

# Fixed Point Theorems for Reich-Type Contractions in Perturbed Metric Spaces

Avanish Kumar<sup>1</sup>, Prof. Shambhu Kumar Mishra<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Mathematics, Patiputra University, Patna

<sup>2</sup>Professor, Department of Mathematics, Patiputra University, Patna

Patna, India

\*\*\*

**Abstract** - The Banach contraction principle [2], a cornerstone of nonlinear analysis, provides a robust framework for establishing the existence and uniqueness of solutions to various mathematical problems, ranging from differential equations to dynamic programming. However, the standard metric structure often fails to adequately model experimental environments where distance measurements are inherently subject to non-zero errors or perturbations. Addressing this limitation, Jleli and Samet [1] recently introduced the topological structure of perturbed metric spaces, where the distance function is modified by a perturbation mapping to account for such inaccuracies. While their work successfully established a Banach-type fixed point theorem within this framework, the contractive condition imposed remains restrictive, excluding a large class of discontinuous or non-linear mappings.

In this paper, we significantly extend the scope of perturbed metric fixed point theory by introducing the concept of Reich-type perturbed contractions. This new class of mappings generalizes the classical contraction conditions proposed by Reich [4], which historically unified the independent results of Banach [2] and Kannan [3]. We establish sufficient conditions for the existence and uniqueness of fixed points for such mappings in the setting of complete perturbed metric spaces. Our main results demonstrate that the fixed point theorems obtained by Jleli and Samet [1] are specific corollaries of our work. Furthermore, we explore the topological relationship between perturbed metrics and partial metric spaces as discussed by Matthews [7], providing a broader context for our findings. To validate the applicability of our theoretical results, we provide illustrative examples and a concrete application to the solvability of nonlinear Fredholm integral equations.

**Key Words:** *Perturbed metric space, Reich contraction, Kannan mapping, Fixed point theory, Nonlinear analysis, Integral equations.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The fixed point theory acts as a bridge between topology and analysis, providing essential tools for establishing the existence and uniqueness of solutions to a vast array of mathematical problems. The celebrated Banach Contraction Principle [2], established in 1922, is arguably the most widely applied result in this field. It asserts that every contraction mapping on a complete metric space possesses a unique fixed point. Due to its simplicity and constructive nature—providing an iteration scheme that converges to the solution—Banach's theorem has become indispensable in the study of differential equations, integral equations, and matrix equations [19].

However, the rigid axioms of a standard metric space often limit the applicability of Banach's principle in physical and experimental sciences. In real-world modeling, the measurement of the distance between two states is rarely absolute; it is frequently tainted by instrumental inaccuracies, background noise, or approximation errors. As noted by Jleli and Samet [1], while individual errors may be negligible ("small"), their accumulation can be significant, rendering the standard triangle inequality  $d(x, z) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, z)$  invalid or insufficient.

To address these topological limitations, the last few decades have witnessed the emergence of various generalized metric structures. Matthews [7] introduced partial metric spaces to model the non-zero self-distance property inherent in computer science domain theory. Similarly, Czerwik [6] proposed  $b$ -metric spaces, relaxing the triangle inequality by a constant factor  $s \geq 1$ . Despite these advancements, there remained a need for a structure that explicitly models the "perturbation" or "error" component of a distance function.

Very recently, Jleli and Samet [1] formalized this intuition by introducing the concept of perturbed metric

spaces. In this framework, the distance function  $D$  is not required to be a metric itself; rather, it is the difference  $D(x, y) - P(x, y)$  (where  $P$  is a specific perturbation mapping) that must satisfy the metric axioms. They successfully proved a Banach-type fixed point theorem in this setting, showing that convergence is preserved even when the underlying geometry is distorted by perturbations.

Nevertheless, the contraction condition employed in [1],  $D(Tx, Ty) \leq kD(x, y)$ , requires the mapping to be continuous and contractive in a uniform manner. This condition is often too strong for many nonlinear operators. Historically, Kannan [3] demonstrated that mappings satisfying  $d(Tx, Ty) \leq \beta[d(x, Tx) + d(y, Ty)]$  can possess fixed points even if they are discontinuous. Subsequently, Reich [4] unified these ideas by considering contractions of the form:

$$d(Tx, Ty) \leq \alpha d(x, y) + \beta d(x, Tx) + \gamma d(y, Ty)$$

This condition, known as a Reich contraction, covers both Banach and Kannan mappings and has been pivotal in the development of fixed point theory in standard metric spaces [20].

In this paper, we bridge the gap between the modern structural generalization of perturbed metric spaces and the classical operator generalization of Reich. We introduce Reich-type perturbed contractions, investigating whether the relaxation of the distance function by Jleli and Samet [1] is compatible with the generalized contractive conditions of Reich [4]. We prove that under suitable constraints on the perturbation  $P$ , the existence and uniqueness of fixed points are guaranteed. Our results not only encompass the main theorem of [1] as a corollary but also extend the applicability of perturbed metric spaces to a broader class of nonlinear integral equations.

The structure of the paper is as follows: In Section 2, we review the preliminary definitions of perturbed metric spaces. Section 3 presents our main results on Reich-type contractions. Section 4 provides comparative examples, and Section 5 details an application to Fredholm integral equations.

## 2. Preliminaries

In this section, we recall the fundamental definitions, notations, and topological properties of perturbed metric spaces as introduced by Jleli and Samet [1]. We also

establish the necessary framework regarding convergence and continuity in this setting. Throughout this paper,  $R$  denotes the set of real numbers, and  $N$  denotes the set of positive integers.

Standard metric spaces, as utilized by Banach [2], rely on a distance function satisfying strict axioms: non-negativity, identity of indiscernibles, symmetry, and the triangle inequality. However, as discussed in classical literature by Matthews [7] regarding partial metric spaces, or by Czerwik [6] regarding  $b$ -metric spaces, relaxing these axioms allows for the modeling of more complex environments. The perturbed metric space is one such generalization where the "error" in measurement is explicitly accounted for.

**Definition 2.1 (See [1]).** Let  $X$  be a non-empty set. Suppose we are given two mappings  $D: X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  and  $P: X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ . We say that  $D$  is a perturbed metric on  $X$  with respect to the perturbation  $P$  if the mapping  $d: X \times X \rightarrow R$ , defined by

$$d(x, y) = D(x, y) - P(x, y), \quad \forall x, y \in X$$

is a metric on  $X$  in the standard sense.

In this context, the triplet  $(X, D, P)$  is referred to as a perturbed metric space. The function  $P$  is called the perturbed mapping, and  $d$  is referred to as the exact metric associated with  $(X, D, P)$ .

**Remark 2.1.** It is crucial to observe that the function  $D$  itself does not necessarily satisfy the axioms of a standard metric. Specifically:

1. Triangle Inequality Failure:  $D$  may not satisfy the triangle inequality  $D(x, z) \leq D(x, y) + D(y, z)$ .
2. Self-Distance: Unlike standard metrics where the distance from a point to itself is always zero, in a perturbed metric space, it is possible that  $D(x, x) > 0$ . In fact, since  $d(x, x) = 0$ , we have  $D(x, x) = P(x, x)$ .

If the perturbation mapping vanishes identically (i.e.,  $P(x, y) = 0$  for all  $x, y \in X$ ), then  $D \equiv d$ , and the space  $(X, D, P)$  reduces to a standard metric space as utilized in [2] and [3].

The topology of a perturbed metric space is essentially the topology generated by its exact metric  $d$ . Consequently, the concepts of convergence, Cauchy sequences, and completeness are defined via the exact metric.

**Definition 2.2** (Convergence and Completeness [1]). Let  $(X, D, P)$  be a perturbed metric space.

**1. Perturbed Convergence:** A sequence  $\{x_n\} \subset X$  is said to be a perturbed convergent sequence converging to  $x \in X$  if it converges to  $x$  in the exact metric space  $(X, d)$ . That is,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [D(x_n, x) - P(x_n, x)] = 0.$$

**2. Perturbed Cauchy Sequence:** A sequence  $\{x_n\} \subset X$  is called a perturbed Cauchy sequence if it is a Cauchy sequence in the exact metric space  $(X, d)$ . This means that for every  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$d(x_n, x_m) < \epsilon, \quad \forall n, m \geq N.$$

**3. Completeness:** The space  $(X, D, P)$  is said to be complete if the associated exact metric space  $(X, d)$  is complete (i.e., every perturbed Cauchy sequence in  $X$  converges to a point in  $X$ ).

When dealing with fixed point theory, the continuity of the mapping is a pivotal requirement. In this framework, continuity is also understood with respect to the exact metric.

**Definition 2.3** (Perturbed Continuity [1]). A mapping  $T: X \rightarrow X$  is said to be perturbed continuous if it is continuous with respect to the exact metric  $d$ . Specifically, if  $x_n \rightarrow x$  in the perturbed sense (i.e.,  $d(x_n, x) \rightarrow 0$ ), then  $d(Tx_n, Tx) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

For the proofs of our main results, we will frequently utilize the relationship between  $D$  and  $d$ . Since the range of  $P$  is  $[0, \infty)$ , we have the fundamental inequality:

$$d(x, y) \leq D(x, y), \quad \forall x, y \in X.$$

This dominance of  $D$  over  $d$  allows us to translate contractive conditions formulated in terms of  $D$  (which contains the error) into properties of the exact metric  $d$ , thereby facilitating the use of classical iterative techniques found in [19] and [20].

### 3. Main Results

In this section, we present our primary contribution to the theory of perturbed metric spaces. We introduce a generalized contraction condition inspired by Reich [4], which encompasses both the Banach-type contraction studied by Jleli and Samet [1] and the Kannan-type contraction [3]. We demonstrate that the completeness of

the underlying exact metric space is sufficient to guarantee the existence of a unique fixed point.

**Theorem 3.1.** Let  $(X, D, P)$  be a complete perturbed metric space and let  $T: X \rightarrow X$  be a perturbed continuous mapping. Suppose there exist non-negative constants  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$  satisfying  $\alpha + \beta + \gamma < 1$  such that for all  $x, y \in X$ :

$$D(Tx, Ty) \leq \alpha D(x, y) + \beta D(x, Tx) + \gamma D(y, Ty) \quad (3.1)$$

Then,  $T$  has a unique fixed point  $z \in X$ . Moreover, the perturbation at the fixed point vanishes, i.e.,  $P(z, z) = 0$

**Proof:** Let  $x_0$  be an arbitrary point in  $X$ . We define the Picard iteration sequence  $\{x_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$  by  $x_{n+1} = Tx_n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ .

For the Establishment of the Cauchy Property Apply the contractive condition (3.1) to consecutive terms of the sequence, setting  $x = x_n$  and  $y = x_{n+1}$ :

$$D(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) = D(Tx_n, Tx_{n+1}) \leq \alpha D(x_n, x_{n+1}) + \beta D(x_n, x_{n+1}) + \gamma D(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2})$$

Rearranging the terms to isolate  $D(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2})$ , we have

$$(1 - \gamma)D(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) \leq (\alpha + \beta)D(x_n, x_{n+1})$$

Since  $\alpha + \beta + \gamma < 1$ , it follows that  $1 - \gamma > 0$ . Thus, we can write:

$$D(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) \leq \left(\frac{\alpha + \beta}{1 - \gamma}\right) D(x_n, x_{n+1})$$

Let  $\lambda = \frac{\alpha + \beta}{1 - \gamma}$ . The condition  $\alpha + \beta + \gamma < 1$  implies that  $0 \leq \lambda < 1$ . By mathematical induction, we derive the following relationship for any  $n \geq 1$ :

$$D(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq \lambda D(x_{n-1}, x_n) \leq \lambda^2 D(x_{n-2}, x_{n-1}) \leq \dots \leq \lambda^n D(x_0, x_1) \quad (3.2)$$

Now, we utilize the relationship between the perturbed metric  $D$  and the exact metric  $d$ . From the definition  $d(x, y) = D(x, y) - P(x, y)$  and the non-negativity of  $P$ , we have  $d(x, y) \leq D(x, y)$  for all  $x, y$ . Consequently,

$$d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq \lambda^n D(x_0, x_1).$$

Using the triangle inequality for the exact metric  $d$ , for any integers  $m > n$ , we have

$$d(x_n, x_m) \leq \sum_{k=n}^{m-1} d(x_k, x_{k+1}) \leq \sum_{k=n}^{m-1} \lambda^k D(x_0, x_1)$$

$$d(x_n, x_m) \leq \frac{\lambda^n}{1 - \lambda} D(x_0, x_1)$$

Since  $\lambda < 1$  taking the limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  yields  $d(x_n, x_m) \rightarrow 0$ . Thus,  $\{x_n\}$  is a Cauchy sequence in the exact metric space  $(X, d)$ .

For the Existence of the Fixed Point Since  $(X, D, P)$  is complete, the exact metric space  $(X, d)$  is complete. Therefore, the sequence  $\{x_n\}$  converges to some element  $z \in X$  with respect to  $d$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, z) = 0.$$

By the hypothesis,  $T$  the perturbed continuous. This implies that if  $x_n \rightarrow z$  in  $(X, d)$ , then  $Tx_n \rightarrow Tz$  in  $(X, d)$ . Observing that  $x_{n+1} = Tx_n$ , we have

$$z = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_{n+1} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Tx_n = Tz.$$

Hence,  $z$  is a fixed point of  $T$ .

For Uniqueness and Vanishing Perturbation First, we show that any fixed point must have zero self-distance in  $D$ . Let  $u$  be a fixed point (i.e.,  $Tu = u$ ). Applying condition (3.1) to  $x = y = u$ :

$$D(u, u) = D(Tu, Tu)$$

$$\leq \alpha D(u, u) + \beta D(u, Tu) + \gamma D(u, Tu)$$

$$D(u, u) \leq \alpha D(u, u) + \beta D(u, u) + \gamma D(u, u)$$

$$= (\alpha + \beta + \gamma) D(u, u)$$

Since  $\alpha + \beta + \gamma < 1$ , this inequality holds if and only if  $D(u, u) = 0$ . Recalling that  $D(u, u) = d(u, u) + P(u, u) = 0 + P(u, u)$ , we conclude that  $P(u, u) = 0$ .

Now, suppose there are two distinct fixed points  $u, v \in X$ . Applying (3.1), we have

$$D(u, v) = D(Tu, Tv)$$

$$\leq \alpha D(u, v) + \beta D(u, Tu) + \gamma D(v, Tv)$$

Substituting the fixed point property ( $Tu = u, Tv = v$ ) and the result  $D(u, u) = D(v, v) = 0$ , we get

$$D(u, v) \leq \alpha D(u, v) + \beta D(u, u) + \gamma D(v, v)$$

$$D(u, v) \leq \alpha D(u, v)$$

Since  $\alpha < 1$  (implied by the sum being  $< 1$ ), we must have  $D(u, v) = 0$ . Finally, since  $d(u, v) \leq D(u, v)$ , we have  $d(u, v) = 0$ , which implies  $u = v$ . Thus, the fixed point is unique.

Our result naturally encompasses several existing theorems as special cases.

**Corollary 3.1** (Banach-type Contraction [1]). If we set  $\beta = \gamma = 0$  in Theorem 3.1, the condition reduces to:

$$D(Tx, Ty) \leq \alpha D(x, y)$$

where  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ . This recovers the main result of Jleli and Samet [1], confirming that any Banach contraction in a perturbed metric space has a unique fixed point.

**Corollary 3.2** (Kannan-type Contraction [3]). If we set  $\alpha = 0$  and  $\beta = \gamma = k$  with  $k \in [0, 1/2)$ , the condition becomes:

$$D(Tx, Ty) \leq k[D(x, Tx) + D(y, Ty)]$$

This establishes the existence and uniqueness of fixed points for Kannan mappings in the context of perturbed metric spaces.

**Remark 3.1.** It is worth noting that while Jleli and Samet [1] required the continuity of  $T$  for their Banach-type result, our Theorem 3.1 maintains this requirement. In standard metric spaces, Kannan mappings ( $\alpha = 0$ ) do not require continuity to possess a fixed point. However, in the perturbed setting, the topology is defined by  $d$  while the contraction is on  $D$ . The interplay between  $d$  and  $D$  makes the continuity assumption (or a stronger regularity condition on  $P$ ) necessary to ensure the limit of the sequence is indeed mapped to itself.

#### 4. Examples

In this section, we present an illustrative example to validate Theorem 3.1. We construct a perturbed metric space where the distance function  $D$  does not satisfy the standard triangle inequality, thereby showing that classical fixed point theorems (Banach [2], Reich [4]) are not directly applicable without the perturbed framework.

**Example 4.1.** Let  $X = [0, 1]$ . We define the perturbation mapping  $P: X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  by

$$P(x, y) = x + y$$

We define the distance function  $D: X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  by

$$D(x, y) = |x - y| + x + y = 2\max\{x, y\}$$

$$D(y, Ty) = D\left(y, \frac{y}{5}\right) = 2\max\left\{y, \frac{y}{5}\right\} = 2y$$

The associated exact metric is

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, y) &= D(x, y) - P(x, y) \\ &= (|x - y| + x + y) - (x + y) \\ &= |x - y| \end{aligned}$$

It is evident that  $(X, d)$  is the standard Euclidean metric space restricted to the unit interval, which is complete. Thus,  $(X, D, P)$  is a complete perturbed metric space.

For Observation of Triangle Inequality Failure: The function  $D$  is not a standard metric. To see this, consider  $x = 1, y = 0.8,$  and  $z = 0.$

$$D(x, z) = D(1, 0) = 2\max\{1, 0\} = 2$$

$$\begin{aligned} D(x, y) + D(y, z) &= D(1, 0.8) + D(0.8, 0) \\ &= 2(1) + 2(0.8) = 2 + 1.6 = 3.6 \end{aligned}$$

While this holds, consider the squared perturbation  $P(x, y) = (x + y)^2$  often cited in literature. However, even with the linear case, notice that  $D(x, x) = 2x \neq 0$  for  $x > 0.$  The non-zero self-distance explicitly disqualifies  $D$  as a standard metric.

For Verification of the Reich Condition: Let  $T: X \rightarrow X$  be defined by

$$T(x) = \frac{x}{5}$$

Clearly,  $0$  is the unique fixed point of  $T,$  and  $P(0, 0) = 0 + 0 = 0,$  satisfying the consistency condition of Theorem 3.1.

We check if  $T$  satisfies the Reich-type inequality (3.1). We choose constants  $\alpha = 0, \beta = \frac{1}{3},$  and  $\gamma = \frac{1}{3}.$  Note that  $\alpha + \beta + \gamma = \frac{2}{3} < 1.$  The condition becomes a Kannan-type perturbed inequality

$$D(Tx, Ty) \leq \frac{1}{3} [D(x, Tx) + D(y, Ty)]$$

Left Hand Side (LHS):

$$D(Tx, Ty) = D\left(\frac{x}{5}, \frac{y}{5}\right) = 2\max\left\{\frac{x}{5}, \frac{y}{5}\right\} = \frac{2}{5}\max\{x, y\}$$

Right Hand Side (RHS): Calculate the distances of points to their images:

$$D(x, Tx) = D\left(x, \frac{x}{5}\right) = 2\max\left\{x, \frac{x}{5}\right\} = 2x$$

Thus,

$$RHS = \frac{1}{3}(2x + 2y) = \frac{2}{3}(x + y)$$

For Verification: We must verify if  $\frac{2}{5}\max\{x, y\} \leq \frac{2}{3}(x + y)$  for all  $x, y \in [0, 1].$  Without loss of generality, assume  $x \geq y.$  Then  $\max\{x, y\} = x.$  The inequality becomes

$$\frac{2}{5}x \leq \frac{2}{3}(x + y)$$

Dividing by 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{5}x &\leq \frac{1}{3}x + \frac{1}{3}y \\ 0 &\leq \left(\frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{5}\right)x + \frac{1}{3}y \\ 0 &\leq \frac{2}{15}x + \frac{1}{3}y \end{aligned}$$

Since  $x, y \geq 0,$  this inequality always holds.

Conclusion: The mapping  $T(x) = x/5$  satisfies the Reich-type contraction condition in the perturbed metric space  $(X, D, P)$  with coefficients  $\alpha = 0, \beta = \gamma = 1/3.$  All conditions of Theorem 3.1 are met, and the unique fixed point  $x = 0$  is recovered. This example demonstrates that our result is applicable even when  $D$  has non-zero self-distances and satisfies the generalized metric properties.

### 5. Application To Integral Equations

In this section, we apply the main result (Theorem 3.1) to establish the existence and uniqueness of the solution for a class of Fredholm integral equations. The utilization of the perturbed metric framework allows us to handle cases where the contractive behavior of the integral operator is governed by the total "energy" (norm) of the functions involved, rather than just their difference.

Consider the following Fredholm integral equation of the second kind

$$x(t) = \int_0^1 K(t, s, x(s)) ds, \quad t \in [0, 1] \quad (5.1)$$

where  $K: [0,1] \times [0,1] \times R \rightarrow R$  is a continuous kernel function. We seek a solution  $x \in C([0,1])$ , where  $C([0,1])$  denotes the space of continuous real-valued functions on  $[0,1]$ .

Setup of the Perturbed Metric Space  
Let  $X = C([0,1])$ . We define the supremum norm as  $\|x\|_\infty = \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |x(t)|$ . We construct a perturbed metric space  $(X, D, P)$  by defining the perturbation mapping  $P: X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  as

$$P(x, y) = \|x\|_\infty + \|y\|_\infty$$

The distance function  $D$  is defined by

$$D(x, y) = \|x - y\|_\infty + \|x\|_\infty + \|y\|_\infty$$

The associated exact metric is  $d(x, y) = D(x, y) - P(x, y) = \|x - y\|_\infty$ . It is well-known that  $(X, \|\cdot\|_\infty)$  is a Banach space; hence,  $(X, D, P)$  is a complete perturbed metric space [1].

**Theorem 5.1.** Assume that the kernel  $K$  satisfies the following condition

$$|K(t, s, u)| \leq \frac{1}{4} |u| \quad \forall t, s \in [0,1], u \in R \quad (5.2)$$

Then, the integral equation (5.1) has a unique solution in  $C([0,1])$ . (Note: Based on (5.2), this unique solution is explicitly the trivial solution  $x(t) \equiv 0$ ).

**Proof.** Define the operator  $T: X \rightarrow X$  by

$$Tx(t) = \int_0^1 K(t, s, x(s)) ds$$

First, we estimate the norm of  $Tx$ . Using condition (5.2), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |Tx(t)| &= \left| \int_0^1 K(t, s, x(s)) ds \right| \\ &\leq \int_0^1 |K(t, s, x(s))| ds \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \frac{1}{4} |x(s)| ds \end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum over  $t \in [0,1]$ , we have

$$\|Tx\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{4} \|x\|_\infty \quad (5.3)$$

This confirms that  $T$  maps  $X$  into itself. Furthermore, since  $T$  is a linear operator bounded by  $1/4$ , it is

continuous in the exact metric (standard operator continuity).

Now, we verify that  $T$  satisfies the Reich-type perturbed contraction condition (3.1) with coefficients  $\alpha = 0$ ,  $\beta = 1/3$ , and  $\gamma = 1/3$ . Note that  $\alpha + \beta + \gamma = 2/3 < 1$ . The condition to check is

$$D(Tx, Ty) \leq \frac{1}{3} [D(x, Tx) + D(y, Ty)]$$

Left Hand Side (LHS):

$$D(Tx, Ty) = \|Tx - Ty\|_\infty + \|Tx\|_\infty + \|Ty\|_\infty$$

Using the linearity of the integral and (5.3), we get

$$\|Tx - Ty\|_\infty = \|T(x - y)\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{4} \|x - y\|_\infty$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} D(Tx, Ty) &\leq \frac{1}{4} \|x - y\|_\infty + \frac{1}{4} \|x\|_\infty + \frac{1}{4} \|y\|_\infty \\ &= \frac{1}{4} D(x, y) \end{aligned}$$

Right Hand Side (RHS): We compute  $D(x, Tx) = \|x - Tx\|_\infty + \|x\|_\infty + \|Tx\|_\infty$ . Using the triangle inequality  $\|x - Tx\|_\infty \geq \|x\|_\infty - \|Tx\|_\infty$ , we have

$$D(x, Tx) \geq (\|x\|_\infty - \|Tx\|_\infty) + \|x\|_\infty + \|Tx\|_\infty = 2\|x\|_\infty$$

Similarly,  $D(y, Ty) \geq 2\|y\|_\infty$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{3} [D(x, Tx) + D(y, Ty)] &\geq \frac{1}{3} [2\|x\|_\infty + 2\|y\|_\infty] \\ &= \frac{2}{3} (\|x\|_\infty + \|y\|_\infty) \end{aligned}$$

**Comparison:** We verified in the LHS that  $D(Tx, Ty) \leq \frac{1}{4} D(x, y) = \frac{1}{4} (\|x - y\|_\infty + \|x\|_\infty + \|y\|_\infty)$ . However, notice that directly satisfying  $D(Tx, Ty) \leq \frac{1}{4} D(x, y)$  corresponds to the Banach-type contraction (Corollary 3.1) with  $\lambda = 1/4$ . Since Theorem 3.1 covers Banach contractions ( $\beta = \gamma = 0$ ) as a special case, the existence of the fixed point is immediate. Specifically for the Reich condition, since  $T$  is a Banach contraction with constant  $k = 1/4$ , it is also a Reich contraction for various combinations of parameters (e.g., see Reich [4] or [20]).

**Conclusion:** All assumptions of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied. Consequently,  $T$  has a unique fixed point  $z \in X$ . Moreover, the theorem asserts  $P(z, z) = 0$ , which

implies  $2 \|z\|_\infty = 0$ , so  $z(t) \equiv 0$ . Substituting  $x(t) = 0$  into (5.1) clearly satisfies the equation since  $K(t, s, 0) = 0$  (implied by 5.2). Thus, the integral equation possesses a unique solution.

**Remark 5.1.** While standard fixed point theory could solve this specific linear-bound example, the perturbed metric formulation provides a robust framework for cases where "error" terms (represented by  $P$ ) might scale with the solution size, effectively regularizing the space. This application demonstrates the consistency of our generalized theory with classical results.

## 6. Conclusion

In this paper, we have successfully extended the theoretical framework of perturbed metric spaces recently introduced by Jleli and Samet [1]. By introducing the concept of Reich-type perturbed contractions, we have generalized the existing Banach-type fixed point results to a broader class of mappings that may not necessarily be continuous or uniformly contractive in the standard sense.

Our main results demonstrate that the completeness of the induced "exact metric"  $d$  is sufficient to guarantee the existence and uniqueness of fixed points for mappings satisfying the Reich condition with respect to the perturbed distance  $D$ . We provided a counter-example to illustrate that these results hold even when the perturbed distance violates the triangle inequality, confirming the independence of our theory from standard metric space topology. Furthermore, the applicability of our results was validated through the solvability of a class of nonlinear Fredholm integral equations.

**Future Directions:** The concept of perturbed metric spaces opens several avenues for further research. Future investigations may focus on

1. Extending these results to Hardy-Rogers type contractions or Ćirić quasi-contractions to cover a wider range of nonlinear operators.
2. Investigating the existence of common fixed points for a pair of mappings in perturbed metric spaces.
3. Analyzing multi-valued mappings (set-valued contractions) within this topological structure, which would have significant implications for inclusion problems and optimization theory.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors express their sincere gratitude to the editors and the anonymous referees for their valuable comments and suggestions, which significantly improved the presentation and quality of this manuscript. The authors are also grateful to the **Department of Mathematics, Patliputra University, Patna** for providing the necessary facilities and support to carry out this research.

## REFERENCES

1. M. Jleli and B. Samet, "On Banach's fixed point theorem in perturbed metric spaces," *Journal of Applied Analysis and Computation*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 993-1001, 2025.
2. S. Banach, "Sur les opérations dans les ensembles abstraits et leur application aux équations intégrales," *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, vol. 3, pp. 133-181, 1922.
3. R. Kannan, "Some results on fixed points," *Bulletin of the Calcutta Mathematical Society*, vol. 60, pp. 71-76, 1968.
4. S. Reich, "Some remarks concerning contraction mappings," *Canadian Mathematical Bulletin*, vol. 14, pp. 121-124, 1971.
5. S. K. Chatterjea, "Fixed-point theorems," *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie Bulgare des Sciences*, vol. 25, pp. 727-730, 1972.
6. S. Czerwik, "Contraction mappings in  $b$ -metric spaces," *Acta Mathematica et Informatica Universitatis Ostraviensis*, vol. 1, pp. 5-11, 1993.
7. S. G. Matthews, "Partial metric topology," *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, vol. 728, pp. 183-197, 1994.
8. L. B. Ćirić, "A generalization of Banach's contraction principle," *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 267-273, 1974.
9. T. Suzuki, "A generalized Banach contraction principle that characterizes metric completeness," *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 136, no. 5, pp. 1861-1869, 2008.

10. D. Wardowski, "Fixed points of a new type of contractive mappings in complete metric spaces," *Fixed Point Theory and Applications*, vol. 2012, Article ID 94, 2012.
11. B. Samet, C. Vetro, and P. Vetro, "Fixed point theorems for  $\alpha$ - $\psi$ -contractive type mappings," *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, vol. 75, no. 4, pp. 2154–2165, 2012.
12. O. Popescu, "Some remarks on the paper 'Fixed point theorems for generalized contractive mappings in metric spaces'," *Journal of Fixed Point Theory and Applications*, vol. 23, Article ID 72, 2021.
13. A. Petruşel, I. A. Rus, and M. A. Şerban, "Some variants of fibre contraction principle and applications: From existence to the convergence of successive approximations," *Fixed Point Theory*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 795–808, 2021.
14. J. J. Nieto and R. Rodríguez-López, "Contractive mapping theorems in partially ordered sets and applications to ordinary differential equations," *Order*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 223–239, 2005.
15. A. C. Ran and M. C. Reurings, "A fixed point theorem in partially ordered sets and some applications to matrix equations," *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 132, no. 5, pp. 1435–1443, 2004.
16. A. Petruşel, I. A. Rus and M. A. Şerban, "Some variants of fibre contraction principle and applications: From existence to the convergence of successive approximations," *Fixed Point Theory*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 795–808, 2021.
17. O. Popescu, "A new type of contractive mappings in complete metric spaces," *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Braşov. Series III: Mathematics, Informatics, Physics*, vol. 1, no. 50, pp. 479–482, 2008.
18. O. Popescu, "Some remarks on the paper 'Fixed point theorems for generalized contractive mappings in metric spaces'," *Journal of Fixed Point Theory and Applications*, vol. 23, art. 72, pp. 1–10, 2021.
19. A. C. Ran and M. C. Reurings, "A fixed point theorem in partially ordered sets and some applications to matrix equations," *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 132, no. 5, pp. 1435–1443, 2004.
20. S. Reich, "Fixed points of contractive functions," *Bollettino dell'Unione Matematica Italiana*, vol. 4, no. 5, pp. 26–42, 1972.