

**SUZUKI TYPE UNIQUE COMMON TRIPLED FIXED POINT
THEOREM FOR WEAK ϕ -CONTRACTION IN
MULTIPLICATIVE METRIC SPACES**

V.M.L. Hima Bindu¹ §, G.N.V. Kishore²

¹Department of Mathematics

K.L. University

Vaddeswaram, Guntur, 522 502, Andhra Pradesh, INDIA

gnvkishore@kluniversity.in

Abstract: In this paper, we obtain a Suzuki type unique common tripled fixed point theorem for weak ϕ -contraction in multiplicative metric spaces.

AMS Subject Classification: 54H25, 47H10, 54E50

Key Words: multiplicative metric, weakly compatible maps, tripled fixed point, Suzuki type contraction

1. Introduction

The notion of multiplicative metric was introduced by Bashirov et al. [3] in 2008. After that Ozavsar and Cevikel (see [8]) investigated its topological properties and proved some fixed point theorems. For more works on fixed, common fixed point theorems in Multiplicative metric spaces, we refer to [5, 2, 6, 9].

The coupled fixed point is introduced by Bhaskar and Lakshmikantham, see [4]. Later some of authors proved coupled fixed and coupled common fixed point theorems (see [1, 7, 10, 11, 16]).

Received: March 15, 2016

Published: July 20, 2016

© 2016 Academic Publications, Ltd.

url: www.acadpubl.eu

§Correspondence author

In 2010, a fixed point of order $N \geq 3$ was established by Samet and Vetro, see [12]. Later several authors obtained coincidence and common tripled fixed point theorem in various spaces, for example refer to [13, 14, 15]

The aim of this paper is to prove Suzuki type unique common tripled fixed point theorem for weak ϕ -contraction in Multiplicative metric spaces.

First we give the following theorem of Suzuki [17].

Theorem 1.1. (see [17]) *Let (X, d) be a complete metric space and let T be a mapping on X . Define a non-increasing function $\theta : [0, 1) \rightarrow (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ by*

$$\theta(r) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } 0 \leq r \leq \frac{(\sqrt{5}-1)}{2}, \\ (1-r)r^{-2} & \text{if } \frac{(\sqrt{5}-1)}{2} \leq r \leq 2^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \\ (1+r)^{-1} & \text{if } 2^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq r < 1. \end{cases}$$

Assume that there exists $r \in [0, 1)$ such that

$$\theta(r)d(x, Tx) \leq d(x, y) \Rightarrow d(Tx, Ty) \leq rd(x, y)$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Then there exists a unique fixed point z of T . Moreover $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T^n x = z$ for all $x \in X$.

Now we recall some basic definitions and examples in multiplicative metric spaces.

Definition 1.2. (see [3]) Multiplicative metric on a nonempty set X is a mapping $d : X \times X \rightarrow R^+$ satisfying the following conditions:

$$(d_1) \quad d(x, y) \geq 1 \text{ for all } x, y \in X$$

$$(d_2) \quad d(x, y) = 1 \text{ if and only if } x = y,$$

$$(d_3) \quad d(x, y) = d(y, x),$$

$$(d_4) \quad d(x, y) \leq d(x, z).d(z, y) \text{ for all } x, y, z \in X.$$

The pair (X, d) is called a multiplicative metric space.

Example 1.3. (see [9]) Let R_+^n be the collection of all n - tuples of positive real numbers. And let

$$d^* : R_+^n \times R_+^n \rightarrow R$$

be defined as

$$d^*(x, y) = \left| \frac{x_1}{y_1} \right|^* \cdot \left| \frac{x_2}{y_2} \right|^* \cdots \left| \frac{x_n}{y_n} \right|^*$$

where $x = (x_1, x_2 \cdots x_n), y = (y_1, y_2 \cdots y_n) \in R_+^n$ and $|\cdot|^* : R_+ \rightarrow R_+$ is defined as follows

$$|a|^* = \begin{cases} a & \text{if } a \geq 1 \\ \frac{1}{a} & \text{if } a < 1 \end{cases}$$

Then clearly $d^*(x, y)$ is a multiplicative metric.

Example 1.4. (see [9]) Let $d : R \times R \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ be defined as $d(x, y) = a^{|x-y|}$ where $x, y \in R$ and $a > 1$. Then $d(x, y)$ is multiplicative metric.

Definition 1.5. (see [8]) Let (X, d) be a multiplicative metric space, x_0 an arbitrary point in X , and $\epsilon > 1$. A multiplicative open ball $B(x_0, \epsilon)$ of radius ϵ centered at x_0 is the set $\{z \in X : d(z, x_0) < \epsilon\}$.

A sequence $\{x_n\}$ in a multiplicative metric space (X, d) is said to be multiplicative convergent to some point $x \in X$ if, for any given $\epsilon > 1$, then there exists $n_0 \in N$ such that $x_n \in B(x, \epsilon)$ for all $n \geq n_0$. If $\{x_n\}$ converges to x , we write $x_n \rightarrow x$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Definition 1.6. (see [8]) A sequence $\{x_n\}$ in a multiplicative metric space (X, d) is said to be multiplicative convergent to x in X if and only if $d(x_n, x) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Definition 1.7. (see [8]) Let (X, d_X) and (Y, d_Y) be two multiplicative metric space and x_0 an arbitrary but fixed element of X . A mapping $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is said to be multiplicative continuous at x_0 if and only if $x_n \rightarrow x_0$ in (X, d_X) implies that $f(x_n) \rightarrow f(x_0)$ in (Y, d_Y) . That is, given arbitrary $\epsilon > 1$, then there exists $\delta > 1$ which depends on x_0 and ϵ such that $d_Y(fx, fx_0) < \epsilon$ for all those x in X for which $d_X(x, x_0) < \delta$.

Definition 1.8. (see [8]) A sequence $\{x_n\}$ in a multiplicative metric space (X, d) is said to be multiplicative Cauchy sequence if, for any $\epsilon > 1$, there exists $n_0 \in N$ such that $d(x_m, x_n) < \epsilon$ for all $m, n \geq n_0$.

Definition 1.9. (see [8]) A multiplicative metric space (X, d) is said to be complete if every multiplicative Cauchy sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X is multiplicative convergent in X .

Definition 1.10. [4] An element $(x, y) \in X \times X$ is called a coupled fixed point of mapping $F : X \times X \rightarrow X$ if $x = F(x, y)$ and $y = F(y, x)$.

Definition 1.11. [1] An element $(x, y) \in X \times X$ is called (g_1) a coupled coincident point of mappings $F : X \times X \rightarrow X$ and $f : X \rightarrow X$ if $fx = F(x, y)$ and $fy = F(y, x)$.

(g_2) a common coupled fixed point of mappings $F : X \times X \rightarrow X$ and $f : X \rightarrow X$ if $x = fx = F(x, y)$ and $y = fy = F(y, x)$.

Definition 1.12. [1] The mappings $F : X \times X \rightarrow X$ and $f : X \rightarrow X$ are called w - compatible if $f(F(x, y)) = F(fx, fy)$ and $f(F(y, x)) = F(fy, fx)$ whenever $fx = F(x, y)$ and $fy = F(y, x)$.

Definition 1.13. [14] An element $(x, y, z) \in X \times X \times X$ is called

(i) a tripled coincident point of $F : X \times X \times X \rightarrow X$ and $f : X \rightarrow X$ if

$$fx = F(x, y, z), \quad fy = F(y, z, x) \text{ and } fz = F(z, x, y),$$

(ii) a common tripled fixed point of $F : X \times X \times X \rightarrow X$ and $f : X \rightarrow X$ if

$$x = fx = F(x, y, z), \quad y = fy = F(y, z, x) \text{ and } z = fz = F(z, x, y).$$

Definition 1.14. [14] The mappings $F : X \times X \times X \rightarrow X$ and $f : X \rightarrow X$ are called w - compatible if $f(F(x, y, z)) = F(fx, fy, fz)$, $f(F(y, z, x)) = F(fy, fz, fx)$ and $f(F(z, x, y)) = F(fz, fx, fy)$ whenever $fx = F(x, y, z)$, $fy = F(y, z, x)$ and $fz = F(z, x, y)$.

Let Φ be set of all continuous functions $\phi : [1, \infty) \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ such that

(i) ϕ is non - decreasing with $\phi(t) < t$

(ii) $\lim_{t \rightarrow r^+} \phi(t) < r, t > 1$

Now we prove our main result.

2. Main Result

Theorem 2.1. Let (X, d) be multiplicative metric space and let $T : X \times X \times X \rightarrow X$ and $g : X \rightarrow X$ be mappings satisfying

(2.1.1)

$$\frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx, T(x, y, z)), \\ d(gy, T(y, z, x)), \\ d(gz, T(z, x, y)) \end{array} \right\} \leq \max \{d(gx, gu), d(gy, gv), d(gz, gw)\}$$

implies that

$$d(T(x, y, z), T(u, v, w)) \leq$$

$$\phi \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx, gu), d(gy, gv), d(gz, gw), \\ d(gx, T(x, y, z)), d(gy, T(y, z, x)), d(gz, T(z, x, y)), \\ \frac{d(gu, T(u, v, w)), d(gv, T(v, w, u)), d(gw, T(w, u, v))}{\sqrt{d(gx, T(u, v, w))}, \sqrt{d(gy, T(v, w, u))}, \sqrt{d(gz, T(w, u, v))}} \end{array} \right\} \right),$$

for all x, y, z, u, v, w in X and $\phi \in \Phi$,

(2.1.2) $T(X \times X \times X) \subseteq g(X)$ and $g(X)$ is a complete subspaces of X ,

(2.1.3) the pair (T, g) is w - compatible.

Then T and g have a unique common tripled fixed point in $X \times X \times X$.

Proof. Let x_0, y_0, z_0 be arbitrary points in X . From (2.1.2), there exist sequences $\{x_n\}, \{y_n\}, \{z_n\}, \{u_n\}, \{v_n\}$ and $\{w_n\}$ in X such that

$$\begin{aligned} gx_{n+1} &= T(x_n, y_n, z_n), \\ gy_{n+1} &= T(y_n, z_n, x_n), \\ gz_{n+1} &= T(z_n, x_n, y_n), \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots \end{aligned}$$

Case (a) : If $gx_m = gx_{m+1}$, $gy_m = gy_{m+1}$ and $gz_m = gz_{m+1}$ for some m .

Then (x_m, y_m, z_m) is tripled coincidence point in $X \times X \times X$.

Case (b): Assume $gx_n \neq gx_{n+1}$ or $gy_n \neq gy_{n+1}$ or $gz_n \neq gz_{n+1}$ for all n .

Clearly we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}d(gx_n, T(x_n, y_n, z_n)) &\leq d(gx_n, gx_{n+1}) \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), \\ d(gy_n, gy_{n+1}), \\ d(gz_n, gz_{n+1}) \end{array} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_n, T(x_n, y_n, z_n)), \\ d(gy_n, T(y_n, z_n, x_n)), \\ d(gz_n, T(z_n, x_n, y_n)) \end{array} \right\} \leq \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), \\ d(gy_n, gy_{n+1}), \\ d(gz_n, gz_{n+1}) \end{array} \right\}.$$

From (2.1.1) , we get

$$\begin{aligned} & d(T(x_n, y_n, z_n), T(x_{n+1}, y_{n+1}, z_{n+1})) \\ \leq & \phi \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), d(gy_n, gy_{n+1}), d(gz_n, gz_{n+1}), \\ d(gx_n, T(x_n, y_n, z_n)), d(gy_n, T(y_n, z_n, x_n)), \\ d(gz_n, T(z_n, x_n, y_n)), \\ d(gx_{n+1}, T(x_{n+1}, y_{n+1}, z_{n+1})), \\ d(gy_{n+1}, T(y_{n+1}, z_{n+1}, x_{n+1})), \\ d(gz_{n+1}, T(z_{n+1}, x_{n+1}, y_{n+1})), \\ \sqrt{d(gx_n, T(x_{n+1}, y_{n+1}, z_{n+1}))}, \\ \sqrt{d(gy_n, T(y_{n+1}, z_{n+1}, x_{n+1}))}, \\ \sqrt{d(gz_n, T(z_{n+1}, x_{n+1}, y_{n+1}))} \end{array} \right\} \right), \\ = & \phi \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), d(gy_n, gy_{n+1}), \\ d(gz_n, gz_{n+1}), d(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), d(gy_n, gy_{n+1}), \\ d(gz_n, gz_{n+1}), d(gx_{n+1}, gx_{n+2}), d(gy_{n+1}, gy_{n+2}), \\ \frac{d(gz_{n+1}, gz_{n+2})}{\sqrt{d(gx_n, gx_{n+2})}}, \\ \frac{d(gz_{n+1}, gz_{n+2})}{\sqrt{d(gy_n, gy_{n+2})}}, \frac{d(gz_{n+1}, gz_{n+2})}{\sqrt{d(gz_n, gz_{n+2})}} \end{array} \right\} \right), \\ \leq & \phi \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), d(gy_n, gy_{n+1}), \\ d(gz_n, gz_{n+1}), d(gx_{n+1}, gx_{n+2}), d(gy_{n+1}, gy_{n+2}), \\ \frac{d(gz_{n+1}, gz_{n+2})}{\sqrt{d(gx_n, gx_{n+2})}}, \\ \frac{d(gz_{n+1}, gz_{n+2})}{\sqrt{d(gy_n, gy_{n+2})}}, \frac{d(gz_{n+1}, gz_{n+2})}{\sqrt{d(gz_n, gz_{n+2})}} \end{array} \right\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

But

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{d(gx_n, gx_{n+2})} & \leq \sqrt{d(gx_n, gx_{n+1}) \cdot d(gx_{n+1}, gx_{n+2})} \\ & \leq \max \{d(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), d(gx_{n+1}, gx_{n+2})\}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly

$$\sqrt{d(gy_n, gy_{n+2})} \leq \max \{d(gy_n, gy_{n+1}), d(gy_{n+1}, gy_{n+2})\}$$

and

$$\sqrt{d(gz_n, gz_{n+2})} \leq \max \{d(gz_n, gz_{n+1}), d(gz_{n+1}, gz_{n+2})\}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & d(gx_{n+1}, gx_{n+2}) \\ & \leq \phi \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), d(gy_n, gy_{n+1}), d(gz_n, gz_{n+1}), \\ d(gx_{n+1}, gx_{n+2}), d(gy_{n+1}, gy_{n+2}), d(gz_{n+1}, gz_{n+2}) \end{array} \right\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Put $R_n = \max \{d(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), d(gy_n, gy_{n+1}), d(gz_n, gz_{n+1})\}$.

Hence

$$d(gx_{n+1}, gx_{n+2}) \leq \phi(\max\{R_n, R_{n+1}\}).$$

Similarly

$$d(gy_{n+1}, gy_{n+2}) \leq \phi(\max\{R_n, R_{n+1}\})$$

and

$$d(gz_{n+1}, gz_{n+2}) \leq \phi(\max\{R_n, R_{n+1}\})$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} R_{n+1} &= \max\{d(gx_{n+1}, gx_{n+2}), d(gy_{n+1}, gy_{n+2}), d(gz_{n+1}, gz_{n+2})\} \\ &\leq \phi\left(\max\left\{\begin{array}{l} d(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), d(gy_n, gy_{n+1}), d(gz_n, gz_{n+1}), \\ d(gx_{n+1}, gx_{n+2}), d(gy_{n+1}, gy_{n+2}), d(gz_{n+1}, gz_{n+2}) \end{array}\right\}\right) \\ &\leq \phi(\max\{R_n, R_{n+1}\}). \end{aligned}$$

If R_{n+1} is maximum, we get

$$R_{n+1} \leq \phi(R_{n+1}) < R_{n+1}$$

which is a contradiction.

Hence R_n is a maximum

$$\begin{aligned} R_{n+1} &\leq \phi(R_n) \\ &< R_n. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Similarly

$$R_{n+2} < R_{n+1}.$$

Thus $\{R_n\}$ is decreasing sequence of positive real number and must converges to a real number $\delta \geq 1$ (say).

Suppose $\delta > 1$.

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (1), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi(R_n) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \delta^+} \phi(t), \text{ where } t = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} R_n \\ &< \delta \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction.

Hence $\delta = 1$. Thus

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max\{d(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), d(gy_n, gy_{n+1}), d(gz_n, gz_{n+1})\} = 1$$

which implies that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(gx_n, gx_{n+1}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(gy_n, gy_{n+1}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(gz_n, gz_{n+1}) = 1. \quad (2)$$

Now we prove that $\{gx_n\}$, $\{gy_n\}$ and $\{gz_n\}$ are multiplicative Cauchy sequences.

On contrary suppose that $\{gx_n\}$ or $\{gy_n\}$ or $\{gz_n\}$ are not multiplicative Cauchy sequences.

Then there exist an $\epsilon > 1$ and monotone increasing sequence of natural numbers $\{m_k\}$ and $\{n_k\}$ such that $n_k > m_k > k$,

$$\max\{d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k}), d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k}), d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k})\} \geq \epsilon \quad (3)$$

and

$$\max\{d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_{k-1}}), d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_{k-1}}), d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_{k-1}})\} < \epsilon. \quad (4)$$

From (3) and (4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &\leq \max\{d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k}), d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k}), d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k})\} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_{k-1}}).d(gx_{n_{k-1}}, gx_{n_k}), \\ d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_{k-1}}).d(gy_{n_{k-1}}, gy_{n_k}), \\ d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_{k-1}}).d(gz_{n_{k-1}}, gz_{n_k}) \end{array} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\epsilon \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \max\{d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k}), d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k}), d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k})\} \leq \epsilon.$$

Thus

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \max\{d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k}), d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k}), d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k})\} = \epsilon. \quad (5)$$

Form (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &\leq \max\{d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k}), d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k}), d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k})\} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_{k+1}}).d(gx_{n_{k+1}}, gx_{n_k}), \\ d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_{k+1}}).d(gy_{n_{k+1}}, gy_{n_k}), \\ d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_{k+1}}).d(gz_{n_{k+1}}, gz_{n_k}) \end{array} \right\} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k}).d(gx_{n_k}, gx_{n_{k+1}}).d(gx_{n_{k+1}}, gx_{n_k}), \\ d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k}).d(gy_{n_k}, gy_{n_{k+1}}).d(gy_{n_{k+1}}, gy_{n_k}), \\ d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k}).d(gz_{n_k}, gz_{n_{k+1}}).d(gz_{n_{k+1}}, gz_{n_k}) \end{array} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_{k+1}}), \\ d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_{k+1}}), \\ d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_{k+1}}) \end{array} \right\} = \epsilon. \tag{6}$$

From (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &\leq \max\{d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k}), d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k}), d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k})\} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{m_{k+1}}).d(gx_{m_{k+1}}, gx_{n_k}), \\ d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{m_{k+1}}).d(gy_{m_{k+1}}, gy_{n_k}), \\ d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{m_{k+1}}).d(gz_{m_{k+1}}, gz_{n_k}) \end{array} \right\} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{m_{k+1}}).d(gx_{m_{k+1}}, gx_{n_{k+2}}).d(gx_{n_{k+2}}, gx_{n_k}), \\ d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{m_{k+1}}).d(gy_{m_{k+1}}, gy_{n_{k+2}}).d(gy_{n_{k+2}}, gy_{n_k}), \\ d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{m_{k+1}}).d(gz_{m_{k+1}}, gz_{n_{k+2}}).d(gz_{n_{k+2}}, gz_{n_k}) \end{array} \right\} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{m_{k+1}}).d(gx_{m_{k+1}}, gx_{n_{k+2}}).d(gx_{n_{k+2}}, gx_{n_{k+1}}).d(gx_{n_{k+1}}, gx_{n_k}), \\ d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{m_{k+1}}).d(gy_{m_{k+1}}, gy_{n_{k+2}}).d(gy_{n_{k+2}}, gy_{n_{k+1}}).d(gy_{n_{k+1}}, gy_{n_k}), \\ d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{m_{k+1}}).d(gz_{m_{k+1}}, gz_{n_{k+2}}).d(gz_{n_{k+2}}, gz_{n_{k+1}}).d(gz_{n_{k+1}}, gz_{n_k}) \end{array} \right\} \tag{7} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{m_{k+1}}))^2.d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k}).(d(gx_{n_{k+2}}, gx_{n_{k+1}}))^2.(d(gx_{n_{k+1}}, gx_{n_k}))^2, \\ (d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{m_{k+1}}))^2.d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k}).(d(gy_{n_{k+2}}, gy_{n_{k+1}}))^2.(d(gy_{n_{k+1}}, gy_{n_k}))^2, \\ (d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{m_{k+1}}))^2.d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k}).(d(gz_{n_{k+2}}, gz_{n_{k+1}}))^2.(d(gz_{n_{k+1}}, gz_{n_k}))^2 \end{array} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, using (2), (5) and (7), we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \max\{d(gx_{m_{k+1}}, gx_{n_{k+2}}), d(gy_{m_{k+1}}, gy_{n_{k+2}}), d(gz_{m_{k+1}}, gz_{n_{k+2}})\} = \epsilon. \tag{8}$$

Also from (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &\leq \max\{d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k}), d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k}), d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k})\} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_{k+2}}).d(gx_{n_{k+2}}, gx_{n_k}), \\ d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_{k+2}}).d(gy_{n_{k+2}}, gy_{n_k}), \\ d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_{k+2}}).d(gz_{n_{k+2}}, gz_{n_k}), \end{array} \right\} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_{k+2}}).d(gx_{n_{k+2}}, gx_{n_{k+1}}).d(gx_{n_{k+1}}, gx_{n_k}), \\ d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_{k+2}}).d(gy_{n_{k+2}}, gy_{n_{k+1}}).d(gy_{n_{k+1}}, gy_{n_k}), \\ d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_{k+2}}).d(gz_{n_{k+2}}, gz_{n_{k+1}}).d(gz_{n_{k+1}}, gz_{n_k}) \end{array} \right\} \tag{9} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k}).(d(gx_{n_{k+2}}, gx_{n_{k+1}}))^2.(d(gx_{n_{k+1}}, gx_{n_k}))^2, \\ d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k}).(d(gy_{n_{k+2}}, gy_{n_{k+1}}))^2.(d(gy_{n_{k+1}}, gy_{n_k}))^2, \\ d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k}).(d(gz_{n_{k+2}}, gz_{n_{k+1}}))^2.(d(gz_{n_{k+1}}, gz_{n_k}))^2 \end{array} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, from (2),(5) and (9)

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \max\{d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_{k+2}}), d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_{k+2}}), d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_{k+2}})\} = \epsilon. \tag{10}$$

Again from (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \epsilon &\leq \max\{d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k}), d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k}), d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k})\} \\
 &\leq \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{m_{k+1}}).d(gx_{m_{k+1}}, gx_{n_k}), \\ d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{m_{k+1}}).d(gy_{m_{k+1}}, gy_{n_k}), \\ d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{m_{k+1}}).d(gz_{m_{k+1}}, gz_{n_k}) \end{array} \right\} \\
 &\leq \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{m_{k+1}}).d(gx_{m_{k+1}}, gx_{n_{k+1}}).d(gx_{n_{k+1}}, gx_{n_k}), \\ d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{m_{k+1}}).d(gy_{m_{k+1}}, gy_{n_{k+1}}).d(gy_{n_{k+1}}, gy_{n_k}), \\ d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{m_{k+1}}).d(gz_{m_{k+1}}, gz_{n_{k+1}}).d(gz_{n_{k+1}}, gz_{n_k}) \end{array} \right\} \quad (11) \\
 &\leq \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{m_{k+1}}))^2.d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k}).(d(gx_{n_{k+1}}, gx_{n_k}))^2, \\ (d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{m_{k+1}}))^2.d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k}).(d(gy_{n_{k+1}}, gy_{n_k}))^2, \\ (d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{m_{k+1}}))^2.d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k}).(d(gz_{n_{k+1}}, gz_{n_k}))^2 \end{array} \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, from (2),(5) and (11), we have that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \max\{d(gx_{m_k+1}, gx_{n_k+1}), d(gy_{m_k+1}, gy_{n_k+1}), d(gz_{m_k+1}, gz_{n_k+1})\} = \epsilon. \quad (12)$$

Now from (3), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 \epsilon &\leq \max\{d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k}), d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k}), d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k})\} \\
 &\leq \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_{k+1}}).d(gx_{n_{k+1}}, gx_{n_k}), \\ d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_{k+1}}).d(gy_{n_{k+1}}, gy_{n_k}), \\ d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_{k+1}}).d(gz_{n_{k+1}}, gz_{n_k}), \end{array} \right\} \\
 &\leq \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{m_{k+1}}).d(gx_{m_{k+1}}, gx_{n_{k+2}}).d(gx_{n_{k+2}}, gx_{n_{k+1}}).d(gx_{n_{k+1}}, gx_{n_k}), \\ d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{m_{k+1}}).d(gy_{m_{k+1}}, gy_{n_{k+2}}).d(gy_{n_{k+2}}, gy_{n_{k+1}}).d(gy_{n_{k+1}}, gy_{n_k}), \\ d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{m_{k+1}}).d(gz_{m_{k+1}}, gz_{n_{k+2}}).d(gz_{n_{k+2}}, gz_{n_{k+1}}).d(gz_{n_{k+1}}, gz_{n_k}) \end{array} \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, using (2), we obtain that

$$\epsilon \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \max\{d(gx_{m_{k+1}}, gx_{n_{k+2}}), d(gy_{m_{k+1}}, gy_{n_{k+2}}), d(gz_{m_{k+1}}, gz_{n_{k+2}})\}. \quad (13)$$

Now we will show that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k}, T(x_{m_k}, y_{m_k}, z_{m_k})), \\ d(gy_{m_k}, T(y_{m_k}, z_{m_k}, x_{m_k})), \\ d(gz_{m_k}, T(z_{m_k}, x_{m_k}, y_{m_k})) \end{array} \right\} \\
 \leq \max \{d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k+1}), d(gy_{m_k}, gx_{n_k+1}), d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k+1})\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

On contrary suppose that

$$\max \{d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k+1}), d(gy_{m_k}, gx_{n_k+1}), d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k+1})\}$$

$$< \frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k}, T(x_{m_k}, y_{m_k}, z_{m_k})), \\ d(gy_{m_k}, T(y_{m_k}, z_{m_k}, x_{m_k})), \\ d(gz_{m_k}, T(z_{m_k}, x_{m_k}, y_{m_k})) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2} \min\{1, 1, 1\} = \frac{1}{2}$$

which is a contradiction.

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k}, T(x_{m_k}, y_{m_k}, z_{m_k})), \\ d(gy_{m_k}, T(y_{m_k}, z_{m_k}, x_{m_k})), \\ d(gz_{m_k}, T(z_{m_k}, x_{m_k}, y_{m_k})) \end{array} \right\} \\ & \leq \max \{d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k+1}), d(gy_{m_k}, gx_{n_k+1}), d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k+1})\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now from (2.1.1), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & d(T(x_{m_k}, y_{m_k}, z_{m_k}), T(x_{n_k+1}, y_{n_k+1}, z_{n_k+1})) \\ & \leq \phi \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k+1}), d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k+1}), \\ d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k+1}), \\ d(gx_{m_k}, T(x_{m_k}, y_{m_k}, z_{m_k})), \\ d(gy_{m_k}, T(y_{m_k}, z_{m_k}, x_{m_k})), \\ d(gz_{m_k}, T(z_{m_k}, x_{m_k}, y_{m_k})), \\ d(gx_{n_k+1}, T(x_{n_k+1}, y_{n_k+1}, z_{n_k+1})), \\ d(gy_{n_k+1}, T(y_{n_k+1}, z_{n_k+1}, x_{n_k+1})), \\ \sqrt{d(gx_{m_k}, T(x_{n_k+1}, y_{n_k+1}, z_{n_k+1}))}, \\ \sqrt{d(gy_{m_k}, T(y_{n_k+1}, z_{n_k+1}, x_{n_k+1}))}, \\ \sqrt{d(gz_{m_k}, T(z_{n_k+1}, x_{n_k+1}, y_{n_k+1}))} \end{array} \right\}, \right. \\ & \left. = \phi \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k+1}), d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k+1}), \\ d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k+1}), d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{m_k+1}), \\ d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{m_k+1}), d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{m_k+1}), \\ d(gx_{n_k+1}, gx_{n_k+2}), d(gy_{n_k+1}, gy_{n_k+2}), \\ d(gz_{n_k+1}, gz_{n_k+2}), \sqrt{d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k+2})}, \\ \sqrt{d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k+2})}, \sqrt{d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k+2})} \end{array} \right\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$d(gx_{m_k+1}, gx_{n_k+2}) \leq \phi \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k+1}), d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k+1}), \\ d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k+1}), d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{m_k+1}), \\ d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{m_k+1}), d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{m_k+1}), \\ d(gx_{n_k+1}, gx_{n_k+2}), d(gy_{n_k+1}, gy_{n_k+2}), \\ d(gz_{n_k+1}, gz_{n_k+2}), \sqrt{d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k+2})}, \\ \sqrt{d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k+2})}, \sqrt{d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k+2})} \end{array} \right\} \right).$$

Similarly, we have

$$d(gy_{m_k+1}, gy_{n_k+2}) \leq \phi \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k+1}), d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k+1}), \\ d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k+1}), d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{m_k+1}), \\ d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{m_k+1}), d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{m_k+1}), \\ d(gx_{n_k+1}, gx_{n_k+2}), d(gy_{n_k+1}, gy_{n_k+2}), \\ d(gz_{n_k+1}, gz_{n_k+2}), \sqrt{d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k+2})}, \\ \sqrt{d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k+2})}, \sqrt{d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k+2})} \end{array} \right\} \right)$$

and

$$d(gz_{m_k+1}, gz_{n_k+2}) \leq \phi \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k+1}), d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k+1}), \\ d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k+1}), d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{m_k+1}), \\ d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{m_k+1}), d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{m_k+1}), \\ d(gx_{n_k+1}, gx_{n_k+2}), d(gy_{n_k+1}, gy_{n_k+2}), \\ d(gz_{n_k+1}, gz_{n_k+2}), \sqrt{d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k+2})}, \\ \sqrt{d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k+2})}, \sqrt{d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k+2})} \end{array} \right\} \right).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k+1}, gx_{n_k+2}), \\ d(gy_{m_k+1}, gy_{n_k+2}), \\ d(gz_{m_k+1}, gz_{n_k+2}) \end{array} \right\} \\ & \leq \phi \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k+1}), d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k+1}), \\ d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k+1}), d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{m_k+1}), \\ d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{m_k+1}), d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{m_k+1}), \\ d(gx_{n_k+1}, gx_{n_k+2}), d(gy_{n_k+1}, gy_{n_k+2}), \\ d(gz_{n_k+1}, gz_{n_k+2}), \sqrt{d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k+2})}, \\ \sqrt{d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k+2})}, \sqrt{d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k+2})} \end{array} \right\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

From (13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &\leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k+1}, gx_{n_k+2}), \\ d(gy_{m_k+1}, gy_{n_k+2}), \\ d(gz_{m_k+1}, gz_{n_k+2}) \end{array} \right\} \\ &\leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \phi \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k+1}), d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k+1}), \\ d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k+1}), d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{m_k+1}), \\ d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{m_k+1}), d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{m_k+1}), \\ d(gx_{n_k+1}, gx_{n_k+2}), d(gy_{n_k+1}, gy_{n_k+2}), \\ d(gz_{n_k+1}, gz_{n_k+2}), \sqrt{d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k+2})}, \\ \sqrt{d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k+2})}, \sqrt{d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k+2})} \end{array} \right\} \right) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \epsilon^+} \phi(t) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} t &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k+1}), d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k+1}), \\ d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k+1}), d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{m_k+1}), \\ d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{m_k+1}), d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{m_k+1}), \\ d(gx_{n_k+1}, gx_{n_k+2}), d(gy_{n_k+1}, gy_{n_k+2}), \\ d(gz_{n_k+1}, gz_{n_k+2}), \sqrt{d(gx_{m_k}, gx_{n_k+2})}, \\ \sqrt{d(gy_{m_k}, gy_{n_k+2})}, \sqrt{d(gz_{m_k}, gz_{n_k+2})} \end{array} \right\} > 1 \\ &< \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction.

Hence $\{gx_n\}$, $\{gy_n\}$ and $\{gz_n\}$ are Cauchy sequences in the multiplicative metric space (X, d) .

Hence we have

$$\lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} d(gx_n, gx_m) = \lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} d(gy_n, gy_m) = \lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} d(gz_n, gz_m) = 1.$$

Suppose $g(X)$ is a complete subspace of X .

Since $\{gx_n\}$, $\{gy_n\}$ and $\{gz_n\}$ are Cauchy sequence in the multiplicative metric space $(g(X), d)$.

It follows that $\{gx_n\}$, $\{gy_n\}$ and $\{gz_n\}$ convergent to some r , s and t in $g(X)$.

Thus

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(gx_n, r) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(gy_n, s) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(gz_n, t) = 1.$$

Since $r, s, t \in g(X)$, there exist $a, b, c \in X$ such that $r = ga$, $s = gb$ and $t = gc$.

Now we claim that for each $n \geq 1$, at least one of the following holds

$$\frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), \\ d(gy_n, gy_{n+1}), \\ d(gz_n, gz_{n+1}) \end{array} \right\} \leq \max \{ d(gx_n, ga), d(gy_n, gb), d(gz_n, gc) \}$$

or

$$\frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{n+1}, gx_{n+2}), \\ d(gy_{n+1}, gy_{n+2}), \\ d(gz_{n+1}, gz_{n+2}) \end{array} \right\} \leq \max \{ d(gx_{n+1}, ga), d(gy_{n+1}, gb), d(gz_{n+1}, gc) \}.$$

On contrary suppose that

$$\frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), \\ d(gy_{n+1}, gy_{n+2}), \\ d(gz_{n+1}, gz_{n+2}) \end{array} \right\} > \max \{ d(gx_n, ga), d(gy_n, gb), d(gz_{n+1}, gc) \}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{n+1}, gx_{n+2}), \\ d(gy_{n+1}, gy_{n+2}), \\ d(gz_{n+1}, gz_{n+2}) \end{array} \right\} > \max \{ d(gx_{n+1}, ga), d(gy_{n+1}, gb), d(gz_{n+1}, gb) \}.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} d(gx_n, gx_{n+1}) &\leq d(gx_n, ga).d(ga, gx_{n+1}) \\ &< \frac{1}{2}d(gx_n, gx_{n+1}).\frac{1}{2}d(gx_{n+1}, gx_{n+2}) \\ &= \frac{1}{4}d(gx_n, gx_{n+1}).d(gx_{n+1}, gx_{n+2}). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ and using (2), we have $1 \leq \frac{1}{4}$ which is a contradiction.

Hence claim holds.

Sub case (i): Suppose

$$\frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), \\ d(gy_n, gy_{n+1}), \\ d(gz_n, gz_{n+1}) \end{array} \right\} \leq \max \{ d(gx_n, ga), d(gy_n, gb), d(gz_n, gc) \}.$$

Now we prove that $T(a, b, c) = r$, $T(b, c, a) = s$ and $T(c, a, b) = t$.

From (2.1.1), we get that

$$d(T(x_n, y_n, z_n), T(a, b, c)) \leq \phi \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_n, ga), d(gy_n, gb), d(gz_n, gc), \\ d(gx_n, T(x_n, y_n, z_n)), d(gy_n, T(y_n, z_n, x_n)), \\ d(gz_n, T(z_n, x_n, y_n)), d(ga, T(a, b, c)), \\ d(gb, T(b, c, a)), d(gc, T(c, a, b)), \\ \sqrt{d(gx_n, T(a, b, c))}, \sqrt{d(gy_n, T(b, c, a))}, \sqrt{d(gz_n, T(c, a, b))} \end{array} \right\} \right).$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & d(ga, T(a, b, c)) \\ & \leq \phi \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(ga, ga), d(gb, gb), d(gc, gc), \\ d(ga, ga), d(gb, gb), \\ d(gc, gc), d(ga, T(a, b, c)), \\ d(gb, T(b, c, a)), d(gc, T(c, a, b)), \\ \sqrt{d(ga, T(a, b, c))}, \sqrt{d(gb, T(b, c, a))}, \sqrt{d(gc, T(c, a, b))} \end{array} \right\} \right) \\ & \leq \phi \left(\max \{ d(ga, T(a, b, c)), d(gb, T(b, c, a)), d(gc, T(c, a, b)) \} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} & d(gb, T(b, c, a)) \\ & \leq \phi \left(\max \{ d(ga, T(a, b, c)), d(gb, T(b, c, a)), d(gc, T(c, a, b)) \} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & d(gc, T(c, a, b)) \\ & \leq \phi \left(\max \{ d(ga, T(a, b, c)), d(gb, T(b, c, a)), d(gc, T(c, a, b)) \} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(ga, T(a, b, c)), \\ d(gb, T(b, c, a)), \\ d(gc, T(c, a, b)) \end{array} \right\} \\ & \leq \phi \left(\max \{ d(ga, T(a, b, c)), d(gb, T(b, c, a)), d(gc, T(c, a, b)) \} \right) \\ & < \max \{ d(ga, T(a, b, c)), d(gb, T(b, c, a)), d(gc, T(c, a, b)) \}, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction.

Hence $r = ga = T(a, b, c)$, $s = gb = T(b, c, a)$ and $t = gc = T(c, a, b)$.

Since (T, g) is w - compatible, we have $T(r, s, t) = gr$, $T(s, t, r) = gs$ and $T(t, r, s) = gt$.

Now we show that $T(r, s, t) = gr = r$, $T(s, t, r) = gs = s$ and $T(t, r, s) = gt = t$.

Let us suppose that $T(r, s, t) \neq r$ or $T(s, t, r) \neq s$ or $T(t, r, s) \neq t$.

Clearly

$$\frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ \begin{array}{c} d(gr, T(r, s, t)), d(gs, T(s, t, r)), \\ d(gt, T(t, r, s)) \end{array} \right\} \leq \max \{d(gr, ga), d(gs, gb), d(gt, gc)\}$$

implies that

$$\begin{aligned} d(T(r, s, t), r) &= d(T(r, s, t), T(a, b, c)) \\ &\leq \phi \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{c} d(gr, ga), d(gs, gb), d(gt, gc), \\ d(gr, T(r, s, t)), d(gs, T(s, t, r)), d(gt, T(t, r, s)), \\ d(ga, T(a, b, c)), d(gb, T(b, c, a)), \\ d(gc, T(c, a, b)), \sqrt{d(gr, T(a, b, c))}, \\ \sqrt{d(gs, T(b, c, a))}, \sqrt{d(gt, T(c, a, b))} \end{array} \right\} \right) \\ &\leq \phi \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{c} d(r, T(r, s, t)), \\ d(s, T(s, t, r)), \\ d(t, T(t, r, s)) \end{array} \right\} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we can show that

$$d(T(s, t, r), s) \leq \phi \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{c} d(r, T(r, s, t)), \\ d(s, T(s, t, r)), \\ d(t, T(t, r, s)) \end{array} \right\} \right)$$

and

$$d(T(t, r, s), s) \leq \phi \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{c} d(r, T(r, s, t)), \\ d(s, T(s, t, r)), \\ d(t, T(t, r, s)) \end{array} \right\} \right)$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \max \left\{ \begin{array}{c} d(r, T(r, s, t)), \\ d(s, T(s, t, r)), \\ d(t, T(t, r, s)) \end{array} \right\} &\leq \phi \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{c} d(r, T(r, s, t)), \\ d(s, T(s, t, r)), \\ d(t, T(t, r, s)) \end{array} \right\} \right) \\ &< \max \left\{ \begin{array}{c} d(r, T(r, s, t)), \\ d(s, T(s, t, r)), \\ d(t, T(t, r, s)) \end{array} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

is a contradiction.

Hence (r, s, t) is common tripled fixed point of T and g .

Let (r^*, s^*, t^*) be another common tripled fixed point of T and g .

Clearly

$$\frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gr, T(r, s, t)), \\ d(gs, T(s, t, r)), \\ d(gt, T(t, r, s)) \end{array} \right\} \leq \max \{d(gr, gr^*), d(gs, gs^*), d(gt, gt^*)\}$$

implies that

$$\begin{aligned} d(r, r^*) &= d(T(r, s, t), T(r^*, s^*, t^*)) \\ &\leq \phi \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gr, gr^*), d(gs, gs^*), d(gt, gt^*), \\ d(gr, T(r, s, t)), d(gs, T(s, t, r)), d(gt, T(t, r, s)), \\ d(gr^*, T(r^*, s^*, t^*)), d(gs^*, T(s^*, t^*, r^*)), \\ d(gt^*, T(t^*, r^*, s^*)), \sqrt{d(gr, T(r^*, s^*, t^*))}, \\ \sqrt{d(gs, T(s^*, t^*, r^*))}, \sqrt{d(gt, T(t^*, r^*, s^*))} \end{array} \right\} \right) \\ &\leq \phi (\max \{ d(r, r^*), d(s, s^*), d(t, t^*) \}). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we can show that

$$d(s, s^*) \leq \phi (\max \{ d(r, r^*), d(s, s^*), d(t, t^*) \})$$

and

$$d(t, t^*) \leq \phi (\max \{ d(r, r^*), d(s, s^*), d(t, t^*) \}).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \max \{ d(r, r^*), d(s, s^*), d(t, t^*) \} &\leq \phi (\max \{ d(r, r^*), d(s, s^*), d(t, t^*) \}) \\ &< \max \{ d(r, r^*), d(s, s^*), d(t, t^*) \} \end{aligned}$$

is a contradiction.

Hence $r = r^*, s = s^*$ and $t = t^*$.

Hence (r, s, t) is a unique common tripled fixed point of T and g .

Now we claim that $r \neq s$ or $s \neq t$ or $t \neq r$.

Clearly

$$\frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gr, T(r, s, t)), \\ d(gs, T(s, t, r)), \\ d(gt, T(t, r, s)) \end{array} \right\} \leq \max \{d(gr, gs), d(gs, gt), d(gt, gr)\}$$

implies that

$$d(r, s) = d(T(r, s, t), T(s, t, r))$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \phi \left(\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gr, gs), d(gs, gt), d(gt, gr), \\ d(gr, T(r, s, t)), d(gs, T(s, t, r)), d(gt, T(t, r, s)), \\ d(gs, T(s, t, r)), d(gt, T(t, r, s)), \\ d(gr, T(r, s, t)), \sqrt{d(gr, T(s, t, r))}, \\ \sqrt{d(gs, T(t, r, s))}, \sqrt{d(gt, T(r, s, t))} \end{array} \right\} \right) \\ &\leq \phi \left(\max \{ d(r, s), d(s, t), d(t, r) \} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we can show that

$$d(s, t) \leq \phi \left(\max \{ d(r, s), d(s, t), d(t, r) \} \right)$$

and

$$d(t, r) \leq \phi \left(\max \{ d(r, s), d(s, t), d(t, r) \} \right).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \max \{ d(r, s), d(s, t), d(t, r) \} &\leq \phi \left(\max \{ d(r, s), d(s, t), d(t, r) \} \right) \\ &< \max \{ d(r, s), d(s, t), d(t, r) \} \end{aligned}$$

is a contradiction.

Thus $r = s = t$.

Hence (r, r, r) is unique common tripled fixed point of T and g .

There exist a unique common tripled fixed point of T and g when

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d(gx_{n+1}, gx_{n+2}), \\ d(gy_{n+1}, gy_{n+2}), \\ d(gz_{n+1}, gz_{n+2}) \end{array} \right\} \\ \leq \max \{ d(gx_{n+1}, ga), d(gy_{n+1}, gb), d(gz_{n+1}, gc) \} \end{aligned}$$

holds. □

Example 2.2. Let $X = [0, 1]$ and $d(x, y) = e^{|x-y|}$ for all $x, y \in X$ then (X, d) is a complete multiplicative metric space. Let $T : X \times X \times X \rightarrow X$ and $g : X \rightarrow X$ be defined by $T(x, y, z) = \frac{x+y+z}{4}$ and $g(x) = \frac{x}{2}$. Let $\phi : [1, \infty) \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ be defined by $\phi(t) = t^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Then T and g satisfies all the conditions of Theorem 2.1.

Clearly $(0, 0, 0)$ is the unique common tripled fixed point of T and g .

References

- [1] M. Abbas, M. Alikhan and S. Radenović, Common coupled fixed point theorems in cone metric spaces for w -compatible mappings. *Appl. Math. Comput.* 2010; Volume 217, Issue 1, 195 - 202.
- [2] M. Abbas, M. La Sen and T. Nazir, Common fixed points of generalized rational type cocyclic mappings in multiplicative metric spaces. Hindawi Publishing Corporation, *Discrete Dynamics in nature and society*, Volume 2015, Article ID 532725, 10 pages, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2015/532725>.
- [3] A. E. Bashirov, E. M. Kurpinar and A. Ozyapici, Multiplicative calculus and its applications, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 337 (2008), 36 - 48. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jmaa.2007.03.081>
- [4] T. G. Bhaskar and V. Lakshmikantham, Fixed point theorems in partially ordered metric spaces and applications. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 2006, 65, 1379 - 1393.
- [5] X. He, M. Song and D. Chen, Common fixed points for weak commutative mappings on a multiplicative metric space, *Fixed Point Theory Appl.*, 48 (2014), 9 pages. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1687-1812-2014-48>
- [6] S. M. Kang, P. Nagpal, G. Sudhir Kumar and Sanjay Kumar, Fixed Points for Multiplicative Expansive Mappings in Multiplicative Metric Spaces, *Int. J. Math. Anal. (Ruse)*, Vol. 9, 2015, no. 39, 1939 - 1946.
- [7] V. Lakshmikantham and Lj. Ćirić, Coupled fixed point theorems for nonlinear contractions in partially ordered metric spaces. *Nonlinear Anal.* 2009, 70, 4341 - 4349.
- [8] M. Ozavsar and A. C. Cevikel, Fixed point of multiplicative contraction mappings on multiplicative metric spaces, *arXiv:1205.5131v1 [math.GM]*, 2012.
- [9] M. Sarwar and Badshah-e-Rome, Some unique fixed point theorems in multiplicative metric space, *arXiv:1410.3384v2 [math.GM]* 29 Dec 2014.
- [10] K. P. R. Rao, G. N. V. Kishore and N. Van Luong, A unique common coupled fixed point theorem for four maps under $\psi - \phi$ contractive condition in partial metric spaces. *Cubo* 2012, Vol.14, No03, 115 - 127.
- [11] K. P. R. Rao, G. N. V. Kishore and V. C. C. Raju, A coupled fixed point theorem for two pairs of w -compatible maps using altering distance function in partial metric space. *J. Adv. Res. Pure Math.* 2012, 4(4), 96 - 114.
- [12] Samet, B, Vetro, C Coupled fixed point, f -invariant set and fixed point of N -order. *Ann. Funct. Anal.* 1(2), 46-56 (2010)
- [13] Berinde, V, Borcut, M Tripled fixed point theorems for contractive type mappings in partially ordered metric spaces. *Nonlinear Anal.* 74(15), 4889-4897 (2011)
- [14] Aydi, H, Abbas, M, Sintunavarat, W, Kumam, P Tripled fixed point of W -compatible mappings in abstract metric spaces. *Fixed Point Theory Appl.* 2012, 134 (2012). [doi:10.1186/1687-1812-2012-134](https://doi.org/10.1186/1687-1812-2012-134).
- [15] Aydi, H, Karapinar, E, Postolache, M Tripled coincidence point theorems for weak -contractions in partially ordered metric spaces. *Fixed Point Theory Appl.* 2012, 44 (2012).
- [16] W. Shatanawi, B. Samet and M. Abbas, Coupled fixed point theorems for mixed monotone mappings in ordered partial metric spaces. *Mathematical and Computer Modeling* 2012, 55, 680 - 687.

- [17] T. Suzuki, A generalized Banach contraction principle which characterizes metric completeness. *Proc.Amer.Math.Soc.* 2008. vol. 136, pp. 1861-1869.