

COMMON FIXED POINT THEOREM FOR COINCIDENTALLY COMMUTING MAPPINGS IN MULTIPLICATIVE METRIC SPACES

Avinash Chandra Upadhyaya

Deenbandhu Chhotu Ram University of Science and Technology,
Murthal, Sonapat-131039, Haryana (India).

Abstract : In this paper ,we prove a unique common fixed point theorems using Presic type contraction in complete multiplicative metric spaces.

Key words : Multiplicative metric spaces, Presic type contraction, k-weak compatible mappings, fixed point.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 47H10, 54H25.

Introduction and preliminaries.

The set of positive real numbers is not complete with respect to usual metric. To overcome this difficulty, in 2008, Bashirov et al. [5] introduced the concept of multiplicative metric spaces as follows:

Definition1.1. ([5]) Let X be a non-empty set. A multiplicative metric is a mapping

$d: X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ satisfying the following conditions:

- (i) $d(x, y) \geq 1$ for all $x, y \in X$ and $d(x, y) = 1$ if and only if $x=y$;
- (ii) $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$ for all $x, y \in X$;
- (iii) $d(x, y) \leq d(x, z) \cdot d(z, y)$ for all $x, y, z \in X$ (multiplicative triangle inequality).

Then mapping d together with X i.e., (X, d) is known as multiplicative metric spaces.

Example1.2.([5]) Let \mathbb{R}^{n+} be the collection of all n-tuples of positive real numbers.

Let $d^*: \mathbb{R}^{n+} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined as follows:

$$d^*(x, y) = \left(\left| \frac{x_1}{y_1} \right|^* \cdot \left| \frac{x_2}{y_2} \right|^* \dots \left| \frac{x_n}{y_n} \right|^* \right),$$

where $x=(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, $y=(y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+}$ and $|\cdot|^*: \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is defined by

$$|a|^* = \begin{cases} a & \text{if } a \geq 1; \\ \frac{1}{a} & \text{if } a < 1. \end{cases}$$

Then (X, d) is a multiplicative metric space.

Example1.3. ([10]) Let $d: \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ be defined by

$$d(x, y) = a^{|x-y|}, \text{ where } x, y \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } a > 1.$$

Then d(x, y) is multiplicative metric and (X, d) is a multiplicative metric space. We may call it usual multiplicative metric spaces.

In 2015, M. Abbas et.al. introduced the notion of multiplicative absolute value function as follow:

Definition 1.4.([2]) A multiplicative absolute value function $|\cdot|: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is defined as

$$|x| = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x \geq 1 \\ \frac{1}{x} & \text{if } x \in (0,1) \\ 1 & \text{if } x = 0 \\ -\frac{1}{x} & \text{if } x \in (-1,0) \\ -x & \text{if } x \leq -1 \end{cases}$$

Proposition 1.5.([2]) For arbitrary $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^+$, the multiplicative absolute value function $|\cdot|: \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ satisfies the following:

- (1) $|x| \geq 1$.
- (2) $x \leq |x|$.
- (3) $1/|x| \leq x$ if $x > 0$ and $x \leq 1/|x|$ if $x \leq 0$.
- (4) $|x \cdot y| \leq |x| |y|$.

One can refer to ([10]) for detailed multiplicative metric topology.

Definition1.6.([7]) Let (X, d) be a multiplicative metric space. A sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X said to be a

- (i) multiplicative convergent sequence to x, if for every multiplicative open ball $B_\epsilon(x) = \{y \mid d(x, y) < \epsilon\}$, $\epsilon > 1$, there exists a natural number N such that $x_n \in B_\epsilon(x)$ for all $n \geq N$, i. e, $d(x_n, x) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
- (ii) multiplicative Cauchy sequence if for all $\epsilon > 1$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(x_n, x_m) < \epsilon$ for all $m, n > N$ i. e, $d(x_n, x_m) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

A multiplicative metric space is called complete if every multiplicative Cauchy sequence in X is multiplicative convergent to $x \in X$.

In 2012, Ozavsar gave the concept of multiplicative contraction mapping and proved some fixed point theorem for these maps in complete multiplicative metric spaces.

Definition 1.7.([7]) Let (X, d) be a multiplicative metric space. The map $f : X \rightarrow X$ is called a multiplicative contraction if there exists a real constant $\lambda \in [0, 1)$ such that

$$(1.1) \quad d(f(x_1), f(x_2)) \leq (d(x_1, x_2))^\lambda \text{ for all } x, y \in X.$$

Consider the k -th order nonlinear difference equation

$x_{n+k} = f(x_n, \dots, x_{n+k-1})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with the initial values $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k \in X$, where (X, d) is a metric space, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq 1$

and $f : X^k \rightarrow X$.

Equation (1.1) can be studied for fixed point theory in view of the fact that

$x^* \in X$ is a solution of (1.1) if and only if x^* is a fixed point of f , that is, $x^* = f(x^*, \dots, x^*)$.

Definition 1.8. Let (X, d) be a metric space, k a positive integer, and

$f : X^k \rightarrow X$ and $g : X \rightarrow X$ mappings.

(b) An element $x \in X$ is said to be a fixed point of f if $x = f(x, \dots, x)$.

(c) If $x = gx = f(x, \dots, x)$, then x is called a common fixed point of f and g .

(d) Mappings f and g are said to be commuting if $f(gx, \dots, gx) = f(x, \dots, x)$, for all $x \in X$.

(f) Mappings f and g are said to be weakly commuting if

$$d(f(g(x, \dots, x)), g(f(x, \dots, x))) \leq d(f(x, \dots, x), g(x, \dots, x)) \text{ for all } x \in X.$$

(b) An element $x \in X$ is said to be a coincidence point of f and g if $gx = f(x, \dots, x)$.

(e) Mappings f and g are said to be k -compatible (coincidentally commuting)

if $g(f(p, p, \dots, p)) = f(gp, gp, \dots, gp)$, whenever $p \in X$ is such that $gp = f(p, p, \dots, p)$.

Remark 1.09. The above definition are used in similar mode multiplicative metric spaces.

Remark 1.10. For $k=1$, the above definitions reduce to the usual definition of commuting and weakly compatible mappings in a multiplicative metric space.

In 1965, S.B. Presic in [8] gives the most important results on this direction by

generalizing the Banach contraction mapping principle as follows:

Theorem 1.11. ([8]). Let (X, d) be a complete metric space, k a positive integer and $T : X^k \rightarrow X$ a mapping satisfying the following contractive type condition

$$(1.2.1) \quad d(T(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k), T(x_2, x_3, \dots, x_{k+1})) \leq q_1 d(x_1, x_2) + q_2 d(x_2, x_3) + \dots + q_k d(x_k, x_{k+1})$$

for every $x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_k, x_{k+1} \in X$, where q_1, q_2, \dots, q_k are non-negative constants such that $q_1 + q_2 + \dots + q_k < 1$.

Then there exists a unique point x in X such that $T(x, x, \dots, x) = x$.

Moreover, if x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k are arbitrary points in X and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $x_{n+k} = T(x_n, x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{n+k-1})$ then the sequence $\{x_n\}$ is convergent and $\lim x_n = T(\lim x_n, \lim x_n, \dots, \lim x_n)$.

2. Main results

Now we prove above theorem in setting of multiplicative metric space as follows:

In 2011, R. George, M. S. Khan[6] proved following theorem in metric spaces as follows:

Theorem 2.1.[6] Let (X, d) be a metric space, k a positive integer, $T : X^k \rightarrow X$ and

$f : X \rightarrow X$ be mappings satisfying the following conditions :

$$(2.1) \quad T(X^k) \subset f(X)$$

$$(2.2) \quad d(T(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_k), T(x_2, x_3, x_4, \dots, x_k, x_{k+1})) \leq \lambda \max\{d(fx_i, fx_{i+1}) : 1 \leq i \leq k\},$$

where $x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_k, x_{k+1}$ are arbitrary elements in X and $\lambda \in (0, 1)$

$$(2.3) \quad f(X) \text{ is complete.}$$

Then $C(f, T) \neq \emptyset$.

Further, if f is idempotent at some $u \in C(f, T)$, and f and T are coincidentally commuting then f and T has a common fixed point.

The set of coincidence points of f and T is denoted by $C(f, T)$.

Theorem 2.2 Let (X, d) be a multiplicative metric space, k a positive integer,

let T be a mapping of X^k into X and let f be a mapping of X into X satisfying

$$(2.4) \quad T(X^k) \subseteq f(X),$$

$$(2.5) \quad f(X) \text{ is complete,}$$

$$(2.6) \quad (f, T) \text{ is a coincidentally commuting and } f \text{ is idempotent,}$$

$$(2.7) \quad d(T(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_k), T(x_2, x_3, x_4, \dots, x_k, x_{k+1}))$$

$$\leq [\max\{d(fx_i, fx_{i+1}) : 1 \leq i \leq k\}]^\lambda, \text{ for all } x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_k, x_{k+1} \in X, \text{ where } 0 < \lambda < 1,$$

$$(2.8) \quad d(T(u, u, \dots, u), T(v, v, \dots, v)) < d(fu, fv), \text{ for all distinct } u, v \in X.$$

Then there exists a unique point $z \in X$ such that $tz = z = T(z, z, \dots, z)$.

Proof. Let $x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_k$ be arbitrary elements in X . By (2.4),

we define a sequence $\{y_n\}$ in $f(X)$ as follows :

$$y_{n+k} = f(x_{n+k}) = T(x_n, x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{n+k-1}), \text{ for } n=1,2, \dots$$

For simplicity set $\alpha_n = d(y_n, y_{n+1})$. We shall prove by induction that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\alpha_n \leq K^{\theta^n} \quad (\text{where } \theta = (\lambda)^{1/k} < 1, K = \max\{(\alpha_1)^{1/\theta}, (\alpha_2)^{1/\theta^2}, \dots, (\alpha_k)^{1/\theta^k}\})$$

According to the definition of K we see that (2.11) is true for $n = 1, \dots, k$.

Now let the following k inequalities: $\alpha_n \leq K^{\theta^n}$, $\alpha_{n+1} \leq K^{\theta^{n+1}}$, \dots , $\alpha_{n+k-1} \leq K^{\theta^{n+k-1}}$ be the induction hypotheses.

Then we have:

$$\alpha_{n+k} = d(y_{n+k}, y_{n+k+1}) = d(T(x_n, x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{n+k-1}), T(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}, \dots, x_{n+k}))$$

$$\leq \max\{d(fx_n, fx_{n+1}), d(fx_{n+1}, fx_{n+2}), \dots, d(fx_{n+k-1}, fx_{n+k})\}^\lambda$$

$$= [\max\{\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}, \dots, \alpha_{n+k-1}\}]^\lambda$$

$$\leq [\max\{K^{\theta^n}, K^{\theta^{n+1}}, \dots, K^{\theta^{n+k-1}}\}]^\lambda$$

$$\leq [K^{\theta^n}]^\lambda \quad \{\text{as } \theta < 1\}$$

$$= K^{\theta^{n+k}} \quad \{\text{as } \lambda = \theta^k\}$$

Thus inductive proof of (2.5) is complete. Now, for $n, p \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$d(y_n, y_{n+p}) \leq d(y_n, y_{n+1}) \cdot d(y_{n+1}, y_{n+2}) \cdot \dots \cdot d(y_{n+p-1}, y_{n+p})$$

$$\leq K^{\theta^n} \cdot K^{\theta^{n+1}} \cdot \dots \cdot K^{\theta^{n+p-1}}$$

$$\leq K^{\theta^n(1+\theta+\theta^2+\dots)}$$

$$\leq K^{\theta^n/1-\theta}.$$

Hence sequence $\{y_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $f(X)$. As $f(X)$ is complete, there exists $z \in f(X)$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n = z$. Hence there exists a point $p \in X$ such that $z = fp$.

Now consider

$$d(fx_{n+k}, T(p, p, \dots, p)) = d(T(p, p, \dots, p), T(x_n, x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{n+k-1}))$$

$$\leq d(T(p, p, \dots, p), T(p, p, \dots, p, x_n)) \cdot d(T(p, p, \dots, p, x_n), T(p, p, \dots, p, x_{n+1}))$$

$$\cdot d(T(p, p, \dots, p, x_{n+1}), T(p, p, \dots, p, x_{n+2})) \cdot d(T(p, p, \dots, p, x_{n+2}), T(p, p, \dots, p, x_{n+3})) \cdot \dots \cdot d(T(p, p, \dots, p, x_{n+k-2}), T(x_n, x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{n+k-1}))$$

$$\leq [d(fp, fx_n)]^\lambda \cdot [\max\{d(fp, fx_n), d(fx_n, fx_{n+1})\}]^\lambda \cdot [\max\{d(fp, fx_n), d(fx_n, fx_{n+1}), d(fx_{n+1}, fx_{n+2})\}]^\lambda \cdot [\max\{d(fp, fx_n), d(fx_n, fx_{n+1}), d(fx_{n+1}, fx_{n+2}), d(fx_{n+2}, fx_{n+3})\}]^\lambda$$

$$\cdot \dots \cdot [\max\{d(fp, fx_n), d(fx_n, fx_{n+1}), \dots, d(fx_{n+k-2}, fx_{n+k-1})\}]^\lambda$$

$$\cdot \dots \cdot [\max\{d(fp, fx_n), d(fx_n, fx_{n+1}), \dots, d(fx_{n+k-2}, fx_{n+k-1})\}]^\lambda$$

$$\cdot \dots \cdot [\max\{d(fp, fx_n), d(fx_n, fx_{n+1}), \dots, d(fx_{n+k-2}, fx_{n+k-1})\}]^\lambda$$

$$\cdot \dots \cdot [\max\{d(fp, fx_n), d(fx_n, fx_{n+1}), \dots, d(fx_{n+k-2}, fx_{n+k-1})\}]^\lambda$$

$$\cdot \dots \cdot [\max\{d(fp, fx_n), d(fx_n, fx_{n+1}), \dots, d(fx_{n+k-2}, fx_{n+k-1})\}]^\lambda$$

$$\cdot \dots \cdot [\max\{d(fp, fx_n), d(fx_n, fx_{n+1}), \dots, d(fx_{n+k-2}, fx_{n+k-1})\}]^\lambda$$

$$\cdot \dots \cdot [\max\{d(fp, fx_n), d(fx_n, fx_{n+1}), \dots, d(fx_{n+k-2}, fx_{n+k-1})\}]^\lambda$$

$$\cdot \dots \cdot [\max\{d(fp, fx_n), d(fx_n, fx_{n+1}), \dots, d(fx_{n+k-2}, fx_{n+k-1})\}]^\lambda$$

$$\cdot \dots \cdot [\max\{d(fp, fx_n), d(fx_n, fx_{n+1}), \dots, d(fx_{n+k-2}, fx_{n+k-1})\}]^\lambda$$

$$\cdot \dots \cdot [\max\{d(fp, fx_n), d(fx_n, fx_{n+1}), \dots, d(fx_{n+k-2}, fx_{n+k-1})\}]^\lambda$$

$$\cdot \dots \cdot [\max\{d(fp, fx_n), d(fx_n, fx_{n+1}), \dots, d(fx_{n+k-2}, fx_{n+k-1})\}]^\lambda$$

$$\cdot \dots \cdot [\max\{d(fp, fx_n), d(fx_n, fx_{n+1}), \dots, d(fx_{n+k-2}, fx_{n+k-1})\}]^\lambda$$

$$\cdot \dots \cdot [\max\{d(fp, fx_n), d(fx_n, fx_{n+1}), \dots, d(fx_{n+k-2}, fx_{n+k-1})\}]^\lambda$$

$$\cdot \dots \cdot [\max\{d(fp, fx_n), d(fx_n, fx_{n+1}), \dots, d(fx_{n+k-2}, fx_{n+k-1})\}]^\lambda$$

$$\cdot \dots \cdot [\max\{d(fp, fx_n), d(fx_n, fx_{n+1}), \dots, d(fx_{n+k-2}, fx_{n+k-1})\}]^\lambda$$

$$\cdot \dots \cdot [\max\{d(fp, fx_n), d(fx_n, fx_{n+1}), \dots, d(fx_{n+k-2}, fx_{n+k-1})\}]^\lambda$$

$$\cdot \dots \cdot [\max\{d(fp, fx_n), d(fx_n, fx_{n+1}), \dots, d(fx_{n+k-2}, fx_{n+k-1})\}]^\lambda$$

$$\cdot \dots \cdot [\max\{d(fp, fx_n), d(fx_n, fx_{n+1}), \dots, d(fx_{n+k-2}, fx_{n+k-1})\}]^\lambda$$

$$\cdot \dots \cdot [\max\{d(fp, fx_n), d(fx_n, fx_{n+1}), \dots, d(fx_{n+k-2}, fx_{n+k-1})\}]^\lambda$$

$$\cdot \dots \cdot [\max\{d(fp, fx_n), d(fx_n, fx_{n+1}), \dots, d(fx_{n+k-2}, fx_{n+k-1})\}]^\lambda$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$d(fp, T(p, p, \dots, p)) \leq 1, \text{ so that } fp = T(p, p, \dots, p).$$

Now suppose that f is idempotent, while f and T are coincidentally commuting pair. Then we have $ffp = fp$ and $f(T(p, p, \dots, p)) = T(fp, fp, \dots, fp)$. Therefore, $fp = ffp = f(T(p, p, \dots, p)) = T(fp, fp, \dots, fp)$. Thus fp is a common fixed point of f and T . We now have $z = fz = T(z, z, \dots, z)$.

Uniqueness:

Suppose that there exists a point $z' \neq z$ in X such that $z' = fz' = T(z', z', \dots, z')$.

Then $d(z, z') = d(T(z, z, \dots, z), T(z', z', \dots, z')) < d(fz, fz')$ from (2.8) = $d(z, z')$, which is a contradiction.

Therefore $z = z'$. Hence z is the unique point fixed point.

References

- [1] M. Abbas, B. Ali, Y. I. Suleiman, *Common fixed points of locally contractive mappings in multiplicative metric spaces with application*, Hindawi Publishing corporation *International Journal of Mathematics and mathematical sciences* Volume 2015, article ID 218683.
- [2] M. Abbas, M. De la Sen and T. Nazir, *Common fixed points of generalized rational type cocyclic mappings in multiplicative metric spaces*, Hindawi Publishing corporation *Discrete Dynamics in Nature and Society*, Vol. 2015, Article ID 532725, 10 pages.
- [3] M. Abbas, D. Ili'c, T. Nazir *Iterative Approximation of Fixed Points of Generalized Weak Presic Type k-Step Iterative Method for a Class of Operators*, *Filomat* 29:4 (2015), 713–724, DOI 10.2298/FIL1504713A
- [4] Ya.I. Alber, S. Guerre-Delabriere, *Principles of weakly contractive maps in Hilbert spaces*, in: *New Results in Operator Theory*, in: I. Goldberg, Yu. Lyubich (Eds.), *Advances and Appl.*, vol. 98, Birkhauser Verlag, 1997, pp.7-22.
- [5] A.E. Bashirov, E.M. Kurplnara, and A. Ozyapici, *Multiplicative calculus and its applicatiopns*. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 337, (2008), 36-48.
- [6] R. George, M. S. Khan, *On Presic Type Extension of Banach Contraction Principle*, *Int. Journal of Math. Analysis*, Vol. 5, 2011, no. 21, 1019 - 1024
- [7] M. Ozavsar and A.C. Cevikel, *Fixed point of multiplicative contraction mappings on multiplicative metric space*, *ArXiv:1205.5131v1 [matn.GN]* (2012).
- [8] S. B. Presic, *Sur une classe d'inequations aux differences finite et sur laconvergence de certain es suites*, *Pub.de. l'Inst. Math. Belgrade* 5(19)(1965), 75-78.
- [9] B.E. Rhoades, *Some theorems on weakly contractive maps*, *Nonlinear Analysis TMA* 47(4)(2001) 2683-2693.
- [10] M. Sarwar, R. Badshah-e, *Some unique fixed point Theorems in multiplicative metric space*, *ArXiv:1410.3384v2 [matn.GM]* (2014).
