



Fixed Point Theorems Using α –Admissible Mappings in Metric Spaces

Deepika ^a and Manoj Kumar ^{a*}

^a Mastnath University, Asthal Bohar, Rohtak, India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/ARJOM/2023/v19i3648

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/93300>

Original Research Article

Received: 15/11/2022
Accepted: 18/01/2023
Published: 02/03/2023

Abstract

In this paper, we shall prove the fixed point theorems in metric space using α –admissible mapping. Some existing results of literature shall be deduced from the main results. In the end, we shall provide an example to support our result.

Keywords: α –admissible mappings; complete metric space; fixed point.

2010 MSC: 47H10, 54H25.

1 Introduction

In 1922, Banach gave a principle to obtain the fixed point in the complete metric space. Since then, many researchers have worked on the Banach fixed point theorem (see, for example, [1-38]) and tried to generalize this principle. In 2012, Samet et al. [25] introduced the new concepts of mappings called α –admissible mappings in metric space. Recently, in 2013 Farhan et al. [1] gave new contractions using α –admissible mapping in metric spaces.

*Corresponding author: Email: manojantil18@gmail.com;

In this paper, we shall generalize Farhan's et al. [1] contractions and give fixed point theorems for such contractions.

2 Preliminaries

To prove our main results we need some basic definitions from literature as follows:

Definition([39]): "Let X be a set. A metric space is an ordered pair (X, d) where d is a function $d: X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

- (1) $d(x, y) \geq 0$. (non-negativity)
- (2) $d(x, y) = 0$ iff $x = y$. (non-degeneracy)
- (3) $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$ (symmetry)
- (4) $d(x, z) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, z)$ (triangle inequality)"

Definition([40]) : "A sequence $\{x_n\}$ in a metric space (X, d) is said to converge if there is a point $x \in X$ and for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(x_n, x) < \epsilon$ for every $n > N$ ".

Definition: "A sequence $\{x_n\}$ in a metric space (X, d) is Cauchy if for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(x_n, x_m) < \epsilon$ for every $n, m > N$ ".

Definition([40]) : "A metric space (X, d) is said to be complete if every Cauchy sequence is convergent".

Definition([25]) : "Let $f: X \rightarrow X$ and $\alpha: X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$. We say that f is an α – admissible mapping if $\alpha(x, y) \geq 1$ implies $\alpha(fx, fy) \geq 1$, for all $x, y \in X$ ".

3 Main Results

In this section, we shall prove fixed point theorems.

Theorem 3.1: Let (X, d) be a complete metric space and $T: X \rightarrow X$ be an α – admissible mapping. Assume that there exists a function $\beta: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that, for any bounded sequence $\{t_n\}$ of positive reals, $\beta(t_n) \rightarrow 1$ implies $t_n \rightarrow 0$ and

$$(d(Tx, Ty) + 1)^{\alpha(x, Tx)\alpha(y, Ty)} \leq \beta(M(x, y))M(x, y) + 1, \text{ for all } x, y \in X \text{ and } 1 \geq 1. \quad (1)$$

Where $M(x, y) = \max\{d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty)\}$

Suppose that either

(3.1) T is continuous, or

(3.2) If $\{x_n\}$ is a sequence in X such that $x_n \rightarrow x$, $\alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 1$, for all n , then $(\alpha, Tx) \geq 1$.

If there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $\alpha(x_0, Tx_0) \geq 1$, then T has a fixed point.

Proof: Let $x_0 \in X$ such that $\alpha(x_0, Tx_0) \geq 1$. Construct a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X as $x_{n+1} = Tx_n$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

If $x_{n+1} = x_n$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $Tx_n = x_n$ and we are done.

So, we suppose that $d(x_n, x_{n+1}) > 0$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Since T is α – admissible, there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $\alpha(x_0, Tx_0) \geq 1$ which implies $\alpha(x_0, x_1) \geq 1$.

Similarly, we can say that $\alpha(x_1, x_2) = \alpha(Tx_0, T^2x_0) \geq 1$.

By continuing this process, we get

$$\alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 1, \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{2}$$

By using equation (2), we have

$$d(x_n, x_{n+1}) + l = d(Tx_{n-1}, Tx_n) + l \leq (d(Tx_{n-1}, Tx_n) + l)^{\alpha(x_{n-1}, Tx_{n-1})\alpha(x_n, Tx_n)}.$$

Now using equation (1), we get

$$d(x_n, x_{n+1}) + l \leq \beta(M(x_{n-1}, x_n))M(x_{n-1}, x_n) + l, \tag{3}$$

$$\begin{aligned} M(x_{n-1}, x_n) &= \max\{d(x_{n-1}, x_n), d(x_{n-1}, Tx_{n-1}), d(x_n, Tx_n)\}, \\ &= \max\{d(x_{n-1}, x_n), d(x_{n-1}, x_n), d(x_n, x_{n+1})\}, \end{aligned}$$

Assume that if possible $d(x_n, x_{n+1}) > d(x_{n-1}, x_n)$.

Then, $M(x_{n-1}, x_n) = d(x_n, x_{n+1})$.

Using this in equation (3), we get

$$d(x_n, x_{n+1}) < \beta(d(x_n, x_{n+1}))d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \tag{4}$$

$\Rightarrow d(x_n, x_{n+1}) < d(x_n, x_{n+1})$, which is a contradiction.

So $d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq d(x_{n-1}, x_n)$, for all n .

It follows that the sequence $\{d(x_n, x_{n+1})\}$ is a monotonically decreasing sequence of positive real numbers. So, it is convergent and suppose that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, x_{n+1}) = d$. Clearly, $d \geq 0$.

Claim: $d = 0$.

Equation (4) implies that

$$\frac{d(x_n, x_{n+1})}{d(x_{n-1}, x_n)} \leq \beta(d(x_{n-1}, x_n)) \leq 1,$$

Which implies that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta(d(x_{n-1}, x_n)) = 1$.

Using the property of the function β , we conclude that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, x_{n+1}) = 0$. (5)

Now, we will show that $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Suppose, to the contrary that $\{x_n\}$ is not a Cauchy sequence. Then there exists $\epsilon > 0$ and sequences $m(k)$ and $n(k)$ such that for all positive integers k , we have

$$n(k) > m(k) > k, d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}) \geq \epsilon \text{ and } d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)-1}) < \epsilon.$$

By the triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon \leq d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}) &\leq d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)-1}) + d(x_{m(k)-1}, x_{m(k)}) \\ &< \epsilon + d(x_{m(k)-1}, x_{m(k)}), \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{N}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit as $k \rightarrow +\infty$ in the above inequality and using equation (5), we get

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}) = \epsilon. \tag{6}$$

Again by triangle inequality, we have

$$d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)+1}) \leq d(x_{m(k)}, x_{m(k)+1}) + d(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)}) + d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{n(k)}).$$

Taking the limit as $k \rightarrow +\infty$, together with (5) and (6), we deduce that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)+1}) = \epsilon. \tag{7}$$

From equations (1),(2),(6) and (7), we get

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)+1}) + l &\leq (d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)+1}) + l)^{\alpha(x_{n(k)}, Tx_{n(k)})\alpha(x_{m(k)}, Tx_{m(k)})}, \\ &= (d(Tx_{n(k)}, Tx_{m(k)}) + l)^{\alpha(x_{n(k)}, Tx_{n(k)})\alpha(x_{m(k)}, Tx_{m(k)})} \\ &\leq \beta(M(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}))M(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}) + l \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

$$M(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}) = \max \{d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}), d(x_{n(k)}, x_{n(k)+1}), d(x_{m(k)}, x_{m(k)+1})\}$$

So, equation (8) implies that

$$d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)+1}) \leq \beta(M(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}))M(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}) \leq 1,$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \beta(d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)})) = 1.$$

By using definition of β function, we get

$$\Rightarrow \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}) = 0 < \epsilon, \text{ which is a contradiction.}$$

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

Since (X, d) is a complete space, so $\{x_n\}$ is convergent and assume that $x_n \rightarrow x$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Since T is continuous, then we have

$$Tx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Tx_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_{n+1} = x.$$

So, x is a fixed point of T .

Now, suppose that (3.2) holds, then $\alpha(x, Tx) \geq 1$ and by using equations (1) and (2) we get

$$\begin{aligned} d(Tx, x_{n+1}) + l &\leq (d(Tx, Tx_n) + l)^{\alpha(x, Tx)\alpha(x_n, Tx_n)} \\ &\leq \beta(M(x, x_n))M(x, x_n) + l. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Where $M(x, x_n) = \max\{d(x, Tx), d(x, x_n), d(x, Tx_n)\}$.

Clearly, from equation (9) and using triangle inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} d(Tx, x) &\leq d(Tx, x_{n+1}) + d(x_{n+1}, x) \\ &\leq \beta(M(x, x_n))M(x, x_n) + d(x_{n+1}, x) \end{aligned}$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$d(Tx, x) = 0 \text{ which implies } Tx = x.$$

Theorem 3.2: Let (X, d) be a complete metric space and $T: X \rightarrow X$ be an α –admissible mapping. Assume that there exists a function $\beta: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that for any bounded sequence $\{t_n\}$ of positive reals, $\beta(t_n) \rightarrow 1$ which implies that $t_n \rightarrow 0$ and

$$(\alpha(x, Tx) \cdot \alpha(y, Ty) + 1)^{d(Tx, Ty)} \leq 2^{\beta(M(x,y))M(x,y)}, \text{ for all } x, y \in X. \tag{10}$$

Suppose that either

(3.3) T is continuous or

(3.4) If $\{x_n\}$ is a sequence in X such that $x_n \rightarrow x, \alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 1$ for all n , then $\alpha(x, Tx) \geq 1$.

If there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $\alpha(x_0, Tx_0) \geq 1$, then T has a fixed point.

Proof: Let $x_0 \in X$ such that $\alpha(x_0, Tx_0) \geq 1$.

Define a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X as $x_n = Tx_{n-1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

If $x_{n+1} = x_n$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $Tx_n = x_n$ and we are done. Hence, we suppose that $x_{n+1} \neq x_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. As in Theorem (3.1), we conclude that $\alpha(x_n, Tx_n) \geq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

From equation (10), we get

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{d(Tx_{n-1}, Tx_n)} &\leq (\alpha(x_{n-1}, Tx_{n-1})\alpha(x_n, Tx_n) + 1)^{d(Tx_{n-1}, Tx_n)} \\ &\leq 2^{\beta(M(x_{n-1}, x_n))M(x_{n-1}, x_n)} \end{aligned}$$

Which yields that

$$d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq \beta(M(x_{n-1}, x_n))M(x_{n-1}, x_n). \tag{11}$$

$$\begin{aligned} M(x_{n-1}, x_n) &= \max \{d(x_{n-1}, x_n), d(x_{n-1}, Tx_{n-1}), d(x_n, Tx_n)\}, \\ &= \max \{d(x_{n-1}, x_n), d(x_{n-1}, x_n), d(x_n, x_{n+1})\}. \end{aligned}$$

If possible suppose that

$$d(x_n, x_{n+1}) > d(x_{n-1}, x_n).$$

Then $M(x_{n-1}, x_n) = d(x_n, x_{n+1})$

Using this, equation (11) implies that $d(x_n, x_{n+1}) < d(x_n, x_{n+1})$, which is a contradiction.

So, $d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq d(x_{n-1}, x_n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

So, $\{d(x_n, x_{n+1})\}$ is a monotonically decreasing sequence of positive reals. So, there exists $d \in R^+ \cup \{0\}$ such that

$$d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \rightarrow d \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

Claim: $d = 0$.

Equation (11) implies that

$$\frac{d(x_n, x_{n+1})}{M(x_{n-1}, x_n)} \leq M(d(x_{n-1}, x_n)) \leq l, \text{ which implies}$$

$$\frac{d(x_n, x_{n+1})}{d(x_{n-1}, x_n)} \leq \beta(d(x_{n-1}, x_n)) \leq l.$$

Taking $n \rightarrow \infty$, we get $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta(d(x_{n-1}, x_n)) = 1$. Using definition of β function, we get

$$\Rightarrow \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, x_{n+1}) = 0. \tag{12}$$

We prove that $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Suppose, to the contrary, that $\{x_n\}$ is not a Cauchy sequence. Then there exists $\epsilon > 0$ and sequences $m(k)$ and $n(k)$ such that for all positive integers k ,

$$n(k) > m(k) > k, d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}) \geq \epsilon \text{ and } d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)-1}) < \epsilon.$$

Following the related lines in the proof of Theorem (3.1), we get

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}) = \epsilon \tag{13}$$

$$\text{and } \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)+1}) = \epsilon. \tag{14}$$

Using equations (10), (13) and (14), we get

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)+1})} &\leq (\alpha(x_{n(k)}, Tx_{n(k)})\alpha(x_{m(k)}, Tx_{m(k)}) + 1)^{d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)+1})} \\ &= (\alpha(x_{n(k)}, Tx_{n(k)})\alpha(x_{m(k)}, Tx_{m(k)}) + 1)^{d(Tx_{n(k)}, Tx_{m(k)})} \\ &\leq 2^{\beta(M(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}))M(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)})} \end{aligned}$$

Where $M(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}) = \max\{d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}), d(x_{n(k)}, x_{n(k)+1}), d(x_{m(k)}, x_{m(k)+1})\}$.

Hence, $\frac{2^{d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)+1})}}{M(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)})} \leq \beta(M(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)})) \leq 1$.

By taking $k \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \beta(d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)})) = 1.$$

$\Rightarrow \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}) = 0 < \epsilon$, which is a contradiction.

So, $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence and as X is complete, so $\{x_n\} \rightarrow x$.

Now suppose the T is continuous.

$$Tx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Tx_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_{n+1} = x.$$

$\Rightarrow Tx = x$.

$\Rightarrow x$ is fixed point of T .

Next, we suppose that the condition (3.4) holds, then $\alpha(x, Tx) \geq 1$.

Now by equation (10), we get

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{d(Tx, x_{n+1})} &\leq (\alpha(x, Tx)\alpha(x_n, Tx_n) + 1)^{d(Tx, Tx_n)} \\ &\leq 2^{\beta(M(x, x_n))M(x, x_n)}, \end{aligned}$$

Where

$$\begin{aligned} M(x, x_n) &= \max\{d(x, x_n), d(x, Tx), d(x_n, x_{n+1})\} \\ \Rightarrow d(Tx, x_{n+1}) &\leq \beta(M(x, x_n))M(x, x_n) \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Using triangle inequality,

$$d(Tx, x) \leq d(Tx, x_{n+1}) + d(x_{n+1}, x).$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ and using (15), we get

$$\begin{aligned} d(Tx, x) &= 0. \\ \Rightarrow Tx &= x. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3.3: Let (X, d) be a complete metric space and $T: X \rightarrow X$ be an α -admissible mapping. Assume that there exists a function $\beta: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that, for any bounded sequence $\{t_n\}$ of positive reals, $\beta(t_n) \rightarrow 1$ implies $t_n \rightarrow 0$ and

$$\alpha(x, Tx)\alpha(y, Ty)d(Tx, Ty) \leq \beta(M(x, y))M(x, y), \forall x, y \in X. \tag{16}$$

Suppose that either

(3.5) T is continuous or

(3.6) If $\{x_n\}$ is a sequence in X such that $x_n \rightarrow x$ and $\alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq l$ for all n , then $\alpha(x, Tx) \geq l$.

If there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $\alpha(x_0, Tx_0) \geq l$, then T has a fixed point.

Proof: Let $x_0 \in X$ such that $\alpha(x_0, Tx_0) \geq l$. Construct a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X such that $x_{n+1} = Tx_n \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $x_{n+1} = x_n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $Tx_n = x_n$ and we are done.

So, assume $x_n \neq x_{n+1}$ for all $n \geq 1$.

$$\text{As in Theorem (3.1), we conclude that } \alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq l \text{ for all } n. \tag{17}$$

Now by equation (16), we get

$$d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq \alpha(x_n, Tx_{n-1})\alpha(x_n, Tx_n)d(Tx_{n-1}, Tx_n) \leq \beta(M(x_{n-1}, x_n))M(x_{n-1}, x_n). \tag{18}$$

Where $M(x_{n-1}, x_n) = \max\{d(x_{n-1}, x_n), d(x_{n-1}, Tx_{n-1}), d(x_n, Tx_n)\}$
 $= \max\{d(x_{n-1}, x_n), d(x_{n-1}, x_n), d(x_n, x_{n+1})\}$

If possible assume that $d(x_{n-1}, x_n) < d(x_n, x_{n+1})$, then $M(x_{n-1}, x_n) = d(x_n, x_{n+1})$.

Using this from equation (16), we get

$$d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq \beta(d(x_{n-1}, x_n))d(x_{n-1}, x_n) \tag{19}$$

$d(x_n, x_{n+1}) < d(x_n, x_{n+1})$, which is a contradiction.

So, $d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq d(x_n, x_{n-1})$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

It follows that $\{d(x_n, x_{n+1})\}$ is a monotonically decreasing sequence of positive reals. So, there exists $d \geq 0$ such that $d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \rightarrow d$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Therefore, (19) implies that

$$\frac{d(x_n, x_{n+1})}{d(x_{n-1}, x_n)} \leq \beta(d(x_{n-1}, x_n)) \leq 1.$$

Thus we find that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta(d(x_n, x_{n+1})) = 1$.

$$\Rightarrow \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, x_{n+1}) = 0. \tag{20}$$

Next, we will prove that the sequence $\{x_n\}$ is Cauchy. Suppose, to the contrary, that $\{x_n\}$ is not a Cauchy sequence. Then there exists $\epsilon > 0$ and sequences $m(k)$ and $n(k)$ such that for all positive integers k ,

$$n(k) > m(k) > k, d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}) \geq \epsilon \text{ and } d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)-1}) < \epsilon.$$

Again, by following the lines of the proof of Theorem (3.1), we derive that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}) = \epsilon. \tag{21}$$

$$\text{and } \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)+1}) = \epsilon. \tag{22}$$

now, combining (16), (21) and (22), we get

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)+1}) &\leq \alpha(x_{n(k)}, Tx_{n(k)})\alpha(x_{m(k)}, Tx_{m(k)})d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)+1}) \\ &= \alpha(x_{n(k)}, Tx_{n(k)})\alpha(x_{m(k)}, Tx_{m(k)})d(Tx_{n(k)}, Tx_{m(k)}) \\ &\leq \beta(M(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}))M(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}). \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Where $M(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}) = \max \{d(x_{n(k)}, x_{n(k)+1}), d(x_{m(k)}, x_{m(k)+1}), d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)})\}$

Now, equation (23) implies

$$\frac{d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)+1})}{M(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)})} \leq \beta(M(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)})) \leq 1.$$

Taking $\rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \beta(d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)})) = 1.$$

$\Rightarrow \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}) = 0 < \epsilon$, which is a contradiction.

So, $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Since X is complete, so $\{x_n\} \rightarrow x$.

First suppose that T is continuous. So,

$$Tx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Tx_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_{n+1} = x.$$

$\Rightarrow x$ is fixed point.

Now suppose that (3.6) holds, then $\alpha(x, Tx) \geq l$ and using (16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(Tx, x_{n+1}) &\leq d(Tx, Tx_n)\alpha(x, Tx)\alpha(x_n, Tx_n) \\ &\leq \beta(M(x, x_n))M(x, x_n) \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Where $M(x, x_n) = \max \{d(x, x_n), d(x, Tx), d(x_n, Tx_n)\}$

and $d(Tx, x) \leq d(Tx, x_{n+1}) + d(x_{n+1}, x)$

Using (24), we get

$$d(Tx, x) \leq \beta(M(x, x_n))M(x, x_n) + d(x_{n+1}, x)$$

Taking as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$d(Tx, x) = 0 \Rightarrow Tx = x.$$

Theorem 3.4: Assume that all the hypothesis of theorem (3.1), (3.2) and (3.3) hold. Adding the following condition:

$$(3.7) \text{ If } x = Tx, \text{ then } \alpha(x, Tx) \geq l.$$

We obtain the uniqueness of fixed point.

Proof: Let z and z^* be two distinct fixed point of T in the setting of Theorem (3.1) and condition (3.7) holds, then

$$\alpha(z, Tz) \geq l \text{ and } \alpha(z^*, Tz^*) \geq l.$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{So, } d(Tz, Tz^*) + l &\leq (d(Tz, Tz^*) + l)^{\alpha(z, Tz)\alpha(z^*, Tz^*)} \\ &\leq \beta(M(z, z^*))M(z, z^*) + l. \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Where } M(z, z^*) &= \max \{d(z, z^*), d(Tz, z), d(Tz^*, z)\} \\ &= d(z, z^*). \end{aligned}$$

So, equation (25) implies

$$\begin{aligned} d(z, z^*) &= d(Tz, Tz^*) \leq \beta(d(z, z^*))d(z, z^*) \\ \Rightarrow \beta(d(z, z^*)) &= 1 \\ \Rightarrow d(z, z^*) &= 0 \Rightarrow z = z^*. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, one can prove for theorem (3.2) and (3.3).

Example 3.5: Let $X = \{0, 1, 2\}$ and $d(x, y) = |x - y|$. Clearly, (X, d) is a complete metric space.

Define $T(0) = 0, T(1) = 0$ and $T(2) = 2$.

All possible pairs of (x, y) are as follows:

(x, y)	$d(Tx, Ty)$	$d(x, Tx)$	$d(y, Ty)$	$d(x, y)$	$M(x, y)$
(0, 0)	0	0	0	0	0
(0, 1)	0	0	1	1	1
(0, 2)	2	0	0	2	2
(1, 1)	0	1	1	0	1
(1, 2)	2	1	0	1	1
(2, 2)	0	0	0	0	0

Let $\alpha = l$ and $\beta = \frac{l}{2}$.

Putting these values in equation (1), we get

$$\text{When } (x, y) = (0, 0), (0 + l) \leq \frac{l}{2}(0) + l \Rightarrow l \leq l.$$

$$\text{When } (x, y) = (0, 1), (0 + l) \leq \frac{l}{2}(1) + l \Rightarrow l \leq \frac{l}{2} + l.$$

$$\text{When } (x, y) = (0, 2), (2 + l) \leq \frac{l}{2}(2) + l \Rightarrow 2 + l \leq l + l.$$

$$\text{When } (x, y) = (1, 1), (0 + l) \leq \frac{l}{2}(1) + l \Rightarrow l \leq \frac{l}{2} + l.$$

When $(x, y) = (1, 2), (2 + l) \leq \frac{1}{2}(1) + l \Rightarrow 2 + l \leq \frac{1}{2} + l$.

When $(x, y) = (2, 2), (0 + l) \leq \frac{1}{2}(0) + l \Rightarrow l \leq l$.

Hence, theorem (3.1) is verified.

4 Consequences

Some existing results of literature can be deduced from our main results as follows:

Corollary 4.1.(Farhan et al. [1]) Let (X, d) be a complete metric space and $f: X \rightarrow X$ be an α –admissible mapping. Assume that there exists a function $\beta: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that, for any bounded sequence $\{t_n\}$ of positive reals, $\beta(t_n) \rightarrow 1$ implies $t_n \rightarrow 0$ and

$$(d(fx, fy) + 1)^{\alpha(x,fx)\alpha(y,fy)} \leq \beta(d(x, y))d(x, y) + l$$

for all $x, y \in X$ where $l \geq 1$. Suppose that either

- (a) f is continuous, or
- (b) if $\{x_n\}$ is a sequence in X such that $x_n \rightarrow x, \alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq l$ for all n , then $\alpha(x, fx) \geq l$.

If there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $\alpha(x_0, fx_0) \geq l$, then f has a fixed point.

Proof: Taking $M(x, y) = d(x, y)$ in Theorem 1, one can get the proof.

Corollary 4.2. (Farhan et al. [1]) Let (X, d) be a complete metric space and $f: X \rightarrow X$ be an α –admissible mapping. Assume that there exists a function $\beta: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that, for any bounded sequence $\{t_n\}$ of positive reals, $\beta(t_n) \rightarrow 1$ implies $t_n \rightarrow 0$ and

$$(\alpha(x, fx)\alpha(y, fy) + 1)^{d(fx, fy)} \leq 2^{\beta(d(x, y))d(x, y)}$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Suppose that either

- (a) f is continuous, or
- (b) If $\{x_n\}$ is a sequence in X such that $x_n \rightarrow x, \alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq l$ for all n , then $\alpha(x, fx) \geq l$.

If there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $\alpha(x_0, fx_0) \geq l$, then f has a fixed point.

Proof: Taking $M(x, y) = d(x, y)$ in Theorem 2.

Corollary 4.3. (Farhan et al. [1]) Let (X, d) be a complete metric space and $f: X \rightarrow X$ be an α –admissible mapping. Assume that there exists a function $\beta: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that, for any bounded sequence $\{t_n\}$ of positive reals, $\beta(t_n) \rightarrow 1$ implies $t_n \rightarrow 0$ and

$$\alpha(x, fx)\alpha(y, fy)d(fx, fy) \leq \beta(d(x, y))d(x, y)$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Suppose that either

- (a) f is continuous, or
- (b) If $\{x_n\}$ is a sequence in X such that $x_n \rightarrow x, \alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq l$ for all n , then $\alpha(x, fx) \geq l$.

If there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $\alpha(x_0, fx_0) \geq l$, then f has a fixed point.

Proof: Taking $M(x, y) = d(x, y)$ in Theorem 3, one can get the proof easily.

Corollary 4.4. (Farhan et al. [1]) Assume that all the hypotheses of theorem (1), (2) and (3) hold. Adding the following condition:

(c) If $x = fx$, then $\alpha(x, fx) \geq l$,

we obtain the uniqueness of the fixed point of f .

Proof: Taking $M(x, y) = d(x, y)$ in Theorem 4.

Competing Interests

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

References

- [1] Farhana A, Peyman S, Nawab H,admissible mappings and related fixed point theorems”, Hussain et al. J Ineq Appl. 2013;2013:114.
- [2] Aydi H, Karapınar E, Erhan İM. I: Coupled coincidence point and coupled fixed point theorems via generalized Meir-Keeler type contractions. Anal. 2012;2012:Abstr Appl:Article ID 781563. DOI: 10.1155/2012/781563
- [3] Aydi H, Karapınar E, Shatanawi W. Tripled common fixed point results for generalized contractions in ordered generalized metric spaces. Fixed Point Theor Appl. 2012;101:2012.
- [4] Aydi H, Karapınar E, Vetro C. Meir-Keeler type contractions for tripled fixed points. Acta Math Sci. 2012;32(6):2119-30. DOI: 10.1016/S0252-9602(12)60164-7
- [5] Aydi H, Vetro C, Sintunavarat W, Kumam P. Coincidence and fixed points for contractions and cyclical contractions in partial metric spaces. Fixed Point Theor Appl. 2012;2012(1). DOI: 10.1186/1687-1812-2012-124
- [6] Ćirić L, Abbas M, Saadati R, Hussain N. Common fixed points of almost generalized contractive mappings in ordered metric spaces. Appl Math Comput. 2011;217:5784-9.
- [7] Ćirić L, Hussain N, Ćakic N. Common fixed points for Ćirić type f -weak contraction with applications. Publ Math (Debr.). 2010;76(1-2):31-49.
- [8] Ćirić LB. A generalization of Banach principle. Proc Am Math Soc. 1974;45:727-30.
- [9] Hussain N, Berinde V, Shafqat N. Common fixed point and approximation results for generalized ϕ – contractions. Fixed Point Theor. 2009;10:111-24.
- [10] Hussain N, Cho YJ. Weak contractions, common fixed points and invariant approximations. J Inequal Appl. 2009;2009(1):Article ID 390634. DOI: 10.1155/2009/390634
- [11] Hussain N, Jungck G. Common fixed point and invariant approximation results for noncommuting generalized (f, g) -nonexpansive maps. J Math Anal Appl. 2006;321(2):851-61. DOI: 10.1016/j.jmaa.2005.08.045
- [12] Hussain N, Khamsi MA, Latif A. Banach operator pairs and common fixed points in hyperconvex metric spaces. Nonlinear Anal. 2011;74(17):5956-61. DOI: 10.1016/j.na.2011.05.072

- [13] Hussain N, Khamsi MA. On asymptotic pointwise contractions in metric spaces. *Nonlinear Anal.* 2009;71(10):4423-9.
DOI: 10.1016/j.na.2009.02.126
- [14] Hussain N, Pathak HK. Subweakly biased pairs and Jungck contractions with applications. *Numer Funct Anal Optim.* 2011;32(10):1067-82.
DOI: 10.1080/01630563.2011.587627
- [15] Jachymski J. Equivalent conditions for generalized contractions on (ordered) metric spaces. *Nonlinear Anal.* 2011;74(3):768-74.
DOI: 10.1016/j.na.2010.09.025
- [16] Kannan R. Some results on fixed points. *Bull Calcutta Math Soc.* 1968;60:71-6.
- [17] Karapınar E, Erhan IM. Fixed point theorems for operators on partial metric spaces. *Appl Math Lett.* 2011;24:1900-4.
- [18] Karapınar E, Samet B. Generalized $(\alpha-\psi)$ contractive type mappings and related fixed point theorems with applications. *Anal.* 2012;2012:Abstr Appl:Article ID 793486.
- [19] Karapınar E, Yuce IS. Fixed point theory for cyclic generalized weak ϕ -contraction on partial metric spaces. *Anal.* 2012;2012:Abstr Appl:Article ID 491542.
- [20] Karapınar E, Yüksel U. Some common fixed point theorems in partial metric spaces. *J Appl Math.* 2011;2011:Article ID 26362.
DOI: 10.1155/2011/263621
- [21] Karapınar E. Best proximity points of cyclic mappings. *Appl Math Lett.* 2012;25(11):1761-6.
DOI: 10.1016/j.aml.2012.02.008
- [22] Karapınar E. Generalizations of Caristi Kirk's theorem on partial metric spaces. *Fixed Point Theor Appl.* 2011;2011(1).
DOI: 10.1186/1687-1812-2011-4
- [23] Karapınar E. Weak ϕ -contraction on partial metric spaces. *J Comput Anal Appl.* 2012;14(2):206-10.
- [24] Nashine HK, Sintunavarat W, Kumam P. Cyclic generalized contractions and fixed point results with applications to an integral equation. *Fixed Point Theor Appl.* 2012;2012(1):Article ID 217.
DOI: 10.1186/1687-1812-2012-217
- [25] Samet B, Vetro C, Vetro P. Fixed point theorem for $\alpha-\psi$ contractive type mappings. *Nonlinear Anal.* 2012;75(4):2154-65.
DOI: 10.1016/j.na.2011.10.014
- [26] Sintunavarat W, Cho YJ, Kumam P. Common fixed point theorems for c -distance in ordered cone metric spaces. *Comput Math Appl.* 2011;62(4):1969-78.
DOI: 10.1016/j.camwa.2011.06.040
- [27] Sintunavarat W, Kim JK, Kumam P. Fixed point theorems for a generalized almost (ϕ, φ) -contraction with respect to S in ordered metric spaces. *J Inequal Appl.* 2012;263:2012.
- [28] Sintunavarat W, Kumam P. Common fixed point theorems for generalized JH -operator classes and invariant approximations. *J Inequal Appl.* 2011;67:2011.
- [29] Sintunavarat W, Kumam P. Generalized common fixed point theorems in complex valued metric spaces and applications. *J Inequal Appl.* 2012;2012(1):Article ID 84.
DOI: 10.1186/1029-242X-2012-84

- [30] Sintunavarat W, Kumam P. Gregus type fixed points for a tangential multi-valued mappings satisfying contractive conditions of integral type. *J Inequal Appl.* 2011;2011(1):Article ID 3.
DOI: 10.1186/1029-242X-2011-3
- [31] Sintunavarat W, Kumam P. Weak condition for generalized multi-valued (f, α, β) -weak contraction mappings. *Appl Math Lett.* 2011;24(4):460-5.
DOI: 10.1016/j.aml.2010.10.042
- [32] Akbar F, Khan AR. Common fixed point and approximation results for noncommuting maps on locally convex spaces. *Fixed Point Theor Appl.* 2009;2009:Article ID 207503.
DOI: 10.1155/2009/207503
- [33] Berinde V. Approximating common fixed points of noncommuting almost contractions in metric spaces. *Fixed Point Theor.* 2010;11(2):179-88.
- [34] Berinde V. Common fixed points of noncommuting almost contractions in cone metric spaces. *Math Commun.* 2010;15(1):229-41.
- [35] Berinde V. Common fixed points of noncommuting discontinuous weakly contractive mappings in cone metric spaces. *Taiwan J Math.* 2010;14(5):1763-76.
DOI: 10.11650/twjm/1500406015
- [36] Edelstein M. On fixed and periodic points under contractive mappings. *J Lond Math Soc.* 1962;s1-37(1):74-9.
DOI: 10.1112/jlms/s1-37.1.74
- [37] Harjani J, Sadarangani K. Fixed point theorems for weakly contractive mappings in partially ordered sets. *Nonlinear Anal.* 2009;71(7-8):3403-10.
DOI: 10.1016/j.na.2009.01.240
- [38] Suzuki T. A generalized Banach contraction principle that characterizes metric completeness. *Proc Am Math Soc.* 2008;136:1861-70.
- [39] Bryant V. *Metric spaces: iteration and application.* Cambridge University Press. ISBN 0-521-31897-1; 1985.
- [40] George A, Veeramani P. On some results in fuzzy metric spaces. *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* 1994;64(3):395-9.
DOI: 10.1016/0165-0114(94)90162-7

© 2023 Deepika and Kumar; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here (Please copy paste the total link in your browser address bar)

<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/93300>