Hindawi Publishing Corporation
Fixed Point Theory and Applications
Volume 2007, Article ID 17301, 9 pages
doi:10.1155/2007/17301

*Research Article*

# Fixed Points of Weakly Compatible Maps Satisfying a General Contractive Condition of Integral Type

Ishak Altun, Duran Türkoğlu, and Billy E. Rhoades

Received 10 October 2006; Revised 22 May 2007; Accepted 14 September 2007

Recommended by Jerzy Jezierski

We prove a fixed point theorem for weakly compatible maps satisfying a general contractive condition of integral type.

Copyright © 2007 Ishak Altun et al. 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

Branciari [1] obtained a fixed point result for a single mapping satisfying an analogue of Banach's contraction principle for an integral-type inequality. The authors in [2–6] proved some fixed point theorems involving more general contractive conditions. Also in [7], Suzuki shows that Meir-Keeler contractions of integral type are still Meir-Keeler contractions. In this paper, we establish a fixed point theorem for weakly compatible maps satisfying a general contractive inequality of integral type. This result substantially extends the theorems of [1, 4, 6].

Sessa [8] generalized the concept of commuting mappings by calling self-mappings $A$ and $S$ of metric space $(X,d)$ a weakly commuting pair if and only if $d(ASx,SAx) \leq d(Ax, Sx)$ for all $x \in X$. He and others proved some common fixed point theorems of weakly commuting mappings [8–11]. Then, Jungck [12] introduced the concept of compatibility and he and others proved some common fixed point theorems using this concept [12–16].

Clearly, commuting mappings are weakly commuting and weakly commuting mappings are compatible. Examples in [8, 12] show that neither converse is true.

Recently, Jungck and Rhoades [14] defined the concept of weak compatibility.

*Definition 1.1* (see [14, 17]). Two maps $A, S : X \to X$ are said to be weakly compatible if they commute at their coincidence points.

Again, it is obvious that compatible mappings are weakly compatible. Examples in [14, 17] show that neither converse is true. Many fixed point results have been obtained for weakly compatible mappings (see [14, 17–21]).

Lemma 1.2 (see [22]). *Let $\psi : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be a right continuous function such that $\psi(t) < t$ for every $t > 0$, then $\lim_{n\to\infty} \psi^n(t) = 0$, where $\psi^n$ denotes the $n$-times repeated composition of $\psi$ with itself.*

## 2. Main result

Now we give our main theorem.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $A$, $B$, $S$, and $T$ be self-maps defined on a metric space $(X,d)$ satisfying the following conditions:*

(i) $S(X) \subseteq B(X)$, $T(X) \subseteq A(X)$,

(ii) *for all $x, y \in X$, there exists a right continuous function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$, $\psi(0) = 0$, and $\psi(s) < s$ for $s > 0$ such that*

$$\int_0^{d(Sx,Ty)} \varphi(t)dt \le \psi\left(\int_0^{M(x,y)} \varphi(t)dt\right), \tag{2.1}$$

*where $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is a Lebesque integrable mapping which is summable, nonnegative and such that*

$$\int_0^{\varepsilon} \varphi(t)dt > 0 \quad \text{for each } \varepsilon > 0, \tag{2.2}$$

$$M(x,y) = \max\left\{d(Ax,By), d(Sx,Ax), d(Ty,By), \frac{d(Sx,By) + d(Ty,Ax)}{2}\right\}. \tag{2.3}$$

*If one of $A(X)$, $B(X)$, $S(X)$, or $T(X)$ is a complete subspace of $X$, then*

(1) *$A$ and $S$ have a coincidence point, or*

(2) *$B$ and $T$ have a coincidence point.*

*Further, if $S$ and $A$ as well as $T$ and $B$ are weakly compatible, then*

(3) *$A$, $B$, $S$, and $T$ have a unique common fixed point.*

*Proof.* Let $x_0 \in X$ be an arbitrary point of $X$. From (i) we can construct a sequence $\{y_n\}$ in $X$ as follows:

$$y_{2n+1} = Sx_{2n} = Bx_{2n+1}, \qquad y_{2n+2} = Tx_{2n+1} = Ax_{2n+2} \tag{2.4}$$

for all $n = 0, 1, \ldots$. Define $d_n = d(y_n, y_{n+1})$. Suppose that $d_{2n} = 0$ for some $n$. Then $y_{2n} = y_{2n+1}$; that is, $Tx_{2n-1} = Ax_{2n} = Sx_{2n} = Bx_{2n+1}$, and $A$ and $S$ have a coincidence point. □

Similarly, if $d_{2n+1} = 0$, then $B$ and $T$ have a coincidence point. Assume that $d_n \neq 0$ for each $n$.

Then, by (ii),

$$\int_0^{d(Sx_{2n},Tx_{2n+1})} \varphi(t)dt \le \psi\left(\int_0^{M(x_{2n},x_{2n+1})} \varphi(t)dt\right), \tag{2.5}$$

where

$$M(x_{2n},x_{2n+1}) = \max\left\{d(Ax_{2n},Bx_{2n+1}),d(Sx_{2n},Ax_{2n}),d(Tx_{2n+1},Bx_{2n+1}),\right.$$
$$\left.\frac{d(Sx_{2n},Bx_{2n+1})+d(Tx_{2n+1},Ax_{2n})}{2}\right\} \tag{2.6}$$
$$= \max\{d_{2n},d_{2n+1}\}.$$

Thus from (2.5), we have

$$\int_0^{d_{2n+1}} \varphi(t)dt \le \psi\left(\int_0^{\max\{d_{2n},d_{2n+1}\}} \varphi(t)dt\right). \tag{2.7}$$

Now, if $d_{2n+1} \ge d_{2n}$ for some $n$, then, from (2.7), we have

$$\int_0^{d_{2n+1}} \varphi(t)dt \le \psi\left(\int_0^{d_{2n+1}} \varphi(t)dt\right) < \int_0^{d_{2n+1}} \varphi(t)dt, \tag{2.8}$$

which is a contradiction. Thus $d_{2n} > d_{2n+1}$ for all $n$, and so, from (2.7), we have

$$\int_0^{d_{2n+1}} \varphi(t)dt \le \psi\left(\int_0^{d_{2n}} \varphi(t)dt\right). \tag{2.9}$$

Similarly,

$$\int_0^{d_{2n}} \varphi(t)dt \le \psi\left(\int_0^{d_{2n-1}} \varphi(t)dt\right). \tag{2.10}$$

In general, we have for all $n = 1,2,\ldots,$

$$\int_0^{d_n} \varphi(t)dt \le \psi\left(\int_0^{d_{n-1}} \varphi(t)dt\right). \tag{2.11}$$

From (2.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^{d_n} \varphi(t)dt &\le \psi\left(\int_0^{d_{n-1}} \varphi(t)dt\right)\\ &\le \psi^2\left(\int_0^{d_{n-2}} \varphi(t)dt\right)\\ &\vdots\\ &\le \psi^n\left(\int_0^{d_0} \varphi(t)dt\right),\end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

and, taking the limit as $n \to \infty$ and using Lemma 1.2, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_0^{d_n} \varphi(t)dt \le \lim_{n\to\infty} \psi^n\left(\int_0^{d_0} \varphi(t)dt\right) = 0, \tag{2.13}$$

which, from (2.2), implies that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} d_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} d(y_n, y_{n+1}) = 0. \tag{2.14}$$

We now show that $\{y_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. For this it is sufficient to show that $\{y_{2n}\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Suppose that $\{y_{2n}\}$ is not a Cauchy sequence. Then there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for each even integer $2k$ there exist even integers $2m(k) > 2n(k) > 2k$ such that

$$d(y_{2n(k)}, y_{2m(k)}) \geq \varepsilon. \tag{2.15}$$

For every even integer $2k$, let $2m(k)$ be the least positive integer exceeding $2n(k)$ satisfying (2.15) such that

$$d(y_{2n(k)}, y_{2m(k)-2}) < \varepsilon. \tag{2.16}$$

Now

$$0 < \delta := \int_0^{\varepsilon} \varphi(t)dt \leq \int_0^{d(y_{2n(k)}, y_{2m(k)})} \varphi(t)dt \leq \int_0^{d(y_{2n(k)}, y_{2m(k)-2}) + d_{2m(k)-2} + d_{2m(k)-1}} \varphi(t)dt. \tag{2.17}$$

Then by (2.14), (2.15), and (2.16), it follows that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_0^{d(y_{2n(k)}, y_{2m(k)})} \varphi(t)dt = \delta. \tag{2.18}$$

Also, by the triangular inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| d(y_{2n(k)}, y_{2m(k)-1}) - d(y_{2n(k)}, y_{2m(k)}) \right| &\leq d_{2m(k)-1}, \\ \left| d(y_{2n(k)+1}, y_{2m(k)-1}) - d(y_{2n(k)}, y_{2m(k)}) \right| &\leq d_{2m(k)-1} + d_{2n(k)}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{|d(y_{2n(k)}, y_{2m(k)-1}) - d(y_{2n(k)}, y_{2m(k)})|} \varphi(t)dt &\leq \int_0^{d_{2m(k)-1}} \varphi(t)dt, \\ \int_0^{|d(y_{2n(k)+1}, y_{2m(k)-1}) - d(y_{2n(k)}, y_{2m(k)})|} \varphi(t)dt &\leq \int_0^{d_{2m(k)-1} + d_{2n(k)}} \varphi(t)dt. \end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

Using (2.18), we get

$$\int_0^{d(y_{2n(k)}, y_{2m(k)-1})} \varphi(t)dt \longrightarrow \delta, \tag{2.21}$$

$$\int_0^{d(y_{2n(k)+1}, y_{2m(k)-1})} \varphi(t)dt \longrightarrow \delta, \tag{2.22}$$

as $k \to \infty$. Thus

$$d(y_{2n(k)}, y_{2m(k)}) \leq d_{2n(k)} + d(y_{2n(k)+1}, y_{2m(k)}) \leq d_{2n(k)} + d(Sx_{2n(k)}, Tx_{2m(k)-1}), \tag{2.23}$$

and so

$$\int_0^{d(y_{2n(k)},y_{2m(k)})} \varphi(t)dt \le \int_0^{d_{2n(k)}+d(Sx_{2n(k)},Tx_{2m(k)-1})} \varphi(t)dt. \tag{2.24}$$

Letting $k \to \infty$ on both sides of the last inequality, we have

$$\delta \le \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_0^{d(Sx_{2n(k)},Tx_{2m(k)-1})} \varphi(t)dt \le \lim_{k\to\infty} \psi\left( \int_0^{M(x_{2n(k)},x_{2m(k)-1})} \varphi(t)dt \right), \tag{2.25}$$

where

$$M(x_{2n(k)},x_{2m(k)-1}) = \max\left\{ d(y_{2n(k)},y_{2m(k)-1}), d_{2n(k)}, d_{2m(k)-1}, \frac{d(y_{2n(k)+1},y_{2m(k)-1}) + d(y_{2n(k)},y_{2m(k)})}{2} \right\}. \tag{2.26}$$

Combining (2.14), (2.15), (2.16), (2.18), (2.21), and (2.22) yields the following contradiction from (2.25):

$$\delta \le \psi(\delta) < \delta. \tag{2.27}$$

Thus $\{y_{2n}\}$ is a Cauchy sequence and so $\{y_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence.

Now, suppose that $A(X)$ is complete. Note that the sequence $\{y_{2n}\}$ is contained in $A(X)$ and has a limit in $A(X)$. Call it $u$. Let $v \in A^{-1}u$. Then $Av = u$. We will use the fact that the sequence $\{y_{2n-1}\}$ also converges to $u$. To prove that $Sv = u$, let $r = d(Sv,u) > 0$. Then taking $x = v$ and $y = x_{2n-1}$ in (ii),

$$\int_0^{d(Sv,y_{2n})} \varphi(t)dt = \int_0^{d(Sv,Tx_{2n-1})} \varphi(t)dt \le \psi\left( \int_0^{M(v,x_{2n-1})} \varphi(t)dt \right), \tag{2.28}$$

where

$$M(v,x_{2n-1}) = \max\left\{ d(u,y_{2n-1}), d(Sv,u), d(y_{2n},y_{2n-1}), \frac{d(Sv,y_{2n-1}) + d(y_{2n},u)}{2} \right\}. \tag{2.29}$$

Since $\lim_n d(Sv,y_{2n}) = r$, $\lim_n d(u,y_{2n-1}) = \lim_n d(y_{2n},y_{2n-1}) = 0$, and $\lim_n [d(Sv,y_{2n-1}) + d(y_{2n},u)] = r$, we may conclude that

$$\int_0^r \varphi(t)dt \le \psi\left( \int_0^r \varphi(t)dt \right) < \int_0^r \varphi(t)dt, \tag{2.30}$$

which is a contradiction. Hence from (2.2), $Sv = u$. This proves (1).

Since $S(X) \subseteq B(X)$, $Sv = u$ implies that $u \in B(X)$. Let $w \in B^{-1}u$. Then $Bw = u$. By using the argument of the previous section, it can be easily verified that $Tw = u$. This proves (2).

The same result holds if we assume that $B(X)$ is complete instead of $A(X)$.

Now if $T(X)$ is complete, then by (i), $u \in T(X) \subseteq A(X)$. Similarly if $S(X)$ is complete, then $u \in S(X) \subseteq B(X)$. Thus (1) and (2) are completely established.

To prove (3), note that $S$, $A$ and $T$, $B$ are weakly compatible and

$$u = Sv = Av = Tw = Bw, \tag{2.31}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} Au &= ASv = SAv = Su, \\ Bu &= BTw = TBw = Tu. \end{aligned} \tag{2.32}$$

If $Tu \neq u$ then, from (ii), (2.31) and (2.32),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{d(u,Tu)} \varphi(t)dt = \int_0^{d(Sv,Tu)} \varphi(t)dt &\leq \psi\left( \int_0^{M(v,u)} \varphi(t)dt \right) \\ &= \psi\left( \int_0^{d(u,Tu)} \varphi(t)dt \right) < \int_0^{d(u,Tu)} \varphi(t)dt, \end{aligned} \tag{2.33}$$

which is a contradiction. So $Tu = u$. Similarly $Su = u$. Then, evidently from (2.32), $u$ is a common fixed point of $A$, $B$, $S$, and $T$.

The uniqueness of the common fixed point follows easily from condition (ii).

*Remark 2.2.* Theorem 2.1 is a generalization of the main theorem of [1], Theorem 2 of [4], and Theorem 2 of [6].

If $\varphi(t) \equiv 1$, then Theorem 2.1 of this paper reduces to Theorem 2.1 of [17].

If $\varphi(t) \equiv 1$ and $\psi = ht$, $0 \leq h < 1$, then Theorem 2.1 of this paper reduces to Corollary 3.1 of [20].

The following example shows that our main theorem is generalization of Corollary 3.1 of [20].

*Example 2.3.* Let $X = \{1/n : n \in N\} \cup \{0\}$ with Euclidean metric and $S$, $T$, $A$, $B$ are self maps of $X$ defined by

$$S\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{n+1} & \text{if } n \text{ is odd}, \\ \dfrac{1}{n+2} & \text{if } n \text{ is even}, \\ 0 & \text{if } n = \infty, \end{cases} \qquad T\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{n+1} & \text{if } n \text{ is even}, \\ \dfrac{1}{n+2} & \text{if } n \text{ is odd}, \\ 0 & \text{if } n = \infty, \end{cases} \tag{2.34}$$

$$A\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) = B\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) = \frac{1}{n} \quad \forall n \in N \cup \{\infty\}.$$

Clearly $S(X) \subseteq B(X)$, $T(X) \subseteq A(X)$, $A(X)$ is a complete subspace of $X$ and $A, S$ and $B, T$ are weakly compatible.

Now suppose that the contractive condition of Corollary 3.1 of [20] is satisfying, that is, there exists $h \in [0,1)$ such that

$$d(Sx,Ty) \leq hM(x,y) \tag{2.35}$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Therefore, for $x \neq y$, we have

$$\frac{d(Sx,Ty)}{M(x,y)} \leq h < 1, \tag{2.36}$$

but since $\sup_{x\neq y}(d(Sx,Ty)/M(x,y)) = 1$, one has a contradiction. Thus the condition (2.35) is not satisfied.

Now we define $\varphi(t) = \max\{0, t^{1/t-2}[1-\log t]\}$ for $t > 0$, $\varphi(0) = 0$. Then for any $\tau \in (0,e)$,

$$\int_0^{\tau} \varphi(t)dt = \tau^{1/\tau}. \tag{2.37}$$

Thus we must show that there exists a right continuous function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$, $\psi(s) < s$ for $s > 0$, $\psi(0) = 0$ such that

$$\big(d(Sx,Ty)\big)^{1/d(Sx,Ty)} \leq \psi\big((M(x,y))^{1/M(x,y)}\big) \tag{2.38}$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Now we claim that (2.38) is satisfying with $\psi(s) = s/2$, that is,

$$\big(d(Sx,Ty)\big)^{1/d(Sx,Ty)} \leq \frac{1}{2}\big((M(x,y))^{1/M(x,y)}\big) \tag{2.39}$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Since the function $\tau \to \tau^{1/\tau}$ is nondecreasing, we show sufficiently that

$$\big(d(Sx,Ty)\big)^{1/d(Sx,Ty)} \leq \frac{1}{2}\big((d(x,y))^{1/d(x,y)}\big) \tag{2.40}$$

instead of (2.39). Now using Example 4 of [6], we have (2.40), thus the condition (2.38) is satisfied.

**Acknowledgments**

The authors thank the referees for their appreciation, valuable comments, and suggestions. This work has been supported by Gazi University Project no. 05/2006-16.

## References


[1] A. Branciari, "A fixed point theorem for mappings satisfying a general contractive condition of integral type," *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, vol. 29, no. 9, pp. 531–536, 2002.

[2] A. Aliouche, "A common fixed point theorem for weakly compatible mappings in symmetric spaces satisfying a contractive condition of integral type," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 322, no. 2, pp. 796–802, 2006.

[3] A. Djoudi and A. Aliouche, "Common fixed point theorems of Gregus type for weakly compatible mappings satisfying contractive conditions of integral type," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 329, no. 1, pp. 31–45, 2007.

[4] B. E. Rhoades, "Two fixed-point theorems for mappings satisfying a general contractive condition of integral type," *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, vol. 2003, no. 63, pp. 4007–4013, 2003.

[5] D. Türkoğlu and I. Altun, "A common fixed point theorem for weakly compatible mappings in symmetric spaces satisfying an implicit relation," to appear in *Matemática Mexicana. Boletín. Tercera Serie*.

[6] P. Vijayaraju, B. E. Rhoades, and R. Mohanraj, "A fixed point theorem for a pair of maps satisfying a general contractive condition of integral type," *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, vol. 2005, no. 15, pp. 2359–2364, 2005.

[7] T. Suzuki, "Meir-Keeler contractions of integral type are still Meir-Keeler contractions," *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, vol. 2007, Article ID 39281, 6 pages, 2007.

[8] S. Sessa, "On a weak commutativity condition of mappings in fixed point considerations," *Institut Mathématique. Publications. Nouvelle Série*, vol. 32 (46), pp. 149–153, 1982.

[9] B. E. Rhoades and S. Sessa, "Common fixed point theorems for three mappings under a weak commutativity condition," *Indian Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 47–57, 1986.

[10] S. Sessa and B. Fisher, "Common fixed points of weakly commuting mappings," *Bulletin of the Polish Academy of Sciences. Mathematics*, vol. 35, no. 5-6, pp. 341–349, 1987.

[11] S. L. Singh, K. S. Ha, and Y. J. Cho, "Coincidence and fixed points of nonlinear hybrid contractions," *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 247–256, 1989.

[12] G. Jungck, "Compatible mappings and common fixed points," *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 771–779, 1986.

[13] G. Jungck, "Compatible mappings and common fixed points. II," *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 285–288, 1988.

[14] G. Jungck and B. E. Rhoades, "Fixed points for set valued functions without continuity," *Indian Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 227–238, 1998.

[15] H. Kaneko and S. Sessa, "Fixed point theorems for compatible multi-valued and single-valued mappings," *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 257–262, 1989.

[16] D. Türkoğlu, I. Altun, and B. Fisher, "Fixed point theorem for sequences of maps," *Demonstratio Mathematica*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 461–468, 2005.

[17] S. L. Singh and S. N. Mishra, "Remarks on Jachymski's fixed point theorems for compatible maps," *Indian Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 611–615, 1997.

[18] Lj. B. Ćirić and J. S. Ume, "Some common fixed point theorems for weakly compatible mappings," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 314, no. 2, pp. 488–499, 2006.

[19] M. A. Ahmed, "Common fixed point theorems for weakly compatible mappings," *The Rocky Mountain Journal of Mathematics*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 1189–1203, 2003.

[20] R. Chugh and S. Kumar, "Common fixed points for weakly compatible maps," *Proceedings of the Indian Academy of Sciences. Mathematical Sciences*, vol. 111, no. 2, pp. 241–247, 2001.
[21] V. Popa, "A general fixed point theorem for four weakly compatible mappings satisfying an implicit relation," *Univerzitet u Nišu. Prirodno-Matematički Fakultet. Filomat*, no. 19, pp. 45–51, 2005.
[22] J. Matkowski, "Fixed point theorems for mappings with a contractive iterate at a point," *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 62, no. 2, pp. 344–348, 1977.

Ishak Altun: Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science and Arts, Kirikkale University, 71450 Yahsihan, Kirikkale, Turkey
*Email address*: ishakaltun@yahoo.com

Duran Türkoğlu: Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science and Arts, Gazi University, 06500 Teknikokullar, Ankara, Turkey
*Email address*: dturkoglu@gazi.edu.tr

Billy E. Rhoades: Department of Mathematics, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405, USA
*Email address*: rhoades@indiana.edu

Mathematical Problems in Engineering

# 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