Nonlinear Functional Analysis and Applications
Vol. 27, No. 3 (2022), pp. 587-601
ISSN: 1229-1595(print), 2466-0973(online)
https://doi.org/10.22771/nfaa.2022.27.03.08
http://nfaa.kyungnam.ac.kr/journal-nfaa

GENERALIZED CONTRACTIONS VIA $\mathcal{Z}$-CONTRACTION

Duangkamon Kitkuan[1] and Sompob Saelee[2]

[1]Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science and Technology,
Rambhai Barni Rajabhat University, Chanthaburi 22000, Thailand
e-mail: duangkamon.k@rbru.ac.th

[2]Faculty of Science and Technology, Bansomdejchaopraya Rajabhat University,
1061 Issaraphap Road, Hiranrujee, Thonburi Bangkok 10600 Thailand
e-mail: sompob.sa@bsru.ac.th

Abstract. In this article, we introduce the concept of contractive mapping, which is generally weak in metric spaces, and show the existence and uniqueness of the fixed point for such mapping in a metric space.

1. Introduction

The metric fixed point theory has been expanded, changed and presented in various forms from Banach's contraction principle (see [1, 2, 3, 11, 12]).

Samet et al. [19] introduced the concept of α-ψ-contractive mapping. It defines the concept of accepting α-admissible and the use of the Bianchini Grandolfi gauge function [4], and the authors examined the existence and uniqueness of fixed points for mapping.

Khojasteh et al. [7] defines the concept of simulation and the new class defining function of nonlinear contraction, namely $\mathcal{Z}$-contractions which outlines Banach contraction principle and combines several known types of contractions. For other results on this interesting approach, see [5, 8, 9, 13, 14, 18].

[0]Received July 4, 2021. Revised February 22, 2022. Accepted March 31, 2022.
[0]2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 47H09, 47H10.
[0]Keywords: Generalized contractions, $\mathcal{Z}$-contraction, simulation functions, α-admissible.
[0]Corresponding author: S. Saelee(sompob.sa@bsru.ac.th).

2. Preliminaries

Definition 2.1. ([19]) Let $\mathscr{Q}: \mathscr{X} \to \mathscr{X}$ be a self-mapping and $\alpha : \mathscr{X} \times \mathscr{X} \to [0, \infty)$ be a function. $\mathscr{Q}$ is said to be α-admissible if

$$\alpha(\mu, \rho) \geq 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \alpha(\mathscr{Q}\mu, \mathscr{Q}\rho) \geq 1, \quad \text{for all } \mu, \rho \in \mathscr{X}.$$

Definition 2.2. ([15]) Let $\mathscr{Q}: \mathscr{X} \to \mathscr{X}$ be a self-mapping and $\alpha : \mathscr{X} \times \mathscr{X} \to [0, \infty)$ be a function. $\mathscr{Q}$ is said to be α-orbital admissible if

$$\alpha(\mu, \mathscr{Q}\mu) \geq 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \alpha(\mathscr{Q}\mu, \mathscr{Q}\mu) \geq 1.$$

Moreover, $\mathscr{Q}$ is called triangular α-orbital admissible if it satisfies the following conditions:

(a) $\mathscr{Q}$ is α-orbital admissible.
(b) $\alpha(\mu, \rho) \geq 1$ and $\alpha(\rho, \mathscr{Q}\rho) \geq 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \alpha(\mu, \mathscr{Q}\rho) \geq 1$.

Definition 2.3. ([16]) If $\phi^n(\eta) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ for every $\eta \in [0, \infty)$, where ϕ^n is the n-th iterate of ϕ then an increasing function $\phi : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ is a comparison.

Let Ψ be the family of functions $\psi : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ satisfying the following conditions:

(a) ψ is nondecreasing.
(b) $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \psi^n(\eta) < \infty$ for all $\eta > 0$, where ψ^n is the n-th iterate of ψ.

Lemma 2.4. ([16]) *If $\psi \in \Psi$, then the following hold:*

(a) *$\{\psi^n(\eta)\}$ converges to 0 as $n \to \infty$ for all $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^+$;*
(b) *$\psi(\eta) < \eta$, for any $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^+$;*
(c) *ψ is continuous at 0;*
(d) *the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \psi^n(\eta)$ converges for any $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^+$.*

Karapinar and Samet [6] introduced a generalized α-ψ contractive type mapping which is defined by

$$\alpha(\mu, \rho)\Lambda(\mathscr{Q}\mu, \mathscr{Q}\rho) \leq \psi(\mathscr{M}(\mu, \rho)), \quad \text{for all } \mu, \rho \in \mathscr{X},$$

where

$$\mathscr{M}(\mu, \rho) = \max\left\{\Lambda(\mu, \rho), \frac{\Lambda(\mu, \mathscr{Q}\mu) + \Lambda(\rho, \mathscr{Q}\rho)}{2}, \frac{\Lambda(\mu, \mathscr{Q}\rho) + \Lambda(\rho, \mathscr{Q}\mu)}{2}\right\},$$

$(\mathscr{X}, \Lambda)$ is a metric space, $\mathscr{Q}: \mathscr{X} \to \mathscr{X}$ is a given mapping, $\alpha : \mathscr{X} \times \mathscr{X} \to [0, \infty)$ and $\psi \in \Psi$.

Definition 2.5. ([7]) A simulation function is a mapping $\zeta : [0, \infty) \times [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the following conditions:

($\zeta 1$) $\zeta(0,0)=0$;
($\zeta 2$) $\zeta(\eta,\vartheta)<\vartheta-\eta$ for all $\eta,\vartheta>0$;
($\zeta 3$) if $\{\eta_n\},\{\vartheta_n\}$ are sequences in $(0,\infty)$ such that $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\eta_n=\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\vartheta_n>0$, then

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}(\eta_n,\vartheta_n)<0.$$

We denote the set of all simulation functions by $\mathcal{Z}$.

Let $(\mathscr{X},\Lambda)$ be a metric space, $\mathscr{Q}$ be a self-mapping on $\mathscr{X}$ and $\zeta\in\mathcal{Z}$. We say that $\mathscr{Q}$ is a $\mathcal{Z}$-contraction with respect to ζ [7], if

$$\zeta(\Lambda(\mathscr{Q}\mu,\mathscr{Q}\rho),\Lambda(\mu,\rho))\geq 0,\quad \text{for all } \mu,\rho\in\mathscr{X}.$$

Theorem 2.6. ([7]) *Every $\mathcal{Z}$-contraction on a complete metric space has a unique fixed point.*

Theorem 2.7. ([10]) *Let $(\mathscr{X},\Lambda)$ be a complete metric space and let $\mathscr{Q}:\mathscr{X}\to\mathscr{X}$ be a mapping. Suppose that there exist a simulation function ζ and a lower semi-continuous function $\varphi:\mathscr{X}\to[0,\infty)$ such that*

$$\zeta(\Lambda(\mathscr{Q}\mu,\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho),\Lambda(\mu,\rho)+\varphi(\mu)+\varphi(\rho))\geq 0,$$

for all $\mu,\rho\in\mathscr{X}$. Then $\mathscr{Q}$ has a unique fixed point z such that $\varphi(z)=0$.

3. Main results

Theorem 3.1. *Let $(\mathscr{X},\Lambda)$ be a complete metric space and let $\mathscr{Q}:\mathscr{X}\to\mathscr{X}$ be a mapping. Suppose that there exist a simulation function ζ and $\varphi:X\to[0,\infty)$, $\psi\in\Psi$ and $\alpha:\mathscr{X}\times\mathscr{X}\to[0,\infty)$ such that*

$$\zeta(\alpha(\mu,\rho)(\Lambda(\mathscr{Q}\mu,\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho)),\psi(\mathscr{M}(\mu,\rho)))\geq 0, \tag{3.1}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathscr{M}(\mu,\rho)\\ &=\max\Big\{\Lambda(\mu,\rho)+\varphi(\mu)+\varphi(\rho),\ \Lambda(\mu,\mathscr{Q}\mu)+\varphi(\mu)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu),\\ &\qquad\Lambda(\rho,\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\varphi(\rho)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho),\\ &\qquad\frac{1}{2}\{\Lambda(\mu,\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\varphi(\mu)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\Lambda(\rho,\mathscr{Q}\mu)+\varphi(\rho)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu)\}\Big\}\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

and satisfies

(1) *$\mathscr{Q}$ is triangular α-orbital admissible*;
(2) *there exists $\mu_0\in\mathscr{X}$ such that $\alpha(\mu_0,\mathscr{Q}\mu_0)\geq 1$;*
(3) *$\mathscr{Q}$ is continuous.*

Then there exists $z\in\mathscr{X}$ such that $z=\mathscr{Q}z$.

Proof. From the condition (2), there exists $u_0 \in \mathscr{X}$ such that $\alpha(\mu_0, \mathscr{Q}\mu_0) \geq 1$. Starting with this initial point $u_0 \in \mathscr{X}$ an iterative sequence $\{\mu_n\}$ is constructed by $\mu_{n+1} = \mathscr{Q}\mu_n$ for all $n \geq 0$. If $\mu_{m+1} = \mathscr{Q}\mu_m$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, then μ_m is a fixed point of $\mathscr{Q}$. Thus, to continue our proof. Suppose that $\mu_n \neq \mu_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Using $\mathscr{Q}$ is α-orbital admissible, we obtain

$$\alpha(\mu_0, \mu_1) = \alpha(\mu_0, \mathscr{Q}\mu_0) \geq 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \alpha(\mathscr{Q}\mu_0, \mathscr{Q}\mu_1) = \alpha(\mu_1, \mu_2) \geq 1. \tag{3.3}$$

By induction, we get

$$\alpha(\mu_n, \mu_{n+1}) \geq 1, \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{3.4}$$

Using (3.1) and (3.4), it follows that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \zeta(\alpha(\mu_n, \mu_{n-1})(\Lambda(\mathscr{Q}\mu_n, \mathscr{Q}\mu_{n-1}) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu_n) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu_{n-1})), \psi(\mathscr{M}(\mu_n, \mu_{n-1}))) \\ &= \zeta(\alpha(\mu_n, \mu_{n-1})(\Lambda(\mu_{n+1}, \mu_n) + \varphi(\mu_{n+1}) + \varphi(\mu_n)), \psi(\mathscr{M}(\mu_n, \mu_{n-1}))) \\ &< \psi(\mathscr{M}(\mu_n, \mu_{n-1})) - [\alpha(\mu_n, \mu_{n-1})(\Lambda(\mu_{n+1}, \mu_n) + \varphi(\mu_{n+1}) + \varphi(\mu_n))]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

The above inequality shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(\mu_{n+1}, \mu_n) + \varphi(\mu_{n+1}) + \varphi(\mu_n) &\leq \alpha(\mu_n, \mu_{n-1})(\Lambda(\mu_{n+1}, \mu_n) + \varphi(\mu_{n+1}) + \varphi(\mu_n)) \\ &< \psi(\mathscr{M}(\mu_n, \mu_{n-1})) \\ &< \mathscr{M}(\mu_n, \mu_{n-1}), \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathscr{M}(\mu_n, \mu_{n-1}) \\ &= \max\Big\{\Lambda(\mu_n, \mu_{n-1}) + \varphi(\mu_n) + \varphi(\mu_{n-1}), \Lambda(\mu_n, \mathscr{Q}\mu_n) + \varphi(\mu_n) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu_n), \\ &\qquad \Lambda(\mu_{n-1}, \mathscr{Q}\mu_{n-1}) + \varphi(\mu_{n-1}) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu_{n-1}), \\ &\qquad \frac{1}{2}\{\Lambda(\mu_n, \mathscr{Q}\mu_{n-1}) + \varphi(\mu_n) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu_{n-1}) \\ &\qquad + \Lambda(\mu_{n-1}, \mathscr{Q}\mu_n) + \varphi(\mu_{n-1}) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu_n)\}\Big\} \\ &= \max\Big\{\Lambda(\mu_n, \mu_{n-1}) + \varphi(\mu_n) + \varphi(\mu_{n-1}), \Lambda(\mu_n, \mu_{n+1}) + \varphi(\mu_n) + \varphi(\mu_{n+1}), \\ &\qquad \Lambda(\mu_{n-1}, \mu_n) + \varphi(\mu_{n-1}) + \varphi(\mu_n), \\ &\qquad \frac{1}{2}\{\Lambda(\mu_n, \mu_n) + \varphi(\mu_n) + \varphi(\mu_n) + \Lambda(\mu_{n-1}, \mu_{n+1}) + \varphi(\mu_{n-1}) + \varphi(\mu_{n+1})\}\Big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\{\Lambda(\mu_n,\mu_n)+\varphi(\mu_n)+\varphi(\mu_n)+\Lambda(\mu_{n-1},\mu_{n+1})+\varphi(\mu_{n-1})+\varphi(\mu_{n+1})\}\\&\leq \frac{1}{2}\{\Lambda(\mu_n,\mu_{n+1})+\varphi(\mu_n)+\varphi(\mu_{n+1})+\Lambda(\mu_{n-1},\mu_n)+\varphi(\mu_{n-1})+\varphi(\mu_n)\}\\&\leq \max\{\Lambda(\mu_n,\mu_{n+1})+\varphi(\mu_n)+\varphi(\mu_{n+1}),\Lambda(\mu_{n-1},\mu_n)+\varphi(\mu_{n-1})+\varphi(\mu_n)\},\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

it follows from (3.6) that

$$\Lambda(\mu_{n+1},\mu_n)+\varphi(\mu_{n+1})+\varphi(\mu_n)<\mathscr{M}(\mu_n,\mu_{n-1}). \tag{3.9}$$

If $\mathscr{M}(\mu_n,\mu_{n-1})=\Lambda(\mu_{n+1},\mu_n)+\varphi(\mu_{n+1})+\varphi(\mu_n)$, then it follows from inequality (3.9) that

$$\Lambda(\mu_{n+1},\mu_n)+\varphi(\mu_{n+1})+\varphi(\mu_n)<\Lambda(\mu_{n+1},\mu_n)+\varphi(\mu_{n+1})+\varphi(\mu_n),$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, we have

$$\Lambda(\mu_{n+1},\mu_n)+\varphi(\mu_{n+1})+\varphi(\mu_n)\geq\Lambda(\mu_{n+1},\mu_n)+\varphi(\mu_{n+1})+\varphi(\mu_n),$$

for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$, and so $\mathscr{M}(\mu_n,\mu_{n-1})=\Lambda(\mu_n,\mu_{n-1})+\varphi(\mu_n)+\varphi(\mu_{n-1})$. It follows from (3.6) that

$$\Lambda(\mu_{n+1},\mu_n)+\varphi(\mu_{n+1})+\varphi(\mu_n)<\Lambda(\mu_n,\mu_{n-1})+\varphi(\mu_n)+\varphi(\mu_{n-1}),$$

which implies that $\{\Lambda(\mu_n,\mu_{n-1})+\varphi(\mu_n)+\varphi(\mu_{n-1})\}$ is a decreasing sequence and bounded below by zero. Moreover, the inequality (3.6) turns into

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda(\mu_n,\mu_{n+1})&\leq\alpha(\mu_n,\mu_{n-1})(\Lambda(\mu_{n+1},\mu_n)+\varphi(\mu_{n+1})+\varphi(\mu_n))\\&<\psi(\mathscr{M}(\mu_n,\mu_{n-1}))<\mathscr{M}(\mu_n,\mu_{n-1})\\&<\Lambda(\mu_n,\mu_{n-1})+\varphi(\mu_n)+\varphi(\mu_{n-1}).\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Accordingly, there exists $R\geq 0$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}[\Lambda(\mu_n,\mu_{n-1})+\varphi(\mu_n)+\varphi(\mu_{n-1})]=R\geq 0.$$

We will show that have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\Lambda(\mu_n,\mu_{n-1})=0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n\to\infty}\varphi(\mu_n)=0. \tag{3.11}$$

Suppose that $R>0$ from the inequality (3.10), we get

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}[\alpha(\mu_n,\mu_{n-1})(\Lambda(\mu_n,\mu_{n-1})+\varphi(\mu_n)+\varphi(\mu_{n-1}))]=R \tag{3.12}$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathscr{M}(\mu_n,\mu_{n-1})=R. \tag{3.13}$$

It follows from the condition ($\zeta 3$), with

$$\vartheta_n=\alpha(\mu_n,\mu_{n-1})(\Lambda(\mu_{n+1},\mu_n)+\varphi(\mu_{n+1})+\varphi(\mu_n))$$

and

$$\eta_n = \mathscr{M}(\mu_n, \mu_{n-1})$$

that

$$0 \leq \limsup_{n\to\infty}[\alpha(\mu_n, \mu_{n-1})(\Lambda(\mu_{n+1}, \mu_n) + \varphi(\mu_{n+1}) + \varphi(\mu_n)), \mathscr{M}(\mu_n, \mu_{n-1})] < 0,$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, we have $R = 0$ and from (3.12), since $\varphi \geq 0$, equation (3.11) holds.

Finally, we will show that $\{\mu_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathscr{X}$. Using the method of Reduction ad absurdum. Suppose to the contrary that $\{\mu_n\}$ is not a Cauchy sequence. Then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n > m > N$ and $\Lambda(\mu_m, \mu_n) > \varepsilon$. On the other hand, from (3.11), there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\Lambda(\mu_n, \mu_{n+1}) < \varepsilon, \quad \text{for all } n > n_0. \tag{3.14}$$

We can find two subsequences $\{\mu_{n_k}\}$ and $\{\mu_{m_k}\}$ of $\{\mu_n\}$ such that

$$n_0 \leq n_k \leq m_k \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda(\mu_{m_k}, \mu_{n_k}) > \varepsilon, \quad \text{for all } k, \tag{3.15}$$

where m_k is the smallest index satisfying (3.15). Thus

$$\Lambda(\mu_{m_k-1}, \mu_{n_k}) < \varepsilon, \quad \text{for all } k. \tag{3.16}$$

On account of (3.14), (3.15), and the triangular inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &< \Lambda(\mu_{m_k}, \mu_{n_k}) \\ &\leq \Lambda(\mu_{m_k}, \mu_{m_k-1}) + \Lambda(\mu_{m_k-1}, \mu_{n_k}) \\ &\leq \Lambda(\mu_{m_k}, \mu_{m_k-1}) + \varepsilon, \text{ for all } k. \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

Taking $k \to \infty$ and using equation (3.11), we obtain

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \Lambda(\mu_{m_k}, \mu_{n_k}) = \varepsilon. \tag{3.18}$$

Using the triangle inequality, we derive that

$$\Lambda(\mu_{m_k}, \mu_{n_k}) \leq \Lambda(\mu_{m_k}, \mu_{m_k+1}) + \Lambda(\mu_{m_k+1}, \mu_{n_k+1}) + \Lambda(\mu_{n_k+1}, \mu_{n_k}), \text{ for all } k.$$

So, we we have

$$\Lambda(\mu_{m_k+1}, \mu_{n_k+1}) \leq \Lambda(\mu_{m_k+1}, \mu_{m_k}) + \Lambda(\mu_{m_k}, \mu_{n_k}) + \Lambda(\mu_{n_k}, \mu_{n_k+1}), \text{ for all } k.$$

Combining the two inequalities above together with (3.11) and (3.17), we obtain

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \Lambda(\mu_{m_k+1}, \mu_{n_k+1}) = \varepsilon. \tag{3.19}$$

Using the same reasoning as above, we get

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \Lambda(\mu_{m_k}, \mu_{n_k+1}) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \Lambda(\mu_{m_k+1}, \mu_{n_k}) = \varepsilon. \tag{3.20}$$

Since $\mathscr{Q}$ is triangular α-orbital admissible, we have

$$\alpha(\mu_{m_k}, \mu_{n_k}) \geq 1. \tag{3.21}$$

Using (3.1), (3.19) and (3.20), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \zeta(\alpha(\mu_{m_k}, \mu_{n_k})(\Lambda(\mathscr{Q}\mu_{m_k}, \mathscr{Q}\mu_{n_k}) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu_{m_k}) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu_{n_k})), \psi(\mathscr{M}(\mu_{m_k}, \mu_{n_k}))) \\ &= \zeta(\alpha(\mu_{m_k}, \mu_{n_k})(\Lambda(\mu_{m_k+1}, \mu_{n_k+1}) + \varphi(\mu_{m_k+1}) + \varphi(\mu_{n_k+1})), \psi(\mathscr{M}(\mu_{m_k}, \mu_{n_k}))) \\ &< \psi(\mathscr{M}(\mu_{m_k}, \mu_{n_k}, \Lambda, \mathscr{Q}, \varphi)) \\ &\quad - [\alpha(\mu_{m_k}, \mu_{n_k})(\Lambda(\mu_{m_k+1}, \mu_{n_k+1}) + \varphi(\mu_{m_k+1}) + \varphi(\mu_{n_k+1}))]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

The above inequality shows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\Lambda(\mu_{m_k+1}, \mu_{n_k+1}) + \varphi(\mu_{m_k+1}) + \varphi(\mu_{n_k+1}) \\ &\leq \alpha(\mu_{m_k}, \mu_{n_k})(\Lambda(\mu_{m_k+1}, \mu_{n_k+1}) + \varphi(\mu_{m_k+1}) + \varphi(\mu_{n_k+1})) \\ &< \psi(\mathscr{M}(\mu_{m_k}, \mu_{n_k})) < \mathscr{M}(\mu_{m_k}, \mu_{n_k}), \end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

for all $k \geq n_1$, where

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathscr{M}(\mu_{m_k}, \mu_{n_k}) \\ &= \max\Big\{\Lambda(\mu_{m_k}, \mu_{n_k}) + \varphi(\mu_{m_k}) + \varphi(\mu_{n_k}), \Lambda(\mu_{m_k}, \mathscr{Q}\mu_{m_k}) + \varphi(\mu_{m_k}) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu_{m_k}), \\ &\qquad \Lambda(\mu_{n_k}, \mathscr{Q}\mu_{n_k}) + \varphi(\mu_{n_k}) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu_{n_k}), \\ &\qquad \frac{1}{2}\{\Lambda(\mu_{m_k}, \mathscr{Q}\mu_{n_k}) + \varphi(\mu_{m_k}) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu_{n_k}) \\ &\qquad + \Lambda(\mu_{n_k}, \mathscr{Q}\mu_{m_k}) + \varphi(\mu_{n_k}) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu_{m_k})\}\Big\} \\ &= \max\Big\{\Lambda(\mu_{m_k}, \mu_{n_k}) + \varphi(\mu_{m_k}) + \varphi(\mu_{n_k}), \Lambda(\mu_{m_k}, \mu_{m_k+1}) + \varphi(\mu_{m_k}) + \varphi(\mu_{m_k+1}), \\ &\qquad \Lambda(\mu_{n_k}, \mu_{n_k+1}) + \varphi(\mu_{n_k}) + \varphi(\mu_{n_k+1}), \\ &\qquad \frac{1}{2}\{\Lambda(\mu_{m_k}, \mu_{n_k+1}) + \varphi(\mu_{m_k}) + \varphi(\mu_{n_k+1}) \\ &\qquad + \Lambda(\mu_{n_k}, \mu_{m_k+1}) + \varphi(\mu_{n_k}) + \varphi(\mu_{m_k+1})\}\Big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

Taking the limit as $k \to \infty$ in (3.24) and using (3.11), (3.18), (3.19) and (3.20), we find that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathscr{M}(\mu_{m_k}, \mu_{n_k}) = \varepsilon. \tag{3.25}$$

It follows from the condition ($\zeta 3$), with

$$\vartheta_n = \alpha(\mu_{m_k}, \mu_{n_k})(\Lambda(\mu_{m_k+1}, \mu_{n_k+1}) + \varphi(\mu_{m_k+1}) + \varphi(\mu_{n_k+1})) \to \varepsilon$$

and $\eta_n = \mathscr{M}(\mu_{m_k},+\mu_{n_k}) \to \varepsilon$ that

$$0 \leq \limsup_{k\to\infty}[\alpha(\mu_{m_k},\mu_{n_k})(\Lambda(\mu_{m_k+1},\mu_{n_k+1})+\varphi(\mu_{m_k+1})+\varphi(\mu_{n_k+1})), \mathscr{M}(\mu_{m_k},\mu_{n_k})] < 0,$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, $\{\mu_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Owing to the fact that $(\mathscr{X},\Lambda)$ is a complete metric space, there exists $z \in \mathscr{X}$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \Lambda(\mu_n, z) = 0. \tag{3.26}$$

Since $\mathscr{Q}$ is continuous, we derive from (3.26) that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \Lambda(\mu_{n+1}, \mathscr{Q}z) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \Lambda(\mathscr{Q}\mu_n, \mathscr{Q}z) = 0. \tag{3.27}$$

Taking into account (3.26), (3.27), and the uniqueness of the limit, we conclude that z is a fixed point of $\mathscr{Q}$, that is, $z = \mathscr{Q}z$. □

Theorem 3.2. *Let $(\mathscr{X},\Lambda)$ be a complete metric space and let $\mathscr{Q}: \mathscr{X} \to \mathscr{X}$ be a mapping. Suppose that there exist a simulation function ζ, and $\varphi : \mathscr{X} \to [0,\infty)$, $\psi \in \Psi$ and $\alpha : \mathscr{X} \times \mathscr{X} \to [0,\infty)$ such that*

$$\zeta(\alpha(\mu,\rho)(\Lambda(\mathscr{Q}\mu,\mathscr{Q}\rho) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho)), \psi(\mathscr{M}(\mu,\rho))) \geq 0, \tag{3.28}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathscr{M}(\mu,\rho) \\ &= \max\Big\{\Lambda(\mu,\rho) + \varphi(\mu) + \varphi(\rho), \Lambda(\mu,\mathscr{Q}\mu) + \varphi(\mu) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu), \\ &\qquad \Lambda(\rho,\mathscr{Q}\rho) + \varphi(\rho) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho), \\ &\qquad \frac{1}{2}\{\Lambda(\mu,\mathscr{Q}\rho) + \varphi(\mu) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho) + \Lambda(\rho,\mathscr{Q}\mu) + \varphi(\rho) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu)\}\Big\} \end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

and satisfies

(1) *$\mathscr{Q}$ is triangular α-orbital admissible*;
(2) *there exists $\mu_0 \in \mathscr{X}$ such that $\alpha(\mu_0,\mathscr{Q}\mu_0) \geq 1$;*
(3) *If $\{\mu_n\}$ is a sequence in $\mathscr{X}$ such that $\alpha(\mu_n,\mu_{n+1}) \geq 1$ for all n and $\mu_n \to \mu \in \mathscr{X}$ as $n \to \infty$, then there exists a subsequence $\{\mu_{n_k}\}$ of $\{\mu_n\}$ such that $\alpha(\mu_{n_k},\mu) \geq 1$ for all k.*

Then there exists $z \in \mathscr{X}$ such that $z = \mathscr{Q}z$.

Proof. Similarly, in the proof of Theorem 3.1, we know that the sequence $\{\mu_n\}$ defined by $\mu_{n+1} = \mathscr{Q}\mu_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathscr{X}$. Since $(\mathscr{X},\Lambda)$ is complete, $\{\mu_n\}$ converges for some $z \in \mathscr{X}$. Since φ is lower semicontinuous, we have

$$\varphi(z) \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \varphi(\mu_n) \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \varphi(\mu_n) = 0,$$

which implies

$$\varphi(z) = 0. \tag{3.30}$$

By (3.4) and condition (2), there exists a subsequence $\{\mu_{n_k}\}$ of $\{\mu_n\}$ such that $\alpha(\mu_{n_k}, z) \geq 1$ for all k. Using (3.28), for all k, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \zeta(\alpha(\mu_{n_k}, z)(\Lambda(\mathscr{Q}\mu_{n_k}, \mathscr{Q}z) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu_{n_k}) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}z)), \psi(\mathscr{Q}(\mu_{n_k}, z))) \\ &= \zeta(\alpha(\mu_{n_k}, z)(\Lambda(\mu_{n_k+1}, \mathscr{Q}z) + \varphi(\mu_{n_k+1}) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}z)), \psi(\mathscr{Q}(\mu_{n_k}, z))) \\ &< \psi(\mathscr{M}(\mu_{n_k}, z)) - [\alpha(\mu_{n_k}, z)(\Lambda(\mu_{n_k+1}, \mathscr{Q}z) + \varphi(\mu_{n_k+1}) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}z))]. \end{aligned}$$

This inequality shows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\Lambda(\mu_{n_k+1}, \mathscr{Q}z) + \varphi(\mu_{n_k+1}) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}z) \\ &\leq \alpha(\mu_{n_k}, z)(\Lambda(\mu_{n_k+1}, \mathscr{Q}z) + \varphi(\mu_{n_k+1}) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}z)) \\ &< \psi(\mathscr{M}(\mu_{n_k}, z)) \\ &< \mathscr{M}(\mu_{n_k}, z), \end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathscr{M}(\mu_{n_k}, z) \\ &= \max\Big\{\Lambda(\mu_{n_k}, z) + \varphi(\mu_{n_k}) + \varphi(z), \Lambda(\mu_{n_k}, \mathscr{Q}\mu_{n_k}) + \varphi(\mu_{n_k}) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu_{n_k}), \\ &\qquad \Lambda(z, \mathscr{Q}z) + \varphi(z) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}z), \\ &\qquad \frac{1}{2}\{\Lambda(\mu_{n_k}, \mathscr{Q}z) + \varphi(\mu_{n_k})) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}z)) + \Lambda(z, \mathscr{Q}\mu_{n_k})) + \varphi(z)) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu_{n_k})\}\Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking $k \to \infty$ in the above equality, we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathscr{M}(\mu_{n_k}, z) = \Lambda(z, \mathscr{Q}z) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}z). \tag{3.32}$$

Suppose that $\Lambda(z, \mathscr{Q}z) > 0$. Taking $k \to \infty$, using (3.31), (3.32) and the continuity of φ, we get

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \Lambda(\mu_{n_k+1}, \mathscr{Q}z) + \varphi(\mu_{n_k+1}) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}z) < \lim_{k\to\infty} \mathscr{M}(\mu_{n_k}, z). \tag{3.33}$$

So,

$$\Lambda(z, \mathscr{Q}z) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}z) < \Lambda(z, \mathscr{Q}z) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}z), \tag{3.34}$$

which is a contradiction, and hence, $\Lambda(z, \mathscr{Q}z) = 0$, that is, $z = \mathscr{Q}z$ and $\varphi(\mathscr{Q}z) = 0$. Since $z = \mathscr{Q}z$ this implies $\varphi(z) = 0$. □

The following theorem is for the uniqueness of the fixed point of the mapping $\mathscr{Q}$.

Theorem 3.3. *For all $\mu, \rho \in Fix(\mathscr{Q})$, we have $\alpha(\mu, \rho) \geq 1$, where $Fix(\mathscr{Q})$ denotes the set of fixed points of $\mathscr{Q}$. If the hypotheses of Theorem* 3.1 *(resp., Theorem* 3.2*) are hold, then $\mathscr{Q}$ has a unique fixed point in $\mathscr{X}$.*

Proof. Suppose z^* is another fixed point of $\mathscr{Q}$. Then $z^* = \mathscr{Q}z^*$ and $\varphi(z^*) = 0$. From assumption, we have

$$\alpha(z, z^*) \geq 1. \tag{3.35}$$

It follows from equation (3.1) and ($\zeta 2$) that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \zeta(\alpha(z, z^*)(\Lambda(\mathscr{Q}z, \mathscr{Q}z^*) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}z) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}z^*)), \psi(\mathscr{M}(z, z^*))) \\ &= \zeta(\alpha(z, z^*)(\Lambda(z, z^*) + \varphi(z) + \varphi(z^*)), \psi(\mathscr{M}(z, z^*))) \\ &< \psi(\mathscr{Q}(z, z^*)) - [\alpha(z, z^*)(\Lambda(z, z^*) + \varphi(z) + \varphi(z^*))], \end{aligned} \tag{3.36}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathscr{M}(z, z^*) \\ &= \max\Big\{\Lambda(z, z^*) + \varphi(z) + \varphi(z^*), \Lambda(z, \mathscr{Q}z) + \varphi(z) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}z), \\ &\qquad \Lambda(z^*, \mathscr{Q}z^*) + \varphi(z^*) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}z^*), \\ &\qquad \frac{1}{2}\{\Lambda(z, \mathscr{Q}z^*) + \varphi(z) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}z^*) + \Lambda(z^*, \mathscr{Q}z) + \varphi(z^*) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}z)\}\Big\} \\ &= \max\Big\{\Lambda(z, z^*) + \varphi(z) + \varphi(z^*), \Lambda(z, z) + \varphi(z) + \varphi(z), \\ &\qquad \Lambda(z^*, z^*) + \varphi(z^*) + \varphi(z^*), \\ &\qquad \frac{1}{2}\{\Lambda(z, z^*) + \varphi(z) + \varphi(z^*) + \Lambda(z^*, z) + \varphi(z^*) + \varphi(z)\}\Big\} \\ &= \Lambda(z^*, z). \end{aligned} \tag{3.37}$$

Using (3.36) and (3.37), we obtain

$$0 < \Lambda(z, z^*) - \alpha(z, z^*)\Lambda(z, z^*). \tag{3.38}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\Lambda(z, z^*) \leq \alpha(z, z^*)\Lambda(z, z^*) < \Lambda(z, z^*), \tag{3.39}$$

which is a contradiction. Thus $z = z^*$. This completes the proof for the uniqueness. □

4. Consequences

Corollary 4.1. *Let $(\mathscr{X}, \Lambda)$ be a complete metric space and let $\mathscr{Q} : \mathscr{X} \to \mathscr{X}$ be a mapping. Suppose that there exist a function $\varphi : \mathscr{X} \to [0, \infty)$, $\psi \in \Psi$ and $\alpha : \mathscr{X} \times \mathscr{X} \to [0, \infty)$ such that*

$$\alpha(\mu, \rho)(\Lambda(\mathscr{Q}\mu, \mathscr{Q}\rho) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho)) \leq \psi(\mathscr{M}(\mu, \rho)),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathscr{M}(\mu,\rho)\\&=\max\Big\{\Lambda(\mu,\rho)+\varphi(\mu)+\varphi(\rho),\Lambda(\mu,\mathscr{Q}\mu)+\varphi(\mu)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu),\\&\qquad\Lambda(\rho,\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\varphi(\rho)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho),\\&\qquad\frac{1}{2}\{\Lambda(\mu,\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\varphi(\mu)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\Lambda(\rho,\mathscr{Q}\mu)+\varphi(\rho)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu)\}\Big\}\end{aligned}$$

and satisfies

(1) $\mathscr{Q}$ *is triangular* α*-orbital admissible*;
(2) *there exists* $\mu_0 \in \mathscr{X}$ *such that* $\alpha(\mu_0, \mathscr{Q}\mu_0) \geq 1$;
(3) $\mathscr{Q}$ *is continuous.*

Then there exists $z \in \mathscr{X}$ *such that* $z = \mathscr{Q}z$.

Proof. By taking as simulation function

$$\zeta(\eta,\vartheta)=\psi(\vartheta)-\eta,\quad \text{for all } \eta,\vartheta\geq 0$$

and following the proof of Theorem 3.1, then we can prove the corollary. □

Corollary 4.2. *Let* $(\mathscr{X}, \Lambda)$ *be a complete metric space and let* $\mathscr{Q} : \mathscr{X} \to \mathscr{X}$ *be a mapping. Suppose that there exist a function* $\varphi : \mathscr{X} \to [0, \infty)$, $\psi \in \Psi$ *such that*

$$\Lambda(\mathscr{Q}\mu,\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho)\leq\psi(\mathscr{M}(\mu,\rho)),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathscr{M}(\mu,\rho)\\&=\max\Big\{\Lambda(\mu,\rho)+\varphi(\mu)+\varphi(\rho),\Lambda(\mu,\mathscr{Q}\mu)+\varphi(\mu)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu),\\&\qquad\Lambda(\rho,\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\varphi(\rho)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho),\\&\qquad\frac{1}{2}\{\Lambda(\mu,\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\varphi(\mu)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\Lambda(\rho,\mathscr{Q}\mu)+\varphi(\rho)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu)\}\Big\}\end{aligned}$$

and satisfies

(1) $\mathscr{Q}$ *is triangular* α*-orbital admissible*;
(2) *there exists* $\mu_0 \in \mathscr{X}$ *such that* $\alpha(\mu_0, \mathscr{Q}\mu_0) \geq 1$;
(3) $\mathscr{Q}$ *is continuous.*

Then there exists $z \in \mathscr{X}$ *such that* $z = \mathscr{Q}z$.

Proof. Take $\alpha(\mu, \rho) = 1$ for all $\mu, \rho \in \mathscr{X}$ in Corollary 4.1. □

We can easily prove the two corollaries from the Theorem 3.1.

Corollary 4.3. *Let $(\mathscr{X}, \Lambda)$ be a complete metric space and let $\mathscr{Q} : \mathscr{X} \to \mathscr{X}$ be a mapping. Suppose that there exist a simulation function ζ, $\varphi : \mathscr{X} \to [0, \infty)$ and $\alpha : \mathscr{X} \times \mathscr{X} \to [0, \infty)$ such that*

$$\zeta(\alpha(\mu,\rho)(\Lambda(\mathscr{Q}\mu,\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho)),\Lambda(\mathscr{Q}\mu,\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho))) \geq 0,$$

and satisfies

(1) *$\mathscr{Q}$ is triangular α-orbital admissible*;
(2) *there exists $\mu_0 \in \mathscr{X}$ such that $\alpha(\mu_0, \mathscr{Q}\mu_0) \geq 1$;*
(3) *$\mathscr{Q}$ is continuous.*

Then there exists $z \in \mathscr{X}$ such that $z = \mathscr{Q}z$.

Corollary 4.4. *Let $(\mathscr{X}, \Lambda)$ be a complete metric space and let $\mathscr{Q} : \mathscr{X} \to \mathscr{X}$ be a mapping. Suppose that there exist a simulation function ζ, $\varphi : \mathscr{X} \to [0, \infty)$ and $\alpha : \mathscr{X} \times \mathscr{X} \to [0, \infty)$ such that*

$$\zeta(\alpha(\mu,\rho)(\Lambda(\mathscr{Q}\mu,\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho)),\Lambda(\mathscr{Q}\mu,\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho))) \geq 0,$$

and satisfies

(1) *$\mathscr{Q}$ is triangular α-orbital admissible*;
(2) *there exists $\mu_0 \in \mathscr{X}$ such that $\alpha(\mu_0, \mathscr{Q}\mu_0) \geq 1$;*
(3) *If $\{\mu_n\}$ is a sequence in $\mathscr{X}$ such that $\alpha(\mu_n, \mu_{n+1}) \geq 1$ for all n and $\mu_n \to \mu \in \mathscr{X}$ as $n \to \infty$, then there exists a subsequence $\{\mu_{n_k}\}$ of $\{\mu_n\}$ such that $\alpha(\mu_{n_k}, \mu) \geq 1$ for all k.*

Then there exists $z \in \mathscr{X}$ such that $z = \mathscr{Q}z$.

Corollary 4.5. *Let $(\mathscr{X}, \Lambda)$ be a complete metric space and let $\mathscr{Q} : \mathscr{X} \to \mathscr{X}$ be a mapping. Suppose that there exist a simulation function ζ and $\varphi : \mathscr{X} \to [0, \infty)$ such that*

$$\zeta(\Lambda(\mathscr{Q}\mu,\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho),\Lambda(\mathscr{Q}\mu,\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho))) \geq 0,$$

and satisfies

(1) *$\mathscr{Q}$ is triangular α-orbital admissible*;
(2) *there exists $\mu_0 \in \mathscr{X}$ such that $\alpha(\mu_0, \mathscr{Q}\mu_0) \geq 1$;*
(3) *$\mathscr{Q}$ is continuous.*

Then there exists $z \in \mathscr{X}$ such that $z = \mathscr{Q}z$.

Proof. Take $\alpha(\mu, \rho) = 1$ for all $\mu, \rho \in \mathscr{X}$ in Corollary 4.3. □

Corollary 4.6. *Let $(\mathscr{X}, \Lambda)$ be a complete metric space and let $\mathscr{Q} : \mathscr{X} \to \mathscr{X}$ be a mapping. Suppose that there exist a simulation function ζ and $\varphi : \mathscr{X} \to [0, \infty)$ such that*

$$\zeta(\Lambda(\mathscr{Q}\mu,\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho),\Lambda(\mathscr{Q}\mu,\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho))) \geq 0,$$

and satisfies

(1) *$\mathscr{Q}$ is triangular α-orbital admissible*;
(2) *there exists $x_0 \in \mathscr{X}$ such that $\alpha(\mu_0, \mathscr{Q}\mu_0) \geq 1$;*
(3) *If $\{\mu_n\}$ is a sequence in $\mathscr{X}$ such that $\alpha(\mu_n, \mu_{n+1}) \geq 1$ for all n and $\mu_n \to \mu \in \mathscr{X}$ as $n \to \infty$, then there exists a subsequence $\{\mu_{n_k}\}$ of $\{\mu_n\}$ such that $\alpha(\mu_{n_k}, \mu) \geq 1$ for all k.*

Then there exists $z \in \mathscr{X}$ such that $z = \mathscr{Q}z$.

Proof. Take $\alpha(\mu, \rho) = 1$ for all $\mu, \rho \in \mathscr{X}$ in Corollary 4.4. □

5. Illustrative example

Example 5.1. Let $\mathscr{X} = [0, \infty)$ and the metric be defined by the usual metric. Let $\psi(\eta) = \dfrac{5\eta}{4}$ for $\eta > 0$, and let

$$\varphi(\eta) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{\eta}{6}, & \text{if } 0 \leq \eta \leq 1, \\ \dfrac{\eta}{6} + \dfrac{1}{6}, & \text{if } 1 \leq \eta \leq 6, \\ \eta, & \text{if } \eta \geq 6. \end{cases}$$

Then $\psi \in \Psi$, φ is lower semicontinuous, and $\dfrac{\eta}{6} \leq \varphi(\eta) \leq \eta$, $\eta \geq 0$.

The mapping $\mathscr{Q} : \mathscr{X} \to \mathscr{X}$ is defined by $\mathscr{Q}\mu = \dfrac{3\mu^2}{6 + 6\mu}$. Define a function $\alpha : \mathscr{X} \times \mathscr{X} \to [0, \infty)$ by

$$\alpha(\mu, \rho) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } 0 \leq \mu, \rho \leq 6, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $\zeta(\mu, \rho) = \lambda\rho - \mu$, $\lambda \in [0, 1)$. We now show that Theorem 3.1 holds. Without loss of generality, assume that $\mu \geq \rho$. Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2}\{\Lambda(\mu, \mathscr{Q}\rho) + \varphi(\mu) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho) + \Lambda(\rho, \mathscr{Q}\mu) + \varphi(\rho) + \varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu)\} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}\left\{\Lambda(\mu, \mathscr{Q}\rho) + \frac{\mu}{6} + \frac{\mathscr{Q}\rho}{6} + \Lambda(\rho, \mathscr{Q}\mu) + \frac{\rho}{6} + \frac{\mathscr{Q}\mu}{6}\right\} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}\left\{\frac{1}{6}\{\Lambda(\mu, \mathscr{Q}\rho) + \mu + \mathscr{Q}\rho + \Lambda(\rho, \mathscr{Q}\mu) + \rho + \mathscr{Q}\mu\}\right\} \\ &= \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{6}\left(\mu + \dfrac{\mu^2}{1 + \mu}\right), & \text{if } \rho \leq \dfrac{3\mu^2}{6 + 6\mu} \\ \dfrac{1}{6}(\mu + \rho), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &> \frac{1}{6}\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Also, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathscr{M}(\mu,\rho)\\
&= \max\Big\{\Lambda(\mu,\rho)+\varphi(\mu)+\varphi(\rho),\ \Lambda(\mu,\mathscr{Q}\mu)+\varphi(\mu)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu),\\
&\qquad \Lambda(\rho,\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\varphi(\rho)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho),\\
&\qquad \frac{1}{2}\{\Lambda(\mu,\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\varphi(\mu)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\Lambda(\rho,\mathscr{Q}\mu)+\varphi(\rho)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu)\}\Big\}\\
&\geq \frac{1}{6}\max\Big\{\Lambda(\mu,\rho)+\mu+\rho,\ \Lambda(\mu,\mathscr{Q}\mu)+\mu+\mathscr{Q}\mu,\\
&\qquad \Lambda(\rho,\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\rho+\mathscr{Q}\rho,\\
&\qquad \frac{1}{2}\{\Lambda(\mu,\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\mu+\mathscr{Q}\rho+\Lambda(\rho,\mathscr{Q}\mu)+\rho+\mathscr{Q}\mu\}\Big\}\\
&= \frac{1}{6}\max\Big\{2\mu,2\mu,2\rho,\frac{1}{6}\mu\Big\}\\
&= \frac{1}{3}\mu
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\alpha(\mu,\rho)(\Lambda(\mathscr{Q}\mu,\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho)) &\leq \Lambda(\mathscr{Q}\mu,\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho)\\
&\leq \Lambda(\mathscr{Q}\mu,\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\mathscr{Q}\mu+\mathscr{Q}\rho\\
&\leq \left|\frac{3\mu^2}{6+6\mu}-\frac{3\rho^2}{6+6\rho}\right|+\frac{3\mu^2}{6+6\mu}+\frac{3\rho^2}{6+6\rho}\\
&= \frac{\mu^2}{1+\mu}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence, for $\lambda\in[0,1)$ we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\zeta(\alpha(\mu,\rho)(\Lambda(\mathscr{Q}\mu,\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho)),\psi(\mathscr{M}(\mu,\rho)))\\
&= \lambda\psi(\mathscr{M}(\mu,\rho)))-\alpha(\mu,\rho)(\Lambda(\mathscr{Q}\mu,\mathscr{Q}\rho)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\mu)+\varphi(\mathscr{Q}\rho))\\
&\geq \frac{5}{4}\lambda\left(\frac{1}{3}\mu\right)-\frac{\mu^2}{1+\mu}\\
&= \frac{5\lambda\mu}{12}-\frac{\mu^2}{1+\mu}\geq 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, all the conditions of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied, then $\mathscr{Q}$ has a unique fixed point which is 0.

Acknowledgments: First, Duangkamon Kitkuan would like to thank the support of the Research and Development Institute, Rambhaibarni Rajabhat University. Finally, Sompob Saelee would like to thank the support of the Research and Development Institute, Bansomdejchaopraya Rajabhat University.

References

[1] M.U. Ali, T. Kamram and E. Karapinar, *An approach to existence of fixed points of generalized contractive multivalued mappings of integral type via admissible mapping*, Abstr. Appl. Anal., **2014** (2014), Article ID 141489.

[2] V. Berinde, *Generalized contractions in quasimetric spaces*, Seminar on Fixed Point Theory, Babe-Bolyai Univ. Cluj-Napoca, **3**(1) (1993), 3–9.

[3] V. Berinde, *Iterative approximation of fixed points*, Editura Efemeride, Baia Mare, Romania, 2002.

[4] R.M. Bianchini and M. Grandolfi, *Transformazioni di tipo contracttivo generalizzato in uno spazio metrico*, Atti Acad. Naz. Lincei, VII. Ser., Rend., Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat, Nature, **45** (1968), 212–216.

[5] L. Budhia, H. Aydi, A.H. Ansari and D. Gopal, *Some new fixed point results in rectangular metric spaces with an application to fractional-order functional differential equations*, Nonlinear Anal.: Model. Control, **25**(4) (2020), 580–597.

[6] E. Karapinar and B. Samet, *Generalized α-ψ contractive type mappings and related fixed point theorems with applications*, Abst. Appl. Anal., **2012** (2012), Article ID 793486, 17 pages.

[7] F. Khojasteh, S. Shukla and S. Radenović, *A new approach to the study of fixed point theorems via simulation functions*, Filomat, **29**(6) (2015), 1189–1194.

[8] P. Kumam, D. Gopal and L. Budhiyi, *A new fixed point theorem under Suzuki type Z-contraction mappings*, J. Math. Anal., **8**(1) (2017), 113–119.

[9] H. Lakzian, D. Gopal and W. Sintunavarat, *New fixed point results for mappings of contractive type with an application to nonlinear fractional differential equations*, J. Fixed Point Theory Appl., **18**(2) (2022), 251–266.

[10] A. Nastasi and P. Vetro, *Fixed point results on metric and partial metric spaces via simulation functions*, J. Nonlinear Sci. Appl., **8** (2015), 1059–1069.

[11] D. O'Regan, N. Shahzad and R.P. Agarwal, *Fixed point theory for generalized contractive maps on spaces with vector-valued metrics*, Fixed Point Theory and Appl., (Eds. Y.J. Cho, J.K. Kim, S. M. Kang), Vol. 6, Nova Sci. Publ., New York, 2007, 143–149.

[12] A. Padcharoen, D. Gopal, P. Chaipunya and P. Kumam, *Fixed point and periodic point results for α-type F-contractions in modular metric spaces*, Fixed Point Theory Appl., **2016**(1) (2016), 1–12.

[13] A. Padcharoen and J.K. Kim, *Berinde type results via simulation functions in metric spaces*, Nonlinear Funct. Anal. Appl., **25**(3) (2020), 511–523.

[14] A. Padcharoen, P. Kumam, P. Saipara and P. Chaipunya, *Generalized Suzuki type $\mathcal{Z}$-contraction in complete metric spaces*, Kragujevac J. Math., **42**(3) (2018), 419–430.

[15] O. Popescu, *Some new fixed point theorems for α-Geraghty contractive type maps in metric spaces*, Fixed Point Theory Appl., **2014**:90 (2014).

[16] I.A. Rus, *Generalized Contractions and Applications*, Cluj University Press, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, 2001.

[17] I.A. Rus, *Principles and Applications of the Fixed Point Theory (in Romanian)*, Editura Dacia, Clui-Napoca, 1979

[18] P. Saipara, P. Kumam and P. Bunpatcharacharoen, *Some results for generalized Suzuki type $\mathcal{Z}$-contraction in θ metric spaces*, Thai J. Math., (2018), 203–219.

[19] B. Samet, C. Vetro and P. Vetro, *Fixed point theorems for α-ψ-contractive type mapping*, Nonlinear Anal., **75**(4) (2012), 2154–2165.