



Contents list available at JMCS

Journal of Mathematics and Computer Science

Journal Homepage: [www.tjmcs.com](http://www.tjmcs.com)



## Fixed Point Theorems for Multi-valued Weakly $C$ -contractive Mappings in Quasi-ordered Metric Spaces

E. Nazari

Department of Mathematics, Tafresh University, Tehran Ave. Tafresh, Iran.  
*nazari.esmaeil@gmail.com*

### Article history:

Received November 2014

Accepted December 2014

Available online January 2015

### *Abstract*

The goal of this paper is to present some common fixed point theorems for multivalued weakly  $C$ -contractive mappings in quasi-ordered complete metric space. These results generalizes the existing fixed point results in the literature.

Keywords: Multivalued mapping, Hausdorff distance, Weakly  $C$ -contractive mapping, Common fixed point.

### 1. Introduction

Fixed point theory for contractive mapping first studied by Banach [1]. He proved that every contraction defined on a complete metric space has a unique fixed point. Since then the fixed point theory for single valued and multivalued mappings in metric space has been rapidly developed. In 1972, Chatterjea [2] introduce the concept of  $C$  -contraction as follows.

**Definition1.1.** A mapping  $T : X \rightarrow X$  where  $(X, d)$  is a metric space is said to be a  $C$  -contraction if there exists  $k \in (0, 0.5)$  such that for all  $x, y \in X$  the following inequality holds:

$$d(Tx, Ty) \leq k((d(x, Ty) + d(y, Tx))).$$

Chatterjea [2] proved the following theorem:

**Theorem1.1.** Every C-contraction in a complete metric space has a unique fixed point.

Choudhury [3] introduce the concept of weakly C -contractive mapping as a generalization of C -contractive mapping and prove that every weakly C -contractive mapping in a complete metric space has a unique fixed point.

**Definition1.2.** Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space. A mapping  $T : X \rightarrow X$ , is said to be weakly C-contractive if for all  $x, y \in X$ ,

$$d(Tx, Ty) \leq \frac{1}{2}(d(x, Ty) + d(y, Tx)) - \varphi(d(x, Ty), d(y, Tx)),$$

Where  $\varphi : [0, \infty)^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is a continuous function such that  $\varphi(x, y) = 0$  if and only  $x = y = 0$ .

Harjani et al. [5] announced some fixed point results for weakly C -contractive mappings in a complete metric space endowed with a partial order. Meanwhile, Shatanawi [9] proved some fixed point theorems for a nonlinear weakly C -contraction type mapping in metric and ordered metric spaces. In this paper, we introduce the concept of multivalued weakly C -contractive mappings in quasi-ordered partial metric spaces and we prove some existence theorems of common fixed point for such mappings in the context of complete quasi-partial metric spaces under certain conditions.

## 2. Preliminaries

Let  $(X, d, \leq)$  be a quasi-ordered metric space, with an order  $\leq$  as a quasi-order (that is, a reflexive and transitive relation) and a metric d. Assume that X having the following properties which appears in [8]:

**(H1):** if  $\{x_n\}$  is a non-decreasing (resp. non-increasing) sequence in X such that  $x_n \rightarrow x$ , then  $x_n \leq x$  (resp.  $x_n \geq x$ ) for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Let  $2^X$  denote the family consisting of all nonempty subsets of X we define the Hausdorff-Pseude metric in  $H_d : 2^X \times 2^X \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$  given by

$$H_d(C, D) = \max\{\sup_{a \in C} d(a, D), \sup_{b \in D} d(C, b)\},$$

where  $d(a, D) = \inf_{b \in D} d(a, b)$ ,  $d(C, b) = \inf_{a \in C} d(a, b)$ .

**Definition2.1.** Let  $(X, d, \leq)$  be a quasi-ordered metric space. We say that X is sequentially complete if every Cauchy sequence whose consecutive terms are comparable in X converges.

**Definition2.2.** [6,7] Let X be a quasi-ordered metric space. A subset  $D \subseteq X$  is said to be approximative if the multivalued mapping

$$P_D(x) = \{y \in D : d(x, y) = d(D, x)\}, \quad \forall x \in X$$

has nonempty values.

The multivalued mapping  $T : X \rightarrow 2^X$  is said to have approximative values, AV for short, if  $Tx$  is approximative for each  $x \in X$ .

The multivalued mapping  $T : X \rightarrow 2^X$  is said to have comparable approximative values, CAV for short, if  $T$  has approximative values and, for each  $z \in X$ , there exists  $y \in P_{Tz}(x)$  such that  $y$  is comparable to  $z$ .

The multivalued mapping  $T : X \rightarrow 2^X$  is said to have upper comparable approximative values, UCAV, for short (resp: lower comparable approximative values, LCAV for short) if  $T$  has approximative values and, for each  $z \in X$ , there exists  $y \in P_{Tz}(x)$  such that  $y \geq z$  (resp:  $y \leq z$ ). It is clear that  $T$  has approximative values if it has compact values. In addition, if  $T$  is single-valued, Then UCAV (LCAV) means that  $Tx \geq x$  ( $Tx \leq x$ ) for  $x \in X$ .

**Definition2.3.** The multivalued mappings  $T, S$  are said to have a common fixed point if there is  $x \in X$  such that  $x \in Tx$  and  $x \in Sx$ .

In what follows, we give an analogy of the contraction which called multivalued  $C$ -weakly contraction mapping will play an important role in this sequel. To this end, we first introduce the following function.

Let  $a \in (0, \infty]$ ,  $\mathfrak{R}_a^+ = [0, a)$ . let  $f : \mathfrak{R}_a^+ \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$  satisfy,

- (i)  $f(0) = 0$  and  $f(t) > 0$  for each  $t \in (0, a)$
- (ii)  $f$  is non-decreasing on  $\mathfrak{R}_a^+$
- (iii)  $f$  is continuous
- (iv)  $f(t+s) \leq f(t) + f(s)$  for  $s, t \in \mathfrak{R}_a^+$ .

For examples of such function  $f$  we refer to (6).

Define

$$\mathfrak{F}[0, a) = \{f \mid f \text{ satisfies (i)-(iv) above}\}.$$

Let  $a \in (0, \infty]$ ,  $\varphi : \mathfrak{R}_a^+ \times \mathfrak{R}_a^+ \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}^+$  satisfy

- (i)  $\varphi(t, s) = 0$  if and only if  $s = t = 0$ .
- (ii)  $\varphi$  is continuous.
- (iii) For any sequence  $\{r_n\}$  with  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r_n = 0$ , there exist  $a \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  and  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\varphi(r_n, 0) \geq (1-a)r_n$  (or  $\varphi(0, r_n) \geq (1-a)r_n$ ) for each  $n \geq n_0$ . Define  $\Phi([0, a) \times [0, a)) = \{\varphi : \varphi \text{ satisfies (i)-(iii) above}\}.$

**Definition2.3.** Let  $X$  be a metric space and  $d = \sup\{d(x, y) : x, y \in X\}$ . Set  $a = d$  if  $d = \infty$  and  $a > d$  if  $d < \infty$ . Suppose the multivalued mappings  $T, S : X \rightarrow 2^X$ ,  $f \in \mathfrak{F}[0, a]$  and  $\varphi \in \Phi([0, f(a-0)) \times [0, f(a-0))$  satisfy

$$f(H_d(Tx, Sy)) \leq f\left(\frac{1}{2}(d(x, Sy) + d(y, Tx))\right) - \varphi(f(d(x, Sy)), f(d(y, Tx)))$$

For all  $x, y \in X$  with  $x$  and  $y$  comparable. Then we say  $T$  and  $S$  satisfy weakly  $C$ -contraction with respect to  $f$  and  $\varphi$ .

**Definition2.4.** For two subsets  $A, B$  of  $X$ , we say that  $A \leq_r B$  if, for each  $a \in A$ , there exists  $b \in B$  such that  $a \leq b$ , and  $A \leq B$  if each  $a \in A$  and each  $b \in B$  imply that  $a \leq b$ . A multi-valued mapping  $T : X \rightarrow 2^X$  is said to be  $r$ -non-decreasing ( $r$ -non-increasing) if  $x \leq y$  implies that  $Tx \leq_r Ty$  ( $Ty \leq_r Tx$ ) for all  $x, y \in X$ .  $T$  is said to be  $r$ -monotone if  $T$  is  $r$ -non-decreasing or  $r$ -non-increasing. The notion of non-decreasing (non-increasing) is similarly defined by writing  $\leq$  instead of the notation  $\leq_r$ .

### 3. Main Result

In this section we established common fixed point theorems for multivalued mappings on quasi-ordered complete metric spaces. The idea of the present theorem3.1 originate from the study of an analogous problem for single-valued mappings in [4] and [9], and multivalued mappings in [6], [7] and [10].

**Theorem3.1.** Let  $X$  be a quasi-ordered sequentially complete metric space and satisfy (H1). Suppose that the multivalued mappings  $T$  and  $S$  have UCAV and satisfy the weakly  $C$ -contraction with respect to  $f$  and  $\varphi$ , then  $T$  and  $S$  have a common fixed point. Further, for each  $x_0 \in X$ , the iterated sequence  $\{x_n\}$  with  $x_{2n+1} \in Tx_{2n}$  and  $x_{2n+2} \in Sx_{2n+1}$  converges to the common fixed point of  $T$  and  $S$ .

**Proof:** First we show that, if  $T$  or  $S$  has a fixed point it is a common fixed point of  $T$  and  $S$ . Indeed, let  $x$  be a fixed point of  $T$  then we have,

$$\begin{aligned} f(d(x, Sx)) &\leq f(H_d(Tx, Sx)) \\ &\leq f(0.5(d(x, Sx) + d(x, Tx))) - \varphi(f(d(x, Sx)), f(d(x, Tx))) \\ &= f(0.5d(x, Sx)) - \varphi(f(d(x, Sx)), 0) \\ &\leq f(d(x, Sx)) - \varphi(f(d(x, Sx)), 0) \end{aligned}$$

This implies that,  $\varphi(f(d(x, Sx)), 0) = 0$  and hence  $f(d(x, Sx)) = 0$  therefore  $d(x, Sx) = 0$ . Since  $x$  is AV, therefore there exist  $y \in P_{Sx}(x)$  such that  $d(y, x) = 0$  i.e,  $y = x$ . Thus

$x \in Sx$ . Let  $x_0 \in X$ , if  $x_0 \in Tx_0$  the proof is finished. Otherwise, from the fact that  $Tx_0$  has UCAV it follows there exists  $x_1 \in Tx_0$  with  $x_1 \neq x_0$  and  $x_1 \geq x_0$  such that

$$d(x_0, x_1) = \inf_{x \in Tx_0} d(x, x_0) = d(Tx_0, x_0).$$

Again since  $Sx_1$  has UCAV it follows there exist  $x_2 \in Sx_1$  with  $x_2 \neq x_1$  and  $x_2 \geq x_1$  such that

$$d(x_1, x_2) = \inf_{x \in Sx_1} d(x, x_1) = d(Sx_1, x_1).$$

By induction and using UCAV, we can find in this way a sequence  $\{x_n\}$  in  $X$  with  $x_{n+1} \geq x_n$  such that  $x_{2n+1} \in Tx_{2n}$  and

$$d(x_{2n+1}, x_{2n}) = d(Tx_{2n}, x_{2n})$$

and  $x_{2n+2} \in Sx_{2n+1}$  with

$$d(x_{2n+2}, x_{2n+1}) = d(Sx_{2n+1}, x_{2n+1}).$$

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned} d(Tx_{2n}, x_{2n}) &\leq \sup_{x \in Sx_{2n-1}} d(Tx_{2n}, x) \\ &\leq H_d(Tx_{2n}, Sx_{2n-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$d(x_{2n+1}, x_{2n}) \leq H_d(Tx_{2n}, Sx_{2n-1}). \quad (1)$$

Similarly we can show that

$$d(x_{2n+2}, x_{2n+1}) \leq H_d(Sx_{2n+1}, Tx_{2n}). \quad (2)$$

Now we show that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_{n+1}, x_n) = 0$ . By using (2) and since  $f$  is non-decreasing, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &f(d(x_{2n+1}, x_{2n+2})) \leq f(H_d(Tx_{2n}, Sx_{2n+1})) \\ &\leq f(0.5(d(x_{2n}, Sx_{2n+1}) + d(x_{2n+1}, Tx_{2n}))) - \varphi(f(d(x_{2n}, Sx_{2n+1})), f(d(x_{2n+1}, Tx_{2n}))) \\ &\leq f(0.5(d(x_{2n}, x_{2n+2})) - \varphi(f(d(x_{2n}, x_{2n+2})), 0) \leq f(0.5d(x_{2n}, x_{2n+2})). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

As  $f$  is a non-decreasing function, we get

$$d(x_{2n+1}, x_{2n+2}) \leq 0.5d(x_{2n}, x_{2n+2}). \quad (3)$$

Since

$$d(x_{2n}, x_{2n+2}) \leq d(x_{2n}, x_{2n+1}) + d(x_{2n+1}, x_{2n+2}).$$

We have

$$d(x_{2n+1}, x_{2n+2}) \leq d(x_{2n}, x_{2n+1}). \quad (4)$$

Similarly, by using (1) one can show that

$$d(x_{2n}, x_{2n+1}) \leq 0.5d(x_{2n-1}, x_{2n+1}). \quad (5)$$

Thus

$$d(x_{2n}, x_{2n+1}) \leq d(x_{2n-1}, x_{2n}). \quad (6)$$

From (4) and (6), we have

$$d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq d(x_{n-1}, x_n), \quad \forall n \in N. \quad (7)$$

So, by (7) we get that  $\{d(x_n, x_{n+1}) : n \in N\}$  is a non-increasing sequence. Hence there is  $r \geq 0$  such that

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

By (3) and (5) we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_n, x_{n+1}) &\leq 0.5d(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1}) \\ &\leq 0.5(d(x_{n-1}, x_n) + d(x_n, x_{n+1})). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and using (8), we get that

$$r \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.5d(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1}) \leq 0.5(r + r).$$

Hence

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1}) = 2r.$$

Using the continuity  $f$ ,  $\varphi$  and (3), we get that

$$f(r) \leq f(0.5(2r)) - \varphi(f(2r), 0),$$

which implies that  $\varphi(f(2r), 0) = 0$  and hence  $r = 0$ .

Next we show that  $(x_n)$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $X$ . Since  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(d(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1})) = 0$ , from

assumption (iii) of  $\varphi$  there exists  $0 < a < \frac{1}{2}$  and  $n_0 \in N$  such that

$$\varphi(f(d(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1})), 0) \geq af(d(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1})) \quad \text{for all } n \geq n_0.$$

On the other hand, for any given  $\epsilon > 0$ , we choose  $\delta > 0$  to be small enough such that

$$f(\delta) < \frac{a}{1-2a} f(\epsilon) . \text{ Moreover, there exists } n_1 \text{ such that } d(x_{n+1}, x_n) \leq \delta , \text{ for each } n \geq n_1.$$

Now for any numbers  $m > n \geq \max\{n_0, n_1\}$ , from the inequality (1) and (2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(d(x_{n+1}, x_n)) &\leq f(H_d(Tx_n, Sx_{n-1})) \quad (\text{ or } f(H_d(Tx_{n-1}, Sx_n))) \\ &\leq f(0.5(d(x_n, Sx_{n-1}) + d(x_{n-1}, Tx_n))) \\ &\quad - \varphi(f(d(x_n, Sx_{n-1})), f(d(x_{n-1}, Tx_n))) \\ &\leq f(0.5(d(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1}))) - \varphi(0, f(d(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1}))) \\ &\leq f(d(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1})) - (1-a)f(d(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1})) \\ &\leq af(d(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1})) \\ &\leq a(f(d(x_{n-1}, x_n)) + f(d(x_n, x_{n+1}))). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$f(d(x_n, x_{n+1})) \leq (a / (1-a)) f(d(x_{n-1}, x_n)).$$

Set  $\alpha = \frac{a}{1-a} < 1$ . By repeating this procedure, for any  $k > n$  we obtain

$$f(d(x_k, x_{k-1})) \leq \alpha f(d(x_{k-1}, x_{k-2})) \leq \dots \leq \alpha^{k-n} f(d(x_n, x_{n-1})).$$

Therefore, from the assumption of  $f$  we have,

$$\begin{aligned} f(d(x_m, x_n)) &\leq f(d(x_m, x_{m-1})) + f(d(x_{m-1}, x_{m-2})) + \dots + f(d(x_{n+1}, x_n)) \\ &\leq \alpha^{m-n} f(d(x_n, x_{n-1})) + \alpha^{m-n-1} f(d(x_n, x_{n-1})) + \dots \\ &\quad + \alpha f(d(x_n, x_{n-1})) \\ &= (\alpha - \alpha^{m-n+1} / (1-\alpha)) f(d(x_n, x_{n-1})) \\ &< (\alpha / (1-\alpha)) f(d(x_n, x_{n-1})) < (\alpha / (1-\alpha)) f(\delta) \\ &= (a / (1-2a)) f(\delta) < f(\epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that  $d(x_m, x_n) < \epsilon$ , so  $\{x_n\}$  is a  $\leq$ -non-decreasing Cauchy sequence. Since  $X$  is a sequentially complete, there exists  $x^* \in X$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x^*$ . Finally, we prove that  $x^*$  is a common fixed point of  $T$  and  $S$ . For every  $n \in N$ , (H1) guarantees that  $x_n$  is comparable to  $x^*$ , so for  $n \in N$  we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
 f(d(x_{2n+2}, Sx^*)) &\leq f(\sup_{x \in Tx_{2n+1}} d(x, Sx^*)) \leq f(H_d(Tx_{2n+1}, Sx^*)) \\
 &\leq f(0.5(d(x_{2n+1}, Sx^*) + d(x^*, Tx_{2n+1}))) - \varphi(f(d(x_{2n+1}, Sx^*), f(d(x^*, Tx_{2n+1})))) \\
 &\leq f(0.5(d(x_{2n+1}, Sx^*) + d(x^*, x_{2n+2}))) - \varphi(f(d(x_{2n+1}, Sx^*), f(d(x^*, x_{2n+2}))))
 \end{aligned}$$

(9)

Since  $\varphi$  is l.s.c, letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in (9) we get

$$f(d(x^*, Sx^*)) \leq f(0.5d(x^*, Sx^*)) - \varphi(f(d(x^*, Sx^*), 0)).$$

Which implies  $\varphi(f(d(x^*, Sx^*), 0) = 0$  and hence  $d(x^*, Sx^*) = 0$ . Since  $Sx^*$  is AV, there exist  $y \in P_{Sx^*}$  such that  $d(y, x^*) = 0$  i.e,  $y = x^*$ , therefore  $x^* \in Sx^*$ , i.e  $x^*$  is a fixed point of  $S$ , and so it is a common fixed point. This completes the proof.

Similar to the proof of Theorem 3.1 we have the following Theorem.

**Theorem.3.2.** Let  $X$  be a sequentially complete quasi-ordered metric space and satisfy (H1). Suppose that  $T, S : X \rightarrow 2^X$  be two mappings that satisfy weakly  $C$ -contraction with respect to  $f$  and  $\varphi$ , and have LCAV. Then  $T$  and  $S$  have a common fixed point. Further, for each  $x_0 \in X$ , the iterated sequence  $\{x_n\}$  with  $x_{2n+1} \in Tx_{2n}$  and  $x_{2n+2} \in Sx_{2n+1}$  converges to the common fixed point of  $T$  and  $S$ .

**Theorem3.3.** Let  $X$  be an totally ordered sequentially complete metric space and satisfy (H1) and the following

(H2)  $x \leq y \leq z$  implies that  $d(z, x) \geq d(y, x)$  for all  $x, y, z \in X$ .

Suppose that  $T$  and  $S$  satisfy all conditions given in Theorem 3.1 (resp. in Theorem 3.2), then  $T, S$  have a unique common fixed point  $x \in X$  and the iterated convergence of Theorem 3.1 holds.

**Proof:** Theorem 3.1 (resp. Theorem 3.2) ensures existence of common fixed points. To prove the uniqueness, let both  $x$  and  $y$  be common fixed point of  $T$  and  $S$ . Since  $(X, \leq)$  is a totally ordered space, we have either  $x > y$  or  $y > x$ . Without loss of generality, we assume that the former is true. If  $T$  has UCAV, we have  $x^* \in Tx$ , with  $x \leq x^*$  and  $d(x^*, y) = d(Tx, y)$ . From our assumption it follows that  $d(x^*, y) \geq d(x, y)$ . On the other



hand,  $x \in Tx$  implies that  $d(x^*, y) \leq d(x, y)$ . Hence,  $d(x^*, y) = d(x, y) = d(Tx, y)$ . If  $x \neq y$ , then  $d(x, y) > 0$ . Thus

$$d(x, y) = d(Tx, y) \leq H_d(Tx, Sy). \quad (10)$$

If  $T$  has LCAV, so does  $S$ , we have  $y^* \in Sy$  with  $y^* \leq y$  and  $d(y^*, x) = d(Sy, x)$ . From (H2) it follows that  $d(y^*, x) \geq d(x, y)$ . On the other hand,  $y \in Sy$  implies that  $d(y^*, x) \leq d(x, y)$ . Hence,  $d(y^*, x) = d(x, y) = d(x, Sy)$ . At all events, (10) holds if  $x \neq y$ .

$$\begin{aligned} f(d(x, y)) \leq f(H_d(Tx, Sy)) &\leq f\left(\frac{1}{2}(d(y, Tx) + d(x, Sy))\right) - \varphi(d(y, Tx), d(x, Sy)) \\ &= f(d(x, y)) - \varphi(d(x, y), d(x, y)) < f(d(x, y)) \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction. Consequently, the inequality  $x < y$  is not true. By the same methods we can verify that  $y < x$  is also not true. Thus  $x = y$ .

**Theorem.3.3.** Let  $X$  be a sequentially complete quasi-ordered metric space and satisfy (H1). Suppose that  $T, S : X \rightarrow 2^X$  be two mappings have AV, are non-decreasing, and weak  $C$ -contraction with respect to  $f$  and  $\varphi$ . If there exists  $x_0 \in X$  such that  $\{x_0\} \leq Sx_0 \leq Tx_0$ . Then  $T$  and  $S$  have a common fixed point. Further, the iterated convergence of Theorem 3.1 holds.

**Proof:** let  $x_0 \in X$ , if  $x_0 \in Sx_0$  then is a common fixed point of  $T$  and  $S$  thus the proof is complete. Otherwise, since  $Sx$  has AV, there exist  $x_1 \in Sx_0$  with  $x_1 \geq x_0$  and  $d(x_0, x_1) = d(Sx_0, x_0)$ . Since  $x \geq x_1$  for all  $x \in Tx_1$ . If  $x_1 \in Tx_1$ , the proof is finished, otherwise, by means of  $Tx$  is AV, there exist  $x_2 \in Tx_1$  with  $x_2 \geq x_1$  and  $d(x_1, x_2) = d(Tx_1, x_1)$ . Inductively, we can construct a sequence  $x_n$  in  $X$  as  $x_n \neq x_{n-1}$  and  $x_n \geq x_{n-1}$  such that  $x_{2n+1} \in T_{2n}$ ,  $x_{2n+2} \in Sx_{2n+1}$  and (1), (2) hold. Now the rest of the proof is the same as theorem 3.1.

## References

- [1] S. Banach, "Sur les opérations dans les ensembles abstraits et leurs applications aux équations intégrales", Fund.Math. 3(1922), 133-181 (French).
- [2] S. K. Chatterjea, "Fixed point theorems", C. R. Acad. Bulgare Sci. 25,727-730 (1972).

- [3] B. S. Choudhury, “*Unique fixed point theorem for weakly C-contractive mappings*”, Kathmandu University Journal of Science, Engineering and Technology 5, 6-13 (2009).
- [4] A. Choudhury, T. Som, “*Few common fixed point results for weakly commuting mappings*”, Journal of Mathematics and Computer Science. 6 (2013), 27-35.
- [5] J. Harjani, Lopez, B. Sadarangani, “*Fixed point theorems for weakly C-contractive mappings in ordered metric spaces*”, Computers and Mathematics with Applications 61 (2011) 790-796.
- [6] S. H. Hong, “*Fixed points of multivalued operators in ordered metric spaces with applications*”, Nonlinear Anal. 72 (2010) 3929-3942.
- [7] S. H. Hong, D. Guan, L. Wang, “*Hybrid fixed points of multivalued operators in metric spaces with applications*”, Nonlinear Anal. 70 (2009) 4106-4117.
- [8] J. J. Nieto, R. Rodriguez-Lopez, “*Contractive mapping theorems in partially ordered sets and applications to ordinary differential equations*”, Order. 22 (2005), 223- 239.
- [9] W. Shatanawi, “*Fixed point theorems for nonlinear weakly C-contractive mappings in metric spaces*”, Mathematical and Computer Modelling. 54 (2011) 2816-2826.
- [10] Z. Qiu, “*Existence and uniqueness of common fixed points for two multivalued operators in ordered metric spaces*”, Computers and Mathematics with Applications 63, (2012), 1279-1286.