Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science

Volume 39, Issue 5, Page 29-43, 2024; Article no.JAMCS.115155
ISSN: 2456-9968
(Past name: British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science, Past ISSN: 2231-0851)

Common Fixed Points of Dass-Gupta Rational Contraction and E-Contraction

Deepak Singh [a*], Manoj Ughade [b], Sheetal Yadav [c], Alok Kumar [a] and Manoj Kumar Shukla [b]

[a] *Department of Mathematics, Swami Vivekanand University, Sagar-470001, Madhya Pradesh, India.*
[b] *Department of Mathematics, Institute for Excellence in Higher Education (IEHE), Bhopal-462016, Madhya Pradesh, India.*
[c] *Department of Mathematics, Mata Gujri Mahila Mahavidhyala (Auto), Jabalpur-482001, Madhya Pradesh, India.*

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/JAMCS/2024/v39i51888

Open Peer Review History:
This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/115155

Original Research Article

Received: 02/01/2024
Accepted: 06/04/2024
Published: 06/04/2024

Abstract

In this paper, we establish some common fixed-point theorems in supermetric space for Dass-Gupta Rational Contraction, E-contraction, generalized E-contraction and rational Dass-Gupta E-contraction. Additionally, these theorems expand and generalize several intriguing findings from metric fixed-point theory to the supermetric setting. Furthermore, an example is provided to support our results.

Keywords: fixed point; E-contraction; rational contraction; supermetric space.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: *47H10, 54H25*

**Corresponding author: Email: deepaksinghresearch2023@gmail.com;*

1 Introduction

A fixed point of a function is a point that doesn't move when the function is applied to it. In many branches of mathematics and its applications, including numerical analysis, optimization, and the study of dynamical systems, fixed points play a crucial role. They frequently depict equilibrium states of systems or solutions to equations. Finding a fixed point in an iterative process, for instance, can be comparable to finding a solution to the equation that is being iterated in the context of numerical equation-solving techniques.

A key finding in the theory of metric spaces is the Banach Contraction Principle, sometimes referred to as the Contraction Mapping Theorem. It gives the circumstances in which there is a unique fixed point for a mapping from a metric space to itself. This idea is fundamental to many branches of mathematics and its applications, such as functional analysis, numerical techniques, analysis, and optimization. It offers a strong tool for proving convergence in iterative algorithms and ensures the existence and uniqueness of solutions to certain equations and problems. The literature then extensively generalized the Banach contraction principle (see [1, 2, 3,4,5, 17-19]). It is widely used in applied and pure mathematics alike.

In 1968, Kannan [6] developed a modified version of this theory and removed the continuity requirement. The first important variation of Banach's remarkable finding on the metric fixed-point theory is Kannan's fixed-point theorem. Dass and Gupta [2] presented the Rational Contraction, which is a generalization of the Banach Contraction Mapping Principle. By using rational functions as the contraction condition rather than constants, it expands the concept of contraction maps to a more generic context. The traditional contraction mapping principle is made broader by the Dass-Gupta Rational Contraction condition, which permits the contraction factor to change based on the points being mapped. In certain applications, this enables a more flexible foundation. Similar to mappings satisfying the Banach Contraction Mapping Principle, the existence and uniqueness of fixed points for mappings satisfying the Dass-Gupta Rational Contraction condition can be determined by taking advantage of the rational function's properties as well as the underlying metric space's completeness.

The notion of E-contraction was introduced by Fulga and Proca [7]. Later, this concept has been improved by several authors, e.g., [8, 9, 10]. A point that is simultaneously fixed under two or more mappings or functions is referred to as a common fixed point. Put differently, a point θ such that $\Delta_i(\theta) = \theta,$ for all $i = 1,2, \dots, n,$ is a common fixed point given two or more functions $\Delta_1, \Delta_2, \dots, \Delta_n.$ Sirajo [11] proved some common fixed-point theorems for contraction mapping in metric space. Many researchers are concentrating on the field of common fixed points, as evidenced by pioneering articles such as [12, 13, 14].

Supermetric space was introduced by Fulga and Karapinar [15]. In this framework, we were able to derive various fixed-point theorems, and we think this approach could help relieve the congestion and squeeze issues previously mentioned [16].

In supermetric space, we establish some common fixed-point theorems for Dass-Gupta Rational type contraction and E-contraction. These theorems expand and generalize several intriguing findings from metric fixed-point theory to the super metric setting. Furthermore, we present an example to illustrate our theorems.

2 Preliminaries

First, we recall the basic results and definitions.

***Definition* 2.1** (see [7]) Let $(\mathfrak{D}, \tau)$ be a metric space. A mapping and $\Delta: \mathfrak{D} \to \mathfrak{D}$ is said to be an E-contraction if there exists a real number $\mathfrak{c} \in [0,1)$ such that

$$\tau(\Delta\theta, \Delta\vartheta) \leq \mathfrak{c}[\tau(\theta, \vartheta) + |\tau(\theta, \Delta\theta) - \tau(\vartheta, \Delta\vartheta)|]$$

for all $\theta, \vartheta \in \mathfrak{D}$.

***Definition* 2.2** (see [2]) Let $(\mathfrak{D}, \tau)$ be a metric space. A mapping and $\Delta: \mathfrak{D} \to \mathfrak{D}$ is said to be a Dass-Gupta Rational contraction if there exist real numbers $\mathfrak{c}_1, \mathfrak{c}_2 \in [0,1)$ with $\mathfrak{c}_1 + \mathfrak{c}_2 < 1$ such that

$$\tau(\Delta\theta,\Delta\vartheta) \leq \mathfrak{c}_1 \frac{[1+\tau(\theta,\Delta\theta)]\tau(\vartheta,\Delta\vartheta)}{1+\tau(\theta,\vartheta)} + \mathfrak{c}_2\tau(\theta,\vartheta)$$

for all $\theta,\vartheta \in \mathfrak{D}$.

***Definition* 2.3** (see [15]) Consider $\mathfrak{D}$ to be a non-empty set. A function $\mathfrak{d}: \mathfrak{D}\times\mathfrak{D} \to [0,+\infty)$ is considered a super metric if it fulfills the subsequent axioms:

(s1). $\forall\ \theta,\vartheta \in \mathfrak{D}$, if $\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\vartheta) = 0 \Rightarrow\ \theta = \vartheta$.
(s2). $\forall\ \theta,\vartheta \in \mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{d}(\theta,\vartheta) = \mathfrak{d}(\vartheta,\theta)$.
(s3). There exists $\mathfrak{s} \geq 1$ such that for every $\vartheta \in \mathfrak{D}$, there exist distinct sequences $\{\theta_i\},\{\vartheta_i\} \subset \mathfrak{D}$, with $\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\vartheta_i) \to 0$ when $i \to \infty$, such that

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\sup \mathfrak{d}(\vartheta_i,\vartheta) \leq \mathfrak{s}\lim_{i\to\infty}\sup \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\vartheta)$$

The tripled $(\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{d},\mathfrak{s})$ is called a supermetric space.

***Definition* 2.4** (see [15]) A sequence $\{\theta_i\}$ on a supermetric space $(\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{d},\mathfrak{s})$:

1. converges to $\theta \in \mathfrak{D} \Leftrightarrow \lim_{i\to\infty} \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta) = 0$.
2. is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathfrak{D} \Leftrightarrow \lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\{\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_j): j > i\} = 0$.

***Proposition* 2.5** (see [15]) The limit of a convergent sequence is unique on a supermetric space.

***Definition* 2.6** (see [15]) A supermetric space $(\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{d},\mathfrak{s})$ is called complete if and only if each Cauchy sequence is convergent in $\mathfrak{D}$.

***Theorem* 2.7** (see [15]) Let $(\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{d},\mathfrak{s})$ be a complete supermetric space and $\Delta: \mathfrak{D} \to \mathfrak{D}$ be a mapping. Suppose that $0 < c < 1$ such that

$$\mathfrak{d}(\Delta\theta,\Delta\vartheta) \leq c\ \mathfrak{d}(\theta,\vartheta)$$

for all $(\theta,\vartheta) \in \mathfrak{D}$. Then, Δ has a unique fixed point in $\mathfrak{D}$.

3 Common Fixed-Point Theorems for Rational Contraction

This section contains some common fixed-point theorems using Dass-Gupta rational type contraction, an illustrative example and deductions.

Theorem 3.1 Let $(\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{d},\mathfrak{s})$ be a complete supermetric space and Υ,Δ be self-mappings of $\mathfrak{D}$. If there exist real numbers $\mathfrak{r}_1,\ \mathfrak{r}_2 \geq 0$ with $\mathfrak{r}_1 + \mathfrak{r}_2 < 1$ such that

$$\mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta,\Delta\vartheta) \leq\ \mathfrak{r}_1 \frac{[1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\Upsilon\theta)]\mathfrak{d}(\vartheta,\Delta\vartheta)}{1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\vartheta)} +\ \mathfrak{r}_2\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\vartheta) \tag{1}$$

for all $\theta,\vartheta \in \mathfrak{D}$. Then, Υ and Δ have a unique common fixed point in $\mathfrak{D}$.

Proof. Let $\theta_0 \in \mathfrak{D}$ and we define the class of iterative sequences $\{\theta_i\}$ such that $\theta_{i+1} = \Upsilon\theta_i$, $\theta_{i+2} = \Delta\theta_{i+1}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\theta_{i+2} \neq \Delta\theta_{i+1}$ for each nonnegative integer i. Indeed, if there exist a nonnegative integer i_0 such that $\theta_{i_0+2} = \Delta\theta_{i_0+1}$, then our proof of the Theorem proceeds as follows. By contractive condition (1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta_{i+2}) &= \mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta_i,\Delta\theta_{i+1}) \\ &\leq\ \mathfrak{r}_1 \frac{[1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\Upsilon\theta_i)]\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\Delta\theta_{i+1})}{1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})} +\ \mathfrak{r}_2\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1}) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \mathfrak{r}_1 \frac{[1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})]\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta_{i+2})}{1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})} + \mathfrak{r}_2\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})$$
$$\leq \mathfrak{r}_1\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta_{i+2}) + \mathfrak{r}_2\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1}).$$

The last inequality gives,

$$0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta_{i+2}) \leq \frac{\mathfrak{r}_2}{1-\mathfrak{r}_1}\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1}) = c\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})$$

where $c = \frac{\mathfrak{r}_2}{1-\mathfrak{r}_1}$. From this, we can write

$$0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta_{i+2}) \leq c\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1}) \leq c^2\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1},\theta_i) \leq \cdots \leq c^{i+1}\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_0,\theta_1). \tag{2}$$

On the other hand, one writes,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1}) &= \mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta_{i-1},\Delta\theta_i) \\ &\leq \mathfrak{r}_1 \frac{[1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1},\Delta\theta_{i-1})]\mathfrak{d}\big((\theta_i,\Upsilon\theta_i)\big)}{1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1},\theta_i)} + \mathfrak{r}_2\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1},\theta_i) \\ &= \mathfrak{r}_1 \frac{[1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1},\theta_i)]\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})}{1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1},\theta_i)} + \mathfrak{r}_2\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1},\theta_i) \\ &\leq \mathfrak{r}_1\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1}) + \mathfrak{r}_2\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i-1}), \end{aligned}$$

which yields that,

$$0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta_i) \leq \frac{\mathfrak{r}_2}{1-\mathfrak{r}_1}\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i-1}) = c\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i-1}).$$

And then, we can write

$$0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1}) \leq c\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i-1}) \leq c^2\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1},\theta_{i-2}) \leq \cdots \leq c^i\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_0,\theta_1). \tag{3}$$

By appealing to (2) and (3), we find that

$$0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1}) \leq c^i\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_0,\theta_1). \tag{4}$$

Taking the limit as i tends to infinity in inequality (4), we get

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1}) = 0. \tag{5}$$

In what follows, we want to show that the sequence $\{\theta_i\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Now suppose that, $i,j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $i > j$.Then from inequality (5) and using (s3), we get

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\sup \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+2}) \leq \mathfrak{s}\lim_{i\to\infty}\sup \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta_{i+2}) \leq \mathfrak{s}\lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\{c^{i+1}\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_0,\theta_1)\}.$$

Hence, $\lim_{i\to\infty}\sup \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+2}) = 0$. Similarly, we have

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\sup \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+3}) \leq \mathfrak{s}\lim_{i\to\infty}\sup \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+2},\theta_{i+3}) \leq \mathfrak{s}\lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\{c^{i+2}\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_0,\theta_1)\}.$$

Inductively, one can conclude that $\lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\{\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_j): i > j\} = 0$. Thus, $\{\theta_i\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in a complete supermetric space $(\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{d},\mathfrak{s})$, the sequence $\{\theta_i\}$ converges to $\theta^* \in \mathfrak{D}$ and then $\lim_{i\to\infty}\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta^*) = 0$. Further, we show that θ^* is a common fixed point of Υ and Δ. If not, $\theta^* \neq \Upsilon\theta^* \neq \Delta\theta^*$, and then $\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Upsilon\theta^*) > 0$ and $\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Delta\theta^*) > 0$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+2},\Upsilon\theta^*) &= \mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta^*,\theta_{i+2}) = \mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta^*,\Delta\theta_{i+1}) \\ &\leq \mathfrak{r}_1 \frac{[1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Upsilon\theta^*)]\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\Delta\theta_{i+1})}{1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\theta_{i+1})} + \mathfrak{r}_2\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\theta_{i+1}) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \mathfrak{r}_1 \frac{[1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Upsilon\theta^*)]\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta_{i+2})}{1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\theta_{i+1})} + \mathfrak{r}_2\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\theta_{i+1}).$$

Taking the limit as $i \to \infty$, we derive $\limsup_{i\to\infty} \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+2},\Upsilon\theta^*) \leq 0$. Thus, we have,

$$0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Upsilon\theta^*) \leq \limsup_{i\to\infty} \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+2},\Upsilon\theta^*) \leq 0,$$

and one can conclude that $\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Upsilon\theta^*) = 0$, which implies that $\Upsilon\theta^* = \theta^*$.On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+2},\Delta\theta^*) &= \mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta_{i+1},\Delta\theta^*) \\ &\leq \mathfrak{r}_1 \frac{[1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\Upsilon\theta_{i+1})]\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Delta\theta^*)}{1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta^*)} + \mathfrak{r}_2\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta^*) \\ &= \mathfrak{r}_1 \frac{[1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta_{i+2})]\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Delta\theta^*)}{1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta^*)} + \mathfrak{r}_2\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta^*). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit as $i \to \infty$, we derive $\limsup_{i\to\infty} \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+2},\Delta\theta^*) \leq \mathfrak{r}_1\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Delta\theta^*)$. Thus, we have,

$$0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Delta\theta^*) \leq \limsup_{i\to\infty} \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+2},\Delta\theta^*) \leq \mathfrak{r}_1\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Delta\theta^*),$$

and one can conclude that $\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Upsilon\theta^*) = 0$, which implies that $\Delta\theta^* = \theta^*$. Hence, θ^* is a common fixed point of Υ and Δ. We shall now prove the uniqueness of θ^*. Suppose there exists another point $\vartheta^* \in \mathfrak{D}$ such that $\Upsilon\vartheta^* = \Delta\vartheta^* = \vartheta^*$. Then, by inequality (1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta^*,\Delta\vartheta^*) &\leq \mathfrak{r}_1 \frac{[1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Upsilon\theta^*)]\mathfrak{d}(\vartheta^*,\Delta\,\vartheta^*)}{1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\vartheta^*)} + \mathfrak{r}_2\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\vartheta^*) \\ &\leq \mathfrak{r}_2\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\vartheta^*) < d(\theta^*,\vartheta^*), \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, the common fixed point is unique.

If we take $\Upsilon = \Delta$ in inequality (1), then we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 3.2 Let $(\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{d},\mathfrak{s})$ be a complete supermetric space and Υ be a self-mapping of $\mathfrak{D}$. If there exist real numbers $\mathfrak{r}_1$, $\mathfrak{r}_2 \geq 0$ with $\mathfrak{r}_1 + \mathfrak{r}_2 < 1$ such that

$$\mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta,\Upsilon\vartheta) \leq \mathfrak{r}_1 \frac{[1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\Upsilon\theta)]\mathfrak{d}(\vartheta,\Upsilon\vartheta)}{1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\vartheta)} + \mathfrak{r}_2\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\vartheta) \tag{6}$$

for all $\theta,\vartheta \in \mathfrak{D}$. Then, Υ has a unique fixed point in $\mathfrak{D}$.

If we take $\mathfrak{r}_1 = 0$ and $\mathfrak{r}_2 = \mathfrak{r}$ in Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.2, respectively, then we obtain the following corollaries.

Corollary 3.3 Let $(\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{d},\mathfrak{s})$ be a complete supermetric space and Υ,Δ be two self-mappings of $\mathfrak{D}$. If there exists a real number $0 \leq \mathfrak{r} < 1$ such that

$$\mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta,\Delta\vartheta) \leq \mathfrak{r}\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\vartheta) \tag{7}$$

for all $\theta,\vartheta \in \mathfrak{D}$. Then, Υ and Δ have a unique common fixed point in $\mathfrak{D}$.

Corollary 3.4 Let $(\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{d},\mathfrak{s})$ be a complete supermetric space and Υ be a self-mapping of $\mathfrak{D}$. If there exists real number $0 \leq \mathfrak{r} < 1$ such that

$$\mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta,\Upsilon\vartheta) \leq \mathfrak{r}\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\vartheta) \tag{8}$$

for all $\theta,\vartheta \in \mathfrak{D}$. Then, Υ has a unique fixed point in $\mathfrak{D}$.

We give an example which satisfy the conditions of Theorem 3.1.

Example 3.5 Let $\mathfrak{s} = 1$, and the function $\mathfrak{d}: [0,1] \times [0,1] \to [0,+\infty)$ be defined as follows:

$\mathfrak{d}(\theta, \vartheta) = \theta\vartheta$ for all $\theta \neq \vartheta$, and $\theta, \vartheta \in (0,1)$;
$\mathfrak{d}(\theta, \vartheta) = 0$ for all $\theta = \vartheta$, and $\theta, \vartheta \in [0,1]$;
$\mathfrak{d}(0, \vartheta) = \mathfrak{d}(\vartheta, 0) = \vartheta$ for all $\vartheta \in (0,1]$;
$\mathfrak{d}(1, \vartheta) = \mathfrak{d}(\vartheta, 1) = 1 - \frac{\vartheta}{2}$ for all $\vartheta \in [0,1)$.

First, we claim that $\mathfrak{d}$ is supermetric on $[0,1]$. We will concentrate on (s3) because (s1) and (s2) are simple to confirm. For any $\vartheta \in (0,1)$, we can choose the sequences $\{\theta_i\}, \{\vartheta_i\} \subset [0,1]$, where

$$\theta_i = \frac{i^2+1}{i^2+2}, \text{ and } \vartheta_i = \frac{i+1}{i^2+2}, \text{ for any } i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \theta_i = \lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{i^2+1}{i^2+2} = \lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{1+\frac{1}{i^2}}{1+\frac{2}{i^2}} = 1,$$

and

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \vartheta_i = \lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{i+1}{i^2+2} = \lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{1+\frac{1}{i}}{i\left(1+\frac{2}{i^2}\right)} = 0.$$

Then, we have

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \vartheta_i) = \lim_{i\to\infty} \theta_i\vartheta_i = \lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{i^2+1}{i^2+2}\frac{i+1}{i^2+2} = \lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{1+\frac{1}{i^2}}{1+\frac{2}{i^2}} \lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{1+\frac{1}{i}}{i\left(1+\frac{2}{i^2}\right)} = 0.$$

Thus,

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\ \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \vartheta) = \lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\ \theta_i\vartheta = \lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\left\{\left(\frac{i^2+1}{i^2+2}\right)\vartheta\right\} = \vartheta \lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\left(\frac{i^2+1}{i^2+2}\right) = \vartheta,$$
$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\ \mathfrak{d}(\vartheta_i, \vartheta) = \lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\ \vartheta_i\vartheta = \lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\left\{\left(\frac{i+1}{i^2+2}\right)\vartheta\right\} = \vartheta \lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\left(\frac{i+1}{i^2+2}\right) = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\ \mathfrak{d}(\vartheta_i, \vartheta) = 0 < \vartheta = \mathfrak{s} \lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\ \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \vartheta),$$

and (s3) holds.
If $\vartheta = 0$, using the same sequences, we get

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\ \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \vartheta) = \lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\ \theta_i = \lim_{i\to\infty}\sup \frac{i^2+1}{i^2+2} = \lim_{i\to\infty}\sup \frac{1+\frac{1}{i^2}}{1+\frac{2}{i^2}} = 1,$$
$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\ \mathfrak{d}(\vartheta_i, \vartheta) = \lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\ \vartheta_i = \lim_{i\to\infty}\sup \frac{i+1}{i^2+2} = \lim_{i\to\infty}\sup \frac{1+\frac{1}{i}}{i\left(1+\frac{2}{i^2}\right)} = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\ \mathfrak{d}(\vartheta_i, \vartheta) = 0 < 1 = \mathfrak{s} \lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\ \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \vartheta),$$

and again (s3) holds.

If $\vartheta = 1$, using choosing $\theta_i = \frac{i+1}{i^2+2}$, and $\vartheta_i = \frac{i+2}{i+3}$, for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \theta_i = \lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{i+1}{i^2+2} = 0 \text{ and } \lim_{i\to\infty} \vartheta_i = \lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{i+2}{i+3} = 1.$$

Then, we have

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \vartheta_i) = \lim_{i\to\infty} \theta_i \vartheta_i = \lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{i+1}{i^2+2}\frac{i+2}{i+3} = 0.$$

Thus,

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\ \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \vartheta) = \lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\left(1-\frac{\theta_i}{2}\right) = \lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\left(1-\frac{i+1}{2(i^2+2)}\right) = \lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\frac{2i^2-i+3}{2(i^2+2)} = 1,$$
$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\ \mathfrak{d}(\vartheta_i, \vartheta) = \lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\left(1-\frac{\vartheta_i}{2}\right) = \lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\left(1-\frac{i+2}{2(i+3)}\right) = \lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\frac{i+4}{2(i+3)} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\ \mathfrak{d}(\vartheta_i, \vartheta) = \frac{1}{2} < 1 = \mathfrak{s}\lim_{i\to\infty}\sup\ \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \vartheta),$$

and again (s3) holds. Hence, $\mathfrak{d}$ defines a supermetric on $[0, 1]$. Define two self-mappings Υ, Δ on $[0, 1]$ as

$$\Upsilon\theta = \frac{\theta}{4}, \text{ if } \theta \in [0,1) \text{ and } \Upsilon\theta = \frac{1}{16}, \text{ if } \theta = 1,$$
$$\Delta\theta = \frac{\theta}{2}, \text{ if } \theta \in [0,1) \text{ and } \Delta\theta = \frac{1}{8}, \text{ if } \theta = 1.$$

Taking $\mathfrak{r}_1 = \frac{1}{9}$, $\mathfrak{r}_2 = \frac{1}{2}$.

We consider the following cases:

1. If $\theta, \vartheta \in (0,1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta, \Delta\vartheta) &= \mathfrak{d}\left(\frac{\theta}{4}, \frac{\vartheta}{2}\right) = \frac{\theta\vartheta}{8} \le \frac{1}{9}\frac{(1+\theta^2)\vartheta^2}{(8+\theta\vartheta)} + \frac{1}{2}\theta\vartheta \\ &\le \mathfrak{r}_1 \frac{[1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\Upsilon\theta)]\mathfrak{d}(\vartheta,\Delta\vartheta)}{1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\vartheta)} + \mathfrak{r}_2\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\vartheta).\end{aligned}$$

2. If $\theta = 0, \vartheta \in (0,1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta, \Delta\vartheta) &= \mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon 0, \Delta\vartheta) = \mathfrak{d}\left(0, \frac{\vartheta}{2}\right) = \frac{\vartheta}{2} \le \frac{1}{9}(0) + \frac{1}{2}\vartheta \\ &\le \mathfrak{r}_1 \frac{[1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\Upsilon\theta)]\mathfrak{d}(\vartheta,\Delta\vartheta)}{1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\vartheta)} + \mathfrak{r}_2\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\vartheta).\end{aligned}$$

3. If $\theta = 0, \vartheta = 0$, or $\theta = 1, \vartheta = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta, \Delta\vartheta) &= 0 \le \frac{1}{9}\frac{(1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\Upsilon\theta))\mathfrak{d}(\vartheta,\Delta\vartheta)}{1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\vartheta)} + \frac{1}{2}\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\vartheta) \\ &\le \mathfrak{r}_1 \frac{[1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\Upsilon\theta)]\mathfrak{d}(\vartheta,\Delta\vartheta)}{1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\vartheta)} + \mathfrak{r}_2\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\vartheta).\end{aligned}$$

4. If $\theta = 0, \vartheta = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta, \Delta\vartheta) &= \mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon 0, \Delta 1) = \mathfrak{d}\left(0, \frac{1}{8}\right) = \frac{1}{8} \\ &\le \frac{1}{9}\frac{(1+0)\left(\frac{1}{8}\right)}{1+1} + \frac{1}{2}(1) \\ &= \mathfrak{r}_1 \frac{[1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\Upsilon\theta)]\mathfrak{d}(\vartheta,\Delta\vartheta)}{1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\vartheta)} + \mathfrak{r}_2\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\vartheta).\end{aligned}$$

5. If $\theta = 1, \vartheta \in (0,1)$, we have

$$\mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta,\Delta\vartheta)=\mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon 1,\Delta\vartheta)=\mathfrak{d}\left(\frac{1}{16},\frac{\vartheta}{2}\right)=\frac{\vartheta}{32}\leq\frac{1}{9}\frac{\left(1+\frac{\vartheta^2}{32}\right)}{1+\vartheta}+\frac{1}{2}\vartheta$$
$$\leq\ \mathfrak{r}_1\,\mathfrak{r}_1\frac{[1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\Upsilon\theta)]\mathfrak{d}(\vartheta,\Delta\vartheta)}{1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\vartheta)}+\ \mathfrak{r}_2\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\vartheta)+\ \mathfrak{r}_2\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\vartheta).$$

In view of Theorem 3.1, we conclude that Υ and Δ have a unique common fixed point $0\in[0,1]$.

4 Common Fixed-Point Theorems for E-contraction

This section contains some common fixed-point theorems using E-contraction, generalized E-contraction, rational E-contraction, and deductions.

Theorem 4.1 Let $(\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{d},\mathfrak{s})$ be a complete supermetric space and Υ,Δ be self-mappings of $\mathfrak{D}$. If there exists a real number $\mathfrak{r}\in[0,1[$ such that

$$\mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta,\Delta\vartheta)\leq\mathfrak{r}[\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\vartheta)+|\ \mathfrak{d}(\theta,\Upsilon\theta)-\ \mathfrak{d}(\vartheta,\Delta\vartheta)|] \tag{9}$$

for all $\theta,\vartheta\in\mathfrak{D}$. Then, Υ and Δ have a unique common fixed point in $\mathfrak{D}$.

Proof Following the steps of proof of Theorem 3.1, we construct the sequence $\{\theta_i\}$ by iterating

$$\theta_{i+1}=\Upsilon\theta_i,\ \theta_{i+2}=\Delta\theta_{i+1}\text{ for all } i\in\mathbb{N}.$$

where $\theta_0\in\mathfrak{D}$ is arbitrary point. Then, by inequality (9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}0<\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta_{i+2})&=\mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta_i,\Delta\theta_{i+1})\\&\leq\mathfrak{r}[\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})+|\ \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\Upsilon\theta_i)-\ \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\Delta\theta_{i+1})|]\\&=\mathfrak{r}[\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})+|\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})-\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta_{i+2})|].\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

If $\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})<d(\theta_{i+1},\theta_{i+2})$ for some i, from (10), we have

$$\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta_{i+2})\leq\mathfrak{r}[\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})-\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta_{i+2})]=\mathfrak{r}\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta_{i+2}),$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, $\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})>d(\theta_{i+1},\theta_{i+2})$ and so from (10), we have

$$\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta_{i+2})\leq\mathfrak{r}[\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})-\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta_{i+2})].$$

The last inequality gives,

$$0<\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta_{i+2})\leq\frac{2\mathfrak{r}}{1+\mathfrak{r}}\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})=c\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1}).$$

where $c=\frac{2\mathfrak{r}}{1+\mathfrak{r}}$. From this, we can write,

$$0<\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta_{i+2})\leq c_1\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})\leq{c_1}^2\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1},\theta_i)\leq\cdots\leq{c_1}^{i+1}\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_0,\theta_1). \tag{11}$$

On the other hand, one writes

$$\begin{aligned}0<\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})&=\mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta_{i-1},\Delta\theta_i)\\&\leq\mathfrak{r}[\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1},\theta_i)+|\ \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1},\Upsilon\theta_{i-1})-\ \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\Delta\theta_i)|]\\&=\mathfrak{r}[\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i-1})+|\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1},\theta_i)-\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})|].\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

If $\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1},\theta_i)<d(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})$ for some i, from (12), we have

$$\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})\leq\mathfrak{r}[\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i-1})-\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1},\theta_i)+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})]=\mathfrak{r}\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1}).$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, $\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1},\theta_i)>d(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})$ and so from (12), we have

$$\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) \le \mathfrak{r}[\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i-1}) + \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \theta_i) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1})],$$

which yields that,

$$0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_i) \le \frac{2\mathfrak{r}}{1+\mathfrak{r}} \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i-1}) = c\, \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i-1}).$$

where $c_2 = \frac{2\mathfrak{r}}{1+\mathfrak{r}}$. Then, we can write

$$0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) \le c_2\, \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i-1}) \le {c_2}^2\, \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \theta_{i-2}) \le \cdots \le {c_2}^i\, \mathfrak{d}(\theta_0, \theta_1). \tag{13}$$

By appealing to (11) and (13), we find that

$$0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) \le c^i\, \mathfrak{d}(\theta_0, \theta_1). \tag{14}$$

Taking limit as i tends to infinity in inequality (14), we get

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) = 0.$$

As already elaborated in the proof of Theorem 3.1, the classical procedure leads to $\{\theta_i\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in a complete supermetric space $(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{s})$. Hence, the sequence $\{\theta_i\}$ converges to $\theta^* \in \mathfrak{D}$ and then $\lim_{i\to\infty} \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta^*) = 0$. Further, we show that θ^* is a common fixed point of Υ and Δ. If not, $\theta^* \ne \Upsilon\theta^* \ne \Delta\theta^*$, and then $\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Upsilon\theta^*) > 0$ and $\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Delta\theta^*) > 0$. From (9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+2}, \Upsilon\theta^*) &= \mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta^*, \theta_{i+2}) = \mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta^*, \Delta\theta_{i+1}) \\ &\le \mathfrak{r}[\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \theta_{i+1}) + |\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Upsilon\theta^*) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \Delta\theta_{i+1})|] \\ &\le \mathfrak{r}[\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \theta_{i+1}) + |\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Upsilon\theta^*) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2})|]. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit as $i \to \infty$, we derive $\lim_{i\to\infty} \sup \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+2}, \Upsilon\theta^*) \le \mathfrak{r}\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Upsilon\theta^*)$. Thus, we have,

$$0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Upsilon\theta^*) \le \lim_{i\to\infty} \sup \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+2}, \Upsilon\theta^*) \le \mathfrak{r}\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Upsilon\theta^*).$$

and one can conclude that $\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Upsilon\theta^*) = 0$, which implies that $\Upsilon\theta^* = \theta^*$.On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+2}, \Delta\theta^*) &= \mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta_{i+1}, \Delta\theta^*) \\ &\le \mathfrak{r}[\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+1}) + |\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \Upsilon\theta_{i+1}) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Delta\theta^*)|] \\ &\le \mathfrak{r}[\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \theta_{i+1}) + |\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2}) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Delta\theta^*)|]. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit as $i \to \infty$, we derive $\lim_{i\to\infty} \sup\ \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+2}, \Delta\theta^*) \le \mathfrak{r}\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Delta\theta^*)$. Thus, we have,

$$0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Delta\theta^*) \le \lim_{i\to\infty} \sup\ \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+2}, \Delta\theta^*) \le \mathfrak{r}\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Delta\theta^*).$$

and one can conclude that $\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Upsilon\theta^*) = 0$, which implies that $\Delta\theta^* = \theta^*$. Hence, θ^* is a common fixed point of Υ and Δ. We shall now prove the uniqueness of θ^*. Suppose there exists another point $\vartheta^* \in \mathfrak{D}$ such that $\Upsilon\vartheta^* = \Delta\vartheta^* = \vartheta^*$. Then, by inequality (9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \vartheta^*) &= \mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta^*, \Delta\vartheta^*) \\ &\le \mathfrak{r}[\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \vartheta^*) + |\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Upsilon\theta^*) - \mathfrak{d}(\vartheta^*, \Delta\, \vartheta^*)|] \\ &\le \mathfrak{r}\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \vartheta^*) < d(\theta^*, \vartheta^*). \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, the common fixed point θ^* is unique.

If we take $\Upsilon = \Delta$ in contractive condition (9), then we obtain the following corollary.

***Corollary* 4.2** Let $(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{s})$ be a complete supermetric space and Δ be a self-mapping of $\mathfrak{D}$. If there exists a real number $\mathfrak{r} \in [0,1[$ such that

$$\mathfrak{d}(\Delta\theta, \Delta\vartheta) \leq \mathfrak{r}[\mathfrak{d}(\theta, \vartheta) + |\, \mathfrak{d}(\theta, \Delta\theta) - \mathfrak{d}(\vartheta, \Delta\vartheta)|] \tag{15}$$

for all $\theta, \vartheta \in \mathfrak{D}$. Then, Δ has a unique fixed point in $\mathfrak{D}$.

***Theorem* 4.3** Let $(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{s})$ be a complete supermetric space and Υ, Δ be self-mappings of $\mathfrak{D}$. If there exists a real number $\mathfrak{r} \in [0,1[$ such that

$$\mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta, \Delta\vartheta) \leq \mathfrak{r} \max\left\{\mathfrak{d}(\theta, \vartheta) + |\, \mathfrak{d}(\theta, \Upsilon\theta) - \mathfrak{d}(\vartheta, \Delta\vartheta)|, \frac{\mathfrak{d}(\theta, \Upsilon\theta) + \mathfrak{d}(\vartheta, \Delta\vartheta)}{2}\right\} \tag{16}$$

for all $\theta, \vartheta \in \mathfrak{D}$. Then, Υ and Δ have a unique common fixed point in $\mathfrak{D}$.

Proof Following the steps of proof of Theorem 3.1, we construct the sequence $\{\theta_i\}$ by iterating

$$\theta_{i+1} = \Upsilon\theta_i,\ \theta_{i+2} = \Delta\theta_{i+1} \text{ for all } i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

where $\theta_0 \in \mathfrak{D}$ is arbitrary point. Then, by (16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2}) &= \mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta_i, \Delta\theta_{i+1}) \\ &\leq \mathfrak{r} \max\left\{\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) + |\, \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \Upsilon\theta_i) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \Delta\theta_{i+1})|, \frac{\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \Upsilon\theta_i) + \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \Delta\theta_{i+1})}{2}\right\} \\ &= \mathfrak{r} \max\left\{\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) + |\, \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2})|, \frac{\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) + \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2})}{2}\right\} \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

If $\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) < d(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2})$ for some i, from (17), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2}) &\leq \mathfrak{r} \max\left\{\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) + \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2}), \frac{\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) + \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2})}{2}\right\} \\ &= \mathfrak{r} \max\left\{\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2}), \frac{\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) + \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2})}{2}\right\} \\ &\leq \mathfrak{r}\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2}), \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, $\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) > d(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2})$ and so from (17), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2}) &\leq \mathfrak{r} \max\left\{\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) + \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2}), \frac{\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) + \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2})}{2}\right\} \\ &\leq \mathfrak{r} \max\{2\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2}), \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1})\} \\ &= \mathfrak{r}[2\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2})]. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality gives

$$0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2}) \leq \frac{2\mathfrak{r}}{1+\mathfrak{r}} \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) = c\, \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}).$$

where $c = \frac{2\mathfrak{r}}{1+\mathfrak{r}}$. From this, we can write,

$$0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2}) \leq c_1\, \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) \leq {c_1}^2\, \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \theta_i) \leq \cdots \leq {c_1}^{i+1}\, \mathfrak{d}(\theta_0, \theta_1). \tag{18}$$

On the other hand, one writes

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) &= \mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta_{i-1}, \Delta\theta_i) \\ &\leq \mathfrak{r} \max\left\{\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \theta_i) + |\, \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \Upsilon\theta_{i-1}) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \Delta\theta_i)|, \frac{\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \Upsilon\theta_{i-1}) + \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \Delta\theta_i)}{2}\right\} \\ &= \mathfrak{r} \max\left\{\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i-1}) + |\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \theta_i) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1})|, \frac{\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \theta_i) + \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1})}{2}\right\} \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

If $\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \theta_i) < d(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1})$ for some i, from (19), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1}) &\le \mathfrak{r}\max\left\{\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i-1}) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1},\theta_i) + \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1}), \tfrac{\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1},\theta_i)+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})}{2}\right\}\\ &\le \mathfrak{r}\max\left\{\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1}), \tfrac{\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1},\theta_i)+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})}{2}\right\}\\ &\le \mathfrak{r}\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1}),\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, $\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1},\theta_i) > d(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})$ and so from (19), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1}) &\le \mathfrak{r}\max\left\{\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i-1}) + \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1},\theta_i) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1}), \tfrac{\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1},\theta_i)+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})}{2}\right\}\\ &\le \mathfrak{r}\max\{2\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i-1}) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1}), \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1},\theta_i)\}\\ &= \mathfrak{r}\,[2\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i-1}) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1})],\end{aligned}$$

which yields that,

$$0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta_i) \le \tfrac{2\mathfrak{r}}{1+\mathfrak{r}}\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i-1}) = c\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i-1}).$$

where $c_2 = \frac{2\mathfrak{r}}{1+\mathfrak{r}}$. Then, we can write

$$0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1}) \le c_2\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i-1}) \le {c_2}^2\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1},\theta_{i-2}) \le \cdots \le {c_2}^i\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_0,\theta_1). \tag{20}$$

By appealing to (11) and (13), we find that

$$0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1}) \le c^i\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_0,\theta_1). \tag{21}$$

Taking limit as i tends to infinity in inequality (19), we get

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta_{i+1}) = 0. \tag{22}$$

As already elaborated in the proof of Theorem 3.1, the classical procedure leads to $\{\theta_i\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in a complete supermetric space $(\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{d},\mathfrak{s})$. Hence, the sequence $\{\theta_i\}$ converges to $\theta^* \in \mathfrak{D}$ and then $\lim_{i\to\infty}\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i,\theta^*) = 0$. Further, we show that θ^* is the fixed point of Υ and Δ. If not, $\theta^* \ne \Upsilon\theta^* \ne \Delta\theta^*$, and then $\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Upsilon\theta^*) > 0$ and $\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Delta\theta^*) > 0$. From (16), we have

$$\begin{aligned}0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+2},\Upsilon\theta^*) &= \mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta^*,\theta_{i+2}) = \mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta^*,\Delta\theta_{i+1})\\ &\le \mathfrak{r}\max\left\{\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\theta_{i+1}) + |\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Upsilon\theta^*) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\Delta\theta_{i+1})|, \tfrac{\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Upsilon\theta^*)+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\Delta\theta_{i+1})}{2}\right\}\\ &= \mathfrak{r}\max\left\{\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\theta_{i+1}) + |\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Upsilon\theta^*) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta_{i+2})|, \tfrac{\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Upsilon\theta^*)+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta_{i+2})}{2}\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Taking limit as $i \to \infty$, we derive $\limsup_{i\to\infty}\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+2},\Upsilon\theta^*) \le \mathfrak{r}\max\left\{\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Upsilon\theta^*), \frac{\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Upsilon\theta^*)}{2}\right\}$. Thus, we have,

$$0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Upsilon\theta^*) \le \limsup_{i\to\infty}\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+2},\Upsilon\theta^*) \le \mathfrak{r}\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Upsilon\theta^*).$$

and one can conclude that $\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Upsilon\theta^*) = 0$, which implies that $\Upsilon\theta^* = \theta^*$.On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+2},\Delta\theta^*) &= \mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta_{i+1},\Delta\theta^*)\\ &\le \mathfrak{r}\max\left\{\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta^*) + |\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\Upsilon\theta_{i+1}) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Delta\theta^*)|, \tfrac{\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\Upsilon\theta_{i+1})+\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Delta\theta^*)}{2}\right\}\\ &= \mathfrak{r}\max\left\{\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta^*) + |\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta_{i+2}) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Delta\theta^*)|, \tfrac{\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta_{i+2})+\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Delta\theta^*)}{2}\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Taking limit as $i \to \infty$, we derive $\limsup_{i\to\infty}\ \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+2},\Delta\theta^*) \le \mathfrak{r}\max\left\{\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Delta\theta^*), \frac{\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Delta\theta^*)}{2}\right\}$. Thus, we have,

$$0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Delta\theta^*) \le \limsup_{i\to\infty}\ \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+2},\Delta\theta^*) \le \mathfrak{r}\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Delta\theta^*).$$

and one can conclude that $\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Upsilon\theta^*) = 0$, which implies that $\Delta\theta^* = \theta^*$. Hence, θ^* is a common fixed point of Υ and Δ. We shall now prove the uniqueness of θ^*. Suppose there exists another point $\vartheta^* \in \mathfrak{D}$ such that $\Upsilon\vartheta^* = \Delta\vartheta^* = \vartheta^*$. Then, by inequality (16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \vartheta^*) &= \mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta^*, \Delta\vartheta^*) \\ &\leq \mathfrak{r}\max\left\{\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \vartheta^*) + |\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Upsilon\theta^*) - \mathfrak{d}(\vartheta^*, \Delta\,\vartheta^*)|, \frac{\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Upsilon\theta^*) + \mathfrak{d}(\vartheta^*, \Delta\,\vartheta^*)}{2}\right\} \\ &= \mathfrak{r}\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \vartheta^*) < d(\theta^*, \vartheta^*). \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, the common fixed point is unique.

If we take $\Upsilon = \Delta$ in condition (16), then we obtain the following corollary.

***Corollary* 4.4** Let $(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{s})$ be a complete supermetric space and Δ be a self-mapping of $\mathfrak{D}$. If there exists real number $\mathfrak{r} \in [0,1[$ such that

$$\mathfrak{d}(\Delta\theta, \Delta\vartheta) \leq \mathfrak{r}\max\left\{\mathfrak{d}(\theta, \vartheta) + |\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta, \Delta\theta) - \mathfrak{d}(\vartheta, \Delta\vartheta)|, \frac{\mathfrak{d}(\theta, \Delta\theta) + \mathfrak{d}(\vartheta, \Delta\vartheta)}{2}\right\} \tag{23}$$

for all $\theta, \vartheta \in \mathfrak{D}$. Then, Δ has a unique fixed point in $\mathfrak{D}$.

***Theorem* 4.5** Let $(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{s})$ be a complete supermetric space and Υ, Δ be self-mappings of $\mathfrak{D}$. If there exist real number $\mathfrak{r}_1, \mathfrak{r}_2 \in [0,1[$ with $\mathfrak{r}_1 + \mathfrak{r}_2 < 1$ such that

$$\mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta, \Delta\vartheta) \leq \mathfrak{r}_1[\mathfrak{d}(\theta, \vartheta) + |\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta, \Upsilon\theta) - \mathfrak{d}(\vartheta, \Delta\vartheta)|] + \mathfrak{r}_2\frac{[1 + \mathfrak{d}(\theta, \Upsilon\theta)]\mathfrak{d}(\vartheta, \Delta\vartheta)}{1 + \mathfrak{d}(\theta, \vartheta)} \tag{24}$$

for all $\theta, \vartheta \in \mathfrak{D}$. Then, Υ and Δ have a unique common fixed point in $\mathfrak{D}$.

Proof Following the steps of proof of Theorem 3.1, we construct the sequence $\{\theta_i\}$ by iterating

$$\theta_{i+1} = \Upsilon\theta_i,\ \theta_{i+2} = \Delta\theta_{i+1} \text{ for all } i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

where $\theta_0 \in \mathfrak{D}$ is arbitrary point. Then, by (24), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2}) &= \mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta_i, \Delta\theta_{i+1}) \\ &\leq \mathfrak{r}_1[\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) + |\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \Upsilon\theta_i) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \Delta\theta_{i+1})|] + \mathfrak{r}_2\frac{[1 + \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \Upsilon\theta_i)]\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \Delta\theta_{i+1})}{1 + \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1})} \\ &= \mathfrak{r}_1[\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) + |\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2})|] + \mathfrak{r}_2\frac{[1 + \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1})]\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2})}{1 + \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1})} \\ &\leq \mathfrak{r}_1[\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) + |\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2})|] + \mathfrak{r}_2\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2}) \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

If $\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) < d(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2})$ for some i, from (25), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2}) &\leq \mathfrak{r}_1[\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) + \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2})] + \mathfrak{r}_2\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2}) \\ &= \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2}) + \mathfrak{r}_2\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2}) \\ &= (\mathfrak{r}_1 + \mathfrak{r}_2)\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2}), \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, $\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) > d(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2})$ and so from (25), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2}) &\leq \mathfrak{r}_1[\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) + \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2})] + \mathfrak{r}_2\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2}) \\ &= \mathfrak{r}_1[2\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2})] + \mathfrak{r}_2\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2}) \\ &= 2\mathfrak{r}_1\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) - \mathfrak{r}_1\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2}) + \mathfrak{r}_2\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2}) \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality gives,

$$0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2}) \leq \frac{2\mathfrak{r}_1}{1 + \mathfrak{r}_1 - \mathfrak{r}_2}\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) = c\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}).$$

where $c = \frac{2\mathfrak{r}_1}{1+\mathfrak{r}_1-\mathfrak{r}_2}$. From this, we can write,

$$0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2}) \leq c_1 \, \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) \leq {c_1}^2 \, \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \theta_i) \leq \cdots \leq {c_1}^{i+1} \, \mathfrak{d}(\theta_0, \theta_1). \tag{25}$$

On the other hand, one writes

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) &= \mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta_{i-1}, \Delta\theta_i) \\ &\leq \mathfrak{r}_1[\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \theta_i) + |\, \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \Upsilon\theta_{i-1}) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \Delta\theta_i)|] + \mathfrak{r}_2 \frac{[1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \Upsilon\theta_{i-1})]\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \Delta\theta_i)}{1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \theta_i)} \\ &= \mathfrak{r}_1[\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \theta_i) + |\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \theta_i) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1})|] + \mathfrak{r}_2 \frac{[1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \theta_i)]\mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1})}{1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \theta_i)} \\ &\leq \mathfrak{r}_1[\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \theta_i) + |\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \theta_i) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1})|] + \mathfrak{r}_2 \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

If $\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \theta_i) < d(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1})$ for some i, from (26), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) &\leq \mathfrak{r}_1[\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \theta_i) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \theta_i) + \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1})] + \mathfrak{r}_2 \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) \\ &= \mathfrak{r}_1 \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) + \mathfrak{r}_2 \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) \\ &= (\mathfrak{r}_1 + \mathfrak{r}_2) \, \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}), \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, $\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \theta_i) > d(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1})$ and so from (26), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) &\leq \mathfrak{r}_1[\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \theta_i) + \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \theta_i) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1})] + \mathfrak{r}_2 \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) \\ &= \mathfrak{r}_1[2\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \theta_i) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1})] + \mathfrak{r}_2 \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}). \end{aligned}$$

which yields that,

$$0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_i) \leq \frac{2\mathfrak{r}_1}{1+\mathfrak{r}_1-\mathfrak{r}_2} \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i-1}) = c \, \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i-1}).$$

where $c_2 = \frac{2\mathfrak{r}_1}{1+\mathfrak{r}_1-\mathfrak{r}_2}$. Then, we can write

$$0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) \leq c_2 \, \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i-1}) \leq {c_2}^2 \, \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i-1}, \theta_{i-2}) \leq \cdots \leq {c_2}^i \, \mathfrak{d}(\theta_0, \theta_1). \tag{27}$$

By appealing to (25) and (27), we find that

$$0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) \leq c^i \, \mathfrak{d}(\theta_0, \theta_1). \tag{28}$$

Taking limit as i tends to infinity in inequality (28), we get

$$\lim_{i \to \infty} \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) = 0. \tag{29}$$

As already elaborated in the proof of Theorem 3.1, the classical procedure leads to $\{\theta_i\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in a complete supermetric space $(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{s})$. Hence, the sequence $\{\theta_i\}$ converges to $\theta^* \in \mathfrak{D}$ and then $\lim_{i \to \infty} \mathfrak{d}(\theta_i, \theta^*) = 0$. Further, we show that θ^* is the fixed point of Υ and Δ. If not, $\theta^* \neq \Upsilon\theta^* \neq \Delta\theta^*$, and then $\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Upsilon\theta^*) > 0$ and $\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Delta\theta^*) > 0$. From (24), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+2}, \Upsilon\theta^*) &= \mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta^*, \theta_{i+2}) = \mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta^*, \Delta\theta_{i+1}) \\ &\leq \mathfrak{r}_1[\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \theta_{i+1}) + |\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Upsilon\theta^*) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \Delta\theta_{i+1})|] + \mathfrak{r}_2 \frac{[1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Upsilon\theta^*)]\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \Delta\theta_{i+1})}{1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \theta_{i+1})} \\ &= \mathfrak{r}_1[\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \theta_{i+1}) + |\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Upsilon\theta^*) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2})|] + \mathfrak{r}_2 \frac{[1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Upsilon\theta^*)]\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2})}{1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \theta_{i+1})}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking limit as $i \to \infty$, we derive $\lim_{i \to \infty} \sup \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+2}, \Upsilon\theta^*) \leq \mathfrak{r}_1 \mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Upsilon\theta^*)$. Thus, we have,

$$0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Upsilon\theta^*) \leq \lim_{i \to \infty} \sup \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+2}, \Upsilon\theta^*) \leq \mathfrak{r}_1 \mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Upsilon\theta^*).$$

and one can conclude that $\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Upsilon\theta^*) = 0$, which implies that $\Upsilon\theta^* = \theta^*$.On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+2}, \Delta\theta^*) &= \mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta_{i+1}, \Delta\theta^*) \\ &\leq \mathfrak{r}_1[\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta^*) + |\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \Upsilon\theta_{i+1}) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Delta\theta^*)|] + \mathfrak{r}_1 \frac{[1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\Upsilon\theta_{i+1})]\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Delta\theta^*)}{1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta^*)} \\ &= \mathfrak{r}_1[\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta^*) + |\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1}, \theta_{i+2}) - \mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Delta\theta^*)|] + \mathfrak{r}_1 \frac{[1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta_{i+2})]\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Delta\theta^*)}{1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+1},\theta^*)}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking limit as $i \to \infty$, we derive $\limsup_{i\to\infty} \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+2}, \Delta\theta^*) \leq \mathfrak{r}_1\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Delta\theta^*)$. Thus, we have,

$$0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Delta\theta^*) \leq \limsup_{i\to\infty} \mathfrak{d}(\theta_{i+2}, \Delta\theta^*) \leq \mathfrak{r}_1\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Delta\theta^*).$$

and one can conclude that $\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Upsilon\theta^*) = 0$, which implies that $\Delta\theta^* = \theta^*$. Hence, θ^* is a common fixed point of Υ and Δ. We shall now prove the uniqueness of θ^*. Suppose there exists another point $\vartheta^* \in \mathfrak{D}$ such that $\Upsilon\vartheta^* = \Delta\vartheta^* = \vartheta^*$. Then, by inequality (24), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \vartheta^*) &= \mathfrak{d}(\Upsilon\theta^*, \Delta\vartheta^*) \\ &\leq \mathfrak{r}_1[\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \vartheta^*) + |\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \Upsilon\theta^*) - \mathfrak{d}(\vartheta^*, \Delta\,\vartheta^*)|] + \mathfrak{r}_1 \frac{[1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\Upsilon\theta^*)]\mathfrak{d}(\vartheta^*,\Delta\,\vartheta^*)}{1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*,\vartheta^*)} \\ &= \mathfrak{r}_1\mathfrak{d}(\theta^*, \vartheta^*) < d(\theta^*, \vartheta^*). \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, the common fixed point is unique.

If we take $\Upsilon = \Delta$ in condition (24), then we obtain the following corollary.

***Corollary* 4.6** Let $(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{s})$ be a complete supermetric space and Δ be a self-mapping of $\mathfrak{D}$. If there exist real numbers $\mathfrak{r}_1, \mathfrak{r}_2 \in [0,1[$ with $\mathfrak{r}_1 + \mathfrak{r}_2 < 1$ such that

$$\mathfrak{d}(\Delta\theta, \Delta\vartheta) \leq \mathfrak{r}_1[\mathfrak{d}(\theta, \vartheta) + |\,\mathfrak{d}(\theta, \Delta\theta) - \mathfrak{d}(\vartheta, \Delta\vartheta)|] + \mathfrak{r}_2 \frac{[1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\Delta\theta)]\,\mathfrak{d}(\vartheta,\Delta\vartheta)}{1+\mathfrak{d}(\theta,\vartheta)} \tag{30}$$

for all $\theta, \vartheta \in \mathfrak{D}$. Then, Δ has a unique fixed point in $\mathfrak{D}$.

If we take $\mathfrak{r}_2 = 0$ and $\mathfrak{r}_1 = \mathfrak{r}$ in condition (30), then we obtain the following corollary.

***Corollary* 4.7** Let $(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{s})$ be a complete supermetric space and Δ be a self-mapping of $\mathfrak{D}$. If there exists a real number $\mathfrak{r}$ with $0 \leq \mathfrak{r} < 1$ such that

$$\mathfrak{d}(\Delta\theta, \Delta\vartheta) \leq \mathfrak{r}\mathfrak{d}(\theta, \vartheta) \tag{31}$$

for all $\theta, \vartheta \in \mathfrak{D}$. Then, Δ has a unique fixed point in $\mathfrak{D}$

Acknowledgements

The author is very grateful to the reviewers for their insightful reading the manuscript and valuable comments.

Competing Interests

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

References

[1] Czerwik S.: Contraction mappings in b-metric spaces. Acta Math. Inform. Univ. Ostrav. 1993;1:5–11.

[2] Dass B.K., Gupta S.: An extension of Banach contraction principle through rational expressions, Indian J. Pure Appl. Math. 1975;6:1455-1458.

[3] Jleli M, Samet B.: A generalized metric space and related fixed-point theorems. Fixed Point Theory Appl. 2015;61.

[4] Matthews S. G.: Partial metric topology, Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences. 1994;728(1): 183–197.

[5] Reich S.: Kannan's fixed-point theorem. Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. 1971;4(4):1–11.

[6] Karapinar E.: A note on a rational form contraction with discontinuities at fixed points. Fixed Point Theory. 2020;21:211–220.

[7] Fulga A, Proca A.: A new Generalization of Wardowski Fixed Point Theorem in Complete Metric Spaces. Adv. Theory Nonlinear Anal. Its Appl. 2017;1:57–63.

[8] Alqahtani B., Fulga A.: Karapınar E, A short note on the common fixed points of the Geraghty contraction of type ES, T. Demonstr. Math. 2018;51:233–240.

[9] Fulga, A., Karapınar, E.: Revisiting of some outstanding metric fixed point theorems via E-contraction. Analele Univ. Ovidius Constanta-Ser. Mat. 2018;26:73–97.

[10] Karapınar E., Fulga A., Aydi H.: Study on Pata E-contractions. Adv. Differ. Equ. 2020;539.

[11] Sirajo Y.: Common fixed points of contraction mapping in metric space. Pan American Journal of mathematics. 2021;31(1):73-82.

[12] Fisher B. Khan M.S.: Common Fixed Points and Constant Mappings, Studia Sci. Math. Hungar. 1978; 11:467-470.

[13] Shagari et. al.: Common fixed points of L-fuzzy Maps for Meir-Keeler type contractions. J. Adv. Math. Stud.m 2019;12(2):218-229.

[14] Tiwari S.K., Dubey R.P., Dubey A.K.: Cone Metric Spaces and Common Fixed-Point Theorems for Generalized Jaggi and Das–Gupta Contractive Mapping. Int. j. of Mathematical Archive. 2013;4(10): 93-100.

[15] Karapinar E., Fulga A.: Contraction in Rational Forms in the Framework of Super Metric Spaces, MPDI, Mathematic. 2022;10; 3077:1-12.

[16] Alqahtani B., Fulga A., Karapınar E.: Sehgal Type Contractions on b-Metric Space. Symmetry. 2018;10: 560.

[17] Alqahtani B., Fulga A., Karapinar E., Rakocevic V.: Contractions with rational inequalities in the extended b-metric space. J. Inequal. Appl. 2019;220.

[18] Huang H., Singh Y.M., Khan M.S., Radenovic S.: Rational type contractions in extended b-metric spaces. Symmetry. 2021;13: 614.

[19] Kannan, R.: Some results on fixed-point s. Bull. Calcutta Math. Soc. 1968, 60, 71–76.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here (Please copy paste the total link in your browser address bar)
https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/115155