

Le Van Hot
A fixed point theorem

Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae, Vol. 26 (1985), No. 2, 299--308

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/106369>

Terms of use:

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, 1985

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://project.dml.cz>

A FIXED POINT THEOREM
LE VAN HOT

Abstract: Using the maximal principle we prove a new fixed point theorem.

Key words: Banach space, fixed point theorem, uniformly convex function.

Classification: Primary: 47H10

Secondary: 47H15, 47H17

Since recent years many authors have used the maximal principle to prove fixed point theorems, for example [1],[2],[3].

In this paper, using that idea we prove a new fixed point theorem and show some applications.

Let X be a Banach space, D a subset of X . By $\text{conv } D$ we denote the convex hull of D . Let P be a binary relation on D . We say that P is reflexive if $P(x,x)$ for all $x \in D$, P is closed if the set $\{(x,y) \in D \times D : P(x,y)\}$ is closed on $D \times D$. The function $h: \text{conv } D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be uniformly convex if it is convex and for each $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that:

$$h\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right) \leq \frac{1}{2} (h(x) + h(y)) - \delta$$

for all $x,y \in \text{conv } D$, $\|x-y\| > \epsilon$. If S is a subset of D , (h/S) denotes the restriction of h on S , $R(h/S)$ denotes the range of (h/S) .

Theorem: Let D be a closed subset of a Banach space X , P a reflexive closed relation on D , $h: \text{conv } D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ a uniformly convex continuous bounded function attaining its minimum $x_0 \in D$. Let $f: D \rightarrow D$ be a map such that:

- 1) if $x \in D$ and $P(x_0, x)$, then $P(x_0, f(x))$,
- 2) if $x, y \in D$, $P(x, y)$ and $h(\frac{1}{2}(x+y)) \geq h(x)$, then $P(f(x), f(y))$ and $h(\frac{1}{2}(f(x)+f(y))) \geq h(f(x))$.

Then f has a fixed point.

Proof: Let \mathcal{M} be the family of all nonempty subsets S of D containing x_0 and satisfying the following conditions:

- a) if $x, y \in S$, $h(x) < h(y)$, then $P(x, y)$ and $h(x) < h(f(x)) \leq h(y)$ and $h(f(x)) = h(y)$ if and only if $f(x) = y$;
- b) if $x, y \in S$, $h(x) \leq h(y)$, then $h(x) \leq h(\frac{1}{2}(x+y))$,
- c) if $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $h(x_0) < a < \sup \{h(x) \mid x \in S\}$ and $a \notin R(h|_S)$, then there exists an $x \in S$ such that $h(x) < a < h(f(x))$.

Obviously, $\{x_0\} \in \mathcal{M}$, thus $\mathcal{M} \neq \emptyset$.

Lemma 1: If $S \in \mathcal{M}$, then $h(x_1) \neq h(x_2)$ for all $x_1, x_2 \in S$ and $x_1 \neq x_2$.

Proof: Suppose that there are $x_1, x_2 \in S$, $x_1 \neq x_2$ and $h(x_1) = h(x_2)$, then by b) and by uniform convexity of h we have:
 $h(x_1) < h(\frac{1}{2}(x_1 + x_2)) < \frac{1}{2}(h(x_1) + h(x_2)) \implies h(x_2) > h(x_1)$,
a contradiction. This finishes the proof of Lemma 1.

Lemma 2: If $S \in \mathcal{M}$, $(x_n) \subseteq S$, $h(x_n) \uparrow a$, then (x_n) is a Cauchy sequence and moreover, if $x \in S$, $h(x) = a$, then $x = \lim x_n$.

Proof: Suppose that (x_n) is not a Cauchy sequence, then there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ and a subsequence (x_{n_i}) such that:

$\|x_{n_i} - x_{n_j}\| \geq \epsilon$ for $i \neq j$. By the uniform convexity of h there exists a $\sigma' > 0$ such that:

$$h(x_{n_i}) \leq h\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_{n_i} + x_{n_{i+1}})\right) \leq \frac{1}{2}(h(x_{n_i}) + h(x_{n_{i+1}})) - \sigma'.$$

Thus $h(x_{n_{i+1}}) \geq h(x_{n_i}) + 2\sigma' \geq h(x_1) + 2i\sigma'$ for all i .

This contradicts the boundedness of h . Now, let $x \in S$ and $h(x) = a$. If $x \neq \lim x_n$, then there is an $\epsilon > 0$ and n_0 such that:

$\|x_n - x\| \geq \epsilon$ for all $n > n_0$. Then there is a $\sigma' > 0$ such that:

$$h(x_n) \leq h\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_n + x)\right) \leq \frac{1}{2}(h(x_n) + h(x)) - \sigma',$$

$$h(x) \geq h(x_n) + 2\sigma' \quad \text{for all } n \geq n_0.$$

This contradicts the assumption $h(x) = \lim h(x_n)$ and the proof of Lemma 2 is complete.

Lemma 3. Let $S \in \mathcal{M}$ and $x \in S$ be such that $h(x_0) < h(x) < \sup\{h(x) | x \in S\}$, then $f(x) \in S$.

Proof: Suppose that $f(x) \notin S$. We claim that $h(f(x)) \notin R(h|S)$. In fact, if $h(f(x)) = h(y)$ for some $y \in S$, then $h(x) < h(y)$ and $y \neq f(x)$; then by a) $h(f(x)) < h(y)$, a contradiction. This shows that $h(f(x)) \notin R(h|S)$ and $h(f(x)) < \sup\{h(x) | x \in S\}$. Now by c) there exists a $z \in S$ such that $h(z) < h(f(x)) < h(f(z))$ but by Lemma 1) and by a) it is impossible. That proves that $f(x) \in S$ and ends the proof of Lemma 3.

Lemma 4. Let $S \in \mathcal{M}$, $x \in D$, $h(x_0) < h(x) \leq h(u)$ for some $u \in S$. Suppose that there exists a sequence $(x_n) \subseteq S$ such that $\lim x_n = x; h(x_n) \uparrow h(x)$, then $x \in S$.

Proof: If $h(x) \notin R(h|S)$, then $h(x) < h(u)$. In fact if $h(x) = h(u)$ then by Lemma 2, $u = \lim x_n = x \in S$, a contradiction. By the condition c) there is a $z \in S$ such that $h(z) < h(x) < h(f(z))$. Then there is an integer n_0 such that $h(z) < h(x_{n_0}) < h(f(z))$. This contradicts the condition a). This shows $h(x) \in R(h|S)$ and $h(x) = h(y)$ for some $y, y \in S$. By Lemma 2) $y = \lim x_n = x \in S$. This ends the proof of Lemma 4.

Lemma 5. Let $S \in \mathcal{M}$, $y \in S$, $y \neq x_0$; then either $y = f(z)$ for a $z \in S$, $z \neq y$ or $y = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(z_n)$; $h(f(z_n)) \uparrow h(y)$ for a sequence $(z_n) \subseteq S$.

Proof. Put $M_y = \sup \{h(x) \mid x \in S; h(x) < h(y)\}$.

1) If $M_y = h(y)$, then there is a $(z_n) \subseteq S$ such that $h(z_n) \uparrow h(y)$. By the condition a) we have $h(z_n) < h(f(z_n)) \leq h(z_{n+1}) < h(y)$. Thus $h(f(z_n)) \uparrow h(y)$. By Lemma 3) $f(z_n) \in S$ for all n and by Lemma 2) $y = \lim f(z_n)$.

2) If $M_y < h(y)$, then by c) there is a $z \in S$ such that $h(z) < \frac{1}{2}(M_y + h(y)) < h(f(z)) \leq h(y)$. By Lemma 3) $f(z) \in S$ and by Lemma 1) $f(z) = y$. Of course $y \neq z$. This completes the proof of Lemma 5.

Lemma 6. Let $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{M}$ and suppose that for each $x \in S_1$ there is a $u \in S_2$ such that $h(x) \leq h(u)$. Then $S_1 \subseteq S_2$.

Proof: Suppose that $S_1 \not\subseteq S_2$, then $S_1 \setminus S_1 \cap S_2 \neq \emptyset$. Let $\bar{x} \in S_1 \setminus S_1 \cap S_2$. By assumption there is a $u \in S_2$ such that $h(u) \geq h(\bar{x})$. Put $A = \{x \in S_1 \cap S_2; \forall y \in S_1; h(y) < h(x) \Rightarrow y \in S_2\}$. Of course $A \neq \emptyset$ since $x_0 \in A$. It is clear that $h(x) < h(\bar{x})$ for all $x \in A$. Put $M_A = \sup \{h(x) \mid x \in A\} \leq h(\bar{x})$.

1) If $M_A \in R(h \upharpoonright A)$, then $M_A = h(y) < h(\bar{x})$ for some $y \in A$. By Lemma 3) $f(y) \in S_1 \cap S_2$; $h(y) < h(f(y))$ and if $z \in S_1$, $h(z) < h(f(y))$, then $h(z) \leq h(y)$. Thus $z \in A$. Therefore $f(y) \in A$, a contradiction.

2) If $M_A \notin R(h \upharpoonright A)$, then there is an $(x_n) \subseteq A$, $h(x_n) \uparrow M_A$. By Lemma 4) $\lim x_n = x \in S_1 \cap S_2$. It is clear that $x \in A$. It contradicts the fact $h(x) = M_A \notin R(h \upharpoonright A)$. This shows that $S_1 \setminus S_1 \cap S_2 = \emptyset$ and $S_1 \subseteq S_2$.

Lemma 7. $\bar{S} = \cup \{S \mid S \in \mathcal{M}\} \in \mathcal{M}$.

Proof: It is easy to verify that \bar{S} satisfies all conditions a), b), c).

Now we return to the proof of the theorem. Put

$M = \sup \{h(x) \mid x \in \bar{S}\}$. If $M \notin R(h|\bar{S})$, then there is a sequence $(x_n) \subseteq \bar{S}$, $h(x_n) \uparrow M$. By Lemma 2 there is an $\bar{x} = \lim x_n$ and $h(\bar{x}) = M$. Put $\tilde{S} = \bar{S} \cup \{\bar{x}\}$. It is obvious that \tilde{S} satisfies the condition c).

Now we verify that \tilde{S} also satisfies the conditions a), b), too. Let $x \in \tilde{S}$, $h(x) < h(\bar{x})$, then $x \in \bar{S}$ and there exists an n_0 such that $h(x) < h(x_n)$ for all $n > n_0$. Since $\bar{S} \in \mathcal{M}$, we have $P(x, x_n)$ and $h(x) \leq h(f(x)) \leq h(x_n)$; $h(x) \leq h(\frac{1}{2}(x+x_n))$ for all $n > n_0$. Since P is closed and h is continuous, it follows that $P(x, \bar{x})$, $h(x) < h(f(x)) < \lim h(x_n) = h(\bar{x})$ and $h(x) \leq \lim h(\frac{1}{2}(x+x_n)) = h(\frac{1}{2}(x+\bar{x}))$. This shows that $\tilde{S} \in \mathcal{M} \Rightarrow \tilde{S} \subseteq \bar{S}$ and $\bar{x} \in \bar{S}$. This contradicts the fact $M = h(\bar{x}) \notin R(h|\bar{S})$. Then there is a $u \in \bar{S}$ such that $h(u) = M$. Put $\tilde{S} = \bar{S} \cup \{f(u)\}$. Of course \tilde{S} satisfies the condition c). Let $x \in \tilde{S}$, $h(x) < h(f(u))$, then $x \in \bar{S}$. If $x = x_0$, then of course $P(x_0, u)$ and $h(x_0) \leq h(\frac{1}{2}(x_0+f(u))) \leq \frac{1}{2}(h(x_0)+h(f(u))) \Rightarrow h(f(u)) \geq h(x_0)$ and by assumption 1) we have $P(x_0, f(u))$.

If $x \neq x_0$, then either $x = f(z)$ for a $z \in \bar{S}$ or $x = \lim f(z_n)$, $h(f(z_n)) \uparrow h(x)$ for a sequence $(z_n) \subseteq \bar{S}$.

1) Let $x = f(z)$ for a $z \in \bar{S}$, $x \neq z$, then $h(z) < h(x) \leq h(u)$. By the conditions a), b) we have $P(z, u)$ and $h(\frac{1}{2}(z+u)) \geq h(z)$. By assumption 2) it follows that $P(x, f(u))$ and $\frac{1}{2}(h(f(u)) + h(x)) \geq h(\frac{1}{2}(x+f(u))) \geq h(x) \Rightarrow h(f(u)) \geq h(x)$.

2) If $x = \lim f(z_n)$: $h(f(z_n)) \uparrow h(x)$ for a sequence $(z_n) \subseteq \bar{S}$, then $P(z_n, u)$ and $h(\frac{1}{2}(u+z_n)) \geq h(z_n)$. By assumption 2) we have $P(f(z_n), f(u))$ and $\frac{1}{2}(h(f(u)) + h(f(z_n))) \geq h(\frac{1}{2}(f(u) + f(z_n))) \geq h(f(z_n))$. Since P is closed and h is continuous, it follows that: $P(x, f(u))$ and $\frac{1}{2}(h(f(u)) + h(x)) \geq h(\frac{1}{2}(f(u) + x)) \geq h(x) \Rightarrow h(f(u)) \geq h(x)$.

This proves that $P(x, f(u))$, $h(\frac{1}{2}(f(u) + x)) \geq h(x)$, $h(f(u)) \geq h(x)$ for all $x \in \bar{S}$, especially for $x = u$.

Now let $x \in \overline{S}$, $h(x) < h(f(u))$. Then $x \in \overline{S}$. If $x \neq u$, then $h(x) < h(u)$. Since $\overline{S} \in \mathcal{M}$, we have $h(f(x)) > h(x)$, $h(f(x)) \leq h(u) \leq h(f(u))$. This proves that \overline{S} satisfies the conditions a), b), too, and $\overline{S} \in \mathcal{M}$. Therefore $\overline{S} \subseteq \overline{S} \Rightarrow f(u) \in \overline{S}$ and $h(f(u)) = h(u)$. By Lemma 1) $f(u) = u$. This completes the proof of the theorem. For the sake of completeness we include the following

Lemma 8. Let X be a uniformly convex Banach space, D a convex bounded subset of X , then the function $h(x) = \|x\|^2$ is uniformly convex, continuous and bounded on D .

Proof: The boundedness and the continuity of h are obvious.

Now without loss of generality we can suppose that D is contained in the unit ball $B_1(0)$ of X . Suppose that h is not uniformly convex, then there exist an $\epsilon > 0$ and subsequences $(x_n), (y_n) \in D$ such that: $\|\frac{1}{2}(x_n + y_n)\|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}(\|x_n\|^2 + \|y_n\|^2) - \frac{1}{n}$ for all $n = 1, 2, \dots$. We can suppose that $a = \lim \|x_n\| \geq \lim \|y_n\| = b$. Put $\lambda_n = \|y_n\|(\|x_n\|)^{-1}$, then $\lim \lambda_n = \lambda = ba^{-1}$.

1) Let $\lambda < 1$, then $\|\frac{1}{2}(x_n + y_n)\| \leq \frac{1}{2}(\|x_n\| + \|y_n\|) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \lambda_n)\|x_n\|$. By assumption it follows that:

$$-\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{2}(1 + \lambda_n)^2 \|x_n\|^2 \leq \|\frac{1}{2}(x_n + y_n)\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{4}(1 + \lambda_n)^2 \|x_n\|^2.$$

Taking limit we have a contradiction: $\frac{1}{4}(1 - \lambda)^2 \leq 0$.

2) Let $\lambda = 1$. We can suppose that $\|x_n - \lambda_n y_n\| \geq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon$ for all n . Then $\|x_n\| = \|\lambda_n y_n\| > \frac{1}{4} \epsilon$. Of course

$$\|(\|x_n\|)^{-1} x_n - (\|y_n\|)^{-1} y_n\| = (\|x_n\|)^{-1} \|x_n - \lambda_n y_n\| > (2\|x_n\|)^{-1} \epsilon > \frac{1}{2} \epsilon.$$

By the uniform convexity of X there exists a $\sigma > 0$ such that $\|(2\|x_n\|)^{-1}(x_n - \lambda_n y_n)\| < 1 - \sigma$.

By assumption it follows that:

$$-\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{2}(1 + \lambda_n^2) \|x_n\|^2 \leq \|(\|x_n\|)^{-1}(x_n + \lambda_n y_n)\| \|x_n\| +$$

$$+ (1 - \lambda_n) \frac{1}{2} \|y_n\|^2 \leq [(1 - \sigma) \|x_n\| + (1 - \lambda_n) \frac{1}{2} \|y_n\|]^2.$$

Then $0 < a^2 < (1 - \sigma)^2 a^2$, a contradiction. This proves that h is uniformly convex.

Corollary 1. Let $O \in D$ be a bounded closed subset of a uniformly convex Banach space, P a reflexive closed relation on D . Let $f: D \rightarrow D$ be a map such that:

1) if $x \in D$, $P(O, x)$, then $P(O, f(x))$

2) if $x, y \in D$; $P(x, y)$ and $\|\frac{1}{2}(x+y)\| \geq \|x\|$,

then $P(f(x), f(y))$ and $\|\frac{1}{2}(f(x)+f(y))\| \geq \|f(x)\|$.

Then f has a fixed point.

Now if the relation P is defined by $P(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in D$, then we have:

Corollary 2. Let D be a closed subset of a Banach space, $h: \text{conv } D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ a uniformly convex continuous bounded function attaining its minimum at $x_0 \in D$. Suppose that $f: D \rightarrow D$ is a map such that if $x, y \in D$, $h(\frac{1}{2}(x+y)) \geq h(x)$, then $h(\frac{1}{2}(f(x) + f(y))) \geq h(f(x))$. Then f has a fixed point.

If the relation P on D is defined by: $P(x, y)$ if and only if $h(\lambda x + (1-\lambda)y) \geq h(x)$ for all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ then we have:

Corollary 3. Let D , h be as in Corollary 2 and $f: D \rightarrow D$ map such that: if $x, y \in D$, $h((1-\lambda)x + \lambda y) \geq h(x)$, then $h((1-\lambda)f(x) + \lambda f(y)) \geq h(f(x))$ for all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Then f has a fixed point.

All notions concerning Banach lattices used here are standard, we refer the reader for instance to [6].

Corollary 4. Let X be a uniformly convex Banach lattice, $O \in D$ a closed, bounded subset of the positive cone C^+ of X . Let $f: D \rightarrow D$ be a map such that: if $x, y \in D$, $x \leq y$, then $f(x) \leq f(y)$.

Then f has a fixed point.

Proof: It is sufficient to note that if $x, y \in D$ and $x \leq y$, then $\|x\| \leq \|y\|$.

Let X be a Banach space. $L_2^X([0,1])$ denotes the Lebesgue space of all strongly measurable functions $x: [0,1] \rightarrow X$ such that:

$$\|x\|_{L_2} = \left(\int_0^1 \|x(t)\|^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty.$$

Lemma 9. Let X be a uniformly convex Banach lattice, $D = \{x \in L_2^X([0,1]) : \|x(t)\|_X \leq K \text{ for all } t \in [0,1]\}$

for some positive number K , then the function $h(x) = \|x\|_{L_2}^2$ is uniformly convex on D .

Proof: Let ϵ be a given positive number, $x, y \in D$ such that $\|x-y\|_{L_2} > \epsilon$. Put $I = [0,1]; A = \{t \in I, \|x(t)-y(t)\|_X \geq \frac{1}{2}\epsilon\}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Then } \int_0^1 \|x(t)-y(t)\|^2 dt &\leq \int_A \|x(t)-y(t)\|^2 dt + \int_{I \setminus A} (4)^{-1} \cdot \epsilon^2 dt < \\ < 4K^2 \mu(A) + \frac{1}{4} \epsilon^2 \implies \mu(A) \geq \frac{3}{16} \epsilon^2. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 8, there exists a $\sigma > 0$ such that:

$$\|\frac{1}{2}(x(t)+y(t))\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}(\|x(t)\|^2 + \|y(t)\|^2) - \sigma \text{ for all } t \in A.$$

It follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\frac{1}{2}(x+y)\|_{L_2}^2 &\leq \int_A \|\frac{1}{2}(x(t)+y(t))\|^2 dt + \int_{I \setminus A} \|\frac{1}{2}(x(t)+y(t))\|^2 dt \leq \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_A (\|x(t)\|^2 + \|y(t)\|^2 - \sigma) dt + \int_{I \setminus A} \frac{1}{2}(\|x(t)\|^2 + \|y(t)\|^2) dt \leq \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}(\|x\|_{L_2}^2 + \|y\|_{L_2}^2) - \frac{3}{16} \cdot \epsilon^2. \end{aligned}$$

This ends the proof of Lemma 9.

Now we consider the Cauchy problem of differential equation in Banach lattice X :

$$(I) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{x} = f(t, x) \\ x(0) = x_0 \end{cases}$$

where $f: [0,1] \times X \rightarrow X$ satisfies the Carathéodory conditions, i. e.:

- 1) $f(t, \cdot)$ is continuous for a. e. $t \in [0,1]$,
- 2) $f(\cdot, x)$ is strong measurable for every $x \in X$.

We say that (I) has a solution, if there exists a continuous function $x: [0,1] \rightarrow X$ such that: $x(t) = x_0 + \int_0^t f(s, x(s)) ds$ for all $t \in [0,1]$.

Corollary 5. Let X be a uniformly convex Banach lattice, $f: [0,1] \times X \rightarrow X$ satisfies the Carathéodory conditions, and:

- 1) there is a function $\beta(t) \in L_1([0,1])$ such that $\|f(t, x)\| \leq \beta(t)$ for all $t \in [0,1]; x \in X$,
- 2) $0 \leq f(t, x) \leq f(t, y)$ if $0 \leq x \leq y; t \in [0,1]$.

Then for each $x_0 \in C^+$ the problem (I) has a solution.

Proof. Put $D = \{x \in L_2^X([0,1]): x(t) \geq 0 \text{ and } \|x(t)\|_X \leq \|x_0\| + \int_0^1 \beta(t) dt \text{ for all } t \in [0,1]\}$, $F_f(x)(t) = x_0 + \int_0^t f(s, x(s)) ds$ for $x \in D, t \in [0,1]$. One can verify that $F_f: D \rightarrow D$ and $F_f(x) \leq F_f(y)$ if $x, y \in D; x \leq y$. Now we define a relation P on D such that $P(x, y)$ if and only if $x \leq y$. Put $h(x) = \|x\|_{L_2}^2$. By Lemma 9, h is a uniformly convex continuous bounded function on $D \ni 0$. If $x, y \in X, x \leq y$, then $\frac{1}{2}(x+y) \geq x$ and $\|\frac{1}{2}(x+y)\|^2 \geq \|x\|^2$. Therefore if $x, y \in D, x \leq y$, then $F_f(x) \leq F_f(y)$, $\frac{1}{2}(F_f(x) + F_f(y)) \geq F_f(x)$ and $\|\frac{1}{2}(F_f(x) + F_f(y))\|^2 \geq \|F_f(x)\|^2$. By the theorem F_f has a fixed point $\bar{x} \in D$. It is easy to see that \bar{x} is a solution of (I).

References

- [1] H. BRÉZIS, F. BROWDER: A general ordering principle in non-linear functional analysis, *Advances in Math.* 21 (1976), 355-364.

- [2] F. BRØNSTED: Fixed points and partial orders, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 60(1978), 365-366.
- [3] J. CARISTI: Fixed point theorems for mapping satisfying inwardness conditions, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 215 (1976), 241-251.
- [4] I. EKELAND: Nonconvex minimization problems, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (New Series) 1(1979), 443-474.
- [5] B. FUCHSTEINER: Iterations and fixed points, Pacific J. Math. 68(1977), 73-79.
- [6] H. SCHAEFER: Banach lattices and positive operators, Springer-Verlag, New York (1974).

Math. Dept. of Economical Institute, Hanoi, Vietnam

(Oblatum 28.5. 1984)