

Article

Some fixed point theorems for F -expansive mapping in generalized metric spaces

Mohamed Rossafi^{1,*} and Abdelkarim Kari²

¹ LASMA Laboratory Department of Mathematics Faculty of Sciences, Dhar El Mahraz University Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah, Fes, Morocco.

² Laboratory of Algebra, Analysis and Applications Faculty of Sciences Ben M'Sik, Hassan II University, Casablanca, Morocco.; abdkrimkariprofes@gmail.com.

* Correspondence: mohamed.rossafi@usmba.ac.ma

Academic Editor: Antonella Nastasi

Received: 31 February 2021; Accepted: 23 July 2021; Published: 13 August 2021.

Abstract: In this paper, we present the notion of generalized F -expansive mapping in complete rectangular metric spaces and study various fixed point theorems for such mappings. The findings of this paper, generalize and improve many existing results in the literature.

Keywords: Fixed point; rectangular metric spaces; F -expansive mappings.

MSC: 47H10, 54H25.

1. Introduction

The fixed point theory is a very interesting research area in due to its wide range of applicability, to resolve diverse problems emanating from the theory of nonlinear differential equations and integral equations.

Wardowski [1], generalized the famous Banach theorem [2] for F -contraction on metric spaces, several mathematicians extended this new notion for contraction on metric spaces [3–6].

The concept of a rectangular metric space was introduced by Branciari in [7]. After that, several interesting results about the existence of fixed points in rectangular metric spaces have been obtained [8–11]. Recently, Kari *et al.*, [12], obtained some results for generalized $\theta - \phi$ -expansive mapping in rectangular metric spaces.

In 1984, Wang *et al.*, [13], presented some interesting work on expansion mappings in metric spaces. Recently, Kumar *et al.*, [14], introduced a new concept of (α, ψ) -expansive mappings and established some fixed point theorems for such mapping in complete rectangular metric spaces.

In this paper, inspired by the idea of F -contraction introduced by Wardowski [1] in metric spaces, we presented generalized F -expansive mapping and establish various fixed point theorems for such mappings in complete rectangular metric spaces. Our theorems extend, generalize and improve many existing results.

2. Preliminaries

By an expansion mappings [13] on a metric space (X, d) , we understand a mapping $T : X \rightarrow X$ satisfying for all $x, y \in X$:

$$d(Tx, Ty) \geq kd(x, y),$$

where k is a real in $]1, +\infty[$.

In 2000 Branciari [7] introduced the concept of rectangular metric spaces.

Definition 1. [7] Let X be a non-empty set and $d : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a mapping such that for all $x, y \in X$ and for all distinct points $u, v \in X$, each of them different from x and y , on has

- (i) $d(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $x = y$;
- (ii) $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$ for all distinct points $x, y \in X$;

(iii) $d(x, y) \leq d(x, u) + d(u, v) + d(v, y)$ (the rectangular inequality).

Then (X, d) is called a rectangular metric space.

Definition 2. [15] Let $T : X \rightarrow X$ and $\alpha, \eta : X \times X \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$. We say that T is a triangular (α, η) -admissible mapping if

$$(T_1) \quad \alpha(x, y) \geq 1 \Rightarrow \alpha(Tx, Ty) \geq 1, x, y \in X;$$

$$(T_2) \quad \eta(x, y) \leq 1 \Rightarrow \eta(Tx, Ty) \leq 1, x, y \in X;$$

$$(T_3) \quad \begin{cases} \alpha(x, y) \geq 1 \\ \alpha(y, z) \geq 1 \end{cases} \Rightarrow \alpha(x, z) \geq 1 \text{ for all } x, y, z \in X;$$

$$(T_4) \quad \begin{cases} \eta(x, y) \leq 1 \\ \eta(y, z) \leq 1 \end{cases} \Rightarrow \eta(x, z) \leq 1 \text{ for all } x, y, z \in X.$$

Definition 3. [15] Let (X, d) be a rectangular metric space and let $\alpha, \eta : X \times X \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ be two mappings. Then

- (a) T is α -continuous mapping on (X, d) , if for given point $x \in X$ and sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X , $x_n \rightarrow x$ and $\alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, imply that $Tx_n \rightarrow Tx$.
- (b) T is η sub-continuous mapping on (X, d) , if for given point $x \in X$ and sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X , $x_n \rightarrow x$ and $\eta(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, imply that $Tx_n \rightarrow Tx$.
- (c) T is (α, η) -continuous mapping on (X, d) , if for given point $x \in X$ and sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X , $x_n \rightarrow x$ and $\alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 1$ or $\eta(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, imply that $Tx_n \rightarrow Tx$.

Recently Hussain *et al.*, gives the following definition [16]:

Definition 4. [16] Let (X, d) be a rectangular metric space and let $\alpha, \eta : X \times X \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ be two mappings. The space X is said to be

- (a) α -complete, if every Cauchy sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X with $\alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, converges in X .
- (b) η -sup-complete, if every Cauchy sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X with $\eta(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, converges in X .
- (c) (α, η) -complete, if every Cauchy sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X with $\alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 1$ or $\eta(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, converges in X .

Definition 5. [16] Let (X, d) be a rectangular metric space and let $\alpha, \eta : X \times X \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ be two mappings. The space (X, d) is said to be

- (a) (X, d) is α -regular, if $x_n \rightarrow x$, where $\alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, implies $\alpha(x_n, x) \geq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (b) (X, d) is η -sub-regular, if $x_n \rightarrow x$, where $\eta(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, implies $\eta(x_n, x) \leq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (c) (X, d) is (α, η) -regular, if $x_n \rightarrow x$, where $\alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 1$ or $\eta(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, imply that $\alpha(x_n, x) \geq 1$ or $\eta(x_n, x) \leq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

The following definition introduced by Wardowski [1]:

Definition 6. [1] Let \mathbb{F} be the family of all functions $F : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

- (i) F is strictly increasing;
- (ii) for each sequence $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of positive numbers $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = 0$, if and only if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(x_n) = -\infty$;
- (iii) there exists $k \in]0, 1[$ such that $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} x^k F(x) = 0$.

Recently, Piri and Kuman [4] extended the result of Wardowski [1] by changing the condition (iii) in the Definition 6 as follow:

Definition 7. [4] Let Γ be the family of all functions $F : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

- (i) F is strictly increasing;
- (ii) for each sequence $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of positive numbers $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = 0$, if and only if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(x_n) = -\infty$;
- (iii) F is continuous.

3. Fixed point theorem on rectangular metric spaces

We introduce a new notion of generalized F -expansive mapping in the context of rectangular metric spaces as follows:

Definition 8. Let (X, d) be a rectangular metric space and $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a given mapping. T is said to be generalized F -expansive mapping if there exists $F \in \mathbb{F}$ and $\tau > 0$ such that

$$M(x, y) > 0 \Rightarrow F(d(Tx, Ty)) - \tau \geq F(M(x, y)), \text{ for all } x, y \in X, \tag{1}$$

where $M(x, y) = \min \{d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty), d(x, Ty)\}$.

Theorem 1. Let (X, d) be a $(\alpha - \eta)$ -complete generalized metric space, and $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a bijective, generalized F -expansive mapping satisfying following conditions

- (i) T^{-1} is a triangular (α, η) -admissible mapping;
- (ii) there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $\alpha(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \geq 1$ or $\eta(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \leq 1$;
- (iii) T is a (α, η) -continuous.

Then T has a fixed point. Moreover, T has a unique fixed point when $\alpha(z, u) \geq 1$ or $\eta(z, u) \leq 1$ for all $z, u \in \text{Fix}(T)$.

Proof. Let $x_0 \in X$ such that $\alpha(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \geq 1$ or $\eta(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \leq 1$. We define the sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X by $x_n = Tx_{n+1}$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Since T^{-1} is an triangular (α, η) -admissible mapping, then

$$\alpha(x_0, x_1) = \alpha(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \geq 1 \Rightarrow \alpha(T^{-1}x_0, T^{-1}x_1) = \alpha(x_1, x_2) \geq 1,$$

or

$$\eta(x_0, x_1) = \eta(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \leq 1 \Rightarrow \eta(T^{-1}x_0, T^{-1}x_1) = \eta(x_1, x_2) \leq 1.$$

Continuing this process we have

$$\alpha(x_{n-1}, x_n) \geq 1,$$

or

$$\eta(x_{n-1}, x_n) \leq 1,$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By (T_3) and (T_4) , one has.

$$\alpha(x_m, x_n) \geq 1 \text{ or } \eta(x_m, x_n) \leq 1, \quad \forall m, n \in \mathbb{N}, m \neq n. \tag{2}$$

Suppose that there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x_{n_0} = Tx_{n_0}$. Then x_{n_0} is a fixed point of T and the prove is finished. Hence, we assume that $x_n \neq Tx_n$, i.e., $d(x_{n-1}, x_n) > 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Step 1: We shall prove

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} d(x_n, x_{n+1}) = 0.$$

Applying inequality (1) with $x = x_n$ and $y = x_{n+1}$, we obtain

$$F(d(x_{n-1}, x_n)) = F(d(Tx_n, Tx_{n+1})) > F(d(Tx_n, Tx_{n+1})) - \tau \geq F(M(x_n, x_{n+1})), \tag{3}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} M(x_n, x_{n+1}) &= \min \{d(x_n, x_{n+1}), d(x_n, Tx_n), d(x_{n+1}, Tx_{n+1}), d(x_n, Tx_{n+1})\} \\ &= \min \{d(x_n, x_{n+1}), d(x_n, x_{n-1}), d(x_{n+1}, x_n), d(x_n, x_n)\} \\ &= \min \{d(x_n, x_{n+1}), d(x_n, x_{n-1})\}. \end{aligned}$$

If for some n , $M(x_n, x_{n+1}) = d(x_n, x_{n-1})$, then the inequality (3), we get

$$F(d(x_{n-1}, x_n)) > F(d(Tx_n, Tx_{n+1})) - \tau \geq F(d(x_{n-1}, x_n)). \quad (4)$$

It is a contradiction. Hence $M(x_n, x_{n+1}) = d(x_n, x_{n+1})$. Therefore

$$F(d(Tx_n, Tx_{n+1})) - \tau \geq F(d(x_n, x_{n+1})). \quad (5)$$

Thus,

$$F(d(x_n, x_{n+1})) \leq F(d(x_{n-1}, x_n)) - \tau \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (6)$$

Continuing this process, we get

$$F(d(x_n, x_{n+1})) \leq F(d(x_{n-1}, x_n)) - \tau \leq \dots \leq F(d(x_0, x_1)) - n\tau. \quad (7)$$

Now, by (6) and the condition F_3 of Definition 2, we deduce that

$$d(x_n, x_{n+1}) < d(x_{n-1}, x_n). \quad (8)$$

Taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (7) and using the condition F_2 , we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} d(x_n, x_{n+1}) = 0. \quad (9)$$

Step 2: Now, we shall prove

$$x_n \neq x_m, \text{ for all } m, n \in \mathbb{N}, m \neq n. \quad (10)$$

On the contrary, assume that $x_n = x_m$ for some $n = m + k > m$. Indeed, suppose that $x_n = x_m$, so we have

$$x_n = Tx_{n+1} = Tx_{m+1} = x_m.$$

Denote $d_n = d(x_n, x_{n+1})$. By the inequality (8), we have

$$d_n < d_{n-1}.$$

Continuing this process, we get

$$d_m = d_n < d_{n-1} < \dots < d_m. \quad (11)$$

Which is a contradiction. Thus (10) hold.

Step 3: We prove shall

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} d(x_n, x_{n+2}) = 0. \quad (12)$$

Applying inequality (1) with $x = x_n, y = x_{n+2}$, we obtain

$$F(d(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1})) = F(d(Tx_n, Tx_{n+2})) > F(d(Tx_n, Tx_{n+2})) - \tau \geq F(M(x_n, x_{n+2})), \quad (13)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} M(x_n, x_{n+2}) &= \min \{d(x_n, x_{n+2}), d(x_n, Tx_n), d(x_{n+2}, Tx_{n+2}), d(x_n, Tx_{n+2})\} \\ &= \min \{d(x_n, x_{n+2}), d(x_n, x_{n-1}), d(x_{n+2}, x_{n+1}), d(x_n, x_{n+1})\} \\ &= \min \{d(x_n, x_{n+2}), d(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2})\}. \end{aligned}$$

Take $a_n = d(x_n, x_{n+2})$ and $b_n = d(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2})$. Thus, by (13), one can write

$$F(a_{n-1}) = F(d(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1})) = F(d(Tx_n, Tx_{n+2})) > F(d(Tx_n, Tx_{n+2})) - \tau \geq F[M(x_n, x_{n+2})] = F(\min\{a_n, b_n\}).$$

Therefore,

$$a_{n-1} \geq \min \{a_n, b_n\}.$$

Again, by (8)

$$b_{n-1} \geq b_n \geq \min \{a_n, b_n\}.$$

Which implies that

$$\min \{a_n, b_n\} \leq \min \{a_{n-1}, b_{n-1}\}, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then the sequence $\min \{a_n, b_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is monotone non increasing. Thus, there exists $\lambda \geq 0$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min \{a_n, b_n\} = \lambda.$$

Assume that $\lambda > 0$. By (9), we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min \{a_n, b_n\} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min \{a_n, b_n\} = \lambda.$$

Taking the $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty}$ in (13), and using (F₃), we obtain

$$F(\lambda) = F\left(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{a_{n-1}\}\right) \geq F\left(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{a_n\}\right) > F\left(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{a_n\}\right) - \tau \geq F\left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min \{a_n, b_n\}\right),$$

which implies that

$$F(\lambda) > F(\lambda) - \tau \geq F(\lambda).$$

Therefore,

$$F(\lambda) < F(\lambda).$$

By (F₁), we get

$$\lambda < \lambda.$$

It is a contradiction, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, x_{n+2}) = 0. \tag{14}$$

Step 4: We shall prove that $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in (X, d) , that is

$$\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, x_m) = 0 \text{ for all } n \neq m. \tag{15}$$

If otherwise there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ for which we can find sequence of positive integers $\{x_{n(k)}\}_k$ and $\{x_{m(k)}\}_k$ of $\{x_n\}$ such that, for all positive integers $k, n(k) > m(k) > k$,

$$d(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)}) \geq \varepsilon \text{ and } d(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)-1}) < \varepsilon. \tag{16}$$

Now, using (9), (14), (16) and the rectangular inequality, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &\leq d(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)}) \\ &\leq d(x_{m(k)}, x_{m(k)+1}) + d(x_{m(k)+1}, x_{m(k)-1}) + d(x_{m(k)-1}, x_{n(k)}) \\ &< d(x_{m(k)}, x_{m(k)+1}) + d(x_{m(k)+1}, x_{m(k)-1}) + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)}) = \varepsilon. \tag{17}$$

Now, by rectangular inequality, we have

$$d(x_{m(k)+1}, x_{n(k)+1}) \leq d(x_{m(k)+1}, x_{m(k)}) + d(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)}) + d(x_{n(k)}, x_{n(k)+1}). \tag{18}$$

$$d(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)}) \leq d(x_{m(k)}, x_{m(k)+1}) + d(x_{m(k)+1}, x_{n(k)+1}) + d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{n(k)}). \tag{19}$$

$$\varepsilon \leq d(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)}) \leq d(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)-1}) + d(x_{n(k)-1}, x_{n(k)+1}) + d(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{n(k)}). \tag{20}$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ in the above inequalities, using (9), (16) and (17), we obtain

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d(x_{m(k)+1}, x_{n(k)+1}) = \varepsilon, \tag{21}$$

and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)-1}) = \varepsilon. \tag{22}$$

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned} M(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)}) &= \min \left\{ d(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)}), d(x_{m(k)}, Tx_{m(k)}), d(x_{n(k)}, Tx_{n(k)}), d(x_{m(k)}, Tx_{n(k)}) \right\} \\ &= \min \left\{ d(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)}), d(x_{m(k)}, x_{m(k)-1}), d(x_{n(k)}, x_{n(k)-1}), d(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)-1}) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ in the above inequalities and using (9), (17) and (22), we get that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} M(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)}) = \varepsilon. \tag{23}$$

By (21), let $A = \frac{\varepsilon}{2} > 0$, from the definition of the limit, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$|d(x_{m(k)+1}, x_{n(k)+1}) - \varepsilon| \leq A \quad \forall n \geq n_0.$$

This implies that

$$d(x_{m(k)+1}, x_{n(k)+1}) \geq A > 0 \quad \forall n \geq n_0,$$

and by (23), let $B = \frac{\varepsilon}{2} > 0$, from the definition of the limit, there exists $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$M(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)}) \geq B > 0 \quad \forall n \geq n_1.$$

Applying (1) with $x = x_{m(k)}$ and $y = x_{n(k)}$, we obtain

$$F(d(x_{m(k)+1}, x_{n(k)+1})) > F(d(x_{m(k)+1}, x_{n(k)+1})) - \tau \geq F(M(d(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)})))$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ the above inequality and using (F3), we obtain

$$F\left(\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d(x_{m(k)+1}, x_{n(k)+1})\right) > F\left(\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d(x_{m(k)+1}, x_{n(k)+1})\right) - \tau \geq F\left(\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} M(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)})\right),$$

Therefore,

$$F(\varepsilon) < F(\varepsilon).$$

It is a contradiction. Then

$$\lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} d(x_m, x_n) = 0.$$

It follows that $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in X . Since (X, d) is (α, η) -complete and

$$\alpha(x_{n-1}, x_n) \geq 1 \text{ or } \eta(x_{n-1}, x_n) \leq 1,$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the there exists $z \in X$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, z) = 0.$$

Step 5: We show that $d(Tz, z) = 0$ arguing by contradiction, we assume that

$$d(Tz, z) > 0.$$

By rectangular inequality we get,

$$d(Tx_n, Tz) \leq d(Tx_n, x_n) + d(x_n, z) + d(z, Tz), \tag{24}$$

$$d(z, Tz) \leq d(z, x_n) + d(x_n, Tx_n) + d(Tx_n, Tz). \tag{25}$$

By letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ in inequality (24) and (25) we obtain

$$d(z, Tz) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(Tx_n, Tz) \leq d(z, Tz).$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(Tx_n, Tz) = d(z, Tz). \tag{26}$$

Since T is (α, η) -continuous, then $Tx_n \rightarrow Tz$ i.e $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(Tx_n, Tz) = 0$. Hence $d(Tz, z) = 0$, so $Tz = z$.

Step 6: (Uniqueness) Now, suppose that $z, u \in X$ are two fixed points of T such that $u \neq z$ and $\alpha(z, u) \geq 1$ or $\eta(z, u) \leq 1$. Therefore, we have

$$d(Tz, Tu) = d(z, u) > 0.$$

Applying (1) with $x = z$ and $y = u$, we have

$$F(d(Tu, Tz)) - \tau \geq F(M(z, u)),$$

where

$$M(z, u) = \min \{d(z, u), d(z, Tz), d(u, Tu), d(z, Tu)\} = d(z, u).$$

Therefore, we have

$$F(d(z, u)) > F(d(u, z)) - \tau \geq F(d(z, u)).$$

It is a contradiction. Therefore $u = z$. \square

Theorem 2. Let $\alpha, \eta : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be two function and let (X, d) be a (α, η) –complete rectangular metric space. Let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a bijective mapping satisfying the following conditions:

- (i) T^{-1} is a triangular (α, η) -admissible mapping;
- (ii) T is a generalized (α, η) – F -expansive mapping ;
- (iii) $\alpha(z, T^{-1}z) \geq 1$ or $\eta(z, T^{-1}z) \leq 1$, for all $z \in \text{Fix}(T)$.

Then T has a fixed point.

Proof. Let $z \in \text{Fix}(T^n)$ for some fixed $n > 1$. As $\alpha(z, T^{-1}z) \geq 1$ or $\eta(z, T^{-1}z) \leq 1$ and T^{-1} is a triangular (α, η) -admissible mapping, then

$$\alpha(T^{-1}z, T^{-2}z) \geq 1 \text{ or } \eta(T^{-2}z, T^{-1}z) \leq 1.$$

Continuing this process, we have

$$\alpha(T^{-n}z, T^{-n-1}z) \geq 1 \text{ or } \eta(T^{-n}z, T^{-n-1}z) \leq 1,$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By (T3) and (T4), we get

$$\alpha(T^{-m}z, T^{-n}z) \geq 1 \text{ or } \eta(T^{-m}z, T^{-n}z) \leq 1, \quad \forall m, n \in \mathbb{N}, n \neq m.$$

Since T is a bijective mapping, then $T^{-n}z = z = T^n z$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $z \in \text{Fix}(T)$. Therefore,

$$\alpha(T^m z, T^n z) \geq 1 \text{ or } \eta(T^m z, T^n z) \leq 1, \quad \forall m, n \in \mathbb{N}, n \neq m.$$

Assume that $z \notin \text{Fix}(T)$, i.e. $d(z, Tz) > 0$. Then, we have

$$d(z, Tz) = d(T^n z, Tz) = d(TT^{n-1}z, Tz).$$

Applying (1) with $x = z$ and $y = T^{n-1}z$, we obtain

$$F(d(z, Tz)) - \tau = F(d(TT^{n-1}z, Tz)) - \tau \geq F(M(T^{n-1}z, z)),$$

where

$$M(T^{n-1}z, z) = \min \{d(z, T^{n-1}z), d(z, Tz), d(T^{n-1}z, TT^{n-1}z), d(T^{n-1}z, Tz)\}. \tag{27}$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (27), we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} M(T^{n-1}z, z) = d(z, Tz)$$

Now, using (F_3) , we get

$$F(d(z, Tz)) - \tau \geq F(d(z, Tz)).$$

It is a contradiction. Then $z \in \text{Fix}(T)$. \square

Example 1. Let $X = [1, +\infty[$ and $d : X \times X \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ define by

$$d(x, y) = |x - y|.$$

Then (X, d) is a metric space and rectangular metric space. Define mapping $T : X \rightarrow X$ and $\alpha, \eta : X \times X \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ by

$$T(x) = x^2$$

and

$$\alpha(x, y) = \frac{x + y}{\max\{x, y\} + 1},$$

$$\eta(x, y) = \frac{|x - y|}{\max\{x, y\} + 1}.$$

Then, T is an (α, η) -continuous triangular (α, η) -admissible mapping and T is a bijective mapping.

Let $F(t) = \ln(t)$, $\tau = \ln(2)$. Evidently, $(\alpha(x, y) \geq 1$ or $(x, y) \leq 1)$ and $\min\{d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty), d(y, Tx)\} > 0$ are when $x \neq y \neq 1$.

Now, consider the following two cases:

Case 1: $(x > y > 1)$

As

$$d(Tx, Ty) = x^2 - y^2, F(d(Tx, Ty)) = \ln(x^2 - y^2) = \ln(x - y) + \ln(x + y).$$

Thus,

$$F(d(Tx, Ty)) - \tau = \ln(x^2 - y^2) - \ln(2) = \ln(x - y) + \ln(x + y) - \ln(2).$$

We have

$$F(d(x, y)) = \ln(x - y).$$

On the other hand

$$F(d(x, y)) - F(d(Tx, Ty)) + \tau = \ln(x^2 - y^2) = \ln(x - y) - \ln(x - y) - \ln(x + y) + \ln(2) = \ln(x - y) + \ln(2).$$

Since $x, y \in]1, +\infty[$, then

$$-\ln(x + y) + \ln(2) \leq 0.$$

Which implies that

$$F(d(Tx, Ty)) - \tau \geq F(d(x, y)) \geq F[\min\{d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty), d(y, Tx)\}].$$

Case 2: $(y > x > 1)$

As

$$d(Ty, Tx) = y^2 - x^2, F(d(Ty, Tx)) = \ln(y^2 - x^2) = \ln(y - x) + \ln(y + x),$$

Thus,

$$F(d(Ty, Tx)) - \tau = \ln(y^2 - x^2) - \ln(2) = \ln(y - x) + \ln(y + x) - \ln(2).$$

We have

$$F(d(x, y)) = \ln(y - x).$$

On the other hand

$$F(d(y, x)) - F(d(Ty, Tx)) + \tau = \ln(y - x) - \ln(y - x) - \ln(y + x) + \ln(2) = -\ln(x + y) + \ln(2).$$

Since $y, x \in]1, +\infty[$, then

$$\ln(y - x) + \ln(2) \leq 0.$$

Which implies that

$$F(d(Ty, Tx)) - \tau \geq F(d(y, x)) \geq F[\min\{d(y, x), d(y, Ty), d(x, Tx), d(x, Ty)\}].$$

Hence, the condition (1) is satisfied. Therefore, T has a unique fixed point $z = 1$.

Theorem 3. Let $\alpha, \eta : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be two functions and let $d(X, d)$ be a (α, η) -complete rectangular metric space. Let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a bijective mapping satisfying the following assertions:

- (i) T^{-1} is triangular (α, η) -admissible;
- (ii) T is a generalized (α, η) - F -expansive mapping;
- (iii) there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $\alpha(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \geq 1$ or $\eta(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \leq 1$;
- (iv) (X, d) is a (α, η) -regular rectangular metric space.

Then T has a fixed point. Moreover, T has a unique fixed point whenever $\alpha(z, u) \geq 1$ or $\eta(z, u) \leq 1$ for all $z, u \in \text{Fix}(T)$.

Proof. Let $x_0 \in X$ such that $\alpha(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \geq 1$ or $\eta(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \leq 1$. Similar to the proof of Theorem 1, we can conclude that

$$(\alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 1 \text{ or } \eta(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq 1), \text{ and } x_n \rightarrow z \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

and from inequality (26), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(Tx_n, Tz) = d(z, Tz).$$

From (iv) $\alpha(x_n, z) \geq 1$ or $\eta(x_n, z) \leq 1$, hold for $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Suppose that $Tz = x_{n_0-1} = Tx_{n_0}$ for some $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}^*$. From Theorem 1 we know that the members of the sequence $\{x_n\}$ are distinct. Hence, we have $Tz \neq Tx_n$, i.e. $d(Tz, Tx_n) > 0$ for all $n > n_0$. Thus, we can apply (1) to x_n and z for all $n > n_0$ to get

$$F(d(Tz, Tx_n)) - \tau \geq F(M(z, x_n)), \forall n \geq n_0,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} M(z, x_n) &= \min\{d(z, x_n), d(z, Tz), d(x_n, Tx_n), d(z, Tx_n)\} \\ &= \min\{d(z, x_n), d(z, Tz), d(x_n, x_{n-1}), d(z, x_{n-1})\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$F(d(Tz, Tx_n)) - \tau \geq F(\min\{d(z, x_n), d(z, Tz), d(x_n, x_{n-1}), d(z, x_{n-1})\}). \tag{28}$$

By letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ in inequality (28), we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(d(Tz, Tx_n)) > \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(d(Tz, Tx_n)) - \tau \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(\min\{d(z, x_n), d(z, Tz), d(x_n, x_{n-1}), d(z, x_{n-1})\}).$$

Since F is continuous function and $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} M(z, x_n) = d(z, Tz)$, we conclude that

$$F(d(z, Tz)) > F(d(z, Tz)),$$

which implies that

$$d(z, Tz) < d(z, Tz).$$

It is a contradiction. Hence $Tz = z$. The proof of the uniqueness is similarly to that of Theorem 1. \square

Corollary 1. Let $\alpha, \eta : X \times X \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ be two functions, (X, d) be a (α, η) -complete rectangular metric space and $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a bijective mapping. Suppose that for all $x, y \in X$ with $\alpha(x, y) \geq 1$ or $\eta(x, y) \leq 1$ and $M(x, y) > 0$ we have

$$F(d(Tx, Ty)) - \tau \geq F(d(x, y)).$$

Then T has a fixed point, if

- (i) T^{-1} is a triangular (α, η) -admissible mapping;
- (ii) there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $\alpha(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \geq 1$ or $\eta(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \leq 1$;
- (iii) T is a (α, η) -continuous; or
- (iv) (X, d) is an (α, η) -regular rectangular metric space.

Moreover, T has a unique fixed point when $\alpha(z, u) \geq 1$ or $\eta(z, u) \leq 1$ for all $z, u \in \text{Fix}(T)$.

4. Fixed point theorem on rectangular metric spaces endowed with a partial order

Definition 9. [16] Let (X, d, \preceq) be an ordered rectangular metric space and $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a mapping. Then

- 1) (X, d) is said to be O -complete, if every Cauchy $\{n_n\}$ in X with $x_n \preceq x_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ or $x_n \succeq x_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, converges in X .
- 2) (X, d) is said to be O -regular, if for each sequence $\{n_n\}$ in X $\{x_n\} \rightarrow x$ and $x_n \preceq x_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ or $x_n \succeq x_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ imply that $\{n_n\} \preceq x$ or $\{n_n\} \succeq x$ respectively.
- 3) T is said to be O -continuous, if for given $x \in X$ and sequence $\{n_n\}$ with $x_n \succeq x_{n+1}$ or $x_n \preceq x_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{n_n\} \rightarrow x \Rightarrow Tx_n \rightarrow Tx$.

Definition 10. Let (X, d, \preceq) be an ordered rectangular metric spaces and $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a mapping. We say that T be an ordered F -expansive mapping, if for all $x, y \in X$ with $x \preceq y$ or $x \succeq y$ such that

$$M(x, y) > 0 \Rightarrow F(d(Tx, Ty)) - \tau \geq F(M(x, y)),$$

where $M(x, y) = \min \{d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty), d(x, Ty)\}$.

Theorem 4. Let (X, d, \preceq) be an O -complete partially ordered rectangular metric space. Let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a bijective self mapping on X satisfying the following assertions:

- (i) T^{-1} is monotone ;
- (ii) T is an ordered F -expansive mapping;
- (iii) there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $x_0 \preceq T^{-1}x_0$ or $x_0 \succeq T^{-1}x_0$
- (iv) either T is O -continuous; or
- (v) (X, d) is O -regular.

Then T has a fixed point. Moreover, T has a unique fixed point whenever $z \preceq u$ or $z \succeq u$ for all $z, u \in \text{Fix}(T)$.

Proof. Define the mapping $\alpha : X \times X \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ by

$$\alpha(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \preceq y \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and the mapping $\eta : X \times X \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ by

$$\eta(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \succeq y \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Using condition (iii) we have

$$x_0 \preceq T^{-1}x_0 \Rightarrow \alpha(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \geq 1,$$

or

$$x_0 \succeq T^{-1}x_0 \Rightarrow \eta(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \leq 1.$$

Owing to the monotonicity of T^{-1} , we get

$$\alpha(x, y) \geq 1 \Rightarrow x \preceq y \Rightarrow T^{-1}x \preceq T^{-1}y \Rightarrow \alpha(T^{-1}x, T^{-1}y) \geq 1,$$

or

$$\eta(x, y) \leq 1 \Rightarrow x \succeq y \Rightarrow T^{-1}x \succeq T^{-1}y \Rightarrow \eta(T^{-1}x, T^{-1}y) \leq 1.$$

Therefore, (T_1) and (T_2) hold.

On the other hand, if

$$\begin{cases} \alpha(x, y) \geq 1 \\ \alpha(x, y) \geq 1 \end{cases} \Rightarrow \begin{cases} x \preceq y \\ y \preceq z \end{cases}$$

or

$$\begin{cases} \eta(x, y) \leq 1 \\ \eta(x, y) \leq 1 \end{cases} \Rightarrow \begin{cases} x \succeq y \\ y \succeq z \end{cases}$$

Since (X, d) be an O-complete partially ordered rectangular metric space, we conclude that

$$x \preceq z \text{ or } x \succeq z \Rightarrow \alpha(x, z) \geq 1 \text{ or } \eta(x, z) \leq 1.$$

Thus, (T_3) and (T_4) hold. This shows that T^{-1} is a triangular (α, η) –admissible mapping then

$$(\alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 1 \text{ or } \eta(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq 1).$$

Now, if T is O-continuous, then $x_n \preceq x_{n+1}$ or $x_n \succeq x_{n+1} \Rightarrow \alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 1$ or $\eta(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq 1$ and $x_n \rightarrow z$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ with $z \in X \Rightarrow Tx_n \rightarrow Tx$. The existence and uniqueness of a fixed point follows from Theorem 1.

Now, suppose that follow (X, d, \preceq) is O-regular. Let $\{x_n\}$ be a sequence such that

$$\{n_n\} \preceq x \text{ or } \{n_n\} \succeq x,$$

which implies that

$$(\alpha(x_n, x) \geq 1 \text{ or } \eta(x_n, x) \leq 1),$$

for all n and $x_n \rightarrow x$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This shows that (X, d) is (α, η) – regular. Thus, the existence and uniqueness of fixed point from Theorem 3. \square

Corollary 2. Let (X, d, \preceq) be an O-complete partially ordered rectangular metric spaces. Further, let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a bijective self mapping on X be such that T^{-1} is a monotone mapping and there exist $k \in]0, 1[$ such that $kd(Tx, Ty) \geq d(x, y)$, for all $x, y \in X$ with $x \preceq y$ or $x \succeq y$. Also, suppose that the following conditions hold:

- (i) there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $x_0 \preceq T^{-1}x_0$ or $x_0 \succeq T^{-1}x_0$;
- (ii) either T is O-continuous; or
- (iii) X is O-regular.

Then T has a fixed point. Moreover, T has a unique fixed point whenever $z \preceq u$ or $z \succeq u$ for all $z, u \in \text{Fix}(T)$.

Proof. Let $F(t) = \ln(t)$ for all $t \in]0, +\infty[$ and $\tau = \frac{1}{\ln(k)}$. Clearly $F \in \mathbb{F}$ and $\tau > 0$. We prove that T is a generalized F -expansive mapping. Indeed, Since

$$kd(Tx, Ty) \geq d(x, y).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \ln [k.d(Tx, Ty)] &= \ln [d(Tx, Ty)] + \ln(k) \\ &= \ln (d(Tx, Ty)) - \frac{1}{\ln(k)} \\ &\geq \ln [d(x, y)] \\ &\geq \ln [\min\{d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty), d(Tx, y)\}]. \end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of Theorems 1 and 4, T has a unique fixed point $x \in X$. \square

Corollary 3. Let (X, d, \preceq) be an O -complete partially ordered rectangular metric spaces. Further, let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a bijective self mapping on X such that T^{-1} is a monotone mapping and there exist $\alpha \in]0, \frac{1}{2}[$ such that

$$\alpha d(Tx, Ty) \geq \frac{d(x, Tx) + d(y, Ty)}{2}$$

for all $x, y \in X$ with $x \preceq y$ or $x \succeq y$. Also suppose that the following conditions hold:

- (i) there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $x_0 \preceq T^{-1}x_0$ or $x_0 \succeq T^{-1}x_0$;
- (ii) either T is O -continuous; or
- (iii) X is O -regular.

Then T has a fixed point. Moreover, T has a unique fixed point whenever $z \preceq u$ or $z \succeq u$ for all $z, u \in \text{Fix}(T)$.

Proof. Let $F(t) = \ln(t)$ for all $t \in]0, +\infty[$ and $\tau = \frac{1}{\ln(2\alpha)}$. Clearly $F \in \mathbb{F}$ and $\tau > 0$. We prove that T is a generalized F -expansive mapping. Indeed, since

$$\alpha d(Tx, Ty) \geq \frac{d(x, Tx) + d(y, Ty)}{2}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \ln [2\alpha.d(Tx, Ty)] &= \ln [d(Tx, Ty)] + \ln(2\alpha) \\ &= \ln (d(Tx, Ty)) - \frac{1}{\ln(2\alpha)} \\ &\geq \ln [d(x, Tx) + d(y, Ty)] \\ &\geq \ln [\min\{d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty), d(Tx, y)\}]. \end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of Theorems 1 and 4, T has a unique fixed point $x \in X$. \square

Corollary 4. Let (X, d, \preceq) be an O -complete partially ordered rectangular metric spaces. Further, let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a bijective self mapping on X , such that T^{-1} is a monotone mapping and there exist $\lambda \in]0, \frac{1}{3}[$ such that

$$\alpha d(Tx, Ty) \geq \frac{d(x, y) + d(x, Tx) + d(y, Ty)}{3}$$

for all $x, y \in X$ with $x \preceq y$ or $x \succeq y$. Also suppose that the following conditions hold:

- (i) there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $x_0 \preceq T^{-1}x_0$ or $x_0 \succeq T^{-1}x_0$;
- (ii) either T is O -continuous; or
- (iii) X is O -regular.

Then T has a fixed point. Moreover, T has a unique fixed point whenever $z \preceq u$ or $z \succeq u$ for all $z, u \in \text{Fix}(T)$.

Proof. Let $F(t) = \ln(t)$ for all $t \in]0, +\infty[$, and $\tau = \frac{1}{\ln(3\lambda)}$. Clearly $F \in \mathbb{F}$ and $\tau > 0$. We prove that T is a F -expansive mapping. Indeed, since

$$\lambda d(Tx, Ty) \geq \frac{d(x, y) + d(x, Tx) + d(y, Ty)}{3}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \ln [3\lambda \cdot d(Tx, Ty)] &= \ln [d(Tx, Ty)] + \ln(3\lambda) \\ &= \ln (d(Tx, Ty)) - \frac{1}{\ln(3\lambda)} \\ &\geq \ln [d(x, y) + d(x, Tx) + d(y, Ty)] \\ &\geq \ln [\min\{d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty), d(Tx, Ty)\}]. \end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of Theorems 1 and 4, T has a unique fixed point $x \in X$. \square

Author Contributions: All authors contributed equally to the writing of this paper. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest: "The authors declare no conflict of interest."

References

- [1] Wardowski, D. (2012). Fixed points of a new type of contractive mappings in complete metric spaces. *Fixed Point Theory and Applications*, 2012, Article No. 94, <https://doi.org/10.1186/1687-1812-2012-94>.
- [2] Banach, S. (1922). Sur les opérations dans les ensembles abstraits et leur application aux équations intégrales. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 3(1), 133-181.
- [3] Kari, A., Rossafi, M., Marhrani, E. M., & Aamri, M. (2020). Fixed-point theorem for nonlinear-contraction via-distance. *Advances in Mathematical Physics*, 2020, Article ID 6617517, <https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/6617517>.
- [4] Piri, H., & Kumam, P. (2014). Some fixed point theorems concerning F -contraction in complete metric spaces. *Fixed Point Theory and Applications*, 2014, Article No. 210, <https://doi.org/10.1186/1687-1812-2014-210>.
- [5] Wardowski, D. (2018). Solving existence problems via F -contractions. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 146(4), 1585-1598.
- [6] Wardowski, D., & Van Dung, N. (2014). Fixed points of F -weak contractions on complete metric spaces. *Demonstratio Mathematica*, 47(1), 146-155.
- [7] Branciari, A. (2000). A fixed point theorem of Banach-Caccioppoli type on a class of generalized metric spaces. *Publicationes Mathematicae Debrecen*, 57, 31-37.
- [8] Jleli, M., & Samet, B. (2014). A new generalization of the Banach contraction principle. *Journal of Inequalities and Applications*, 2014, Article No. 38, <https://doi.org/10.1186/1029-242X-2014-38>.
- [9] Kirk, W. A., & Shahzad, N. (2013). Generalized metrics and Caristi's theorem. *Fixed Point Theory and Applications*, 2013, Article No. 129, <https://doi.org/10.1186/1687-1812-2013-129>.
- [10] Samet, B. (2009). A fixed point theorem in a generalized metric space for mappings satisfying a contractive condition of integral type. *International Journal of Mathematical Analysis*, 3(25-28), 1265-1271.
- [11] Samet, B. (2010). Discussion on: a fixed point theorem of Banach-Caccioppoli type on a class of generalized metric spaces by A. Branciari. *Publicationes Mathematicae Debrecen*, 76(4), 493-494.
- [12] Rossafi, M., Kari, A., Marhrani, E. M., & Aamri, M. (2021). Fixed point theorems for generalized expansive mapping in rectangular metric spaces. *Abstract and Applied Analysis*, 2021, Article ID 6642723, <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/6642723>.
- [13] Wang, S. Z. (1984). Some fixed point theorems on expansion mappings. *Math Japon.*, 29, 631-636.
- [14] Kumar, M., Araci, S., & Kumam, P. (2016). Fixed point theorems for generalized (α, ψ) -expansive mappings in generalized metric spaces. *Communications in Mathematics and Applications*, 7(3), 227-240.
- [15] Hussain, N., Kutbi, M. A., & Salimi, P. (2014). Fixed point theory in α -complete metric spaces with applications. *Abstract and Applied Analysis*, 2014, Article ID 280817, <https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/280817>.
- [16] Hussain, N., Parvaneh, V., Alamri, B. A., & Kadelburg, Z. (2017). F -HR-type contractions on (α, η) -complete rectangular b -metric spaces. *Journal of Nonlinear Sciences and Applications*, 10, 1030-1043.



© 2021 by the authors; licensee PSRP, Lahore, Pakistan. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).