

RESEARCH

Open Access

# Fixed point and weak convergence theorems for point-dependent $\lambda$ -hybrid mappings in Banach spaces

Young-Ye Huang<sup>1</sup>, Jyh-Chung Jeng<sup>2</sup>, Tian-Yuan Kuo<sup>3</sup> and Chung-Chien Hong<sup>4\*</sup>

\* Correspondence: chong@mail.npust.edu.tw

<sup>4</sup>Department of Industrial Management, National Pingtung University of Science and Technology, 1 Shuefu Rd., Neopu, Pingtung 91201, Taiwan  
Full list of author information is available at the end of the article

## Abstract

The purpose of this article is to study the fixed point and weak convergence problem for the new defined class of point-dependent  $\lambda$ -hybrid mappings relative to a Bregman distance  $D_f$  in a Banach space. We at first extend the Aoyama-Iemoto-Kohsaka-Takahashi fixed point theorem for  $\lambda$ -hybrid mappings in Hilbert spaces in 2010 to this much wider class of nonlinear mappings in Banach spaces. Secondly, we derive an Opial-like inequality for the Bregman distance and apply it to establish a weak convergence theorem for this new class of nonlinear mappings. Some concrete examples in a Hilbert space showing that our extension is proper are also given.

**2010 MSC:** 47H09; 47H10.

**Keywords:** fixed point, Bregman distance, Gâteaux differentiable, subdifferential

## 1 Introduction

Let  $C$  be a nonempty subset of a Hilbert space  $H$ . A mapping  $T : C \rightarrow H$  is said to be

(1.1) nonexpansive if  $\|Tx - Ty\| \leq \|x - y\|$ ,  $\forall x, y \in C$ , cf. [1,2];

(1.2) nonspreading if  $\|Tx - Ty\|^2 \leq \|x - y\|^2 + 2 \langle x - Tx, y - Ty \rangle$ ,  $\forall x, y \in C$ , cf. [3-5];

(1.3) hybrid if  $\|Tx - Ty\|^2 \leq \|x - y\|^2 + \langle x - Tx, y - Ty \rangle$ ,  $\forall x, y \in C$ , cf. [3,5-7].

As shown in [3], (1.2) is equivalent to

$$2\|Tx - Ty\|^2 \leq \|Tx - y\|^2 + \|x - Ty\|^2$$

for all  $x, y \in C$ .

In 1965, Browder [1] established the following

**Browder fixed point Theorem.** *Let  $C$  be a nonempty closed convex subset of a Hilbert space  $H$ , and let  $T : C \rightarrow C$  be a nonexpansive mapping. Then, the following are equivalent:*

- There exists  $x \in C$  such that  $\{T^n x\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded;
- $T$  has a fixed point.

The above result is still true for nonspreading mappings which was shown in Kohsaka and Takahashi [4]. (We call it the Kohsaka-Takahashi fixed point theorem.)

Recently, Aoyama et al. [8] introduced a new class of nonlinear mappings in a Hilbert space containing the classes of nonexpansive mappings, nonspreading mappings and hybrid mappings. For  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ , they call a mapping  $T : C \rightarrow H$

$$(1.4) \lambda\text{-hybrid if } \|Tx - Ty\|^2 \leq \|x - y\|^2 + \lambda \langle x - Tx, y - Ty \rangle, \forall x, y \in C.$$

And, among other things, they establish the following

**Aoyama-Iemoto-Kohsaka-Takahashi fixed point Theorem.** [8] *Let  $C$  be a nonempty closed convex subset of a Hilbert space  $H$ , and let  $T : C \rightarrow C$  be a  $\lambda$ -hybrid mapping. Then, the following are equivalent:*

- (a) *There exists  $x \in C$  such that  $\{T^n x\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded;*
- (b)  *$T$  has a fixed point.*

Obviously,  $T$  is nonexpansive if and only if it is 0-hybrid;  $T$  is nonspreading if and only if it is 2-hybrid;  $T$  is hybrid if and only if it is 1-hybrid.

Motivated by the above works, we extend the concept of  $\lambda$ -hybrid from Hilbert spaces to Banach spaces in the following way:

**Definition 1.1.** *For a nonempty subset  $C$  of a Banach space  $X$ , a Gâteaux differentiable convex function  $f : X \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$  and a function  $\lambda : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , a mapping  $T : C \rightarrow X$  is said to be point-dependent  $\lambda$ -hybrid relative to  $D_f$  if*

$$(1.5) D_f(Tx, Ty) \leq D_f(x, y) + \lambda(y) \langle x - Tx, f(y) - f(Ty) \rangle, \forall x, y \in C,$$

where  $D_f$  is the Bregman distance associated with  $f$  and  $f'(x)$  denotes the Gâteaux derivative of  $f$  at  $x$ .

In this article, we study the fixed point and weak convergence problem for mappings satisfying (1.5). This article is organized in the following way: Section 2 provides preliminaries. We investigate the fixed point problem for point-dependent  $\lambda$ -hybrid mappings in Section 3, and we give some concrete examples showing that even in the setting of a Hilbert space, our fixed point theorem generalizes the Aoyama-Iemoto-Kohsaka-Takahashi fixed point theorem properly in Section 4. Section 5 is devoted to studying the weak convergence problem for this new class of nonlinear mappings.

## 2 Preliminaries

In what follows,  $X$  will be a real Banach space with topological dual  $X^*$  and  $f : X \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$  will be a convex function.  $\mathcal{D}$  denotes the domain of  $f$ , that is,

$$\mathcal{D} = \{x \in X : f(x) < \infty\},$$

and  $\mathcal{D}^\circ$  denotes the algebraic interior of  $\mathcal{D}$ , i.e., the subset of  $\mathcal{D}$  consisting of all those points  $x \in \mathcal{D}$  such that, for any  $y \in X \setminus \{x\}$ , there is  $z$  in the open segment  $(x, y)$  with  $[x, z] \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ . The topological interior of  $\mathcal{D}$ , denoted by  $\text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$ , is contained in  $\mathcal{D}^\circ$ .  $f$  is said to be proper provided that  $\mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset$ .  $f$  is called lower semicontinuous (l.s.c.) at  $x \in X$  if  $f(x) \leq \liminf_{y \rightarrow x} f(y)$ .  $f$  is strictly convex if

$$f(\alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y) < \alpha f(x) + (1 - \alpha)f(y)$$

for all  $x, y \in X$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ .

The function  $f : X \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$  is said to be Gâteaux differentiable at  $x \in X$  if there is  $f'(x) \in X^*$  such that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x + ty) - f(x)}{t} = \langle y, f'(x) \rangle$$

for all  $y \in X$ .

The Bregman distance  $D_f$  associated with a proper convex function  $f$  is the function  $D_f : \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  defined by

$$D_f(y, x) = f(y) - f(x) + f^\circ(x, x - y), \tag{1}$$

where  $f^\circ(x, x - y) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{f(x + t(x - y)) - f(x)}{t}$ .  $D_f(y, x)$  is finite valued if and only if  $x \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ , cf. Proposition 1.1.2 (iv) of [9]. When  $f$  is Gâteaux differentiable on  $D$ , (1) becomes

$$D_f(y, x) = f(y) - f(x) - \langle y - x, f'(x) \rangle, \tag{2}$$

and then the modulus of total convexity is the function  $v_f : \mathcal{D}^\circ \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  defined by

$$v_f(x, t) = \inf\{D_f(y, x) : y \in \mathcal{D}, \|y - x\| = t\}.$$

It is known that

$$v_f(x, ct) \geq cv_f(x, t) \tag{3}$$

for all  $t \geq 0$  and  $c \geq 1$ , cf. Proposition 1.2.2 (ii) of [9]. By definition it follows that

$$D_f(y, x) \geq v_f(x, \|y - x\|). \tag{4}$$

The modulus of uniform convexity of  $f$  is the function  $\delta_f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  defined by

$$\delta_f(t) = \inf \left\{ f(x) + f(y) - 2f\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right) : x, y \in \mathcal{D}, \|x - y\| \geq t \right\}.$$

The function  $f$  is called uniformly convex if  $\delta_f(t) > 0$  for all  $t > 0$ . If  $f$  is uniformly convex then for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$f\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right) \leq \frac{f(x)}{2} + \frac{f(y)}{2} - \delta \tag{5}$$

for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{D}$  with  $\|x - y\| \geq \varepsilon$ .

Note that for  $y \in \mathcal{D}$  and  $x \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & f(x) + f(y) - 2f\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right) \\ &= f(y) - f(x) - \frac{f\left(x + \frac{y-x}{2}\right) - f(x)}{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq f(y) - f(x) - f^\circ(x, y - x) \leq D_f(y, x), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the fact that the function  $t \rightarrow f(x + tz) - f(x)/t$  is nondecreasing on  $(0, \infty)$ . Therefore,

$$v_f(x, t) \geq \delta_f(t) \tag{6}$$

whenever  $x \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$  and  $t \geq 0$ . For other properties of the Bregman distance  $D_f$ , we refer readers to [9].

The normalized duality mapping  $J$  from  $X$  to  $2^{X^*}$  is defined by

$$Jx = \{x^* \in X^* : \langle x, x^* \rangle = \|x\|^2 = \|x^*\|^2\}$$

for all  $x \in X$ .

When  $f(x) = \|x\|^2$  in a smooth Banach space  $X$ , it is known that  $f'(x) = 2J(x)$  for  $x \in X$ , cf. Corollaries 1.2.7 and 1.4.5 of [10]. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_f(y, x) &= \|y\|^2 - \|x\|^2 - \langle y - x, f'(x) \rangle \\ &= \|y\|^2 - \|x\|^2 - 2\langle y - x, Jx \rangle \\ &= \|y\|^2 + \|x\|^2 - 2\langle y, Jx \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, as the normalized duality mapping  $J$  in a Hilbert space  $H$  is the identity operator, we have

$$D_f(y, x) = \|y\|^2 + \|x\|^2 - 2\langle y, x \rangle = \|y - x\|^2.$$

Thus, in case  $\lambda$  is a constant function and  $f(x) = \|x\|^2$  in a Hilbert space, (1.5) coincides with (1.4). However, in general, they are different.

A function  $g : X \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$  is said to be subdifferentiable at a point  $x \in X$  if there exists a linear functional  $x^* \in X^*$  such that

$$g(y) - g(x) \geq \langle y - x, x^* \rangle, \quad \forall y \in X.$$

We call such  $x^*$  the subgradient of  $g$  at  $x$ . The set of all subgradients of  $g$  at  $x$  is denoted by  $\partial g(x)$  and the mapping  $\partial g : X \rightarrow 2^{X^*}$  is called the subdifferential of  $g$ . For a l.s.c. convex function  $f$ ,  $\partial f$  is bounded on bounded subsets of  $\text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$  if and only if  $f$  is bounded on bounded subsets there, cf. Proposition 1.1.11 of [9]. A proper convex l.s.c. function  $f$  is Gâteaux differentiable at  $x \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$  if and only if it has a unique subgradient at  $x$ ; in such case  $\partial f(x) = f'(x)$ , cf. Corollary 1.2.7 of [10].

The following lemma will be quoted in the sequel.

**Lemma 2.1.** (Proposition 1.1.9 of [9]) *If a proper convex function  $f : X \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$  is Gâteaux differentiable on  $\text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$  in a Banach space  $X$ , then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (a) *The function  $f$  is strictly convex on  $\text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$ .*
- (b) *For any two distinct points  $x, y \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$ , one has  $D_f(y, x) > 0$ .*
- (c) *For any two distinct points  $x, y \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$ , one has*

$$\langle x - y, f'(x) - f'(y) \rangle > 0.$$

Throughout this article,  $F(T)$  will denote the set of all fixed points of a mapping  $T$ .

### 3 Fixed point theorems

In this section, we apply Lemma 2.1 to study the fixed point problem for mappings satisfying (1.5).

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $X$  be a reflexive Banach space and let  $f : X \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$  be a l.s.c. strictly convex function so that it is Gâteaux differentiable on  $\text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$  and is bounded on bounded subsets of  $\text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$ . Suppose  $C \subseteq \text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$  is a nonempty closed convex subset of  $X$  and  $T : C \rightarrow C$  is point-dependent  $\lambda$ -hybrid relative to  $D_f$  for some function  $\lambda : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . For  $x \in C$  and any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  define*

$$S_n x = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} T^k x,$$

where  $T^0$  is the identity mapping on  $C$ . If  $\{T^n x\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded, then every weak cluster point of  $\{S_n x\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a fixed point of  $T$ .

*Proof.* Since  $T$  is point-dependent  $\lambda$ -hybrid relative to  $D_f$  we have, for any  $y \in C$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq D_f(T^k x, y) - D_f(T^{k+1} x, Ty) + \lambda(y) \langle T^k x - T^{k+1} x, f'(y) - f'(Ty) \rangle \\ &= f(T^k x) - f(y) - \langle T^k x - y, f'(y) \rangle - f(T^{k+1} x) + f(Ty) + \langle T^{k+1} x - Ty, f'(Ty) \rangle \\ &\quad + \lambda(y) \langle T^k x - T^{k+1} x, f'(y) - f'(Ty) \rangle \\ &= [f(T^k x) - f(T^{k+1} x)] + [f(Ty) - f(y)] + \langle \lambda(y)(T^k x - T^{k+1} x) - T^k x + y, f'(y) \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle T^{k+1} x - Ty - \lambda(y)(T^k x - T^{k+1} x), f'(Ty) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Summing up these inequalities with respect to  $k = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq [f(x) - f(T^n x)] + n[f(Ty) - f(y)] + \langle \lambda(y)(x - T^n x) + ny - nS_n x, f'(y) \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle (n + 1)S_{n+1} x - x - nTy - \lambda(y)(x - T^n x), f'(Ty) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Dividing the above inequality by  $n$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \frac{f(x) - f(T^n x)}{n} + [f(Ty) - f(y)] + \left\langle \frac{\lambda(y)(x - T^n x)}{n} + y - S_n x, f'(y) \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \left\langle \frac{n + 1}{n} S_{n+1} x - \frac{x}{n} - Ty - \frac{\lambda(y)(x - T^n x)}{n}, f'(Ty) \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Since  $\{T^n x\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded,  $\{S_n x\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded, and so, in view of  $X$  being reflexive, it has a subsequence  $\{S_{n_i} x\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  so that  $S_{n_i} x$  converges weakly to some  $v \in C$  as  $n_i \rightarrow \infty$ . Replacing  $n$  by  $n_i$  in (7), and letting  $n_i \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain from the fact that  $\{T^n x\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\{f(T^n x)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  are bounded that

$$0 \leq f(Ty) - f(y) + \langle y - v, f'(y) \rangle + \langle v - Ty, f'(Ty) \rangle. \tag{8}$$

Putting  $y = v$  in (8), we get

$$0 \leq f(Tv) - f(v) + \langle v - Tv, f'(Tv) \rangle,$$

that is,

$$0 \leq -D_f(v, Tv),$$

from which follows that  $D_f(v, Tv) = 0$ . Therefore  $Tv = v$  by Lemma 2.1.  $\square$

The following theorem comes from Theorem 3.1 immediately.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $X$  be a reflexive Banach space and let  $f : X \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$  be a l.s.c. strictly convex function so that it is Gâteaux differentiable on  $\text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$  and is bounded on bounded subsets of  $\text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$ . Suppose  $C \subseteq \text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$  is a nonempty closed convex subset of  $X$  and  $T : C \rightarrow C$  is point-dependent  $\lambda$ -hybrid relative to  $D_f$  for some function  $\lambda : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Then, the following two statements are equivalent:*

- (a) *There is a point  $x \in C$  such that  $\{T^n x\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded.*
- (b)  $F(T) \neq \emptyset$ .

Taking  $\lambda(x) = \lambda$ , a constant real number, for all  $x \in C$  and noting the function  $f(x) = \|x\|^2$  in a Hilbert space  $H$  satisfies all the requirements of Theorem 3.2, the corollary below follows immediately.

**Corollary 3.3.** [8] *Let  $C$  be a nonempty closed convex subset of Hilbert space  $H$  and suppose  $T : C \rightarrow C$  is  $\lambda$ -hybrid. Then, the following two statements are equivalent:*

- (a) *There exists  $x \in C$  such that  $\{T^n(x)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded.*
- (b)  *$T$  has a fixed point.*

We now show that the fixed point set  $F(T)$  is closed and convex under the assumptions of Theorem 3.2.

A mapping  $T : C \rightarrow X$  is said to be quasi-nonexpansive with respect to  $D_f$  if  $F(T) \neq \emptyset$  and  $D_f(v, Tx) \leq D_f(v, x)$  for all  $x \in C$  and all  $v \in F(T)$ .

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $f : X \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$  be a proper strictly convex function on a Banach space  $X$  so that it is Gâteaux differentiable on  $\text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$ , and let  $C \subseteq \text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$  be a nonempty closed convex subset of  $X$ . If  $T : C \rightarrow C$  is quasi-nonexpansive with respect to  $D_f$  then  $F(T)$  is a closed convex subset.*

*Proof.* Let  $x \in \overline{F(T)}$  and choose  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq F(T)$  such that  $x_n \rightarrow x$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . By the continuity of  $D_f(\cdot, Tx)$  and  $D_f(x_n, Tx) \leq D_f(x_n, x)$ , we have

$$D_f(x, Tx) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_f(x_n, Tx) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_f(x_n, x) = D_f(x, x) = 0.$$

Thus, due to the strict convexity of  $f$ , it follows from Lemma 2.2 that  $Tx = x$ . This shows  $F(T)$  is closed. Next, let  $x, y \in F(T)$  and  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ . Put  $z = \alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y$ . We show that  $Tz = z$  to conclude  $F(T)$  is convex. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} & D_f(z, Tz) \\ &= f(z) - f(Tz) - \langle z - Tz, f'(Tz) \rangle \\ &= f(z) + [\alpha f(x) + (1 - \alpha)f(y)] - f(Tz) - \langle z - Tz, f'(Tz) \rangle - [\alpha f(x) + (1 - \alpha)f(y)] \\ &= f(z) + \alpha[f(x) - f(Tz) - \langle x - Tz, f'(Tz) \rangle] \\ &\quad + (1 - \alpha)[f(y) - f(Tz) - \langle y - Tz, f'(Tz) \rangle] - [\alpha f(x) + (1 - \alpha)f(y)] \\ &= f(z) + \alpha D_f(x, Tz) + (1 - \alpha)D_f(y, Tz) - [\alpha f(x) + (1 - \alpha)f(y)] \\ &\leq f(z) + \alpha D_f(x, z) + (1 - \alpha)D_f(y, z) - [\alpha f(x) + (1 - \alpha)f(y)] \\ &= f(z) + \alpha[f(x) - f(z) - \langle x - z, f'(z) \rangle] + (1 - \alpha)[f(y) - f(z) - \langle y - z, f'(z) \rangle] \\ &\quad - [\alpha f(x) + (1 - \alpha)f(y)] \\ &= f(z) + \alpha f(x) - \alpha f(z) - \langle \alpha x - \alpha z, f'(z) \rangle + (1 - \alpha)f(y) - (1 - \alpha)f(z) \\ &\quad - \langle (1 - \alpha)y - (1 - \alpha)z, f'(z) \rangle - [\alpha f(x) + (1 - \alpha)f(y)] \\ &= -\langle \alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y - (\alpha z + (1 - \alpha)z), f'(z) \rangle \\ &= -\langle 0, f'(z) \rangle = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $Tz = z$  by the strictly convex of  $f$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.5.** *Let  $f : X \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$  be a proper strictly convex function on a reflexive Banach space  $X$  so that it is Gâteaux differentiable on  $\text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$  and is bounded on bounded subsets of  $\text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$ , and let  $C \subseteq \text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$  be a nonempty closed convex subset of  $X$ . Suppose  $T : C \rightarrow C$  is point-dependent  $\lambda$ -hybrid relative to  $D_f$  for some function  $\lambda : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and has a point  $x_0 \in C$  such that  $\{T^n(x_0)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded. Then,  $T$  is quasi-nonexpansive with respect to  $D_f$  and therefore,  $F(T)$  is a nonempty closed convex subset of  $C$ .*

*Proof.* In view of Theorem 3.2,  $F(T) \neq \emptyset$ . Now, for any  $v \in F(T)$  and any  $y \in C$ , as  $T$  is point-dependent  $\lambda$ -hybrid relative to  $D_f$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_f(v, Ty) &= D_f(Tv, Ty) \\ &\leq D_f(v, \gamma) + \lambda(y) \langle v - Tv, f'(y) - f'(Ty) \rangle \\ &= D_f(v, \gamma) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $y \in C$ , so  $T$  is quasi-nonexpansive with respect to  $D_f$  and hence,  $F(T)$  is a nonempty closed convex subset of  $C$  by Lemma 3.4.  $\square$

For the remainder of this section, we establish a common fixed point theorem for a commutative family of point-dependent  $\lambda$ -hybrid mappings relative to  $D_f$ .

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $X$  be a reflexive Banach space and let  $f : X \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$  be a l.s.c. strictly convex function so that it is Gâteaux differentiable on  $\text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$  and is bounded on bounded subsets of  $\text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$ . Suppose  $C \subseteq \text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$  is a nonempty bounded closed convex subset of  $X$  and  $\{T_1, T_2, \dots, T_N\}$  is a commutative finite family of point-dependent  $\lambda$ -hybrid mappings relative to  $D_f$  for some function  $\lambda : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  from  $C$  into itself. Then  $\{T_1, T_2, \dots, T_N\}$  has a common fixed point.*

*Proof.* We prove this lemma by induction with respect to  $N$ . To begin with, we deal with the case that  $N = 2$ . By Proposition 3.5, we see that  $F(T_1)$  and  $F(T_2)$  are nonempty bounded closed convex subsets of  $X$ . Moreover,  $F(T_1)$  is  $T_2$ -invariant. Indeed, for any  $v \in F(T_1)$ , it follows from  $T_1T_2 = T_2T_1$  that  $T_1T_2v = T_2T_1v = T_2v$ , which shows that  $T_2v \in F(T_1)$ . Consequently, the restriction of  $T_2$  to  $F(T_1)$  is point-dependent  $\lambda$ -hybrid relative to  $D_f$  and hence by Theorem 3.2,  $T_2$  has a fixed point  $u \in F(T_1)$ , that is,  $u \in F(T_1) \cap F(T_2)$ .

By induction hypothesis, assume that for some  $n \geq 2$ ,  $E = \bigcap_{k=1}^n F(T_k)$  is nonempty. Then,  $E$  is a nonempty closed convex subset of  $X$  and the restriction of  $T_{n+1}$  to  $E$  is a point-dependent  $\lambda$ -hybrid mapping relative to  $D_f$  from  $E$  into itself. By Theorem 3.2,  $T_{n+1}$  has a fixed point in  $X$ . This shows that  $E \cap F(T_{n+1}) \neq \emptyset$ , that is,  $\bigcap_{k=1}^{n+1} F(T_k) \neq \emptyset$ , completing the proof.  $\square$ .

**Theorem 3.7.** *Let  $X$  be a reflexive Banach space and let  $f : X \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$  be a l.s.c. strictly convex function so that it is Gâteaux differentiable on  $\text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$ . Suppose  $C \subseteq \text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$  is a nonempty bounded closed convex subset of  $X$  and  $\{T_i\}_{i \in I}$  is a commutative family of point-dependent  $\lambda$ -hybrid mappings relative to  $D_f$  for some function  $\lambda : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  from  $C$  into itself. Then,  $\{T_i\}_{i \in I}$  has a common fixed point.*

*Proof.* Since  $C$  is a nonempty bounded closed convex subset of the reflexive Banach space  $X$ , it is weakly compact. By Proposition 3.5, each  $F(T_i)$  is a nonempty weakly compact subset of  $C$ . Therefore, the conclusion follows once we note that  $\{F(T_i)\}_{i \in I}$  has the finite intersection property by Lemma 3.6.  $\square$ .

#### 4 Examples

In this section, we give some concrete examples for our fixed point theorem. At first, we need a lemma.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $h$  and  $k$  be two real numbers in  $[0, 1]$ . Then, the following two statements are true.*

- (a)  $(h^2 - k^2)^2 - (h - k)^2 \geq 0$ , if  $\frac{h+k}{2} > 0.5$ .
- (b)  $(h^2 - k^2)^2 - (h - k)^2 \leq 0$ , if  $\frac{h+k}{2} \leq 0.5$ .

*Proof.* First, we represent  $h$  and  $k$  by

$$h = 0.5 + a, \quad \text{where } -0.5 \leq a \leq 0.5,$$

and

$$k = 0.5 + b, \quad \text{where } -0.5 \leq b \leq 0.5.$$

Then, we have

$$(h^2 - k^2)^2 - (h - k)^2 = (a - b)^2(a + b)(a + b + 2).$$

If  $\frac{h+k}{2} > 0.5$ , then  $a + b > 0$ , and so through the above equation, we obtain that  $(h^2 - k^2)^2 - (h - k)^2 \geq 0$ . On the other hand,  $\frac{h+k}{2} \leq 0.5$  implies  $a + b \leq 0$ , and hence,  $(h^2 - k^2)^2 - (h - k)^2 \leq 0$ .

**Example 4.2.** Let  $C = \{x \in l^2(\mathbb{N}) : x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, \dots), 0 \leq x_i \leq 1 - \frac{1}{i+1}\}$  and  $\delta$  be a positive number so small that  $\sqrt{\delta} < 0.5$ . Define a mapping  $T : C \rightarrow C$  by

$$Tx = (Tx_1, Tx_2, \dots, Tx_n, \dots) : Tx_i = \begin{cases} x_i^2, & \text{if } \sqrt{\delta} < x_i \leq 1 - \frac{1}{i+1}; \\ \delta, & \text{if } \delta < x_i \leq \sqrt{\delta}; \\ x_i, & \text{if } 0 \leq x_i \leq \delta. \end{cases}$$

Then for any  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $T$  is not  $\lambda$ -hybrid. However, for each  $x \in C$ , if we let  $n_x = \min\{n : \sum_{i=n+1}^{\infty} x_i^2 \leq \delta^2\}$  and define  $\lambda : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\lambda(x) = \frac{1}{\left(\frac{1}{n_x+1} - \frac{1}{(n_x+1)^2}\right)^2},$$

then  $T$  is point-dependent  $\lambda$ -hybrid, that is,

$$\|Tx - Ty\|^2 \leq \|x - y\|^2 + \lambda(y) \langle x - Tx, y - Ty \rangle \tag{9}$$

for all  $x, y \in C$ . Therefore, we can apply Theorem 3.2 to conclude that  $T$  has a fixed point, while the Aoyama-Iemoto-Kohsaka-Takahashi fixed point theorem fails to give us the desired conclusion.

*Proof.* Let  $x$  and  $y$  be two elements from  $C$  so that the  $m^{\text{th}}$  coordinate of  $x$  is  $1 - \frac{1}{m+1}$  the  $m^{\text{th}}$  coordinate of  $y$  is 0.5 and the rest coordinates of  $x$  and  $y$  are zero. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|Tx - Ty\|^2 - \|x - y\|^2 - m \langle x - Tx, y - Ty \rangle \\ &= \left[ \left(1 - \frac{1}{m+1}\right)^2 - (0.5)^2 \right]^2 - \left[ \left(1 - \frac{1}{m+1}\right) - 0.5 \right]^2 \\ & \quad - m \left[ \left(1 - \frac{1}{m+1}\right) - \left(1 - \frac{1}{m+1}\right)^2 \right] [0.5 - (0.5)^2] \\ &= \frac{9}{16} - \frac{2}{m+1} + \frac{9}{2(m+1)^2} - \frac{4}{(m+1)^3} + \frac{1}{(m+1)^4} - \frac{m^2}{4(m+1)^2} \\ & \rightarrow \frac{5}{16} \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Since the value of above equality is always positive as  $m$  is large enough, we conclude that there is no constant  $\lambda$  to satisfy the inequality:



$$\|Tx - Ty\|^2 \leq \|x - y\|^2 + \lambda \langle x - Tx, y - Ty \rangle$$

for all  $x, y \in C$ .

It remains to show that  $T$  satisfies the inequality (9). We can rewrite the inequality as

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (Tx_i - Ty_i)^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (x_i - y_i)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda(y)(x_i - Tx_i)(y_i - Ty_i).$$

Thus, if we can show that for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$(Tx_i - Ty_i)^2 \leq (x_i - y_i)^2 + \lambda(y)(x_i - Tx_i)(y_i - Ty_i), \tag{10}$$

then the assertion follows. We prove inequality (10) holds for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  by considering the following two cases: (I)  $i > \min\{n_x, n_y\}$  and (II)  $i \leq \min\{n_x, n_y\}$ .

• Case (I).  $i > \min\{n_x, n_y\}$ .

In this case, at least one of  $x_i$  and  $y_i$  is less than or equal to  $\delta$ . Suppose that  $0 \leq x_i \leq \delta$ . There are three subcases to discuss.

(I-1): If  $\sqrt{\delta} < y_i \leq 1 - \frac{1}{i+1}$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} (Tx_i - Ty_i)^2 &= (x_i - y_i^2)^2 \leq (x_i - y_i)^2 \\ &\leq (x_i - y_i)^2 + \lambda(y)(x_i - Tx_i)(y_i - Ty_i). \end{aligned}$$

(I-2):  $\delta < y_i \leq \sqrt{\delta}$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} (Tx_i - Ty_i)^2 &= (x_i - \delta)^2 \leq (x_i - y_i)^2 \\ &\leq (x_i - y_i)^2 + \lambda(y)(x_i - Tx_i)(y_i - Ty_i). \end{aligned}$$

(I-3): If  $0 \leq y_i \leq \delta$ , then we have

$$(Tx_i - Ty_i)^2 = (x_i - y_i)^2 \leq (x_i - y_i)^2 + \lambda(y)(x_i - Tx_i)(y_i - Ty_i).$$

The case that  $0 \leq y_i \leq \delta$  can be proved in the same manner.

• Case (II).  $i \leq \min\{n_x, n_y\}$ .

In this case, there are 9 subcases to discuss.

(II-1):  $\sqrt{\delta} < x_i \leq 1 - \frac{1}{i+1}$  and  $\sqrt{\delta} < y_i \leq 1 - \frac{1}{i+1}$ .

If  $\frac{x_i+y_i}{2} \leq 0.5$ , it follows from Lemma 4.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} (Tx_i - Ty_i)^2 &= (x_i^2 - y_i^2)^2 \leq (x_i - y_i)^2 \\ &\leq (x_i - y_i)^2 + \lambda(y)(x_i - Tx_i)(y_i - Ty_i). \end{aligned}$$

If  $\frac{x_i+y_i}{2} > 0.5$ , then both  $x_i$  and  $y_i$  are greater than  $\frac{1}{i+1}$ , and so by considering the graph of the function  $g(z) = z - z^2$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ , which is symmetric to the line  $L : x = 0.5$ , we have

$$(x_i - x_i^2) \geq \left(\frac{1}{i+1}\right) - \left(\frac{1}{i+1}\right)^2 \geq \left(\frac{1}{n_y+1}\right) - \left(\frac{1}{n_y+1}\right)^2$$

and

$$(y_i - y_i^2) \geq \left(\frac{1}{i+1}\right) - \left(\frac{1}{i+1}\right)^2 \geq \left(\frac{1}{n_y+1}\right) - \left(\frac{1}{n_y+1}\right)^2.$$

Consequently, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (Tx_i - T\gamma_i)^2 &= (x_i^2 - \gamma_i^2)^2 \leq 1 \leq \frac{1}{\left(\frac{1}{n_y+1} - \frac{1}{(n_y+1)^2}\right)^2} (x_i - x_i^2)(\gamma_i - \gamma_i^2) \\ &\leq (x_i - \gamma_i)^2 + \lambda(\gamma)(x_i - Tx_i)(\gamma_i - T\gamma_i). \end{aligned}$$

(II-2):  $\delta < x_i \leq \sqrt{\delta}$  and  $\sqrt{\delta} < \gamma_i \leq 1 - \frac{1}{i+1}$ .

If  $\gamma_i \leq 0.5$ , then  $\frac{x_i+\gamma_i}{2} < 0.5$ . Thus, from Lemma 4.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (Tx_i - T\gamma_i)^2 &= (\delta - \gamma_i^2)^2 \leq (x_i^2 - \gamma_i^2)^2 \\ &\leq (x_i - \gamma_i)^2 \\ &\leq (x_i - \gamma_i)^2 + \lambda(\gamma)(x_i - Tx_i)(\gamma_i - T\gamma_i). \end{aligned}$$

If  $\gamma_i > 0.5$ , we have either

$$\delta < x_i \leq \delta + \left(\frac{1}{i+1}\right) - \left(\frac{1}{i+1}\right)^2$$

or

$$\delta + \left(\frac{1}{i+1}\right) - \left(\frac{1}{i+1}\right)^2 < x_i \leq \sqrt{\delta}.$$

When  $\delta < x_i \leq \delta + \left(\frac{1}{i+1}\right) - \left(\frac{1}{i+1}\right)^2$ , by considering the graph of the function  $g(z) = z - z^2$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ , we have

$$\gamma_i - \gamma_i^2 \geq \left(\frac{1}{i+1}\right) - \left(\frac{1}{i+1}\right)^2 \geq x_i - \delta.$$

and thus, we obtain

$$\gamma_i - x_i \geq \gamma_i^2 - \delta > 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} (Tx_i - T\gamma_i)^2 &= (\delta - \gamma_i^2)^2 \\ &\leq (x_i - \gamma_i)^2 \leq (x_i - \gamma_i)^2 + \lambda(\gamma)(x_i - Tx_i)(\gamma_i - T\gamma_i). \end{aligned}$$

When  $\delta + \left(\frac{1}{i+1}\right) - \left(\frac{1}{i+1}\right)^2 < x_i \leq \sqrt{\delta}$ , both of  $x_i - \delta$  and  $\gamma_i - \gamma_i^2$  are greater than  $\left(\frac{1}{i+1}\right) - \left(\frac{1}{i+1}\right)^2$  and thus also greater than  $\left(\frac{1}{n_y+1}\right) - \left(\frac{1}{n_y+1}\right)^2$ .

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} (Tx_i - T\gamma_i)^2 &= (\delta - \gamma_i^2)^2 \leq 1 \leq \frac{1}{\left(\frac{1}{n_y+1} - \frac{1}{(n_y+1)^2}\right)^2} (x_i - \delta)(\gamma_i - \gamma_i^2) \\ &\leq (x_i - \gamma_i)^2 + \lambda(\gamma)(x_i - Tx_i)(\gamma_i - T\gamma_i). \end{aligned}$$

Likely, we can prove the case:

(II-3):  $\sqrt{\delta} < x_i \leq 1 - \frac{1}{i+1}$  and  $\delta < \gamma_i \leq \sqrt{\delta}$ .

(II-4):  $0 \leq x_i \leq \delta$  and  $\sqrt{\delta} < \gamma_i \leq 1 - \frac{1}{i+1}$ .

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (Tx_i - Ty_i)^2 &= (x_i - y_i^2)^2 \leq (x_i - y_i)^2 \\ &\leq (x_i - y_i)^2 + \lambda(y)(x_i - Tx_i)(y_i - Ty_i). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can prove the case:

(II-5):  $\sqrt{\delta} < x_i \leq 1 - \frac{1}{i+1}$  and  $0 \leq y_i \leq \delta$ .

(II-6):  $\delta < x_i \leq \sqrt{\delta}$  and  $\delta < y_i \leq \sqrt{\delta}$ .

In this case, we have

$$(Tx_i - Ty_i)^2 = (\delta - \delta)^2 = 0 \leq (x_i - y_i)^2 + \lambda(y)(x_i - Tx_i)(y_i - Ty_i).$$

(II-7):  $0 \leq x_i \leq \delta$  and  $\delta < y_i \leq \sqrt{\delta}$ .

This case can be treated as (I-2).

(II-8):  $0 \leq x_i \leq \delta$  and  $0 \leq y_i \leq \delta$ .

This case can be treated as (I-3).

(II-9):  $\delta < x_i \leq \sqrt{\delta}$  and  $0 \leq y_i \leq \delta$ .

This case can be treated as (I-2).  $\square$

To end this section, we give another example which shows that the concept of a nonspreading mapping in the sense of (1.2) is generally different from that of a 2-hybrid mapping relative to some  $D_f$  in Hilbert spaces.

**Example 4.3.** Define  $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $f(x) = x^{10}$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , and define  $T: [0, 0.85] \rightarrow [0, 0.85]$  by  $Tx = x^2$  for all  $x \in [0, 0.85]$ . Then,  $T$  is neither nonexpansive nor nonspreading, but it is  $\lambda$ -hybrid relative to  $D_f$  for any  $\lambda \geq 0$ . Thus, we can apply Theorem 3.2 to conclude  $T$  has a fixed point, while both of the Browder Fixed Point Theorem and the Kohsaka-Takahashi fixed point theorem fail.

*Proof.* It is easy to check that  $T$  is not nonexpansive. As for not nonspreading, taking  $x = 0.85$  and  $y = 0.5$ , we have

$$\|Tx - Ty\|^2 = (x^2 - y^2)^2 = [(0.85)^2 - (0.5)^2]^2 = 0.22325625$$

while

$$\begin{aligned} &\|x - y\|^2 + 2 \langle x - Tx, y - Ty \rangle \\ &= (x - y)^2 + 2(x - x^2)(y - y^2) \\ &= (0.85 - 0.5)^2 + 2[0.85 - (0.85)^2][0.5 - (0.5)^2] = 0.18625. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $T$  is not nonspreading in the sense of (1.2). It remains to show that for any  $\lambda \geq 0$ ,  $T$  is  $\lambda$ -hybrid relative to  $D_f$ . Note at first that, for all  $\lambda \geq 0$  and for all  $x, y \in [0, 0.85]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda \langle x - Tx, f'(y) - f'(Ty) \rangle \\ &= \lambda(x - x^2) (10y^9 - 10y^{18}) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it suffices to prove that  $T$  is 0-hybrid relative to  $D_f$ , that is, to show that

$$D_f(Tx, Ty) - D_f(x, y) \leq 0, \quad \forall x, y \in [0, 0.85].$$

Fixed any  $x \in [0, 0.85]$ , let  $h(y) = D_f(T_x, T_y) - D_f(x, y)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} h(y) &= f(Tx) - f(Ty) - \langle Tx - Ty, f'(Ty) \rangle - [f(x) - f(y) - \langle x - y, f'(y) \rangle] \\ &= x^{20} + 9y^{20} - 10x^2y^{18} - x^{10} - 9y^{10} + 10xy^9. \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} h'(y) &= 180y^{19} - 180x^2y^{17} - 90y^9 + 90xy^8 \\ &= 90y^8(2y^{11} - 2x^2y^9 - y + x) \\ &= 90y^8[2y^9(y^2 - x^2) - (y - x)] \\ &= 90y^8[2y^9(y + x)(y - x) - (y - x)] \\ &= 90y^8(y - x)[2y^9(y + x) - 1]. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $y$  and  $x$  are in  $[0, 0.85]$ , one has

$$2y^9(y + x) - 1 < 2(0.85)^9(0.85 + 0.85) - 1 < 0,$$

and hence

$$h'(y) \begin{cases} \geq 0, & \text{if } y \leq x; \\ \leq 0, & \text{if } y > x. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, we know  $h(y) = 0$  if  $x = y$ . Therefore,  $h(y)$  is always less than or equal to zero and we have proved that  $D_f(Tx, Ty) - D_f(x, y) \leq 0$  for all  $x, y \in [0, 0.85]$ .  $\square$

## 5 Weak convergence theorems

In this section, we discuss the demiclosedness and the weak convergence problem of point-dependent  $\lambda$ -hybrid relative to  $D_f$ . We denote the weak convergence and strong convergence of a sequence  $\{x_n\}$  to  $v$  in a Banach space by  $x_n \rightharpoonup v$  and  $x_n \rightarrow v$ , respectively. For a nonempty closed convex subset  $C$  of a Banach space  $X$ , a mapping  $T : C \rightarrow X$  is demiclosed if for any sequence  $\{x_n\}$  in  $C$  with  $x_n \rightharpoonup v$  and  $x_n - Tx_n \rightarrow 0$ , one has  $Tv = v$ .

We first derive an Opial-like inequality for the Bregman distance. For the Opial's inequality, we refer readers to Lemma 1 of [11].

**Lemma 5.1.** *Suppose  $f : X \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$  is a proper strictly convex function so that it is Gâteaux differentiable on  $\text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$  in a Banach space  $X$  and  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence in  $\mathcal{D}$  such that  $x_n \rightharpoonup v$  for some  $v \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$ . Then*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_f(x_n, v) < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_f(x_n, \gamma), \quad \forall \gamma \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{D}) \text{ with } \gamma \neq v.$$

*Proof.* Since

$$\begin{aligned} &D_f(x_n, v) - D_f(x_n, \gamma) \\ &= f(x_n) - f(v) - \langle x_n - v, f'(v) \rangle - [f(x_n) - f(\gamma) - \langle x_n - \gamma, f'(\gamma) \rangle] \\ &= f(x_n) - f(v) - \langle x_n - v, f'(v) \rangle - f(x_n) + f(\gamma) + \langle x_n - \gamma, f'(\gamma) \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle x_n - v, f'(\gamma) \rangle - \langle x_n - v, f'(v) \rangle \\ &= - [f(v) - f(\gamma) - \langle v - \gamma, f'(\gamma) \rangle] + \langle x_n - v, f'(\gamma) - f'(v) \rangle \\ &= - D_f(v, \gamma) + \langle x_n - v, f'(\gamma) - f'(v) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

and  $x_n \rightarrow v$ , we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [D_f(x_n, v) - D_f(x_n, \gamma)] = -D_f(v, \gamma).$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_f(x_n, v) &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} [(D_f(x_n, v) - D_f(x_n, \gamma)) + D_f(x_n, \gamma)] \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (D_f(x_n, v) - D_f(x_n, \gamma)) + \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_f(x_n, \gamma) \\ &= -D_f(v, \gamma) + \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_f(x_n, \gamma), \end{aligned}$$

and hence in view of  $D_f(v, \gamma) > 0$  for  $\gamma \neq v$  we obtain

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_f(x_n, v) < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_f(x_n, \gamma).$$

□

**Proposition 5.2.** *Let  $f : X \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$  be a strictly convex function so that it is Gâteaux differentiable on  $\text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$  and is bounded on bounded subsets of  $\text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$ . Suppose  $C$  is a closed convex subset of  $\text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$  and  $T : C \rightarrow C$  is point-dependent  $\lambda$ -hybrid relative to  $D_f$  for some  $\lambda : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Then  $T$  is demiclosed.*

*Proof.* Let  $\{x_n\}$  be any sequence in  $C$  with  $x_n \rightarrow v$  and  $x_n - Tx_n \rightarrow 0$ . We have to show that  $Tv = v$ . Since  $f$  is bounded on bounded subsets, by Proposition 1.1.11 of [9] there exists a constant  $M > 0$  such that

$$\max\{\sup\{\|f'(x_n)\| : n \in \mathbb{N}\}, \|\lambda(v)\|, \|f'(Tv)\|, \|f'(v)\|\} \leq M.$$

Rewrite  $D_f(x_n, Tv)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} D_f(x_n, Tv) &= f(x_n) - f(Tv) - \langle x_n - Tv, f'(Tv) \rangle \\ &= f(x_n) + f(Tx_n) - f(Tx_n) - f(Tv) - \langle x_n - Tv, f'(Tv) \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle Tx_n - Tv, f'(Tv) \rangle - \langle Tx_n - Tv, f'(Tv) \rangle \\ &= [f(Tx_n) - f(Tv) - \langle Tx_n - Tv, f'(Tv) \rangle] + f(x_n) - f(Tx_n) \\ &\quad + \langle Tx_n - x_n, f'(Tv) \rangle \\ &= D_f(Tx_n, Tv) + f(x_n) - f(Tx_n) + \langle Tx_n - x_n, f'(Tv) \rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Noting  $f(x_n) - f(Tx_n) \leq \langle x_n - Tx_n, f'(x_n) \rangle$  and  $T$  is point-dependent  $\lambda$ -hybrid relative to  $D_f$  we have from (11) that

$$\begin{aligned} D_f(x_n, Tv) &\leq D_f(Tx_n, Tv) + \langle x_n - Tx_n, f'(x_n) \rangle - \langle x_n - Tx_n, f'(Tv) \rangle \\ &\leq D_f(x_n, v) + \lambda(v) \langle x_n - Tx_n, f'(v) - f'(Tv) \rangle + \langle x_n - Tx_n, f'(x_n) - f'(Tv) \rangle \\ &\leq D_f(x_n, v) + [|\lambda(v)|(\|f'(v)\| + \|f'(Tv)\|) + (\|f'(x_n)\| + \|f'(Tv)\|)] \|x_n - Tx_n\| \\ &\leq D_f(x_n, v) + 2M(M + 1) \|x_n - Tx_n\|. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

If  $Tv \neq v$ , then Lemma 5.1 and (12) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} &\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_f(x_n, v) \\ &< \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_f(x_n, Tv) \\ &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} [D_f(x_n, v) + 2M(M + 1) \|x_n - Tx_n\|] = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_f(x_n, v), \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. This completes the proof.  $\square$

A mapping  $T : C \rightarrow C$  is said to be asymptotically regular if, for any  $x \in C$ , the sequence  $\{T^{n+1}x - T^n x\}$  tends to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Theorem 5.3.** *Suppose the following conditions hold:*

(5.3.1)  $f : X \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$  is l.s.c. uniformly convex function so that it is Gâteaux differentiable on  $\text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$  and is bounded on bounded subsets of  $\text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$  in a reflexive Banach space  $X$ .

(5.3.2)  $C \subseteq \text{Int}(\mathcal{D})$  is a closed convex subset of  $X$ .

(5.3.3)  $T : C \rightarrow C$  is point-dependent  $\lambda$ -hybrid relative to  $D_f$  for some  $\lambda : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and is asymptotically regular with a bounded sequence  $\{T^n x_0\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  for some  $x_0 \in C$ .

(5.3.4) The mapping  $x \rightarrow f(x)$  for  $x \in X$  is weak-to-weak\* continuous.

Then for any  $x \in C$ ,  $\{T^n x\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is weakly convergent to an element  $v \in F(T)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $v \in F(T)$  and  $x \in C$ . If  $\{T^n x\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is not bounded, then there is a subsequence  $\{T^{n_i} x\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $\|v - T^{n_i} x\| \geq 1$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\|v - T^{n_i} x\| \rightarrow \infty$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . From (5.3.3), for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_f(v, T^{n+1}x) &= D_f(Tv, T^{n+1}x) \\ &\leq D_f(v, T^n x) + \lambda(T^n x) \{v - Tv, f'(T^n x) - f'(T^{n+1}x)\} = D_f(v, T^n x) \\ &\leq D_f(v, x), \end{aligned}$$

which in conjunction with (3), (4), and (6) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} D_f(v, x) &\geq D_f(v, T^{n_i} x) \geq v_f(T^{n_i} x, \|v - T^{n_i} x\|) \\ &\geq \|v - T^{n_i} x\| v_f(T^{n_i} x, 1) \\ &\geq \|v - T^{n_i} x\| \delta_f(1) \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{as } i \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. Therefore, for any  $x \in X$ ,  $\{T^n x\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded, and so it has a subsequence  $\{T^{n_j} x\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  which is weakly convergent to  $w$  for some  $w \in C$ . As  $T^{n_j} x - T^{n_j+1} x \rightarrow 0$ , it follows from the demiclosedness of  $T$  that  $w \in F(T)$ . It remains to show that  $T^n x \rightarrow w$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Let  $\{T^{n_k} x\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  be any subsequence of  $\{T^n x\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  so that  $T^{n_k} x \rightarrow u$  for some  $u \in C$ . Then  $u \in F(T)$ . Since both of  $\{D_f(w, T^n x)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\{D_f(u, T^n x)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  are decreasing, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [D_f(w, T^n x) - D_f(u, T^n x)] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [f(w) - f(u) - \langle w - u, f'(T^n x) \rangle] = a$$

for some  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ . Particularly, from (5.3.4) we obtain

$$a = \lim_{n_j \rightarrow \infty} [f(w) - f(u) - \langle w - u, f'(T^{n_j} x) \rangle] = f(w) - f(u) - \langle w - u, f'(w) \rangle$$

and

$$a = \lim_{n_k \rightarrow \infty} [f(w) - f(u) - \langle w - u, f'(T^{n_k} x) \rangle] = f(w) - f(u) - \langle w - u, f'(u) \rangle.$$

Consequently,  $\langle w - u, f'(w) - f'(u) \rangle = 0$ , and hence  $w = u$  by the strict convexity of  $f$ . This shows that  $T^n x \rightarrow w$  for some  $w \in F(T)$ .  $\square$

Adopting the technique of [8], we have the following ergodic theorem for point-dependent  $\lambda$ -hybrid mappings in Hilbert spaces.

**Theorem 5.4.** *Suppose*

(5.4.1)  *$C$  is nonempty closed convex subset of a Hilbert space  $H$ .*

(5.4.2)  *$T : C \rightarrow C$  is a point-dependent  $\lambda$ -hybrid mapping for some function  $\lambda : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , that is,*

$$\|Tx - Ty\|^2 \leq \|x - y\|^2 + \lambda(y)\langle x - Tx, y - Ty \rangle, \quad \forall x, y \in C.$$

(5.4.3)  *$F(T) \neq \emptyset$ .*

*Then for any  $x \in C$ , the sequence  $\{S_n(x)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  defined by*

$$S_n(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} T^k x$$

*converges weakly to some point  $v \in F(T)$ .*

**Author details**

<sup>1</sup>Center for General Education, Southern Taiwan University, 1 Nantai St., Yongkang Dist., Tainan 71005, Taiwan

<sup>2</sup>Nanjeon Institute of Technology, 178 Chaoqin Rd., Yenshui Dist., Tainan 73746, Taiwan <sup>3</sup>Fooyin University, 151 Jinxue

Rd., Daliiao Dist., Kaohsiung 83102, Taiwan <sup>4</sup>Department of Industrial Management, National Pingtung University of Science and Technology, 1 Shuefu Rd., Neopu, Pingtung 91201, Taiwan

**Authors' contributions**

All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

**Competing interests**

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Received: 25 August 2011 Accepted: 23 December 2011 Published: 23 December 2011

**References**

1. Browder, FE: Fixed point theorems for noncompact mappings in a Hilbert space. *Proc Nat Acad Sci USA*. **53**, 1272–1276 (1965). doi:10.1073/pnas.53.6.1272
2. Goebel, K, Kirk, WA: *Topics in Metric Fixed Point Theory*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge **28** (1990)
3. Iemoto, S, Takahashi, W: Approximating common fixed points of nonexpansive mappings and nonspreading mappings in a Hilbert space. *Nonlinear Anal.* **71**, 2082–2089 (2009). doi:10.1016/j.na.2009.03.064
4. Kohsaka, F, Takahashi, W: Fixed point theorems for a class of nonlinear mappings related to maximal monotone operators in Banach spaces. *Arch Math.* **91**, 166–177 (2008). doi:10.1007/s00013-008-2545-8
5. Takahashi, W, Yao, JC: Fixed point theorems and ergodic theorems for nonlinear mappings in Hilbert spaces. *Taiwanese J Math.* **15**, 457–472 (2011)
6. Kocourek, P, Takahashi, W, Yao, JC: Fixed point theorems and weak convergence theorems for generalized hybrid mappings in Hilbert spaces. *Taiwanese J Math.* **14**, 2497–2511 (2010)
7. Takahashi, W: Fixed point theorems for new nonlinear mappings in a Hilbert space. *J Nonlinear Convex Anal.* **11**, 79–88 (2010)
8. Aoyama, K, Iemoto, S, Kohsaka, F, Takahashi, W: Fixed point and ergodic theorems for  $\lambda$ -hybrid mappings in Hilbert spaces. *J Nonlinear Convex Anal.* **11**, 335–343 (2010)
9. Butnariu, D, Iusem, AN: *Totally Convex Functions for Fixed Points Computation and Infinite Dimensional Optimization*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, The Netherlands (2000)
10. Ciorănescu, I: *Geometry of Banach Spaces, Duality Mappings and Nonlinear Problems*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, The Netherlands (1990)
11. Opial, Z: Weak convergence of the sequence of successive approximations for nonexpansive mappings. *Bull Amer Math Soc.* **73**, 591–597 (1967). doi:10.1090/S0002-9904-1967-11761-0

doi:10.1186/1687-1812-2011-105

**Cite this article as:** Huang et al.: Fixed point and weak convergence theorems for point-dependent  $\lambda$ -hybrid mappings in Banach spaces. *Fixed Point Theory and Applications* 2011 **2011**:105.