Hindawi Publishing Corporation
Fixed Point Theory and Applications
Volume 2007, Article ID 27906, 13 pages
doi:10.1155/2007/27906

Research Article

A Common Fixed Point Theorem in D^*-Metric Spaces

Shaban Sedghi, Nabi Shobe, and Haiyun Zhou

Received 27 February 2007; Accepted 16 July 2007

Recommended by Thomas Bartsch

We give some new definitions of D^*-metric spaces and we prove a common fixed point theorem for a class of mappings under the condition of weakly commuting mappings in complete D^*-metric spaces. We get some improved versions of several fixed point theorems in complete D^*-metric spaces.

Copyright © 2007 Shaban Sedghi 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

The concept of fuzzy sets was introduced initially by Zadeh [1] in 1965. Since then, to use this concept in topology and analysis many authors have expansively developed the theory of fuzzy sets and applications. Especially, Deng [2], Erceg [3], Kaleva and Seikkala [4], and Kramosil and Michálek [5] have introduced the concepts of fuzzy metric spaces in different ways. George and Veeramani [6] and Kramosil and Michálek [5] have introduced the concept of fuzzy topological spaces induced by fuzzy metric which have very important applications in quantum particle physics particularly in connection with both string and E-infinity theories which were given and studied by El Naschie [7–10]. Many authors [11–17] have studied the fixed point theory in fuzzy (probabilistic) metric spaces. On the other hand, there have been a number of generalizations of metric spaces. One of such generalizations is generalized metric space (or D-metric space) initiated by Dhage [18] in 1992. He proved the existence of unique fixed point of a self-map satisfying a contractive condition in complete and bounded D-metric spaces. Dealing with D-metric space, Ahmad et al. [19], Dhage [18, 20], Dhage et al. [21], Rhoades [22], Singh and Sharma [23], and others made a significant contribution in fixed point theory of D-metric space. Unfortunately, almost all theorems in D-metric spaces are not valid (see [24–26]).

In this paper, we introduce D^*-metric which is a probable modification of the definition of D-metric introduced by Dhage [18, 20] and prove some basic properties in D^*-metric spaces.

In what follows (X, D^*) will denote a D^*-metric space, $\mathbb{N}$ the set of all natural numbers, and $\mathbb{R}^+$ the set of all positive real numbers.

Definition 1.1. Let X be a nonempty set. A generalized metric (or D^*-metric) on X is a function, $D^* : X^3 \to [0, \infty)$, that satisfies the following conditions for each $x, y, z, a \in X$:

(1) $D^*(x, y, z) \geq 0$,

(2) $D^*(x, y, z) = 0$ if and only if $x = y = z$,

(3) $D^*(x, y, z) = D^*(p\{x, y, z\})$, (symmetry) where p is a permutation function,

(4) $D^*(x, y, z) \leq D^*(x, y, a) + D^*(a, z, z)$.

The pair (X, D^*) is called a generalized metric (or D^*-metric) space.

Immediate examples of such a function are

(a) $D^*(x, y, z) = \max\{d(x, y), d(y, z), d(z, x)\}$,

(b) $D^*(x, y, z) = d(x, y) + d(y, z) + d(z, x)$.

Here, d is the ordinary metric on X.

(c) If $X = \mathbb{R}^n$ then we define

$$D^*(x, y, z) = \left(\|x - y\|^p + \|y - z\|^p + \|z - x\|^p\right)^{1/p} \tag{1.1}$$

for every $p \in \mathbb{R}^+$.

(d) If $X = \mathbb{R}$, then we define

$$D^*(x, y, z) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x = y = z, \\ \max\{x, y, z\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

Remark 1.2. In a D^*-metric space, we prove that $D^*(x, x, y) = D^*(x, y, y)$. For

(i) $D^*(x, x, y) \leq D^*(x, x, x) + D^*(x, y, y) = D^*(x, y, y)$ and similarly

(ii) $D^*(y, y, x) \leq D^*(y, y, y) + D^*(y, x, x) = D^*(y, x, x)$.

Hence by (i), (ii) we get $D^*(x, x, y) = D^*(x, y, y)$.

Let (X, D^*) be a D^*-metric space. For $r > 0$, define

$$B_{D^*}(x, r) = \{y \in X : D^*(x, y, y) < r\}. \tag{1.3}$$

Example 1.3. Let $X = \mathbb{R}$. Denote $D^*(x, y, z) = |x - y| + |y - z| + |z - x|$ for all $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} B_{D^*}(1, 2) &= \{y \in \mathbb{R} : D^*(1, y, y) < 2\} \\ &= \{y \in \mathbb{R} : |y - 1| + |y - 1| < 2\} \\ &= \{y \in \mathbb{R} : |y - 1| < 1\} = (0, 2). \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

Definition 1.4. Let (X,D^*) be a D^*-metric space and $A \subset X$.

(1) If for every $x \in A$, there exists $r > 0$ such that $B_{D^*}(x,r) \subset A$, then subset A is called open subset of X.

(2) Subset A of X is said to be D^*-bounded if there exists $r > 0$ such that $D^*(x,y,y) < r$ for all $x, y \in A$.

(3) A sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X converges to x if and only if $D^*(x_n,x_n,x) = D^*(x,x,x_n) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. That is, for each $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\forall n \geq n_0 \Longrightarrow D^*(x,x,x_n) < \epsilon (*). \tag{1.5}$$

This is equivalent; for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\forall n,m \geq n_0 \Longrightarrow D^*(x,x_n,x_m) < \epsilon (**). \tag{1.6}$$

Indeed, if $(*)$ holds, then

$$D^*(x_n,x_m,x) = D^*(x_n,x,x_m) \leq D^*(x_n,x,x) + D^*(x,x_m,x_m) < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \varepsilon. \tag{1.7}$$

Conversely, set $m = n$ in $(**)$, then we have $D^*(x_n,x_n,x) < \epsilon$.

(4) A sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X is called a Cauchy sequence if for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $D^*(x_n,x_n,x_m) < \epsilon$ for each $n,m \geq n_0$. The D^*-metric space (X,D^*) is said to be complete if every Cauchy sequence is convergent.

Let τ be the set of all $A \subset X$ with $x \in A$ if and only if there exists $r > 0$ such that $B_{D^*}(x,r) \subset A$. Then τ is a topology on X (induced by the D^*-metric D^*).

Lemma 1.5. *Let (X,D^*) be a D^*-metric space. If $r > 0$, then ball $B_{D^*}(x,r)$ with center $x \in X$ and radius r is open ball.*

Proof. Let $z \in B_{D^*}(x,r)$, hence $D^*(x,z,z) < r$. Let $D^*(x,z,z) = \delta$ and $r' = r - \delta$. Let $y \in B_{D^*}(z,r')$, by triangular inequality we have $D^*(x,y,y) = D^*(y,y,x) \leq D^*(y,y,z) + D^*(z,x,x) < r' + \delta = r$. Hence $B_{D^*}(z,r') \subseteq B_{D^*}(x,r)$. Hence the ball $B_{D^*}(x,r)$ is an open ball. □

Definition 1.6. Let (X,D^*) be a D^*-metric space. D^* is said to be a continuous function on X^3 if

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} D^*(x_n,y_n,z_n) = D^*(x,y,z) \tag{1.8}$$

whenever a sequence $\{(x_n,y_n,z_n)\}$ in X^3 converges to a point $(x,y,z) \in X^3$, that is,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} x_n = x, \qquad \lim_{n\to\infty} y_n = y, \qquad \lim_{n\to\infty} z_n = z. \tag{1.9}$$

Lemma 1.7. *Let (X,D^*) be a D^*-metric space. Then D^* is a continuous function on X^3.*

Proof. Suppose the sequence $\{(x_n,y_n,z_n)\}$ in X^3 converges to a point $(x,y,z) \in X^3$, that is,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} x_n = x, \qquad \lim_{n\to\infty} y_n = y, \qquad \lim_{n\to\infty} z_n = z. \tag{1.10}$$

Then for each $\epsilon > 0$ there exist n_1, n_2, and $n_3 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $D^*(x,x,x_n) < \epsilon/3 \forall n \geq n_1$, $D^*(y,y,y_n) < \epsilon/3$ for all $n \geq n_2$, and $D^*(z,z,z_n) < \epsilon/3 \forall n \geq n_3$.

If we set $n_0 = \max\{n_1, n_2, n_3\}$, then for all $n \geq n_0$ by triangular inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} D^*(x_n,y_n,z_n) &\leq D^*(x_n,y_n,z) + D^*(z,z_n,z_n) \\ &\leq D^*(x_n,z,y) + D^*(y,y_n,y_n) + D^*(z,z_n,z_n) \\ &\leq D^*(z,y,x) + D^*(x,x_n,x_n) + D^*(y,y_n,y_n) + D^*(z,z_n,z_n) \\ &< D^*(x,y,z) + \frac{\epsilon}{3} + \frac{\epsilon}{3} + \frac{\epsilon}{3} = D^*(x,y,z) + \epsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{1.11}$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} D^*(x_n,y_n,z_n) - D^*(x,y,z) &< \epsilon, \\ D^*(x,y,z) &\leq D^*(x,y,z_n) + D^*(z_n,z,z) \\ &\leq D^*(x,z_n,y_n) + D^*(y_n,y,y) + D^*(z_n,z,z) \\ &\leq D^*(z_n,y_n,x_n) + D^*(x_n,x,x) + D^*(y_n,y,y) + D^*(z_n,z,z) \\ &< D^*(x_n,y_n,z_n) + \frac{\epsilon}{3} + \frac{\epsilon}{3} + \frac{\epsilon}{3} = D^*(x_n,y_n,z_n) + \epsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{1.12}$$

That is,

$$D^*(x,y,z) - D^*(x_n,y_n,z_n) < \epsilon. \tag{1.13}$$

Therefore we have $|D^*(x_n,y_n,z_n) - D^*(x,y,z)| < \epsilon$, that is,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} D^*(x_n,y_n,z_n) = D^*(x,y,z). \tag{1.14}$$

□

Lemma 1.8. *Let (X,D^*) be a D^*-metric space. If sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X converges to x, then x is unique.*

Proof. Let $x_n \to y$ and $y \neq x$. Since $\{x_n\}$ converges to x and y, for each $\epsilon > 0$ there exist $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $D^*(x,x,x_n) < \epsilon/2 \forall n \geq n_1$ and $D^*(y,y,x_n) < \epsilon/2 \forall n \geq n_2$.

If we set $n_0 = \max\{n_1, n_2\}$, then for every $n \geq n_0$ by triangular inequality we have

$$D^*(x,x,y) \leq D^*(x,x,x_n) + D^*(x_n,y,y) < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon. \tag{1.15}$$

Hence $D^*(x,x,y) = 0$ which is a contradiction. So, $x = y$. □

Lemma 1.9. *Let (X,D^*) be a D^*-metric space. If sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X is convergent to x, then sequence $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence.*

Proof. Since $x_n \to x$, for each $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $D^*(x_n, x_n, x) < \epsilon/2 \forall n \geq n_0$. Then for every $n, m \geq n_0$, by triangular inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D^*(x_n, x_n, x_m) &\leq D^*(x_n, x_n, x) + D^*(x, x_m, x_m) \\ &< \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{1.16}$$

Hence sequence $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. □

Definition 1.10. Let A and S be two mappings from a D^*-metric space (X, D^*) into itself. Then $\{A, S\}$ is said to be weakly commuting pair if

$$D^*(ASx, SAx, SAx) \leq D^*(Ax, Sx, Sx), \tag{1.17}$$

for all $x \in X$. Clearly, a commuting pair is weakly commuting, but not conversely as shown in the following example.

Example 1.11. Let (X, D^*) be a D^*-metric space, where $X = [0, 1]$ and

$$D^*(x, y, z) = |x - y| + |y - z| + |x - z|. \tag{1.18}$$

Define self-maps A and S on X as follows:

$$Sx = \frac{x}{2}, \quad Ax = \frac{x}{x+2} \quad \forall x \in X. \tag{1.19}$$

Then for all x in X one gets

$$\begin{aligned} D^*(SAx, ASx, ASx) &= \left| \frac{x}{x+4} - \frac{x}{2x+4} \right| + \left| \frac{x}{x+4} - \frac{x}{x+4} \right| + \left| \frac{x}{x+4} - \frac{x}{2x+4} \right| \\ &= \frac{2x^2}{(x+4)(2x+4)} \leq \frac{2x^2}{2x+4} \\ &= \left| \frac{x}{2} - \frac{x}{x+2} \right| + \left| \frac{x}{2} - \frac{x}{x+2} \right| + 0 \\ &= D^*(Sx, Ax, Ax). \end{aligned} \tag{1.20}$$

So $\{A, S\}$ is a weakly commuting pair.

However, for any nonzero $x \in X$ we have

$$SAx = \frac{x}{x+4} > \frac{x}{2x+4} = ASx. \tag{1.21}$$

Thus A and S are not commuting mappings.

2. The main results

A class of implicit relation. Throughout this section (X, D^*) denotes a D^*-metric space and Φ denotes a family of mappings such that each $\varphi \in \Phi$, $\varphi : (\mathbb{R}^+)^5 \to \mathbb{R}^+$, and φ is continuous and increasing in each coordinate variable. Also $\gamma(t) = \varphi(t, t, a_1 t, a_2 t, t) < t$ for every $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ where $a_1 + a_2 = 3$.

Example 2.1. Let $\varphi : (\mathbb{R}^+)^5 \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be defined by

$$\varphi(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4, t_5) = \frac{1}{7}(t_1 + t_2 + t_3 + t_4 + t_5). \tag{2.1}$$

The following lemma is the key in proving our result.

Lemma 2.2. *For every $t > 0$, $\gamma(t) < t$ if and only if $\lim_{n\to\infty} \gamma^n(t) = 0$, where γ^n denotes the composition of γ with itself n times.*

Our main result, for a complete D^*-metric space X, reads as follows.

Theorem 2.3. *Let A be a self-mapping of complete D^*-metric space (X, D^*), and let S, T be continuous self-mappings on X satisfying the following conditions:*

(i) *$\{A, S\}$ and $\{A, T\}$ are weakly commuting pairs such that $A(X) \subset S(X) \cap T(X)$;*

(ii) *there exists a $\varphi \in \Phi$ such that for all $x, y \in X$,*

$$\begin{aligned} &D^*(Ax, Ay, Az) \\ &\quad \le \varphi(D^*(Sx, Ty, Tz), D^*(Sx, Ax, Ax), D^*(Sx, Ay, Ay), D^*(Ty, Ax, Ax), D^*(Ty, Ay, Ay)). \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

Then A, S, and T have a unique common fixed point in X.

Proof. Let $x_0 \in X$ be an arbitrary point in X. Then $Ax_0 \in X$. Since $A(X)$ is contained in $S(X)$, there exists a point $x_1 \in X$ such that $Ax_0 = Sx_1$. Since $A(X)$ is also contained in $T(X)$, we can choose a point $x_2 \in X$ such that $Ax_1 = Tx_2$. Continuing this way, we define by induction a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X such that

$$\begin{aligned} Sx_{2n+1} &= Ax_{2n} = y_{2n}, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, \\ Tx_{2n+2} &= Ax_{2n+1} = y_{2n+1}, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots. \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

For simplicity, we set

$$d_n = D^*(y_n, y_{n+1}, y_{n+1}), \quad n = 0, 1, 2 \ldots. \tag{2.4}$$

We prove that $d_{2n} \le d_{2n-1}$. Now, if $d_{2n} > d_{2n-1}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, since φ is an increasing function, then

$$\begin{aligned} d_{2n} &= D^*(y_{2n}, y_{2n+1}, y_{2n+1}) = D^*(Ax_{2n}, Ax_{2n+1}, Ax_{2n+1}) = D^*(Ax_{2n+1}, Ax_{2n}, Ax_{2n}) \\ &\le \varphi\begin{pmatrix} D^*(Sx_{2n+1}, Tx_{2n}, Tx_{2n}), & D^*(Sx_{2n+1}, Ax_{2n+1}, Ax_{2n+1}), D^*(Sx_{2n+1}, Ax_{2n}, Ax_{2n}) \\ D^*(Tx_{2n}, Ax_{2n+1}, Ax_{2n+1}), & D^*(Tx_{2n}, Ax_{2n}, A_{2n}) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \varphi\begin{pmatrix} D^*(y_{2n}, y_{2n-1}, y_{2n-1}), & D^*(y_{2n}, y_{2n+1}, y_{2n+1}), D^*(y_{2n}, y_{2n}, y_{2n}) \\ D^*(y_{2n-1}, y_{2n+1}, y_{2n+1}), & D^*(y_{2n-1}, y_{2n}, y_{2n}) \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

Since

$$D^*(y_{2n-1}, y_{2n+1}, y_{2n+1}) \le D^*(y_{2n-1}, y_{2n-1}, y_{2n}) + D^*(y_{2n}, y_{2n+1}, y_{2n+1}) = d_{2n-1} + d_{2n}, \tag{2.6}$$

hence by the above inequality we have

$$d_{2n} \le \varphi(d_{2n-1}, d_{2n}, 0, d_{2n-1} + d_{2n}, d_{2n-1}) \le \varphi(d_{2n}, d_{2n}, d_{2n}, 2d_{2n}, d_{2n}) < d_{2n}, \tag{2.7}$$

a contradiction. Hence $d_{2n} \le d_{2n-1}$. Similarly, one can prove that $d_{2n+1} \le d_{2n}$ for $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. Consequently, $\{d_n\}$ is a nonincreasing sequence of nonnegative reals. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} d_1 &= D^*(y_1, y_2, y_2) = D^*(Ax_1, Ax_2, Ax_2) \\ &\le \varphi \begin{pmatrix} D^*(Sx_1, Tx_2, Tx_2), & D^*(Sx_1, Ax_1, Ax_1), D^*(Sx_1, Ax_2, Ax_2) \\ D^*(Tx_2, Ax_1, Ax_1), & D^*(Tx_2, Ax_2, A_2) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \varphi \begin{pmatrix} D^*(y_0, y_1, y_1), & D^*(y_0, y_1, y_1), D^*(y_0, y_2, y_2) \\ D^*(y_1, y_1, y_1), & D^*(y_1, y_2, y_2) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \varphi(d_0, d_0, d_0 + d_1, 0, d_0) \\ &\le \varphi(d_0, d_0, 2d_0, d_0, d_0) = \gamma(d_0). \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

In general, we have $d_n \le \gamma^n(d_0)$. So if $d_0 > 0$, then Lemma 2.2 gives $\lim_{n\to\infty} d_n = 0$. For $d_0 = 0$, we clearly have $\lim_{n\to\infty} d_n = 0$, since then $d_n = 0$ for each n. Now we prove that sequence $\{Ax_n = y_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Since $\lim_{n\to\infty} d_n = 0$, it is sufficient to show that the sequence $\{Ax_{2n} = y_{2n}\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Suppose that $\{Ax_{2n} = y_{2n}\}$ is not a Cauchy sequence. Then there is an $\epsilon > 0$ such that for each even integer $2k$, for $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$, there exist even integers $2n(k)$ and $2m(k)$ with $2k \le 2n(k) < 2m(k)$ such that

$$D^*(Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2m(k)}) > \epsilon. \tag{2.9}$$

Let, for each even integer $2k, 2m(k)$ be the least integer exceeding $2n(k)$ satisfying (2.9). Therefore

$$D^*(Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2m(k)-2}) \le \epsilon, \qquad D^*(Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2m(k)}) > \epsilon. \tag{2.10}$$

Then, for each even integer $2k$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &< D^*(Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2m(k)}) \\ &\le D^*(Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2m(k)-2}) + D^*(Ax_{2m(k)-2}, Ax_{2m(k)-2}, Ax_{2m(k)-1}) \\ &\quad + D^*(Ax_{2m(k)-1}, Ax_{2m(k)-1}, Ax_{2m(k)}) \\ &= D^*(Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2m(k)-2}) + d_{2m(k)-2} + d_{2m(k)-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

So, by (2.10) and $d_n \to 0$, we obtain

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} D^*\left(Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2m(k)}\right) = \epsilon. \tag{2.12}$$

It follows immediately from the triangular inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| D^*\left(Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2m(k)-1}\right) - D^*\left(Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2m(k)}\right) \right| \le d_{2m(k)-1}, \\ &\left| D^*\left(Ax_{2n(k)+1}, Ax_{2n(k)+1}, Ax_{2m(k)-1}\right) - D^*\left(Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2m(k)}\right) \right| < d_{2m(k)-1} + d_{2n(k)}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

Hence by (2.10), as $k \to \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} D^*\left(Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2m(k)-1}\right) &\longrightarrow \epsilon, \\ D^*\left(Ax_{2n(k)+1}, Ax_{2n(k)+1}, Ax_{2m(k)-1}\right) &\longrightarrow \epsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} &D^*\left(Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2m(k)}\right) \\ &\le D^*\left(Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2n(k)+1}\right) + D^*\left(Ax_{2n(k)+1}, Ax_{2m(k)}, Ax_{2m(k)}\right) \\ &\le d_{2n(k)} + \varphi\begin{pmatrix} D^*\left(Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2m(k)-1}, Ax_{2m(k)-1}\right), & d_{2n(k)}, D^*\left(Ax_{2n(k)}, Ax_{2m(k)}, Ax_{2m(k)}\right) \\ D^*\left(Ax_{2m(k)-1}, Ax_{2n(k)+1}, Ax_{2n(k)+1}\right), & d_{2m(k)-1} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

Using (2.14), $\lim_{k\to\infty} d_n = 0$, and continuity and nondecreasing property of φ in each coordinate variable, we have

$$\epsilon \le \varphi(\epsilon, 0, \epsilon, \epsilon, 0) \le \varphi(\epsilon, \epsilon, 2\epsilon, \epsilon, \epsilon) = \gamma(\epsilon) < \epsilon \tag{2.16}$$

as $k \to \infty$, which is a contradiction. Thus $\{Ax_n = y_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence and hence by completeness of X, it converges to $z \in X$. That is,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} Ax_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} y_n = z. \tag{2.17}$$

Since the sequences $\{Sx_{2n+1} = y_{2n+1}\}$ and $\{Tx_{2n} = y_{2n}\}$ are subsequences of $\{Ax_n = y_n\}$; they have the same limit z. As S and T are continuous, we have $STx_{2n} \to Sz$ and $TSx_{2n+1} \to Tz$.

Now consider

$$\begin{aligned} D^*\left(STx_{2n}, TSx_{2n+1}, TSx_{2n+1}\right) &= D^*\left(SAx_{2n-1}, TAx_{2n}, TAx_{2n}\right) \\ &\le D^*\left(SA_{2n-1}, ASx_{2n-1}, ASx_{2n-1}\right) \\ &\quad + D^*\left(ASx_{2n-1}, ASx_{2n-1}, ATx_{2n}\right) \\ &\quad + D^*\left(ATx_{2n}, ATx_{2n}, TAx_{2n}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

Using (ii) and the weak commutativity of $\{A,S\}$ and $\{A,T\}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&D^*(STx_{2n}, TSx_{2n+1}, TSx_{2n+1})\\
&\quad\le D^*(Sx_{2n-1}, Ax_{2n-1}, Ax_{2n-1}) + D^*(ASx_{2n-1}, ATx_{2n}, ATx_{2n}) + D^*(Ax_{2n}, Ax_{2n}, Tx_{2n})\\
&\quad\le D^*(Sx_{2n-1}, Ax_{2n-1}, Ax_{2n-1})\\
&\qquad+\varphi\begin{pmatrix} D^*(S^2x_{2n-1}, T^2x_{2n}, T^2x_{2n}), & D^*(S^2x_{2n-1}, ASx_{2n-1}, ASx_{2n-1}),\\ & D^*(S^2x_{2n-1}, ATx_{2n}, ATx_{2n})\\ D^*(T^2x_{2n}, ASx_{2n-1}, ASx_{2n-1}), & D^*(T^2x_{2n}, ATx_{2n}, ATx_{2n}) \end{pmatrix}\\
&\qquad+D^*(Ax_{2n}, Ax_{2n}, Tx_{2n})\\
&\quad\le D^*(Sx_{2n-1}, Ax_{2n-1}, Ax_{2n-1})\\
&\qquad+\varphi\begin{pmatrix} D^*(S^2x_{2n-1}, T^2x_{2n}, T^2x_{2n}), D^*(S^2x_{2n-1}, S^2x_{2n-1}, SAx_{2n-1})\\ \qquad\qquad + D^*(Sx_{2n-1}, Sx_{2n-1}, Ax_{2n-1}),\\ D^*(S^2x_{2n-1}, TAx_{2n}, TAx_{2n}) + D^*(Tx_{2n}, Tx_{2n}, Ax_{2n}),\\ D^*(T^2x_{2n}, SAx_{2n-1}, SAx_{2n-1}) + D^*(Sx_{2n-1}, Sx_{2n-1}, Ax_{2n-1}),\\ D^*(T^2x_{2n}, TAx_{2n}, TAx_{2n}) + D^*(Tx_{2n}, Ax_{2n}, Ax_{2n}) \end{pmatrix}\\
&\qquad+D^*(Ax_{2n}, Ax_{2n}, Tx_{2n}).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

If $D^*(Sz,Tz,Tz) > 0$, then as $n\to\infty$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&D^*(Sz,Tz,Tz)\\
&\quad\le D^*(z,z,z) + \varphi\begin{pmatrix} D^*(Sz,Tz,Tz), & D^*(Sz,Sz,Sz)+0, D^*(Sz,Tz,Tz)+0\\ D^*(Tz,Sz,Sz)+0, & D^*(Tz,Tz,Tz)+0 \end{pmatrix} + 0\\
&\quad\le \gamma(D^*(Sz,Tz,Tz)) < D^*(Sz,Tz,Tz),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

a contradiction.Therefore, $Sz = Tz$.

Now we will prove that $Az = Sz$. To end this, consider the inequality

$$D^*(SAx_{2n+1}, Az, Az) \le D^*(SAx_{2n+1}, ASx_{2n+1}, ASx_{2n+1}) + D^*(Az, Az, ASx_{2n+1}). \tag{2.21}$$

Again using (ii) and the weak commutativity of $\{A,S\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
D^*(SAx_{2n+1}, Az, Az) &\le D^*(Sx_{2n+1}, Ax_{2n+1}, Ax_{2n+1})\\
&\quad+\varphi\begin{pmatrix} D^*(Sz,Tz,TSx_{2n+1}), & D^*(Sz,Az,Az), D^*(Sz,Az,Az)\\ D^*(Tz,Az,Az), & D^*(Tz,Az,Az) \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

Taking $n\to\infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D^*(Sz,Az,Az) &\le D^*(z,z,z)+\varphi\begin{pmatrix} D^*(Sz,Tz,Tz), D^*(Sz,Az,Az), D^*(Sz,Az,Az) \\ D^*(Tz,Az,Az), D^*(Tz,Az,Az) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \varphi(0,D^*(Sz,Az,Az),D^*(Sz,Az,Az),D^*(Sz,Az,Az),D^*(Sz,Az,Az)) \\ &\le \delta(D^*(Sz,Az,Az)) < D^*(Sz,Az,Az) \end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

given there by $Sz = Az$. Thus $Az = Sz = Tz$. It now follows that

$$D^*(Az,Ax_{2n},Ax_{2n}) \le \varphi\begin{pmatrix} D^*(Sz,Tx_{2n},Tx_{2n}), & D^*(Sz,Az,Az), D^*(Sz,Ax_{2n},Ax_{2n}) \\ D^*(Tx_{2n},Az,Az), & D^*(Tx_{2n},Ax_{2n},Ax_{2n}) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.24}$$

Then as $n\to\infty$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} D^*(Az,z,z) &\le \varphi(D^*(Sz,z,z),0,D^*(Sz,z,z),D^*(z,Az,Az),0) \\ &\le \gamma(D^*(Az,z,z)) < D^*(Az,z,z), \end{aligned} \tag{2.25}$$

a contradiction, and therefore $Az = z = Sz = Tz$. Thus z is a common fixed point of A, S, and T. The unicity of the common fixed point is not hard to verify. This completes the proof of the theorem. □

Example 2.4. Let (X, D^*) be a D^*-metric space, where $X = [0,1]$ and

$$D^*(x,y,z) = |x-y| + |y-z| + |x-z|. \tag{2.26}$$

Define self-maps A, T, and S on X as follows:

$$Sx = x, \qquad Ax = 1, \qquad Tx = \frac{x+1}{2}, \tag{2.27}$$

for all $x \in X$.

Let

$$\varphi(t_1,t_2,t_3,t_4,t_5) = \frac{1}{7}(t_1+t_2+t_3+t_4+t_5). \tag{2.28}$$

Then

$$A(X) = \{1\} \subset [0,1] \cap \left[\frac{1}{2},1\right] = S(X) \cap T(X), \tag{2.29}$$

and for every $x \in X$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D^*(ATx,TAx,TAx) &= D^*(1,1,1) = 0 \le D^*(Ax,Tx,Tx), \\ D^*(ASx,SAx,SAx) &= D^*(1,1,1) = 0 \le D^*(Ax,Sx,Sx). \end{aligned} \tag{2.30}$$

That is, the pairs (A,S) and (A,T) are weakly commuting.

Also for all $x, y, z \in X$, we have

$$D^*(Ax, Ay, Az) = 0 \leq \varphi(D^*(Sx, Ty, Tz), D^*(Sx, Ax, Ax), D^*(Sx, Ay, Ay), D^*(Ty, Ax, Ax), D^*(Ty, Ay, Ay)). \tag{2.31}$$

That is, all conditions of Theorem 2.3 hold and 1 is the unique common fixed point of A, S, and T.

Corollary 2.5. *Let A, R, S, T, and H be self-mappings of complete D^*-metric space (X, D^*), and let SR, TH be continuous self-mappings on X satisfying the following conditions:*

(i) *$\{A, SR\}$ and $\{A, TH\}$ are weakly commuting pairs such that $A(X) \subset SR(X) \cap TH(X)$;*

(ii) *there exists a $\varphi \in \Phi$ such that for all $x, y \in X$,*

$$D^*(Ax, Ay, Az) \leq \varphi \begin{pmatrix} D^*(SRx, THy, THz), D^*(SRx, Ax, Ax), D^*(SRx, Ay, Ay), \\ D^*(THy, Ax, Ax), D^*(THy, Ay, Ay) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.32}$$

If $SR = RS, TH = HT, AH = HA$, and $AR = RA$, then A, S, R, H, and T have a unique common fixed point in X.

Proof. By Theorem 2.3, A, TH, and SR have a unique common fixed point in X. That is, there exists $a \in X$, such that $A(a) = TH(a) = SR(a) = a$. We prove that $R(a) = a$. By (ii), we get

$$D^*(ARa, Aa, Aa) \leq \varphi \begin{pmatrix} D^*(SRRa, THa, THa), D^*(SRRa, ARa, ARa), D^*(SRRa, Aa, Aa), \\ D^*(THa, ARa, ARa), D^*(THa, Aa, Aa) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.33}$$

Hence if $Ra \neq a$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} D^*(Ra, a, a) &\leq \varphi(D^*(Ra, a, a), D^*(Ra, Ra, Ra), D^*(Ra, a, a), D^*(a, Ra, Ra), D^*(a, a, a)) \\ &\leq \varphi(D^*(Ra, a, a), D^*(Ra, a, a), D^*(Ra, a, a), 2D^*(Ra, a, a), D^*(Ra, a, a)) \\ &< D^*(Ra, a, a), \end{aligned} \tag{2.34}$$

a contradiction. Therefore it follows that $Ra = a$. Hence $S(a) = SR(a) = a$. Similarly, we get that $T(a) = H(a) = a$. □

Corollary 2.6. *Let A_i be a sequence self-mapping of complete D^*-metric space (X, D^*) for $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and let S, T be continuous self-mappings on X satisfying the following conditions:*

(i) *there exists $i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\{A_{i_0}, S\}$ and $\{A_{i_0}, T\}$ are weakly commuting pairs such that $A_{i_0}(X) \subset S(X) \cap T(X)$;*

(ii) *there exists a* $\varphi \in \Phi$ *and* $i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that for all* $x, y \in X$,

$$D^*(A_i x, A_j y, A_k z) \leq \varphi\begin{pmatrix} D^*(Sx, Ty, Tz), D^*(Sx, A_i x, A_i x), D^*(Sx, A_j y, A_j y), \\ D^*(Ty, A_i x, A_i x), D^*(Ty, A_j y, A_j y) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.35}$$

Then $A_i, S,$ *and* T *have a unique common fixed point in* X *for every* $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. By Theorem 2.3, S, T, and A_{i_0}, for some $i = j = k = i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, have a unique common fixed point in X. That is, there exists a unique $a \in X$ such that

$$S(a) = T(a) = A_{i_0}(a) = a. \tag{2.36}$$

Suppose there exists $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $i \neq i_0$ and $j = i_0, k = i_0$. Then we have

$$D^*(A_i a, A_{i_0} a, A_{i_0} a) \leq \varphi\begin{pmatrix} D^*(Sa, Ta, Ta), D^*(Sa, A_i a, A_i a), D^*(Sa, A_{i_0} a, A_{i_0} a), \\ D^*(Ta, A_i a, A_i a), D^*(Ta, A_{i_0} a, A_{i_0} a) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.37}$$

Hence if $A_i a \neq a$, then we get

$$\begin{aligned} D^*(A_i a, a, a) &\leq \varphi\begin{pmatrix} D^*(a, a, a), D^*(a, A_i a, A_i a), D^*(a, a, a), \\ D^*(a, A_i a, A_i a), D^*(a, a, a) \end{pmatrix} \\ &\leq \varphi\begin{pmatrix} D^*(A_i a, a, a), D^*(A_i a, a, a), D^*(A_i a, a, a), \\ 2D^*(A_i a, a, a), D^*(A_i a, a, a) \end{pmatrix} \\ &< D^*(A_i a, a, a), \end{aligned} \tag{2.38}$$

a contradiction. Hence for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$ it follows that $A_i(a) = a$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$. □

References

[1] L. A. Zadeh, "Fuzzy sets," *Information and Control*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 338–353, 1965.

[2] Z. Deng, "Fuzzy pseudo-metric spaces," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 86, no. 1, pp. 74–95, 1982.

[3] M. A. Erceg, "Metric spaces in fuzzy set theory," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 69, no. 1, pp. 205–230, 1979.

[4] O. Kaleva and S. Seikkala, "On fuzzy metric spaces," *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 215–229, 1984.

[5] I. Kramosil and J. Michálek, "Fuzzy metrics and statistical metric spaces," *Kybernetika*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 336–344, 1975.

[6] A. George and P. Veeramani, "On some results in fuzzy metric spaces," *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 395–399, 1994.

[7] M. S. El Naschie, "On the uncertainty of Cantorian geometry and the two-slit experiment," *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 517–529, 1998.

[8] M. S. El Naschie, "A review of E-infinity theory and the mass spectrum of high energy particle physics," *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 209–236, 2004.

[9] M. S. El Naschie, "On a fuzzy Kähler-like manifold which is consistent with the two-slit experiment," *International Journal of Nonlinear Sciences and Numerical Simulation*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 95–98, 2005.

[10] Y. Tanaka, Y. Mizno, and T. Kado, "Chaotic dynamics in Friedmann equation," *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 407–422, 2005.
[11] J. X. Fang, "On fixed point theorems in fuzzy metric spaces," *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 107–113, 1992.
[12] V. Gregori and A. Sapena, "On fixed-point theorems in fuzzy metric spaces," *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, vol. 125, no. 2, pp. 245–252, 2002.
[13] O. Hadžić, *Fixed Point Theory in Probabilistic Metric Spaces*, University of Novi Sad, Institute of Mathematics, Novi Sad, Yugoslavia, 1995.
[14] D. Miheţ, "A Banach contraction theorem in fuzzy metric spaces," *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, vol. 144, no. 3, pp. 431–439, 2004.
[15] B. Schweizer, H. Sherwood, and R. M. Tardiff, "Contractions on probabilistic metric spaces: examples and counterexamples," *Stochastica*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 5–17, 1988.
[16] G. Song, "Comments on: "A common fixed point theorem in a fuzzy metric space"," *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, vol. 135, no. 3, pp. 409–413, 2003.
[17] R. Vasuki and P. Veeramani, "Fixed point theorems and Cauchy sequences in fuzzy metric spaces," *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, vol. 135, no. 3, pp. 415–417, 2003.
[18] B. C. Dhage, "Generalised metric spaces and mappings with fixed point," *Bulletin of the Calcutta Mathematical Society*, vol. 84, no. 4, pp. 329–336, 1992.
[19] B. Ahmad, M. Ashraf, and B. E. Rhoades, "Fixed point theorems for expansive mappings in D-metric spaces," *Indian Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 32, no. 10, pp. 1513–1518, 2001.
[20] B. C. Dhage, "A common fixed point principle in D-metric spaces," *Bulletin of the Calcutta Mathematical Society*, vol. 91, no. 6, pp. 475–480, 1999.
[21] B. C. Dhage, A. M. Pathan, and B. E. Rhoades, "A general existence principle for fixed point theorems in D-metric spaces," *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, vol. 23, no. 7, pp. 441–448, 2000.
[22] B. E. Rhoades, "A fixed point theorem for generalized metric spaces," *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 457–460, 1996.
[23] B. Singh and R. K. Sharma, "Common fixed points via compatible maps in D-metric spaces," *Radovi Matematički*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 145–153, 2002.
[24] S. V. R. Naidu, K. P. R. Rao, and N. Srinivasa Rao, "On the topology of D-metric spaces and generation of D-metric spaces from metric spaces," *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, vol. 2004, no. 51, pp. 2719–2740, 2004.
[25] S. V. R. Naidu, K. P. R. Rao, and N. Srinivasa Rao, "On the concepts of balls in a D-metric space," *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, vol. 2005, no. 1, pp. 133–141, 2005.
[26] S. V. R. Naidu, K. P. R. Rao, and N. Srinivasa Rao, "On convergent sequences and fixed point theorems in D-metric spaces," *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, vol. 2005, no. 12, pp. 1969–1988, 2005.

Shaban Sedghi: Department of Mathematics, Islamic Azad University-Ghaemshahr Branch, P.O. Box 163, Ghaemshahr, Iran
Email address: sedghi_gh@yahoo.com

Nabi Shobe: Department of Mathematics, Islamic Azad University-Babol Branch, Babol, Iran
Email address: nabi_shobe@yahoo.com

Haiyun Zhou: Department of Mathematics, Shijiazhuang Mechnical Engineering University, Shijiazhuang 050003, China
Email address: witman66@yahoo.com.cn

Journal of Applied Mathematics and Decision Sciences

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; mskklai@cityu.edu.hk