

# Coupled Common Fixed Point Theorem for Two Maps in Modular Spaces

K.P.R.Rao<sup>1</sup>, Sk.Sadik<sup>2</sup>, K.V. Sivaparvati<sup>3</sup>

Professor, Department of Mathematics, Acharya Nagarjuna University, Nagarjuna Nagar, Andhra Pradesh, India<sup>1</sup>

Assistant Professor, Department of Mathematics, Sir CRR College of Engineering, Eluru, Andhra Pradesh, India<sup>2</sup>

Academic Consultant, Department of Applied Mathematics, Dr.MRAR PG Centre, Nuzvid, Andhra Pradesh, India<sup>3</sup>

**ABSTRACT:** In this paper, we obtain a coupled common fixed point theorem in modular spaces. We also give an example to illustrate our main theorem.

**KEYWORDS:** Modular spaces, Coupled fixed points,  $\rho$  - compatible mappings.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The concept of a modular space was initiated by Nakano [5] and was redefined and generalized by Musielak and Orlicz [7]. Since then, several fixed point and common fixed point theorems in the frame work of modular spaces have been investigated. For more details see ([1] – [4], [6], [8], [10] – [20], [22]). Bhaskar and Lakshmikantham [21] introduced the concept of coupled fixed points and later several authors obtained coupled fixed point and coupled common fixed point theorems in various spaces. Recently Abbas et al. [9] introduced  $W$ -compatible mappings in cone metric spaces. In this paper, combining these concepts, we obtain a coupled common fixed point theorem for Jungck type mappings in modular spaces. We also give an example to illustrate our main theorem. Now we give some basic definitions on modular spaces.

**Definition 1.1** Let  $X$  be an arbitrary real or complex vector space. A functional  $\rho : X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is called modular if for any  $x, y \in X$ , the following conditions hold:

$$(\rho_1) \rho(x) = 0 \text{ if and only if } x = 0,$$

$$(\rho_2) \rho(\lambda x) = |\lambda| \rho(x) \text{ for every scalar } \lambda \text{ with } |\lambda| = 1,$$

$$(\rho_3) \rho(\lambda x + \mu y) \leq \rho(x) + \rho(y) \text{ whenever } \lambda + \mu = 1 \text{ and } \lambda, \mu \geq 0.$$

Note that  $X_\rho = \{x \in X : \rho(\lambda x) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \lambda \rightarrow 0\}$  is called a modular space.

**Remark 1.2** Let  $X_\rho$  be a modular space. Then

$$(i) \rho\left(\frac{x}{2}\right) \leq \rho(x) \text{ for all } x \in X_\rho$$

**Proof.**  $\rho\left(\frac{x}{2}\right) = \rho\left(\frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}0\right) \leq \rho(x) + \rho(0) = \rho(x)$ , from  $(\rho_3)$  and  $(\rho_1)$ .

$$(ii) \rho(x + y) \leq \rho(2x) + \rho(2y) \text{ for all } x, y \in X_\rho$$

**Proof.**  $\rho(x + y) = \rho\left(\frac{1}{2}(2x) + \frac{1}{2}(2y)\right) \leq \rho(2x) + \rho(2y)$ , from  $(\rho_3)$ .

## International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology

(An ISO 3297: 2007 Certified Organization)

Vol. 5, Issue 9, September 2016

**Definition 1.3** Let  $X_\rho$  be a modular space.

- (i) The sequence  $\{x_n\}$  in  $X_\rho$  is called  $\rho$ -convergent to  $x \in X_\rho$  if and only if  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho(x_n - x) = 0$ .
- (ii)  $\rho$ -Cauchy if and only if  $\lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} \rho(x_n - x_m) = 0$ .
- (iii) A subset  $C$  of  $X_\rho$  is called  $\rho$ -closed if the  $\rho$ -limit of a  $\rho$ -convergent sequence of  $C$  is still in  $C$ .
- (iv) A subset  $C$  of  $X_\rho$  is called  $\rho$ -complete if any  $\rho$ -Cauchy sequence in  $C$  is  $\rho$ -convergent and its  $\rho$ -limit belongs to  $C$ .
- (v)  $\rho$  is said to satisfy the  $\Delta_2$ -condition if  $\rho(2x_n) \rightarrow 0$  whenever  $\rho(x_n) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .
- (vi) we say that  $\rho$  has the Fatou property if  $\rho(x - y) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho(x_n - y)$  for all  $y \in X_\rho$  whenever  $\rho(x_n - x) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Definition 1.4** Let  $X_\rho$  be a modular space. We say that  $T : X_\rho \rightarrow X_\rho$  is  $\rho$ -continuous if  $\rho(Tx_n - Tx) \rightarrow 0$  whenever  $\rho(x_n - x) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Definition 1.5** Let  $X_\rho$  be a modular space and  $F : X_\rho \times X_\rho \rightarrow X_\rho$  and  $g : X_\rho \rightarrow X_\rho$ . Then the pair  $(F, g)$  is said to be  $\rho$ -compatible if  $\rho(F(gx_n, gy_n) - g(F(x_n, y_n))) \rightarrow 0$  and  $\rho(F(gy_n, gx_n) - g(F(y_n, x_n))) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  whenever there exist sequences  $\{x_n\}$  and  $\{y_n\}$  in  $X_\rho$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(x_n, y_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} gx_n = t$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(y_n, x_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} gy_n = t'$  for some  $t$  and  $t'$  in  $X_\rho$ .

**Definition 1.6** Let  $X_\rho$  be a modular space and  $F : X_\rho \times X_\rho \rightarrow X_\rho$  and  $g : X_\rho \rightarrow X_\rho$ . Then the pair  $(F, g)$  is said to be  $\rho$ -weakly compatible if  $F(gx, gy) = g(F(x, y))$  and  $F(gy, gx) = g(F(y, x))$  whenever there exist  $x$  and  $y$  in  $X_\rho$  such that  $F(x, y) = gx$  and  $F(y, x) = gy$ .

**Definition 1.7** Let  $X_\rho$  be a modular space and  $F : X_\rho \times X_\rho \rightarrow X_\rho$ . Then  $F$  is said to be  $\rho$ -continuous if  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho(F(x_n, y_n) - F(x, y)) = 0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho(F(y_n, x_n) - F(y, x))$  whenever  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho(x_n - x) = 0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho(y_n - y)$ .

**Definition 1.8** ([9]) Let  $X$  be a nonempty set. An element  $(x, y) \in X \times X$  is called

- (i) a coupled coincidence point of  $F : X \times X \rightarrow X$  and  $g : X \rightarrow X$  if  $gx = F(x, y)$  and  $gy = F(y, x)$ .
- (ii) a common coupled fixed point of  $F : X \times X \rightarrow X$  and  $g : X \rightarrow X$  if  $x = gx = F(x, y)$  and  $y = gy = F(y, x)$ .

Kaushik et al.[19]introduced the following  $\alpha$ -admissible mapping concept which is a generalization of the concept introduced by Mursaleen et al. [15].

# International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology

(An ISO 3297: 2007 Certified Organization)

Vol. 5, Issue 9, September 2016

**Definition 1.9** ([19]) Let  $X$  be a nonempty set and  $\alpha : X^2 \times X^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  be a function. Let  $F : X \times X \rightarrow X$ ,  $g : X \rightarrow X$  be mappings. Then  $F$  and  $g$  are said to be  $\alpha$ -admissible if

$$\alpha((gx, gy), (gu, gv)) \geq 1 \Rightarrow \alpha((F(x, y), F(y, x)), (F(u, v), F(v, u))) \geq 1 \text{ for all } x, y, u, v \in X.$$

If  $g = I$  (Identity map), then the above definition is the concept of Mursaleen et al. [15].

We say that the pair  $(F, g)$  is triangular  $\alpha$ -admissible if  $F$  and  $g$  are  $\alpha$ -admissible and if  $\alpha((x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)) \geq 1, \alpha((x_2, y_2), (x_3, y_3)) \geq 1 \Rightarrow \alpha((x_1, y_1), (x_3, y_3)) \geq 1, \forall x_1, x_2, x_3, y_1, y_2, y_3 \in X$ .

Now we prove our main result.

## II. MAIN RESULT

**Theorem 2.1**. Let  $X_\rho$  be a  $\rho$ -complete modular space, where  $\rho$  satisfies the  $\Delta_2$ -condition. Let

$F : X_\rho \times X_\rho \rightarrow X_\rho$  and  $g : X_\rho \rightarrow X_\rho$  be mappings satisfying

$$(2.1.1). \quad F(X_\rho \times X_\rho) \subseteq g(X_\rho),$$

$$(2.1.2). \quad \alpha((gx, gy), (gu, gv)) \rho(F(x, y) - F(u, v)) \leq \lambda M_{x,y}^{u,v} \text{ for all } x, y, u, v \in X_\rho, \text{ where } \lambda \in (0, 1) \text{ and}$$

$$M_{x,y}^{u,v} = \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \rho(gx - gu), \rho(gy - gv), \rho(gx - F(x, y)), \\ \rho(gy - F(y, x)), \rho(gu - F(u, v)), \rho(gv - F(v, u)), \\ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \rho\left(\frac{gx - F(u, v)}{2}\right) + \rho\left(\frac{gu - F(x, y)}{2}\right) \right], \\ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \rho\left(\frac{gy - F(v, u)}{2}\right) + \rho\left(\frac{gv - F(y, x)}{2}\right) \right] \end{array} \right\}$$

$$(2.1.3). \quad F \text{ and } g \text{ are } \rho\text{-continuous,}$$

$$(2.1.4). \quad \text{the pair } (F, g) \text{ is } \rho\text{-compatible,}$$

$$(2.1.5) \text{ (a) } \alpha((gx_0, gy_0), (F(x_0, y_0), F(y_0, x_0))) \geq 1 \text{ and}$$

$$(2.1.5) \text{ (b) } \alpha((gy_0, gx_0), (F(y_0, x_0), F(x_0, y_0))) \geq 1 \text{ for some } x_0, y_0 \in X,$$

$$(2.1.6) \text{ the pair } (F, g) \text{ is triangular } \alpha\text{-admissible.}$$

Then  $F$  and  $g$  have a coupled coincidence point in  $X \times X$ .

Further if we assume that

$$(2.1.7) \quad \alpha((gx, gy), (gu, gv)) \geq 1, \alpha((gy, gx), (gv, gu)) \geq 1$$

whenever  $(x, y)$  and  $(u, v)$  are coupled coincidence points of  $F$  and  $g$ ,

then  $F$  and  $g$  have a unique coupled common fixed point.

**Proof.** Let  $x_0, y_0 \in X_\rho$  satisfying (2.1.5)(a) and (2.1.5)(b). From (2.1.1), there exist sequences  $\{x_n\}$  and  $\{y_n\}$  in  $X_\rho$  such that

$$gx_{n+1} = F(x_n, y_n), \quad gy_{n+1} = F(y_n, x_n), \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots \tag{1}$$

From (2.1.5)(a), we have

## International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology

(An ISO 3297: 2007 Certified Organization)

Vol. 5, Issue 9, September 2016

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha((gx_0, gy_0), (F(x_0, y_0), F(y_0, x_0))) \geq 1 \\ &\Rightarrow \alpha((gx_0, gy_0), (gx_1, gy_1)) \geq 1, \text{ from (1)} \\ &\Rightarrow \alpha((F(x_0, y_0), F(y_0, x_0)), (F(x_1, y_1), F(y_1, x_1))) \geq 1, \text{ from (2.1.6)} \\ &\Rightarrow \alpha((gx_1, gy_1), (gx_2, gy_2)) \geq 1, \text{ from (1)} \\ &\Rightarrow \alpha((F(x_1, y_1), F(y_1, x_1)), (F(x_2, y_2), F(y_2, x_2))) \geq 1, \text{ from (2.1.6)} \\ &\Rightarrow \alpha((gx_2, gy_2), (gx_3, gy_3)) \geq 1, \text{ from (1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Continuing in this way, we have

$$\alpha((gx_n, gy_n), (gx_{n+1}, gy_{n+1})) \geq 1 \quad \forall n. \tag{2}$$

Similarly from (2.1.5)(b), we can obtain

$$\alpha((gy_n, gx_n), (gy_{n+1}, gx_{n+1})) \geq 1 \quad \forall n. \tag{3}$$

Let  $R_n = \max\{\rho(gx_n - gx_{n+1}), \rho(gy_n - gy_{n+1})\}$ .

Using (2), consider

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(gx_{n+1} - gx_{n+2}) &= \rho(F(x_n, y_n) - F(x_{n+1}, y_{n+1})) \\ &\leq \alpha((gx_n, gy_n), (gx_{n+1}, gy_{n+1})) \rho(F(x_n, y_n) - F(x_{n+1}, y_{n+1})) \\ &\leq \lambda M_{x_n, y_n}^{x_{n+1}, y_{n+1}} \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where

$$M_{x_n, y_n}^{x_{n+1}, y_{n+1}} = \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \rho(gx_n - gx_{n+1}), \rho(gy_n - gy_{n+1}), \rho(gx_n - gx_{n+1}), \\ \rho(gy_n - gy_{n+1}), \rho(gx_{n+1} - gx_{n+2}), \rho(gy_{n+1} - gy_{n+2}), \\ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \rho\left(\frac{gx_n - gx_{n+2}}{2}\right) + \rho\left(\frac{gx_{n+1} - gx_{n+1}}{2}\right) \right], \\ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \rho\left(\frac{gy_n - gy_{n+2}}{2}\right) + \rho\left(\frac{gy_{n+1} - gy_{n+1}}{2}\right) \right] \end{array} \right\}.$$

Consider

$$\begin{aligned} \rho\left(\frac{gx_n - gx_{n+2}}{2}\right) &= \rho\left(\frac{gx_n - gx_{n+1} + gx_{n+1} - gx_{n+2}}{2}\right) \\ &\leq \rho(gx_n - gx_{n+1}) + \rho(gx_{n+1} - gx_{n+2}), \text{ from } (\rho_3) \\ &\leq 2 \max\{\rho(gx_n - gx_{n+1}), \rho(gx_{n+1} - gx_{n+2})\} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly

$$\rho\left(\frac{gy_n - gy_{n+2}}{2}\right) \leq 2 \max\{\rho(gy_n - gy_{n+1}), \rho(gy_{n+1} - gy_{n+2})\}.$$

Thus  $M_{x_n, y_n}^{x_{n+1}, y_{n+1}} = \max\{R_n, R_{n+1}\}$ .

(4) becomes  $\rho(gx_{n+1} - gx_{n+2}) \leq \lambda \max\{R_n, R_{n+1}\}$ .

Similarly using (2.1.2) and (3), we have  $\rho(gy_{n+1} - gy_{n+2}) \leq \lambda \max\{R_n, R_{n+1}\}$ .

Thus

$$R_{n+1} \leq \lambda \max\{R_n, R_{n+1}\} \tag{5}$$

If  $\max\{R_n, R_{n+1}\} = R_{n+1}$  for some  $n$  then from (5), we have

## International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology

(An ISO 3297: 2007 Certified Organization)

Vol. 5, Issue 9, September 2016

$R_{n+1} \leq \lambda R_{n+1}$  which in turn yields that  $R_{n+1} = 0$ .

By proceeding as in the above we can show that  $R_{n+2} = 0, R_{n+3} = 0, \dots$ .

Thus  $\{gx_n\}$  and  $\{gy_n\}$  are constant Cauchy sequences.

Suppose  $\max\{R_n, R_{n+1}\} = R_n$  for all  $n$ .

Then from (5), we have  $R_{n+1} \leq \lambda R_n$  for all  $n$ .

Thus  $R_{n+1} \leq \lambda^n R_1$  for all  $n$

$\rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Thus

$$\rho(gx_n - gx_{n+1}) \rightarrow 0 \text{ and } \rho(gy_n - gy_{n+1}) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (6)$$

Suppose either  $\{gx_n\}$  or  $\{gy_n\}$  is not Cauchy.

Then there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  for which we can find sub sequences  $\{gx_{m(k)}\}, \{gx_{n(k)}\}, \{gy_{m(k)}\}$  and  $\{gy_{n(k)}\}$  with  $m(k) > n(k) > k$  such that for every  $k$

$$\max\{\rho(gx_{m(k)} - gx_{n(k)}), \rho(gy_{m(k)} - gy_{n(k)})\} \geq \varepsilon. \quad (7)$$

Moreover, corresponding to  $n(k)$ , we can choose  $m(k)$  in such a way that it is the smallest integer with  $m(k) > n(k)$  and satisfying (7). Then

$$\max\{\rho(2(gx_{m(k)-1} - gx_{n(k)})), \rho(2(gy_{m(k)-1} - gy_{n(k)}))\} < \varepsilon. \quad (8)$$

From (7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &\leq \max\{\rho(gx_{m(k)} - gx_{n(k)}), \rho(gy_{m(k)} - gy_{n(k)})\} \\ &= \max\left\{\begin{aligned} &\rho(gx_{m(k)} - gx_{m(k)-1} + gx_{m(k)-1} - gx_{n(k)}), \\ &\rho(gy_{m(k)} - gy_{m(k)-1} + gy_{m(k)-1} - gy_{n(k)}) \end{aligned}\right\} \\ &\leq \max\left\{\begin{aligned} &\rho(2(gx_{m(k)} - gx_{m(k)-1})) + \rho(2(gx_{m(k)-1} - gx_{n(k)})), \\ &\rho(2(gy_{m(k)} - gy_{m(k)-1})) + \rho(2(gy_{m(k)-1} - gy_{n(k)})) \end{aligned}\right\}, \text{ from Remark 1.2(ii)} \\ &\leq \max\{\rho(2(gx_{m(k)} - gx_{m(k)-1})), \rho(2(gy_{m(k)} - gy_{m(k)-1}))\} \\ &\quad + \max\{\rho(2(gx_{m(k)-1} - gx_{n(k)})), \rho(2(gy_{m(k)-1} - gy_{n(k)}))\} \\ &< \max\{\rho(2(gx_{m(k)} - gx_{m(k)-1})), \rho(2(gy_{m(k)} - gy_{m(k)-1}))\} + \varepsilon, \text{ from (8)}. \end{aligned}$$

From (6) and since  $\rho$  satisfies the  $\Delta_2$ -condition, we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \max\{\rho(gx_{m(k)} - gx_{n(k)}), \rho(gy_{m(k)} - gy_{n(k)})\} = \varepsilon \quad (9)$$

Using (2) and triangular property of  $\alpha$ , we have

$$\alpha((gx_{m(k)-1}, gy_{m(k)-1}), (gx_{n(k)-1}, gy_{n(k)-1})) \geq 1.$$

Now from (2.1.2), we have

## International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology

(An ISO 3297: 2007 Certified Organization)

Vol. 5, Issue 9, September 2016

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \rho(gx_{m(k)} - gx_{n(k)}) \\
 &= \rho(F(x_{m(k)-1}, y_{m(k)-1}) - F(x_{n(k)-1}, y_{n(k)-1})) \\
 &\leq \alpha((gx_{m(k)-1}, gy_{m(k)-1}), (gx_{n(k)-1}, gy_{n(k)-1})) \rho(F(x_{m(k)-1}, y_{m(k)-1}) - F(x_{n(k)-1}, y_{n(k)-1})) \\
 &\leq \lambda M_{x_{m(k)-1}, y_{m(k)-1}, x_{n(k)-1}, y_{n(k)-1}} \tag{10}
 \end{aligned}$$

Where

$$M_{x_{m(k)-1}, y_{m(k)-1}, x_{n(k)-1}, y_{n(k)-1}} = \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \rho(gx_{m(k)-1} - gx_{n(k)-1}), \rho(gy_{m(k)-1} - gy_{n(k)-1}), \\ \rho(gx_{m(k)-1} - gx_{m(k)}), \rho(gy_{m(k)-1} - gy_{m(k)}), \\ \rho(gx_{n(k)-1} - gx_{n(k)}), \rho(gy_{n(k)-1} - gy_{n(k)}), \\ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \rho\left(\frac{gx_{m(k)-1} - gx_{n(k)}}{2}\right) + \rho\left(\frac{gx_{n(k)-1} - gx_{m(k)}}{2}\right) \right], \\ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \rho\left(\frac{gy_{m(k)-1} - gy_{n(k)}}{2}\right) + \rho\left(\frac{gy_{n(k)-1} - gy_{m(k)}}{2}\right) \right] \end{array} \right\}.$$

Consider

$$\begin{aligned}
 \rho(gx_{m(k)-1} - gx_{n(k)-1}) &= \rho(gx_{m(k)-1} - gx_{n(k)} + gx_{n(k)} - gx_{n(k)-1}) \\
 &\leq \rho(2(gx_{m(k)-1} - gx_{n(k)})) + \rho(2(gx_{n(k)} - gx_{n(k)-1})), \text{ from Remark 1.2(ii)} \\
 &< \varepsilon + \rho(2(gx_{n(k)} - gx_{n(k)-1})), \text{ from (8)}
 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly  $\rho(gy_{m(k)-1} - gy_{n(k)-1}) < \varepsilon + \rho(2(gy_{n(k)} - gy_{n(k)-1}))$ .

Consider

$$\begin{aligned}
 \rho\left(\frac{gx_{m(k)-1} - gx_{n(k)}}{2}\right) &= \rho\left(\frac{gx_{m(k)-1} - gx_{m(k)} + gx_{m(k)} - gx_{n(k)}}{2}\right) \\
 &\leq \rho(gx_{m(k)-1} - gx_{m(k)}) + \rho(gx_{m(k)} - gx_{n(k)}), \text{ from } (\rho_3)
 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly

$$\begin{aligned}
 \rho\left(\frac{gx_{n(k)-1} - gx_{m(k)}}{2}\right) &\leq \rho(gx_{n(k)-1} - gx_{n(k)}) + \rho(gx_{n(k)} - gx_{m(k)}), \\
 \rho\left(\frac{gy_{m(k)-1} - gy_{n(k)}}{2}\right) &\leq \rho(gy_{m(k)-1} - gy_{m(k)}) + \rho(gy_{m(k)} - gy_{n(k)}), \\
 \rho\left(\frac{gy_{n(k)-1} - gy_{m(k)}}{2}\right) &\leq \rho(gy_{n(k)-1} - gy_{n(k)}) + \rho(gy_{n(k)} - gy_{m(k)}).
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus (10) becomes

$$\rho(gx_{m(k)} - gx_{n(k)}) \leq \lambda \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \varepsilon + \rho(2(gx_{n(k)} - gx_{n(k)-1})), \\ \varepsilon + \rho(2(gy_{n(k)} - gy_{n(k)-1})), \\ \rho(gx_{m(k)-1} - gx_{m(k)}), \rho(gy_{m(k)-1} - gy_{m(k)}), \\ \rho(gx_{n(k)-1} - gx_{n(k)}), \rho(gy_{n(k)-1} - gy_{n(k)}), \\ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \rho(gx_{m(k)-1} - gx_{m(k)}) + \rho(gx_{m(k)} - gx_{n(k)}) \right] \\ \quad + \rho(gx_{n(k)-1} - gx_{n(k)}) + \rho(gx_{n(k)} - gx_{m(k)}) \right], \\ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \rho(gy_{m(k)-1} - gy_{m(k)}) + \rho(gy_{m(k)} - gy_{n(k)}) \right] \\ \quad + \rho(gy_{n(k)-1} - gy_{n(k)}) + \rho(gy_{n(k)} - gy_{m(k)}) \right] \end{array} \right\}.$$

## International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology

(An ISO 3297: 2007 Certified Organization)

Vol. 5, Issue 9, September 2016

Similarly we have

$$\rho(gy_{m(k)} - gy_{n(k)}) \leq \lambda \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \varepsilon + \rho(2(gx_{n(k)} - gx_{n(k-1)})), \\ \varepsilon + \rho(2(gy_{n(k)} - gy_{n(k-1)})), \\ \rho(gx_{m(k-1)} - gx_{m(k)}), \rho(gy_{m(k-1)} - gy_{m(k)}), \\ \rho(gx_{n(k-1)} - gx_{n(k)}), \rho(gy_{n(k-1)} - gy_{n(k)}), \\ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \rho(gx_{m(k-1)} - gx_{m(k)}) + \rho(gx_{m(k)} - gx_{n(k)}) \right] \\ \quad + \rho(gx_{n(k-1)} - gx_{n(k)}) + \rho(gx_{n(k)} - gx_{m(k)}) \right], \\ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \rho(gy_{m(k-1)} - gy_{m(k)}) + \rho(gy_{m(k)} - gy_{n(k)}) \right] \\ \quad + \rho(gy_{n(k-1)} - gy_{n(k)}) + \rho(gy_{n(k)} - gy_{m(k)}) \right] \end{array} \right\}$$

Thus

$$\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \rho(gx_{m(k)} - gx_{n(k)}), \\ \rho(gy_{m(k)} - gy_{n(k)}) \end{array} \right\} \leq \lambda \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \varepsilon + \rho(2(gx_{n(k)} - gx_{n(k-1)})), \\ \varepsilon + \rho(2(gy_{n(k)} - gy_{n(k-1)})), \\ \rho(gx_{m(k-1)} - gx_{m(k)}), \rho(gy_{m(k-1)} - gy_{m(k)}), \\ \rho(gx_{n(k-1)} - gx_{n(k)}), \rho(gy_{n(k-1)} - gy_{n(k)}), \\ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \rho(gx_{m(k-1)} - gx_{m(k)}) + \rho(gx_{m(k)} - gx_{n(k)}) \right] \\ \quad + \rho(gx_{n(k-1)} - gx_{n(k)}) + \rho(gx_{n(k)} - gx_{m(k)}) \right], \\ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \rho(gy_{m(k-1)} - gy_{m(k)}) + \rho(gy_{m(k)} - gy_{n(k)}) \right] \\ \quad + \rho(gy_{n(k-1)} - gy_{n(k)}) + \rho(gy_{n(k)} - gy_{m(k)}) \right] \end{array} \right\}$$

Letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$  and using (6), (9) and  $\Delta_2$ -condition, we get

$\varepsilon \leq \lambda\varepsilon$ . It is a contradiction.

Hence  $\{gx_n\}$  and  $\{gy_n\}$  are Cauchy sequences. Since  $X_\rho$  is  $\rho$ -complete space, there exist  $x, y \in X_\rho$  such that

$gx_n \rightarrow x$  and  $gy_n \rightarrow y$ .

Since the pair  $(F, g)$  is  $\rho$ -compatible, we have  $\rho(g(F(x_n, y_n)) - F(gx_n, gy_n)) \rightarrow 0$  and  $\rho(g(F(y_n, x_n)) - F(gy_n, gx_n)) \rightarrow 0$ .

Since  $F$  is  $\rho$ -continuous, we have  $\rho(F(gx_n, gy_n) - F(x, y)) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Now

$$\rho\left(\frac{gx - F(x, y)}{4}\right) = \rho\left(\frac{\frac{gx - F(gx_n, gy_n)}{2} + \frac{F(gx_n, gy_n) - F(x, y)}{2}}{2}\right)$$

## International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology

(An ISO 3297: 2007 Certified Organization)

Vol. 5, Issue 9, September 2016

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \rho\left(\frac{gx - F(gx_n, gy_n)}{2}\right) + \rho\left(\frac{F(gx_n, gy_n) - F(x, y)}{2}\right) \\ &\leq \rho(gx - g(F(x_n, y_n))) + \rho(g(F(x_n, y_n)) - F(gx_n, gy_n)) + \rho(F(gx_n, gy_n) - F(x, y)), \\ &\hspace{15em} \text{from } (\rho_3) \text{ and Remark 1.2(i)} \\ &\rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty, \text{ since } g \text{ and } F \text{ are } \rho\text{-continuous and } (F, g) \text{ is } \rho\text{-compatible} \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $gx = F(x, y)$ .

Similarly we can show that  $gy = F(y, x)$ .

Thus  $(x, y)$  is a coupled coincidence point of  $F$  and  $g$ .

**Claim:** If  $(u, v)$  is another coupled coincidence point of  $F$  and  $g$ , then  $gx = gu$  and  $gy = gv$ .

By (2.1.7), we have  $\alpha((gx, gy), (gu, gv)) \geq 1$ .

Consider

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(gx - gu) &= \rho(F(x, y) - F(u, v)) \\ &\leq \alpha((gx, gy), (gu, gv)) \rho(F(x, y) - F(u, v)) \\ &\leq \lambda \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \rho(gx - gu), \rho(gy - gv), \rho(gx - F(x, y)), \\ \rho(gy - F(y, x)), \rho(gu - F(u, v)), \rho(gv - F(v, u)), \\ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \rho\left(\frac{gx - F(u, v)}{2}\right) + \rho\left(\frac{gu - F(x, y)}{2}\right) \right], \\ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \rho\left(\frac{gy - F(v, u)}{2}\right) + \rho\left(\frac{gv - F(y, x)}{2}\right) \right] \end{array} \right\} \\ &\leq \lambda \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \rho(gx - gu), \rho(gy - gv), 0, 0, 0, 0, \\ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \rho\left(\frac{gx - gu}{2}\right) + \rho\left(\frac{gu - gx}{2}\right) \right], \\ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \rho\left(\frac{gy - gv}{2}\right) + \rho\left(\frac{gv - gy}{2}\right) \right] \end{array} \right\} \\ &= \lambda \max\{\rho(gx - gu), \rho(gy - gv)\}, \text{ from Remark 1.2(i)} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly

$$\rho(gy - gv) \leq \lambda \max\{\rho(gx - gu), \rho(gy - gv)\}.$$

Thus

$$\max\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \rho(gx - gu), \\ \rho(gy - gv) \end{array} \right\} \leq \lambda \max\{\rho(gx - gu), \rho(gy - gv)\}$$

which in turn yields that  $gx = gu$  and  $gy = gv$ . Hence the claim.

Denote  $gx = p$  and  $gy = q$ .

Then  $gp = g(gx) = g(F(x, y)) = F(gx, gy) = F(p, q)$ , since  $\rho$ -compatibility of  $(F, g)$  implies  $\rho$ -weakly compatibility of  $(F, g)$ .

Similarly  $gq = F(q, p)$ . Thus  $(p, q)$  is a coupled coincidence point of  $F$  and  $g$ .

By the claim we have  $gx = gp$  and  $gy = gq$ .

Thus  $p = gp$  and  $q = gq$ .

Hence  $F(p, q) = gp = p$  and  $F(q, p) = gq = q$ .

Hence  $(p, q)$  is a coupled common fixed point of  $F$  and  $g$ .



## International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology

(An ISO 3297: 2007 Certified Organization)

Vol. 5, Issue 9, September 2016

Suppose  $(p', q')$  is another coupled common fixed point of  $F$  and  $g$ .

Then from (2.1.7), we have  $\alpha((gp, gq), (gp', gq')) \geq 1$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(p - p') &= \rho(F(p, q) - F(p', q')) \\ &\leq \alpha((gp, gq), (gp', gq')) \rho(F(p, q) - F(p', q')) \\ &\leq \lambda \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \rho(p - p'), \rho(q - q'), \rho(p - p), \\ \rho(q - q), \rho(p' - p'), \rho(q' - q'), \\ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \rho\left(\frac{p - p'}{2}\right) + \rho\left(\frac{p' - p}{2}\right) \right], \\ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \rho\left(\frac{q - q'}{2}\right) + \rho\left(\frac{q' - q}{2}\right) \right] \end{array} \right\} \\ &= \lambda \max\{\rho(p - p'), \rho(q - q')\}, \text{ from Remark 1.2(i)} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly

$$\rho(q - q') \leq \lambda \max\{\rho(p - p'), \rho(q - q')\}.$$

Thus

$$\max\{\rho(p - p'), \rho(q - q')\} \leq \lambda \max\{\rho(p - p'), \rho(q - q')\}$$

which in turn yields that  $p = p', q = q'$ .

Thus  $(p, q)$  is the unique coupled common fixed point of  $F$  and  $g$ .

Now, we give an example to illustrate Theorem 2.1.

**Example 2.2** Let  $X_\rho = l^1$ , where  $\rho(x) = \|x\| = \sum |x_i|$  for  $x \in l^1$ . Define  $F : l^1 \times l^1 \rightarrow l^1$  and  $g : l^1 \rightarrow l^1$  by

$$F(x, y) = \left( \frac{x_1 + y_1}{12}, \frac{x_2 + y_2}{12}, 0, 0, \dots \right), g(x) = \left( \frac{x_1}{3}, \frac{x_2}{3}, 0, 0, \dots \right) \text{ for all } x = (x_1, x_2, \dots) \in l^1 \text{ and } y = (y_1, y_2, \dots) \in l^1.$$

Define  $\alpha : X_\rho^2 \times X_\rho^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  as  $\alpha((x, y), (u, v)) = \frac{3}{2}$  if  $x, y, u, v \in l^1$  with at least one of first two values of all  $x, y, u$  and  $v$  is not zero and 0, otherwise

Let  $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots), y = (y_1, y_2, \dots), u = (u_1, u_2, \dots), v = (v_1, v_2, \dots) \in l^1$ .

Case(a): Suppose at least one of first two values of all  $x, y, u$  and  $v$  is not zero.

Consider

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha((gx, gy), (gu, gv)) \rho(F(x, y) - F(u, v)) \\ &= \frac{3}{2} \rho \left( \left( \frac{x_1 + y_1}{12}, \frac{x_2 + y_2}{12}, 0, 0, \dots \right) - \left( \frac{u_1 + v_1}{12}, \frac{u_2 + v_2}{12}, 0, 0, \dots \right) \right) \\ &= \frac{3}{2} \rho \left( \frac{x_1 + y_1 - u_1 - v_1}{12}, \frac{x_2 + y_2 - u_2 - v_2}{12}, 0, 0, \dots \right) \\ &= \frac{3}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{12} |x_1 + y_1 - u_1 - v_1| + \frac{1}{12} |x_2 + y_2 - u_2 - v_2| \right] \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{12} (|x_1 - u_1| + |y_1 - v_1|) + \frac{1}{12} (|x_2 - u_2| + |y_2 - v_2|) \right] \\ &= \frac{3}{8} \left[ \frac{1}{3} (|x_1 - u_1| + |x_2 - u_2|) + \frac{1}{3} (|y_1 - v_1| + |y_2 - v_2|) \right] \end{aligned}$$

# International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology

(An ISO 3297: 2007 Certified Organization)

Vol. 5, Issue 9, September 2016

$$= \frac{3}{8} [\rho(gx - gu) + \rho(gy - gv)]$$

$$\leq \frac{3}{4} \max \{ \rho(gx - gu), \rho(gy - gv) \}$$

Case(b): Suppose first two values of at least one of  $x, y, u$  and  $v$  are zero.

Then  $\alpha((x, y), (u, v)) = 0$ .

Thus in both cases, (2.1.2) is satisfied with  $\lambda = \frac{3}{4}$ . One can easily verify the remaining conditions. Clearly  $(0, 0)$  is the unique coupled common fixed point of  $F$  and  $g$ .

### III. CONCLUSION

By choosing  $\alpha, F$  and  $g$  in Theorem 2.1, one can obtain several fixed point results in modular spaces.

### REFERENCES

- [1] A.Razani and R.Moradi, "Common fixed point theorems of integral type in modular spaces", Bulletin of the Iranian Mathematical Society, vol.35 (2), pp. 11 – 24, 2009.
- [2] C.Mongkolkeha and P.Kumam, "Fixed point and common fixed point theorems for generalized weak contraction mappings of integral type in modular spaces", Int. J. Math. Sci., vol. 2011, 12 pages, 2011.
- [3] C.Mongkolkeha and P.Kumam, "Common fixed points for generalized weak contraction mappings in modular spaces", Sci.Math.Jpn., vol. 75, pp. 69 – 78, 2012.
- [4] C.Mongkolkeha and P.Kumam, "Some Fixed point results for generalized weak contraction mappings in modular spaces", Int. J. Anal., vol. 2013, 6 pages, 2013.
- [5] H.Nakano, "Modulare semi - ordered linear spaces", Tokyo Math.Bookser, vol.1, Maruzen, Tokyo (1950).
- [6] I.Altun, M.Abbas and H.Simsek, "A fixed point theorem on cone metric spaces with new type contractivity", Banach J.Math.Anal., vol. 5 (2), pp. 15 – 24, 2011.
- [7] J.Musielak and W.Orlicz, "On modular spaces", Stud.Math., vol.18, pp. 49 – 56, 1959.
- [8] K.Kuakket and P.Kumam, "Fixed points of asymptotic pointwise contractions in modular spaces", Appl.Math.Lett., vol. 24 (11), pp. 1795 – 1798, 2011.
- [9] M.Abbas, M.Alikhan and S.Radenovic, "Common coupled fixed point theorems in cone metric space for  $\mathcal{W}$  - compatible mappings", Applied Mathematics and Computation, vol. 217 (1), pp. 195 – 202, 2010.
- [10] M.Abbas, S.Ali and P.Kumam, "Common fixed points in partially ordered modular function spaces", Journal of inequalities and Applications, vol. 2014, 12 pages, 2014.
- [11] M.A.Khamsi, "Quasicontraction mapping in modular spaces without  $\Delta_2$  - condition", Fixed Point Theory and Applications, vol. 2008, 6 pages, 2008.
- [12] M.A.Khamsi, W.K.Kozolowski and S.Reich, "Fixed point theory in modular function spaces", Nonlinear Anal., vol. 14, pp. 935 – 953, 1990.
- [13] M.A.Kutbi and A.Latif, "Fixed points of multivalued mappings in modular function spaces", Fixed Point Theory Appl., vol. 2009, 12 pages, 2009.
- [14] M.Beygmohammadi and A.Razani, "Two fixed - point theorems for mappings satisfying a general contractive condition of integral type in the modular space", Int.J.Math. Math.Sci., vol. 2010, 10 pages, 2010.
- [15] M. Musaleen, S. A. Mohiuddine and R. P. Agarwal, "Coupled fixed point theorems for  $\alpha - \Psi$  -contractive type mappings in partially ordered metric spaces", Fixed Point Theory and Applications, vol. 2012, 11 pages, 2012.
- [16] M.Ozturk, M.Abbas and E.Girgin, "Fixed points of mappings satisfying contractive condition of integral type in modular spaces endowed with a graph", Fixed Point Theory Appl., vol. 2014 (220), 17 pages, 2014.
- [17] M.Ozturk, M.Abbas and E.Girgin, "Common fixed point results of a pair of generalized  $(\psi, \varphi)$  - contraction mappings in modular spaces", Fixed Point Theory and Applications, vol. 2016, 19 pages, 2016.
- [18] M.Paknazar, M.Eshaghi, J.Cho and S.M.Vaezpour, "A pata - type fixed point theorem in modular spaces with application", Fixed Point Theory Appl., vol. 2013 (239), 10 pages, 2013.
- [19] P.Kaushik, S.Kumar and P.Kumam, "Coupled coincidence point theorems for  $\alpha - \Psi$  -contractive type mappings in partially ordered metric spaces", Fixed Point Theory and Applications, vol. 2013, 10 pages, 2013.
- [20] P.Kumam, "Fixed point theorems for nonexpansive mappings in modular spaces", Arch.Math., vol. 40, pp. 345 – 353, 2004.
- [21] T.G. Bhaskar and V. Lakshmikantham, "Fixed point theorems in partially ordered metric spaces and applications", Nonlinear Analysis, vol. 65 (7), pp. 1379 – 1393, 2006.
- [22] T.L.Shateri, "Fixed point in modular spaces with new type contractivity", International Journal of Applied mathematical research, vol. 3 (4), pp. 587 – 591, 2014.