

Research Article

Fixed Points of Weakly Contractive Maps and Boundedness of Orbits

Jie-Hua Mai and Xin-He Liu

Received 10 October 2006; Revised 8 January 2007; Accepted 31 January 2007

Recommended by William Art Kirk

We discuss weakly contractive maps on complete metric spaces. Following three methods of generalizing the Banach contraction principle, we obtain some fixed point theorems under some relatively weaker and more general contractive conditions.

Copyright © 2007 J.-H. Mai and X.-H. Liu. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

1. Introduction

The Banach contraction principle is one of the most fundamental fixed point theorems.

THEOREM 1.1 (Banach contraction principle). *Let (X, d) be a complete metric space, and let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a map. If there exists a constant $c \in [0, 1)$ such that*

$$d(f(x), f(y)) \leq c \cdot d(x, y), \quad (\text{C.1})$$

then f has a unique fixed point u , and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f^n(y) = u$ for each $y \in X$.

Since the publication of this result, various authors have generalized and extended it by introducing weakly contractive conditions. In [1], Rhoades gathered 25 contractive conditions in order to compare them and obtain fixed point theorems. Collaço and Silva [2] presented a complete comparison for the maps numbered (1)–(25) by Rhoades [1].

One of the methods of alternating the Banach contractive condition is not to compare $d(f(x), f(y))$ with $d(x, y)$, but compare $d(f^p(x), f^q(y))$ with the distances between any two points in $O_p(x, f) \cup O_q(y, f)$, where $p \geq 1$ and $q \geq 1$ are given integers, and $O_p(x, f) \equiv \{x, f(x), \dots, f^p(x)\}$ (e.g., see [3–6]).

2 Fixed Point Theory and Applications

The generalized banach contraction conjecture was established in [7–10], of which the contractive condition is $\min\{d(f^k(x), f^k(y)) : 1 \leq k \leq J\} \leq c \cdot d(x, y)$, where J is a positive integer.

A further method of alternating the Banach contractive condition is to change the constant $c \in [0, 1]$ in the contractive condition into a function (e.g., see [11–14]).

The third method of alternating the Banach contractive condition is to compare not only $d(f^p(x), f^q(y))$ with the distances between any two points in $O_p(x, f) \cup O_q(y, f)$, but also $d(f^p(x), f^q(y))$ with the distances between any two points in $O(x, f) \cup O(y, f)$, where $O(x, f) \equiv \{f^n(x) : n = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ (e.g., see [6, 15, 16]).

Following the above three methods of generalizing the Banach contraction principle, we present some of fixed point theorems under some relatively weaker and more general conditions.

2. Weakly contractive maps with the infimum of orbital diameters being 0

Throughout this paper, we assume that (X, d) is a complete metric space, and $f : X \rightarrow X$ is a map. Given a subset X_0 of X , denote by $\text{diam}(X_0)$ the diameter of X_0 , that is, $\text{diam}(X_0) = \sup\{d(x, y) : x, y \in X_0\}$. For any $x \in X$, write $O(x) = O(x, f) = \{x, f(x), f^2(x), \dots\}$. $O(x)$ is called the orbit of x under f . $O(x)$ is usually regarded as a set of points, while sometimes it is regarded as a sequence of points. Denote by \mathbb{Z}_+ the set of all nonnegative integers, and denote by \mathbb{N} the set of all positive integers. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, write $\mathbb{N}_n = \{1, \dots, n\}$. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, write $\mathbb{Z}_n = \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$, and $O_n(x) = O_n(x, f) = \{x, f(x), \dots, f^n(x)\}$.

For any given map $f : X \rightarrow X$, define $\rho : X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ as follows:

$$\rho(x) = \text{diam}(O(x, f)) = \sup\{d(f^i(x), f^j(x)) : i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_+\} \quad \text{for any } x \in X. \quad (*)$$

Definition 2.1 (see [16]). Let (X, d) be a metric space, and let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a map. If for any sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X , $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho(x_n) = \rho(x)$ whenever $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$, then ρ is called to be closed, and f is called to have closed orbital diametral function.

That f has closed orbital diametral function means $\rho : X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is continuous. It is easy to see that “ f is continuous” and “ f has closed orbital diametral function” do not imply each other.

THEOREM 2.2. *Let (X, d) be a complete metric space, and suppose that $f : X \rightarrow X$ has closed orbital diametral function or $f : X \rightarrow X$ is continuous. If there exist a nonnegative real number s , an increasing function $\mu : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, 1]$, and a family of functions $\{\gamma_{ij} : X \times X \rightarrow [0, 1] : i, j = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ such that, for any $x, y \in X$,*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \gamma_{ij}(x, y) \leq 1 - \mu(d(x, y)), \quad (2.1)$$

$$d(f(x), f(y)) \leq s \cdot [\rho(x) + \rho(y)] + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \gamma_{ij}(x, y) d(f^i(x), f^j(y)), \quad (2.2)$$

then f has a unique fixed point if and only if $\inf\{\rho(x) : x \in X\} = 0$.

Proof. The necessity is obvious. Now we show the sufficiency.

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, since $\inf\{\rho(x) : x \in X\} = 0$, we can choose a point $v_n \in X$ such that $\rho(v_n) < 1/n$. We claim that v_1, v_2, \dots is a Cauchy sequence of points. In fact, if v_1, v_2, \dots is not a Cauchy sequence of points, then there exists $\delta > 0$ such that, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there are $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $i > j > k$ satisfying $d(v_i, v_j) > 3\delta$. Let $\mu_0 = \mu(\delta)$. Choose $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2(s+1)/k < \delta\mu_0/2$, and choose $n > m > k$ such that $d(v_n, v_m) > 3\delta$. Then for any $x \in O(v_n)$ and any $y \in O(v_m)$, we have

$$d(x, y) \geq d(v_n, v_m) - \rho(v_n) - \rho(v_m) > 3\delta - \frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{m} > \delta, \quad (2.3)$$

this implies $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \gamma_{ij}(x, y) \leq 1 - \mu(d(x, y)) \leq 1 - \mu_0$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} d(f(x), f(y)) &\leq s \cdot [\rho(x) + \rho(y)] + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \gamma_{ij}(x, y) [d(x, y) + \rho(x) + \rho(y)] \\ &< (s+1)[\rho(x) + \rho(y)] + (1 - \mu_0)d(x, y) \\ &\leq (s+1)[\rho(v_n) + \rho(v_m)] + (1 - \mu_0)d(x, y) \\ &< \frac{2(s+1)}{k} + (1 - \mu_0)d(x, y) < \frac{\delta\mu_0}{2} + (1 - \mu_0)d(x, y) \\ &< \left(1 - \frac{\mu_0}{2}\right)d(x, y). \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

It follows from (2.4) that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} d(f^i(v_n), f^i(v_m)) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} (1 - \mu_0/2)^i \cdot d(v_n, v_m) = 0$. But this contradicts (2.3).

Thus v_1, v_2, \dots must be a Cauchy sequence of points. We may assume that it converges to w .

Case 1. If f has closed orbital diametral function, then the function ρ is closed. Noting that $\rho(v_n) < 1/n$, we have $\rho(w) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho(v_n) = 0$, which implies that w is a fixed point of f .

Case 2. If f is continuous, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(v_n) = f(w)$. Since $d(v_n, f(v_n)) \leq \rho(v_n) < 1/n$, we get $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(v_n, f(v_n)) = 0$, and then $d(w, f(w)) = 0$. Hence w is a fixed point of f .

Thus in both cases w is a fixed point of f .

Suppose u is also a fixed point of f . If $u \neq w$, then by (2.2) and (2.1) we can obtain $d(u, w) = d(f(u), f(w)) \leq s \cdot (0 + 0) + [1 - \mu(d(u, w))] \cdot d(u, w) < d(u, w)$, which is a contradiction. Hence $u = w$, and w is the unique fixed point of f . Theorem 2.2 is proved. \square

THEOREM 2.3. *Let (X, d) be a complete metric space, and suppose that $f : X \rightarrow X$ has closed orbital diametral function or $f : X \rightarrow X$ is continuous. If there exist $s \geq 0$ and $t \in [0, 1)$ such that, for any $x, y \in X$,*

$$d(f(x), f(y)) \leq s \cdot [\rho(x) + \rho(y)] + t \cdot \max\{d(f^i(x), f^j(y)) : i \in \mathbb{Z}_+, j \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}, \quad (2.5)$$

then f has a unique fixed point if and only if $\inf\{\rho(x) : x \in X\} = 0$.

4 Fixed Point Theory and Applications

The proof of Theorem 2.3 is similar to that of Theorem 2.2, and is omitted.

In [16], Sharma and Thakur discussed the condition

$$\begin{aligned} d(f(x), f(y)) \leq & ad(x, y) + b[d(x, f(x)) + d(y, f(y))] \\ & + c[d(x, f(y)) + d(y, f(x))] + e[d(x, f^2(x)) + d(y, f^2(y))] \\ & + g[d(f(x), f^2(x)) + d(f(y), f^2(y))], \end{aligned} \quad (C)$$

where a, b, c, e, g are all nonnegative real numbers with $3a + 2b + 4c + 5e + 3g \leq 1$.

In Theorem 2.2, set $s = b + e + g$, $\mu \equiv 1 - (a + 2c + g)$, $\gamma_{00} \equiv a$, $\gamma_{01} = \gamma_{10} \equiv c$, $\gamma_{21} \equiv g$, and $\gamma_{ij} \equiv 0$, otherwise. Then (C) implies (2.2). In Theorem 2.3, set $s = b + e + g$, and $t = a + 2c + g$. Then (C) implies (2.5), too. Thus, by each of Theorems 2.2 and 2.3, we can obtain the following theorem, which improves the main result of Sharma and Thakur [16].

THEOREM 2.4. *Suppose that (X, d) is a complete metric space, and $f : X \rightarrow X$ has closed orbital diametral function. If (C) holds for any $x, y \in X$ with $a + 2c + g < 1$, then $\inf\{\rho(x) : x \in X\} = 0$ if and only if f has a fixed point.*

3. Weakly contractive maps with an orbit on which the moving distance being bounded

In Theorems 2.2 and 2.3, to determine whether f has a fixed point or not, we need the condition that the infimum of orbital diameters is 0. In the following, we will not rely on this condition and discuss some contractive maps whose contractive conditions are still relatively weak. Throughout this section, we assume that $f : X \rightarrow X$ is continuous.

Let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a given map. For any integers $i \geq 0$, $j \geq 0$, and $x, y \in X$, write

$$\begin{aligned} d_{ij}(x) &= d_{ijf}(x) = d(f^i(x), f^j(x)), \\ d_{ij}(x, y) &= d_{ijf}(x, y) = d(f^i(x), f^j(y)). \end{aligned} \quad (*')$$

Definition 3.1. Let $Y \subset X$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and $g : X \rightarrow X$ be a self-mapping. If $\sup\{d(g^k(y), y) : y \in Y\} < \infty$, then the moving distance of g^k on Y is bounded.

Obviously, we have the following.

PROPOSITION 3.2. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. If $g(Y) \subset Y$ and the moving distance of g on Y is bounded, then the moving distance of g^m on Y is also bounded.*

However, the converse of the above proposition does not hold. In fact, we have the following counterexample.

Example 3.3. Let $\mathbb{R} = (-\infty, +\infty)$. Define $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$f(x) = -x \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.1)$$

It is easy to see that the moving distance of f^2 on \mathbb{R} is bounded (equal to 0), while the moving distance of f on \mathbb{R} is unbounded.

THEOREM 3.4. *Let m, n be two given positive integers, and let $d_{ij}(x)$ be defined as in $(*)$. Suppose there exist nonnegative real numbers a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots with $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i < 1$ such that*

$$d_{n+m,n}(x) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i d_{i+m,i}(x) \quad \forall x \in X. \quad (3.2)$$

Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (1) f has a periodic point with period being some factor of m ;
- (2) there is an orbit $O(v, f)$ such that the moving distance of f^m on $O(v, f)$ is bounded;
- (3) f has a bounded orbit.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (3) \Rightarrow (2) is clear. Now we prove (2) \Rightarrow (1). Let $a = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i$, then $a \in [0, 1)$. If $a = 0$, then (2) \Rightarrow (1) holds obviously, and hence we may assume $a \in (0, 1)$. Let $b_i = a_i/a$, then $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} b_i = 1$. By (3.2) we get

$$d_{n+m,n}(x) \leq a \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} b_i d_{i+m,i}(x) \quad \text{for any } x \in X. \quad (3.3)$$

Assume $\{d(f^m(y), y) : y \in O(v, f)\}$ is bounded. We claim that

$$d_{n+m,n}(v) \leq a \cdot \max \{d_{i+m,i}(v) : i \in \mathbb{Z}_{n-1}\}. \quad (3.4)$$

In fact, if (3.4) does not hold, then by (3.3) there exists $j > n$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} d_{j+m,j}(v) &\geq \frac{1}{a} \cdot d_{n+m,n}(v) > 0, \\ d_{i+m,i}(v) &< \frac{1}{a} \cdot d_{n+m,n}(v), \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, j-1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Combining (3.5) we obtain

$$d_{j+m,j}(v) > a \cdot \max \{d_{i+m,i}(v) : i \in \mathbb{Z}_{j-1}\}. \quad (3.6)$$

Similarly, we can obtain an infinite sequence of integers $j_0 < j_1 < j_2 < \dots$ satisfying

$$d_{j_k+m,j_k}(v) \geq \frac{1}{a} \cdot d_{j_{k-1}+m,j_{k-1}}(v), \quad k = 1, 2, 3, \dots \quad (3.7)$$

However, this contradicts to that $\{d(f^m(y), y) : y \in O(v, f)\}$ is bounded. Therefore, (3.4) must hold.

For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $O(f^k(v), f) \subseteq O(v, f)$. Replacing v in (3.4) with $f^k(v)$, we have

$$d_{n+m+k,n+k}(v) \leq a \cdot \max \{d_{i+m+k,i+k}(v) : i \in \mathbb{Z}_{n-1}\}. \quad (3.8)$$

6 Fixed Point Theory and Applications

Write $b = \max\{d_{i+m,i}(v) : i \in \mathbb{Z}_{n-1}\}$. For $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, by (3.8) we can successively get

$$\begin{aligned} d_{n+j+m,n+j}(v) &\leq ab, \\ d_{2n+j+m,2n+j}(v) &\leq a^2b, \\ &\vdots \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

In general, we have

$$d_{kn+j+m,kn+j}(v) \leq a^k b, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots \tag{3.10}$$

Therefore, it follows from $0 < a < 1$ and (3.10) that $v, f^m(v), f^{2m}(v), f^{3m}(v), \dots$ is a Cauchy sequence. We may assume it converges to $w \in X$. Then $f^m(w) = w$, and hence w is a periodic point of f with period being some factor of m . Theorem 3.4 is proved. \square

As a corollary of Theorem 3.4, we have the following.

THEOREM 3.5. *Let n be a given positive integer, and let $d_{ij}(x)$ be defined as in $(*)'$. Suppose there exist nonnegative real numbers a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots with $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i < 1$ such that*

$$d_{nn}(x, y) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i d_{ii}(x, y) \quad \text{for any } x, y \in X. \tag{3.11}$$

Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (1) f has a fixed point;
- (2) f has an orbit $O(v, f)$ such that for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ the moving distance of f^m on $O(v, f)$ is bounded; and
- (3) f has a bounded orbit.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (3) \Rightarrow (2) is clear. It remains to prove (2) \Rightarrow (1). Suppose the moving distance of f^m on $O(v, f)$ is bounded. Let $x = f^m(v)$, $y = v$, then (3.11) implies (3.2). Therefore, by Theorem 3.4, there exists $w \in X$ such that $f^m(w) = w$.

Since $O(w, f)$ is a finite set, there exist $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d_{pq}(w) = \rho(w)$. By (3.11) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(w) &= d_{pq}(w) = d_{nn}(f^{(m-1)n+p}(w), f^{(m-1)n+q}(w)) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i d_{ii}(f^{(m-1)n+p}(w), f^{(m-1)n+q}(w)) \leq \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i \right) \cdot \rho(w). \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

Therefore, it follows from $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i < 1$ that $\rho(w) = 0$. Hence w is a fixed point of f . Theorem 3.5 is proved. \square

Remark 3.6. In Theorem 3.5, from (3.11) it follows that f has at most one fixed point, and f has no other periodic point except this point.

Remark 3.7. Equation (3.11) implies that

$$d_{nn}(x, y) \leq \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i \right) \text{diam}(O(x, f) \cup O(y, f)) \quad \text{for any } x, y \in X, \quad (3.13)$$

which is still a particular case of the condition (C3) introduced by Walter [6]. However, all orbits of f are assumed to be bounded in Walter's [6, Theorem 1], while it suffices to assume that f has a bounded orbit in Theorem 3.5. Thus, Theorem 3.5 cannot be deduced from [6, Theorem 1] as a particular case.

Example 3.8. Let $X = [0, +\infty) \subset \mathbb{R}$, and let $f(x) = 2x$ for any $x \in X$. It is easy to see that $O(0, f)$ is the unique bounded orbit of f , and for $n = 1$, (3.11) is satisfied with $a_i = (1/2^{2i+1})$ ($i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$).

THEOREM 3.9. *Let m, n be two given positive integers, $v \in X$, and let $d_{ij}(x)$ be defined as in $(*)'$. Suppose there exist nonnegative real numbers $a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{n-1}$ with $\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i \leq 1$ such that*

$$d_{n+m,n}(x) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i d_{i+m,i}(x) \quad \text{for any } x \in O(v, f). \quad (3.14)$$

Then the moving distance of f^m on $O(v, f)$ is bounded.

Proof. Write $b = \max\{d_{i+m,i}(v) : i \in \mathbb{Z}_{n-1}\}$. Let $a = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i$, then $a \in [0, 1]$. Without loss of generality, we may assume, by increasing one of the numbers $a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{n-1}$ if necessary, that $a = 1$. For $j = n, n+1, n+2, \dots$, by (3.14) we can successively get

$$d_{j+m,j}(v) \leq b. \quad (3.15)$$

By (3.15) we have $d(f^m(y), y) \leq b$ for any $y \in O(v, f)$. Therefore, the moving distance of f^m on $O(v, f)$ is bounded. Theorem 3.9 is proved. \square

By Theorems 3.9 and 3.4, we can immediately obtain the following.

COROLLARY 3.10. *Let m, n be two given positive integers, and let $d_{ij}(x)$ be defined as in $(*)'$. Suppose there exist nonnegative real numbers $a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{n-1}$ with $\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i < 1$ such that*

$$d_{n+m,n}(x) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i d_{i+m,i}(x) \quad \text{for any } x \in X. \quad (3.16)$$

Then f has a periodic point with period being some factor of m .

COROLLARY 3.11. *Let m, n be two given positive integers, $v \in X$, and let $d_{ij}(x)$ be defined as in $(*)'$. Suppose there exist nonnegative real numbers $a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{n-1}$ and b_0, b_1, b_2, \dots*

8 Fixed Point Theory and Applications

with $\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i \leq 1$ and $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} b_j < 1$ such that, for any $x \in O(v, f)$,

$$d_{n+m,n}(x) \leq \min \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i d_{i+m,i}(x), \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} b_j d_{j+m,j}(x) \right\}. \quad (3.17)$$

Then the moving distance of f on $O(v, f)$ is bounded.

Proof. It follows from (3.17) and Theorem 3.9 that the moving distance of f^m on $O(v, f)$ is bounded. Therefore, by (3.17) and the proof of Theorem 3.4, $v, f^m(v), f^{2m}(v), \dots$ converges to a k -period point w of f , where k is a factor of m . Hence $(v, f(v), f^2(v), \dots)$ (regarded as a sequence of points) converges to the periodic orbit $O(w, f)$. Thus $O(v, f)$ is bounded, and the moving distance of f on $O(v, f)$ is bounded. Corollary 3.11 is proved. \square

Coefficients in the preceding contractive conditions (3.2), (3.11), (3.14), (3.16), and (3.17) are all constants. Now we discuss the cases in which coefficients are variables.

THEOREM 3.12. *Let m, n be two given positive integers, and let $d_{ij}(x)$ be defined as in $(*)$. If there exists a decreasing function $\gamma_i : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ satisfying*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \gamma_i(t) < 1 \quad \text{for any } t > 0, \quad (3.18)$$

such that

$$d_{n+m,n}(x) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \gamma_i(d_{i+m,i}(x)) \cdot d_{i+m,i}(x) \quad \text{for any } x \in X, \quad (3.19)$$

then $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} d_{i+m,i}(v) = 0$ for any $v \in X$ if and only if the moving distance of f^m on $O(v, f)$ is bounded.

Proof. The necessity is obvious. Now we show the sufficiency. For any $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we may assume $\gamma_i(0) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +0} \gamma_i(t)$, and

$$\gamma_i(t) \geq \frac{\gamma_i(0)}{2} \quad \text{for any } t > 0. \quad (3.20)$$

In fact, if it is not true, we may define $\gamma'_i : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by $\gamma'_i(0) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +0} \gamma_i(t)$ and $\gamma'_i(t) = \max\{\gamma_i(t), \gamma'_i(0)/2\}$ (for any $t > 0$), and replace γ'_i with γ_i , then both (3.18) and (3.19) still hold.

Let $c = \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} d_{i+m,i}(v)$. Since $\{d(f^m(y), y) : y \in O(v, f)\}$ is bounded, $c < \infty$. Assume $c > 0$. Let $a_i = \gamma_i(c/2)$, and $a = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i$, then $a < 1$. Choose $\delta > 0$ such that $a(c + \delta) < c - \delta$. Choose an integer $k > n$ such that $d_{k+m,k}(v) > c - \delta$ and $\sup\{d_{j+m,j}(v) : j \geq k - n\} < c + \delta$. Write

$$\begin{aligned} M_1 &= \left\{ i \geq 0 : d_{i+m,i}(f^{k-n}(v)) > \frac{c}{2} \right\}, \\ M_2 &= \left\{ i \geq 0 : d_{i+m,i}(f^{k-n}(v)) \leq \frac{c}{2} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

By (3.19) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 c - \delta < d_{k+m,k}(v) &= d_{n+m,n}(f^{k-n}(v)) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \gamma_i d_{i+m,i}(f^{k-n}(v)) \cdot d_{i+m,i}(f^{k-n}(v)) \\
 &= \left(\sum_{i \in M_1} + \sum_{i \in M_2} \right) \gamma_i (d_{i+m,i}(f^{k-n}(v))) \cdot d_{i+m,i}(f^{k-n}(v)) \\
 &\leq \sum_{i \in M_1} \gamma_i \left(\frac{c}{2} \right) \cdot (c + \delta) + \sum_{i \in M_2} \gamma_i(0) \cdot \frac{c}{2} \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \gamma_i \left(\frac{c}{2} \right) \cdot (c + \delta) = a(c + \delta) < c - \delta,
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

which is a contradiction. Thus we have $c = 0$. Theorem 3.12 is proved. \square

Remark 3.13. In Theorem 3.12, if (3.2) does not hold, then only by (3.18) and (3.19) it is not enough to deduce that f has periodic points. Now we present such a counterexample.

Example 3.14. Let $X = \{\sqrt{n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, then X is a complete subspace of the Euclidean space \mathbb{R} . Define $f : X \rightarrow X$ by $f(\sqrt{n}) = \sqrt{n+1}$ (for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$), then f is uniformly continuous. For any $k \geq 1$, take $\gamma_k(t) \equiv 0$ (for any $t > 0$). Let $c_k = (\sqrt{m+n+k} - \sqrt{n+k})/(\sqrt{m+k} - \sqrt{k})$, then $\{c_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is an increasing sequence. Choose arbitrarily a decreasing function $\gamma_0 : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $\gamma_0(\sqrt{m+k} - \sqrt{k}) = c_k$, then both (3.18) and (3.19) hold for any $x \in X$. However, it is clear that f has no periodic points.

4. Weakly contractive maps with bounded orbits

Throughout this section, we assume that (X, d) is a complete metric space, and $f : X \rightarrow X$ is a continuous map. For any given f , let $d_{ij}(x, y)$ be defined as in $(*)$.

THEOREM 4.1. *Let p, q be two given positive integers. Assume there exist decreasing functions $\gamma_{ij} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ for all $(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2$ satisfying*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \gamma_{ij}(t) < 1 \quad \text{for any } t > 0, \tag{4.1}$$

such that

$$d_{pq}(x, y) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \gamma_{ij}(d_{ij}(x, y)) \cdot d_{ij}(x, y) \quad \text{for any } x, y \in X. \tag{4.2}$$

Then f has at most one fixed point, and f has a fixed point if and only if f has a bounded orbit.

Proof. It follows from (4.2) that f has at most one fixed point. If f has a fixed point w , then $O(w, f)$ is bounded. Conversely, suppose f has a bounded orbit $O(v, f)$. Write $v_i = f^i(v)$. Let $c = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \rho(v_i)$, then $c < \infty$. If (v, v_1, v_2, \dots) is not a Cauchy sequence of points, then $c > 0$. Analogous to the proof of Theorem 3.12, we may assume $\gamma_{ij}(t) \geq \gamma_{ij}(0)/2$ for any $(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2$ and $t > 0$. Let $a = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \gamma_{ij}(c/2)$, then $a < 1$. Choose $\delta > 0$ such that

10 Fixed Point Theory and Applications

$a(c + \delta) < c - \delta$. Choose $n > k > p + q$ such that $d(v_n, v_k) > c - \delta$ and $\rho(O(v_{k-p-q}, f)) < c + \delta$. By (4.2) we get

$$c - \delta < d(v_n, v_k) = d_{pq}(v_{n-p}, v_{k-q}) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \gamma_{ij} (d_{ij}(v_{n-p}, v_{k-q})) \cdot d_{ij}(v_{n-p}, v_{k-q}). \quad (4.3)$$

Furthermore, similar to (3.22), splitting the sum on the right of (4.3) into two sums according to whether $d_{ij}(v_{n-p}, v_{k-q})$ is greater than $c/2$ or not, we get

$$c - \delta < \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \gamma_{ij} \left(\frac{c}{2} \right) \cdot (c + \delta) = a(c + \delta) < c - \delta, \quad (4.4)$$

which is a contradiction. Thus v, v_1, v_2, \dots is a Cauchy sequence of points. Assume it converges to w . By (4.2) we have

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} d(v_{i+1}, v_i) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} d_{p,q}(v_{i+1-p}, v_{i-q}) = 0. \quad (4.5)$$

Therefore, by the continuity of f we conclude that w is a fixed point of f . Theorem 4.1 is proved. \square

Appendix

Weakly contractive maps with the infimum of orbital diameters being 0 were also discussed in [17], of which the following two theorems are the main results.

THEOREM A.1 (see [17, Theorem 2]). *Suppose that (X, d) is a complete metric space, and $f : X \rightarrow X$ is a continuous map. Assume there exist $a_i \geq 0$ ($i = 0, 1, \dots, 10$) satisfying*

$$3a_0 + a_1 + a_2 + 2a_3 + 2a_4 + 2a_5 + 3a_6 + a_7 + 2a_8 + 4a_9 + 6a_{10} \leq 1 \quad (A.1)$$

such that, for any $x, y \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} d(f(x), f(y)) &\leq a_0 d(x, y) + a_1 d(x, f(x)) + a_2 d(y, f(y)) + a_3 d(x, f(y)) \\ &\quad + a_4 d(y, f(x)) + a_5 d(x, f^2(x)) + a_6 d(y, f^2(x)) + a_7 d(f(x), f^2(x)) \\ &\quad + a_8 d(f(y), f^2(x)) + a_9 d(f^2(y), f^3(x)) + a_{10} d(f^3(y), f^4(x)). \end{aligned} \quad (A.2)$$

Then the following three statements are equivalent:

- (1) f has a fixed point;
- (2) $\inf \{d(x, f(x)) : x \in X\} = 0$;
- (3) $\inf \{\rho(x) : x \in X\} = 0$.

THEOREM A.2 (see [17, Theorem 4]). Suppose that (X, d) is a complete metric space, and $f : X \rightarrow X$ is a continuous map. Assume there exist $c_i \geq 0$ ($c_i = 0, 1, \dots, 6$) and $b_j \geq 0$ ($j = 0, 1, \dots, k$) satisfying

$$3c_0 + c_1 + c_2 + 2c_3 + 2c_4 + c_5 + 3c_6 + 2b_0 + 2 \sum_{j=1}^k j b_j \leq 1 \quad (\text{A.3})$$

such that, for any $x, y \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} d(f(x), f(y)) &\leq c_0 d(x, y) + c_1 d(x, f(x)) + c_2 d(y, f(y)) \\ &\quad + c_3 d(x, f(y)) + c_4 d(x, f^2(x)) + c_5 d(f(x), f^2(x)) \\ &\quad + c_6 d(y, f^2(x)) + \sum_{j=0}^k b_j d(f^j(y), f^{j+1}(x)). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Then the following three statements are equivalent:

- (i) f has a fixed point;
- (ii) $\inf \{d(x, f(x)) : x \in X\} = 0$;
- (iii) $\inf \{\rho(x) : x \in X\} = 0$.

The equivalence of (1) (or (i)) and (3) (or (iii)) follows from our Theorem 2.2 or Theorem 2.3. However, (2) (or (ii)) is not equivalent to each of (1) (or (i)) and (3) (or (iii)). Thus, there are some mistakes in the main results of [17]. In fact, we have such a counterexample.

Example A.3. Let $X = \{x_{ij} : i, j \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Define $f : X \rightarrow X$ by $f(x_{ij}) = x_{i+1, j}$ (for any $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$). Define a metric d on X as follows:

$$d(x_{ij}, x_{mn}) = d(x_{mn}, x_{ij}) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } i = m, j = n; \\ \frac{1}{n}, & \text{if } j = n, i = 1, m = 2; \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Then (X, d) is a discrete space. Thus X is complete, f is continuous, and $\inf_{x \in X} d(x, f(x)) = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} d(x_{1n}, x_{2n}) = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} 1/n = 0$. Let $c_5 = a_7 \geq 0$ be a real number, and let other coefficients a_i , c_j , and b_k be all 0, then both (A.1) and (A.3) hold. For the given (X, d) and $f : X \rightarrow X$, since $d(f(x), f(y)) \leq 1$, and $c_5 d(f(x), f^2(x)) = a_7 d(f(x), f^2(x)) = 1$, both (A.2) and (A.4) hold, too. However, it is clear that f has no fixed points, and each of its orbital diameter is 1. Thus, in [17], the condition (2) (or (ii)) in Theorems 2 and 4 does not imply each of (1) (or (i)) and (3) (or (iii)).

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the referees for many valuable and constructive comments and suggestions for improving this paper. The work was supported by the Special Foundation of National Prior Basis Research of China (Grant no. G1999075108).

References

- [1] B. E. Rhoades, "A comparison of various definitions of contractive mappings," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 226, pp. 257–290, 1977.
- [2] P. Collaço and J. C. E. Silva, "A complete comparison of 25 contraction conditions," *Nonlinear Analysis. Theory, Methods & Applications*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 471–476, 1997.
- [3] L. B. Ćirić, "A generalization of Banach's contraction principle," *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 267–273, 1974.
- [4] B. Fisher, "Quasi-contractions on metric spaces," *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 75, no. 2, pp. 321–325, 1979.
- [5] L. F. Guseman Jr., "Fixed point theorems for mappings with a contractive iterate at a point," *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 615–618, 1970.
- [6] W. Walter, "Remarks on a paper by F. Browder about contraction," *Nonlinear Analysis. Theory, Methods & Applications*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 21–25, 1981.
- [7] J. R. Jachymski, B. Schroder, and J. D. Stein Jr., "A connection between fixed-point theorems and tiling problems," *Journal of Combinatorial Theory. Series A*, vol. 87, no. 2, pp. 273–286, 1999.
- [8] J. R. Jachymski and J. D. Stein Jr., "A minimum condition and some related fixed-point theorems," *Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society. Series A*, vol. 66, no. 2, pp. 224–243, 1999.
- [9] J. Merryfield, B. Rothschild, and J. D. Stein Jr., "An application of Ramsey's theorem to the Banach contraction principle," *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 130, no. 4, pp. 927–933, 2002.
- [10] J. Merryfield and J. D. Stein Jr., "A generalization of the Banach contraction principle," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 273, no. 1, pp. 112–120, 2002.
- [11] D. W. Boyd and J. S. W. Wong, "On nonlinear contractions," *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 458–464, 1969.
- [12] J. Jachymski, "A generalization of the theorem by Rhoades and Watson for contractive type mappings," *Mathematica Japonica*, vol. 38, no. 6, pp. 1095–1102, 1993.
- [13] W. A. Kirk, "Fixed points of asymptotic contractions," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 277, no. 2, pp. 645–650, 2003.
- [14] E. Rakotch, "A note on contractive mappings," *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 459–465, 1962.
- [15] G. Jungck, "Fixed point theorems for semi-groups of self maps of semi-metric spaces," *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 125–132, 1998.
- [16] B. K. Sharma and B. S. Thakur, "Fixed point with orbital diametral function," *Applied Mathematics and Mechanics*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 145–148, 1996.
- [17] D. F. Xia and S. L. Xu, "Fixed points of continuous self-maps under a contractive condition," *Mathematica Applicata*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 81–84, 1998 (Chinese).

Jie-Hua Mai: Institute of Mathematics, Shantou University, Shantou, Guangdong 515063, China
 Email address: jhmai@stu.edu.cn

Xin-He Liu: Institute of Mathematics, Guangxi University, Nanning, Guangxi 530004, China
 Email address: xhlwhl@gxu.edu.cn

Special Issue on Decision Support for Intermodal Transport

Call for Papers

Intermodal transport refers to the movement of goods in a single loading unit which uses successive various modes of transport (road, rail, water) without handling the goods during mode transfers. Intermodal transport has become an important policy issue, mainly because it is considered to be one of the means to lower the congestion caused by single-mode road transport and to be more environmentally friendly than the single-mode road transport. Both considerations have been followed by an increase in attention toward intermodal freight transportation research.

Various intermodal freight transport decision problems are in demand of mathematical models of supporting them. As the intermodal transport system is more complex than a single-mode system, this fact offers interesting and challenging opportunities to modelers in applied mathematics. This special issue aims to fill in some gaps in the research agenda of decision-making in intermodal transport.

The mathematical models may be of the optimization type or of the evaluation type to gain an insight in intermodal operations. The mathematical models aim to support decisions on the strategic, tactical, and operational levels. The decision-makers belong to the various players in the intermodal transport world, namely, drayage operators, terminal operators, network operators, or intermodal operators.

Topics of relevance to this type of decision-making both in time horizon as in terms of operators are:

- Intermodal terminal design
- Infrastructure network configuration
- Location of terminals
- Cooperation between drayage companies
- Allocation of shippers/receivers to a terminal
- Pricing strategies
- Capacity levels of equipment and labour
- Operational routines and lay-out structure
- Redistribution of load units, railcars, barges, and so forth
- Scheduling of trips or jobs
- Allocation of capacity to jobs
- Loading orders
- Selection of routing and service

Before submission authors should carefully read over the journal's Author Guidelines, which are located at <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/jamds/guidelines.html>. 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	June 1, 2009
First Round of Reviews	September 1, 2009
Publication Date	December 1, 2009

Lead Guest Editor

Gerrit K. Janssens, Transportation Research Institute (IMOB), Hasselt University, Agoralaan, Building D, 3590 Diepenbeek (Hasselt), Belgium; Gerrit.Janssens@uhasselt.be

Guest Editor

Cathy Macharis, Department of Mathematics, Operational Research, Statistics and Information for Systems (MOSI), Transport and Logistics Research Group, Management School, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Pleinlaan 2, 1050 Brussel, Belgium; Cathy.Macharis@vub.ac.be