COMMON FIXED POINTS OF SINGLE-VALUED AND MULTIVALUED MAPS

YICHENG LIU, JUN WU, AND ZHIXIANG LI

Received 19 June 2005 and in revised form 1 September 2005

We define a new property which contains the property (EA) for a hybrid pair of single- and multivalued maps and give some new common fixed point theorems under hybrid contractive conditions. Our results extend previous ones. As an application, we give a partial answer to the problem raised by Singh and Mishra.

1. Introduction and preliminaries

Let (X,d) be a metric space. Then, for $x \in X$, $A \subset X$, $d(x,A) = \inf\{d(x,y),\ y \in A\}$. We denote $CB(X)$ as the class of all nonempty bounded closed subsets of X. Let H be the Hausdorff metric with respect to d, that is,

$$H(A,B) = \max\left\{\sup_{x\in A} d(x,B), \sup_{y\in B} d(y,A)\right\}, \tag{1.1}$$

for every $A,B \in CB(X)$. A self-map T defined on X satisfies Rhoades' contractive definition in following sense: (see [19]) for all $x, y \in X$, $x \neq y$,

$$d(Tx,Ty) < \max\{d(x,y), d(x,Tx), d(y,Ty), d(x,Ty), d(y,Tx)\}. \tag{1.2}$$

The fixed points theorems for Rhoades-type contraction mapping were investigated by many authors [1, 5, 8, 10, 13, 16, 22] and the more results on this fields can be found in [2, 4, 9, 11, 15, 23]. Hybrid fixed point theory for nonlinear single-valued and multivalued maps is a new development in the domain of contraction-type multivalued theory (see [3, 7, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 20] and references therein). In 1998, Jungck and Rhoades [12] introduced the notion of weak compatibility to the setting of single-valued and multivalued maps. In [21], Singh and Mishra introduced the notion of (IT)-commutativity for hybrid pair of single-valued and multivalued maps which need not be weakly compatible. Recently, Aamri and El Moutawakil [1] defined a property (EA) for self-maps which contained the class of noncompatible maps. More recently, Kamran [13] extended the property (EA) for a hybrid pair of single- and multivalued maps and generalized the notion of (IT)-commutativity for such pair.

International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences 2005:19 (2005) 3045–3055
DOI: 10.1155/IJMMS.2005.3045

The aim of this paper is to define a new property which contains the property (EA) for a hybrid pair of single- and multivalued maps and give some new common fixed point theorems under hybrid contractive conditions. As an application, we give an affirmative (half-) answer (Theorem 2.8) to the open problem in [21].

Now we state some known definitions and facts.

Definition 1.1 [12]. Maps $f : X \to X$ and $T : X \to CB(X)$ are weakly compatible if they commute at their coincidence points, that is, if $fTx = Tfx$ whenever $fx \in Tx$.

Definition 1.2 [21]. Maps $f : X \to X$ and $T : X \to CB(X)$ are said to be (IT)-commuting at $x \in X$ if $fTx \subset Tfx$ whenever $fx \in Tx$.

Definition 1.3 [1]. Maps $f, g : X \to X$ are said to satisfy the property (EA) if there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} fx_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} gx_n = t \in X$.

Definition 1.4 [13]. Maps $f : X \to X$ and $T : X \to CB(X)$ are said to satisfy the property (EA) if there exist a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X, some t in X, and A in $CB(X)$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} fx_n = t \in A = \lim_{n\to\infty} Tx_n. \tag{1.3}$$

Definition 1.5 [13]. Let $T : X \to CB(X)$. The map $f : X \to X$ is said to be T-weakly commuting at $x \in X$ if $ffx \in Tfx$.

For the rest of the introduction, we state the following theorem as the prototype in this paper.

Theorem 1.6 (see [13]). *Let f be a self-map of the metric space (X,d) and let F be a map from X into $CB(X)$ such that*

(1) *(f,F) satisfies the property (EA);*

(2) *for all $x \neq y$ in X,*

$$H(Fx,Fy) < \max\left\{d(fx,fy), \frac{d(fx,Fx)+d(fy,Fy)}{2}, \frac{d(fx,Fy)+d(fy,Fx)}{2}\right\}. \tag{1.4}$$

If fX is closed subset of X, then

(a) *f and F have a coincidence point;*

(b) *f and F have a common fixed point provided that f is F-weakly commuting at v and $ffv = fv$ for $v \in C(f,F)$, where $C(f,F) = \{x : x$ is a coincidence point of f and $F\}$.*

2. Main results

We begin with the following definition.

Definition 2.1. (1) Let $f, g, F, G : X \to X$. The maps pair (f,F) and (g,G) are said to satisfy the *common property (EA)* if there exist two sequences $\{x_n\}$, $\{y_n\}$ in X and some t in X such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} Gy_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} Fx_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} fx_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} gy_n = t \in X. \tag{2.1}$$

(2) Let $f,g : X \to X$ and $F,G : X \to CB(X)$. The maps pair (f,F) and (g,G) are said to satisfy the *common property (EA)* if there exist two sequences $\{x_n\}$, $\{y_n\}$ in X, some t in X, and A, B in $CB(X)$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} Fx_n = A, \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} Gy_n = B, \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} fx_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} gy_n = t \in A \cap B. \tag{2.2}$$

Example 2.2. Let $X = [1,+\infty)$ with the usual metric. Define $f,g : X \to X$ and $F,G : X \to CB(X)$ by $f(x) = 2 + x/3$, $g(x) = 2 + x/2$, and $F(x) = [1,2+x]$, $G(x) = [3,3+x/2]$ for all $x \in X$. Consider the sequences $\{x_n\} = \{3+1/n\}$, $\{y_n\} = \{2+1/n\}$. Clearly, $\lim_{n\to\infty} Fx_n = [1,5] = A$, $\lim_{n\to\infty} Gy_n = [3,4] = B$, $\lim_{n\to\infty} fx_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} gy_n = 3 \in A \cap B$. Therefore, (f,F) and (g,G) are said to satisfy the common property (EA).

Theorem 2.3. *Let f, g be two self-maps of the metric space (X,d) and let F, G be two maps from X into $CB(X)$ such that*

(1) *(f,F) and (g,G) satisfy the common property (EA);*

(2) *for all $x \neq y$ in X,*

$$H(Fx,Gy) < \max\left\{d(fx,gy), \frac{d(fx,Fx)+d(gy,Gy)}{2}, \frac{d(fx,Gy)+d(gy,Fx)}{2}\right\}. \tag{2.3}$$

If fX and gX are closed subsets of X, then

(a) *f and F have a coincidence point;*

(b) *g and G have a coincidence point;*

(c) *f and F have a common fixed point provided that f is F-weakly commuting at v and $ffv = fv$ for $v \in C(f,F)$;*

(d) *g and G have a common fixed point provided that g is G-weakly commuting at v and $ggv = gv$ for $v \in C(g,G)$;*

(e) *f, g, F, and G have a common fixed point provided that both (c) and (d) are true.*

Proof. Since (f,F) and (g,G) satisfy the common property (EA), there exist two sequences $\{x_n\}$, $\{y_n\}$ in X and $u \in X$, $A,B \in CB(X)$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} Fx_n = A, \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} Gy_n = B,$$
$$\lim_{n\to\infty} fx_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} gy_n = u \in A \cap B. \tag{2.4}$$

By virtue of fX and gX being closed, we have $u = fv$ and $u = gw$ for some $v,w \in X$. We claim that $fv \in Fv$ and $gw \in Gw$. Indeed, condition (2) implies that

$$H(Fx_n,Gw) < \max\left\{d(fx_n,gw), \frac{d(fx_n,Fx_n)+d(gw,Gw)}{2}, \frac{d(fx_n,Gw)+d(gw,Fx_n)}{2}\right\}. \tag{2.5}$$

Taking the limit as $n \to \infty$, we obtain

$$H(A,Gw) < \max\left\{d(fv,gw), \frac{d(fv,A)+d(gw,Gw)}{2}, \frac{d(fv,Gw)+d(gw,A)}{2}\right\}$$
$$= \frac{d(gw,Gw)}{2}. \tag{2.6}$$

Since $gw = fv \in A$, it follows from the definition of Hausdorff metric that

$$d(gw,Gw) \leq H(A,Gw) \leq \frac{d(gw,Gw)}{2}, \tag{2.7}$$

which implies that $gw \in Gw$.

On the other hand, by condition (2) again, we have

$$H(Fv,Gy_n) < \max\left\{d(fv,gy_n), \frac{d(fv,Fv)+d(gy_n,Gy_n)}{2}, \frac{d(fv,Gy_n)+d(gy_n,Fv)}{2}\right\}. \tag{2.8}$$

Similarly, we obtain

$$d(fv,Fv) \leq H(Fv,B) \leq \frac{d(fv,Fv)}{2}. \tag{2.9}$$

Hence $fv \in Fv$. Thus f and F have a coincidence point v, g and G have a coincidence point w. This ends the proofs of part (a) and part (b).

Furthermore, by virtue of condition (c), we obtain $ffv = fv$ and $ffv \in Ffv$. Thus $u = fu \in Fu$. This proves (c). A similar argument proves (d). Then (e) holds immediately. □

Remark 2.4. In Theorem 2.3, if F, G are two maps from K into $CB(X)$, where K is a closed subset of X. In this case, it is necessary to assume that (X,d) is a metrically convex metric space. In this direction, many excellent works have appeared (see [5, 21]).

Corollary 2.5 (see [13, Theorem 3.10]). *Let f be a self-map of the metric space (X,d) and let F be a map from X into $CB(X)$ such that*

(1) *(f,F) satisfies the property (EA);*

(2) *for all $x \neq y$ in X,*

$$H(Fx,Fy) < \max\left\{d(fx,fy), \frac{d(fx,Fx)+d(fy,Fy)}{2}, \frac{d(fx,Fy)+d(fy,Fx)}{2}\right\}. \tag{2.10}$$

If fX is closed subset of X, then

(a) *f and F have a coincidence point;*

(b) *f and F have a common fixed point provided that f is F-weakly commuting at v and $ffv = fv$ for $v \in C(f,F)$.*

Proof. Let $F = G$ and $f = g$, then the results follow from Theorem 2.3 immediately. □

If $f = g$, we can conclude the following corollary.

Corollary 2.6. *Let f be a self-map of the metric space (X,d) and let F, G be two maps from X into $CB(X)$ such that*
(1) *(f,F) and (f,G) satisfy the common property (EA);*
(2) *for all $x \neq y$ in X,*

$$H(Fx,Gy) < \max\left\{d(fx,fy),\frac{d(fx,Fx)+d(fy,Gy)}{2},\frac{d(fx,Gy)+d(fy,Fx)}{2}\right\}. \tag{2.11}$$

If fX is closed subset of X, then
(a) *f, G and F have a coincidence point;*
(b) *f, G and F have a common fixed point provided that f is both F-weakly commuting and G-weakly commuting at v and $ffv = fv$ for $v \in C(f,F)$.*

If both F and G are single-valued maps in Theorem 2.3, then we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2.7. *Let f, g, F, and G be four self-maps of the metric space (X,d) such that*
(1) *(f,F) and (g,G) satisfy the common property (EA);*
(2) *for all $x \neq y$ in X,*

$$d(Fx,Gy) < \max\left\{d(fx,gy),\frac{d(fx,Fx)+d(gy,Gy)}{2},\frac{d(fx,Gy)+d(gy,Fx)}{2}\right\}. \tag{2.12}$$

If fX and gX are closed subsets of X, then
(a) *f and F have a coincidence point;*
(b) *g and G have a coincidence point;*
(c) *f and F have a common fixed point provided that f is F-weakly commuting at v and $ffv = fv$ for $v \in C(f,F)$;*
(d) *g and G have a common fixed point provided that g is G-weakly commuting at v and $ggv = gv$ for $v \in C(g,G)$;*
(e) *f, g, F, and G have a common fixed point provided that both (c) and (d) are true.*

Theorem 2.8. *Let f, g be two self-maps of the complete metric space (X,d), let $\lambda \in (0,1)$ be a constant, and let F, G be two maps from X into $CB(X)$ such that for all $x \neq y$ in X,*

$$H(Fx,Gy) \le \lambda \max\left\{d(fx,gy),d(fx,Fx),d(gy,Gy),\frac{d(fx,Gy)+d(gy,Fx)}{2}\right\}. \tag{2.13}$$

If fX and gX are closed subsets of X and $FX \subset gX$, $GX \subset fX$, then
(a) *f and F have a coincidence point;*
(b) *g and G have a coincidence point;*
(c) *f and F have a common fixed point provided that f is F-weakly commuting at v and $ffv = fv$ for $v \in C(f,F)$;*

(d) *g and G have a common fixed point provided that g is G-weakly commuting at v and $ggv = gv$ for $v \in C(g,G)$;*
(e) *f, g, F, and G have a common fixed point provided that both (c) and (d) are true.*

Proof. For any given $x_0 \in X$, by virtue of $FX \subset gX$, there is $x_1 \in X$ such that $y_1 = gx_1 \in Fx_0$. Now since Fx_0 and Gx_1 are closed sets and $y_1 \in Fx_0$, we can find $y_2 \in Gx_1$ such that

$$d(y_1,y_2) \le H(Fx_0,Gx_1)+\lambda. \tag{2.14}$$

Since $GX \subset fX$, there exists x_2 such that $fx_2 = y_2 \in Gx_1$, then we choose $y_3 \in Fx_2$ satisfying

$$d(y_2,y_3) \le H(Gx_1,Fx_2)+\lambda^2, \tag{2.15}$$

and $y_3 = gx_3$ for some $x_3 \in X$.

We continue this process to obtain a sequence $\{y_n\}$ in X such that

$$\begin{gathered} y_{2n} = fx_{2n} \in Gx_{2n-1}, \qquad y_{2n+1} = gx_{2n+1} \in Fx_{2n}, \\ d(y_{2n},y_{2n+1}) \le H(Gx_{2n-1},Fx_{2n})+\lambda^{2n}, \\ d(y_{2n-1},y_{2n}) \le H(Fx_{2n-2},Gx_{2n-1})+\lambda^{2n-1}, \quad n = 1,2,\dots. \end{gathered} \tag{2.16}$$

Let $a_n = d(y_n,y_{n+1})$, then

$$\begin{aligned} a_{2n} = d(y_{2n},y_{2n+1}) &\le H(Gx_{2n-1},Fx_{2n})+\lambda^{2n} \\ &\le \lambda \max\bigg\{d(fx_{2n},gx_{2n-1}),d(fx_{2n},Fx_{2n}),d(gx_{2n-1},Gx_{2n-1}), \\ &\qquad \frac{d(fx_{2n},Gx_{2n-1})+d(gx_{2n-1},Fx_{2n})}{2}\bigg\}+\lambda^{2n}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

By $fx_{2n} \in Gx_{2n-1}$, we have

$$d(gx_{2n-1},Gx_{2n-1}) \le d(gx_{2n-1},fx_{2n}), \qquad d(fx_{2n},Fx_{2n}) \le H(Gx_{2n-1},Fx_{2n}). \tag{2.18}$$

Thus, we rewrite (2.17) as

$$a_{2n} \le \lambda \max\left\{d(fx_{2n},gx_{2n-1}),\frac{d(gx_{2n-1},Fx_{2n})}{2}\right\}+\lambda^{2n}. \tag{2.19}$$

Hence, we obtain

$$a_{2n} \le \lambda \max\left\{a_{2n-1},\frac{a_{2n-1}+a_{2n}}{2}\right\}+\lambda^{2n}. \tag{2.20}$$

If $a_{2n-1} \le a_{2n}$ for some n, we have $a_{2n} \le \lambda^{2n}/(1-\lambda)$. Otherwise, we get

$$a_{2n} \le \lambda a_{2n-1}+\lambda^{2n}. \tag{2.21}$$

Therefore, by (2.20), we achieve

$$a_{2n} \le \max\left\{\lambda a_{2n-1} + \lambda^{2n}, \frac{\lambda^{2n}}{1-\lambda}\right\}. \tag{2.22}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} a_{2n-1} &\le H(Gx_{2n-1}, Fx_{2n-2}) + \lambda^{2n-1} \\ &\le \lambda \max\Big\{d(fx_{2n-2}, gx_{2n-1}), d(fx_{2n-2}, Fx_{2n-2}), d(gx_{2n-1}, Gx_{2n-1}), \\ &\qquad \frac{d(fx_{2n-2}, Gx_{2n-1}) + d(gx_{2n-1}, Fx_{2n-2})}{2}\Big\} + \lambda^{2n-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

Since $gx_{2n-1} \in Fx_{2n-2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(gx_{2n-1}, Gx_{2n-1}) &\le H(Gx_{2n-1}, Fx_{2n-2}), \\ d(fx_{2n-2}, Fx_{2n-2}) &\le d(gx_{2n-1}, fx_{2n-2}). \end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$a_{2n-1} \le \lambda \max\left\{a_{2n-2}, \frac{a_{2n-2} + a_{2n-1}}{2}\right\} + \lambda^{2n-1}. \tag{2.25}$$

Similarly, we get

$$a_{2n-1} \le \max\left\{\lambda a_{2n-2} + \lambda^{2n-1}, \frac{\lambda^{2n-1}}{1-\lambda}\right\}. \tag{2.26}$$

By (2.22) and (2.26), we obtain

$$a_n \le \max\left\{\lambda a_{n-1} + \lambda^n, \frac{\lambda^n}{1-\lambda}\right\}, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots. \tag{2.27}$$

It is easy to see that

$$a_n \le \max\left\{\lambda^n(a_0 + n), \frac{\lambda^n}{1-\lambda}\right\}, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots. \tag{2.28}$$

Thus, there exists $n_0 > 0$ such that for $n \ge n_0$,

$$a_n \le \lambda^n(a_0 + n). \tag{2.29}$$

Hence $\lim_{n\to\infty} a_n = 0$.

In order to prove that $\{y_n\}$ is Cauchy sequence, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we choose a sufficiently large number N such that

$$\lambda^N(a_0 + N) \le \frac{\varepsilon(1-\lambda)}{2}, \quad \lambda^N \le \frac{\varepsilon(1-\lambda)^2}{4}. \tag{2.30}$$

Thus, for any positive integer k, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d(y_N, y_{N+k}) &\le \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} a_{N+i} \le \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \lambda^{N+i}(a_0 + N + i) \\ &< \lambda^N (a_0 + N) \frac{1}{1-\lambda} + \lambda^N \left(\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} i\lambda^i \right) \\ &< \lambda^N (a_0 + N) \frac{1}{1-\lambda} + \lambda^N \frac{2}{(1-\lambda)^2} \le \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{2.31}$$

This implies that $\{y_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Thus there is u satisfying

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} y_n = u = \lim_{n\to\infty} f x_{2n} = \lim_{n\to\infty} g x_{2n+1}. \tag{2.32}$$

Since fX and gX are closed, there exist a, b such that $fa = u = gb$. A similar argument proves that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n\to\infty} F x_{2n} &= \lim_{n\to\infty} G x_{2n+1}, \\ u \in \lim_{n\to\infty} F x_{2n} &= \lim_{n\to\infty} G x_{2n+1}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.33}$$

Then (f,F) and (g,G) satisfy the common property (EA). The rest of the proof follows Theorem 2.3 immediately, then the proof of Theorem 2.8 is complete. □

Corollary 2.9. *Let f, g be two self-maps of the complete metric space (X,d), let $\lambda \in (0,1)$ be a constant, and let F, G be two maps from X into $CB(X)$ such that for all $x \neq y$ in X,*

$$\begin{aligned} H(Fx,Gy) \le\ & \alpha d(fx,gy) + \beta \max\{d(fx,Fx), d(gy,Gy)\} \\ & + \gamma \max\{d(fx,Gy) + d(gy,Fx), d(fx,Fx) + d(gy,Gy)\}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.34}$$

and $\alpha + \beta + 2\gamma < 1$. If fX and gX are closed subsets of X and $FX \subset gX$, $GX \subset fX$, then

(a) *f and F have a coincidence point;*
(b) *g and G have a coincidence point;*
(c) *f and F have a common fixed point provided that f is F-weakly commuting at v and $ffv = fv$ for $v \in C(f,F)$;*
(d) *g and G have a common fixed point provided that g is G-weakly commuting at v and $ggv = gv$ for $v \in C(g,G)$;*
(e) *f, g, F, and G have a common fixed point provided that both (c) and (d) are true.*

Proof. Let $\lambda = \alpha + \beta + 2\gamma$. Following (2.34) and $\max\{d(fx,Fx), d(gy,Gy)\} \ge (d(fx,Fx) + d(gy,Gy))/2$, it is easy to see that

$$H(Fx,Gy) \le \lambda \max\left\{ d(fx,gy), d(fx,Fx), d(gy,Gy), \frac{d(fx,Gy) + d(gy,Fx)}{2} \right\}. \tag{2.35}$$

Thus by Theorem 2.8, we arrive to the conclusion in Corollary 2.9. □

The next theorem involves a function φ. Various conditions on φ have been investigated by different authors [4, 6, 15, 16]. Let $\varphi:\mathbb{R}^+\to\mathbb{R}^+$ continue and satisfy the following conditions:

(A_1) φ is nondecreasing on $\mathbb{R}^+$,

(A_2) $0<\varphi(t)<t$, for each $t\in(0,+\infty)$.

Theorem 2.10. *Let f, g be two self-maps of the metric space (X,d) and let $F,G:X\to X$ be two maps from X into $CB(X)$ such that*

(1) *(f,F) and (g,G) satisfy the common property (EA);*

(2) *for all $x\neq y$ in X,*

$$H(Fx,Gy)\leq\varphi\big(\max\{d(fx,gy),d(fx,Fx),d(gy,Gy),d(fx,Gy),d(gy,Fx)\}\big). \tag{2.36}$$

If fX and gX are closed subsets of X, then

(a) *f and F have a coincidence point;*

(b) *g and G have a coincidence point;*

(c) *f and F have a common fixed point provided that f is F-weakly commuting at v and $ffv=fv$ for $v\in C(f,F)$;*

(d) *g and G have a common fixed point provided that g is G-weakly commuting at v and $ggv=gv$ for $v\in C(g,G)$;*

(e) *f, g, F, and G have a common fixed point provided that both (c) and (d) are true.*

Proof. Since (f,F) and (g,G) satisfy the common property (EA), there exist two sequences $\{x_n\}$, $\{y_n\}$ in X and $u\in X$, $A,B\in CB(X)$ such that

$$\begin{gathered}\lim_{n\to\infty}Fx_n=A,\lim_{n\to\infty}Gy_n=B,\\ \lim_{n\to\infty}fx_n=\lim_{n\to\infty}gy_n=u\in A\cap B.\end{gathered} \tag{2.37}$$

By virtue of fX and gX being closed, we have $u=fv$ and $u=gw$ for some $v,w\in X$. We claim that $fv\in Fv$ and $gw\in Gw$. Indeed, condition (2) implies that

$$H(Fx_n,Gw)\leq\varphi\big(\max\{d(fx_n,gw),d(fx_n,Fx_n),d(gw,Gw),d(fx_n,Gw),d(gw,Fx_n)\}\big). \tag{2.38}$$

Taking the limit as $n\to\infty$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}H(A,Gw)&\leq\varphi\big(\max\{d(fv,gw),d(fv,A),d(gw,Gw),d(fv,Gw),d(gw,A)\}\big)\\ &\leq\varphi(d(gw,Gw))<d(gw,Gw).\end{aligned} \tag{2.39}$$

Since $gw=fv\in A$, it follows from the definition of Hausdorff metric that

$$d(gw,Gw)\leq H(A,Gw)<d(gw,Gw), \tag{2.40}$$

which implies that $gw\in Gw$.

On the other hand, by condition (2) again, we have

$$H(Fv,Gy_n) \le \varphi(\max\{d(fv,gy_n),d(fv,Fv),d(gy_n,Gy_n),d(fv,Gy_n),d(gy_n,Fv)\}). \tag{2.41}$$

Similarly, we obtain

$$d(fv,Fv) \le H(Fv,B) < d(fv,Fv). \tag{2.42}$$

Hence $fv \in Fv$. Thus f and F have a coincidence point v, g and G have a coincidence point w. This ends the proofs of part (a) and part (b). The rest of proof is similar to the argument of Theorem 2.3. □

References

[1] M. Aamri and D. El Moutawakil, *Some new common fixed point theorems under strict contractive conditions*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **270** (2002), no. 1, 181–188.

[2] A. Ahmad and M. Imdad, *Some common fixed point theorems for mappings and multi-valued mappings*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **218** (1998), no. 2, 546–560.

[3] J. S. Bae, *Fixed point theorems for weakly contractive multivalued maps*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **284** (2003), no. 2, 690–697.

[4] D. W. Boyd and J. S. W. Wong, *On nonlinear contractions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **20** (1969), no. 2, 458–464.

[5] Lj. B. Ćirić and J. S. Ume, *Multi-valued non-self-mappings on convex metric spaces*, Nonlinear Anal. **60** (2005), no. 6, 1053–1063.

[6] D. Downing and W. A. Kirk, *A generalization of Caristi's theorem with applications to nonlinear mapping theory*, Pacific J. Math. **69** (1977), no. 2, 339–346.

[7] R. Espínola and W. A. Kirk, *Set-valued contractions and fixed points*, Nonlinear Anal. **54** (2003), no. 3, 485–494.

[8] M. Frigon, *Fixed point results for generalized contractions in gauge spaces and applications*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **128** (2000), no. 10, 2957–2965.

[9] A. Granas and J. Dugundji, *Fixed Point Theory*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer, New York, 2003.

[10] T. Hicks and B. E. Rhoades, *Fixed points and continuity for multivalued mappings*, Int. J. Math. Math. Sci. **15** (1992), no. 1, 15–30.

[11] V. I. Istrăţescu, *Fixed Point Theory: An Introduction*, Mathematics and Its Applications, vol. 7, D.Reidel, Dordrecht, 1981.

[12] G. Jungck and B. E. Rhoades, *Fixed points for set valued functions without continuity*, Indian J. Pure Appl. Math. **29** (1998), no. 3, 227–238.

[13] T. Kamran, *Coincidence and fixed points for hybrid strict contractions*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **299** (2004), no. 1, 235–241.

[14] T.-C. Lim, *A fixed point theorem for weakly inward multivalued contractions*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **247** (2000), no. 1, 323–327.

[15] ———, *On characterizations of Meir-Keeler contractive maps*, Nonlinear Anal. Ser. A: Theory Methods **46** (2001), no. 1, 113–120.

[16] Y. C. Liu and Zh. X. Li, *Schaefer Type Theorem and Periodic Solutions of Evolution Equations*, to appear in J. Math. Anal. Appl.

[17] S. V. R. Naidu, *Fixed point theorems for a broad class of multimaps*, Nonlinear Anal. **52** (2003), no. 3, 961–969.

[18] P. Oliveira, *Two results on fixed points*, Nonlinear Anal. **47** (2001), no. 4, 2703–2717.

[19] B. E. Rhoades, *A comparison of various definitions of contractive mappings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **226** (1977), 257–290.

[20] N. Shahzad, *Coincidence points and R-subweakly commuting multivalued maps*, Demonstratio Math. **36** (2003), no. 2, 427–431.

[21] S. L. Singh and S. N. Mishra, *Coincidences and fixed points of nonself hybrid contractions*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **256** (2001), no. 2, 486–497.

[22] T. Suzuki, *Generalized Caristi's fixed point theorems by Bae and others*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **302** (2005), no. 2, 502–508.

[23] T. Suzuki and W. Takahashi, *Fixed point theorems and characterizations of metric completeness*, Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal. **8** (1996), no. 2, 371–382 (1997).

Yicheng Liu: Department of Mathematics and System Sciences, College of Science, National University of Defense Technology, Changsha 410073, China
E-mail address: liuyc2001@hotmail.com

Jun Wu: College of Mathematics and Econometrics, Hunan University, Changsha 410082, China
E-mail address: junwmath@hotmail.com

Zhixiang Li: Department of Mathematics and System Sciences, College of Science, National University of Defense Technology, Changsha 410073, China
E-mail address: zhxli02@yahoo.com.cn

Special Issue on Time-Dependent Billiards

Call for Papers

This subject has been extensively studied in the past years for one-, two-, and three-dimensional space. Additionally, such dynamical systems can exhibit a very important and still unexplained phenomenon, called as the Fermi acceleration phenomenon. Basically, the phenomenon of Fermi acceleration (FA) is a process in which a classical particle can acquire unbounded energy from collisions with a heavy moving wall. This phenomenon was originally proposed by Enrico Fermi in 1949 as a possible explanation of the origin of the large energies of the cosmic particles. His original model was then modified and considered under different approaches and using many versions. Moreover, applications of FA have been of a large broad interest in many different fields of science including plasma physics, astrophysics, atomic physics, optics, and time-dependent billiard problems and they are useful for controlling chaos in Engineering and dynamical systems exhibiting chaos (both conservative and dissipative chaos).

We intend to publish in this special issue papers reporting research on time-dependent billiards. The topic includes both conservative and dissipative dynamics. Papers discussing dynamical properties, statistical and mathematical results, stability investigation of the phase space structure, the phenomenon of Fermi acceleration, conditions for having suppression of Fermi acceleration, and computational and numerical methods for exploring these structures and applications are welcome.

To be acceptable for publication in the special issue of Mathematical Problems in Engineering, papers must make significant, original, and correct contributions to one or more of the topics above mentioned. Mathematical papers regarding the topics above are also welcome.

Authors should follow the Mathematical Problems in Engineering manuscript format described at http://www.hindawi.com/journals/mpe/. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking System at http://mts.hindawi.com/ according to the following timetable:

Manuscript Due	December 1, 2008
First Round of Reviews	March 1, 2009
Publication Date	June 1, 2009

Guest Editors

Edson Denis Leonel, Departamento de Estatística, Matemática Aplicada e Computação, Instituto de Geociências e Ciências Exatas, Universidade Estadual Paulista, Avenida 24A, 1515 Bela Vista, 13506-700 Rio Claro, SP, Brazil ; edleonel@rc.unesp.br

Alexander Loskutov, Physics Faculty, Moscow State University, Vorob'evy Gory, Moscow 119992, Russia; loskutov@chaos.phys.msu.ru