in Y$  such that  $\varphi(z) = \inf_{y \in Y} \varphi(y)$ . Since  $\eta(p(z, Tz)) \leq F(\varphi(z) - \varphi(Tz))$ , we have from  $F^{-1}([0, \infty)) \subset [0, \infty)$  that

$$\varphi(Tz) = \varphi(z) \text{ and } \eta(p(z, Tz)) = 0. \quad (4.2)$$

So, there exists  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  such that

$$\eta(p(z, Tz)) \leq F(\varphi(z) - \varphi(Tz)) \leq \varepsilon_0$$

and thus,

$$\gamma(p(z, Tz)) \leq \eta(p(z, Tz)) = 0. \quad (4.3)$$

From (4.1), we have

$$\eta(p(Tz, T^2z)) \leq F(\varphi(Tz) - \varphi(T^2z)).$$

This together with (4.2) and the condition  $F^{-1}([0, \infty)) \subset [0, \infty)$  implies that

$$\varphi(Tz) = \varphi(T^2z) \text{ and so } \gamma(p(Tz, T^2z)) = 0. \quad (4.4)$$

It follows from  $(w_1)$  and the subadditivity of  $\gamma$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(p(z, T^2z)) &\leq \gamma(p(z, Tz) + p(Tz, T^2z)) \\ &\leq \gamma(p(z, Tz)) + \gamma(p(Tz, T^2z)) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

Since (4.3), (4.5) and  $\gamma$  is amenable, we have

$$p(z, Tz) = 0 \text{ and } p(z, T^2z) = 0. \quad (4.6)$$

Thus, from Lemma 2.1 (iii), it follows that

$$Tz = T^2z. \quad (4.7)$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, there exists  $z_0 \in Y \subset X$  such that  $Tz_0 = z_0$ . Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(p(z_0, z_0)) &= \eta(p(z_0, Tz_0)) \leq F(\varphi(z_0) - \varphi(Tz_0)) = F(\varphi(z_0) - \varphi(z_0)) \\ &= F(0) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

So  $\gamma(p(z_0, z_0)) = 0$ . Since  $\gamma$  is amenable, we obtain  $p(z_0, z_0) = 0$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

We conclude this section by the following examples which show the applicability of Theorem 4.1.

**Example 4.1.** Let  $X = \omega$  and  $\rho$  be a quasi-metric on  $X$  defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(x, x) &= 0, & \text{for all } x \in X, \\ \rho(n, 0) &= \frac{1}{n}, & \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, \\ \rho(0, n) &= 1, & \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, \\ \rho(n, m) &= \left| \frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{m} \right|, & \text{for all } n, m \in \mathbb{N}.\end{aligned}$$

Then  $(X, \rho)$  is  $\bar{\rho}$ -sequentially complete quasi-metric space (see [2]). Define  $\varphi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $\varphi(x) = x^2$ ,  $\forall x \in X$ . Then,  $\varphi$  is a  $\bar{\rho}$ -lower semicontinuous and bounded below function. Let  $T : X \rightarrow X$  be a mapping on  $X$  defined by

$$T(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{x}{2}, & \text{if } x \text{ is even,} \\ x, & \text{if } x \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

for all  $x \in X$ . Now, define  $p : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  by  $p(x, y) = |x - y|$  for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $p(x, y) = 0$  for  $x = 0$  or  $y = 0$  is a  $w$ -distance on  $X$ . Take  $\eta(x) = x^\alpha$  for  $0 < \alpha \leq 1$  and  $F(x) = x^\beta$  for  $\beta \geq 1$  and  $x \geq 0$ . Therefore, we have the following cases:

Case 1: If  $x \in \mathbb{N}$  is odd, then

$$\eta(p(x, T(x))) = \eta(p(x, x)) = \eta(|x - x|) = \eta(0) = 0 = F(\varphi(x) - \varphi(T(x))).$$

Case 2: If  $x \in \mathbb{N}$  is even, then

$$\eta(p(x, T(x))) = \eta\left(p\left(x, \frac{x}{2}\right)\right) = \eta\left(\left|x - \frac{x}{2}\right|\right) = \eta\left(\frac{x}{2}\right) = \left(\frac{x}{2}\right)^\alpha,$$

and

$$F(\varphi(x) - \varphi(T(x))) = F\left(\varphi(x) - \varphi\left(\frac{x}{2}\right)\right) = F\left(x^2 - \frac{x^2}{4}\right) = F\left(\frac{3}{4}x^2\right) = \left(\frac{3}{4}x^2\right)^\beta.$$

Since  $x \leq x^2$ , it follows that  $\frac{1}{2}x \leq \frac{1}{2}x^2 \leq \frac{3}{4}x^2$  and then  $\left(\frac{1}{2}x\right)^\alpha \leq \left(\frac{3}{4}x^2\right)^\alpha \leq \left(\frac{3}{4}x^2\right)^\beta$ , where  $\alpha \leq 1 \leq \beta$ . It follows that

$$\eta(p(x, T(x))) \leq F(\varphi(x) - \varphi(T(x))).$$

Case 3: If  $x = 0$ , then

$$\eta(p(0, T(0))) = \eta(p(0, 0)) = \eta(0) = 0 = F(\varphi(0) - \varphi(T(0))).$$

Hence, in each cases, we have  $\eta(p(x, T(x))) \leq F(\varphi(x) - \varphi(T(x)))$  for all  $x \in X$ , that is,  $T$  satisfies the Caristi's condition and we can apply Theorem 4.1. Note that  $T$  has 0 and all odd points as fixed points.

**Example 4.2.** Let  $X = \mathbb{R}^+$  and  $\rho$  be a quasi-metric on  $X$  given by

$$\rho(x, y) = \max\{y - x, 0\}, \text{ for all } x, y \in X.$$

Then  $(X, \rho)$  is  $\bar{\rho}$ -sequentially complete quasi-metric space (see [2]). In fact, since  $\rho(x, 0) = \max\{-x, 0\} = 0$ , we have  $\bar{\rho}(0, x) = 0$  for all  $x \in X$ . Thus, every sequence in  $X$  is  $\bar{\rho}$ -convergent to 0. Let  $T : X \rightarrow X$  be a mapping on  $X$  defined by  $Tx = x + 1$  for all  $x \in X$ . Let  $\varphi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be defined by  $\varphi(x) = x - 1$  for every  $x \in X$ . Then  $\varphi$  is  $\bar{\rho}$ -lower semicontinuous and bounded below function. Take  $p(x, y) = y$  for all  $x, y \in X$ . Then  $p$  is a  $w$ -distance on  $X$ .

Let  $\eta(x) = x^\alpha$  for  $0 < \alpha \leq 1$  and  $F(x) = x^\beta$  for  $\beta \geq 1$  and  $x \in X$ . Then

$$\eta(p(x, Tx)) = (x + 1)^\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad F(\varphi(x) - \varphi(Tx)) = (-1)^\beta.$$

So,

$$\eta(p(x, Tx)) \geq F(\varphi(x) - \varphi(Tx)) \quad \text{if } \beta \text{ even}$$

and

$$\eta(p(x, Tx)) > F(\varphi(x) - \varphi(Tx)) \quad \text{if } \beta \text{ odd.}$$

Note that  $T$  has no fixed points in  $X$  and  $T$  does not satisfy the Caristi's condition.

## 5. EKELAND'S VARIATIONAL PRINCIPLE

In this section, we prove a general form of the Ekeland's variational principle in quasi-metric spaces. Our result generalizes various known results of some authors, including Kada, Suzuki and Takahashi [9], Zhang and Jiang [19] and Cobzas [4] in the setting of quasi-metric spaces via  $w$ -distance  $p$ .

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $(X, \rho)$  be a  $\bar{\rho}$ -sequentially complete quasi-metric space and  $\varphi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a  $\bar{\rho}$ -lower semicontinuous and bounded below function. Let  $p$  be a  $w$ -distance on  $X$ . Then the following statements hold:*

(1) *For any  $x \in X$ , there exists  $y \in X$  such that  $\varphi(y) \leq \varphi(x)$  and*

$$\gamma(p(y, s)) > F(\varphi(y) - \varphi(s)),$$

*for all  $s \in X \setminus \{y\}$ .*

(2) *For any  $\varepsilon > 0, \lambda > 0$  and  $x \in X$  with  $p(x, x) = 0$  and*

$$\varphi(x) \leq \inf_{t \in X} \varphi(t) + \varepsilon,$$

*where  $\gamma \in \Gamma, \eta \in A$  and  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ , there exists  $y \in X$  such that*

(i):  $\varphi(y) \leq \varphi(x)$ ;

(ii):  $\gamma(p(x, y)) \leq \frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon} F(\varepsilon)$ ;

(iii):  $F(\varphi(y) - \varphi(s)) < \frac{\varepsilon}{\lambda} \gamma(p(y, s))$ , for all  $s \in X \setminus \{y\}$ .

*Proof.* (1) Let  $x \in X$  and define

$$Z = \{y \in X : \varphi(y) \leq \varphi(x)\}.$$

Clearly,  $Z \neq \emptyset$  as  $\varphi(x) \leq \varphi(x)$ . We show that  $Z$  is a  $\bar{\rho}$ -sequentially complete. Let  $(y_n)$  be a  $\rho^s$ -Cauchy sequence in  $Z$  such that  $y_n \xrightarrow{\bar{\rho}} y$ . Since  $y_n \in Z$ , then  $\varphi(y_n) \leq \varphi(x)$ . By use of the lower semicontinuity of  $\varphi$  with respect to  $\bar{\rho}$ , we have

$$\varphi(y) \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(y_i) \leq \varphi(x),$$

which follows that  $y \in Z$ . Now, we show that there exists  $y \in Z$  such that

$$\gamma(p(y, s)) > F(\varphi(y) - \varphi(s)),$$

for all  $s \in X$  with  $y \neq s$ . If not, then, for each  $y \in Z$ , there is  $a \in X$  such that  $a \neq y$  and

$$\gamma(p(y, a)) \leq F(\varphi(y) - \varphi(a)).$$

Since  $\varphi(a) \leq \varphi(y) \leq \varphi(x)$ ,  $a \in Z$ , we find from the minimization theorem (Theorem 3.1 with  $\eta = \gamma$ ) that there is  $z \in Z$  such that  $\varphi(z) = \inf_{t \in Z} \varphi(t)$ . Again, for  $z \in Z$ , there exists  $b \in Z$  such that

$$b \neq z \text{ and } \gamma(p(z, b)) \leq F(\varphi(z) - \varphi(b)). \quad (5.1)$$

Using  $F^{-1}([0, \infty)) \subset [0, \infty)$ , we get  $\varphi(b) \leq \varphi(z)$ , From the minimality of  $\varphi(z)$ , we have  $\varphi(z) = \varphi(b)$ . In view of (5.1), we have  $\gamma(p(z, b)) = 0$ . Since  $\gamma$  is amenable, we have

$$p(z, b) = 0. \quad (5.2)$$

Similarly, for  $b \in Z$ , there exists  $c \in Z$  such that

$$c \neq b \text{ and } \gamma(p(b, c)) \leq F(\varphi(b) - \varphi(c)). \quad (5.3)$$

So,  $\varphi(b) = \varphi(c)$  and by (5.3) we obtain  $\gamma(p(b, c)) = 0$ . Since  $\gamma$  is amenable, we have

$$p(b, c) = 0. \quad (5.4)$$

Then, we immediately get from  $(w_1)$ , (5.2) and (5.4) that

$$p(z, c) = 0. \quad (5.5)$$

In view of (5.2), (5.5) and using Lemma 2.1 (iii), we have  $b = c$ , which contradicts to (5.3).

(2). Define

$$Y = \left\{ y \in X : F(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{\lambda} \gamma(p(x, y)) \right\}.$$

Clearly,  $x \in Y$  and then  $Y \neq \emptyset$ . To prove that  $Y$  is a  $\bar{\rho}$ -sequentially complete, let  $(y_n)$  be a  $\rho^s$ -Cauchy sequence in  $Y$  such that  $(y_n)$  is  $\bar{\rho}$ -convergent to some  $y \in X$ . Since  $y_n \in Y$ , we obtain

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{\lambda} \gamma(p(x, y_n)) \leq F(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y_n)). \quad (5.6)$$

By use of the lower semicontinuity of  $\varphi$  with respect to  $\bar{\rho}$ , we have

$$\varphi(y) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(y_n).$$

Setting  $\beta = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(y_n)$ , we find that there is a subsequence  $\varphi(y_{n_k})$  such that  $\varphi(y_{n_k}) \rightarrow \beta$ . It follows from  $F^{-1}([0, \infty)) \subset [0, \infty)$  and (5.6) that  $\varphi(x) - \varphi(y_n) \geq 0$ . Since  $\gamma$  is continuous and  $F$  is increasing, upper semicontinuous on  $\mathbb{R}^+$ , we have from (5.6) that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\varepsilon}{\lambda} \gamma(p(x, y)) &= \frac{\varepsilon}{\lambda} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \gamma(p(x, y_{n_k})) \\ &\leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} F(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y_{n_k})) \\ &\leq F(\varphi(x) - \beta) \leq F(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $y \in Y$ . The same manner of proof of statement (1) of this theorem yields  $y \in Y$  such that

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{\lambda} \gamma(p(y, s)) > F(\varphi(y) - \varphi(s)),$$

for each  $s \in X$  with  $s \neq y$ . On the other side, since  $y \in Y$ , we obtain

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{\lambda} \gamma(p(x, y)) \leq F(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)). \quad (5.7)$$

Using  $F^{-1}([0, \infty)) \subset [0, \infty)$ , we get

$$\varphi(y) \leq \varphi(x). \quad (5.8)$$

Also, by using (5.8) and the monotonicity of  $F$  on  $\mathbb{R}^+$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\varepsilon}{\lambda} \gamma(p(x, y)) &\leq F(\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)) \\ &\leq F\left(\varphi(x) - \inf_{t \in X} \varphi(t)\right) \\ &\leq F(\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

## REFERENCES

- [1] S. Al-Homidan, Q.H. Ansari, J.-C. Yao, Some generalizations of ekeland-type variational principle with applications to equilibrium problems and fixed point theory, *Nonlinear Anal.* 69 (2008), 126-139.
- [2] C. Alegre, J. Marin and S. Romaguera, A fixed point theorem for generalized contractions involving  $w$ -distances on complete quasi-metric spaces, *Fixed Point Theory Appl.* 2014, (2014), 40.
- [3] J. Caristi, Fixed point theorems for mappings satisfying inwardness conditions, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 215 (1976), 241-251.
- [4] S. Cobzas, Completeness in quasi-metric spaces and Ekelandv variational principle, *Topology and its Applications*, 158 (2011), 1073-1084.
- [5] S. Cobzas, Functional analysis in asymmetric normed spaces, arXiv:1006.1175v1, 2010
- [6] S. Cobzas, Functional Analysis in Asymmetric Normed Spaces, *Burkhäuser*, 2013.
- [7] J.C. Kelly, Bitopological spaces, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* 13 (1963), 71-89.
- [8] J. Marin, C. Alegre, Modified  $w$ -distances on quasi-metric spaces and a fixed point theorem on complete quasi-metric spaces, *Iberoamerican Conference on General Topology and its Applications*, pp. 26-31, Spain, 2014.
- [9] O. Kada, T. Suzuki, W. Takahashi, Nonconvex minimization theorems and fixed point theorem in complete metric spaces, *Math. Japonica*, 44 (1996), 381-391.
- [10] S. Park, On generalizations of the Ekeland-type variational principles, *Nonlinear Anal.* 39 (2000), 881-889.
- [11] I.L. Reilly, P.V. Subrahmanyam and M.K. Vamanamurthy, Cauchy sequences in quasi-pseudo-metric spaces, *Monatsh. Math.* 93 (1982), 127-140.
- [12] N. Shioji, T. Suzuki, W. Takahashi, Contractive mappings, Kannan mappings and metric completeness, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 126 10 (1998), 3117-3124.
- [13] T. Suzuki, Several fixed point theorems in complete metric spaces, *Yokohama Math. J.* 44 (1997), 61-72.
- [14] T. Suzuki, W. Takahashi, Fixed point theorems and characterizations of metric completeness, *Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal.* 8 (1996), 371-382.
- [15] T. Suzuki, Generalized diistance and existence theorems in complete metric spaces, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 253 (2001), 440-458.
- [16] W. Takahashi, Existence theorems generalizing fixed point theorems for multivalued mappings, In: M.A. Thera, J.B. Baillon, (ed.) *Fixed Point Theory and Applications*, Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series, vol. 252, pp. 397-406, 1991.
- [17] J.-S. Ume, Fixed point theorems related to Ćirić's contraction principle, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 225 (1998), 630-640.
- [18] J.-S. Ume, Existence theorem for generalized distance on complete metric spaces, *Fixed Point Theory Appl.* 2010 (2010), 397150.
- [19] G. Zhang, D. Jiang, On the fixed point theorems of Caristi type, *Fixed Point Theory* 14 (2013), 523-530.