

A generalisation of fixed point theorems in a 2-metric space ¹

Mantu Saha, Debashis Dey and Anamika Ganguly

Abstract

Here we generalise, improve and unify the fixed point theorems due to Delbosco[1], Skof[8], Khan et al.[5] and several other fixed point theorems for a single map and common fixed point theorems ([6], [7]) for a pair of mappings in a setting of 2-metric space.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 47H10, 54H25.

Key words and phrases: metric space, 2-metric space, fixed point, common fixed point

1 Introduction

Delbosco[1] and Skof[8] have established a fixed point theorem for self maps of complete metric spaces by introducing a class Φ of functions $\phi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfying the following conditions:

- (i) $\phi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is continuous in R^+ and strictly increasing in R^+ .
- (ii) $\phi(t) = 0$ if and only if $t = 0$.
- (iii) $\phi(t) \geq Mt^\mu$ for every $t > 0$, $\mu > 0$ are constants.

In 1977, F.Skof[8] gave the following theorem.

Theorem 1 *Let T be a self map of a complete metric space (X, d) and $\phi \in \Phi$ such that for every $x, y \in X$*

$$(1) \quad \phi(d(Tx, Ty)) \leq a\phi(d(x, y)) + b\phi(d(x, Tx)) + c\phi(d(y, Ty))$$

where a, b and c are three nonnegative constants satisfying $a + b + c < 1$. Then T has a unique fixed point.

¹Received 4 April, 2009

Accepted for publication (in revised form) 2 December, 2009

In 1984, Khan et al.[5] generalised the Theorem 1 by using much extensive condition than (1) and removed the condition (iii). They proved the following theorem as follows.

Theorem 2 *Let T be a self map of a complete metric space (X, d) and ϕ satisfying (i) and (ii). Furthermore, let a, b, c be three decreasing functions from R^+ into $[0, 1)$ such that $a(t) + 2b(t) + c(t) < 1$ for every $t > 0$. Suppose T satisfies the following condition*

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} \phi(d(Tx, Ty)) \leq & a(d(x, y))\phi(d(x, y)) + b(d(x, y))[\phi(d(x, Tx)) \\ & + \phi(d(y, Ty))] + c(d(x, y)) \min\{\phi(d(x, Ty)), \\ & \phi(d(x, Ty))\} \end{aligned}$$

where $x, y \in X$ and $x \neq y$. Then T has a unique fixed point.

We first give a 2-metric analogue of Theorem 2. In this connection we need some preliminary ideas about 2-metric space.

2 Preliminaries

In Sixties, Gähler([2]-[3]) first defined 2-metric space as follows: Let X be a non empty set. A real valued function d on $X \times X \times X$ is said to be a 2-metric on X if

- (I) given distinct elements x, y of X , there exists an element z of X such that $d(x, y, z) \neq 0$
- (II) $d(x, y, z) = 0$ when at least two of x, y, z are equal,
- (III) $d(x, y, z) = d(x, z, y) = d(y, z, x)$ for all x, y, z in X , and
- (IV) $d(x, y, z) \leq d(x, y, w) + d(x, w, z) + d(w, y, z)$ for all x, y, z, w in X .

When d is a 2-metric on X , then the ordered pair (X, d) is called a 2-metric space.

Definition 1 *A sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X is said to be a Cauchy sequence if for each $a \in X$, $\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, x_m, a) = 0$.*

Definition 2 *A sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X is convergent to an element $x \in X$ if for each $a \in X$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, x, a) = 0$.*

Definition 3 *A complete 2-metric space is one in which every Cauchy sequence in X converges to an element of X .*

3 Main Results

Theorem 3 Let T be a self map of a complete 2-metric space (X, d) and ϕ satisfying (i) and (ii). Furthermore, let a, b, c be three decreasing functions from R^+ into $[0, 1)$ such that $a(t) + 2b(t) + c(t) < 1$ for every $t > 0$. Suppose T satisfies the following condition

$$(3) \quad \begin{aligned} \phi(d(Tx, Ty, u)) &\leq a(d(x, y, u))\phi(d(x, y, u)) \\ &+ b(d(x, y, u))[\phi(d(x, Tx, u)) + \phi(d(y, Ty, u))] \\ &+ c(d(x, y, u))\min\{\phi(d(x, Ty, u)), \phi(d(y, Tx, u))\} \end{aligned}$$

where $x, y, u \in X$, each two of x, y and u are distinct. Then T has a unique fixed point.

Proof. Let $x_0 \in X$ be arbitrary.

Define $x_{n+1} = Tx_n$; $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, also let $\alpha_n = d(x_n, x_{n+1}, u)$ for $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$; and $\beta_n = \phi(\alpha_n)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{n+1} &= \phi(\alpha_{n+1}) \\ &= \phi(d(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}, u)) \\ &= \phi(d(Tx_n, Tx_{n+1}, u)) \\ &\leq a(d(x_n, x_{n+1}, u))\phi(d(x_n, x_{n+1}, u)) \\ &\quad + b(d(x_n, x_{n+1}, u))[\phi(d(x_n, Tx_n, u)) + \phi(d(x_{n+1}, Tx_{n+1}, u))] \\ &\quad + c(d(x_n, x_{n+1}, u))\min\{\phi(d(x_n, Tx_{n+1}, u)), \\ &\quad \phi(d(x_{n+1}, Tx_n, u))\} \\ &= a(d(x_n, x_{n+1}, u))\phi(d(x_n, x_{n+1}, u)) \\ &\quad + b(d(x_n, x_{n+1}, u))[\phi(d(x_n, x_{n+1}, u)) + \phi(d(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}, u))] \\ &\quad + c(d(x_n, x_{n+1}, u))\min\{\phi(d(x_n, x_{n+2}, u)), \phi(d(x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}, u))\} \\ &= a(\alpha_n)\phi(\alpha_n) + b(\alpha_n)[\phi(\alpha_n) + \phi(\alpha_{n+1})] \end{aligned}$$

$$(4) \quad \text{implies} \quad \beta_{n+1} \leq \frac{a(\alpha_n) + b(\alpha_n)}{1 - b(\alpha_n)}\beta_n$$

Since $a(t) + 2b(t) + c(t) < 1$, $a(\alpha_n) + 2b(\alpha_n) < 1$ which implies

$$\frac{a(\alpha_n) + b(\alpha_n)}{1 - b(\alpha_n)} < 1$$

If we set

$$r = \frac{a(\alpha_n) + b(\alpha_n)}{1 - b(\alpha_n)}$$

then from (4) we get $\beta_{n+1} \leq r\beta_n$ where $r < 1$. So $\beta_n \leq r^n\beta_0$, such that $\beta_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since $\beta_n < \beta_{n-1}$ and ϕ is strictly increasing, $\alpha_n < \alpha_{n-1}$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$. Thus $\alpha_n \rightarrow \alpha$ (say). Then $\beta_n = \phi(\alpha_n) \rightarrow \phi(\alpha)$, since ϕ is continuous. So $\phi(\alpha) = 0$ and hence by (ii), $\alpha = 0$ implies $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$.

We now show that $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. We prove it by contradiction. Then for every positive integer ϵ and for every positive integer k there exist two positive integers $m(k)$ and $n(k)$ such that

$$(5) \quad k < n(k) < m(k) \text{ and } d(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)}, u) > \epsilon$$

For each integer k , let $m(k)$ be the least integer for which $m(k) > n(k) > k$,

$$d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)-1}, u) \leq \epsilon \text{ and } d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}, u) > \epsilon$$

Then we have

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} \epsilon &< d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}, u) \\ &\leq d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}, x_{m(k)-1}) \\ &\quad + d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)-1}, u) + d(x_{m(k)-1}, x_{m(k)}, u) \end{aligned}$$

Now by (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}, x_{m(k)-1})) &= \phi(d(Tx_{n(k)-1}, Tx_{m(k)-1}, x_{m(k)-1})) \\ &\leq a(d(x_{n(k)-1}, x_{m(k)-1}, x_{m(k)-1})) \\ &\quad \phi(d(x_{n(k)-1}, x_{m(k)-1}, x_{m(k)-1})) \\ &\quad + b(d(x_{n(k)-1}, x_{m(k)-1}, x_{m(k)-1})) \\ &\quad [\phi(d(x_{n(k)-1}, Tx_{n(k)-1}, x_{m(k)-1})) \\ &\quad + \phi(d(x_{m(k)-1}, Tx_{m(k)-1}, x_{m(k)-1}))] \\ &\quad + c(d(x_{n(k)-1}, x_{m(k)-1}, x_{m(k)-1})) \\ &\quad \min\{\phi(d(x_{n(k)-1}, Tx_{m(k)-1}, x_{m(k)-1})), \\ &\quad \phi(d(x_{m(k)-1}, Tx_{n(k)-1}, x_{m(k)-1}))\} \\ &= a(d(x_{n(k)-1}, x_{m(k)-1}, x_{m(k)-1})) \\ &\quad \phi(d(x_{n(k)-1}, x_{m(k)-1}, x_{m(k)-1})) \\ &\quad + b(d(x_{n(k)-1}, x_{m(k)-1}, x_{m(k)-1})) \\ &\quad [\phi(d(x_{n(k)-1}, x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)-1})) \\ &\quad + \phi(d(x_{m(k)-1}, x_{m(k)}, x_{m(k)-1}))] \\ &\quad + c(d(x_{n(k)-1}, x_{m(k)-1}, x_{m(k)-1})) \\ &\quad \min\{\phi(d(x_{n(k)-1}, x_{m(k)}, x_{m(k)-1})), \\ &\quad \phi(d(x_{m(k)-1}, x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)-1}))\} \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

which implies by (ii)

$$(7) \quad d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}, x_{m(k)-1}) = 0$$

So by (6) and (7) we get, $\epsilon < d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}, u) \leq 0 + \epsilon + \alpha_{m(k)-1}$. Since $\{\alpha_n\}$ converges to 0, $d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}, u) \rightarrow \epsilon$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Again

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)}, u) &\leq d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)}) + d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{n(k)}, u) \\ &\quad + d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}, u) \\ &= \alpha_{n(k)} + d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}, u), \end{aligned}$$

since $d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)})$ can be made 0 as we have done in equation (7). So $d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)}, u) \leq \alpha_{n(k)} + d(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}, u) \rightarrow \epsilon$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. In the similar way

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_{n(k)+2}, x_{m(k)}, u) &\leq d(x_{n(k)+2}, x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)+1}) + d(x_{n(k)+2}, x_{n(k)+1}, u) \\ &\quad + d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)}, u) \\ &= \alpha_{n(k)+1} + d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)}, u), \end{aligned}$$

since $d(x_{n(k)+2}, x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)+1})$ can be made 0 as we have done in equation (7). So $d(x_{n(k)+2}, x_{m(k)}, u) \leq \alpha_{n(k)+1} + d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)}, u) \rightarrow \epsilon$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and in similar fashion we can show $d(x_{n(k)+2}, x_{m(k)+1}, u) \rightarrow \epsilon$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Using (3),

we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(d(x_{n(k)+2}, x_{m(k)+1}, u)) &= \phi(d(Tx_{n(k)+1}, Tx_{m(k)}, u)) \\
&\leq a(d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)}, u)) \\
&\quad \phi(d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)}, u)) \\
&\quad + b(d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)}, u)) \\
&\quad [\phi(d(x_{n(k)+1}, Tx_{n(k)+1}, u)) \\
&\quad + \phi(d(x_{m(k)}, Tx_{m(k)}, u))] \\
&\quad + c(d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)}, u)) \\
&\quad \min\{\phi(d(x_{n(k)+1}, Tx_{m(k)}, u)), \\
&\quad \phi(d(x_{m(k)}, Tx_{n(k)+1}, u))\} \\
&= a(d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)}, u)) \\
&\quad \phi(d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)}, u)) \\
&\quad + b(d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)}, u)) \\
&\quad [\phi(d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{n(k)+2}, u)) \\
&\quad + \phi(d(x_{m(k)}, x_{m(k)+1}, u))] \\
&\quad + c(d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)}, u)) \\
&\quad \min\{\phi(d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)+1}, u)), \\
&\quad \phi(d(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)+2}, u))\}
\end{aligned}$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$\phi(\epsilon) \leq a(\epsilon)\phi(\epsilon) + c(\epsilon)\phi(\epsilon) = \{a(\epsilon) + c(\epsilon)\}\phi(\epsilon) < \phi(\epsilon)$$

which is a contradiction. So $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Since X is complete 2-metric space, $\lim_n x_n = z \in X$. Now we shall show that $Tz = z$.

Again using (3) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(d(x_{n(k)+1}, Tz, u)) &= \phi(d(Tx_{n(k)}, Tz, u)) \\
&\leq a(d(x_{n(k)}, z, u))\phi(d(x_{n(k)}, z, u)) \\
&\quad + b(d(x_{n(k)}, z, u))[\phi(d(x_{n(k)}, Tx_{n(k)}, u)) \\
&\quad + \phi(d(z, Tz, u))] + c(d(x_{n(k)}, z, u)) \\
&\quad \min\{\phi(d(x_{n(k)}, Tz, u)), \phi(d(z, Tx_{n(k)}, u))\}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{implies } \phi(d(x_{n(k)+1}, Tz, u)) &\leq a(d(x_{n(k)}, z, u)) \phi(d(x_{n(k)+1}, z, u)) \\ &\quad + b(d(x_{n(k)}, z, u)) \\ &\quad [\phi(d(x_{n(k)}, x_{n(k)+1}, u)) \\ &\quad + \phi(d(z, Tz, u))] \\ &\quad + c(d(x_{n(k)}, z, u)) \\ &\quad \min \{ \phi(d(x_{n(k)}, Tz, u)), \\ &\quad \phi(d(z, x_{n(k)+1}, u)) \} \end{aligned}$$

Passing limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ on bothsides of the inequality we get, $\phi(d(z, Tz, u)) = 0$ which gives by (ii), $d(z, Tz, u) = 0$ i.e. $Tz = z$. Next let w be another fixed point of T . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(d(z, w, u)) &= \phi(d(Tz, Tw, u)) \\ &\leq a(d(z, w, u)) \phi(d(z, w, u)) \\ &\quad + b(d(z, w, u)) [\phi(d(z, Tz, u)) + \phi(d(w, Tw, u))] \\ &\quad + c(d(z, w, u)) \min \{ \phi(d(z, Tw, u)), \\ &\quad \phi(d(w, Tz, u)) \} \\ &= [a(d(z, w, u)) + c(d(z, w, u))] \phi(d(z, w, u)) \\ &< \phi(d(z, w, u)), \quad \text{since } a(t) + c(t) < 1 \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction leads to the fact that $z = w$ and thus completes the proof.

Next we verify the Theorem (3) by a proper example.

Example 1. Let $X = R^+ \times R^+$ and d be a 2-metric which expresses $d(x, y, u)$ as the area of the Euclidean triangle with vertices $x = (x_1, x_2)$, $y = (y_1, y_2)$ and $u = (u_1, u_2)$. Then (X, d) is a complete 2-metric space[6].

Now take $x = (1, 0)$, $y = (2, 0)$ and $u = (1, 1)$ also let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a mapping such that

$$\begin{aligned} Tx &= (2, 0) \text{ where } x = (1, 0) \in X \text{ and} \\ Ty &= (3, 0) \text{ where } y = (2, 0) \in X \end{aligned}$$

Now setting $a(t) = \frac{2}{5}$, $b(t) = \frac{1}{5}$, $c(t) = \frac{1}{6}$ and $\phi(t) = t^2$; $t \in R^+$. We observe that all the conditions of Theorem (3) satisfied except the condition (3). Also it is very clear that T has no fixed point in X in this case.

Next we establish a common fixed point theorem in this line.

Theorem 4 Let S and T be self mappings of a complete 2-metric space (X, d) and ϕ satisfying (i) and (ii). Furthermore, let a, b, c be three decreasing

functions from R^+ into $[0, 1)$ such that $a(t) + 2b(t) + c(t) < 1$ for every $t > 0$. Suppose S and T satisfy the following condition

$$(8) \quad \begin{aligned} \phi(d(Sx, Ty, u)) &\leq a(d(x, y, u))\phi(d(x, y, u)) \\ &+ b(d(x, y, u))[\phi(d(x, Sx, u)) + \phi(d(y, Ty, u))] \\ &+ c(d(x, y, u))\min\{\phi(d(x, Ty, u)), \\ &\phi(d(y, Sx, u))\} \end{aligned}$$

where $x, y, u \in X$, each two of x, y and u are distinct. Then S and T have a unique common fixed point in X .

Proof. Let $x_0 \in X$ be arbitrary. Define $x_{2n} = Sx_{2n-1}$ and $x_{2n+1} = Tx_{2n}$; $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, also let $\alpha_n = d(x_n, x_{n+1}, u)$ for $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$; and $\beta_n = \phi(\alpha_n)$. We also assume that $\alpha_n > 0$ for every n . Now for an even integer n , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_n &= \phi(\alpha_n) \\ &= \phi(d(x_n, x_{n+1}, u)) \\ &= \phi(d(Sx_{n-1}, Tx_n, u)) \\ &\leq a(d(x_{n-1}, x_n, u))\phi(d(x_{n-1}, x_n, u)) \\ &\quad + b(d(x_{n-1}, x_n, u))[\phi(d(x_{n-1}, Sx_{n-1}, u)) + \phi(d(x_n, Tx_n, u))] \\ &\quad + c(d(x_{n-1}, x_n, u))\min\{\phi(d(x_{n-1}, Tx_n, u)), \phi(d(x_n, Sx_{n-1}, u))\} \\ &= a(d(x_{n-1}, x_n, u))\phi(d(x_{n-1}, x_n, u)) \\ &\quad + b(d(x_{n-1}, x_n, u))[\phi(d(x_{n-1}, x_n, u)) + \phi(d(x_n, x_{n+1}, u))] \\ &\quad + c(d(x_{n-1}, x_n, u))\min\{\phi(d(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1}, u)), \phi(d(x_n, x_n, u))\} \\ &= a(\alpha_{n-1})\phi(\alpha_{n-1}) + b(\alpha_{n-1})[\phi(\alpha_{n-1}) + \phi(\alpha_n)] \end{aligned}$$

$$(9) \quad \text{implies} \quad \beta_n \leq \frac{a(\alpha_{n-1}) + b(\alpha_{n-1})}{1 - b(\alpha_{n-1})}\beta_{n-1}$$

Since $a(t) + 2b(t) + c(t) < 1$, $a(\alpha_{n-1}) + 2b(\alpha_{n-1}) < 1$ which implies

$$\frac{a(\alpha_{n-1}) + b(\alpha_{n-1})}{1 - b(\alpha_{n-1})} < 1$$

If we set

$$r = \frac{a(\alpha_{n-1}) + b(\alpha_{n-1})}{1 - b(\alpha_{n-1})}$$

then from (3.9) we get $\beta_n \leq r\beta_{n-1}$ where $r < 1$. So $\beta_n \leq r^n\beta_0$, such that $\beta_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since $\beta_n < \beta_{n-1}$ and ϕ is strictly increasing, $\alpha_n < \alpha_{n-1}$,

$n = 1, 2, \dots$ Thus $\alpha_n \rightarrow \alpha$ (say). Then $\beta_n = \phi(\alpha_n) \rightarrow \phi(\alpha)$, since ϕ is continuous. So $\phi(\alpha) = 0$ and hence by (ii), $\alpha = 0$ implies $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$.

We now show that $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. We prove it by contradiction. Then for every positive integer ϵ and for every positive integer k there exist two positive integers $2p(k)$ and $2q(k)$ such that

$$(10) \quad k < 2q(k) < 2p(k) \quad \text{and} \quad d(x_{2p(k)}, x_{2q(k)}, u) > \epsilon$$

For each integer k , let $2p(k)$ be the least integer for which $2p(k) > 2q(k) > k$,

$$d(x_{2q(k)}, x_{2p(k)-2}, u) \leq \epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad d(x_{2q(k)}, x_{2p(k)}, u) > \epsilon$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon < d(x_{2q(k)}, x_{2p(k)}, u) &\leq d(x_{2q(k)}, x_{2p(k)}, x_{2p(k)-2}) + d(x_{2q(k)}, x_{2p(k)-2}, u) \\ &\quad + d(x_{2p(k)-2}, x_{2p(k)}, u) \end{aligned}$$

Since we can easily show that $d(x_{2q(k)}, x_{2p(k)}, x_{2p(k)-2}) = 0$ as we have shown in equation (7) of Theorem (3).

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon < d(x_{2q(k)}, x_{2p(k)}, u) &\leq d(x_{2q(k)}, x_{2p(k)-2}, u) + d(x_{2p(k)-2}, x_{2p(k)}, u) \\ &\leq d(x_{2q(k)}, x_{2p(k)-2}, u) \\ &\quad + d(x_{2p(k)-2}, x_{2p(k)}, x_{2p(k)-1}) \\ &\quad + d(x_{2p(k)-2}, x_{2p(k)-1}, u) + d(x_{2p(k)-1}, x_{2p(k)}, u) \end{aligned}$$

Again we can show like equation (7) of Theorem (3),

$d(x_{2p(k)-2}, x_{2p(k)}, x_{2p(k)-1}) = 0$. Thus

$$(11) \quad \epsilon < d(x_{2q(k)}, x_{2p(k)}, u) \leq \epsilon + 0 + \alpha_{2p(k)-2} + \alpha_{2p(k)-1}$$

Since $\{\alpha_n\}$ converges to 0, $d(x_{2q(k)}, x_{2p(k)}, u) \rightarrow \epsilon$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Now } d(x_{2q(k)}, x_{2p(k)+1}, u) &\leq d(x_{2q(k)}, x_{2p(k)+1}, x_{2p(k)}) \\ &\quad + d(x_{2q(k)}, x_{2p(k)}, u) \\ &\quad + d(x_{2p(k)}, x_{2p(k)+1}, u) \\ &\leq d(x_{2q(k)}, x_{2p(k)}, u) + \alpha_{2p(k)} \end{aligned}$$

since we can show that $d(x_{2q(k)}, x_{2p(k)+1}, x_{2p(k)}) = 0$ as we have done in equation (7) of Theorem (3).

$$(12) \quad \text{So } d(x_{2q(k)}, x_{2p(k)+1}, u) \rightarrow \epsilon \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty$$

Again

$$\begin{aligned}
d(x_{2q(k)}, x_{2p(k)+2}, u) &\leq d(x_{2q(k)}, x_{2p(k)+2}, x_{2p(k)+1}) + d(x_{2q(k)}, x_{2p(k)+1}, u) \\
&\quad + d(x_{2p(k)+1}, x_{2p(k)+2}, u) \\
&\leq d(x_{2q(k)}, x_{2p(k)+1}, u) + d(x_{2p(k)+1}, x_{2p(k)+2}, u), \\
&\quad \text{since } d(x_{2q(k)}, x_{2p(k)+2}, x_{2p(k)+1}) = 0 \text{ for similar} \\
&\quad \text{reason as of equation (7) of Theorem (3)} \\
&\leq d(x_{2q(k)}, x_{2p(k)+1}, x_{2p(k)}) + d(x_{2q(k)}, x_{2p(k)}, u) \\
&\quad + d(x_{2p(k)}, x_{2p(k)+1}, u) + d(x_{2p(k)+1}, x_{2p(k)+2}, u) \\
&\leq 0 + d(x_{2q(k)}, x_{2p(k)}, u) + \alpha_{2p(k)} + \alpha_{2p(k)+1}
\end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$(13) \quad d(x_{2q(k)}, x_{2p(k)+2}, u) \rightarrow \epsilon \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty$$

$$(14) \quad \text{Similarly, } d(x_{2q(k)+1}, x_{2p(k)+2}, u) \rightarrow \epsilon \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty$$

Now from (8) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(d(x_{2p(k)+2}, x_{2q(k)+1}, u)) &= \phi(d(Sx_{2p(k)+1}, Tx_{2q(k)}, u)) \\
&\leq a(d(x_{2p(k)+1}, x_{2q(k)}, u)) \\
&\quad \phi(d(x_{2p(k)+1}, x_{2q(k)}, u)) \\
&\quad + b(d(x_{2p(k)+1}, x_{2q(k)}, u)) \\
&\quad [\phi(d(x_{2p(k)+1}, Sx_{2p(k)+1}, u)) \\
&\quad + \phi(d(x_{2q(k)}, Tx_{2q(k)}, u))] \\
&\quad + c(d(x_{2p(k)+1}, x_{2q(k)}, u)) \\
&\quad \min\{\phi(d(x_{2p(k)+1}, Tx_{2q(k)}, u)), \\
&\quad \phi(d(x_{2q(k)}, Sx_{2p(k)+1}, u))\}
\end{aligned}$$

Passing limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$ we get by (12), (13) and (14),

$$\phi(\epsilon) \leq a(\epsilon)\phi(\epsilon) + c(\epsilon)\phi(\epsilon) = \{a(\epsilon) + c(\epsilon)\}\phi(\epsilon) < \phi(\epsilon)$$

which is a contradiction. So $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Since X is complete 2-metric space, $\lim_n x_n = z \in X$. Again using (8) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(d(x_{2p(k)+2}, Tz, u)) &= \phi(d(Sx_{2p(k)+1}, Tz, u)) \\ &\leq a(d(x_{2p(k)+1}, z, u)) \phi(d(x_{2p(k)+1}, z, u)) \\ &\quad + b(d(x_{2p(k)+1}, z, u)) \\ &\quad [\phi(d(x_{2p(k)+1}, Sx_{2p(k)+1}, u)) \\ &\quad + \phi(d(z, Tz, u))] + c(d(x_{2p(k)+1}, z, u)) \\ &\quad \min \{ \phi(d(x_{2p(k)+1}, Tz, u)), \\ &\quad \phi(d(z, Sx_{2p(k)+1}, u)) \} \end{aligned}$$

Taking limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$ we get $\phi(d(z, Tz, u)) = 0$ implies $d(z, Tz, u) = 0$ by property (ii). Hence $Tz = z$. Similarly it can be shown that $Sz = z$. So S and T have a common fixed point $z \in X$. We now show that z is the unique common fixed point of S and T . If not, then let w be another fixed point of S and T . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(d(z, w, u)) &= \phi(d(Sz, Tw, u)) \\ &\leq a(d(z, w, u)) \phi(d(z, w, u)) \\ &\quad + b(d(z, w, u)) [\phi(d(z, Sz, u)) + \phi(d(w, Tw, u))] \\ &\quad + c(d(z, w, u)) \min \{ \phi(d(z, Tw, u)), \\ &\quad \phi(d(w, Sz, u)) \} \\ &= [a(d(z, w, u)) + c(d(z, w, u))] \phi(d(z, w, u)) \\ &< \phi(d(z, w, u)), \quad \text{since } a(t) + c(t) < 1 \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Hence $z = w$ and thus completes the proof.

Remark 1. In the same way we can verify the Theorem (4) by setting $S(1, 0) = (2, 0)$ and $T(2, 0) = (3, 0)$ taking all the values same on the complete 2-metric space (X, d) as described in Example 1.

References

- [1] D. Delbosco, *Un estensione di un teorema sul punto fisso di S.Reich*, Rend. Sem. Mat. Univers. Politecn. Torino , **35**(1976-77), 233 - 239.
- [2] S.Gähler, *2-metric Raume and ihre topologische strucktur*, Math.Nachr., **26**(1963), 115-148.

- [3] S.Gähler, *Über die Uniformisierbarkeit 2-metrischer Räume*, Math.Nachr. **28**(1965), 235 - 244.
- [4] K.Iseki, *Fixed point theorems in 2-metric space*, Math.Seminar.Notes, Kobe Univ.,**3**(1975), 133 - 136.
- [5] M.S.Khan, *Fixed point theorems by altering distance between the points*, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. , **30** (1984), 1 - 9.
- [6] Z. Liu, F. Zhang and J. Mao, *Common Fixed Points for Compatible Mappings of Type (A)*, Bull. Malaysian Math. Soc.(Second Series) **22** (1999), 67 - 86.
- [7] R.A. Rashwan and A.M.Sadeek, *A common fixed point theorem in complete metric spaces*, Southwest journal of pure and applied mathematics, **01**(1996), 6 - 10.
- [8] F.Skof, *Teorema di punti fisso per applicazioni negli spazi metrici*, Atti. Accad. Aci. Torino, **111** (1977), 323-329.

Mantu Saha
The University of Burdwan
Department of Mathematics
Burdwan-713104, West Bengal, India
e-mail: mantusaha@yahoo.com

Debahis Dey
Koshigram Union Institution,
Koshigram-713150, Burdwan,
West Bengal, India,
e-mail: debashisdey@yahoo.com

Anamika Ganguly
Balgona Saradamoni Balika Vidyalaya,
Balgona Station and Chati,
P.O. Bhatar, Dist. Burdwan, West Bengal India,
e-mail: anamika.simi@gmail.com