Research Article

On a Conjecture for a Higher-Order Rational Difference Equation

Maoxin Liao,[1,2] Xianhua Tang,[1] and Changjin Xu[1,3]

[1] *School of Mathematical Sciences and Computing Technology, Central South University, Changsha, Hunan 410083, China*

[2] *School of Mathematics and Physics, University of South China, Hengyang, Hunan 421001, China*

[3] *College of Science, Hunan Institute of Engineering, Xiangtan, Hunan 411104, China*

Correspondence should be addressed to Maoxin Liao, maoxinliao@163.com

This paper studies the global asymptotic stability for positive solutions to the higher order rational difference equation $x_n = (\prod_{j=1}^{m}(x_{n-k_j}+1) + \prod_{j=1}^{m}(x_{n-k_j}-1))/(\prod_{j=1}^{m}(x_{n-k_j}+1) - \prod_{j=1}^{m}(x_{n-k_j}-1))$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$, where m is odd and $x_{-k_m}, x_{-k_m+1}, \ldots, x_{-1} \in (0, \infty)$. Our main result generalizes several others in the recent literature and confirms a conjecture by Berenhaut et al., 2007.

1. Introduction

In 2007, Berenhaut et al. [1] proved that every solution of the following rational difference equation

$$x_n = \frac{x_{n-k} + x_{n-m}}{1 + x_{n-k}x_{n-m}}, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \tag{1.1}$$

converges to its unique equilibrium 1, where $x_{-m}, x_{-m+1}, \ldots, x_{-1} \in (0, \infty)$ and $1 \leq k < m$. Based on this fact, they put forward the following two conjectures.

Conjecture 1.1. *Suppose that $1 \leq k < l < m$ and that $\{x_n\}$ satisfies*

$$x_n = \frac{x_{n-k} + x_{n-l} + x_{n-m} + x_{n-k}x_{n-l}x_{n-m}}{1 + x_{n-k}x_{n-l} + x_{n-l}x_{n-m} + x_{n-m}x_{n-k}}, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \tag{1.2}$$

with $x_{-m}, x_{-m+1}, \ldots, x_{-1} \in (0, \infty)$. Then, the sequence $\{x_n\}$ converges to the unique equilibrium 1.

Conjecture 1.2. *Suppose that m is odd and $1 \le k_1 < k_2 < \cdots < k_m$, and define $S = \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$. If $\{x_n\}$ satisfies*

$$x_n = \frac{f_1(x_{n-k_1}, x_{n-k_2}, \ldots, x_{n-k_m})}{f_2(x_{n-k_1}, x_{n-k_2}, \ldots, x_{n-k_m})}, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \tag{1.3}$$

with $x_{-k_m}, x_{-k_m+1}, \ldots, x_{-1} \in (0, \infty)$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
f_1(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_m) &= \sum_{j \in \{1,3,\ldots,m\}} \sum_{\{t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_j\} \subset S; t_1 < t_2 < \cdots < t_j} y_{t_1} y_{t_2} \cdots y_{t_j}, \\
f_2(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_m) &= 1 + \sum_{j \in \{2,4,\ldots,m-1\}} \sum_{\{t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_j\} \subset S; t_1 < t_2 < \cdots < t_j} y_{t_1} y_{t_2} \cdots y_{t_j}.
\end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

Then the sequence $\{x_n\}$ converges to the unique equilibrium 1.

Motivated by [2], Berenhaut et al. started with the investigation of the following difference equation $y_n = A + (y_{n-k}/y_{n-m})^p$ for $p > 0$ (see, [3, 4]). Among others, in [3] they used a transformation method, which has turned out to be very useful in studying (1.1) and (1.2) as well as in confirming Conjecture 1.1; see [5].

Some particular cases of (1.2) had been studied previously by Li in [6, 7], by using semicycle analysis similar to that in [8]. The problem concerning periodicity of semicycles of difference equations was solved in very general settings by Berg and Stević in [9], partially motivated also by [10].

In the meantime, it turned out that the method used in [11] by Çinar et al. can be used in confirming Conjecture 1.2 (see also [12]). More precisely [11, 12] use Corollary 3 from [13] in solving similar problems. For example, Çinar et al. has shown, in an elegant way, that the main result in [14] is a consequence of Corollary 3 in [13]. With some calculations it can be also shown that Conjecture 1.2 can be confirmed in this way (see [15]).

Some other related results can be found in [16–24].

In this paper, we will prove that Conjecture 1.2 is correct by using a new method. Obviously, our results generalize the corresponding works in [1, 5–7] and other literature.

2. Preliminaries and Notations

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
f_1(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_m) &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{m} (y_j + 1) + \prod_{j=1}^{m} (y_j - 1) \right], \\
f_2(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_m) &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{m} (y_j + 1) - \prod_{j=1}^{m} (y_j - 1) \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Define function G as follows:

$$G(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_m) = \frac{\prod_{j=1}^m (y_j + 1) + \prod_{j=1}^m (y_j - 1)}{\prod_{j=1}^m (y_j + 1) - \prod_{j=1}^m (y_j - 1)}, \qquad y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_m > 0. \tag{2.2}$$

Then we can rewrite (1.3) as

$$x_n = \frac{\prod_{j=1}^m \left(x_{n-k_j} + 1\right) + \prod_{j=1}^m \left(x_{n-k_j} - 1\right)}{\prod_{j=1}^m \left(x_{n-k_j} + 1\right) - \prod_{j=1}^m \left(x_{n-k_j} - 1\right)}, \qquad n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, \tag{2.3}$$

or

$$x_n = G(x_{n-k_1}, x_{n-k_2}, \ldots, x_{n-k_m}), \qquad n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, \tag{2.4}$$

where m is an odd integer and $x_{-k_m}, x_{-k_m+1}, \ldots, x_{-1} \in (0, \infty)$.

The following lemma can be obtained by simple calculations.

Lemma 2.1. *Let G be defined by* (2.2). *Then*

$$\frac{\partial G}{\partial y_i} = \frac{4 \prod_{j=1, j \neq i}^m \left(y_j^2 - 1\right)}{\left[\prod_{j=1}^m (y_j + 1) - \prod_{j=1}^m (y_j - 1)\right]^2} \begin{cases} > 0, & \prod\limits_{j=1, j \neq i}^m (y_j - 1) > 0, \\ < 0, & \prod\limits_{j=1, j \neq i}^m (y_j - 1) < 0, \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

$i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$.

Lemma 2.2. *Assume that $0 < \alpha < 1 < \beta < +\infty$. If $\alpha \leq y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_m \leq \beta$, then*

$$\min\{A_1, A_3, \ldots, A_m\} \leq G(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_m) \leq \max\{B_1, B_3, \ldots, B_m\}, \tag{2.6}$$

where

$$A_i = \frac{(\alpha + 1)^i (\beta + 1)^{m-i} + (\alpha - 1)^i (\beta - 1)^{m-i}}{(\alpha + 1)^i (\beta + 1)^{m-i} - (\alpha - 1)^i (\beta - 1)^{m-i}},$$

$$B_i = \frac{(\alpha + 1)^{m-i} (\beta + 1)^i + (\alpha - 1)^{m-i} (\beta - 1)^i}{(\alpha + 1)^{m-i} (\beta + 1)^i - (\alpha - 1)^{m-i} (\beta - 1)^i}, \tag{2.7}$$

$i = 1, 3, \ldots, m$.

Proof. Since $G(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_m)$ is symmetric in $y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_m$, we can assume, without loss of generality, that $\alpha \le y_1 \le y_2 \le \cdots \le y_m \le \beta$. Then there are $m + 1$ possible cases:

(1) $\alpha \le 1 \le y_1 \le y_2 \le \cdots \le y_m \le \beta$;

(2) $\alpha \le y_1 \le 1 \le y_2 \le \cdots \le y_m \le \beta$;

(3) $\alpha \le y_1 \le y_2 \le 1 \le \cdots \le y_m \le \beta$;

(4) $\alpha \le y_1 \le y_2 \le y_3 \le 1 \le \cdots \le y_m \le \beta$;

$$\vdots$$

(m+1) $\alpha \le y_1 \le y_2 \le \cdots \le y_m \le 1 \le \beta$.

And, for the above cases (1)–(m+1), by the monotonicity of $G(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_m)$, in turn, we may get

(1) $1 \le G(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_m) \le B_m$;

(2) $A_1 \le G(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_m) \le 1$;

(3) $1 \le G(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_m) \le B_{m-2}$;

(4) $A_3 \le G(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_m) \le 1$;

$$\vdots$$

(m+1) $A_m \le G(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_m) \le 1$.

From the above inequalities, it follows that (2.6) holds. The proof is complete. $\square$

Lemma 2.3. *Assume that $0 < \alpha < 1 < \beta < +\infty$ .Then*

$$A_i = \frac{(\alpha + 1)^i (\beta + 1)^{m-i} + (\alpha - 1)^i (\beta - 1)^{m-i}}{(\alpha + 1)^i (\beta + 1)^{m-i} - (\alpha - 1)^i (\beta - 1)^{m-i}} \ge \alpha, \tag{2.8}$$

$$B_i = \frac{(\alpha + 1)^{m-i} (\beta + 1)^i + (\alpha - 1)^{m-i} (\beta - 1)^i}{(\alpha + 1)^{m-i} (\beta + 1)^i - (\alpha - 1)^{m-i} (\beta - 1)^i} \le \beta, \tag{2.9}$$

$i = 1, 3, \ldots, m.$

Proof. For $i = 1, 3, \ldots, m$, it is easy to see that

$$(\alpha - 1)^{i-1} (\beta - 1)^{m-i} \le (\alpha + 1)^{i-1} (\beta + 1)^{m-i}, \tag{2.10}$$

which yields

$$(\alpha + 1)(\alpha - 1)^i (\beta - 1)^{m-i} \ge (\alpha - 1)(\alpha + 1)^i (\beta + 1)^{m-i}, \tag{2.11}$$

and so

$$\alpha \left[(\alpha + 1)^i (\beta + 1)^{m-i} - (\alpha - 1)^i (\beta - 1)^{m-i} \right] \le (\alpha + 1)^i (\beta + 1)^{m-i} + (\alpha - 1)^i (\beta - 1)^{m-i}. \tag{2.12}$$

It follows that (2.8) holds. Similarly, for $i = 1, 3, \ldots, m$, it is easy to see that

$$(\alpha - 1)^{m-i} (\beta - 1)^{i-1} \leq (\alpha + 1)^{m-i} (\beta + 1)^{i-1}, \tag{2.13}$$

which yields

$$(\beta + 1)(\alpha - 1)^{m-i} (\beta - 1)^{i} \leq (\beta - 1)(\alpha + 1)^{m-i} (\beta + 1)^{i}. \tag{2.14}$$

It follows that (2.9) holds. The proof is complete. $\qquad\square$

Lemma 2.4. *Let*

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_{j+1} &= \min\{A_{1j}, A_{3j}, \ldots, A_{mj}\}, \\
\beta_{j+1} &= \max\{B_{1j}, B_{3j}, \ldots, B_{mj}\},
\end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{ij} &= \frac{(\alpha_j + 1)^{i} (\beta_j + 1)^{m-i} + (\alpha_j - 1)^{i} (\beta_j - 1)^{m-i}}{(\alpha_j + 1)^{i} (\beta_j + 1)^{m-i} - (\alpha_j - 1)^{i} (\beta_j - 1)^{m-i}}, \\
B_{ij} &= \frac{(\alpha_j + 1)^{m-i} (\beta_j + 1)^{i} + (\alpha_j - 1)^{m-i} (\beta_j - 1)^{i}}{(\alpha_j + 1)^{m-i} (\beta_j + 1)^{i} - (\alpha_j - 1)^{m-i} (\beta_j - 1)^{i}},
\end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

$i = 1, 3, \ldots, m$; $j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. *Assume that* $0 < \alpha_0 < 1 < \beta_0 < +\infty$. *Then*

$$\lim_{j \to \infty} \alpha_j = \lim_{j \to \infty} \beta_j = 1. \tag{2.17}$$

Proof. By induction, we easily show that

$$0 < \alpha_j < 1 < \beta_j < +\infty, \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots. \tag{2.18}$$

It follows from Lemma 2.3 that

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{ij} &= \frac{(\alpha_j + 1)^{i} (\beta_j + 1)^{m-i} + (\alpha_j - 1)^{i} (\beta_j - 1)^{m-i}}{(\alpha_j + 1)^{i} (\beta_j + 1)^{m-i} - (\alpha_j - 1)^{i} (\beta_j - 1)^{m-i}} \geq \alpha_j, \\
B_{ij} &= \frac{(\alpha_j + 1)^{m-i} (\beta_j + 1)^{i} + (\alpha_j - 1)^{m-i} (\beta_j - 1)^{i}}{(\alpha_j + 1)^{m-i} (\beta_j + 1)^{i} - (\alpha_j - 1)^{m-i} (\beta_j - 1)^{i}} \leq \beta_j,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

$i = 1, 3, \ldots, m$; $j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. Hence, by (2.15) and (2.18), we have

$$\alpha_j \leq \alpha_{j+1} < 1 < \beta_{j+1} \leq \beta_j, \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots. \tag{2.20}$$

Equation (2.20) implies that the limits $\lim_{j\to\infty}\alpha_j$ and $\lim_{j\to\infty}\beta_j$ exist, and

$$\alpha^* = \lim_{j\to\infty}\alpha_j \in [\alpha_0, 1], \qquad \beta^* = \lim_{j\to\infty}\beta_j \in [1, \beta_0]. \tag{2.21}$$

It follows from (2.16) that

$$A_i^* := \lim_{j\to\infty}A_{ij} = \frac{(\alpha^*+1)^i(\beta^*+1)^{m-i} + (\alpha^*-1)^i(\beta^*-1)^{m-i}}{(\alpha^*+1)^i(\beta^*+1)^{m-i} - (\alpha^*-1)^i(\beta^*-1)^{m-i}},$$

$$B_i^* := \lim_{j\to\infty}B_{ij} = \frac{(\alpha^*+1)^{m-i}(\beta^*+1)^i + (\alpha^*-1)^{m-i}(\beta^*-1)^i}{(\alpha^*+1)^{m-i}(\beta^*+1)^i - (\alpha^*-1)^{m-i}(\beta^*-1)^i},$$

$$\tag{2.22}$$

$i = 1, 3, \ldots, m$. Let $j \to \infty$ in (2.15), we have

$$\alpha^* = \min\{A_1^*, A_3^*, \ldots, A_m^*\},$$

$$\beta^* = \max\{B_1^*, B_3^*, \ldots, B_m^*\}. \tag{2.23}$$

It follows that there exist $i, j \in \{1, 3, \ldots, m\}$ such that

$$\alpha^* = \frac{(\alpha^*+1)^i(\beta^*+1)^{m-i} + (\alpha^*-1)^i(\beta^*-1)^{m-i}}{(\alpha^*+1)^i(\beta^*+1)^{m-i} - (\alpha^*+1)^i(\beta^*+1)^{m-i}},$$

$$\beta^* = \frac{(\alpha^*+1)^{m-j}(\beta^*+1)^j + (\alpha^*-1)^{m-j}(\beta^*-1)^j}{(\alpha^*+1)^{m-j}(\beta^*+1)^j - (\alpha^*-1)^{m-j}(\beta^*-1)^j}. \tag{2.24}$$

From (2.24), we have

$$(\alpha^*-1)\left[(\alpha^*+1)^{i-1}(\beta^*+1)^{m-i} - (\alpha^*-1)^{i-1}(\beta^*-1)^{m-i}\right] = 0,$$

$$(\beta^*-1)\left[(\alpha^*+1)^{m-j}(\beta^*+1)^{j-1} - (\alpha^*-1)^{m-j}(\beta^*-1)^{j-1}\right] = 0. \tag{2.25}$$

Since

$$(\alpha^*+1)^{i-1}(\beta^*+1)^{m-i} - (\alpha^*-1)^{i-1}(\beta^*-1)^{m-i} > 0,$$

$$(\alpha^*+1)^{m-j}(\beta^*+1)^{j-1} - (\alpha^*-1)^{m-j}(\beta^*-1)^{j-1} > 0, \tag{2.26}$$

it follows from (2.25) and (2.18) that $\alpha^* = \beta^* = 1$. The proof is complete. $\qquad\square$

3. Proof of Conjecture 1.2

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that $0 < \alpha < 1 < \beta < +\infty$ and that*

$$x_{-k_m}, x_{-k_m+1}, \ldots, x_{-1} \in [\alpha, \beta]. \tag{3.1}$$

Then the solution $\{x_n\}$ of (1.3) satisfies

$$x_n \in [\alpha, \beta], \quad for\ n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots. \tag{3.2}$$

Theorem 3.1 is a direct corollary of Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3.

Proof of Conjecture 1.2. Let $\{x_n\}$ be a solution of (1.3) with $x_{-k_m}, x_{-k_m+1}, \ldots, x_{-1} \in (0, \infty)$. We need to prove that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} x_n = 1. \tag{3.3}$$

Choose $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1)$ and $\beta_0 \in (1, +\infty)$ such that

$$x_{-k_m}, x_{-k_m+1}, \ldots, x_{-1} \in [\alpha_0, \beta_0]. \tag{3.4}$$

In view of Theorem 3.1, we have

$$x_n \in [\alpha_0, \beta_0], \quad n = -k_m, -k_m + 1, -k_m + 2, \ldots. \tag{3.5}$$

Let α_j, β_j, A_{ij}, and B_{ij} be defined as in Lemma 2.4. Then by (3.5) and Lemma 2.2, we have

$$\min\{A_{10}, A_{30}, \ldots, A_{m0}\} \le G(x_{n-k_1}, x_{n-k_2}, \ldots, x_{n-k_m})$$
$$\le \max\{B_{10}, B_{30}, \ldots, B_{m0}\}, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots. \tag{3.6}$$

That is

$$x_n \in [\alpha_1, \beta_1], \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots. \tag{3.7}$$

By (3.7) and Lemma 2.2, we obtain

$$\min\{A_{11}, A_{31}, \ldots, A_{m1}\} \le G(x_{n-k_1}, x_{n-k_2}, \ldots, x_{n-k_m})$$
$$\le \max\{B_{11}, B_{31}, \ldots, B_{m1}\}, \quad n = k_m, k_m + 1, k_m + 2, \ldots. \tag{3.8}$$

That is

$$x_n \in [\alpha_2, \beta_2], \quad n = k_m, k_m + 1, k_m + 2, \ldots. \tag{3.9}$$

Repeating the above procedure, in general, we can obtain

$$x_n \in [\alpha_{j+1}, \beta_{j+1}], \quad n = jk_m, jk_m + 1, jk_m + 2, \ldots, \ j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots. \tag{3.10}$$

By Lemma 2.4, we have

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} x_n = \lim_{j \to \infty} \alpha_{j+1} = \lim_{j \to \infty} \beta_{j+1} = 1, \tag{3.11}$$

which implies that (3.3) holds. The proof of Conjecture 1.2 is complete. □

Acknowledgments

References

[1] K. S. Berenhaut, J. D. Foley, and S. Stević, "The global attractivity of the rational difference equation $y_n = (y_{n-k} + y_{n-m})/(1 + y_{n-k}y_{n-m})$," *Applied Mathematics Letters*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 54–58, 2007.

[2] S. Stević, "On the recursive sequence $x_{n+1} = \alpha + x_{n-1}^p/x_n^p$," *Journal of Applied Mathematics & Computing*, vol. 18, no. 1-2, pp. 229–234, 2005.

[3] K. S. Berenhaut, J. D. Foley, and S. Stević, "The global attractivity of the rational difference equation $y_n = 1 + (y_{n-k})/(y_{n-m})$," *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 135, no. 4, pp. 1133–1140, 2007.

[4] K. S. Berenhaut, J. D. Foley, and S. Stević, "The global attractivity of the rational difference equation $y_n = A + (y_{n-k}/y_{n-m})^p$," *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 136, no. 1, pp. 103–110, 2008.

[5] K. S. Berenhaut and S. Stević, "The global attractivity of a higher order rational difference equation," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 326, no. 2, pp. 940–944, 2007.

[6] X. Li, "Qualitative properties for a fourth-order rational difference equation," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 311, no. 1, pp. 103–111, 2005.

[7] X. Li, "Global behavior for a fourth-order rational difference equation," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 312, no. 2, pp. 555–563, 2005.

[8] A. M. Amleh, N. Kruse, and G. Ladas, "On a class of difference equations with strong negative feedback," *Journal of Difference Equations and Applications*, vol. 5, no. 6, pp. 497–515, 1999.

[9] L. Berg and S. Stević, "Linear difference equations mod 2 with applications to nonlinear difference equations," *Journal of Difference Equations and Applications*, vol. 14, no. 7, pp. 693–704, 2008.

[10] L. Berg and S. Stević, "Periodicity of some classes of holomorphic difference equations," *Journal of Difference Equations and Applications*, vol. 12, no. 8, pp. 827–835, 2006.

[11] C. Çinar, S. Stević, and I. Yalçinkaya, "A note on global asymptotic stability of a family of rational equations," *Rostocker Mathematisches Kolloquium*, no. 59, pp. 41–49, 2005.

[12] S. Stević, "Global stability and asymptotics of some classes of rational difference equations," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 316, no. 1, pp. 60–68, 2006.

[13] N. Kruse and T. Nesemann, "Global asymptotic stability in some discrete dynamical systems," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 235, no. 1, pp. 151–158, 1999.

[14] X. Li and D. Zhu, "Global asymptotic stability in a rational equation," *Journal of Difference Equations and Applications*, vol. 9, no. 9, pp. 833–839, 2003.

[15] M. Aloqeily, "Global stability of a rational symmetric difference equation," preprint, 2008.

[16] L. Gutnik and S. Stević, "On the behaviour of the solutions of a second-order difference equation," *Discrete Dynamics in Nature and Society*, vol. 2007, Article ID 27562, 14 pages, 2007.

[17] G. Ladas, "A problem from the Putnam Exam," *Journal of Difference Equations and Applications*, vol. 4, no. 5, pp. 497–499, 1998.

[18] "Putnam Exam," *The American Mathematical Monthly*, pp. 734–736, 1965.

[19] S. Stević, "Asymptotics of some classes of higher-order difference equations," *Discrete Dynamics in Nature and Society*, vol. 2007, Article ID 56813, 20 pages, 2007.

[20] S. Stević, "Existence of nontrivial solutions of a rational difference equation," *Applied Mathematics Letters*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 28–31, 2007.

[21] S. Stević, "Nontrivial solutions of a higher-order rational difference equation," *Matematicheskie Zametki*, vol. 84, no. 5, pp. 772–780, 2008.

[22] T. Sun and H. Xi, "Global asymptotic stability of a higher order rational difference equation," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 330, no. 1, pp. 462–466, 2007.

[23] X. Yang, F. Sun, and Y. Y. Tang, "A new part-metric-related inequality chain and an application," *Discrete Dynamics in Nature and Society*, vol. 2008, Article ID 193872, 7 pages, 2008.

[24] X. Yang, Y. Y. Tang, and J. Cao, "Global asymptotic stability of a family of difference equations," *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, vol. 56, no. 10, pp. 2643–2649, 2008.