



COMMON FIXED POINT THEOREMS FOR A PAIR OF WEAKLY COMPATIBLE MAPPINGS IN GENERALIZED FUZZY METRIC SPACES

V. MALLIGADEVI and M. JEYARAMAN

Manonmaniam Sundaranar University College
Puliangudi-627855, Tamil Nadu, India
E-mail: sundersaimd@gmail.com

PG and Research Department of Mathematics
Raja Doraisingam Govt. Arts College
Sivaganga-630561, Tamil Nadu, India
E-mail: jeya.math@gmail.com

Abstract

In this paper, we prove two common fixed point theorems for a pair of weakly compatible mappings in generalized fuzzy metric spaces using the (E.A) property.

1. Introduction

The notion of fuzzy sets that was introduced by Zadeh [26] with a view to represent the vagueness in everyday life laid the way to the amplification of fuzzy mathematics. Many authors have enormously developed the theory of fuzzy sets and studied its applications. The theory of fuzzy sets has a wide range of applications in various fields such as medicine, control theory, engineering sciences, etc (See also [3], [12], [15], [22]). George and Veeramani [4], [5] modified the concept of fuzzy metric spaces given by Kramosil and Michalek [11] and defined the hausdorff topology on fuzzy metric spaces and also showed that every metric induces a fuzzy metric. Fixed point theory in fuzzy metric spaces has been developed by Grabiec [6]. Subrahmanyam [23] gave a generalization of Jungck's [9] common fixed point theorem for

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 54H25, 47H10, 47S40.

Keywords: fuzzy metric space, weakly compatible mappings, E.A. Property.

Received July 11, 2019; Accepted September 5, 2019

commuting mappings in the setting of fuzzy metrics spaces. In the recent literature, weaker conditions of commutativity such as weakly commuting mappings, compatible mappings, R -weakly commuting maps, weakly compatible mappings and several others have been considered. In 2002, M. Aamri and D. El Moutawakil [1] introduced the property E. A., which generalizes the concept of non compatible mappings and gave some common fixed point theorems under strict contractive conditions. In 2009, Mujahid Abbas [2], et. al., proved common fixed point theorems for a class of four non compatible mappings in fuzzy metric spaces. In 2010, S. Sedghi et al. [18], proved a common fixed point theorem for weakly compatible mappings in fuzzy metric spaces using the property E. A. In 2010, D. Mihet [13], proved two common fixed point theorems for a pair of weakly compatible maps in fuzzy metric spaces both in the sense of Kramosil and Michalek and in the sense of George and Veeramani, by using E. A. property. For more references on common fixed point theorems in fuzzy metric spaces using E. A. property, see [8], [16], [20], [24]. On the other hand, in 1984, Khan et al. [10] improved the Banach fixed point theorem in metric spaces by introducing a control function, called an altering distance function. Recently, Shen et al. [19] introduced the notion of altering distance in fuzzy metric space and obtained fixed point results. In 2015, N. Wairojjana, et al. [25] proved fixed point results in complete and compact fuzzy metric spaces by imposing a contraction condition and using the idea of altering distance. By using the same altering distance given in [25] and also replacing the completeness of fuzzy metric space by more natural condition of closeness of the range with the help of E. A. property, we prove common fixed point results for a pair of weakly compatible mappings.

2. Preliminaries

Definition 2.1. A binary operation $*$: $[0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a continuous t -norm if for all $p, q, r, s \in [0, 1]$, the following conditions are satisfied:

$$(1) \quad p * 1 = p$$

$$(2) \quad p * q = q * p$$

(3) $p * q \leq r * s$ whenever $p \leq r$ and $q \leq s$

(4) $p * (q * r) = (p * q) * r$.

Definition 2.2. A 3-tuple $(X, M, *)$ is called M -fuzzy metric space if X is an arbitrary non empty set, $*$ is a continuous t -norm and M is a fuzzy set on $X^3 \times (0, \infty)$, satisfying the following conditions:

for each $x, y, z, a \in X$ and $t, s > 0$.

(M1) $M(x, y, z, t) > 0$,

(M2) $M(x, y, z, t) = 1$ if and only if $x = y = z$,

(M3) $M(x, y, z, t) = M(p\{x, y, z\}, t)$ when p is the permutation function.

(M4) $M(x, y, a, t) * M(a, z, z, s) \leq M(x, y, z, t, s)$,

(M5) $M(x, y, z, \cdot) : (0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is continuous,

(M6) $M(x, y, z, t) = 1$ for all $x, y, z \in X$.

Definition 2.3. Let $(X, M, *)$ be a fuzzy metric space.

(i) A sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X is a M -Cauchy sequence if for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, $t > 0$ there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $M(x_n, x_m, x_m, t) > 1 - \varepsilon$ for all $n, m \geq n_0$.

(ii) A sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X is convergent to $x \in X$ if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M(x_n, x, x, t) = 1$, $t > 0$.

(iii) A fuzzy metric space X is M -complete if every M -Cauchy sequence in X is convergent.

Definition 2.4. Two self mappings P and Q on a fuzzy metric space $(X, M, *)$ are said to be compatible if $M(PQx_n, QPx_n, QPx_n, t) = 1$, for all $t > 0$, whenever $\{x_n\}$ is a sequence in X such that $Px_n = Qx_n = x \in X$.

Definition 2.5. Two self maps P and Q of a fuzzy metric space $(X, M, *)$ are said to be weakly compatible if they commute at their coincidence points; i.e., $Px = Qx$ for some $x \in X$ implies that $PQx = QPx$.

Remark 2.6. Two compatible self mappings are weakly compatible, but the converse is not true.

Definition 2.7. A pair of self-maps (P, Q) on a fuzzy metric space $(X, M, *)$ satisfies the property E. A. if there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X such that $M(Px_n, x, x, t) = M(Qx_n, x, x, t) = 1$ for some $x \in X$ and all $t > 0$.

3. Main Results

Definition 3.1. A function $\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is called an altering distance function if it satisfies the following properties: (1) ϕ is strictly decreasing and continuous, (2) $\phi(\lambda) = 0$ if and only if $\lambda = 1$. It is obvious that $\phi(\lambda) = \phi(1) = 0$.

Theorem 3.2. Let $(X, M, *)$ be a generalized fuzzy metric space and T, S be weakly compatible self-maps of X satisfying the following property

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(M(Tx, Ty, Tz, t)) &\leq k_1(t) \min \{ \phi(M(Sx, Sy, Sz, t)), \phi(M(Sx, Tx, Sx, t)), \\ &\quad \phi(M(Sx, Ty, Tz, 2t)), \phi(M(Sy, Ty, Ty, t)) \} \\ &\quad + k_2(t) (\phi(M(Tx, Sy, Sz, 2t))), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $x, y \in X$, $k_1, k_2 : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, 1)$, $t > 0$ and f is an altering distance function.

If T and S satisfy the property E. A. and the range of S is a closed subspace of X , then T and S have a unique common fixed point in X .

Proof. Suppose that T and S satisfy the property E. A., then there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X such that

$$Tx_n = Sx_n = z \in X. \quad (2)$$

Since $S(X)$ is a closed subspace of X , there exists $u \in X$ such that

$$q = Su. \quad (3)$$

For $x = x_n$, $y = u$, $q = u$, (1) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(M(Tx_n, Tu, Tu, t)) &\leq k_1(t) \min \{ \phi(M(Sx_n, Su, Su, t)), \phi(M(Sx_n, Tx_n, Sx_n, t)), \\ &\quad \phi(M, (q, Tu, Tu, 2t)), \phi(M(Su, Tu, Tu, t)) \} \\ &\quad + k_2(t) (\phi(M, (q, Su, Tu, 2t))). \end{aligned}$$

Taking $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}$ and using (2) and (3), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(M(q, Tu, Tu, t)) &\leq k_1(t) \leq k_1(t) \min \{ \phi(M(q, Su, Su, t)), \phi(M(q, q, q, t)), \\ &\quad \phi(M(Sx_n, Tu, Tu, 2t)), \phi(M(q, q, q, t)), \\ &\quad + k_2(t) (\phi(MTx_n, Su, Su, 2t)) \} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(M(q, Tu, Tu, t)) &\leq k_1(t) \min \{ \phi(1), \phi(1), \phi(M(q, Tu, Tu, 2t)), \\ &\quad \phi(M(Su, Tu, Tu, t)) \} + k_2(t) (\phi(M(q, Su, Su, 2t))) \end{aligned}$$

$\phi(M(q, Tu, Tu, t)) = 0$ which implies $M(q, Tu, Tu, t) = 1$, i.e.,

$$Tu = q. \tag{4}$$

From (3) and (4), we have

$$Tu = Su = q. \tag{5}$$

Since T, S are weakly compatible, we get

$$Tq = Sq. \tag{6}$$

Now we shall show that q is a fixed point of T . Suppose let us assume that $Tq \neq q$. In view of (5), (1), (6) and using properties of ϕ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(M(Tq, q, q, t)) &= \phi(M(Tq, Tu, Tu, t)) \\ &\leq k_1(t) \min \{ \phi(M(Sq, Su, Su, t)), \phi(M(Sq, Tq, Sq, t)), \\ &\quad \phi(M(Sq, Su, Su, 2t)), \phi(M(Sq, Tq, Sq, t)) \} \\ &\quad + k_2(t) (\phi(M(Sq, Su, Su, 2t))) \\ &\leq k_1(t) \min \{ \phi(M(Tq, q, q, t)), \phi(1), \phi(M(Tq, q, q, 2t)), \\ &\quad \phi(M(q, q, q, t)) + k_2(t) (\phi(M(Tq, q, q, 2t))) \} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= k_2(t)(\phi(M(Tq, q, q, 2t))) \\
&< \phi(M(Tq, q, q, t)), t > 0
\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, $Tq = q$. Thus,

$$Tq = q = Sq \tag{7}$$

i.e., q is a common fixed point of T and S .

For uniqueness, let $w \in X$ be another common fixed point of T and S such that

$$Tw = Sw = w \text{ and } w \neq q. \tag{8}$$

Then in view of (7), (8), (1) and properties of ϕ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(M(q, w, w, t)) &= \phi(M(Tq, Tw, Tw, t)) \\
&\leq k_1(t) \min \{ \phi(M(Sq, Sw, Sw, t)), \phi(M(Sq, Tq, Sq, t)), \\
&\quad \phi(M(Sq, Tw, 2t)), \phi(M(Sw, Tw, Tw, t)) \} \\
&\quad + k_2(t)(\phi(M(Tq, Sw, Sw, 2t))) \\
&= k_1(t) \min \{ \phi(M(q, w, w, t)), \phi(1), \phi(M(q, w, w, 2t)), \\
&\quad \phi(1) + k_2(t)(\phi(M(q, w, w, 2t))) \} \\
&= k_2(t)(\phi(M(q, w, w, 2t))) \\
&< \phi(M(q, w, w, t)), t > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction and thus, z is the unique common fixed point of T and S .

Theorem: 3.3. *Let $(X, M, *)$ be a fuzzy metric space and T, S be weakly compatible self-maps of X satisfying the following property:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(M(Tx, Ty, Tz, t)) &\leq k_1(t)\phi(M(Sx, Tx, Sx, t)) + k_2(t)\phi(M(Sy, Ty, Ty, t)) \\
&\quad + k_3(t)\phi(M(Sz, Tz, Tz, t)) + k_4(t)\phi(M(Sx, Sy, Sz, t)),
\end{aligned}$$

where $x, y, z \in X$, $k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4 : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, 1)$, $t > 0$ and ϕ is an altering

distance function. If T and S satisfy property E. A. and the range of S is a closed subspace of X , then T and S have a unique common fixed point in X .

Proof. Suppose that T and S satisfy the property E. A., then there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X such that

$$Tx_n = Sx_n = q \in X \quad (9)$$

Since $S(X)$ is a closed subspace of X , there exists $u \in X$ such that

$$q = Su. \quad (10)$$

For $x = x_n$, $y = u$, $z = u$, (9) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(M(q, Tu, Tu, t)) &\leq k_1(t)\phi(M(Sx_n, Tx_n, Sx_n, t)) + k_2(t)\phi(M(Su, Tu, Tu, t)) \\ &\quad + k_3(t)\phi(M(Su, Tu, Tu, t)) + k_4(t)\phi(M(Sx_n, Su, Su, t)). \end{aligned}$$

Taking limit $n \rightarrow \infty$, and using (10) and (11), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(M(q, Tu, Tu, t)) &\leq k_1(t)\phi(M(q, q, q, t)) + k_2(t)\phi(M(q, Tu, Tu, t)) \\ &\quad + k_3(t)\phi(M(q, Tu, Tu, t)) + k_4(t)\phi(M(q, q, q, t)) \\ \phi(M(q, Tu, Tu, t)) &\leq k_1(t) + k_2(t)\phi(M(q, Tu, Tu, t)) \\ &\quad + k_3(t)\phi(M(q, Tu, Tu, t)) + k_4(t)\phi(1) \\ \phi(M(q, Tu, Tu, t)) &\leq k_2(t)\phi(M(q, Tu, Tu, t)) + k_3(t)\phi(M(q, Tu, Tu, t)) \\ (1 - k_2(t) - k_3(t))\phi(M(q, Tu, Tu, t)) &\leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which gives $(M(q, Tu, Tu, t)) = 0$

$$M(q, Tu, Tu, t) = 1$$

i.e.,

$$Tu = q. \quad (11)$$

From (11) and (12), we have

$$Tu = Su = q. \quad (12)$$

Since T, S are weakly compatible, we get

$$Tq = Sq. \quad (13)$$

Now we shall show that z is a fixed point of T . Suppose let us assume that $Tq \neq q$. In view of (9), (13), (14), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \phi(M(Tq, q, q, t)) &= \phi(M(Tq, Tu, Tu, t)) \\
 &\leq k_1(t)\phi(M(Sq, Tq, Sq, t)) + k_2(t)\phi(M(Su, Tu, Su, t)) \\
 &\quad + k_3(t)\phi(M(Su, Tu, Tu, t)) + k_4(t)\phi(M(Sq, Su, Su, t)), \\
 &= k_1(t)\phi(1) + k_2(t)\phi(1) + k_3(t)\phi(1) + k_4(t)\phi(M(Tq, q, q, t)), \\
 &= k_4(t)\phi(M(Tq, q, q, t)), \\
 \phi(M(Tq, q, q, t)) &\leq k_4(t)\phi(M(Tq, q, q, t)), \\
 (1 - k_4(t))\phi(M(Tq, q, q, t)) &\leq 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

which gives $\phi(M(Tq, q, q, t)) = 0$ implies $M(Tq, q, q, t) = 1$. Thus, $Tq = q$. Therefore

$$Tq = q = Sq \tag{14}$$

i.e., q is a common fixed point T and S . For uniqueness, let $w \in X$ be another common fixed point of T and S where

$$Tw = Sw = w \text{ and } w \neq q. \tag{16}$$

In view of (14), (15), (9) and from the properties of f , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \phi(M(q, w, w, t)) &= \phi(M(Tq, Tw, Tw, t)) \\
 &\leq k_1(t)\phi(M(Sq, Tq, Sq, t)) + k_2(t)\phi(M(Sw, Tw, Tw, t)) \\
 &\quad + k_3(t)\phi(M(Sw, Tw, Tw, t)) + k_4(t)\phi(M(Sq, Sq, Sw, t)), \\
 &= k_1(t)\phi(1) + k_2(t)\phi(1) + k_3(t)\phi(1) + k_4(t)\phi(M(q, w, w, t)), \\
 &= k_4(t)\phi(M(q, w, w, t)) \\
 &< \phi(M(q, w, w, t)),
 \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction and thus, q is the unique common fixed point of T and S .

References

- [1] M. Aamri and D. El Moutawakil, Some new common fixed point theorems under strict contractive conditions, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 270 (2002), 181-188.
- [2] M. Abbas, I. Altun and D. Gopal, Common fixed point theorems for non compatible mappings in fuzzy metric spaces, *Bulletin of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 1(2) (2009), 47-56.
- [3] R. Fuller, Neural fuzzy system, *Aobo Akademi Univ., Aobo, ESF Series A.* 443 (1995).
- [4] A. George and P. Veeramani, On some results in fuzzy metric spaces, *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* 64 (1994), 395-399.
- [5] A. George and P. Veeramani, On some results of analysis for fuzzy metric space, *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* 90 (1997), 365-368.
- [6] M. Grabiec, Fixed points in fuzzy metric spaces, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 27(3) (1988), 385-389.
- [7] V. Gregori and A. Sapena, On fixed point theorems in fuzzy metric spaces, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 125 (2002), 245-252.
- [8] M. Imdad, J. Ali and M. Hasan, Common fixed point theorems in fuzzy metric spaces employing common property (E. A.), *Mathematical and Computer Modeling* 55 (2012), 770-778.
- [9] G. Jungck, Commuting mappings and fixed points, *Amer. Math. Monthly* 83 (1976), 261-263.
- [10] M. S. Khan, M. Swaleh and S. Sessa, Fixed point theorems by altering distances between the points, *Bull. Aust. Math. Soc.* 30 (1984), 1-9.
- [11] I. Kramosil and J. Michalek, Fuzzy metric and statistical metric spaces, *Kybernetika* 11 (1975), 336-344.
- [12] A. Mc Bratney and I. O. A. Odeh, Application of fuzzy sets in soil science: fuzzy logic, fuzzy measurements and fuzzy decisions, *Geoderma* 77 (1997), 85-113.
- [13] D. Mihet, Fixed point theorems in fuzzy metric spaces using property E.A., *Nonlinear Analysis* 73(1) (2010), 2184-2188.
- [14] H. K. Pathak, R. R. Lopez and R. K. Verma, A common fixed point theorem using implicit relation and property (E.A.) in metric spaces, *Filomat* 21(2) (2007), 211-234.
- [15] S. Romaguera, A. Sapena and P. Tirado, The Banach fixed point theorem in fuzzy quasi-metric spaces with application to the domain of words, *Topol. Appl.* 154 (2007), 2196-2203.
- [16] K. P. R. Sastry, G. A. Naidu and K. Marthanda Krishna, Common fixed point theorems for four self maps on a fuzzy metric space satisfying common E.A. Property, *Advances in Applied Science Research* 6(10) (2015), 35-39.
- [17] B. Schweizer and A. Sklar, Statistical metric spaces, *Pacific J. Math.* 10(1) (1960), 313-334.

- [18] S. Sedghi, N. Shobe and A. Aliouche, A common fixed point theorem for weakly compatible mappings in fuzzy metric spaces, *General Mathematics* 18(3) (2010), 3-12.
- [19] Y. Shen, D. Qiu and W. Chen, Fixed point theorems in fuzzy metric spaces, *Applied Mathematics Letters* 25(2) (2012), 138-141.
- [20] M. T. Shirude and C. T. Aage, Some fixed point theorems using property E. A. in fuzzy metric spaces, *IJESC* 6(11) (2016), 3411-3414.
- [21] B. Singh and S. Jain, Semi compatibility and fixed point theorems in fuzzy metric space using implicit relation, *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences* 2005 (2005), 2617-2629.
- [22] F. Steimann, On the use and usefulness of fuzzy sets in medical AI, *Artificial Intelligence in Medicine* 21 (2001), 131-137.
- [23] P. V. Subrahmanyam, A common fixed point theorem in fuzzy metric spaces, *Inform. Sci.* 83(2) (1995), 109-112.
- [24] P. Vijayaraju and Z. M. I. Sajath, Some common fixed point theorems in fuzzy metric spaces, *International Journal of Mathematical Analysis* 3(15) (2009), 701-710.
- [25] N. Wairojjana, T. Dosenovic, D. Rakic, D. Gopal and P. Kumam, An altering distance function in fuzzy metric fixed point theorems, *Fixed Point Theory and Applications* (2015), 2015: 69.
- [26] L. A. Zadeh, Fuzzy sets, *Inf. Control* 8 (1965), 338-353.