Global Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics.
ISSN 0973-1768 Volume 13, Number 6 (2017), pp. 2325-2346

http://www.ripublication.com

Common Fixed Point for Generalized Weakly Contractive Maps

Manoj Kumar[1], Vishnu Narayan Mishra[2, *] and Dipti Tapiawala[3,4]

[1]*Department of Mathematics,*

Guru Jambheshwar University of Science and Technology, Hisar-125 001, India

[2]*Applied Mathematics and Humanities Department, S.V. National Institute of Technology, Surat 395 007, Gujarat, India*

[3]*Department of Mathematics, C U Shah university, Surendranagar-Ahmedabad High way Nr Kotharity village Wadhwan City 363030, Surendranagar, Gujarat, India*

[4]*AS and H Department (Mathematics), Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel Institute of Technology, Vasad 388 306, Anand, Gujarat, India*

Abstract

In this paper, first we prove a common fixed point theorem for a pair of weakly compatible maps under generalized weak contractive condition. Secondly, we prove common fixed point theorems for weakly compatible mappings along with E.A. and (CLR_f) properties. At the end, we prove a common fixed point theorem for variants of R-weakly commutative maps.

Keywords: Weakly compatible maps, weak contraction, generalized weak contraction, E.A. property, (CLR_f) property, R-weakly commuting mapping of type (A_g), R-weakly commuting mapping of type (A_f), R-weakly commuting mapping of type (P).

Mathematics Subject Classification: (2001) AMS 47H10, 54H25.

1. INTRODUCTION

In 1922, the Polish mathematician, Banach proved a common fixed point theorem, which ensures the existence and uniqueness of a fixed point under appropriate conditions. This result of Banach is known as Banach's fixed point theorem or Banach contraction principle, which states that " Let (X, d) be a complete metric space. If T satisfies

(1.1) $$d(Tx, Ty) \leq k\, d(x, y)$$

for each x, y in X, where 0 < k < 1, then T has a unique fixed point in X". This theorem provides a technique for solving a variety of applied problems in mathematical sciences and engineering.

This principle is basic tool in fixed point theory.

Many authors extended, generalized and improved Banach fixed point theorem in different ways. For the last quarter of the 20^{th} century, there has been a considerable interest in the study of common fixed point of pair (or family) of mappings satisfying contractive conditions in metric spaces. Several interesting and elegant results were obtained in this direction by various authors. The generalization of Banach's fixed point theorem by Jungck [12] gave a new direction to the "Fixed point theory Literature". This theorem has had many applications, but suffers from the drawback that the definition requires that T be continuous throughout X. There then follows a flood of papers involving contractive definition that do not require the continuity of T. This result was further generalized and extended in various ways by many authors. On the other hand, Sessa [37] coined the notion of weak commutativity and proved common fixed point theorem for a pair of mappings.

Definition 1.1. Two self-mappings f and g of a metric space (X, d) are said to be weakly commuting if $d(fgx, gfx) \leq d(gx, fx)$ for all x in X.

Further, Jungck [13] introduced more generalized commutativity, so called compatibility, which is more general than that of weak commutativity.

Definition 1.2. Two self-mappings f and g of a metric space (X, d) are said to be compatible if $\lim_{n\to\infty} d(fgx_n, gfx_n) = 0$, whenever $\{x_n\}$ is a sequence in X such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} fx_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} gx_n = t$ for some t in X.

This concept has been useful for obtaining fixed point theorems for compatible mappings satisfying contractive conditions and assuming continuity of atleast one of the mappings. It has been known from the paper of Kannan [12] that there exists maps that have a discontinuity in the domain but which have fixed points, moreover, the maps involved in every case were continuous at the fixed point. This paper was a genesis for a multitude of fixed point papers over the next two decades. Some interesting work can be cited in [8-10, 17, 19-27, 29, 33].

In 1994, Pant [31] introduced the notion of R-weakly commuting mappings in metric spaces, firstly to widen the scope of the study of common fixed point theorems from the class of compatible to the wider class of R-weakly commuting mappings. Secondly, maps are not necessarily continuous at the fixed point.

Definition 1.3. A pair of self-mappings (f, g) of a metric space (X, d) is said to be R-weakly commuting if there exists some $R \geq 0$ such that $d(fgx, gfx) \leq R\, d(fx, gx)$ for all x in X.

In 1997, Pathak et al. [32] introduced the improved notions of R-weakly commuting mappings and called these maps as R-weakly commuting mappings of type (A_f) and R-weakly commuting mappings of type (A_g).

Definition 1.4. A pair of self-mappings (f, g) of a metric space (X, d) is said to be

(i) R-weakly commuting mappings of type (A_f) if there exists some $R > 0$ such that

$$d(fgx, ggx) \leq R\, d(fx, gx) \text{ for all x in X.}$$

(ii) R-weakly commuting mappings of type (A_g) if there exists some $R > 0$ such that

$$d(gfx, ffx) \leq R\, d(fx, gx) \text{ for all x in X.}$$

In 1996, Jungck [14] introduced the concept of weakly compatible maps as follows:

Two self maps f and g are said to be weakly compatible if they commute at coincidence points.

Example 1.5. Let $X = \mathbb{R}$. Define $f, g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by $fx = x/3$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $gx = x^2$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Here 0 and 1/3 are two coincidence points for the maps f and g. Note that f and g commute at 0, i.e., $fg(0) = gf(0) = 0$, but $fg(1/3) = f(1/9) = 1/27$ and $gf(1/3) = g(1/9) = 1/81$ and so f and g are not weakly compatible on $\mathbb{R}$.

Example 1.6. Weakly compatible maps need not be compatible. Let $X = [2, 20]$ and d be the usual metric on X. Define mappings $B, T : X \to X$ by $Bx = x$ if $x = 2$ or > 5, Bx = 6 if 2 < x ≤ 5, Tx = x if x = 2, Tx = 12 if 2 < x ≤ 5, Tx = x-3 if x > 5. The mappings B and T are non-compatible, since sequence $\{x_n\}$ defined by $x_n = 5 + (1/n)$, n ≥ 1.

Then $Tx_n \to 2$, $Bx_n \to 2$, $TBx_n \to 2$ and $BTx_n \to 6$. But they are weakly compatible, since they commute at coincidence point at x = 2.

In 2009, Kumar et al. [18] introduced the notion of R-weakly commuting maps of type (P) as follows:

Definition 1.7. A pair of self-mappings (f, g) of a metric space (X, d) is said to be R-weakly commuting mapping of type (P) if there exists some R > 0 such that

$$d(ffx, ggx) \le Rd(fx, gx) \text{ for all x in X.}$$

Remark 1.8. We have suitable examples to show that R- weakly commuting mappings, R-weakly commuting of type (A_f), R-weakly commuting of type (A_g) and R-weakly commuting of type (P) are distinct.

Example 1.9. Consider X = [-1, 1] with usual metric d defined by d(x, y) = $|x - y|$ for all x, y in X. Define fx = $|x|$ and gx = $|x|$ - 1. Then by a straightforward calculation, one can show that

d(fx, gx) = 1, d(fgx, gfx) = 2(1- $|x|$), d(fgx, ggx) = 1, d(gfx, ffx) = 1, d(ffx, ggx) = 2$|x|$ for all x in X.

Now, we conclude the following:

(i) pair (f, g) is not weakly commuting.

(ii) for R = 2, pair (f, g) is R-weakly commuting, R-weakly commuting of type (A_f), R-weakly commuting of type (A_g) and R-weakly commuting of type (P).

(iii) for R = $\frac{3}{2}$, pair (f, g) is R-weakly commuting of type (A_f) but not R-weakly commuting of type (P) and R-weakly commuting.

Example 1.10. Consider X = [0, 1] with usual metric d defined by d(x, y) = $|x - y|$ for all x, y in X. Define fx = x and gx = x^2. Then by a straightforward calculation, one can show that ffx = x, gfx = x^2, fgx = x^2, ggx = x^4 and d(fgx, gfx) = 0, d(fgx, ggx) = $|x^2(x-1)(x+1)|$, d(gfx, ffx) = $|x(x-1)|$, d(ffx, ggx) = $|(x^2+x+1)x(x-1)|$ and d(fx, gx) = $|x(x-1)|$ for all x in X.

Therefore, we conclude that

(i) pair (f, g) is R-weakly commuting for all positive real values of R.

(ii) for R = 3, pair (f, g) is R-weakly commuting of type (A_f), R-weakly commuting of type (A_g) and R-weakly commuting of type (P).

(iii) for R = 2, pair (f, g) is R-weakly commuting of type (A_f), R-weakly commuting of type (A_g) and not R-weakly commuting of type (P) (for this take x = $\frac{3}{4}$).

Example 1.11. Consider X = $[\frac{1}{2}, 2]$. Let us define self maps f and g by fx = $\frac{x+1}{3}$, gx = $\frac{x+2}{5}$.

We calculate the following:

d(fx, gx) = $\frac{2x-1}{15}$, d(fgx, gfx) = 0, d(fgx, ggx) = $\frac{2x-1}{75}$, d(gfx, ffx) = $\frac{2x-1}{45}$ and d(ffx, ggx) = $\frac{8(2x-1)}{225}$.

Now, we conclude the following:

The pair (f, g) is R-weakly commuting for all positive real numbers.

For R ≥ $\frac{8}{15}$, it is R-weakly commuting of type (A_f), R-weakly commuting of type (A_g) and R-weakly commuting of type (P).

For $\frac{1}{3}$ ≤ R < $\frac{8}{15}$, it is R-weakly commuting of type (A_f) and R-weakly commuting of type (A_g) but not R-weakly commuting of type (P).

For $\frac{1}{5}$ ≤ R < $\frac{1}{3}$, it is R-weakly commuting of type (A_f) but not R-weakly commuting of type (A_g) and R-weakly commuting of type (P).

Moreover, such mappings commute at their coincidence points. It is also obvious that f and g can fail to be pointwise R-weakly commuting only if there exists some x in X such that fx = gx but fgx ≠ gfx, that is, only if they possess a coincidence point at which they do not commute. Therefore, the notion of pointwise R-weak commutativity type mapping is equivalent to commutativity at coincidence points.

In 2002, Aamri et al. [1] introduced the notion of E.A. property as follows:

Definition 1.12. Two self-mappings f and g of a metric space (X, d) are said to satisfy E.A. property if there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} fx_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} gx_n = t$ for some t in X.

Example 1.13. Let X = [0, 1] be endowed with the Euclidean metric d(x, y) = $|x - y|$ and let fx = $\frac{1}{5}$ x and gx = $\frac{3}{5}$ x for each x ∈ X.

Consider the sequence $\{x_n\} = \{\frac{1}{n}\}$ so that $\lim_{n\to\infty} fx_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} gx_n = 0$, where 0 ∈ X. Hence the pair (f, g) satisfy the E.A. property.

In 2011, Sintunavarat et al. [38] introduced the notion of (CLR_f) property as follows:

Definition 1.14. Two self-mappings f and g of a metric space (X, d) are said to satisfy (CLR_f) property if there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} fx_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} gx_n =$ fx for some x in X.

Example 1.15. Let X = [0, 1] be endowed with the Euclidean metric d(x, y) = $|x - y|$ and let

fx = x and gx = x^2 for each x ∈ X.

Consider the sequence $\{x_n\} = \{\frac{1}{n}\}$ so that $\lim_{n\to\infty} fx_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} gx_n = 0 = f(0)$. Hence the pair (f, g) satisfy the (CLR_f) property.

2. MAIN RESULTS

In 1984, Khan et al. [16] addressed a new category of fixed point problems with the help of a control function and called it altering distance function.

Definition 2.1. A function $\psi : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ is called an altering distance function if the following properties are satisfied:

(i) $\psi(0) = 0$,

(ii) ψ is continuous and monotonically non-decreasing.

In 1984, Khan et al. [16] proved the following fixed point theorem using altering distance function as follows:

Theorem 2.2. Let (X, d) be a complete metric space. Let ψ be an altering distance function and

f : X → X be a self-mapping which satisfies the following inequality:

(2.1) $$\psi(d(fx, fy)) \leq c\, \psi(d(x, y))$$

for all x,y ∈ X and for some 0 < c < 1. Then f has a unique fixed point.

Altering distance has been used in metric fixed point theory in a number of papers. Some of the works utilizing the concept of altering distance function are noted in [3, 30, 35-36].

In 2000 and 2005, Chaudhary et al. ([6] and [7]) extend the notion of altering distance to two variables and three variables.

An interesting generalization of the contraction principle was suggested by Alber and Guerre-Delabriere [2] in complete metric spaces as follows:

Definition 2.3. A mapping T : X → X, where (X, d) is a metric space, is said to be weakly contractive if

(2.2) $$d(Tx, Ty) \leq d(x, y) - \varphi(d(x, y)),$$

where x,y ∈ X and φ : [0, ∞) → [0, ∞) is a continuous and nondecreasing function such that $\varphi(t) = 0$ if and only if t = 0.

If one takes $\varphi(t) = kt$ where 0 < k < 1, then (2.2) reduces to the type of (1.1).

Weakly contractive mappings have been dealt with in a number of papers. Some of these works are noted in [3, 5, 27, 39].

In 2001, Rhoades [32] proved the following Theorem:

Theorem 2.4. Let T : X → X be a weakly contractive mapping on a complete metric space

(X, d), then T has a unique fixed point.

In fact, Alber and Guerre-Delabriere [2] assumed an additional condition on φ which is $\lim_{t\to\infty} \varphi(t) = \infty$. But Rhoades [32] obtained the result noted in Theorem 2.4 without using this particular assumption.

It may be observed that the function φ has been defined in the same way as the altering distance function, the way but it's behavior is completely different from the use of altering distance function.

In 2008, Dutta et al. [11] proved the following Theorem:

Theorem 2.5. Let (X, d) be a complete metric space and let T : X → X be a self-mapping satisfying the inequality

(2.3) $$\psi(d(Tx, Ty)) \leq \psi(d(x, y)) - \varphi(d(x, y)),$$

where $,\psi$: [0, ∞) → [0, ∞) are both continuous and monotone non-decreasing functions with $\psi(t) = 0 = \varphi(t)$ if and only if t = 0.

Then T has a unique fixed point.

In 2006, Beg et al. [4] generalized Theorem 2.5 in the following form:

Theorem 2.6. Let (X, d) be a metric space and let f be a weakly contractive mapping with respect to g, that is,

(2.4) $$\psi(d(fx, fy)) \leq \psi(d(gx, gy)) - \varphi(d(gx, gy)),$$

for all x,y ∈ X , where $\varphi, \psi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ are two mappings with $\varphi(0) = \psi(0) = 0$, ψ is continuous nondecreasing and φ is lower semi-continuous.

If fX ⊂ gX and gX is a complete subspace of X, then f and g have coincidence point in X.

In 2012, Moradi et al. [28] proved the following Theorems:

Theorem 2.7. Let T be self mapping on a complete metric space (X, d) satisfying the following:

$$\psi(d(Tx, Ty)) \leq \psi(d(x, y)) - \varphi(d(x, y)),$$

for all x,y ∈ X (known as $(\psi - \varphi)$ weakly contractive), where $\varphi, \psi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be two mappings with $\varphi(0) = \psi(0) = 0$, $\varphi(t) > 0$ and $\psi(t) > 0$ for all t > 0.

Also suppose that either

(i) ψ is continuous and $\lim_{n\to\infty} t_n = 0$, if $\lim_{n\to\infty} \varphi(t_n) = 0$.

or

(ii) ψ is monotone non-decreasing and $\lim_{n\to\infty} t_n = 0$, if $\{t_n\}$ is bounded and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \varphi(t_n) = 0$.

Then T has a unique fixed point.

Theorem 2.8. Let T be a self mapping on a complete metric space (X, d) satisfying the following:

$\psi(d(Tx, Ty)) \leq \psi(N(x, y)) - \varphi(N(x, y))$,

where $N(x, y) = \max\{d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty), \frac{d(x,Ty)+ d(y,Tx)}{2}\}$,

for all x,y ∈ X (generalized ($\psi - \varphi$) weakly contractive), where $\varphi : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ is a mapping with $\varphi(0) = 0$ and $\varphi(t) > 0$ for all t > 0 and $\lim_{n\to\infty} t_n = 0$, if $\{t_n\}$ is bounded and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \varphi(t_n) = 0$ and $\psi : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ is a mapping with $\psi(0) = 0$ and $\psi(t) > 0$ for all t > 0.

Also suppose that either

(iii) ψ is continuous

or

(iv) ψ is monotone non-decreasing and for all k > 0, $\varphi(k) > \psi(k) - \psi(k-)$, where $\psi(k-)$ is the

left limit of ψ at k.

Then T has a unique common fixed point.

Now, we prove our results relaxing the condition of completeness on metric space for pair of weakly compatible mappings.

Theorem 2.9. Let f and g be self mappings of a metric space (X, d) satisfying the followings:

(2.5) gX ⊂ fX,

(2.6) gX or fX is complete,

(2.7) $\psi(d(gx, gy)) \leq \psi(N(fx, fy)) - \varphi(N(fx, fy))$,

where $N(fx, fy) = \max\{d(fx, fy), d(fx, gx), d(fy, gy), \frac{d(fx,gy)+ d(fy,gx)}{2}\}$,

for all x,y ∈ X (generalized ($\psi - \varphi$) weakly contractive), where $\varphi : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ is a mapping with $\varphi(0) = 0$ and $\varphi(t) > 0$ for all t > 0 and $\lim_{n\to\infty} t_n = 0$, if $\{t_n\}$ is bounded and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \varphi(t_n) = 0$ and $\psi : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ is a mapping with $\psi(0) = 0$ and $\psi(t) > 0$ for all t > 0.

Suppose also that either

(a) ψ is continuous

or

(b) ψ is monotone non-decreasing and for all k > 0, $\varphi(k) > \psi(k) - \psi(k-)$, where $\psi(k-)$ is the

left limit of ψ at k.

Then f and g have a unique point of coincidence in X. Moreover, if f and g are weakly compatible, then f and g have a unique common fixed point.

Proof. Let $x_0 \in X$. From (2.5), one can construct sequences $\{x_n\}$ and $\{y_n\}$ in X by $y_n = fx_{n+1} = gx_n$, n = 0, 1, 2, ...

Moreover, we assume that if $y_n = y_{n+1}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then there is nothing to prove. Now, we

assume that $y_n \neq y_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

From (2.7), we have

(2.8) $$\psi(d(y_{n+1}, y_n)) \leq \psi(N(y_n, y_{n-1})) - \varphi(N(y_n, y_{n-1})),$$

where

(2.9) $$N(y_n, y_{n-1}) = \max\{ d(y_n, y_{n-1}), d(y_n, y_{n+1}), d(y_{n-1}, y_n), \frac{d(y_n, y_n) + d(y_{n-1}, y_{n+1})}{2}\}.$$

If $d(y_n, y_{n-1}) < d(y_n, y_{n+1})$, then from (2.8) and $y_n \neq y_{n+1}$, we conclude that

(2.10) $$\psi(d(y_{n+1}, y_n)) \leq \psi(d(y_n, y_{n+1})) - \varphi(d(y_n, y_{n+1})) < \psi(d(y_n, y_{n+1})),$$ a contradiction. Therefore, $d(y_n, y_{n+1}) \leq d(y_n, y_{n-1})$.

Hence the sequence $\{ (d(y_n, y_{n+1})) \}$ is monotonically decreasing and bounded below.

From (2.8) and (2.9), we have

(2.11) $$\psi(d(y_{n+1}, y_n)) \leq \psi(d(y_n, y_{n-1})) - \varphi(d(y_n, y_{n-1})).$$

Therefore, the sequence $\{ \psi(d(y_{n+1}, y_n)) \}$ is monotonically decreasing and bounded below. Thus, there exists $r \geq 0$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \psi(d(y_{n+1}, y_n)) = r$.

From (2.11), we have

(2.12) $$\lim_{n\to\infty} \varphi((d(y_n, y_{n-1})) = 0, \text{ implies that, } \lim_{n\to\infty} d(y_{n+1}, y_n) = 0.$$

Now, we claim that $\{y_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Indeed, if it is false, then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ and the subsequences $\{y_{m(k)}\}$ and $\{y_{n(k)}\}$ of $\{y_n\}$ such that n(k) is minimal in the sense that n(k) > m(k) > k and $d(y_{m(k)}, y_{n(k)}) \leq \varepsilon$ and by using the triangular inequality, we obtain

$$\varepsilon < d(y_{m(k)}, y_{n(k)}) \leq d(y_{m(k)}, y_{m(k)-1}) + d(y_{m(k)-1}, y_{n(k)-1}) + d(y_{n(k)-1}, y_{n(k)})$$

$$\leq d(y_{m(k)}, y_{m(k)-1}) + d(y_{m(k)-1}, y_{m(k)}) + d(y_{m(k)}, y_{n(k)-1}) + d(y_{n(k)-1}, y_{n(k)})$$

(2.13) $$\leq 2\, d(y_{m(k)}, y_{m(k)-1}) + \varepsilon + d(y_{n(k)-1}, y_{n(k)}).$$

Letting $k \to \infty$ in the above inequality and using (2.10), we get

(2.14) $$\lim_{k\to\infty} (d(y_{m(k)}, y_{n(k)}) = \lim_{k\to\infty} (d(y_{m(k)-1}, y_{n(k)-1}) = \varepsilon.$$

From (2.7), for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

(2.15) $$\psi(d(y_{m(k)}, y_{n(k)})) \leq \psi(N(y_{m(k)-1}, y_{n(k)-1})) - \varphi(N(y_{m(k)-1}, y_{n(k)-1})),$$

where

(2.16) $$N(y_{m(k)-1}, y_{n(k)-1}) = \max\{ d(y_{m(k)-1}, y_{n(k)-1}), d(y_{m(k)-1}, y_{m(k)}), d(y_{n(k)-1}, y_{n(k)}), \frac{d(y_{m(k)-1}, y_{n(k)}) + d(y_{n(k)-1}, y_{m(k)})}{2}\}$$

If (2.14) and (2.16) holds, then we conclude that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \psi(N(y_{m(k)-1}, y_{n(k)-1})) = \varepsilon$.

If ψ is continuous, then

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \psi(d(y_{m(k)}, y_{n(k)})) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \psi(N(y_{m(k)-1}, y_{n(k)-1})) = \psi(\varepsilon),$$

and hence from (2.15), we conclude that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \varphi(N(y_{m(k)-1}, y_{n(k)-1})) = 0.$$

Since $N(y_{m(k)-1}, y_{n(k)-1})$ is bounded, we conclude that $\lim_{k\to\infty} N(y_{m(k)-1}, y_{n(k)-1}) = 0$, a contradiction.

If ψ is monotone non-decreasing, then from (2.15), we have

$\varepsilon < d(y_{m(k)}, y_{n(k)}) < N(y_{m(k)-1}, y_{n(k)-1})$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and so $d(y_{m(k)}, y_{n(k)}) \to \varepsilon^+$ and $N(y_{m(k)-1}, y_{n(k)-1}) \to \varepsilon^+$ as $k \to \infty$.

Hence $\lim_{k\to\infty} \psi(d(y_{m(k)}, y_{n(k)})) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \psi(N(y_{m(k)-1}, y_{n(k)-1})) = \psi(\varepsilon^+)$, where $\psi(\varepsilon^+)$ is the right limit of ψ at ε.

Therefore, from (2.15), we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \varphi(N(y_{m(k)-1}, y_{n(k)-1})) = 0.$$

Since $\{N(y_{m(k)-1}, y_{n(k)-1})\}$ is bounded, we conclude that $\lim_{k\to\infty} N(y_{m(k)-1}, y_{n(k)-1}) = 0$, a contradiction.

Thus $\{y_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence.

Since fX is complete, so there exists a point z ∈ fX such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} y_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} fx_{n+1} = z$.

Now, we show that z is the common fixed point of f and g.

Since z ∈ fX, so there exists a point p ∈ X such that fp = z.

We claim that fp = gp. Let, if possible, fp ≠ gp.

From (2.7), we have

$$\psi(d(gp, fp)) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \psi(d(gp, gx_n)) \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \psi(N(fp, fx_n)) - \lim_{n\to\infty} \varphi(N(fp, fx_n)),$$

$$= \psi(d(fp, gp)) - \varphi(d(fp, gp)),$$

since $N(fp, fx_n) = \max\{d(fp, fx_n), d(fp, gp), d(fx_n, gx_n), \frac{d(fp,gx_n)+ d(fx_n,gp)}{2}\}$.

Letting limit as n → ∞, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} N(fp, fx_n) = \max\{d(fp, z), d(fp, gp), d(z, z), \frac{d(fp,z)+ d(z,gp)}{2}\}$$

$$= \max\{0, d(fp, gp), 0, \frac{d(fp,gp)}{2}\} = d(fp, gp).$$

If (a) holds, then we have

$\psi(d(gp, fp)) < \psi(d(gp, fp))$, a contradiction.

If (b) holds, then we have

$d(gp, fp) < d(gp, fp)$, a contradiction.

Hence fp = gp = z.

Now we show that z = fp = gp is a common fixed point of f and g. Since fp = gp and f, g are weakly compatible maps, we have fz = fgp = gfp = gz.

We claim that fz = gz = z.

Let, if possible gz ≠ z.

From (2.7), we have

$$\psi(d(gz, z)) = \psi(d(gz, gp)) \leq \psi(N(fz, fp)) - \varphi(N(fz, fp))$$

$$= \psi(d(gz, z)) - \varphi(d(gz, z)),$$

since $N(fz, fp) = \max\{d(fz, fp), d(fz, gz), d(fp, gp), \frac{d(fz,gp)+ d(fp,gz)}{2}\}$

$$= \max\{d(gz, z), d(gz, gz), d(gp, gp), \frac{d(gz,z)+ d(z,gz)}{2}\}$$

$$= d(gz, z).$$

If (a) holds, then we have

ψ(d(gz, z)) < ψ(d(gz, z)) , a contradiction.

If (b) holds, then we have

d(gz, z) < d(gz, z) , a contradiction.

Hence gz = z = fz, so z is the common fixed point of f and g.

For the uniqueness, let u be another common fixed point of f and g, so that fu = gu = u.

We claim that z = u.

Let, if possible, z ≠ u.

From (2.7), we have

ψ(d(z, u)) = ψ(d(gz, gu)) ≤ ψ(N(fz, fu)) – φ(N(fz, fu))

= ψ(d(fz, fu)) – φ(d(fz, fu)), since N(fz, fu) = d(fz, fu).

= ψ(d(z, u)) – φ(d(z, u)).

If (a) holds, then we have

ψ(d(z, u)) < ψ(d(z, u)), a contradiction.

If (b) holds, then we have

d(z, u) < d(z, u), a contradiction.

Thus, we get z = u. Hence z is the unique common fixed point of f and g.

Corollary 2.10. Let f and g be self mappings on a metric space (X, d) satisfying (2.5), (2.6) and the following:

(2.17) ψ(d(gx, gy)) ≤ ψ(d(fx, fy)) – φ(d(fx, fy)),

for all x,y ∈ X (($\psi - \varphi$) weakly contractive), where φ, ψ : [0, ∞) → [0, ∞) are two mappings with φ(0) = ψ(0) = 0, φ(t) > 0 and ψ(t) > 0 for all t > 0.

Suppose also that either

(a) ψ is continuous and $\lim_{n\to\infty} t_n$= 0, if $\lim_{n\to\infty} \varphi(t_n)$ = 0.

or

(b) ψ is monotone non-decreasing and $\lim_{n\to\infty} t_n$= 0, if $\{t_n\}$ is bounded and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \varphi(t_n)$ = 0.

Then f and g have a unique point of coincidence in X. Moreover, if f and g are weakly compatible, then f and g have a unique common fixed point.

Proof. By putting N(fx, fy) = d(fx, fy) in Theorem 2.9, we get the result.

Example 2.11. Let X = [0, 1] be endowed with the Euclidean metric d(x, y) = $|x - y|$ for all x, y in X and let gx = $\frac{1}{5}$ x and fx = $\frac{3}{5}$ x for each x ∈ X. Then

d(gx, gy) = $\frac{1}{5}|x - y|$ and d(fx, fy) = $\frac{3}{5}|x - y|$.

Let ψ(t) = 5t and φ(t) = t. Then

ψ(d(gx, gy)) = $\psi(\frac{1}{5}|x - y|) = 5\frac{1}{5}|x - y| = |x - y|$.

ψ(d(fx, fy)) = $\psi(\frac{3}{5}|x - y|) = 5\frac{3}{5}|x - y| = 3|x - y|$.

φ(d(fx, fy)) = $\varphi(\frac{3}{5}|x - y|) = \frac{3}{5}|x - y|$.

Now

ψ(d(fx, fy)) - φ(d(fx, fy)) = $(3 - \frac{3}{5})\,|x - y| = \frac{12}{5}|x - y|$.

So ψ(d(gx, gy)) < ψ(d(fx, fy)) - φ(d(fx, fy)).

Now, we conclude that f, g satisfy (2.17).

Also gX = $[0, \frac{1}{5}] \subseteq [0, \frac{3}{5}]$ = fX, gX is complete and f, g are weakly compatible. Hence all the conditions of Corollary 2.10 are satisfied. Here 0 is the unique common fixed point of f and g.

3. E.A. AND (CLR_F) PROPERTIES.

Theorem 3.1. Let (X, d) be a metric space and let f and g be weakly compatible self-maps of X satisfying (2.7), (a), (b), and the followings:

(3.1) f and g satisfy the E.A. property,

(3.2) fX is closed subset of X.

Then f and g have a unique common fixed point.

Proof. Since f and g satisfy the E.A. property, there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} fx_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} gx_n = x_0$ for some $x_0 \in X$. Now, fX is closed subset of X, therefore, for

$z \in X$, we have $\lim_{n\to\infty} fx_n = fz$.

We claim that $fz = gz$. Suppose that $fz \neq gz$.

From (2.7),we have

$\psi(d(gx_n, gz)) \leq \psi(N(fx_n, fz)) - \varphi(N(fx_n, fz))$.

Letting $n \to \infty$, we have

$$\psi(d(fz, gz)) \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \psi(N(fx_n, fz)) - \lim_{n\to\infty} \varphi(N(fx_n, fz))$$

$$= \psi(d(fz, gz)) - \varphi(d(fz, gz)), \text{ since } \lim_{n\to\infty} N(fx_n, fz) = d(fz, gz).$$

If (a) holds, then we have

$\psi(d(fz, gz)) < \psi(d(fz, gz))$, a contradiction.

If (b) holds, then we have

$d(fz, gz) < d(fz, gz)$, a contradiction.

Therefore, $fz = gz$.

Now, we show that gz is the common fixed point of f and g.

Suppose that $gz \neq ggz$. Since f and g are weakly compatible $gfz = fgz$ and therefore $ffz = ggz$.

From (2.7), we have

$$\psi(d(gz, ggz)) \leq \psi(N(fz, fgz)) - \varphi(N(fz, fgz))$$

$$= \psi(N(gz, gfz)) - \varphi(N(gz, gfz))$$

$$= \psi(N(gz, ggz)) - \varphi(N(gz, ggz))$$

$$= \psi(d(gz, ggz)) - \varphi(d(gz, ggz)), \text{ since } N(gz, ggz) = d(gz, ggz).$$

If (a) holds, then we have

$\psi(d(gz, ggz)) < \psi(d(gz, ggz))$, a contradiction.

If (b) holds, then we have

$d(gz, ggz) < d(gz, ggz)$, a contradiction.

Hence $ggz = gz$. Hence gz is the common fixed point of f and g.

Finally, we show that the fixed point is unique.

Let u and v be two common fixed points of f and g such that $u \neq v$.

Now $\psi(d(u, v)) = \psi(d(gu, gv))$

$\leq \psi(N(fu, fv)) - \varphi(N(fu, fv))$

$= \psi(N(u, v)) - \varphi(N(u, v))$

$= \psi(d(u, v)) - \varphi(d(u, v))$, since $N(u, v) = d(u, v)$.

If (a) holds, then we have

$\psi(d(u, v)) < \psi(d(u, v))$, a contradiction.

If (b) holds, then we have

$d(u, v) < d(u, v)$, a contradiction.

Therefore, $u = v$, which proves the uniqueness.

Corollary 3.2. Let (X, d) be a metric space and let f and g be weakly compatible self-maps of X satisfying (2.17), (3.1), (3.2), (a) and (b).

Then f and g have a unique common fixed point.

Proof. By putting $N(fx, fy) = d(fx, fy)$ in Theorem 3.1, we get the result.

Theorem 3.3. Let (X, d) be a metric space and let f and g be weakly compatible self-mappings of X satisfying (2.7), (a), (b) and the following:

(3.3) f and g satisfy (CLR_f) property.

Then f and g have a unique common fixed point.

Proof. Since f and g satisfy the (CLR_f) property, there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} fx_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} gx_n = fx$ for some $x \in X$.

Now, we claim that $fx = gx$.

From (2.7), we have

$\psi(d(gx_n, gx)) \leq \psi(N(fx_n, fx)) - \varphi(N(fx_n, fx))$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Letting $n \to \infty$, we have

$\psi(d(fx, gx)) \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \psi(N(fx_n, fx)) - \lim_{n\to\infty} \varphi(N(fx_n, fx))$

$= \psi(d(fx, fx)) - \varphi(d(fx, fx))$

$= \psi(0) - \varphi(0)$, since $\lim_{n\to\infty} N(fx_n, fx) = d(fx, fx) = 0$.

If (a) holds, then we have

$\psi(d(fx, gx)) \leq 0$, implies that $d(fx, gx) = 0$, that is, $fx = gx$.

If (b) holds, then we have

$d(fx, gx) \leq 0$, that is, $fx = gx$.

Thus, we get, $gx = fx$. Let $w = fx = gx$.

Since f and g are weakly compatible $gfx = fgx$, implies that, $fw = fgx = gfx = gw$.

Now, we claim that $gw = w$.

Let, if possible, $gw \neq w$.

From (2.7), we have

$$\psi(d(gw, w)) = \psi(d(gw, gx)) \leq \psi(N(fw, fx)) - \varphi(N(fw, fx))$$

$$= \psi(d(fw, fx)) - \varphi(d(fw, fx))$$

$$= \psi(d(gw, w)) - \varphi(d(gw, w)), \text{ since } N(fw, fx) = d(fw, fx).$$

If (a) holds, then we have

$\psi(d(gw, w)) < \psi(d(gw, w))$, a contradiction.

If (b) holds, then we have

$d(gw, w) < d(gw, w)$, a contradiction.

Thus, we get $gw = w = fw$.

Hence w is the common fixed point of f and g.

For the uniqueness, let u be another common fixed point of f and g such that $fu = u = gu$.

We claim that $w = u$. Let, if possible, $w \neq u$.

From (2.7), we have

$$\psi(d(w, u)) = \psi(d(gw, gu)) \leq \psi(N(fw, fu)) - \varphi(N(fw,fu))$$

$$= \psi(d(fw, fu)) - \varphi(d(fw, fu))$$

$$= \psi(d(w, u)) - \varphi(d(w, u)), \text{ since } N(fw, fu) = d(fw, fu).$$

If (a) holds, then we have

$\psi(d(w, u)) < \psi(d(w, u))$, a contradiction.

If (b) holds, then we have

$d(w, u) < d(w, u)$, a contradiction.

Thus, we get $w = u$.

Hence w is the unique common fixed point of f and g.

Corollary 3.4. Let (X, d) be a metric space and let f and g be weakly compatible self-maps of X satisfying (2.17), (3.3), (a) and (b).

Then f and g have a unique common fixed point.

Proof. By putting N(fx, fy) = d(fx, fy) in Theorem 3.3, we get the result.

Example 3.5. Let X = [0, 1] be endowed with the Euclidean metric d(x, y) = $|x-y|$ and let gx = $\frac{1}{5}$ x and fx = $\frac{3}{5}$ x for each x ∈ X. Then

d(gx, gy) = $\frac{1}{5}|x-y|$ and d(fx, fy) = $\frac{3}{5}|x-y|$.

Let ψ(t) = 5t and φ(t) = t. Then

ψ(d(gx, gy)) = $\psi(\frac{1}{5}|x-y|) = 5\frac{1}{5}|x-y| = |x-y|$.

ψ(d(fx, fy)) = $\psi(\frac{3}{5}|x-y|) = 5\frac{3}{5}|x-y| = 3|x-y|$.

φ(d(fx, fy)) = $\varphi(\frac{3}{5}|x-y|) = \frac{3}{5}|x-y|$.

Now

ψ(d(fx, fy)) - φ(d(fx, fy)) = $(3-\frac{3}{5})\,|x-y| = \frac{12}{5}|x-y|$.

So ψ(d(gx, gy)) < ψ(d(fx, fy)) - φ(d(fx, fy)).

From here, we conclude that f, g satisfy the relation (2.17).

Consider the sequence $\{x_n\} = \{\frac{1}{n}\}$ so that $\lim_{n\to\infty} fx_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} gx_n$ = 0 = f(0), hence the pair (f, g) satisfy the (CLR_f) property. Also f and g are weakly compatible. From here, we also deduce that $\lim_{n\to\infty} fx_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} gx_n$ = 0, where 0 ∈ X, implies that f and g satisfy E.A. property. Hence all the conditions of Corollaries 3.2 and 3.4 are satisfied. Here 0 is the unique common fixed point of f and g.

Theorem 3.6. The Theorems 2.9, 3.1, 3.3 and Corollaries 3.2, 3.4 remains true if a weakly compatible property is replaced by any one (retaining the rest of hypothesis) of the following:

(i) R-weakly commuting property,

(ii) R-weakly commuting property of type (A_f),

(iii) R-weakly commuting property (A_g),

(iv) R-weakly commuting property (P),

(v) weakly commuting property.

Proof. Since all the conditions of all above theorem are satisfied, then the existence of coincidence points for both the pairs is insured. Let x be an arbitrary point of coincidence for the pairs (f, g), then using R-weak commutativity one gets

$$d(fgx, gfx) \leq R\ d(fx, gx) = 0,$$

which amounts to say that fgx = gfx. Thus the pair (f, g) is weakly compatible. Now applying above theorems one concludes that f and g have a unique common fixed point.

In case (f, g) is an R-weakly commuting pair of type (A_f), then

$d(fgx, g^2x) \leq d(fx, gx) = 0$, which amounts to say that $fgx = g^2x$.

Now $d(fgx, gfx) \leq d(fgx, g^2x) + d(g^2x, gfx) \leq 0 + 0 = 0$, yielding thereby fgx = gfx.

In case (f, g) is an R-weakly commuting pair of type (A_g), then

$d(fgx, f^2x) \leq d(fx, gx) = 0$, which amounts to say that $gfx = f^2x$.

Now $d(fgx, gfx) \leq d(fgx, f^2x) + d(f^2x, gfx) \leq 0 + 0 = 0$, yielding thereby fgx = gfx.

Similarly, if pair is R-weakly commuting mapping of type (P) or weakly commuting, then (f, g) also commutes at their points of coincidence. Now in view of above theorems, in all four cases f and g have a unique common fixed point.

REFERENCES

[1] Aamri M. and Moutawakil D. El., Some new common fixed point theorems under strict contractive conditions, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 270, 181-188, 2002.

[2] Alber Ya. I. and Guerre-Delabriere S., Principle of weakly contractive maps in Hilbert spaces, New Results in Operator Theory and Its Applications, I. Gohberg and Y. Basel, Lyubich, Eds., vol. 98 of Operator Theory: Advances and Applications, pp. 7–22, Birkh¨auser, Switzerland, 1997.

[3] Babu G. V. R., Lalitha B., and Sandhya M. L., Common fixed point theorems involving two generalized altering distance functions in four variables, Proceedings of the Jangjeon Mathematical Society, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 83–93, 2007.

[4] Beg I. and Abbas M., Coincidence point and invariant approximation for mappings satisfying generalized weak contractive condition, Fixed Point Theory and Applications, vol. 2006, Article ID 74503, 7 pages, 2006.

[5] Chidume C. E., Zegeye H., and Aneke S. J., Approximation of fixed points of weakly contractive nonself maps in Banach spaces, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications, vol. 270, no. 1, pp. 189–199, 2002.

[6] Choudhury B. S. and Dutta P. N., A unified fixed point result in metric spaces involving a two variable function, Filomat, no. 14, pp. 43–48, 2000.

[7] Choudhury B. S., A common unique fixed point result in metric spaces involving generalized altering distances, Mathematical Communications, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 105– 110, 2005.

[8] Deepmala and Pathak H.K., A study on some problems on existence of solutions for nonlinear functional-integral equations, Acta Mathematica Scientia, 33 B(5) (2013), 1305–1313.

[9] Deepmala, A Study on Fixed Point Theorems for Nonlinear Contractions and its Applications, Ph.D. Thesis (2014), Pt. Ravishankar Shukla University, Raipur 492 010, Chhatisgarh, India.

[10] Deshpande B., Handa A., Deepmala, Using implicit relation to prove common coupled fixed point theorems for two hybrid pairs of mappings, TWMS J. App. Eng. Math., Vol. 6, No.1, 2016, pp. 30-46.

[11] Dutta P. N., Choudhary B. S., A generalization of contraction principle in metric spaces, Hindawi Publishing Corporation, Fixed point theory and applications, vol. 2008, Article ID 406368, 8 pages.

[12] Jungck G., Commuting mapping and fixed point, Amer. Math. Monthly 83 (1976), 261-263.

[13] Jungck G., Compatible mappings and common fixed points, Int. J. Math. Math. Sci, 9(1986), 771-779.

[14] Jungck G., Common fixed points for non-continuous non-self mappings on non-metric spaces, Far East J. Math. Sci. 4(2), (1996), 199-212.

[15] Kannan R., Some Results on fixed points, bull. Cal. Math. Soc., 60(1968), 71-76.

[16] Khan M. S., Swaleh M. and Sessa S., Fixed point theorems by altering distances between the points, Bulletin of the Australian Mathematical Society, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 1– 9, 1984.

[17] Kumar P., Kumar M., Kumar S.; Common fixed point for weakly contractive maps, Journal of analysis and number theory, Vol. 3, No. 1, 2015, pp. 47-54.

[18] Kumar S. and Garg S.K., Expansion Mapping Theorem in Metric Spaces, Int. J. Contemp. Math. Sciences, Vol. 4, 2009, no. 36, 1749-1758.

[19] Mishra L.N., Sen M., On the concept of existence and local attractivity of solutions for some quadratic Volterra integral equation of fractional order, Applied Mathematics and Computation Vol. 285, (2016), 174-183. DOI: 10.1016/j.amc.2016.03.002

[20] Mishra L.N., Agarwal R.P., Sen M., Solvability and asymptotic behavior for some nonlinear quadratic integral equation involving Erd$\acute{\mbox{e}}$lyi-Kober fractional integrals on the unbounded interval, Progress in Fractional Differentiation and Applications Vol. 2, No. 3 (2016), 153-168.

[21] Mishra L.N., Srivastava H.M., Sen M., On existence results for some nonlinear functional-integral equations in Banach algebra with applications, Int. J. Anal. Appl., Vol. 11, No. 1, (2016), 1-10.

[22] Mishra L.N., Sen M., Mohapatra R.N., On existence theorems for some generalized nonlinear functional-integral equations with applications, Filomat, accepted on March 21, 2016, in press.

[23] Mishra L.N., Agarwal R.P., On existence theorems for some nonlinear functional-integral equations, Dynamic Systems and Applications, Vol. 25, (2016), pp. 303-320.

[24] Mishra L.N., Tiwari S.K., Mishra V.N., Khan I.A.; Unique Fixed Point Theorems for Generalized Contractive Mappings in Partial Metric Spaces, Journal of Function Spaces, Volume 2015 (2015), Article ID 960827, 8 pages.

[25] Mishra L.N., Tiwari S.K., Mishra V.N.; Fixed point theorems for generalized weakly S-contractive mappings in partial metric spaces, Journal of Applied Analysis and Computation, Volume 5, Number 4, 2015, pp. 600-612. doi:10.11948/2015047

[26] Mishra V.N., Some Problems on Approximations of Functions in Banach Spaces, Ph.D. Thesis (2007), Indian Institute of Technology, Roorkee 247 667, Uttarakhand, India.

[27] Mishra V.N., Mishra L.N., Trigonometric Approximation of Signals (Functions) in L_p $(p \geq 1)-$ norm, International Journal of Contemporary Mathematical Sciences, Vol. 7, no. 19, 2012, pp. 909 – 918.

[28] Moradi S. and Farajzadeh A., On the fixed point of $(\psi - \varphi)$- weak and generalized $(\psi - \varphi)$- weak contraction mappings, Applied Mathematics Letters 25 (2012), 1257-1262.

[29] Murthy P.P., Mishra L.N., Patel U.D.; n-tupled fixed point theorems for weak-contraction in partially ordered complete G-metric spaces, New Trends in Mathematical Sciences, Vol. 3, No. 4 (2015), pp. 50-75.

[30] Naidu S. V. R., Some fixed point theorems in metric spaces by altering distances, Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 205–212, 2003.

[31] Pant R.P., Common fixed points of non-commuting mappinhs, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 188(1994),436-440.

[32] Pathak H.K., Cho Y.J., Kang S.M., Remarks on R-weakly commuting mappings and common fixed point theorems, Bull. Korean Math. Soc. 34 (1997), No. 2, pp. 247-257.

[33] Pathak H.K. and Deepmala, Common fixed point theorems for PD-operator pairs under Relaxed conditions with applications, Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics, 239 (2013), 103-113.

[34] Rhoades B. E., Some theorems on weakly contractive maps, Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 2683–2693, 2001.

[35] Sastry K. P. R. and Babu G. V. R., Some fixed point theorems by altering distances between the points, Indian Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. 30, no. 6, pp. 641–647, 1999.

[36] Sastry K. P. R., Naidu S. V. R., Babu G. V. R. and Naidu G. A., Generalization of common fixed point theorems for weakly commuting map by altering distances, Tamkang Journal of Mathematics, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 243–250, 2000.

[37] Sessa S., On a weak commutativity conditions of mappings in fixed point consideration, Publ. Inst. Math. Beograd, 32(46) (1982), 146-153.

[38] Sintunavarat W. and Kumam P., Common Fixed Point Theorems for a Pair of Weakly Compatible mappings in Fuzzy Metric Spaces, Hindawi Publishing Corporation, Journal of Applied mathematics, vol. 2011, Article ID 637958, 14 pages.

[39] Zhang Q. and Song Y., Fixed point theory for generalized ϕ-weak contractions, Applied Mathematics Letters, 22 (2009), 75-78.