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ABSTRACT. We give a common fixed point existence theorem for any sequence of commuting $k$-uniformly Lipschitzian mappings (eventually, for $k = 1$ for any sequence of commuting nonexpansive mappings) defined on a bounded and complete metric space $(X, d)$ with uniform normal structure. After that we deduce, by using the Kulesza and Lim (1996), that this result can be generalized to any family of commuting $k$-uniformly Lipschitzian mappings.
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1. Introduction. In classical theorems concerning the existence of fixed points for family of mappings, such as the Kakutani theorem [4] and its well-known generalization due to Ryll-Nardzewski [13], the mappings of the family are usually assumed to be linear, or at least to be weakly continuous and affine [11]. In the nonlinear theory, a stronger geometric structure is required. In particular for a family of nonexpansive mappings, Khamsi proved in [7] that any family of nonexpansive mappings defined on a metric space $(X, d)$ with compact and normal convexity structure $\mathcal{F}$, has a common fixed point. In his proof, Khamsi investigated the concept of 1-local retract. In this paper, we prove that any sequential family of $k$-uniformly Lipschitzian mappings defined on a bounded metric space with a uniform normal convexity structure $\mathcal{F}$ with constant $\beta$, which contains all closed ball of $(X, d)$, has a common fixed point provided that $k^2 \beta < 1$. Recall that any nonexpansive mapping defined on a bounded complete metric space with uniform normal structure with constant $\beta$ has a nonempty fixed point set (Khamsi [6]). For more details on fixed point theory for nonexpansive and $k$-uniformly Lipschitzian mappings in metric spaces we refer the reader to [1, 2, 3].

2. Definitions and preliminaries. In this work, $(X, d)$ will be a metric space. We use $B(x, r)$ to denote the closed ball centered at $x \in X$ with radius $r > 0$. For a subset $A$ of $X$, we write

$$
\begin{align*}
  r_x(A) &= \sup_{y \in A} d(x, y), \\
  r(A) &= \inf_{x \in A} r_x(A), \\
  \delta(A) &= \sup_{x \in A} r_x(A), \\
  \text{cov}(A) &= \bigcap_{B \in \mathcal{F}} B,
\end{align*}
$$

(2.1)

where $\mathcal{F}$ is the family of closed balls containing $A$. A subset $A$ of $X$ is said to be
admissible if and only if $A = \text{cov}(A)$. In other words, $A$ is admissible if it is an intersection of a family of closed balls centered in $X$.

**Definition 2.1.** Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a nonempty family of a subset of $X$. We say that $\mathcal{F}$ defines a convexity structure on $X$ if and only if it is stable by intersection.

In this work, we always assume that $\mathcal{F}$ contains the balls. Also we denote by $\mathcal{A}(X)$ the smallest convexity structure on $X$.

**Definition 2.2.** We say that $\mathcal{F}$ has the property $(R)$ if and only if any decreasing sequence $(X_n)_n$ of nonempty bounded closed subsets of $X$ with $X_n \in \mathcal{F}$ has a nonempty intersection.

**Definition 2.3.** (i) We say that $X$ has uniform normal structure if and only if $r(A) \leq \beta \delta(A)$ for some $0 < \beta < 1$ and for every $A \in \mathcal{F}$.

(ii) We say that $\mathcal{F}$ is normal if and only if $r(A) < \delta(A)$ for every $A \in \mathcal{F}$.

Let us recall that a self mapping $T : X \to X$ is said to be $k$-uniformly Lipschitzian if there exists a $k > 0$ such that

$$d(T^i x, T^i y) \leq kd(x, y)$$

(2.2)

for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $x, y$ in $X$. A 1-uniformly Lipschitzian map is called nonexpansive. For such class of mappings we recall the following most important result.

**Theorem 2.4** (see [6]). *Let $(X,d)$ be a complete bounded metric space. Assume that $X$ has uniform normal structure. Then any nonexpansive mapping defined on $X$ has a fixed point.*

In [7], Khamsi gave the definition and a characterization of a 1-local retract subset of a metric space.

**Definition 2.5.** A subset $A$ is said to be a $k$-local retract if for any family $(B_i)_i$ of closed balls centered in $A$ such that $\cap_{i \in I} B(x_i, r_i) \neq \emptyset$, we have $A \cap \cap_{i \in I} B(x_i, kr_i) \neq \emptyset$.

It is immediate that uniform normal structure is not hereditary. However, for 1-local retract subsets we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let $(X,d)$ be a metric space. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}(X)$ is a uniform normal convexity structure with constant $\beta < 1$. If $Y$ is a 1-local retract subset of $X$, then $\mathcal{A}(Y)$ is a uniform normal structure with the same constant $\beta$.*

The proof is based on the next lemma.

**Lemma 2.7** (see [7]). *Let $(X,d)$ be a metric space and $A$ a nonempty bounded subset of $X$. Then

1. $\text{cov}(A) = \cap_{x \in A} B(x, r_x(A))$.
2. $r_x(A) = r_x(\text{cov} A)$ for every $x$ in $X$.
3. $\delta(A) = \delta(\text{cov} A)$.
4. $r(\text{cov} A) \leq r(A)$.
5. If $(X,d)$ has the $(n,\infty)$ property and is convex, then $\delta(A)/2 \leq r(\text{cov} A) \leq ((n-1)/n) \delta(A)$.*
Recall that \((X, d)\) is said to have the \((n, \infty)\) property if for any family \((B_i)_{i \in I}\) of closed balls of \(X\) such that \(\cap_{i \in J} B_i \neq \emptyset\) for any finite subfamily \(J\) of \(I\) with \(\text{card}(J)\) less than \(n\), we have \(\cap_{i \in I} B_i \neq \emptyset\).

A metric space \((X, d)\) is said to be convex if for all \(x, y \in X\) and \(\alpha \in [0, 1]\) there exists a \(z \in X\) such that
\[
 d(z, x) = \alpha d(x, y), \quad d(z, y) = (1 - \alpha) d(x, y). \tag{2.3}
\]

**Proof of Lemma 2.6.** We assume that \(A\) is not a singleton. By (4) of Lemma 2.7, we have \(r(\text{cov}A) \leq r(A)\). Since \(A \in \mathcal{A}(Y)\), then \(A = \cap_{i \in I} B(x_i, r_i) \cap Y\) with \(x_i \in Y\). Hence \(\text{cov}A \subseteq \cap_{i \in I} B(x_i, r_i)\). Let \(z \in \text{cov}(A)\) and define \(r = r_z(A)\), then \(z \in B = \cap_{x \in A} B(x, r) \cap \cap_{i \in I} B(x_i, r_i)\) is in \(\mathcal{A}(X)\). Since \(Y\) is a 1-local retract of \(X\) then \(B \cap Y \neq \emptyset\). Let \(w \in B \cap Y\), so \(w \in A = \cap_{i \in I} B(x_i, r_i) \cap Y\) and \(w \in \cap_{x \in A} B(x, r)\). We deduce that \(r_w(A) \leq r\). Hence \(r(A) \leq r = r_z(A)\).

Since \(z\) is arbitrary in \(\text{cov}(A)\) we obtain from (2.1) that \(r(A) \leq r(\text{cov}(A))\). But \(\text{cov}(A) \in \mathcal{A}(X)\) which is uniform normal, then
\[
 r(A) \leq r(\text{cov}(A)) \leq \beta \delta(\text{cov}(A)) = \beta \delta(A) \tag{2.4}
\]
from property (4) of Lemma 2.7. \(\square\)

3. Fixed points for \(k\)-uniformly Lipschitzian mappings. In the next theorem, we obtain fixed point theorem for \(k\)-uniformly Lipschitzian mapping by utilizing the existence theorem of nonexpansive mapping [7]. To our knowledge this connection has not been utilized. Moreover, Theorem 3.1 contains the result of Theorem 2.4.

**Theorem 3.1.** Let \((X, d)\) be a complete bounded metric space. Assume that \(X\) has a uniform normal structure with constant \(\beta < 1\). Then any \(k\)-uniformly Lipschitzian mapping \(T : X \to X\) has a fixed point if \(k^2 \beta < 1\).

**Proof.** First we need the following two lemmas.

**Lemma 3.2.** Under the same hypothesis as Theorem 3.1, and for \(T : X \to X\) \(k\)-uniformly Lipschitzian, let
\[
 d'(x, y) = \sup_{i=0,1,...} d(T^i x, T^i y). \tag{3.1}
\]

Then
1. \((X, d')\) is a bounded complete metric space.
2. \(T\) is \(d'\)-nonexpansive, that is,
\[
 d'(T x, T y) \leq d'(x, y) \quad \forall x, y \in X. \tag{3.2}
\]

**Lemma 3.3.** Under the same hypothesis as Theorem 3.1, and for \(T : X \to X\) \(k\)-uniformly Lipschitzian, the family of all admissible subsets of \((X, d')\) is a uniform normal convexity structure with constant \(c\) \((c \leq k^2 \beta)\).
Proof of Lemma 3.2. (1-1) $d'$ is a metric on $X$. Indeed

(1-1-a) For every $x, y$ in $X$, we have $d'(x, y) = 0$ is equivalent to $d(T^i x, T^i y) = 0$ for every $i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$.

Specifically for $i = 0$, it implies that $d(x, y) = 0$. Since $d$ is a metric on $X$, then $x = y$.

(1-1-b) For every $i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$, and every $x, y, z$ in $X$, we have

$$d(T^i x, T^i y) \leq d(T^i x, T^i z) + d(T^i z, T^i y),$$

(3.3) since $d$ is a metric on $X$.

By passing to the supremum on $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we obtain that

$$d'(x, y) \leq d'(x, z) + d'(z, y).$$

(3.4)

(1-1-c) It is immediate that $d'(x, y) = d'(y, x)$ for all $x, y$ in $X$.

(1-2) Since $T$ is $k$-uniformly Lipschitzian on $X$, and by definition of $d'$, we have the inequality

$$d(x, y) \leq d'(x, y) \leq kd(x, y)$$

(3.5) for all $x, y$ in $X$. It follows from this inequality that $(X, d')$ is a bounded complete metric space since $(X, d)$ is.

Proof of Lemma 3.3. Let $A$ be an admissible subset for $d'$, then

$$A = \bigcap_{x \in X} B'(x, r_x'(A)) \subset \operatorname{cov}(A) = \bigcap_{x \in X} B(x, r_x(A)).$$

(3.7)

On the other hand, it follows from the definition of $d'$ that

$$d(z, y) \leq d'(z, y) \leq kd(z, y) \quad \forall z, y \in X.$$  

(3.8)

Hence

$$r_z'(A) \leq kr_z(A) \quad \forall z \in X.$$  

(3.9)

By passing in (3.9) to the infimum on $z \in \bigcap_{x \in X} B'(x, r_x'(A))$, we get

$$\inf_{z \in \bigcap_{x \in X} B'(x, r_x'(A))} r_z'(A) \leq k \inf_{z \in \bigcap_{x \in X} B'(x, r_x'(A))} r_z(A),$$

(3.10)

which implies that

$$r'(A) = \{ \inf_{z \in A} r_z'(A) \mid z \in A = \bigcap_{x \in X} B'(x, r_x'(A)) \} \leq k \{ \inf_{z \in A} r_z(A) \mid z \in \bigcap_{x \in X} B'(x, r_x'(A)) \} \leq k \inf_{z \in A} \left\{ \sup_{x \in A} d(z, x) \mid d(z, x) \leq \frac{r_x(A)}{k} \right\} \leq k \inf_{z \in A} \left\{ k \sup_{x \in A} d(z, x) \mid d(z, x) \leq r_x(A) \right\}$$

(3.11)
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since
\[ \cap_{x \in X} B\left(x, \frac{r_x(A)}{k}\right) \subset \cap_{x \in X} B'(x, r'_x(A)). \] 
(3.12)

Therefore
\[ r'(A) \leq k^2 r(\text{cov}(A)) \leq k^2 \beta \delta(\text{cov}(A)) = k^2 \beta \delta(A) \leq k^2 \beta \delta'(A). \] 
(3.13)

**Proof of Theorem 3.1.** It follows immediately from Theorem 2.4, property (2) of Lemma 3.2, and Lemma 3.3.

By Theorem 3.1, we have \( \text{Fix}(T) \neq \emptyset \) for every \( k \)-uniformly Lipschitzian mapping \( T \) defined on a bounded complete metric space \( (X,d) \) with uniform normal convexity structure \( \mathcal{F} \) with constant \( \beta \leq 1/k^2 \). Moreover, \( \text{Fix}(T) \) is a \( k \)-local retract of \( X \), that is, for every closed ball \( B(x_i, r_i) \), we have
\[ \cap_{i \in I} B(x_i, r_i) \neq \emptyset \implies \cap_{i \in I} B(x_i, kr_i) \cap \text{Fix}(T) \neq \emptyset. \] 
(3.14)

Now we are able to show the following.

**Theorem 3.4.** Let \( T_n : X \to X; n = 0,1,2,... \) be a family of commuting \( k \)-uniformly Lipschitzian mappings. Suppose that \( X \) has a uniform normal convexity structure \( \mathcal{F} \) with constant \( \beta \leq 1/k^2 \). Then \( \cap_{n \in N} \text{Fix}(T_n) \neq \emptyset \) and is a \( k \)-local retract of \( X \).

**Proof of Theorem 3.4.** The first part of the theorem follows immediately from Theorem 3.1. For the second part, let \( (B_i)_{i \in I} \) be a family of closed balls centered in \( \cap_{n \in N} \text{Fix}(T_n) \) such that \( (B_i)_{i \in I} \neq \emptyset \).

We have
\[ B_d(x_i, r_i) \subset B_{d'}(x_i, kr_i) \subset B_d(x_i, kr_i). \] 
(3.15)

Hence
\[ \cap_{i \in I} B_{d'}(x_i, kr_i) \neq \emptyset, \] 
(3.16)

and since \( (T_n) \) are nonexpansive mappings on \( (X,d') \), it follows from Theorem 3.1 that
\[ \cap_{n \in N} \text{Fix}(T_n) \cap \cap_{i \in I} B_{d'}(x_i, kr_i) \neq \emptyset, \] 
(3.17)

which implies that
\[ \emptyset \neq \cap_{n \in N} \text{Fix}(T_n) \cap \cap_{i \in I} B_{d'}(x_i, kr_i) \neq \emptyset. \] 
(3.18)

The problem of whether the conclusion of Theorem 3.4 holds for any commuting family \( (T_i)_{i \in I} \) of \( k \)-uniformly Lipschitzian mappings \( (k > 1) \) was open for several years. However, by using the result of Lim and Kulesza [8] in which they show that weak compactness and weak countably compactness are equivalent, if the metric space has normal structure, we prove the following.
Theorem 3.5. Let \((X,d)\) be a bounded complete metric space with a uniform normal convexity structure \((\beta < 1)\). Then any commuting family \(T_i : X \to X, i \in I\) of \(k\)-uniformly Lipschitzian mappings has a common fixed point provided that \(k^2 \beta < 1\).

Proof. Since \((X,d')\) has uniform normal structure with constant \(c (c < k^2 \beta)\), then by the well-known theorem of Khamsi [6], \(\mathcal{A}(X,d')\) is countably compact.

Hence by the Lim and Kulesza result, it follows that \(\mathcal{A}(X,d')\) is in fact compact. On the other hand, since each \(T_i, i \in I\) is \(d'\)-nonexpansive (Lemma 3.3), it follows that the result of Theorem 3.4 is a direct consequence of Khamsi’s theorem in which he shows that any commuting family of nonexpansive mappings defined on a bounded metric space for which \(\mathcal{A}(X,d')\) is compact and normal, has a common fixed point.

4. Applications. It was proved by Nachbin [10] and Kelley [5] that all Banach spaces which have the \((2, \infty)\) property are those of form \(C(E)\), where \(E\) is a compact Stonian, for example \(l_\infty\) and \(L_\infty\). Then by Theorem 3.5 and property (5) of Lemma 2.7, we have the following.

Corollary 4.1. The unit balls of \(l_\infty\), \(L_\infty\), and \(C(E)\), where \(E\) is a compact Stonian have the common fixed point property for every commuting family \(T_i : X \to X, i \in I\) of \(k\)-uniformly Lipschitzian mappings provided that \(k < \sqrt{2}\).

Lindenstrauss [9] has proved that \(l_1\) has a \((3, \infty)\) property.

Corollary 4.2. The unit ball of \(l_1\) has the common fixed point property for every commuting family \(T_i : X \to X, i \in I\) of \(k\)-uniformly Lipschitzian mappings provided that \(k < \sqrt{3/2}\).

Also, we deduce from Theorem 3.5 and property (5) of Lemma 2.7, the following corollary.

Corollary 4.3. If \((X,d)\) is a Banach space with the \((n, \infty)\) property, and if \(k < \sqrt{n/(n-1)}\), then its unit ball has the common fixed point property for every commuting family \(T_i : X \to X, i \in I\) of \(k\)-uniformly Lipschitzian mappings.

More recently, Prus [12] has proved that all Banach spaces \(L_p\) \((1 < p < +\infty)\) have uniform normal structure with constant \(\beta = (\min(2^{1/p}, 2^{1/q}))^{-1}\), where \(q = p(p-1)^{-1}\) is the conjugate of \(p\).

Hence, we have the following.

Corollary 4.4. The unit balls of \(L_p\) have the common fixed point property for every commuting family \(T_i : X \to X, i \in I\) of \(k\)-uniformly Lipschitzian mappings provided that \(k < \sqrt{\min(2^{1/p}, 2^{1/q})}\).

Now we recall the definition of the most geometrical characterization of \(l_\infty\), \(L_\infty\), and \(C(E)\), where \(E\) is a compact Stonian.
**Definition 4.5.** A metric space \((X,d)\) is said to be hyperconvex if and only if any family \(\{B(x_i,r_i), i \in I\}\) of closed balls of \((X,d)\) such that

\[
d(x_i,x_j) \leq r_i + r_j
\]

for every \(i, j \in I\), has a nonempty intersection.

**Remarks.** (1) Every hyperconvex metric space is complete, and if \(A\) is an admissible subset of \((X,d)\), then also \((A,d)\) is a hyperconvex metric space (see [2]).

(2) Every hyperconvex space is convex. Indeed:

For all \(x,y\) in \(X\) and for any \(\alpha \in [0,1]\), let \(u,v\) in \(X\). We have

\[
\alpha[d(x,u) + d(x,v)] + (1-\alpha)[d(y,u) + d(y,v)] \geq d(u,v).
\]

The hyperconvexity of \((X,d)\) implies that

\[
\cap_{u \in X} B(u, \alpha d(x,u) + (1-\alpha)d(y,u)) \neq \emptyset.
\]

Hence, for every \(x,y\) in \(X\) and for every \(\alpha \in [0,1]\), there exists a \(z \in X\) such that

\[
z \in \cap_{u \in X} B(u, \alpha d(x,u) + (1-\alpha)d(y,u));
\]

that is,

\[
d(u,z) \leq \alpha d(x,u) + (1-\alpha)d(y,u) \quad \forall u \in X.
\]

Therefore

\[
d(x,z) = (1-\alpha)d(x,y), \quad d(y,z) = \alpha d(x,y).
\]

Also by Theorem 3.5 and property (5) of Lemma 2.7, we obtain the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.6.** Let \((X,d)\) be a bounded hyperconvex metric space. Then any family of commuting \(k\)-uniformly Lipschitzian mappings defined on \(X\) has a common fixed point if \(k < \sqrt{2}\).

**Proof.** \((X,d)\) is a bounded hyperconvex metric space. Then from the above remarks, it is complete. Let us prove that \((X,d)\) has the \((2,\infty)\) property. Indeed:

Let \(\{B(x_i,r_i), i \in I\}\) be a family of closed balls of \((X,d)\), such that

\[
B(x_i,r_i) \cap B(x_j,r_j) = \emptyset \quad \forall i,j \in I \quad (i \neq j).
\]

Then we have

\[
d(x_i,x_j) \leq d(x_i,x) + d(x_j,x) \leq r_i + r_j,
\]

where \(x \in B(x_i,r_i) \cap B(x_j,r_j)\).

The hyperconvexity of \((X,d)\) implies that \(\cap_{i \in I} B(x_i,r_i) \neq \emptyset\). Then \((X,d)\) is a convex metric space with the \((2,\infty)\) property. Therefore, by property (5) of Lemma 2.7, \(\mathcal{d}(X)\) is a uniform convexity structure with constant \(\beta = 1/2\). Hence, Theorem 3.5 completes the proof.

\(\square\)
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