

FIXED POINTS AND CONTINUITY FOR MULTIVALUED MAPPINGS

TROY HICKS and B.E. RHOADES

Department of Mathematics
University of Missouri at Rolla
Rolla, Missouri 65401

Department of Mathematics
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47405

(Received July 31, 1990 and in revised form January 11, 1991)

ABSTRACT. Many of the contractive definitions do not require continuity of the map. However, in a previous paper the second author has shown in [1] that, in most cases, the function is continuous at a fixed point. In this paper we show that the same behavior is exhibited for many multivalued mappings.

KEY WORDS AND PHRASES. Continuity, fixed point, multivalued mapping.

1980 AMS SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION CODE. 54 H 25

In a recent paper, Rhoades [1], it was verified that, for most contractive definitions, the contractive definition was strong enough to force continuity of the function at a fixed point, even though continuity was neither assumed nor implied by the contractive definition.

The purpose of this paper is to prove that the situation is the same in the multivalued arena.

Before examining the multivalued cases, we shall establish a result, which is of interest in its own right.

PROPOSITION 1. Let T be a selfmap of a complete metric space with a fixed point p . Then the following are equivalent:

(a) T is continuous at p .

(b) If $\{y_n\}$ is any sequence contained in X with $y_n \rightarrow p$, then $\lim d(y_n, Ty_n) = 0$.

PROOF. To show that (a) and (b) are equivalent, suppose that (a) is satisfied. Then $y_n \rightarrow p$ implies that $Ty_n \rightarrow Tp = p$, and thus $\lim d(y_n, Ty_n) = 0$.

Conversely, $d(Ty_n, Tp) \leq d(Ty_n, y_n) + d(y_n, p)$, so that $\limsup d(Ty_n, Tp) \leq \limsup [d(Ty_n, y_n) + d(y_n, p)] = 0$. Then T is continuous at p .

In the multivalued case, a multivalued map T has a fixed point p if $p \in Tp$. Let $CL(X)$ denote the collection of nonempty closed subsets of X , $D(A, B) := \inf\{d(a, b) : a \in A, b \in B\}$. A multivalued map $T : (X, d) \rightarrow (CL(X), D)$ will be said to be continuous at a point p if $\lim_n d(x_n, p) = 0$ implies that $\lim_n D(Tx_n, Tp) = 0$.

PROPOSITION 2. Let $T : (X, d) \rightarrow (CL(X), D)$, with p a fixed point of T . Then the following are equivalent :

- (a) T is continuous at p ,
- (b) If $\{y_n\} \subset X$ with $\lim y_n = p$, then $\lim D(y_n, Ty_n) = 0$.

Suppose that (a) is satisfied, $D(y_n, Ty_n) \leq D(y_n, p) + D(p, Ty_n) \rightarrow 0$, and (b) is satisfied. Conversely, if (b) holds, then $D(Ty_n, Tp) \leq D(Ty_n, y_n) + D(y_n, p) \rightarrow 0$, and (a) is satisfied.

In Proposition 2, we obtain the same conclusions by replacing $CL(X)$ with $B(X)$, the set of all nonempty bounded subsets of X , and replacing D by $\delta(A, B)$, where $\delta(A, B) := \sup\{d(a, b) : a \in A, b \in B\}$. We can also replace $CL(X)$ with $CB(X)$, the collection of nonempty closed, bounded subsets of X , and replace D with H , the Hausdorff metric.

THEOREM 1. Let $F : X \rightarrow B(X), I : X \rightarrow X, I$ continuous, F, I satisfying

$$\delta(Fx, Fy) \leq c \max\{\delta(Ix, Iy), \delta(Ix, Fx), \delta(Iy, Fy), \delta(Ix, Fy), \delta(Iy, Fx)\} \quad (1)$$

for all x, y in X , $0 \leq c < 1$. If F and I commute and $I(X) \supseteq F(X)$, then F and I have a unique common fixed point $z, Fz = \{z\}$, and F is continuous at z .

The fact that F and I have a unique common fixed point comes from Fisher [2]. Although not mentioned in the statement of Theorem 1, Fisher [2] has shown that $Iz = \{z\}$. To show that F is continuous at z , let $\{y_n\} \subset X, y_n \rightarrow z$. From (1),

$$\delta(Fy_n, z) \leq c \max\{\delta(Iy_n, Iz), \delta(Iy_n, Fy_n), \delta(Iz, Fz), \delta(Iy_n, Fz), \delta(Iz, Fy_n)\}.$$

Since $y_n \rightarrow z$ and I is continuous, $Iy_n \rightarrow Iz = z$. Also, $\delta(Iy_n, Fy_n) \leq \delta(Iy_n, z) + \delta(z, Fy_n)$. Therefore $\delta(Fy_n, z) \leq c[\delta(Iy_n, z) + \delta(z, Fy_n)]$, which implies that $\delta(Fy_n, z) \leq c[\delta(Iy_n, z)]/(1 - c) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and F is continuous at z .

By setting I equal to the identity map, Theorem 1 is a generalization of the result in Fisher [3].

For an integer $n, x \in X, F^n$ is defined inductively by $F^n(x) = F(F^{n-1}(x))$.

THEOREM 2. Let $F : X \rightarrow B(X)$ satisfying

$$\delta(F^p x, Fy) \leq c \max\{\delta(F^r x, F^s y), \delta(F^r x, F^{r'} x), \delta(y, Fy) : 0 \leq r, r' \leq p, s = 0, 1\} \quad (2)$$

for all x, y in $X, 0 \leq c < 1$ for some fixed integer p . If F also maps $B(X)$ into itself, then F has a unique fixed point $z, Fz = \{z\}$, and F is continuous at z .

PROOF. The fact that F has a unique fixed point z and that $Fz = \{z\}$ comes from Fisher [4]. Let $\{y_n\} \subset X, y_n \rightarrow z$. In (2) set $x = z, y = y_n$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(F^p z, Fy_n) &\leq c \max\{\delta(F^r z, F^s y_n), \delta(F^r z, F^{r'} z), \delta(y_n, Fy_n) : 0 \leq r, r' \leq p, s = 0, 1\} \\ &= c \max\{\delta(z, y_n), \delta(z, Fy_n), \delta(y_n, Fy_n)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\delta(y_n, Fy_n) \leq \delta(z, y_n) + \delta(z, Fy_n)$, the above inequality becomes $\delta(z, Fy_n) \leq c[\delta(z, y_n) + \delta(z, Fy_n)]$, which implies that $\delta(z, Fy_n) \leq c[\delta(z, y_n)]/(1 - c) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus F is continuous at z .

Theorem 2 also generalizes the corresponding result in Fisher [4].

For a metric space $X, N(\varepsilon, A) := \{x \in X : d(x, a) < \varepsilon \text{ for some } a \in A \in CL(X), \varepsilon > 0\}$. The Hausdorff metric H is defined by $H(A, B) = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : A \subseteq N(\varepsilon, B) \text{ and } B \subseteq N(\varepsilon, A)\}$, if the infimum exists, and $H(A, B) = \infty$ otherwise. An equivalent definition of H is

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

THEOREM 3. Let $F_1, F_2 : X \rightarrow CB(X)$ satisfying

$$H(F_1x, F_2y) \leq a_1\delta(x, F_1x) + a_2\delta(y, F_2y) + a_3\delta(x, F_2y) + a_4\delta(y, F_1x) + a_5d(x, y) \quad (3)$$

for all x, y in X , where the $a_i \geq 0$, $\sum_{i=1}^5 a_i < 1$ and $a_1 = a_2$ or $a_3 = a_4$. If z is a common fixed point of F_1 and F_2 such that $F_1z = \{z\}$ or $F_2z = \{z\}$, then z is the unique common fixed point of F_1 and F_2 . Moreover, F_1 and F_2 are continuous at z .

PROOF. The conclusions about the fixed point z come from Mendaglio and Dube [5]. We first observe that the hypotheses of the theorem implies that both $F_1z = F_2z = \{z\}$. For, suppose that $F_2z = \{z\}$. Then, in (3) with $x = y = z$, we have

$$H(F_1z, F_2z) \leq a_1\delta(z, F_1z) + a_2\delta(z, F_2z) + a_3\delta(z, F_2z) + a_4\delta(z, F_1z) + a_5\delta(z, z),$$

and $H(F_1z, \{z\}) \leq (a_1 + a_4)\delta(z, F_1z)$. But $H(F_1z, \{z\}) = \delta(z, F_1z)$. Therefore $F_1z = \{z\}$. Similarly, $F_1z = \{z\}$ implies $F_2z = \{z\}$.

To prove continuity, let $\{y_n\} \subset X$, $y_n \rightarrow z$. In (3) set $x = y_n$, $y = z$ to get

$$H(F_1y_n, F_2z) \leq a_1\delta(y_n, F_1y_n) + a_2\delta(z, F_2z) + a_3\delta(y_n, F_2z) + a_4\delta(z, F_1y_n) + a_5d(y_n, z).$$

Thus

$$H(F_1y_n, z) = \delta(F_1y_n, z) \leq \frac{(a_1 + a_2 + a_3)}{1 - a_1 - a_4}d(y_n, z),$$

which tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and F_1 is continuous at z .

Setting $x = z$ and $y = y_n$ in (3) leads to the result that F_2 is continuous at z .

THEOREM 4. Let $F, G : X \rightarrow B(X)$

$$\delta(Fx, Gy) \leq \alpha_1(p)\delta(x, Fx) + \alpha_2(p)\delta(y, Gy) + \alpha_3(p)\delta(x, Gy) + \alpha_4(p)\delta(y, Fx) + \alpha_5(p)d(x, y) \quad (4)$$

for all x, y in X , where $p := \delta(Fx, Gy) > 0$, and where each $\alpha_i : (0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1)$ is a decreasing function such that $(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 2\alpha_3 + 2\alpha_4 + \alpha_5)(t) < 1$ for each $t > 0$. Then there exists a unique point z in X satisfying $Fz = Gz = \{z\}$, F and G have a unique common fixed point in X , and F and G are continuous at z .

That z is the unique common fixed point of F and G follows from Samanta and Baisnab [6]. To prove continuity, let $\{y_n\} \subset X$, $y_n \rightarrow z$. From (4), with $x = y_n$, $y = z$, we have

$$\delta(Fy_n, Gz) \leq \alpha_1(p)\delta(y_n, Fy_n) + \alpha_2(p)\delta(z, Gz) + \alpha_3(p)\delta(y_n, Gz) + \alpha_4(p)\delta(z, Fy_n) + \alpha_5(p)d(y_n, z),$$

or

$$\delta(Fy_n, z) \leq (\alpha_1(p) + \alpha_4(p))\delta(z, Fy_n) + (\alpha_1(p) + \alpha_3(p) + \alpha_5(p))d(y_n, z);$$

i.e.,

$$\delta(Fy_n, z) \leq \frac{\alpha_1(p) + \alpha_3(p) + \alpha_5(p)}{1 - \alpha_1(p) - \alpha_4(p)}d(y_n, z),$$

which tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and F is continuous at z . A similar argument shows that G is continuous at z .

THEOREM 5. Let $F, G : X \rightarrow B(X)$ satisfying

$$\delta(Fx, Gy) \leq \alpha_1 \delta(x, Fx) + \alpha_2 \delta(y, Gy) + \alpha_3 \delta(x, Gy) + \alpha_4 \delta(y, Fx) + \alpha_5 d(x, y) \quad (5)$$

for all x, y in X , where the $\alpha_i \geq 0$, $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 2\alpha_4 + \alpha_5 < 1$ and $\alpha_1 + \alpha_4 < 1$. Then F and G have a common fixed point. If, further, $\alpha_3 + \alpha_4 + \alpha_5 < 1$, then $Fz = Gz = \{z\}$ and z is the unique common fixed point of F and G . Moreover, if F and G have a unique common fixed point z , then F and G are continuous at z .

The fixed point properties come from Theorem 2 of Dixit [7]. To prove continuity, let $\{y_n\} \subset X$, $y_n \rightarrow z$ and set $x = y_n$, $y = z$ in (5) to get

$$\delta(Fy_n, Gz) \leq \alpha_1 \delta(y_n, Fy_n) + \alpha_2 \delta(z, Gz) + \alpha_3 \delta(y_n, Gz) + \alpha_4 \delta(z, Fy_n) + \alpha_5 d(y_n, z).$$

Thus

$$\delta(Fy_n, z) \leq (\alpha_1 + \alpha_4) \delta(z, Fy_n) + (\alpha_1 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_5) d(y_n, z),$$

or,

$$\delta(Fy_n, z) \leq \frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3}{1 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_4} d(y_n, z),$$

which tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and F is continuous at z . A similar argument shows that G is continuous at z .

THEOREM 6. Let $F, G : X \rightarrow B(X)$ satisfying

$$\delta(Fx, Gy) \leq c \max\{\delta(x, Fx), \delta(y, Gy), \delta(x, Gy), \delta(y, Fx), d(x, y)\} \quad (6)$$

for all x, y in X , $0 \leq c < 1$. Then F and G have a unique common fixed point z , $Fz = Gz = \{z\}$, and F and G are continuous at z .

The existence and uniqueness of the fixed point come from Fisher [8]. To prove continuity, let $\{y_n\} \subset X$, $y_n \rightarrow z$ and set $x = y_n$, $y = z$ in (6) to get

$$\delta(Fy_n, Gz) \leq c \max\{\delta(y_n, Fy_n), \delta(z, Gz), \delta(y_n, Gz), \delta(z, Fy_n), d(y_n, z)\},$$

or, since $\delta(y_n, Fy_n) \leq \delta(y_n, z) + \delta(z, Fy_n)$, $\delta(Fy_n, z) \leq c[\delta(y_n, z) + \delta(z, Fy_n)]$, which implies that $\delta(Fy_n, z) \leq c[\delta(y_n, z)/(1 - c)] \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and F is continuous at z .

A similar proof show that G is continuous at z .

THEOREM 7. Let $F, G : X \rightarrow B(X)$, X bounded, F continuous, F commutes with G , and satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(F^p G^p x, Gy) &\leq c \max\{\delta(F^r G^s x, G^i y), \delta(F^r G^s x, F^{r'} G^{s'} y), \delta(y, Gy) \\ &\quad : 0 \leq r, r', s, s' \leq p; i = 0, 1\} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

for all x, y in X , $0 \leq c < 1$, p a fixed positive integer. Then F and G have a unique common fixed point z , $Fz = Gz = \{z\}$, and G is continuous at z .

The existence and uniqueness of the fixed point come from Theorem 2 of Fisher [9]. To prove the continuity of G , let $\{y_n\} \subset X$, $y_n \rightarrow z$, and set $x = z, y = y_n$ in (7) to get

$$\delta(F^p G^p z, G y_n) \leq c \max\{\delta(F^r G^s z, G^i y_n), \delta(F^r G^s z, F^{r'} G^{s'} z), \delta(y_n, G y_n) : 0 \leq r, r', s, s' \leq p; i = 0, 1\},$$

or,

$$\delta(z, G y_n) \leq c \max\{d(z, y_n), \delta(y_n, G y_n)\}.$$

Since $\delta(y_n, G y_n) \leq \delta(z, G y_n) + d(z, y_n)$, $\delta(z, G y_n) \leq c[\delta(z, G y_n) + d(z, y_n)]$, which implies that $\delta(z, G y_n) \leq c[d(y_n, z)/(1 - c)] \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and G is continuous at z .

THEOREM 8. Let $F, G : X \rightarrow B(X)$ satisfying

$$\delta(Fx, Gy) \leq c \max\{d(x, y), \delta(x, Gy), \delta(y, Fx)\} \quad (8)$$

for each x, y in X , $0 \leq c < 1$. Then F and G have a unique common fixed point z , $Fz = Gz = \{z\}$, and F and G are continuous at z .

The existence and uniqueness of the fixed point follow from Fisher [10]. To prove the continuity of G , let $\{y_n\} \subset X$, $y_n \rightarrow z$, and set $x = y_n, y = z$ in (8) to get

$$\delta(F y_n, G z) \leq c \max\{d(y_n, z), \delta(y_n, G z), \delta(z, F y_n)\}$$

Thus $\delta(F y_n, z) \leq c d(y_n, z) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and F is continuous at z . Setting $x = z, y = y_n$ in (8) leads to the fact that G is continuous at z .

THEOREM 9. Let $F, G : X \rightarrow B(X)$, $I, J : X \rightarrow X$ satisfying

$$\delta(Fx, Gy) \leq c \max\{d(Ix, Jy), \delta(Ix, Gy), \delta(Jy, Fx)\} \quad (9)$$

for all x, y in X , $0 \leq c < 1$. If F commutes with I and G commutes with J , $F(X) \subseteq I(X)$, $G(X) \subseteq J(X)$ and, if F or I and G or J are continuous, then F, G, I , and J , have a unique common fixed point z . Further, $Fz = Gz = \{z\}$, and z is the unique common fixed point of F and I and G and J . If I and J are continuous, then F and G are continuous at z . If F and G are continuous, then I and J are continuous at z .

PROOF. The existence and uniqueness of z follow from Theorem 1 of Fisher [11]. Suppose that I and J are continuous. Let $\{y_n\} \subset X$, $y_n \rightarrow z$, and set $x = y_n, y = z$ in (9) to get

$$\delta(F y_n, G z) \leq c \max\{d(I y_n, J z), \delta(I y_n, G z), \delta(J z, F y_n)\}.$$

Thus $\delta(F y_n, z) \leq c d(I y_n, z) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and F is continuous at z .

Now set $x = z, y = y_n$ in (9) to get

$$\delta(F z, G y_n) \leq c \max\{d(I z, J y_n), \delta(I z, G y_n), \delta(J y_n, F z)\},$$

or $\delta(z, G y_n) \leq c d(z, J y_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and G is continuous at z .

A similar argument shows that the assumption that F and J are continuous leads to the continuity of I and J at z .

The special case of Theorem 9 in which I is the identity map on X yields the result in Fisher [12].

THEOREM 10. Let $F, G : X \rightarrow B(X), I, J : X \rightarrow X$ satisfying

$$\delta(Fx, Gy) \leq c \max\{d(Ix, Jy), \delta(Ix, Fx), \delta(Jy, Gy)\} \quad (10)$$

for all x, y in $X, 0 \leq c < 1$. If F commutes with I and G commutes with J , $G(X) \subseteq I(X), F(X) \subseteq J(X)$ and, if I or J is continuous, then F, G, I , and J have a unique common fixed point z . Further, $Fz = Gz = \{z\}$, and z is the unique common fixed point of F, G, I , and J . Further, the continuity of I implies that F is continuous at z , and the continuity of J implies that G is continuous at z .

The existence and uniqueness of z follows from Theorem 1 of Fisher [13]. Suppose that I is continuous. Let $\{y_n\} \subset X, y_n \rightarrow z$, and set $x = y_n, y = z$ in (10) to get

$$\delta(Fy_n, Gz) \leq c \max\{d(Iy_n, Jz), \delta(Iy_n, Fy_n), \delta(Jz, Gz)\};$$

i.e.,

$\delta(Fy_n, z) \leq c \max\{d(Iy_n, z), \delta(Iy_n, Fy_n)\}$, which, since $\delta(Iy_n, Fy_n) \leq \delta(Iy_n, z) + \delta(z, Fy_n)$, implies that $\delta(Fy_n, z) \leq c[\delta(Iy_n, z) + \delta(z, Fy_n)] \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and F is continuous at z .

The assumption that J is continuous leads to the continuity of G at z .

The special case of Theorem 10 with $I = J = I_X$ yields the result of Fisher [10], and the continuity of both F and G at z .

THEOREM 11. Let $F, G : X \rightarrow B(X), I, J : X \rightarrow X$ satisfying

$$\delta(F^p x, Gy) \leq c \max\{\delta(F^r x, Gy), \delta(F^r x, y) : 0 \leq r \leq p\} \quad (11)$$

for all x, y in $X, 0 \leq c < 1$, p a fixed positive integer. If F also maps $B(X)$ into itself, then F and G have a unique common fixed point z . Further, z is the unique fixed point of F and $G, Fz = Gz = \{z\}$, and G is continuous at z .

The existence and uniqueness of z come from Theorem 2 in Fisher [14]. To prove the continuity of F , let $\{y_n\} \subset X, y_n \rightarrow z$, and set $x = z, y = y_n$ in (11) to get

$$\delta(F^p z, Gy_n) \leq c \max\{\delta(F^r z, Gy_n), \delta(F^r z, y_n) : 0 \leq r \leq p\};$$

i.e.,

$$\delta(z, Gy_n) \leq c \max\{\delta(z, Gy_n), \delta(z, y_n)\},$$

which implies that $\delta(z, Gy_n) \leq c \delta(z, y_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and G is continuous at z .

A similar calculation verifies that F is continuous at z .

We now establish continuity for multivalued mappings with metric defined by the Hausdorff metric.

THEOREM 12. Let $T : X \rightarrow CB(X)$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} H(Tx, Ty) \leq & a(x, y)D(x, Tx) + a'(x, y)D(y, Ty) + b(x, y)D(x, Ty) + \\ & b'(x, y)D(y, Tx) + c(x, y)d(x, y) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

for all x, y in $X, a, a', b, b', c : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^+$ and $(a + a' + b + b' + c)(x, y) < 1$ for all x, y in X . If

$$\limsup_{d(z,y) \rightarrow 0} (a + a' + b + b' + c)(x, y) < 1,$$

then for each x_o in X there exists a sequence of iterates converging to a fixed point z of T , and T is continuous at z .

The existence of a fixed point is a consequence of Garegnani and Massa [15]. To prove continuity, let $\{y_n\} \subset X$, $y_n \rightarrow z$, and set $x = y_n$, $y = z$ in (12) to get

$$\begin{aligned} H(Ty_n, Tz) &\leq a(y_n, z)D(y_n, Ty_n) + a'(y_n, z)D(z, Tz) + b(y_n, z)D(y_n, Tz) \\ &\quad + b'(y_n, z)D(z, Ty_n) + c(y_n, z)d(y_n, z). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} D(Ty_n, z) &\leq H(Ty_n, Tz) \leq a(d(y_n, z) + D(z, Ty_n)) + bD(y_n, Tz) \\ &\quad + b'D(z, Ty_n) + cd(y_n, z), \end{aligned}$$

or

$$D(Ty_n, z) \leq \frac{(a + c)d(y_n, z) + bD(y_n, Tz)}{1 - a - b'}$$

which tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$, since $\lim(1 - a - b') > 0$, and $\lim_n D(Ty_n, z) = 0$, which implies that $\lim_n D(y_n, Ty_n) = 0$. Taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ of the inequality involving H yields $\lim_n H(Ty_n, Tz) = 0$, and T is continuous at z .

THEOREM 13. Let $T : X \rightarrow CL(X)$, $f : X \rightarrow X$ such that $TX \subset fX$, fX is (T, f) -orbitally complete and

$$H(Tx, Ty) \leq q \max\{d(fx, fy), D(fx, Tx), D(fy, Ty), [D(fx, Ty) + D(fy, Tx)]/2\} \quad (13)$$

for all x, y in X , $0 < q < 1$. Then T and f have a coincidence point; i.e., there exists a z in X such that $fz \in Tz$.

COROLLARY 1. Let f be the identity map on X . Then, under the hypotheses of Theorem 13, T has a fixed point z , and T is continuous at z .

The fact that T has a fixed point comes from Singh and Kulshrestha [16]. To prove continuity, let $\{y_n\} \subset X$, $y_n \rightarrow z$, and set $x = y_n$, $y = z$ in (13) to get

$$H(Ty_n, Tz) \leq q \max\{d(y_n, z), D(y_n, Ty_n), D(z, Tz), [D(y_n, Tz) + D(z, Ty_n)]/2\}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} D(Ty_n, z) &\leq q \max\{d(y_n, z), D(y_n, Ty_n), 0, [D(y_n, Tz) + D(z, Ty_n)]/2\} \\ &\leq \max\{qd(y_n, z), \frac{q}{1-q}D(y_n, z), \frac{q}{2-q}D(y_n, Tz)\} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

and $\lim_n D(Ty_n, z) = 0$, which implies that $\lim_n D(y_n, Ty_n) = 0$. Taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$, in the inequality involving H , yields $\lim_n H(Ty_n, Tz) = 0$, and T is continuous at z .

The fixed point portion of Corollary 1 is essentially due to Ćirić [17]. The theorem of Ćirić also contains a result of Reich [18] as a special case.

Kaneko [19] proves the Ćirić result under the weaker conditions that X be a reflexive space and the range of T is the family of all nonempty weakly compact subsets of X . He is apparently unaware that the two standard definitions of the Hausdorff metric are equivalent.

Theorems 1 and 2 in Czerwik [20] are special cases of Corollary 1, as are Theorem 1 of Iseki [21] and Theorem 1 of Ray [22].

THEOREM 14. Let (X, d) be a complete metrically convex metric space, K a nonempty closed subset of X , $T : X \rightarrow CB(X)$ such that there exist $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \geq 0, \alpha + 2\beta + 2\gamma < 1$ such that for all x, y in X ,

$$H(Tx, Ty) \leq \alpha d(x, y) + \beta \{D(x, Tx) + D(y, Ty)\} + \gamma \{D(x, Ty) + D(y, Tx)\}. \quad (14)$$

If for each $x \in \partial K, Tx \subset K$ and $(\alpha + \beta + \gamma)(1 + \beta + \gamma)/(1 - \beta - \gamma)^2 < 1$, then there exists a z in K with $z \in Tz$. Moreover T is continuous at z .

The existence of z is Theorem 1 of Itoh [23]. To show continuity, let $\{y_n\} \subset X, y_n \rightarrow z$, and set $x = y_n, y = z$ in (14) to get

$$H(Ty_n, Tz) \leq \alpha d(y_n, z) + \beta \{D(y_n, Ty_n) + D(z, Tz)\} + \gamma \{D(y_n, Tz) + D(z, Ty_n)\}.$$

Then

$$D(z, Ty_n) \leq H(Ty_n, Tz) \leq \alpha d(y_n, z) + \beta \{D(y_n, z) + D(z, Ty_n)\} + \gamma \{D(y_n, Tz) + D(z, Ty_n)\},$$

or,

$$D(z, Ty_n) \leq \frac{(\alpha + \beta)d(y_n, z) + \gamma D(y_n, Tz)}{1 - \beta - \gamma} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

and $\lim_n D(z, Ty_n) = 0$, which implies that $\lim_n D(y_n, Ty_n) = 0$. Now take the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the inequality for H to get $\lim_n H(Tz, Ty_n) = 0$, and T is continuous at z .

THEOREM 15. Let (X, d) be a complete bounded metric space, $F_i : X \rightarrow CL(X), i = 1, 2$ satisfying

$$H(F_1x, F_2y) \leq a_1 D(x, F_1x) + a_2 D(y, F_2y) + a_3 D(y, F_1x) + a_4 D(x, F_2y) + a_5 d(x, y) \quad (15)$$

for all x, y in $X, a_i \geq 0, \sum_{i=1}^5 a_i < 1$ and $a_1 = a_2$ or $a_3 = a_4$. Then F_1 and F_2 have a common fixed point z . Moreover F_1 and F_2 are continuous at z .

The existence of z comes from Theorem 1 of Bose and Mukherjee [24]. To prove continuity of F_1 , let $\{y_n\} \subset X, y_n \rightarrow z$, and set $x = y_n, y = z$ in (15) to get

$$H(F_1y_n, F_2z) \leq a_1 D(y_n, F_1y_n) + a_2 D(z, F_2z) + a_3 D(z, F_1y_n) + a_4 D(y_n, F_2z) + a_5 d(y_n, z).$$

Setting $x = y = z$ in (15) yields the fact that $F_1z = F_2z$. Thus

$$D(F_1y_n, z) \leq H(F_1y_n, F_1z) \leq (a_1 + a_3)D(z, F_1y_n) + a_4 D(y_n, F_2z) + (a_1 + a_5)d(y_n, z),$$

and

$$D(z, F_1 y_n) \leq \frac{a_4 D(y_n, F_2 z) + (a_1 + a_5) d(y_n, z)}{1 - a_1 - a_3},$$

which leads to the facts that $\lim_n D(z, F_1 y_n) = 0$ and $\lim_n D(y_n, F_1 y_n) = 0$. Taking the limit of the inequality for H , and using the fact that $F_1 z = F_2 z$, yields $\lim_n H(F_1 y_n, F_2 z) = 0$, and F_1 is continuous at z .

Similarly, F_2 is continuous at z .

THEOREM 16. Let (X, d) be a complete metrically convex metric space, K a nonempty closed subset of X . Let $S, T : K \rightarrow CB(X)$ satisfying

$$H(Sx, Ty) \leq \alpha d(x, y) + \beta \{D(x, Sx) + D(y, Ty)\} + \gamma \{D(x, Ty) + D(y, Sx)\} \quad (16)$$

for all x, y in X , $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \geq 0$ with $\alpha + 2\beta + 2\gamma < 1$. If for each $x \in \partial K$, $S(x) \subset K$, $T(x) \subset K$ and $(\alpha + \beta + \gamma)(1 + \beta + \gamma)/(1 - \beta - \gamma)^2 < 1$, then there exists a z in K with $z \in Tz$ and $z \in Sz$. Also S and T are continuous at z .

The properties of z come from Theorem 3.1 of Khan [24]. To establish the continuity of S , let $\{y_n\} \subset X$, $y_n \rightarrow z$, and set $x = y_n, y = z$ in (16) to get

$$H(Sy_n, Tz) \leq \alpha d(y_n, z) + \beta \{D(y_n, Sy_n) + D(z, Tz)\} + \gamma \{D(y_n, Tz) + D(z, Sy_n)\}.$$

Thus

$$D(Sy_n, z) \leq H(Sy_n, Tz) = \alpha d(y_n, z) + \beta D(y_n, Sy_n) + \gamma \{D(y_n, Tz) + D(z, Sy_n)\},$$

or,

$$D(Sy_n, z) \leq \frac{(\alpha + \beta) d(y_n, z) + \gamma D(y_n, Tz)}{1 - \beta - \gamma},$$

which implies that $\lim_n D(Sy_n, z) = 0$, and thus that $\lim_n D(y_n, Sy_n) = 0$. Setting $x = y = z$ in (16) yields $Sz = Tz$. Substituting into the inequality for H yields

$$H(Sy_n, Tz) = H(Sy_n, Sz) \leq \alpha d(y_n, z) + \beta D(y_n, Sy_n) + \gamma \{D(y_n, Sz)\} + D(z, Sy_n),$$

which implies that $\lim_n H(Sy_n, Sz) = 0$, and S is continuous at z .

A similar calculation verifies that T is continuous at z .

THEOREM 17. Let $T_n : X \rightarrow CB(X)$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \{H(T_1 x, T_n y)\}^2 &\leq k \max\{D(x, T_1 x) D(y, T_n y), D(x, T_n y) D(y, T_1 x), D(x, T_1 x) D(x, T_n y), \\ &\quad D(y, T_1 x) D(y, T_n y), d^2(x, y)\} \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

for all x, y in X , $n \geq 2$, $0 \leq k < 1/2$. Then $\{T_n\}$ has a common fixed point and $F(T_1) = F(T_n)$, $n > 1$, where $F(T)$ denotes the fixed point set of T . Moreover the $\{T_n\}$ are continuous at each fixed point.

The conclusion concerning the fixed points follows from Theorem 3 of Popa [26]. To prove continuity, let $\{y_n\} \subset X$, $y_n \rightarrow z$, and set $x = z, y = y_k$ in (17) to get

$$\{H(T_1 z, T_n y_k)\}^2 \leq k \max\{D(z, T_1 z)D(y_k, T_n y_k), D(z, T_n y_k)D(y_k, T_1 z), D(z, T_1 z)D(z, T_n y_k), \\ D(y_k, T_1 z)D(y_k, T_n y_k), d^2(z, y_k)\},$$

or

$$\{H(T_1 z, T_n y_k)\}^2 \leq k \max\{0, D(z, T_n y_k)D(y_k, T_1 z), 0, D(y_k, T_1 z)D(y_k, T_n y_k), d^2(z, y_k)\}.$$

Setting $x = y = z$ in (17) yields $T_1 z = T_n z$. Substituting in the above inequality yields $\limsup\{H(T_n z, T_n y_k)\}^2 = 0$ and each T_n is continuous at z .

THEOREM 18. Let (X, d) be a complete metric space, $T_1, T_2 : X \rightarrow CB(X)$ satisfying

$$H^m(T_1 x, T_2 y) \leq c \frac{d^p(x, T_1 x) + d^p(y, T_2 y)}{\delta^{p-m}(x, T_1 x) + \delta^{p-m}(y, T_2 y)} \quad (18)$$

for each x, y in X such that $\delta^{p-m}(x, T_1 x) + \delta^{p-m}(y, T_2 y) \neq 0, 0 < c < 1, m \geq 1, p \geq 2, m < p$. Then T_1 and T_2 have common fixed points. Moreover T_1 and T_2 are continuous at each fixed point.

The fact that T_1 and T_2 have fixed points is Theorem 2 of Popa [27]. To establish continuity, let z be a common fixed point of T_1 and T_2 and let $\{y_n\} \subset X, y_n \rightarrow z$, and set $x = z, y = y_n$ in (18) to get

$$H^m(T_1 z, T_2 y_n) \leq c \frac{d^p(z, T_1 z) + d^p(y_n, T_2 y_n)}{\delta^{p-m}(z, T_1 z) + \delta^{p-m}(y_n, T_2 y_n)} \\ = c \frac{d^p(y_n, T_2 y_n)}{\delta^{p-m}(y_n, T_2 y_n)} \leq c d^m(y_n, T_2 y_n),$$

since $d(y_n, T_2 y_n) \leq \delta(y_n, T_2 y_n)$. Therefore

$$D(z, T_2 y_n) \leq H(T_1 z, T_2 y_n) \leq c^{1/m} d(y_n, T_2 y_n) = c^{1/m} D(y_n, T_2 y_n) \\ \leq c^{1/m} [D(y_n, z) + D(z, T_2 y_n)],$$

or, $D(z, T_2 y_n) \leq c^{1/m} [D(y_n, z)]/(1 - c) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and $\lim_n D(z, T_2 y_n) = 0$. Also, $\lim_n D(y_n, T_2 y_n) = 0$.

If $\delta^{p-m}(z, T_1 z) + \delta^{p-m}(z, T_2 z) = 0$, then $T_1 z = T_2 z = \{z\}$. If $\delta^{p-m}(z, T_1 z) + \delta^{p-m}(z, T_2 z) \neq 0$, then, from (18), $T_1 z = T_2 z$. Substituting in the inequality for H yields $H(T_2 z, T_2 y_n) = H(T_1 z, T_2 y_n) \leq c^{1/m} D(y_n, T_2 y_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and T_2 is continuous at z .

Similarly, T_1 is continuous at z .

Let $C(X)$ denote the nonempty compact subsets of X . A space X is said to be x_o -jointly orbitally complete if every Cauchy sequence of each orbit at x_o is convergent in X .

THEOREM 19. Let $F_i : X \rightarrow C(X), i = 1, 2, X$ x_o -jointly complete for some $x_o \in X$. Suppose there exists a function $\psi : (\mathbf{R}^+)^5 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^+, \psi$ upper semicontinuous and nondecreasing in each variable, such that

$$\gamma(t) := \max\{\psi(t, t, t, t, t), \psi(t, t, 2t, 0, t), \psi(t, t, 0, 2t, t)\}$$

satisfies $\gamma(t) < t$ for each $t > 0$. Suppose that the F_i satisfy

$$H(F_1x, F_2y) \leq \psi\{D(x, F_1x), D(y, F_2y), D(x, F_2y), D(y, F_1x), d(x, y)\} \quad (19)$$

for all x, y in X . Then F_1 and F_2 have a common fixed point. Moreover F_1 and F_2 are continuous at each fixed point.

The existence of a fixed point is Theorem 2.1 of Guay et al [28]. To prove that F_1 is continuous at a fixed point z , let $\{y_n\} \subset X, y_n \rightarrow z$, and set $x = y_n, y = z$ in (19) to get

$$H(F_1y_n, F_2z) \leq \psi\{D(y_n, F_1y_n), D(z, F_2z), D(y_n, F_2z), D(z, F_1y_n), d(y_n, z)\}.$$

Thus

$$D(F_1y_n, z) \leq \psi\{D(y_n, F_1y_n), 0, D(y_n, F_2z), D(z, F_1y_n), d(y_n, z)\}.$$

Suppose that $\delta = \limsup D(F_1y_n, z) > 0$. Since $D(y_n, F_1y_n) \leq D(y_n, z) + D(z, F_1y_n)$, $\limsup D(y_n, F_1y_n) \leq \limsup D(z, F_1y_n)$. Since $z \in F_2z$, $\limsup D(y_n, F_2z) = 0$. Therefore we have $\delta \leq \psi(\delta, 0, 0, \delta, 0) \leq \psi(\delta, \delta, \delta, \delta, \delta) < \delta$, a contradiction. Consequently $\lim_n D(F_1y_n, z) = 0$, and $\lim_n D(y_n, F_1y_n) = 0$.

From (19) with $x = y = z$,

$$H(F_1z, F_2z) \leq \psi\{D(z, F_1z), D(z, F_2z), D(z, F_2z), D(z, F_1z), d(z, z)\} = \psi(0, 0, 0, 0, 0) = 0,$$

and $F_1z = F_2z$. Substituting in the inequality for H we have

$$H(F_1y_n, F_1z) \leq \psi\{D(y_n, F_1y_n), 0, D(y_n, F_1z), D(z, F_1y_n), d(y_n, z)\}.$$

Taking the \limsup as $n \rightarrow \infty$, yields $\limsup_n H(F_1y_n, F_1z) \leq \psi(0, 0, 0, 0, 0) = 0$, and F_1 is continuous at z .

A similar argument verifies that F_2 is continuous at z .

THEOREM 20. Let X be a complete metric space, $F_n : X \rightarrow C(X)$. Suppose that there exists a function ψ satisfying the conditions of Theorem 19 and such that

$$H(F_i x, F_j y) \leq \psi\{D(x, F_i x), D(y, F_j y), D(x, F_j y), D(y, F_i x), d(x, y)\} \quad (20)$$

for each x, y in X , for each $i, j, i \neq j$. Then $\{F_n\}$ has a common fixed point, and each of the F_i is continuous at this fixed point.

The existence of a common fixed point is Theorem 2.5 of Guay et al [28]. The continuity is proved in the same way as in Theorem 19.

Theorem 4 of Kaneko [19] is a special case of Theorem 20.

THEOREM 21. Let (X, d) be a complete Hausdorff uniform space defined by $\{d_\lambda : \lambda \in I\}$. Let $F_i : X \rightarrow 2^X, i = 1, 2$ satisfying

$$H_\lambda(F_1x, F_2y) \leq a_\lambda d_\lambda(x, F_1x) + b_\lambda d_\lambda(y, F_2y) + c_\lambda d_\lambda(x, F_2y) + e_\lambda d_\lambda(y, F_1x) + f_\lambda d_\lambda(x, y) \quad (21)$$

for each x, y in X , where $a_\lambda, b_\lambda, c_\lambda, e_\lambda, f_\lambda \geq 0, a_\lambda + b_\lambda + c_\lambda + e_\lambda + f_\lambda < 1$ and $a_\lambda = b_\lambda$ or $c_\lambda = e_\lambda$. Then F_1 and F_2 have a common fixed point. Also, F_1 and F_2 are continuous at each common fixed point.

The proof that there is a common fixed point z is Theorem 3.1 of Mishra [29]. To prove that F_1 is continuous at z , let $\{y_n\} \subset X, y_n \rightarrow z$, and set $x = y_n, y = z$ in (21) to get

$$H_\lambda(F_1 y_n, F_2 z) \leq a_\lambda d_\lambda(y_n, F_1 y_n) + b_\lambda d_\lambda(z, F_2 z) + c_\lambda d_\lambda(y_n, F_2 z) + e_\lambda d_\lambda(z, F_1 y_n) + f_\lambda d_\lambda(y_n, z).$$

Since $d_\lambda(F_1 y_n, z) \leq H_\lambda(F_1 y_n, F_2 z)$, the above inequality implies that

$$d_\lambda(F_1 y_n, z) \leq \frac{(a_\lambda + f_\lambda)d_\lambda(y_n, z) + c_\lambda d_\lambda(y_n, z)}{1 - a_\lambda - b_\lambda} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

It then follows that $\lim_n d_\lambda(y_n, F_1 y_n) = 0$. Setting $x = y = z$ in (21) yields $F_1 z = F_2 z$. Substituting in the inequality for H gives

$$H_\lambda(F_1 y_n, F_1 z) \leq a_\lambda d_\lambda(y_n, F_1 y_n) + c_\lambda d_\lambda(y_n, F_1 z) + e_\lambda d_\lambda(z, F_1 y_n) + f_\lambda d_\lambda(y_n, z).$$

Taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain $\lim_n H_\lambda(F_1 y_n, F_1 z) = 0$, and F_1 is continuous at z .

Similarly, F_2 is continuous at z .

The result in Mishra and Singh [30] is a special case of Theorem 3.1 of Mishra [29].

THEOREM 22. Let X be a reflexive Banach space, K a nonempty closed bounded convex subset of X . Let T be a mapping of K into the family of nonempty weakly compact convex subsets of K satisfying

$$H(Tx, Ty) \leq \phi(\max\{D(x, Tx), D(y, Ty)\}) \quad (22)$$

for each x, y in X , where $\phi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, nondecreasing, right continuous, such that $\phi(t) < t$ for each $t > 0$. Then there exists a nonempty subset M of K such that $Tx = M$ for each $x \in M$. Moreover, T is continuous at each point of M .

The fact that a subset M exists with the stated properties is Theorem 1 of Kaneko [31]. To prove the continuity of T , let $z \in M$. Let $\{y_n\} \subset X, y_n \rightarrow z$, and set $x = y_n, y = z$ in (22) to get

$$H(Ty_n, Tz) \leq \phi(\max\{D(y_n, Ty_n), D(z, Tz)\}).$$

Thus $D(Ty_n, z) \leq H(Ty_n, Tz) \leq \phi(D(y_n, Ty_n))$. Assume that $\delta = \limsup D(Ty_n, z) > 0$. Then we have $\delta \leq \phi(\limsup [D(y_n, z) + D(Ty_n, z)]) = \phi(\delta) < \delta$, a contradiction. Therefore $\delta = 0$ and T is continuous at z .

THEOREM 23. Let (X, d) be a complete metric space, $\{S_n\}, \{T_n\}$ sequences of maps from $X \rightarrow CB(X)$. Suppose that there exists an $h, 0 < h < 1$, such that, for each m, n , and each x, y in X ,

$$H(S_m x, T_n y) \leq h \max\{d(x, y), D(x, S_m x), D(y, T_n y), [(Dx, T_n y) + D(y, S_m x)]/2\}. \quad (23)$$

Then $\{S_m\}$ and $\{T_n\}$ have a common fixed point z . Moreover, $\{S_m\}$ and $\{T_n\}$ are continuous at z .

The existence of a common fixed point z is Theorem 1 of Kubiak [32]. To prove that each S_m is continuous, let $\{y_k\} \subset X, y_k \rightarrow z$, and set $x = y_k, y = z$ in (23) to get

$$H(S_m y_k, T_n z) \leq h \max\{d(y_k, z), D(y_k, S_m y_k), D(z, T_n z), [(D(y_k, T_n z) + D(z, S_m y_k)]/2\}.$$

Since $D(S_m y_k, z) \leq H(S_m y_k, T_n z)$, the above inequality yields

$$D(S_m y_k, z) \leq h d(y_k, z)/(1 - h) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

It then follows that $\lim_k D(y_k, S_m y_k) = 0$.

Setting $x = y = z$ in (23) gives the result that $S_m z = T_n z$. Substituting in the inequality for H yields

$$H(S_m y_k, S_m z) \leq h \max\{d(y_k, z), D(y_k, S_m y_k), 0, [(D(y_k, S_m z) + D(z, S_m y_k))/2]\},$$

and, taking the limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$ gives $\lim_k H(S_m y_k, S_m z) = 0$, and each S_m is continuous at z .

A similar argument verifies that each T_n is continuous at z .

Special cases of Theorem 1 of Kubiak [32] appear in Avram [33], Iseki [21], Popa [34 - 35], Ray [36], Rus [37], and Wong [38]. Achara [39] has the same result as Kubiak [32], but with $CB(X)$ replaced by $C(X)$.

THEOREM 24. Let (X, d) be a complete metric space, $T_n : X \rightarrow CB(X)$. Suppose that there exist $\alpha_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, 5$ such that

$$\min\{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + 2\alpha_4, \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + 2\alpha_5\} < 1$$

and $m \neq n$ implies

$$H(T_m x, T_n y) \leq \alpha_1 d(x, y) + \alpha_2 D(x, T_m x) + \alpha_3 D(y, T_n y) + \alpha_4 D(x, T_n y) + \alpha_5 D(y, T_m x) \quad (24)$$

for all x, y in X . Then $\{T_n\}$ has a common fixed point.

The proof that the $\{T_n\}$ has a common fixed point is Theorem 1 of Kita [40]. To prove continuity, let z be a common fixed point of $\{T_n\}$, and let $\{y_n\} \subset X, y_n \rightarrow z$.

Suppose that $\alpha_4 < \alpha_5$. Then $\min\{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + 2\alpha_4, \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + 2\alpha_5\} = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + 2\alpha_4 < 1$.

Set $x = z, y = y_k$. From (24),

$$H(T_m z, T_n y_k) \leq \alpha_1 d(z, y_k) + \alpha_2 D(z, T_m z) + \alpha_3 D(y_k, T_n y_k) + \alpha_4 D(z, T_n y_k) + \alpha_5 D(y_k, T_m z),$$

or, since $D(z, T_n y_k) \leq H(T_m z, T_n y_k)$, we obtain

$$D(z, T_n y_k) \leq \frac{(\alpha_1 + \alpha_3)d(z, y_k) + \alpha_5 D(y_k, T_m z)}{1 - \alpha_3 - \alpha_4} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus $\lim_k D(z, T_n y_k) = 0$, which implies that $\lim_k D(y_k, T_n y_k) = 0$.

Substituting $x = y = z$ into (24) verifies that $T_m z = T_n z$. It then follows that

$$H(T_n z, T_n y_k) = H(T_m z, T_n y_k) \leq \alpha_1 d(z, y_k) + \alpha_3 D(y_k, T_n y_k) + \alpha_4 D(z, T_n y_k) + \alpha_5 D(y_k, T_m z).$$

Taking the limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$ yields the result that each T_n is continuous at z .

If $\alpha_4 \geq \alpha_5$, then, setting $x = y_k, y = z$ in (24) yields

$$D(T_m y_k, z) \leq \frac{(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)d(z, y_k) + \alpha_4 D(y_k, T_m z)}{1 - \alpha_3 - \alpha_5} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

from which it follows that each T_m is continuous at z .

Although we have experienced some success with establishing the continuity of multivalued maps at a fixed point, there are some definitions that do not lend themselves to such an analysis. We cite here three examples.

THEOREM K. (Khan and Kubiacyk [41], Theorem 1) Let $S, T : X \rightarrow B(X)$ be such that, for some $\phi \in \Phi := \{\phi : (\mathbf{R}^+)^5 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^+ : \text{is upper semicontinuous from the right, nondecreasing in each variable coordinate such that } \phi(t, t, t, at, bt) < t \text{ for each } t > 0, a, b \geq 0, \text{ with } a + b \leq 2\}$,

$$\delta(Sx, Ty) \leq \phi(d(x, y), \delta(x, Sx), \delta(y, Ty), D(x, Ty), D(y, Tx))$$

for each x, y in X . Then S and T have a unique common fixed point u such that $u \in Su \cap Tu$.

In the above theorem the difficulty arises from the fact that $\delta(u, Tu)$ need not be zero.

THEOREM M. (Mukherjee and Som [42], Theorem 1) Let (X, d) be a complete metric space, $T_1, T_2 : X \rightarrow CB(X)$ satisfying any one of the following conditions for each x, y in X :

- (i) $\delta(x, T_1x) + \delta(y, T_2y) \leq \alpha d(x, y), 1 \leq \alpha < 2$,
- (ii) $\delta(x, T_1x) + \delta(y, T_2y) \leq \beta\{(x, T_2y) + H(y, T_2x) + d(x, y)\}, 1/2 < \beta < 2/3$,
- (iii) $\delta(x, T_1x) + \delta(y, T_2y) + \delta(T_1x, T_2y) \leq \gamma\{H(x, T_2y) + H(y, T_1x)\}, 1 \leq \gamma < 3/2$,
- (iv) $\delta(T_1x, T_2y) \leq \eta \max\{d(x, y), H(x, T_1x), H(y, T_2y), [H(x, T_2y) + H(y, T_1x)]/2\}, 0 \leq \eta < 1$.

Then T_1 and T_2 have a common fixed point.

THEOREM S. (Singh et al [43], Theorem 2.1) Let S, T , be multivalued mappings from a metric space $X \rightarrow CL(X)$. If there exists a function $f : X \rightarrow X$ such that $SX \cup TX \subseteq f(X)$ and, for each x, y in X ,

$$H(Sx, Ty) \leq \phi(\max\{D(fx, Sx), D(fy, Ty), D(fx, Ty), D(fy, Sx), d(fx, fy)\})$$

where $\phi : \mathbf{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^+$, ϕ upper semicontinuous and nondecreasing with $\phi(t) < t$ for each $t > 0$, there exists a point x_0 in X such that (S, T) is asymptotically regular at x_0 and $f(x)$ is $(S, T; f, x_0)$ -orbitally complete, then f, S , and T have a coincidence point. Further, if z is a coincidence point of f, S, T , and fz is a fixed point of f , then

(a) fz is a fixed point of S (resp T) provided f commutes weakly with S (resp T) at z , and

(b) fz is a common fixed point of S and T at z .

ADDED IN PROOF. 1. A closer examination of the proof of Theorem K shows that $\delta(u, Su) = \delta(u, Tu) = 0$. Therefore an argument similar to the one already used repeatedly in this paper yields that S and T are continuous at the fixed point.

2. Theorem M contains an error in the proof. Moreover, conditions (i) and (ii) imply that $T_1x = T_2x = \{x\}$ for each x in X . The parameter values on conditions (iii) and (iv) make it impossible to use standard proof techniques to obtain a fixed point.

3. If one assumes the continuity of f in Theorem S, then it is straightforward to verify that S and T are continuous at the fixed point fz .

REFERENCES

1. RHOADES, B. E. Contractive definitions and continuity, Contemporary Math. 72 (1988), 233-245.
2. FISHER, B. Fixed points of mappings and set-valued mappings. J. Univ. Kuwait 9 (1982), 175-179.
3. FISHER, B. Set-valued mappings on metric spaces. Fund. Math. 12 (1981), 141-145.
4. FISHER, B. Fixed points for set-valued mappings on metric spaces. Bull. Malaysian Math. Soc. 4 (1981), 95-99.
5. MENDAGLIO, V. and DUBE, L. S. On fixed points of multi-valued mappings. Bull. Math. Roumaine 25 (1981), 167-170.
6. SAMANTA, A. and BAISNAB, A. P. Fixed point theorems for set valued mappings. Bull. Calcutta Math. Soc. 79 (1987), 207-214.
7. DIXIT, S. P. A fixed point theorem for set-valued mappings. Bull. Calcutta Math. Soc. 77 (1985), 165-169.
8. FISHER, B. Set-valued mappings on bounded metric spaces. Indian J. Pure and Appl. Math. 11 (1980), 8-12.
9. FISHER, B. Common fixed points of set-valued mappings on bounded metric spaces. Math. Seminar Notes 11 (1983), 307-311.
10. FISHER, B. A result on fixed points for set-valued mappings. Iraqi J. Sci. 21 (1980), 464-469.
11. FISHER, B. Common fixed point theorems for mappings and set-valued mappings. J. Univ. Kuwait 11 (1984), 15-21.
12. FISHER, B. Common fixed points for set-valued mappings, Indian J. Math. 25 (1983), 265-270.
13. FISHER, B. Common fixed points of mappings and set-valued mappings on metric spaces. Kyungpook Math. J. 25 (1985), 35-42.
14. FISHER, B. Common fixed points of set-valued mappings, Punjab Univ. J. of Math. 14-15 (1981-82), 155-164.
15. GAREGNANI, G. and MASSA, S. Multi-valued mappings of contractive type, Istit. Lombardo Accad. Sci. Rend. 112 (1978), 283-288.
16. SINGH, S.L.S. and KULSHRESTHA, C. Coincidence theorems in metric spaces, Indian J. Phys. Nat. Sci. B2 (1982), 19-22.
17. CIRIC, L. J. Fixed points for generalized multi-valued contractions, Mat. Vesnik 9(234) (1972), 265-272.
18. REICH, S. Kannan's fixed point theorems, Boll. UMI 4 (1971), 1-11.
19. KANEKO, H. A comparison of contractive conditions for multi-valued mappings, Kobe J. Math. 3 (1986), 37-45.
20. CZERWICK, S. Multi-valued contraction mappings in metric spaces, Aeq. Math. 16 (1977), 297-302.
21. ISEKI, K. Multi-valued contraction mappings in complete metric spaces, Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova 53 (1975), 15-19.
22. RAY, Barada K. Some fixed point theorems, Nanta Math. 8 (1975), 9-20.
23. ITOH, S. Multivalued generalized contractions and fixed point theorems, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae 18 (1977), 247-258.
24. BOSE, R.K. and MUKHERJEE, R. N. Common fixed points of some multivalued mappings, Tamkang J. Math. 81 (1977), 245-249.
25. KHAN, M.S. Common fixed point theorems for multivalued mappings, Pacific J. Math. 95 (1981), 337-347.

26. POPA, V. Fixed point theorems for a sequence of multifunctions, Bull. Math. Soc. Stiinte Rom. 28 (1984), 251-257.
27. POPA, V. Common fixed points for multifunctions satisfying a rational inequality, Kobe J. Math. 2 (1985), 23-28.
28. GUAY, M.D., SINGH, K.L., and WHITFIELD, J.H.M. Common fixed points for set-valued mappings, Bull de L'Acad Pol. des Sci. 30 (1982), 545-551.
29. MISHRA, S.N. A note on common fixed points of multivalued mappings in uniform spaces, Math. Sem. Notes 9 (1981), 341-347.
30. MISHRA, S.N. and SINGH, S.L. Fixed point of multivalued mappings in uniform spaces, Bull. Calcutta Math. Soc. 77 (1985), 323-329.
31. KANEKO, H. A report on general contractive type conditions for multivalued mappings, Math. Japonica 4 (1988), 57-64.
32. KUBIAK, T. Fixed point theorems for contractive type multivalued mappings, Math. Japonica 109 (1985), 89-101.
33. AVRAM, M. Points fixes communs pour les applications multivoques dans les espaces metriques, Math. Cluj. 17 (1975), 153-156.
34. POPA, V. A common fixed point theorem for a sequence of multifunctions, Studia Univ. Babes-Bolyai Math. 24 (1979), 39-41.
35. POPA, V. Puncte fixe comune pentru un sire de multifunctii, Stud. Cerc. Mat. 34 (1982), 370-373.
36. RAY, Barada K. A note on multi-valued contraction mappings, Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei 56 (1974), 500-503.
37. RUS, I. Fixed point theorems for multi-valued mappings in complete metric spaces, Math. Japonica 25 (1975), 21-24.
38. WONG, C.S. Common fixed points of two mappings, Pacific J. Math. 48 (1975), 299-312.
39. ACHARA, J. Generalized multi-valued contractions and fixed points, Revue Romaine de Math. Pures et Appl. 24 (1979), 178-182.
40. KITA, T. A common fixed point theorems for multivalued mappings, Math. Japonica 22 (1979), 113-116.
41. KHAN, M.S. and KUBIACZYK, I. Fixed point theorems for point to set maps, Math. Japonica 33 (1988), 409-415.
42. MUKHERJEE, R.N. and SOM, T. On some fixed point theorems for generalized multi-valued mappings, Indian J. Pure Appl. Math. 14 (1983), 1506-1509.
43. SINGH, S.L., HA, K.S., and CHO, Y.S. Coincidence and fixed points of nonlinear hybrid contractions, Int. J. Math. and Math. Sci. 12 (1989), 247-256.

Special Issue on Intelligent Computational Methods for Financial Engineering

Call for Papers

As a multidisciplinary field, financial engineering is becoming increasingly important in today's economic and financial world, especially in areas such as portfolio management, asset valuation and prediction, fraud detection, and credit risk management. For example, in a credit risk context, the recently approved Basel II guidelines advise financial institutions to build comprehensible credit risk models in order to optimize their capital allocation policy. Computational methods are being intensively studied and applied to improve the quality of the financial decisions that need to be made. Until now, computational methods and models are central to the analysis of economic and financial decisions.

However, more and more researchers have found that the financial environment is not ruled by mathematical distributions or statistical models. In such situations, some attempts have also been made to develop financial engineering models using intelligent computing approaches. For example, an artificial neural network (ANN) is a nonparametric estimation technique which does not make any distributional assumptions regarding the underlying asset. Instead, ANN approach develops a model using sets of unknown parameters and lets the optimization routine seek the best fitting parameters to obtain the desired results. The main aim of this special issue is not to merely illustrate the superior performance of a new intelligent computational method, but also to demonstrate how it can be used effectively in a financial engineering environment to improve and facilitate financial decision making. In this sense, the submissions should especially address how the results of estimated computational models (e.g., ANN, support vector machines, evolutionary algorithm, and fuzzy models) can be used to develop intelligent, easy-to-use, and/or comprehensible computational systems (e.g., decision support systems, agent-based system, and web-based systems)

This special issue will include (but not be limited to) the following topics:

- **Computational methods:** artificial intelligence, neural networks, evolutionary algorithms, fuzzy inference, hybrid learning, ensemble learning, cooperative learning, multiagent learning

- **Application fields:** asset valuation and prediction, asset allocation and portfolio selection, bankruptcy prediction, fraud detection, credit risk management
- **Implementation aspects:** decision support systems, expert systems, information systems, intelligent agents, web service, monitoring, deployment, implementation

Authors should follow the Journal of Applied Mathematics and Decision Sciences manuscript format described at the journal site <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/jamds/>. 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

Lean Yu, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China; Department of Management Sciences, City University of Hong Kong, Tat Chee Avenue, Kowloon, Hong Kong; yulean@amss.ac.cn

Shouyang Wang, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China; sywang@amss.ac.cn

K. K. Lai, Department of Management Sciences, City University of Hong Kong, Tat Chee Avenue, Kowloon, Hong Kong; mskkklai@cityu.edu.hk