

NONLINEAR INEQUALITIES AND RELATED FIXED POINT PROBLEMS

MUHAMMAD NAZAM, ESKANDAR AMEER,
MOHAMMAD MURSALEEN* AND ÖZLEM ACAR

(Communicated by J. K. Kim)

Abstract. In this paper, we introduce a nonlinear inequality based on four self-mappings. We give necessary conditions which ensure the existence of a common fixed point of four self-mappings satisfying said inequality defined in \acute{S} -metric spaces. A common fixed point problem is discussed. We set up an example to elucidate our main result. Moreover, the existence of a common solution to a system of four integral equations is shown by application of main result.

1. Introduction

The study of metric fixed point theory was initiated by Banach (1922) [4]. The metric fixed point theory has been enriching by introducing several structures, generalizing underlying metric space and contractive condition in it. The Banach contraction principle [4] has been proved in several different abstract metric spaces (see [6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 18]). Before the publication of the paper by Mustafa *et al.* [13] (2006), the metric mappings were defined on X^2 (X is any non-empty set), Mustafa *et al.* [13] introduced a metric mapping defined on X^3 and it is known as G-metric. Mustafa *et al.* [13] proved Banach contraction principle in G-metric space and gave several examples to establish its superiority over Banach contraction principle in metric space. Sedghi *et al.* [17] (2012), following the abstract metric introduced by Mustafa *et al.* [13], introduced another abstract metric defined on X^3 called S -metric and proved analogue of Banach contraction principle (see also [3, 12, 16]).

The concept of F -contraction given by Wardowski [21] proved to be another milestone in fixed point theory and numerous research papers on F -contraction have been published (see [2, 9, 1, 14, 20, 22] and references therein).

In this paper, we follow Mustafa *et al.* [13] and Sedghi *et al.* [17] to introduce another nonlinear inequality known as (F, Ω) -contraction and discuss some new common fixed point problems in \acute{S} -complete metric spaces. Examples are also given for explanation. An application to existence of the solution to a system of integral equations is presented.

Mathematics subject classification (2020): 47H10, 39B62, 26E05.

Keywords and phrases: Nonlinear inequalities, common fixed point problems, complete \acute{S} -metric space, application.

* Corresponding author.

2. Preliminaries

Let Ψ represents the collection of mappings $\Omega : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfying:

($\Omega 1$) Ω is strictly increasing;

($\Omega 2$) $\Omega^{-1}(t) \leq t \leq \Omega(t)$ and $\Omega^{-1}(0) = 0 = \Omega(0)$;

($\Omega 3$) Ω is continuous.

Following are some examples of members of this family.

EXAMPLE 1. Let $\Omega_i : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ defined by

$$\Omega_1(t) = e^t - 1, t \geq 0,$$

$$\Omega_2(t) = te^t, t \geq 0,$$

$$\Omega_3(t) = t^2 + 2t, t \geq 0.$$

DEFINITION 1. [17] Let \mathcal{A} be a nonempty set. A mapping $\tilde{d} : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is said to be a p -metric if if there exists $\Omega \in \Psi$ such that for all $\zeta, \eta, z \in \mathcal{A}$, the following axioms hold:

$$(\tilde{d}_1) \quad \tilde{d}(\zeta, \eta) = 0 \text{ if and only if } \zeta = \eta;$$

$$(\tilde{d}_2) \quad \tilde{d}(\zeta, \zeta) \leq \tilde{d}(\zeta, \eta);$$

$$(\tilde{d}_3) \quad \tilde{d}(\zeta, \eta) = \tilde{d}(\eta, \zeta);$$

$$(d_4) \quad \tilde{d}(\zeta, z) \leq \Omega \left[\tilde{d}(\zeta, \eta) + \tilde{d}(\eta, z) \right].$$

The pair (\mathcal{A}, \tilde{d}) is called a p -metric space.

A b -metric [6] is a p -metric with $\Omega(t) = bt$ for some $b \geq 1$. If $\Omega \in \Psi$, then every metric is a p -metric while a p -metric space becomes a metric space with $\Omega(t) = t$.

DEFINITION 2. [17] Let \mathcal{A} be a nonempty set. A mapping $S : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfying following conditions, for all $\zeta, \eta, v, \sigma \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$(\acute{S}1) \quad S(\zeta, \eta, v) = 0 \text{ if and only if } \zeta = \eta = v;$$

$$(\acute{S}2) \quad S(\zeta, \eta, v) \leq S(\zeta, \zeta, \sigma) + S(\eta, \eta, \sigma) + S(v, v, \sigma).$$

is called an S -metric on \mathcal{A} and the pair (\mathcal{A}, S) is called an S -metric space.

The S -metric space is a generalization of a G -metric space [13], that is, every G -metric space is an S -metric space but, in general, the converse is not true. Following example explains this fact.

EXAMPLE 2. Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\|\cdot\|$ be a norm on \mathcal{A} , then $S(\zeta, \eta, \nu) = \|\eta + \nu - 2\zeta\| + \|\eta - \nu\|$ is an S -metric on \mathcal{A} . However, due to lack of symmetry, it is not G -metric on \mathcal{A} .

Every S -metric space is an S_b -metric space with $b = 1$ but, in general, the converse is not true, see the following example.

EXAMPLE 3. Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{R}$, then $S_*(\zeta, \eta, \nu) = [|\eta + \nu - 2\zeta| + |\eta - \nu|]^2$ is an S_b -metric on \mathcal{A} with $b = 4$, for all $\zeta, \eta, \nu \in \mathcal{A}$. Nevertheless, it is not an S -metric on \mathcal{A} . Indeed, let $\zeta = 3, \eta = 5, \nu = 7$, and $a = \frac{7}{2}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} S_*(3, 5, 7) &= [|5 + 7 - 6| + |5 - 7|]^2 = 8^2 = 64, \\ S_*(3, 3, \frac{7}{2}) &= \left[\left| 3 + \frac{7}{2} - 6 \right| + \left| 3 - \frac{7}{2} \right| \right]^2 = 1^2 = 1, \\ S_*(5, 5, \frac{7}{2}) &= \left[\left| 5 + \frac{7}{2} - 10 \right| + \left| 5 - \frac{7}{2} \right| \right]^2 = 3^2 = 9, \\ S_*(7, 7, \frac{7}{2}) &= \left[\left| 7 + \frac{7}{2} - 14 \right| + \left| 7 - \frac{7}{2} \right| \right]^2 = 7^2 = 49. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} S_*(3, 5, 7) &= 64 \\ &> 59 = S_*(3, 3, \frac{7}{2}) + S_*(5, 5, \frac{7}{2}) + S_*(7, 7, \frac{7}{2}). \end{aligned}$$

DEFINITION 3. Let \mathcal{A} be a nonempty set. A mapping $\acute{S} : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is said to be an \acute{S} -metric if there exists $\Omega \in \Psi$ such that for all $\zeta, \eta, \nu, \sigma \in \mathcal{A}$, we have

- ($\acute{S}1$) $\acute{S}(\zeta, \eta, \nu) = 0$ if and only if $\zeta = \eta = \nu$;
- ($\acute{S}2$) $\acute{S}(\zeta, \eta, \nu) \leq \Omega [\acute{S}(\zeta, \zeta, \sigma) + \acute{S}(\eta, \eta, \sigma) + \acute{S}(\nu, \nu, \sigma)]$.

The pair (\mathcal{A}, \acute{S}) is called an \acute{S} -metric space.

Every metric space is an \acute{S} -metric space but in general the converse is not true (see Example 4).

EXAMPLE 4. Let (\mathcal{A}, S) be an S -metric space, then $\acute{S}(\zeta, \eta, \nu) = e^{S(\zeta, \eta, \nu)} - 1$ is an \acute{S} -metric with $\Omega(t) = e^t - 1$ but it is not metric on \mathcal{A} since, it is not symmetric.

The \acute{S} -metric space is a generalization of S -metric space and S_b -metric space [19]. The S -metric space is an \acute{S} -metric space for each $\Omega \in \Psi$. Every \acute{S} -metric space is an S_b -metric space [19] with $b \geq 1$ and $\Omega(t) = bt$.

DEFINITION 4. The \acute{S} -metric is called symmetric if $\acute{S}(\zeta, \zeta, \eta) = \acute{S}(\eta, \eta, \zeta)$, for all $\zeta, \eta \in \mathcal{A}$.

EXAMPLE 5. Let (\mathcal{A}, S) be an S -metric space. Then

- (i) $\acute{S}(\zeta, \eta, \nu) = e^{S(\zeta, \eta, \nu)} - 1$ is an \acute{S} -metric with $\Omega(t) = e^t - 1$.
- (ii) $\acute{S}(\zeta, \eta, \nu) = S(\zeta, \eta, \nu)e^{S(\zeta, \eta, \nu)}$ is an \acute{S} -metric with $\Omega(t) = te^t$.
- (iii) $\acute{S}(\zeta, \eta, \nu) = \Omega(S(\zeta, \eta, \nu))$ is an \acute{S} -metric and it is symmetric for each $\Omega \in \Psi$.

DEFINITION 5. Let (\mathcal{A}, \acute{S}) be an \acute{S} -metric space. A sequence $\{\zeta_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ is said to be:

- (i) \acute{S} -Cauchy if for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a positive integer n_0 such that for all $m, n \geq n_0$, $\acute{S}(\zeta_n, \zeta_n, \zeta_m) < \varepsilon$,
- (ii) \acute{S} -convergent to a point $\zeta \in \mathcal{A}$ if for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a positive integer n_0 such that for all $n \geq n_0$, $\acute{S}(\zeta, \zeta, \zeta_n) < \varepsilon$. Similarly, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a positive integer n_0 such that for all $n \geq n_0$, $\acute{S}(\zeta_n, \zeta_n, \zeta) < \varepsilon$ and $\acute{S}(\zeta_n, \zeta, \zeta_n) < \varepsilon$.
- (iii) An \acute{S} -metric space \mathcal{A} is called \acute{S} -complete, if each \acute{S} -Cauchy is \acute{S} -convergent in \mathcal{A} .

LEMMA 1. Let (\mathcal{A}, \acute{S}) be an \acute{S} -metric space.

(i) Assume that $\{\zeta_n\}$ and $\{\eta_n\}$ are \acute{S} -convergent to ζ and η , respectively. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega^{-2}(\acute{S}(\zeta, \zeta, \eta)) &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \acute{S}(\zeta_n, \zeta_n, \eta_n) \\ &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \acute{S}(\zeta_n, \zeta_n, \eta_n) \leq \Omega^2(\acute{S}(\zeta, \zeta, \eta)). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if $\zeta = \eta$, then we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \acute{S}(\zeta_n, \zeta_n, \eta_n) = 0$.

(ii) Assume that \acute{S} -metric is symmetric and $\{\zeta_n\}$ is \acute{S} -convergent to ζ and $\nu \in \mathcal{A}$ is arbitrary. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(\zeta, \zeta, \nu)) &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \acute{S}(\zeta_n, \zeta_n, \nu) \\ &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \acute{S}(\zeta_n, \zeta_n, \nu) \leq \Omega(\acute{S}(\zeta, \zeta, \eta)). \end{aligned}$$

DEFINITION 6. [21] Let (\mathcal{A}, d) be a metric space. A map $T : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is said to be an F_w -contraction, if there exist $\tau > 0$ and $F \in \mathcal{F}_1$ such that

$$\forall \zeta, \eta \in \mathcal{A}, d(T(\zeta), T(\eta)) > 0 \Rightarrow \tau + F(d(T(\zeta), T(\eta))) \leq F(d(\zeta, \eta)),$$

where \mathcal{F}_1 is the family of mappings $F_w : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty)$ satisfying: (WF 1) F is strictly increasing; (WF 2) for each sequence $\{t_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset (0, \infty)$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(t_n) = -\infty \Leftrightarrow \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t_n = 0;$$

and (WF 3) there exists $l \in (0, 1)$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} t^l F(t) = 0$.

THEOREM 1. [21] *Let (\mathcal{A}, d) be a complete metric space and let $T : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be an F_w -contraction. Then T has a unique fixed point in \mathcal{A} .*

Piri and Kumam [15] modified the notion of F_w -contraction as follows:

DEFINITION 7. [15] *Let (\mathcal{A}, d) be a metric space. A mapping $T : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is said to be an F -contraction if there exist $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\tau > 0$ such that*

$$\forall \zeta, \eta \in \mathcal{A}, d(T(\zeta), T(\eta)) > 0 \Rightarrow \tau + F(d(T(\zeta), T(\eta))) \leq F(d(\zeta, \eta)),$$

where \mathcal{F} is the set of mappings $F : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty)$ satisfying the following conditions:

(F 1) For all $\zeta, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^+ = (0, \infty)$ such that $\zeta < \eta \Leftrightarrow F(\zeta) < F(\eta)$;

(F 2) For each sequence $\{t_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of positive numbers,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(t_n) = -\infty \text{ if and only if } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t_n = 0;$$

(F 3) F is continuous.

3. Existence Theorems

Let \mathbb{R}_0^+ represents non-negative real numbers and Δ_D be the set of all continuous mappings $D : \mathbb{R}_0^+ \times \mathbb{R}_0^+ \times \mathbb{R}_0^+ \times \mathbb{R}_0^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ with the property (P).

(P): if the numbers $t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4 \in \mathbb{R}^+$ have zero product, then there exists $\tau > 0$ such that $D(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = \tau$.

Let the mapping $E : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$E(\zeta, \eta, \sigma) = \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Omega^{-1} (\acute{S}(S(\zeta), S(\eta), R(\sigma))), \\ \Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{3} \left(\begin{array}{l} \acute{S}(S(\zeta), S(\zeta), f(\zeta)) \\ + \acute{S}(S(\eta), S(\eta), f(\eta)) \\ + \acute{S}(R(\sigma), R(\sigma), g(\sigma)) \end{array} \right) \right), \\ \frac{1}{3} \Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\begin{array}{l} \acute{S}(S(\zeta), S(\zeta), g(\sigma)) \\ + \acute{S}(S(\eta), S(\eta), g(\sigma)) \\ + \acute{S}(R(\sigma), R(\sigma), f(\zeta)) \\ + \acute{S}(R(\sigma), R(\sigma), f(\eta)) \end{array} \right) \right) \end{array} \right\}.$$

DEFINITION 8. Let (\mathcal{A}, \acute{S}) be an \acute{S} -metric space. The self-mappings $f, g, R, S : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ are said to form (F, Ω) -contraction, if there exist $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $D \in \Delta_D$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Omega(\acute{S}(f(\zeta), f(\eta), g(\sigma))) > 0 \\ & \Rightarrow F(\Omega(\acute{S}(f(\zeta), f(\eta), g(\sigma)))) \leq F(E(\zeta, \eta, \sigma)) \\ & -D \left(\acute{S}(S(\zeta), S(\zeta), g(\sigma)), \acute{S}(S(\eta), S(\eta), g(\sigma)), \right. \\ & \left. \acute{S}(R(\sigma), R(\sigma), f(\zeta)), \acute{S}(R(\sigma), R(\sigma), f(\eta)) \right). \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

EXAMPLE 6. Let $\mathcal{A} = [0, 1]$. Define $\acute{S} : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ by,

$$\acute{S}(\zeta, \eta, \sigma) = e^{|\zeta - \sigma| + |\eta - \sigma|} - 1,$$

for all $\zeta, \eta, \sigma \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\Omega(t) = e^t - 1$ (so, $\Omega^{-1}(t) = \ln(t + 1)$). Then, (\mathcal{A}, \acute{S}) is a complete \acute{S} -metric space. Define, $f, S, g, R : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} f(\beta) &= \ln\left(1 + \frac{\beta}{8}\right), \\ S(\beta) &= e^{7\beta} - 1, \\ g(\beta) &= \ln\left(1 + \frac{\beta}{7}\right), \\ R(\beta) &= e^{6\beta} - 1, \end{aligned}$$

for all $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$. Define the mappings $F : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty)$ and $D : \mathbb{R}_0^+ \times \mathbb{R}_0^+ \times \mathbb{R}_0^+ \times \mathbb{R}_0^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ by,

$$F(\alpha) = \ln(\alpha), \text{ for } \alpha > 0, \text{ and } D(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = 1.$$

Now, for all $\zeta, \eta, \sigma \in \mathcal{A}$, with $\Omega(\acute{S}(f(\zeta), f(\eta), g(\sigma))) > 0$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} &F(\Omega(\acute{S}(f(\zeta), f(\eta), g(\sigma)))) \\ &\leq F(E(\zeta, \eta, \sigma)) \\ &\quad -D\left(\acute{S}(S(\zeta), S(\zeta), g(\sigma)), \acute{S}(S(\eta), S(\eta), g(\sigma)), \right. \\ &\quad \left. \acute{S}(R(\sigma), R(\sigma), f(\zeta)), \acute{S}(R(\sigma), R(\sigma), f(\eta))\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the maps $f, g, R, S : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ form (F, Ω) -contraction.

THEOREM 2. Let (\mathcal{A}, \acute{S}) be a complete symmetric \acute{S} -metric space and $f, g, R, S : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be four self-mappings forming (F, Ω) -contraction. Let $\Omega(a + b) \geq \Omega(a) + \Omega(b)$, for each $a, b \in [0, \infty)$. Moreover, if

- (i) $f(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq R(\mathcal{A})$, $g(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq S(\mathcal{A})$ and either $R(\mathcal{A})$ or $S(\mathcal{A})$ is a closed subset of \mathcal{A} ;
- (ii) the pair (f, S) and (g, R) are weak compatible.

Then f, g, R and S admit a unique common fixed point in \mathcal{A} .

Proof. Let $\zeta_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ be an arbitrary point. By (i), there exist $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$f(\zeta_0) = R(\zeta_1) = \eta_0 \text{ and } g(\zeta_1) = S(\zeta_2) = \eta_0.$$

Repeating above steps, we construct a sequence $\{\eta_n\}$ in \mathcal{A} such that

$$\eta_{2n} = f(\zeta_{2n}) = R(\zeta_{2n+1}) \text{ and } \eta_{2n+1} = g(\zeta_{2n+1}) = S(\zeta_{2n+2}); n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

We show that $\{\eta_n\}$ is a \acute{S} -Cauchy sequence. If $\Omega(\acute{S}(f(\zeta_{2n}), f(\zeta_{2n}), g(\zeta_{2n+1}))) > 0$, then by contractive condition (1), we get,

$$\begin{aligned}
 F(\Omega(\acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+1}))) &= F(\Omega(\acute{S}(f(\zeta_{2n}), f(\zeta_{2n}), g(\zeta_{2n+1})))) \\
 &\leq F(E(\zeta_n, \eta_n, \sigma_n)) \\
 &\quad -D \left(\begin{array}{l} \acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n+1}), \\ \acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n+1}), \\ \acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}), \\ \acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}) \end{array} \right), \tag{2}
 \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned}
 &E(\zeta_n, \eta_n, \sigma_n) \\
 &= \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n}), S(\zeta_{2n}), R(\zeta_{2n+1}))), \\ \Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{3} \left(\begin{array}{l} \acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n}), S(\zeta_{2n}), f(\zeta_{2n})) \\ + \acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n}), S(\zeta_{2n}), f(\zeta_{2n})) + \\ \acute{S}(R(\zeta_{2n+1}), R(\zeta_{2n+1}), g(\zeta_{2n+1})) \end{array} \right) \right), \\ \frac{1}{3} \Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\begin{array}{l} 2\acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n}), S(\zeta_{2n}), g(\zeta_{2n+1})) \\ + 2\acute{S}(R(\zeta_{2n+1}), R(\zeta_{2n+1}), f(\zeta_{2n})) \end{array} \right) \right) \end{array} \right\} \\
 &= \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n})), \\ \Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{3} (\acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n}) + \acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n}) + \acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+1})) \right), \\ \frac{1}{3} \Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n+1}) + \acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n})) \end{array} \right\} \\
 &= \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n})), \\ \Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{3} (2\acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n}) + \acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+1})) \right), \\ \frac{1}{3} \Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n+1})) \end{array} \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by the definition of mapping D , inequality (2) turns into the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &F(\Omega(\acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+1}))) \\
 &= F(\Omega(\acute{S}(f(\zeta_{2n}), f(\zeta_{2n}), g(\zeta_{2n+1})))) \\
 &\leq F \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n})), \\ \Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{3} (2\acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n}) + \acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+1})) \right), \\ \frac{1}{3} \Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n+1})) \end{array} \right\} \right) - \tau. \tag{3}
 \end{aligned}$$

As

$$\acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n+1}) \leq \Omega [2\acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n}) + \acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+1})],$$

so,

$$\frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1} [\acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n+1})] \leq \frac{1}{3} [2\acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n}) + \acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+1})].$$

We show that,

$$F(\Omega(\acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+1}))) \leq F(\Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n}))) - \tau.$$

By (F1), we have $\Omega(\acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+1})) \leq \Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n}))$, that is, $\acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+1}) \leq \acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n})$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If

$$\acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+1}) > \acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n}),$$

for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1} [\acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n+1})] \leq \acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+1}). \tag{4}$$

Hence by (4), we get

$$\begin{aligned} F(\acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+1})) &\leq F(\Omega(\acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+1}))) \\ &\leq F(\Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+1}))) - \tau \\ &\leq F(\acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+1})) - \tau, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Now for $n + 1$

$$\begin{aligned} F(\Omega(\acute{S}(\eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+2}))) &= F(\Omega(\acute{S}(\eta_{2n+2}, \eta_{2n+2}, \eta_{2n+1}))) \\ &= F(\Omega(\acute{S}(f(\zeta_{2n+2}), f(\zeta_{2n+2}), g(\zeta_{2n+1})))) \\ &\leq F(E(\zeta_{n+1}, \eta_{n+1}, \sigma_{n+1})) \\ &\quad -D \left(\begin{array}{l} \acute{S}(\eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+1}), \\ \acute{S}(\eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+1}), \\ \acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+2}), \\ \acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+2}) \end{array} \right), \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where,

$$E(\zeta_{n+1}, \eta_{n+1}, \sigma_{n+1}) = \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n+2}), S(\zeta_{2n+2}), R(\zeta_{2n+1}))), \\ \Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{3} \left(\begin{array}{l} \acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n+2}), S(\zeta_{2n+2}), f(\zeta_{2n+2})) \\ + \acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n+2}), S(\zeta_{2n+2}), f(\zeta_{2n+2})) \\ + \acute{S}(R(\zeta_{2n+1}), R(\zeta_{2n+1}), g(\zeta_{2n+1})) \end{array} \right) \right), \\ \frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\begin{array}{l} 2\acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n+2}), S(\zeta_{2n+2}), g(\zeta_{2n+1})) \\ + 2\acute{S}(R(\zeta_{2n+1}), R(\zeta_{2n+1}), f(\zeta_{2n+2})) \end{array} \right) \right) \end{array} \right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \max \left\{ \begin{aligned} &\Omega^{-1} (\acute{S}(\eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n})), \\ &\Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{3} \left(\acute{S}(\eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+2}) + \acute{S}(\eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+2}) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+1}) \right) \Big), \\ &\frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1} (\acute{S}(\eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+1}) + \acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+2})) \end{aligned} \right\}, \\
 &= \max \left\{ \begin{aligned} &\Omega^{-1} (\acute{S}(\eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n})), \\ &\Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{3} (2\acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n}) + \acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+1})) \right), \\ &\frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1} (\acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n+1})) \end{aligned} \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by the definition of mapping D , inequality (5) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
 &F (\Omega (\acute{S}(\eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+2}))) \\
 &= F (\Omega (\acute{S}(f(\zeta_{2n+2}), f(\zeta_{2n+2}), g(\zeta_{2n+1})))) \\
 &\leq F \left(\max \left\{ \begin{aligned} &\Omega^{-1} (\acute{S}(\eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n})), \\ &\Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{3} (2\acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n}) + \acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+1})) \right), \\ &\frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1} (\acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n+1})) \end{aligned} \right\} \right) - \tau.
 \end{aligned}$$

From

$$\acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+2}) \leq \Omega [2\acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+1}) + \acute{S}(\eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+2})],$$

we have,

$$\frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1} [\acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+2})] \leq \frac{1}{3} [2\acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+1}) + \acute{S}(\eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+2})].$$

Similarly, if

$$\acute{S}(\eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+2}) > \acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+1}),$$

for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1} [\acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+2})] \leq \acute{S}(\eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+2}). \tag{6}$$

Hence, by (6), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 F (\acute{S}(\eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+2})) &\leq F (\Omega (\acute{S}(\eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+2}))) \\
 &\leq F (\Omega^{-1} \acute{S}(\eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+2})) - \tau \\
 &\leq F (\acute{S}(\eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+1}, \eta_{2n+2})) - \tau,
 \end{aligned}$$

it is a contradiction. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} F(\acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+1})) &\leq F(\Omega(\acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+1}))) \\ &\leq F(\Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n}))) - \tau \\ &\leq F(\acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n})) - \tau. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have,

$$F(\acute{S}(\eta_n, \eta_n, \eta_{n+1})) \leq F(\acute{S}(\eta_{n-1}, \eta_{n-1}, \eta_n)) - \tau,$$

which further implies,

$$\begin{aligned} F(\acute{S}(\eta_n, \eta_n, \eta_{2n+1})) &\leq F(\acute{S}(\eta_{n-1}, \eta_{n-1}, \eta_n)) - \tau \\ &\leq F(\acute{S}(\eta_{n-2}, \eta_{n-2}, \eta_{n-1})) - 2\tau \\ &\quad \dots \\ &\leq F(\acute{S}(\eta_0, \eta_0, \eta_1)) - n\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the above inequality, we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(\acute{S}(\eta_n, \eta_n, \eta_{n+1})) = -\infty.$$

By (F2), we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \acute{S}(\eta_n, \eta_n, \eta_{n+1}) = 0, \tag{7}$$

Now, we will prove that the sequence $\{\eta_n\}$ is \acute{S} -Cauchy. Assume the contrary, there exist $\varepsilon > 0$ and a subsequences $\{\eta_{2\hat{h}_n}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ and $\{\eta_{2\hat{j}_n}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of $\{\eta_n\}$ such for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$2\hat{j}_n > 2\hat{h}_n > n \text{ and } \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n}) \geq \varepsilon, \tag{8}$$

then,

$$\acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n-1}) < \varepsilon. \tag{9}$$

By contractive condition (1), we get,

$$\begin{aligned} F(\Omega(\acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n+1}))) &= F(\Omega(\acute{S}(f(\zeta_{2\hat{j}_n}), f(\zeta_{2\hat{j}_n}), g(\zeta_{2\hat{h}_n+1})))) \\ &\leq F(E(\eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n})) \\ &\quad -D \left(\begin{array}{l} \acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2\hat{j}_n}), S(\zeta_{2\hat{j}_n}), g(\zeta_{2\hat{h}_n+1})), \\ \acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2\hat{j}_n}), S(\zeta_{2\hat{j}_n}), g(\zeta_{2\hat{h}_n+1})), \\ \acute{S}(R(\zeta_{2\hat{h}_n+1}), R(\zeta_{2\hat{h}_n+1}), f(\zeta_{2\hat{j}_n})), \\ \acute{S}(R(\zeta_{2\hat{h}_n+1}), R(\zeta_{2\hat{h}_n+1}), f(\zeta_{2\hat{j}_n})) \end{array} \right), \tag{10} \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & E\left(\eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n}\right) \\
 &= \max \left\{ \begin{aligned} & \Omega^{-1}\left(\acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2\hat{j}_n}), S(\zeta_{2\hat{j}_n}), R(\zeta_{2\hat{h}_{n+1}}))\right), \\ & \Omega^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{3}\left(\begin{aligned} & \acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2\hat{j}_n}), S(\zeta_{2\hat{j}_n}), f(\zeta_{2\hat{j}_n})) \\ & +\acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2\hat{j}_n}), S(\zeta_{2\hat{j}_n}), f(\zeta_{2\hat{j}_n})) \\ & +\acute{S}(R(\zeta_{2\hat{h}_{n+1}}), R(\zeta_{2\hat{h}_{n+1}}), g(\zeta_{2\hat{h}_{n+1}})) \end{aligned}\right)\right), \\ & \frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}\left(\begin{aligned} & 2\acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2\hat{j}_n}), S(\zeta_{2\hat{j}_n}), g(\zeta_{2\hat{h}_{n+1}})) \\ & +2\acute{S}(R(\zeta_{2\hat{h}_{n+1}}), R(\zeta_{2\hat{h}_{n+1}}), f(\zeta_{2\hat{j}_n})) \end{aligned}\right)\right) \end{aligned} \right\}, \\
 &= \max \left\{ \begin{aligned} & \Omega^{-1}\left(\acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_{n-1}}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_{n-1}}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n})\right), \\ & \Omega^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{3}\left(\begin{aligned} & \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_{n-1}}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_{n-1}}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n})+\acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_{n-1}}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_{n-1}}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n}) \\ & +\acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_{n+1}}) \end{aligned}\right)\right), \\ & \frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1}\left(\acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_{n-1}}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_{n-1}}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_{n+1}})+\acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n})\right) \end{aligned} \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by the definition of mapping D , inequality (10) becomes,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & F\left(\Omega\left(\acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_{n+1}})\right)\right) \tag{11} \\
 &\leq F\left(\max \left\{ \begin{aligned} & \Omega^{-1}\left(\acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_{n-1}}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_{n-1}}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n})\right), \\ & \Omega^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{3}\left(\begin{aligned} & \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_{n-1}}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_{n-1}}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n})+\acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_{n-1}}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_{n-1}}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n}) \\ & +\acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_{n+1}}) \end{aligned}\right)\right), \\ & \frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1}\left(\acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_{n-1}}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_{n-1}}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_{n+1}})+\acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n})\right) \end{aligned} \right\} \right) - \tau.
 \end{aligned}$$

As,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n}) &\leq \Omega\left(2\acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_{n-1}})+\acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_{n-1}})\right) \tag{12} \\
 &\leq \Omega\left(2\acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_{n-1}})+\varepsilon\right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Letting the upper limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (12), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 \varepsilon &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n}) \\
 &\leq \Omega\left(2 \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_{n-1}})+\varepsilon\right) \\
 &\leq \Omega(\varepsilon).
 \end{aligned}$$

Since,

$$\begin{aligned} \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_n-1}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n-1}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n+1}) &= \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{h}_n+1}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n+1}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n-1}) \\ &\leq \Omega \left(2\acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{h}_n+1}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n+1}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n}) + \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_n-1}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n-1}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n}) \right) \\ &\leq \Omega \left(2\acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{h}_n+1}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n+1}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n}) + \varepsilon \right), \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

taking the upper limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (13), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_n-1}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n-1}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n+1}) \\ &\leq \Omega \left(2 \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{h}_n+1}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n+1}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n}) + \varepsilon \right) \\ &\leq \Omega(\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Now, since,

$$\begin{aligned} \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n}) &= \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n}) \\ &\leq \Omega \left(2\acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n+1}) + \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n+1}) \right), \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

taking the upper limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (14), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n}) \\ &\leq \Omega \left(2 \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n+1}) + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n+1}) \right) \\ &\leq \Omega \left(0 + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n+1}) \right) \\ &= \Omega \left(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n+1}) \right), \end{aligned}$$

which then implies,

$$\varepsilon \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n}) \leq \Omega \left(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n+1}) \right). \tag{15}$$

From (11), (15), and since F and Ω are continuous, we get,

$$\begin{aligned} F(\varepsilon) &\leq F \left(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n}) \right) \\ &\leq F \left(\Omega \left(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n+1}) \right) \right) \\ &\leq F \left(\max \left\{ \begin{aligned} &\Omega^{-1} \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_n-1}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n-1}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n}) \right), \\ &\Omega^{-1} \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \left(\frac{1}{3} \left(\begin{aligned} &\acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_n-1}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n-1}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n}) + \\ &\acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_n-1}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n-1}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n}) \\ &+ \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n+1}) \end{aligned} \right) \right) \right) \right), \\ &\frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1} \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{j}_n-1}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n-1}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n+1}) \right) \\ &+ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \acute{S}(\eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{h}_n}, \eta_{2\hat{j}_n}) \end{aligned} \right\} \right) - \tau \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq F \left(\max \left\{ \Omega^{-1}(\Omega(\varepsilon)), \Omega^{-1}(0), \frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1}(2\Omega(\varepsilon)) \right\} \right) - \tau \\ &\leq F \left(\frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1}(2\Omega(\varepsilon)) \right) - \tau. \end{aligned}$$

This implies,

$$\begin{aligned} F(\varepsilon) &\leq F \left(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \acute{S}(\eta_{2j_n}, \eta_{2j_n}, \eta_{2h_n}) \right) \leq F \left(\frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1}(2\Omega(\varepsilon)) \right) - \tau \\ &< F \left(\frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1}(2\Omega(\varepsilon)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By (F1), we get,

$$\varepsilon < \frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1}(2\Omega(\varepsilon)).$$

Thus,

$$\Omega(3\varepsilon) < 2\Omega(\varepsilon).$$

As $\Omega(a + b) \geq \Omega(a) + \Omega(b)$, so $3\Omega(\varepsilon) \leq \Omega(3\varepsilon) < 2\Omega(\varepsilon)$, this is a contradiction. Hence, $\{\eta_n\}$ is an \acute{S} -Cauchy sequence. Since \mathcal{A} is an \acute{S} -complete, so $\{\eta_n\}$ \acute{S} -converges to a point $\eta^* \in \omega$, i.e., $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta_n = \eta^*$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta_{2n} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\zeta_{2n}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} R(\zeta_{2n+1}) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta_{2n+1} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(\zeta_{2n+1}) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S(\zeta_{2n+2}) = \eta^*. \end{aligned}$$

Let $R(\mathcal{A})$ be a closed subset of \mathcal{A} , then, there exists $u \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $R(u) = \eta^*$. we show that $g(u) = \eta^*$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} &F(\Omega(\acute{S}(f(\zeta_{2n}), f(\zeta_{2n}), g(u)))) \\ &\leq F(E(\zeta_n, \zeta_n, u)) \\ &\quad -D \left(\begin{array}{l} \acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n}), S(\zeta_{2n}), g(u)), \\ \acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n}), S(\zeta_{2n}), f(\zeta_{2n})), \\ \acute{S}(R(u), R(u), f(\zeta_{2n})), \\ \acute{S}(R(u), R(u), f(\zeta_{2n})) \end{array} \right), \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where,

$$E(\zeta_n, \zeta_n, u) = \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n}), S(\zeta_{2n}), R(u))), \\ \Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{3} \left(\begin{array}{l} \acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n}), S(\zeta_{2n}), f(\zeta_{2n})) \\ + \acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n}), S(\zeta_{2n}), f(\zeta_{2n})) \\ + \acute{S}(R(u), R(u), g(u)) \end{array} \right) \right), \\ \frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} (2\acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n}), S(\zeta_{2n}), g(u)) + 2\acute{S}(R(u), R(u), f(\zeta_{2n}))) \right) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Thus, by the definition of mapping D , inequality (16) turns into the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & F(\Omega(\acute{S}(f(\zeta_{2n}), f(\zeta_{2n}), g(u)))) \tag{17} \\
 & \leq F \left(\max \left\{ \begin{aligned} & \Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n}), S(\zeta_{2n}), R(u))), \\ & \Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} \acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n}), S(\zeta_{2n}), f(\zeta_{2n})) \\ +\acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n}), S(\zeta_{2n}), f(\zeta_{2n})) \\ +\acute{S}(R(u), R(u), g(u)) \end{pmatrix} \right), \\ & \frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} (2\acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n}), S(\zeta_{2n}), g(u)) + 2\acute{S}(R(u), R(u), f(\zeta_{2n}))) \right) \end{aligned} \right\} - \tau.
 \end{aligned}$$

Since Ω and F are continuous, so by taking upper limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (17), and applying Lemma 1, we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & F(\acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, g(u))) = F(\Omega(\Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, g(u)))) \tag{18} \\
 & \leq F \left(\Omega \left(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, g(u)) \right) \right) \\
 & \leq F \left(\max \left\{ \begin{aligned} & 0, \\ & \Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{3} (0 + 0 + \acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, g(u))) \right), \\ & \frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} (2 \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n}), S(\zeta_{2n}), g(u)) + 0) \right) \end{aligned} \right\} - \tau \right) \\
 & \leq F \left(\max \left\{ \begin{aligned} & 0, \Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{\acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, g(u))}{3} \right), \\ & \frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1} (\Omega(\acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, g(u)))) \end{aligned} \right\} - \tau \right) \\
 & \leq F \left(\max \left\{ \begin{aligned} & 0, \frac{\acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, g(u))}{3}, \\ & \frac{1}{3}\acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, g(u)) \end{aligned} \right\} - \tau \right) \\
 & = F \left(\frac{1}{3}\acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, g(u)) \right) - \tau.
 \end{aligned}$$

Together with (F1), we have,

$$\acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, g(u)) < \frac{1}{3}\acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, g(u)).$$

If $\acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, g(u)) > 0$, then it is a contradiction. Hence, $\eta^* = g(u)$. As the pair (R, g) is weak compatible, we have $g(R(u)) = R(g(u))$, then, $g(\eta^*) = R(\eta^*)$. Now we prove that $g(\eta^*) = \eta^*$, if $g(\eta^*) \neq \eta^*$, then,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & F(\Omega(\acute{S}(f(\zeta_{2n}), f(\zeta_{2n}), g(\eta^*)))) \\
 & \leq F(E(\zeta_n, \zeta_n, \eta^*)) \\
 & \quad -D \left(\begin{aligned} & \acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n+1}), \\ & \acute{S}(\eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n-1}, \eta_{2n+1}), \\ & \acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}), \\ & \acute{S}(\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n}) \end{aligned} \right), \tag{19}
 \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$E(\zeta_n, \zeta_n, \eta^*) = \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n}), S(\zeta_{2n}), R(\eta^*))), \\ \Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} \acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n}), S(\zeta_{2n}), f(\zeta_{2n})) \\ +\acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n}), S(\zeta_{2n}), f(\zeta_{2n})) \\ +\acute{S}(R(\eta^*), R(\eta^*), g(\eta^*)) \end{pmatrix} \right), \\ \frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 2\acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n}), S(\zeta_{2n}), g(\eta^*)) \\ +2\acute{S}(R(\eta^*), R(\eta^*), f(\zeta_{2n})) \end{pmatrix} \right) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Thus, by the definition of mapping D , inequality (19) turns into the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & F(\Omega(\acute{S}(f(\zeta_{2n}), f(\zeta_{2n}), g(\eta^*)))) \tag{20} \\ & \leq F \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n}), S(\zeta_{2n}), R(\eta^*))), \\ \Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} \acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n}), S(\zeta_{2n}), f(\zeta_{2n})) \\ +\acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n}), S(\zeta_{2n}), f(\zeta_{2n})) \\ +\acute{S}(R(\eta^*), R(\eta^*), g(\eta^*)) \end{pmatrix} \right), \\ \frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 2\acute{S}(S(\zeta_{2n}), S(\zeta_{2n}), g(\eta^*)) \\ +2\acute{S}(R(\eta^*), R(\eta^*), f(\zeta_{2n})) \end{pmatrix} \right) \end{array} \right\} - \tau. \end{aligned}$$

Again, as, Ω and F are continuous, so by taking upper limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (20), and applying Lemma 1, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} & F(\acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, g(\eta^*))) \tag{21} \\ & \leq F \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Omega^{-1}(\Omega(\acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, g(\eta^*))))), \\ \Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{0+0+0}{3} \right), \\ \frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \Omega(\acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, g(\eta^*))) \\ +\Omega(\acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, g(\eta^*))) \\ +\Omega(\acute{S}(g(\eta^*), g(\eta^*), \eta^*)) \\ +\Omega(\acute{S}(g(\eta^*), g(\eta^*), \eta^*)) \end{pmatrix} \right) \end{array} \right\} - \tau \right) \\ & \leq F \left(\max \left\{ \acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, g(\eta^*)), \frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1}(\Omega(2\acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, g(\eta^*)))) \right\} \right) - \tau \\ & = \leq F \left(\max \left\{ \acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, g(\eta^*)), \frac{2}{3}\acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, g(\eta^*)) \right\} \right) - \tau \\ & = F(\acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, g(\eta^*))) - \tau, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. Hence, $\eta^* = R(\eta^*) = g(\eta^*)$, that is, η^* is a common fixed point of R and g . Since, $\eta^* = g(\eta^*) \in g(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq S(\mathcal{A})$, then there exists $v \in \mathcal{A}$ such that

$S(v) = \eta^*$. we show that $f(v) = \eta^*$,

$$\begin{aligned} & F(\Omega(\acute{S}(f(v)), f(v), g(\zeta_{2n+1}))) \\ & \leq F(E(\zeta_n, \eta_n, v)) \\ & \quad - D \left(\begin{array}{l} \acute{S}(S(v), S(v), g(\zeta_{2n+1})), \\ \acute{S}(S(v), S(v), g(\zeta_{2n+1})), \\ \acute{S}(R(\zeta_{2n+1}), R(\zeta_{2n+1}), f(v)), \\ \acute{S}(R(\zeta_{2n+1}), R(\zeta_{2n+1}), f(v)) \end{array} \right), \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where,

$$E(\zeta_n, \eta_n, v) = \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(S(v), S(v), R(\zeta_{2n+1}))), \\ \Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} \acute{S}(S(v), S(v), f(v)) \\ +\acute{S}(S(v), S(v), f(v)) \\ +\acute{S}(R(\zeta_{2n+1}), R(\zeta_{2n+1}), g(\zeta_{2n+1})) \end{pmatrix} \right), \\ \frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 2\acute{S}(S(v), S(v), g(\zeta_{2n+1})) \\ +2\acute{S}(R(\zeta_{2n+1}), R(\zeta_{2n+1}), f(v)) \end{pmatrix} \right) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Thus, by the definition of mapping D , inequality (22) turns into the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & F(\Omega(\acute{S}(f(v)), f(v), g(\zeta_{2n+1}))) \tag{23} \\ & \leq F \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(S(v), S(v), R(\zeta_{2n+1}))), \\ \Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} \acute{S}(S(v), S(v), f(v)) \\ +\acute{S}(S(v), S(v), f(v)) \\ +\acute{S}(R(\zeta_{2n+1}), R(\zeta_{2n+1}), g(\zeta_{2n+1})) \end{pmatrix} \right), \\ \frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 2\acute{S}(S(v), S(v), g(\zeta_{2n+1})) \\ +2\acute{S}(R(\zeta_{2n+1}), R(\zeta_{2n+1}), f(v)) \end{pmatrix} \right) \end{array} \right\} - \tau \right). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, as, Ω and F are continuous, so by taking upper limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (23), and applying Lemma 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & F(\acute{S}(f(v), f(v), \eta^*)) \\ & \leq F \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 0, \\ \frac{1}{3}(2\acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, f(v))), \\ \frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1}(\Omega(\acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, f(v)))) \end{array} \right\} \right) - \tau \\ & \leq F \left(\frac{1}{3}(2\acute{S}(f(v), f(v), \eta^*)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $f(v) = \eta^*$. By the weak compatibility of the pair (f, g) , we have $S(f(v)) = f(S(v))$. Therefore, $f(\eta^*) = S(\eta^*)$. We prove that $f(\eta^*) = \eta^*$. If $f(\eta^*) \neq \eta^*$, we

get,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & F(\Omega(\acute{S}(f(\eta^*), f(\eta^*), g(\eta^*)))) \\
 & \leq F(E(\zeta_n, \eta_n, \eta^*)) \\
 & \quad -D \left(\begin{array}{l} \acute{S}(\acute{S}(S(\eta^*), S(\eta^*), g(\eta^*)), \\ \acute{S}(\acute{S}(S(\eta^*), S(\eta^*), g(\eta^*)), \\ \acute{S}(R(\eta^*), R(\eta^*), f(\eta^*)), \\ \acute{S}(R(\eta^*), R(\eta^*), f(\eta^*)) \end{array} \right), \tag{24}
 \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$E(\zeta_n, \eta_n, \eta^*) = \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(S(\eta^*), S(\eta^*), R(\eta^*))), \\ \Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} \acute{S}(S(\eta^*), S(\eta^*), f(\eta^*)) \\ +\acute{S}(S(\eta^*), S(\eta^*), f(\eta^*)) \\ +\acute{S}(R(\eta^*), R(\eta^*), g(\eta^*)) \end{pmatrix} \right), \\ \frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 2\acute{S}(S(\eta^*), S(\eta^*), g(\eta^*)) \\ +2\acute{S}(R(\eta^*), R(\eta^*), f(\eta^*)) \end{pmatrix} \right) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & F(\acute{S}(f(\eta^*), f(\eta^*), \eta^*)) \tag{25} \\
 & \leq F \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(f(\eta^*), f(\eta^*), \eta^*)), \\ 0, \\ \frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1}(2\acute{S}(f(\eta^*), f(\eta^*), \eta^*)) \end{array} \right\} \right) - \tau \\
 & \leq F(\acute{S}(f(\eta^*), f(\eta^*), \eta^*)) - \tau,
 \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, $f(\eta^*) = S(\eta^*) = \eta^*$, that is, η^* is a common fixed point of f, S . Thus,

$$f(\eta^*) = S(\eta^*) = g(\eta^*) = R(\eta^*) = \eta^*.$$

Therefore, η^* is a common fixed point of f, g, R and S . Next, assume that v^* is another common fixed point of f, g, R and S . If $\acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, v^*) > 0$, then,

$$\begin{aligned}
 F(\acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, v^*)) & = F(\Omega(\acute{S}(f(\eta^*), f(\eta^*), g(v^*)))) \\
 & \leq F(E(\zeta_n, \eta_n, v^*)) \\
 & \quad -D \left(\begin{array}{l} \acute{S}\acute{S}(S(\eta^*), S(\eta^*), g(v^*)), \\ \acute{S}(S(\eta^*), S(\eta^*), g(v^*)), \\ \acute{S}(R(v^*), R(v^*), f(\eta^*)), \\ \acute{S}(R(v^*), R(v^*), f(\eta^*)) \end{array} \right),
 \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$E(\zeta, \eta, \sigma) = \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(S(\eta^*), S(\eta^*), R(v^*))), \\ \Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} \acute{S}(S(\eta^*), S(\eta^*), f(\eta^*)) \\ +\acute{S}(S(\eta^*), S(\eta^*), f(\eta^*)) \\ +\acute{S}(R(v^*), R(v^*), g(v^*)) \end{pmatrix} \right), \\ \frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 2\acute{S}(S(\eta^*), S(\eta^*), g(v^*)) \\ +2\acute{S}(R(v^*), R(v^*), f(\eta^*)) \end{pmatrix} \right) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & F(\acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, v^*)) \\ & \leq F \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(S(\eta^*), S(\eta^*), R(v^*))), \\ \Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} \acute{S}(S(\eta^*), S(\eta^*), f(\eta^*)) \\ +\acute{S}(S(\eta^*), S(\eta^*), f(\eta^*)) \\ +\acute{S}(R(v^*), R(v^*), g(v^*)) \end{pmatrix} \right), \\ \frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 2\acute{S}(S(\eta^*), S(\eta^*), g(v^*)) \\ +2\acute{S}(R(v^*), R(v^*), f(\eta^*)) \end{pmatrix} \right) \end{array} \right\} - \tau \right) \\ & \leq F(\acute{S}(\eta^*, \eta^*, v^*)) - \tau, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. Therefore, $\eta^* = v^*$ is a unique common fixed point of f, g, R and S . \square

COROLLARY 1. *Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{S})$ be a complete symmetric \mathcal{S}_b -metric space with $b \geq 1$ and $f, g, R, S: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be four self-mappings with $\Omega(x+y) \geq \Omega(x) + \Omega(y)$, for each $x, y \in [0, \infty)$. Moreover, if*

(i) $f(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq R(\mathcal{A})$, $g(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq S(\mathcal{A})$ and either $R(\mathcal{A})$ or $S(\mathcal{A})$ is a closed subset of \mathcal{A} ;

(ii) for $\zeta, \eta, \sigma \in \mathcal{A}$, there exist $F \in \mathcal{F}$, $b \geq 1$ and $D \in \Delta_D$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{S}(f(\zeta), f(\eta), g(\sigma)) > 0 \\ & \Rightarrow F(b^2\mathcal{S}(f(\zeta), f(\eta), g(\sigma))) \leq F(E(\zeta, \eta, \sigma)) \\ & \quad -D \left(\begin{array}{l} \mathcal{S}(S(\zeta), S(\zeta), g(\sigma)), \mathcal{S}(S(\eta), S(\eta), g(\sigma)), \\ \mathcal{S}(R(\sigma), R(\sigma), f(\zeta)), \mathcal{S}(R(\sigma), R(\sigma), f(\eta)) \end{array} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$E(\zeta, \eta, \sigma) = \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathcal{S}(S(\zeta), S(\eta), R(\sigma)), \\ \frac{1}{3} \left(\begin{array}{l} \mathcal{S}(S(\zeta), S(\zeta), f(\zeta)) \\ + \mathcal{S}(S(\eta), S(\eta), f(\eta)) \\ + \mathcal{S}(R(\sigma), R(\sigma), g(\sigma)) \end{array} \right), \\ \frac{1}{6} \left(\begin{array}{l} \mathcal{S}(S(\zeta), S(\zeta), g(\sigma)) \\ + \mathcal{S}(S(\eta), S(\eta), g(\sigma)) \\ + \mathcal{S}(R(\sigma), R(\sigma), f(\zeta)) + \mathcal{S}(R(\sigma), R(\sigma), f(\eta)) \end{array} \right) \end{array} \right\};$$

(iii) the pair (f, S) and (g, R) are weak compatible.

Then f, g, R and S have a unique common fixed point in \mathcal{A} .

Proof. Take, $\Omega(t) = bt$ ($b \geq 1$) in Theorem 2 \square

COROLLARY 2. Let (\mathcal{A}, \acute{S}) be a complete symmetric \acute{S} -metric space and $f, g : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be two self-mappings with $\Omega(x+y) \geq \Omega(x) + \Omega(y)$, for each $x, y \in [0, \infty)$. Moreover, if

(i) for $\zeta, \eta, \sigma \in \mathcal{A}$, there exist $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $D \in \Delta_D$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\Omega(\acute{S}(f(\zeta), f(\eta), g(\sigma))) > 0 \\ \Rightarrow &F(\Omega(\acute{S}(f(\zeta), f(\eta), g(\sigma)))) \leq F(E(\zeta, \eta, \sigma)) \\ &-D \left(\begin{array}{l} \acute{S}(\zeta, \zeta, g(\sigma)), \acute{S}(\eta, \eta, g(\sigma)), \\ \acute{S}(\sigma, \sigma, f(\zeta)), \acute{S}(\sigma, \sigma, f(\eta)) \end{array} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$E(\zeta, \eta, \sigma) = \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(\zeta, \eta, \sigma)), \\ \Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{3} \left(\begin{array}{l} \acute{S}(\zeta, \zeta, g(\zeta)) + \acute{S}(\eta, \eta, g(\eta)) \\ + \acute{S}(\sigma, \sigma, g(\sigma)) \end{array} \right) \right), \\ \frac{1}{3} \Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\begin{array}{l} \acute{S}(\zeta, \zeta, g(\sigma)) + \acute{S}(\eta, \eta, g(\sigma)) \\ + \acute{S}(\sigma, \sigma, f(\zeta)) + \acute{S}(\sigma, \sigma, f(\eta)) \end{array} \right) \right) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Then f and g admit a unique common fixed point in \mathcal{A} .

COROLLARY 3. Let (\mathcal{A}, \acute{S}) be a complete symmetric \acute{S} -metric space and $g, R : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be two self-mappings with $\Omega(x+y) \geq \Omega(x) + \Omega(y)$, for each $x, y \in [0, \infty)$. Moreover, if

(i) $g(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq R(\mathcal{A})$ and $R(\mathcal{A})$ is a closed subset of \mathcal{A} ;

(ii) for $\zeta, \eta, \sigma \in \mathcal{A}$, there exist $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $D \in \Delta_D$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Omega(\acute{S}(g(\zeta), g(\eta), g(\sigma))) > 0 \\ \Rightarrow & F(\Omega(\acute{S}(g(\zeta), g(\eta), g(\sigma)))) \leq F(E(\zeta, \eta, \sigma)) \\ & -D\left(\acute{S}(R(\zeta), R(\zeta), g(\sigma)), \acute{S}(R(\eta), R(\eta), g(\sigma)), \right. \\ & \left. -D\left(\acute{S}(R(\sigma), R(\sigma), g(\zeta)), \acute{S}(R(\sigma), R(\sigma), g(\eta))\right)\right), \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$E(\zeta, \eta, \sigma) = \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(R(\zeta), R(\eta), R(\sigma))), \\ \Omega^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{3}\left(\begin{array}{l} \acute{S}(R(\zeta), R(\zeta), g(\zeta)) \\ +\acute{S}(R(\eta), R(\eta), g(\eta)) \\ +\acute{S}(R(\sigma), R(\sigma), g(\sigma)) \end{array}\right)\right), \\ \frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}\left(\begin{array}{l} \acute{S}(R(\zeta), R(\zeta), g(\sigma)) \\ +\acute{S}(R(\eta), R(\eta), g(\sigma)) \\ +\acute{S}(R(\sigma), R(\sigma), g(\zeta)) \\ +\acute{S}(R(\sigma), R(\sigma), g(\eta)) \end{array}\right)\right) \end{array} \right\};$$

(iii) the pair (g, R) are weak compatible.

Then g and R admit a unique common fixed point in \mathcal{A} .

COROLLARY 4. Let (\mathcal{A}, \acute{S}) be a complete symmetric \acute{S} -metric space and $S : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be a self-mapping with $\Omega(x+y) \geq \Omega(x) + \Omega(y)$, for each $x, y \in [0, \infty)$. Moreover if

(i) for $\zeta, \eta, \sigma \in \mathcal{A}$, there exist $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $D \in \Delta_D$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Omega(\acute{S}(S(\zeta), S(\eta), S(\sigma))) > 0 \\ \Rightarrow & F(\Omega(\acute{S}(S(\zeta), S(\eta), S(\sigma)))) \leq F(E(\zeta, \eta, \sigma)) \\ & -D\left(\acute{S}(\zeta, \zeta, S(\sigma)), \acute{S}(\eta, \eta, S(\sigma)), \right. \\ & \left. -D\left(\acute{S}(\sigma, \sigma, S(\zeta)), \acute{S}(\sigma, \sigma, S(\eta))\right)\right), \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$E(\zeta, \eta, \sigma) = \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(\zeta, \eta, \sigma)), \\ \Omega^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{3}\left(\begin{array}{l} \acute{S}(\zeta, \zeta, S(\zeta)) + \acute{S}(\eta, \eta, S(\eta)) \\ +\acute{S}(\sigma, \sigma, S(\sigma)) \end{array}\right)\right), \\ \frac{1}{3}\Omega^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}\left(\begin{array}{l} \acute{S}(\zeta, \zeta, S(\sigma)) + \acute{S}(\eta, \eta, S(\sigma)) \\ +\acute{S}(\sigma, \sigma, S(\zeta)) + \acute{S}(\sigma, \sigma, S(\eta)) \end{array}\right)\right) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Then S admits a unique fixed point in \mathcal{A} .

COROLLARY 5. Let (\mathcal{A}, \acute{S}) be a complete symmetric \acute{S} -metric space and $f, g, R, S : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be four self-mappings with $\Omega(x + y) \geq \Omega(x) + \Omega(y)$, for each $x, y \in [0, \infty)$. Moreover, if

(i) $f(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq R(\mathcal{A})$, $g(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq S(\mathcal{A})$ and either $R(\mathcal{A})$ or $S(\mathcal{A})$ is a closed subset of \mathcal{A} ;

(ii) for $\zeta, \eta, \sigma \in \mathcal{A}$, $\exists \lambda \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\Omega(\acute{S}(f(\zeta), f(\eta), g(\sigma))) \leq \lambda \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(S(\zeta), S(\eta), R(\sigma))), \\ \Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{3} \left(\begin{array}{l} \acute{S}(S(\zeta), S(\zeta), f(\zeta)) \\ + \acute{S}(S(\eta), S(\eta), f(\eta)) \\ + \acute{S}(R(\sigma), R(\sigma), g(\sigma)) \end{array} \right) \right), \\ \frac{1}{3} \Omega^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\begin{array}{l} \acute{S}(S(\zeta), S(\zeta), g(\sigma)) + \acute{S}(S(\eta), S(\eta), g(\sigma)) \\ + \acute{S}(R(\sigma), R(\sigma), f(\zeta)) + \acute{S}(R(\sigma), R(\sigma), f(\eta)) \end{array} \right) \right) \end{array} \right\};$$

(iii) the pair (f, S) and (g, R) are weak compatible.

Then f, g, R and S admit a unique common fixed point in \mathcal{A} .

EXAMPLE 7. Let $\mathcal{A} = I^P(0, 1)$, $P > 1$ and

$$\|k\|_P = \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |k_i(t)|^P \right)^{\frac{1}{P}}, \text{ for } t \in (0, \infty).$$

Define $\acute{S} : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ by $\acute{S}(k, q, l) = \|k - l\|_P + \|q - l\|_P$, for all $k, q, l \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\Omega(t) = t$. Then, (\mathcal{A}, \acute{S}) is a complete \acute{S} -metric space and it is symmetric. Define $f, S, g, R : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} f(k(t)) &= \left[\frac{k(t)}{2} \right]^{16}, \\ S(k(t)) &= \left[\frac{k(t)}{2} \right]^8, \\ g(k(\zeta)) &= \left[\frac{k(\zeta)}{2} \right]^8, \\ R(k(t)) &= \left[\frac{k(t)}{2} \right]^4, \end{aligned}$$

where, $\|k(t)\|_P \leq \frac{17}{10}$. Clearly, $f(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq R(\mathcal{A})$ and $g(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq S(\mathcal{A})$. We can easily, see that, $\{f, S\}$ is a weak compatible, if $\{k_n\}$ is a sequence in \mathcal{A} such that,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(k_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S(k_n) = t, \text{ for some } t \in \mathcal{A},$$

then,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |f(k_n) - t| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |S(k_n) - t| = 0,$$

and equivalently,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \left[\frac{\eta_n(t)}{2} \right]^{16} - t \right| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \left[\frac{\eta_n(t)}{2} \right]^8 - t \right| = 0.$$

Thus,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| [k_n(t)]^{16} - 2^{16}t \right| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| [k_n(t)]^8 - 2^8t \right| = 0.$$

By uniqueness of limit, we have $t^{\frac{1}{16}} = t^{\frac{1}{8}}$, hence, $t = 0, 1$. Using continuity of f and S , one get,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|fS(k_n) - Sf(k_n)\|_P &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |fS(k_n(t)) - Sf(k_n(t))|^P \right)^{\frac{1}{P}}, \\ \left(\sum_0^{\infty} |f(t) - S(t)|^P \right)^{\frac{1}{P}} &= \left(\sum_0^{\infty} |0 - 0|^P \right)^{\frac{1}{P}} = 0, \text{ for } t = 0 \in \mathcal{A}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \acute{S}(fS(k_n), fS(k_n), Sf(k_n)) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|fS(k_n) - Sf(k_n)\|_P + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|fS(k_n) - Sf(k_n)\|_P = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the pair $\{g, R\}$ is weak compatible. Define the mapping $F : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty)$ by,

$$F(\alpha) = \ln(\alpha), \text{ for } \alpha > 0, \text{ and } D(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = \ln\left(\frac{1}{r}\right), 0 < r < 1.$$

Now, from

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(k) - g(k)\|_P &= \left\| \left[\frac{k(t)}{2} \right]^{16} - \left[\frac{l(t)}{2} \right]^8 \right\|_P \\ &= \left\| \left[\frac{k(t)}{2} \right]^8 + \left[\frac{l(t)}{2} \right]^4 \right\|_P \left\| \left[\frac{k(t)}{2} \right]^8 - \left[\frac{l(t)}{2} \right]^4 \right\|_P \\ &= \left\| \left[\frac{k(t)}{2} \right]^8 + \left[\frac{l(t)}{2} \right]^4 \right\|_P \|S(k) - R(l)\|_P \\ &\leq r \|S(k) - R(k)\|_P, \end{aligned}$$

where, $r = \left\| \left[\frac{k(t)}{2} \right]^8 + \left[\frac{l(t)}{2} \right]^4 \right\|_P < 1$, (since $\|k(t)\|_P \leq \frac{17}{10}$ and $\|l(t)\|_P \leq \frac{17}{10}$). We can get,

$$\|f(k) - g(l)\|_P \leq r \|S(k) - R(l)\|_P$$

and

$$\|f(q) - g(l)\|_p \leq r \|S(q) - R(l)\|_p,$$

so, for all $k, q, l \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \acute{S}(f(k), f(q), g(l)) &= \|f(k) - g(l)\|_p + \|f(q) - g(l)\|_p \\ &\leq r \|S(k) - R(l)\|_p + r \|S(q) - R(l)\|_p \\ &\leq r [\|S(k) - R(l)\|_p + \|S(q) - R(l)\|_p] \\ &= r \acute{S}(S(k), S(q), R(l)) \\ &\leq r \max \left\{ \begin{aligned} &\acute{S}(S(k), S(q), R(l)), \\ &\frac{1}{3} \left(\acute{S}(S(k), S(k), g(k)) + \acute{S}(S(q), S(q), f(q)) \right) \\ &\quad + \acute{S}(R(l), R(l), g(l)) \right), \\ &\frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{2} \left(\acute{S}(S(k), S(k), g(l)) + \acute{S}(S(q), S(q), g(l)) \right) \\ &\quad + \acute{S}(R(l), R(l), f(k)) + \acute{S}(R(l), R(l), S(q)) \right) \end{aligned} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies,

$$\begin{aligned} &F(\acute{S}(f(k), f(q), g(l))) \\ &\leq F \left(\max \left\{ \begin{aligned} &\acute{S}(S(k), S(q), R(l)), \\ &\frac{1}{3} \left(\acute{S}(S(k), S(k), g(k)) + \acute{S}(S(q), S(q), f(q)) \right) \\ &\quad + \acute{S}(R(l), R(l), g(l)) \right), \\ &\frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{2} \left(\acute{S}(S(k), S(k), g(l)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \acute{S}(S(q), S(q), g(l)) + \acute{S}(R(l), R(l), f(k)) \right) \\ &\quad \left. + \acute{S}(R(l), R(l), S(q)) \right) \end{aligned} \right\} \right) \\ &\quad - \ln \left(\frac{1}{r} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence all the hypotheses of Theorem 2 are satisfied. Thus, f, S, g and R have a unique common fixed point.

COROLLARY 6. *Let (\mathcal{A}, \acute{S}) be a complete symmetric \acute{S} -metric space and $f, g, R, S : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be four self-mappings with $\Omega(x+y) \geq \Omega(x) + \Omega(y)$, for each $x, y \in [0, \infty)$. Moreover, if*

(i) $f(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq R(\mathcal{A})$, $g(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq S(\mathcal{A})$ and either $R(\mathcal{A})$ or $S(\mathcal{A})$ is a closed subset of \mathcal{A} ;

(ii) for $\zeta, \eta, \sigma \in \mathcal{A}$, there exist $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\tau > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\Omega(\acute{S}(f(\zeta), f(\eta), g(\sigma))) > 0 \\ \Rightarrow &\tau + F(\Omega(\acute{S}(f(\zeta), f(\eta), g(\sigma)))) \leq F(\Omega^{-1}(\acute{S}(S(\zeta), S(\eta), R(\sigma))))); \end{aligned}$$

(iii) the pair (f, S) and (g, R) are weak compatible.

Then f, g, R and S admit a unique common fixed point in \mathcal{A} .

4. Application to the system of Volterra type integral equations

Let $I = [0, K] \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a closed and bounded interval and $K > 0$. We consider the system of Volterra type integral equations:

$$y(t) = q(t) + \int_0^t K_1(t, s, y(s)) ds, \tag{26}$$

$$y(t) = q(t) + \int_0^t K_2(t, s, y(s)) ds, \tag{27}$$

$$y(t) = q(t) + \int_0^t K_3(t, s, y(s)) ds, \tag{28}$$

$$y(t) = q(t) + \int_0^t K_4(t, s, y(s)) ds, \tag{29}$$

where, $t \in I$, and $K_i : I \times I \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and $q : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are continuous mappings. Let $\mathcal{A} = C(I, \mathbb{R})$ be the set of real continuous mappings defined on I and

$$Q_i y(t) = q(t) + \int_0^t K_i(t, s, y(s)) ds,$$

for all $t \in I$, $y \in C(I, \mathbb{R})$ and $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Obviously, y is a solution of system (26)–(29) if and only if it is a common fixed point of Q_i for $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.

THEOREM 3. Assume that the following conditions hold:

- (a) $|K(t, s, y(s)) - K(t, s, w(s))| \leq |Q_4(y(s)) - Q_3(w(s))|$, for all $s \in [0, K]$ and $y, w \in C(I, \mathbb{R})$;
- (b) there exists a sequence $\{\eta_n\}$ in \mathcal{A} such that,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(S(\eta_n)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S(f(\eta_n)) \text{ and } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(R(\eta_n)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} R(g(\eta_n)),$$

whenever,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\eta_n) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S(\eta_n) = t \\ \text{and } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(\eta_n) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} R(\eta_n) = t, \end{aligned}$$

for some $t \in \mathcal{A}$;

- (c) for every $t \in I$ and $\tau \geq 1$ is taken arbitrary,

$$\sup_{t \in I} \int_0^t ds < e^{-\tau}.$$

Then system (26)–(29) of integral equations has a solution $y^* \in C(I, \mathbb{R})$.

Proof. We note that $\zeta \in \mathcal{A} = C(I, \mathbb{R})$. Define $\|\zeta\| = \sup_{t \in I} \{|\zeta(t)|\}$. $\|\cdot\|_\tau$ is a norm equivalent to the superimum norm and $(\mathcal{A}, \|\cdot\|)$ is a Banach space. The metric induced by this norm is given by

$$d(\zeta, \eta) = \|\zeta - \eta\| = \sup_{t \in I} \{|\zeta(t) - \eta(t)|\}, \text{ for all } \zeta, \eta \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Define the \acute{S} -metric on \mathcal{A} by $\acute{S}(\zeta, \eta, \delta) = \|\zeta - \delta\| + \|\eta - \delta\|$, for all $\zeta, \eta, \delta \in \mathcal{A}$. Clearly, (\mathcal{A}, \acute{S}) is a complete \acute{S} -metric space. Now, let $y(t), v(t) \in \mathcal{A}$. Then, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} |S_1y(t) - S_2v(t)| &= \left| \int_0^t K_1(t, s, y(s))ds - \int_0^t K_2(t, s, v(s))ds \right| \\ &\leq \int_0^t |K_1(t, s, y(s)) - K_2(t, s, v(s))| ds \\ &\leq \int_0^t |S_4y(t) - S_3v(t)| ds \\ &\leq \int_0^t \sup_{s \in I} |S_4y(s) - S_3v(s)| ds \\ &= \sup_{t \in I} |S_4y(t) - S_3v(t)| \int_0^t ds \\ &= \sup_{t \in I} |S_4y(t) - S_3v(t)| e^{-2\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\max_{t \in I} |S_1y(t) - S_2v(t)| \leq \max_{t \in I} |S_4y(t) - S_3v(t)| e^{-\tau}. \tag{30}$$

Similarly, we have,

$$\max_{t \in I} |S_1w(t) - S_2v(t)| \leq \max_{t \in I} |S_4w(t) - S_3v(t)| e^{-\tau}. \tag{31}$$

Therefore, from (30) and (31), we get,

$$\begin{aligned} &\max_{t \in I} |S_1y(t) - S_2v(t)| + \max_{t \in I} |S_1w(t) - S_2v(t)| \\ &\leq e^{-\tau} \left[\max_{t \in I} |S_4y(t) - S_3v(t)| + \max_{t \in I} |S_4w(t) - S_3v(t)| \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This implies,

$$\begin{aligned} &\acute{S}(S_1y(t), S_1w(t), S_2v(t)) \\ &\leq e^{-\tau} \acute{S}(S_4y(t), S_4w(t), S_3v(t)). \end{aligned}$$

A slight modification gives

$$e^{\acute{S}(S_1y(t), S_1w(t), S_2v(t))} - 1 \leq e^{-\tau} \ln(\acute{S}(S_4y(t), S_4w(t), S_3v(t)) + 1)$$

and

$$\Omega(\mathcal{S}(S_1y(t), S_1w(t), S_2v(t))) \leq e^{-\tau} \Omega^{-1}(\mathcal{S}(S_4y(t), S_4w(t), S_3v(t))).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & \tau + \ln [\Omega(\mathcal{S}(S_1y(t), S_1w(t), S_2v(t)))] \\ & \leq \ln [\Omega^{-1}(\mathcal{S}(S_4y(t), S_4w(t), S_3v(t)))] . \end{aligned}$$

Putting, $S_1 = f$, $S_2 = g$, $S_3 = R$ and $S_4 = S$. Then, all the hypotheses of Corollary 6 are satisfied for $F(r) = \ln(r)$, $\tau > 0$ and $\Omega(t) = e^t - 1$ (so, $\Omega^{-1}(t) = \ln(t + 1)$). Therefore, f , g , R and S have a common fixed point $y^* \in C(I, \mathbb{R})$; that is, $y^* \in C(I, \mathbb{R})$ is a solution of system (26–29). \square

5. Conclusion

This paper suggests a solution for a new common fixed point problem addressing generalized (F, Ω) -contraction in \mathcal{S} -complete metric spaces. This paper produces a new fixed point method for the existence of a solution for a system of integral equations. The new problem can lead to further investigations and applications.

REFERENCES

- [1] O. ACAR, I. ALTUN, *Multivalued F -contractive mappings with a graph and some fixed point results*, Publ. Math. Debrecen **88** (2016), 305–317.
- [2] M. U. ALI, T. KAMRAN, *Multivalued F -contractions and related fixed point theorems with an application*, Filomat **30** (14) (2016), 3779–3793.
- [3] M. ASADI, P. SALIMI, *Some Fixed point and common fixed point theorems for G -metric spaces*, Nonlinear Funct. Anal. Appl., **21** (3) (2016), 523–530.
- [4] S. BANACH, *Sur les opérations dans les ensembles abstraits et leur application aux équations itératives*, Fund. Math. **3** (1922), 133–181.
- [5] S. CZERWIK, *Nonlinear set-valued contraction mappings in b -metric spaces*, Atti Semin. Mat. Fis. Univ. Modena. **46** (2) (1998), 263–276.
- [6] S. CZERWIK, *Contraction mappings in b -metric spaces*, Acta Math. Inf. Univ. Ostrav **1** (1993), 5–11.
- [7] B. C. DHAGE, *Generalized metric space and mapping with fixed point*, Bulletin of the Calcutta Mathematical Society **84** (1992), 329–336.
- [8] B. C. DHAGE, *On generalized metric spaces and topological structure II*, Pure and Applied Matematika Sciences **40** (1994), 37–41.
- [9] G. DURMAZ, G. MINAK, I. ALTUN, *Fixed points of ordered F -contractions*, Hacettepe Journal of Mathematics and Statistics **45** (1) (2016), 15–21.
- [10] S. GAHLER, *2-metrische Raume und ihre topologische Struktur*, Mathematische Nachrichten **26** (1963), 115–148.
- [11] S. GAHLER, *Zur geometrie 2-metrische raume*, Revue Roumaine de Mathematiques Pures et Appliquees **11** (1966), 664–669.
- [12] A. JAVAHERI, S. SEDGHI, H. G. HYUN, *Common fixed point theorems for two mappings in S -metric spaces*, Nonlinear Funct. Anal. Appl., **24** (2) (2019), 417–425.
- [13] Z. MUSTAFA, B. SIMS, *A new approach to generalized metric spaces*, J. Nonlinear Convex Anal. **7** (2006), 289–297.
- [14] M. NAZAM, N. HUSSAIN, A. HUSSAIN, M. ARSHAD, *Fixed point theorems for weakly admissible pair of F -contractions with application*, Nonlinear Analysis: Modelling and Control **24** (6) (2019), 898–918.

- [15] H. PIRI, P. KUMAM, *Some fixed point theorems concerning F -contraction in complete metric spaces*, Fixed Point Theory Appl. **2014** (2014), 11 pages.
- [16] M. M. REZAEI, S. SEDGHI, K. S. KIM, *Coupled common fixed point results in ordered S -metric spaces*, Nonlinear Func. Anal. Appl., **23** (3) (2018), 595–612.
- [17] S. SEDGHI, N. SHOBE, A. ALIOUCHE, *A generalization of fixed point theorem in S -metric spaces*, Mat. Vesnik **64** (2012), 258–266.
- [18] S. SEDGHI, N. SHOBE, H. ZHOU, *A common fixed point theorem in D^* -metric spaces*, Fixed Point Theory Appl. Vol. **2007**, Article ID 27906 (2007), 13 pages.
- [19] S. SEDGHI, A. GHOLIDAHNEH, K. P. R. RAO, *Common fixed point of two R -weakly commuting mappings in S_b -metric spaces*, Math. Sci. Lett. **6** (3) (2017), 249–253.
- [20] D. SINGH, V. JOSHI, J. K. KIM, *Existence of solution to Bessel-type boundary value problem via G - I cyclic F -contractive mappings with graphical verification*, Nonlinear Funct. Anal. Appl., **23** (2) (2018), 205–224.
- [21] D. WARDOWSKI, *Fixed points of a new type of contractive mappings in complete metric spaces*, Fixed Point Theory Appl. **2012**, (2012): 6 pages.
- [22] M. YOUNIS, D. SINGH, D. GOPAL, A. GOYAL, M. S. RATHORE, *On applications of generalized F -contraction to differential equations*, Nonlinear Func. Anal. Appl., **24** (1) (2019), 155–174.

(Received May 29, 2020)

Muhammad Nazam
 Department of Mathematics
 Allama Iqbal Open University
 H-8, Islamabad, Pakistan
 e-mail: muhammad.nazam@aiou.edu.pk

Eskandar Ameer
 Department of Mathematics
 International Islamic University
 H-10, Islamabad – 44000, Pakistan
 and
 Department of Mathematics
 Taiz University
 Taiz, Yemen
 e-mail: eskandarameer@gmail.com

Mohammad Mursaleen
 China Medical University Hospital
 China Medical University
 Taichung, Taiwan
 and
 Department of Mathematics
 Aligarh Muslim University
 Aligarh – 202002, India
 e-mail: mursaleenm@gmail.com

Özlem Acar
 Department of Mathematics
 Faculty of Science, Selcuk University
 Konya, Turkey
 e-mail: ozlem.acar@selcuk.edu.tr