

RESEARCH ARTICLE

ON SOME COMMON FIXED POINT THEOREMS IN A CONE S - METRIC SPACE USING WEAKLY COMPATIBLE SELF MAPS WITH (E-A) PROPERTY

Doaa R. Abd-Elwahed ¹ and D. Dhamodharan ²

¹ Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Al Qassiem University, Al asyah , Saudi E-mail:
D.hussien@qu.edu.sa, doaarizk82@gmail.com

² Department of Mathematics, Jamal Mohamed College (Autonomous), Trichy, Tamilnadu ,India 620 020 E-mail:
dharan raj28@yahoo.com

Abstract

In this paper, we prove a common fixed point theorem for weakly compatible self maps with (E-A)property of a cone S - metric space, An illustrative application is given to support our result. These results generalize some well-known recent results.

1 Introduction

Banach's contraction principle in metric spaces is one of the most important feedback in the theory of fixed points and non-linear analysis in general. From 1922, when Stefan Banach formulated the notion of contraction and proved the famous theorem, scientists around the world are publishing new results that are connected either to establish a generalization of metric space or to get an improvement of contractive condition. G.Jungck [8],[9] first introduced compatible mappings and later Jungck and Rhoades [10] introduced the notion of weakly compatible mappings as a generalization of weakly commuting mappings given by Sessa [12]. Recently, Aamri and Moutawakil [7] introduced the concept of (E.A) property. One of the generalizations of metric spaces is given in the paper of Sedghi et al. In 2012 [1]. They introduced a notion of S -metric spaces and give some of their properties. For more details regarding these spaces we refer [1],[2]. For the sake of transparency, we list the basic properties of an S -metric spaces that will be used later. In 2017[11] Krishnakumar and Dhamodharan introduced the concept of generalised S -metric space of cone S -metric space and prove some fixed point theorems of contractive mappings. Huang and Zhang [13] introduced the concept of cone metric space by replacing the set of real numbers by a general Banach space E which is partially ordered with respect to a cone $P \subset E$. Dhamodharan and Krishnakumar [15] also further extended S -metric space to cone S -metric space. In our paper, we prove a common fixed point theorem for weakly compatible maps (E-A) property in a Cone S metric space. Our paper extends and improves several previous results.

2 Preliminaries

In [13], let E be a Banach space. A subset P of E is called a cone if and only if:

1. P is closed, nonempty and $P \neq 0$
2. $ax + by \in P$ for all $x, y \in P$ and nonnegative real numbers a, b
3. $P \cap (-P) = \{0\}$.

Given a cone $P \subset E$, we define a partial ordering \leq with respect to P by $x \leq y$ if and only if $y - x \in P$. We will write $x < y$ to indicate that $x \leq y$ but $x \neq y$, while x, y will stand for $y - x \in \text{int}P$, where $\text{int}P$ denotes the interior of P . The cone P is called normal if there is a number $K > 0$ such that $0 \leq x \leq y$ implies $\|x\| \leq K \|y\|$ for all $x, y \in E$. The least positive number satisfying the above is called the normal constant.

The cone P is called regular if every increasing sequence which is bounded from above is convergent. That is, if $\{x_n\}$ is a sequence such that $x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \dots \leq x_n \leq \dots \leq y$ for some $y \in E$, then there is $x \in E$ such that $\|x_n - x\| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Equivalently the cone P is regular if and only if every decreasing sequence which is bounded from below is convergent. It is well known that a regular cone is a normal cone. Suppose E is a Banach space, P is a cone in E with $\text{int}P \neq \emptyset$ and \leq is partial ordering with respect to P .

Definition 2.1 [11] Suppose that E is a real Banach space, then P is a cone in E with $\text{int}P \neq \emptyset$, and \leq is partial ordering with respect to P . Let X be a non-empty set, a function $d: X \times X \times X \rightarrow E$ is called a cone S metric on X if it satisfies the following conditions with

1. $S(u, v, z) \geq 0$
2. $S(u, v, z) = 0$ if and only if $u = v = z$.
3. $S(u, v, z) \leq S(u, u, a) + S(v, v, a) + S(z, z, a)$

Then the function S is called a cone S -metric on X and the pair (X, S) is called a cone S -metric space simply CSMS.

Example 2.2 [11] Let $E = \mathbb{R}^2$, $P = \{(x, y): x, y \geq 0\}$, $X = \mathbb{R}$ and $d: X \times X \times X \rightarrow E$ such that then $S(x, y, z) = (d(x, z) + d(y, z), \alpha(d(x, z) + d(y, z)))$, ($\alpha > 0$) is a cone S -metric on X .

Example 2.3 [11] Let (X, d) be a cone metric space. Define $S: X \times X \times X \rightarrow E$ by $S(x, y, z) = d(x, z) + d(y, z) + d(z, x)$ for every $x, y, z \in X$

Example 2.4 [11] Let $E = \mathbb{R}^3$, $P = \{(x, y, z): x, y, z \geq 0\}$, $X = \mathbb{R}$ and $d: X \times X \times X \rightarrow E$ such that

$$S(u, u, u) = (0, 0, 0) = S(v, v, v)$$

$$S(u, v, v) = (0, 1, 1) = S(v, u, v) = S(u, u, v)$$

$$S(v, u, u) = (0, 1, 0) = S(u, v, u) = S(u, v, u)$$

Here (X, S) is a cone S metric space but not a G -cone metric space since $S(u, u, v) \neq S(u, v, v)$

Lemma 2.5 [11] Let (X, S) be a cone S -metric space. Then we have $S(u, u, v) = S(v, v, u)$

Definition 2.6 [11] Let (X, S) be an cone S -metric space .

1. A sequence $\{u_n\}$ in X converges to u if and only if $S(u_n, u_n, u) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. That is, there exists $n_0 \in N$ such that for all $n \geq n_0, S(u_n, u_n, u) \ll c$ for each $c \in E, 0 \ll c$. We denote this by $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n = u$ or $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S(u_n, u_n, u) = 0$.
2. A sequence $\{u_n\}$ in X is called a Cauchy sequence if $S(u_n, u_n, u_m) \rightarrow 0$ as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$. That is, there exists $n_0 \in N$ such that for all $n, m \geq n_0, S(u_n, u_n, u_m) \ll c$ for each $c \in E, 0 \ll c$.
3. The cone S -metric space (X, S) is called complete if every Cauchy sequence is convergent.

In the following lemma we see the relationship between a cone metric and an cone S -metric. Now, we give the definition of weakly compatible of cone S -metric space

Definition 2.7 Let (A, B) be two self maps mappings of cone S a metric space (X, S) , The pair (A, B) is said to be weakly compatible, if $S(ABx, ABx, BAx) \ll 0$, whenever $S(Ax, Ax, Bx) \ll 0$. That is the mappings A and B are said to be weakly compatible if they commute at their coincident points.

Definition 2.8 Let (A, B) be two self maps mappings of a cone S metric space (X, S) . We say that A and B satisfies the property (E.A) if there exists a sequence x_n in X such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Bx_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Ax_n = s$ for $s \in X$.

Example 2.9 let $X = P \cup \{0\}$. Define $f, g: X \rightarrow X$ by $Ax = \frac{x}{5}$ and $Bx = \frac{3x}{5}$ for all $x \in X$, Consider the sequence $x_n = \frac{1}{n^2}$. Clearly $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Bx_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Ax_n = 0$

Then A and B satisfy (E.A) property.

Example 2.10 Let $X = P$ where $P \subseteq [3, \infty) \subset R$. Since $A, B: X \rightarrow X$ by $Ax = x + 2$ and $Bx = 2x + 2$ for all $x \in X$, suppose that property (E.A) holds, then there exist a sequence x_n in X satisfying $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Ax_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Bx_n = r$ for some $r \in X$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = r - 2$,

$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = \frac{r-2}{2}$, then $r = 2$ contradiction since $2 \notin X$

In (2002) M. Aamri and D. El Moutawakil , prove The following theorem.

Theorem 2.11 [7] Let S and T be weakly compatible mappings of a metric space (X, d) such that: (i) T and S satisfy (E.A) - property, (ii) $d(Tx, Ty) < \max\{d(Sx, Sy), \frac{1}{2}[d(Sx, Tx) + d(Sy, Ty)], \frac{1}{2}[d(Sx, Ty) + d(Sy, Tx)]\}$,

for all $x \neq y \in X$ (iii) $T(X) \subset S(X)$. If $S(X)$ or $T(X)$ is a complete subspace of X , then T and S have a unique common fixed point.

Definition 2.12 [14] Suppose that P is a normal cone in E . $a, b \in E$ and $a < b$. we define $[a, b] = \{x \in E: x = tb + (1 - t)a, \text{forsomet } t \in [0,1]\}$

$$(2.1)$$

Respectively.

Definition 2.13 Suppose that P is a normal cone in E . $\zeta: [a, b] \rightarrow P$ is called an integrable function on $[a, b]$ with respect to cone P or to simplicity, Cone integrable function, if and only if for all partition Q of $[a, b]$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_n^{con}(\zeta, Q) = S^{con} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U_n^{con}(\zeta, Q)$, where S^{con} must be unique. We show the common value S^{con} by $\int_a^b \zeta(x) d_p(x)$ to simplicity $\int_a^b \zeta d_p$

Definition 2.14 The function $\zeta: P \rightarrow E$ is called sub-additive cone integrable function if and only if for all $a, b \in P$,

$$\int_0^{a+b} \zeta d_p \leq \int_0^a \zeta d_p + \int_0^b \zeta d_p$$

Example 2.15 Let $E = X = R, d(x, y) = |x - y|, P = (0, \infty)$, and $\zeta(t) = \frac{1}{(t+1)}$ for all $t > 0$. Then for all $a, b \in P$,

$$\int_0^{a+b} \frac{dt}{(t+1)} = \ln(a + b + 1), \int_0^a \frac{dt}{(t+1)} = \ln(a + 1), \int_0^b \frac{dt}{(t+1)} = \ln(b + 1)$$

Since $ab \geq 0$, then $a + b + 1 \leq a + b + 1 + ab = (a + 1)(b + 1)$. Therefore

$$\ln(a + b + 1) \leq \ln(a + 1) \leq \ln(b + 1)$$

This shows that ζ is an example of sub-additive cone integrable function.

3 main result

Theorem 3.1 Let A, B, H and P be a self-maps of a cone S -metric space (X, S) and P is a normal cone satisfying the following conditions: (1) $A(X) \subseteq H(X)$, and $B(X) \subseteq P(X)$. (2) one of $A(X), B(X), H(X)$ and $P(X)$ is closed subset of X . (3) $S(Ax, Ax, By) \leq \max\{S(Px, Px, Hy), \frac{1}{2}[S(Ax, Ax, Px) + S(Hy, Hy, By)], \frac{1}{2}[S(Px, Px, By) + S(Ay, Ay, Hx)]\}$, (4) The pairs (A, P) and (B, H) are weakly compatible. (5) The pairs (A, P) (B, H) satisfies the property (E-A). Then A, B, H and P have a unique common fixed point in X .

Proof. We, first prove the existence of a common fixed point in one of the two cases of the condition (5) and the other case follows similarly with appropriate changes, here we prove the case (B, H) satisfies the property (E-A), then there exist a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X such that,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Bx_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Hx_n = w \text{ for some } w \in X$$

since, $B(X) \subseteq P(X)$, there exists a sequence $\{y_n\}$ in X such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Bx_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Py_n = w \text{ for some } w \in X$$

Now, we prove $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Ax_n = w$, let $Ay_n = r$ and if $r \neq w$, then $S(r, r, w) \neq 0$ from (3), we have

$$S(Ax_n, Ax_n, Bx_n) < \max\{S(Py_n, Py_n, Hx_n), \frac{1}{2}[S(Ay_n, Ay_n, Py_n) + S(Hx_n, Hx_n, Bx_n)], \frac{1}{2}[S(Py_n, Py_n, Bx_n) + S(Ay_n, Ay_n, Hx_n)]\}$$

let $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$S(r, r, w) < \max\{S(w, w, w), \frac{1}{2}[S(r, r, w) + S(w, w, w)], \frac{1}{2}[S(w, w, w) + S(r, r, w)]\}$$

$$S(r, r, w) < \max\{0, \frac{1}{2}[S(r, r, w) + 0], \frac{1}{2}[0 + S(r, r, w)]\}$$

$$S(r, r, w) < S(r, r, w)$$

which is contradiction since, $r = w$. Hence we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Ay_n = w$

Suppose $P(X)$ is closed subset of X , then there exist $q \in X$ such that $Pq = w$ therefore, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Ay_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Bx_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Hx_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Px_n = w = Pq, q \in X$$

Now, from (3) we have

$$S(Aq, Aq, Bx_n) < \max\{S(Pq, Pq, Hx_n), \frac{1}{2}[S(Aq, Aq, Pq) + S(Hx_n, Hx_n, Bx_n)], \frac{1}{2}[S(Pq, Pq, Bx_n) + S(Aq, Aq, Hx_n)]\}$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|S(Aq, Aq, Bx_n)\| < K \| \max\{S(Pq, Pq, Hx_n), \frac{1}{2}[S(Aq, Aq, Pq) + S(Hx_n, Hx_n, Bx_n)], \frac{1}{2}[S(Pq, Pq, Bx_n) + S(Aq, Aq, Hx_n)]\} \|$$

Thus $S(Aq, Aq, Bx_n) = 0$ which implies that $S(Aq, Aq, Bx_n) \ll 0$. Thus $Aq = w$ therefore, we have, $Aq = Pq = w$

since, $A(X) \subseteq H(X)$, there exists a sequence $v \in X$ such that $Aq = Hl = w$

Now, we claim that $Bl = w$, if $Bl \neq w$, then $S(w, w, Bl) > 0$ from (3), we have

$$S(Aq, Aq, Bl) < \max\{S(Pq, Pq, Hl), \frac{1}{2}[S(Aq, Aq, Pq) + S(Hl, Hl, Bl)], \frac{1}{2}[S(Pq, Pq, Bl) + S(Aq, Aq, Hl)]\}$$

$$S(w, w, Bl) < \max\{S(w, w, w), \frac{1}{2}[S(w, w, w) + S(w, w, Bl)], \frac{1}{2}[S(w, w, Bl) + S(w, w, w)]\}$$

$$S(q, q, Bl) < \max\{0, \frac{1}{2}[0 + S(w, w, Bl)], \frac{1}{2}[S(w, w, Bl) + 0]\}$$

which is contradiction since, $Bl = w$.

therefore, we have, thus $Hl = Bl = w$

since, the pair (A, P) is weakly compatible then, $APq = PAq \Rightarrow Aw = Pw$.

We now show that $Aw = w$ if $Aw \neq w$ then $S(Aw, w, w) > 0$ from (3) we have

$$S(Aw, Aw, Bl) < \max\{S(Pw, Pw, Hl), \frac{1}{2}[S(Aw, Aw, Pw) + S(Hl, Hl, Bl)], \frac{1}{2}[S(Pw, Pw, Bl) + S(Aw, Aw, Hl)]\}$$

$$S(Aw, Aw, w) < \max\{S(Aw, Aw, w), \frac{1}{2}[S(Aw, Aw, Aw) + S(w, w, w)], \frac{1}{2}[S(w, w, w) + S(Aw, Aw, w)]\}$$

$$S(Aw, Aw, w) < \max\{S(Aw, Aw, w), \frac{1}{2}[S(Aw, Aw, Aw) + 0], \frac{1}{2}[0 + S(Aw, Aw, w)]\}$$

which is contraction then $Aw = Pw = w$, now we prove w is common fixed point of A and P

Since, the pair (B, H) is weakly compatible then, $BHl = HBl \Rightarrow Bw = Hw$, we prove $Bl = l$

$$S(Aw, Aw, Bw) < \max\{S(Pw, Pw, Hw), \frac{1}{2}[S(Aw, Aw, Pw) + S(Hw, Hw, Bw)], \frac{1}{2}[S(Pw, Pw, Bw) + S(Aw, Aw, Hw)]\}$$

$$S(w, w, Bw) < \max\{S(w, w, Bw), \frac{1}{2}[S(w, w, w) + S(Bw, Bw, Bw)], \frac{1}{2}[S(w, w, Bw) + S(w, w, Bw)]\}$$

$$S(w, w, Bw) < \max\{S(w, w, Bw), 0, \frac{1}{2}[S(w, w, Bw) + S(w, w, Bw)]\}$$

which is contradiction then $Bw = Hw = w$, Similarly, we can prove w is common fixed point of B and H .

Now, we prove the uniqueness of common fixed point of A, B, H and P , if $w \neq u, u \in X$, then $S(w, w, u) > 0$ from (3),

$$S(w, w, u) < \max\{S(Pw, Pw, Hw), \frac{1}{2}[S(Aw, Aw, Pw) + S(Hw, Hw, Bw)], \frac{1}{2}[S(Pw, Pw, Bw) + S(Aw, Aw, Hw)]\}$$

$$S(w, w, u) < \max\{S(w, w, u), \frac{1}{2}[S(w, w, w) + S(u, u, u)], \frac{1}{2}[S(w, w, u) + S(w, w, u)]\}$$

$$S(w, w, u) < \max\{S(w, w, u), 0, 0\}$$

which is contradiction then, then w is common fixed point.

Corollary 3.2 Let A, B, H and P be a self-maps of a cone S -metric space (X, S) and P is a normal cone satisfying the following conditions: (1) $A(X) \subseteq P(X)$, and $B(X) \subseteq P(X)$.

(2) one of $A(X), P(X), H(X)$, and $P(X)$ is closed subset of X .

(3) $S(Ax, Ax, By) < \max\{S(Px, Px, Py), \frac{1}{2}[S(Ax, Ax, Px) + S(Py, Py, Py)], \frac{1}{2}[S(Px, Px, By) + S(Ax, Ax, Py)]\}$,

(4) The pairs (A, P) and (B, P) are weakly compatible.

(5) The pairs (A, P) (B, P) satisfies the property (E-A). Then A, B, H and P have a unique common fixed point in X .

Corollary 3.3 Let A, B, H and P be a self-maps of a cone S -metric space (X, S) and P is a normal cone satisfying the following conditions: (1) $A(X) \subseteq P(X)$.

(2) one of $A(X), P(X), H(X)$, and $P(X)$ is closed subset of X .

(3) $S(Ax, Ax, Ay) < \max\{S(Px, Px, Py), \frac{1}{2}[S(Ax, Ax, Px) + S(Py, Py, Ay)], \frac{1}{2}[S(Px, Px, Ay) + S(Ax, Ax, Py)]\}$,

(4) The pairs (A, P) is weakly compatible.

(5) The pairs (A, P) satisfies the property (E-A). Then A, B, H and P have a unique common fixed point in X .

4 Some integral type contraction

In this we discussed some integral type contraction is satisfying (E.A) property.

Theorem 4.1 Let A, B, H and P be a self-maps of a cone S -metric space (X, S) and P is a normal cone satisfying the following conditions: (1) $A(X) \subseteq H(X)$, and $B(X) \subseteq P(X)$. (2) one of $A(X), B(X), H(X)$ and $P(X)$ is closed subset of X .

(3) $\int_0^{S(Ax, Ax, By)} \zeta d_p \leq \max\{\int_0^{S(Px, Px, Hy)} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(Ax, Ax, Px) + S(Hy, Hy, By)]} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(Px, Px, By) + S(Ay, Ay, Hx)]} \zeta d_p\}$,

where the function $\zeta: P \rightarrow P$ be defined as for each $\epsilon > 0, \int_0^\epsilon \zeta d_p > 0$ (4) The pairs (A, P) and (B, H) are weakly compatible. (5) The pairs (A, P) (B, H) satisfies the property (E-A). Then A, B, H, P have a unique common fixed point in X .

Proof. We, first prove the existence of a common fixed point in one of the two cases of the condition (5) and the other case follows similarly with appropriate changes, here we prove the case (B, H) satisfies the property (E-A), then there exist a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X such that,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Bx_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Hx_n = w \text{ for some } w \in X$$

since, $B(X) \subseteq P(X)$, there exists a sequence $\{y_n\}$ in X such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Bx_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Py_n = w \text{ for some } w \in X$$

Now, we prove $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Ax_n = w$, let $Ay_n = r$ and if $r \neq w$, then $S(r, r, w) \neq 0$ from (3), we have

$$\int_0^{S(Ax_n, Ax_n, Bx_n)} \zeta d_p < \max\{\int_0^{S(Py_n, Py_n, Hx_n)} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(Ay_n, Ay_n, Py_n) + S(Hx_n, Hx_n, Bx_n)]} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(Py_n, Py_n, Bx_n) + S(Ay_n, Ay_n, Hx_n)]} \zeta d_p\}$$

let $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$\int_0^{S(r, r, w)} \zeta d_p < \max\{\int_0^{S(w, w, w)} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(r, r, w) + S(w, w, w)]} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(w, w, w) + S(r, r, w)]} \zeta d_p\}$$

$$\int_0^{S(r, r, w)} \zeta d_p < \max\{0, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(r, r, w) + 0]} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[0 + S(r, r, w)]} \zeta d_p\}$$

$$\int_0^{S(r, r, w)} \zeta d_p < \int_0^{S(r, r, w)} \zeta d_p$$

which is contradiction since, $r = w$. Hence we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Ay_n = w$

Suppose $P(X)$ is closed subset of X , then there exist $q \in X$ such that $Pq = w$ therefore, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Ay_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Bx_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Hx_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Px_n = w = Pq, q \in X$$

Now, from (3) we have

$$\int_0^{S(Aq,Aq,Bx_n)} \zeta d_p < \max\{\int_0^{S(Pq,Pq,Hx_n)} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(Aq,Aq,Pq)+S(Hx_n,Hx_n,Bx_n)]} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(Pq,Pq,Bx_n)+S(Aq,Aq,Hx_n)]} \zeta d_p\}$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\int_0^{S(Aq,Aq,Bx_n)} \zeta d_p\| < K \|\max\{\int_0^{S(Pq,Pq,Hx_n)} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(Aq,Aq,Pq)+S(Hx_n,Hx_n,Bx_n)]} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(Pq,Pq,Bx_n)+S(Aq,Aq,Hx_n)]} \zeta d_p\}\|$$

Thus $S(Aq, Aq, Bx_n) = 0$ which implies that $S(Aq, Aq, Bx_n) \ll 0$. Thus $Aq = w$ therefore, we have, $Aq = Pq = w$

since, $A(X) \subseteq H(X)$, there exists a sequence $v \in X$ such that $Aq = Hl = w$

Now, we claim that $Bl = w$, if $Bl \neq w$, then $S(w, w, Bl) > 0$ from (3), we have

$$\int_0^{S(Aq,Aq,Bl)} \zeta d_p < \max\{\int_0^{S(Pq,Pq,Hl)} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(Aq,Aq,Pq)+S(Hl,Hl,Bl)]} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(Pq,Pq,Bl)+S(Aq,Aq,Hl)]} \zeta d_p\}$$

$$\int_0^{S(w,w,Bl)} \zeta d_p < \max\{\int_0^{S(w,w,w)} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(w,w,w)+S(w,w,Bl)]} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(w,w,Bl)+S(w,w,w)]} \zeta d_p\}$$

$$\int_0^{S(q,q,Bl)} \zeta d_p < \max\{0, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[0+S(w,w,Bl)]} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(w,w,Bl)+0]} \zeta d_p\}$$

which is contradiction since, $Bl = w$.

therefore, we have, thus $Hl = Bl = w$

since, the pair (A, P) is weakly compatible then, $APq = PAq \Rightarrow Aw = Pw$.

We now show that $Aw = w$ if $Aw \neq w$ then $S(Aw, w, w) > 0$ from (3) we have

$$\int_0^{S(Aw,Aw,Bl)} \zeta d_p < \max\{\int_0^{S(Pw,Pw,Hl)} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(Aw,Aw,Pw)+S(Hl,Hl,Bl)]} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(Pw,Pw,Bl)+S(Aw,Aw,Hl)]} \zeta d_p\}$$

$$\int_0^{S(Aw,Aw,w)} \zeta d_p < \max\{\int_0^{S(Aw,Aw,w)} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(Aw,Aw,Aw)+S(w,w,w)]} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(w,w,w)+S(Aw,Aw,w)]} \zeta d_p\}$$

$$\int_0^{S(Aw,Aw,w)} \zeta d_p < \max\{\int_0^{S(Aw,Aw,w)} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(Aw,Aw,Aw)+0]} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[0+S(Aw,Aw,w)]} \zeta d_p\}$$

which is contraction then $Aw = Pw = w$, now we prove w is common fixed point of A and P

Since, the pair (B, H) is weakly compatible then, $BHl = HB l \Rightarrow Bw = Hw$, we prove $Bl = l$

$$\int_0^{S(Aw,Aw,Bw)} \zeta d_p < \max\{\int_0^{S(Pw,Pw,Hw)} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(Aw,Aw,Pw)+S(Hw,Hw,Bw)]} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(Pw,Pw,Bw)+S(Aw,Aw,Hw)]} \zeta d_p\}$$

$$\int_0^{S(w,w,Bw)} \zeta d_p < \max\{\int_0^{S(w,w,Bw)} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(w,w,w)+S(Bw,Bw,Bw)]} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(w,w,Bw)+S(w,w,Bw)]} \zeta d_p\}$$

$$\int_0^{S(w,w,Bw)} \zeta d_p < \max\{\int_0^{S(w,w,Bw)} \zeta d_p, 0, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(w,w,Bw)+S(w,w,Bw)]} \zeta d_p\}$$

which is contradiction then $Bw = Hw = w$, Similarly, we can prove w is common fixed point of B and H .

Now, we prove the uniqueness of common fixed point of A, B, H and P , if $w \neq u, u \in X$, then $S(w, w, u) > 0$ from (3),

$$\int_0^{S(w,w,u)} \zeta d_p < \max\{\int_0^{S(Pw,Pw,Hw)} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(Aw,Aw,Pw)+S(Hw,Hw,Bw)]} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(Pw,Pw,Bw)+S(Aw,Aw,Hw)]} \zeta d_p\}$$

$$\int_0^{S(w,w,u)} \zeta d_p < \max\{\int_0^{S(w,w,u)} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(w,w,w)+S(u,u,u)]} \zeta d_p, \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}[S(w,w,u)+S(w,w,u)]} \zeta d_p\}$$

$$\int_0^{S(w,w,u)} \zeta d_p < \max\{\int_0^{S(w,w,u)} \zeta d_p, 0, 0\}$$

which is contradiction then, then w is common fixed point.

References

- [1] Sedghi, S, Shobe, N., Aliouche, A. A generalization of fixed point theorems in S -metric spaces. *Mat. Vesn.* 64, 258-266 (2012).
- [2] Sedghi, S, Gholidahneh, A, Dos enovic, T, Esfahani, J, Radenovic, S Common fixed point of four maps in Sb -metric spaces. *J. Linear Topol. Algebra* 05(02), 93-104 (2016).
- [3] Sedghi, S., Altun, I., Shobe, N., Salahshour, M.A., Some properties of S -metric spaces and fixed point results. *Kyungpook Math. J.* 54(1), 113-122 (2014).
- [4] Sedghi, S., Dung, N.V., Fixed point theorems on S -metric spaces. *Mat. Vesn.* 66, 113-124 (2014).
- [5] Kyu Kim, J., Sedghi, S., Gholidahneh, A., Mahdi Rezaee, M., Fixed point theorems in S -metric spaces. *East Asian Math. J.* 32(5), 677-684 (2016).
- [6] S. Sedghi, N. Shobkolaei, M. Shahraki, T. Dos enovic, Common fixed point of four maps in S -metric spaces. *Mathematical Sciences* 12:137-143(2018).
- [7] M. Aamri and D. El - Moutawakil, Some new common fixed point theorems under strict contractive conditions, *Math. Anal. Appl.* 270, 181-188 (2002).
- [8] G.Jungck, Common fixed points for non-continuous nonselfmaps on non metricspaces, *Far East J.Math. Sci.* 4, No.2, 199-215 (1996).
- [9] G.Junck, Compatible mappings and Common fixed points, *Int j of Math and Math.Sci.* 9, No.4, 771-779 (1986).
- [10] G.Junck and Rhoads. B.E, Fixed point for set valued functions with out continuity, *Indian j pure Appl. Math.Sci.* 29, 227-238 (1998).
- [11] R. Krishnakumar and D. Dhamodharan, Cone S -metric space and fixed point theorems of contractive mappings, *Annals of pure and applied mathematics*, 14(2), 237 - 243 (2017).
- [12] S.Sessa, On a weak commutativity condition of mappings in fixed point considerations ,*Publ.Inst math.Debre*, 62, 149-153 (1982).
- [13] Huang, LG, Zhang, *Cone metric spaces and fixed point theorems of contractive mappings*, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 332(2007), 1468-1476.
- [14] Farshid Khojasteh, Zahra Goodarzi, and Abdolrahman Razani, Some Fixed Point Theorems of Integral Type Contraction in Cone Metric Spaces, *Fixed Point Theory and Applications*, 13, 2010, doi:10.1155/2010/189684.
- [15] D. Dhamodharan and R. Krishnakumar, Cone S -Metric Space and Fixed Point Theorems of Contractive Mappings, *Ann. Pure Appl. Math.* 14 (2) (2017), 237-243.
- [16] K. ANTHONY SINGH, AND M. R. SINGH, SOME COUPLED FIXED POINT THEOREMS IN CONE Sb -METRIC SPACE, *J. Math. Comput. Sci.* 10 (2020), No. 4, 891-905, 1927-5307.