International Journal of Mathematical Archive-2(8), 2011, Page: 1253-1261
Available online through www.ijma.info ISSN 2229 – 5046

ALTERING DISTANCE OF TWO VARIABLES AND ITS APPLICATION

Piyush Kumar Tripathi*

Amity University
(Deptt. of Amity School Of Engg. & Techonology)
Viraj Khand – 5 Gomti Nagar Lucknow, (U.P.), India

E-mail: piyush.tripathi2007@gmail.com

(Received on: 19-07-11; Accepted on: 03-08-11)

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we have obtained a number of fixed point theorems for self mappings defined on a complete non-Archimedean Menger probabilistic metric space satisfying a contractive inequality by using the concept of altering distance of two variables and non expansive mappings.

INTRODUCTION:

Result on the existence of fixed points for self mappings on a non- Archimedean probabilistic metric space have been obtained by Hadžić [74], Istrătescu [92], Cho, Park and Chang [32] and Cho, Ha and Chang [35] others. In 1994 Chang, Cho, and Kang [25] summarized almost all the results in "*Fixed point theorem for single valued mappings in some special probabilistic metric spaces*" and defined non- Archimedean Menger space of type C_g .

Khan Swaleh and Sessa introduced the notion of altering distance [7] and proved fixed point theorems involving altering distance. Using the idea of altering distance, Binayak S. Choudhury and P. N. Dutta [2] introduced the notion of function of two variables of type *A*. The concept of function of type *A* and the results of the above authors prompted us to go for further generalization of the above results in non – Archimedean Menger probabilistic metric space of type C_g involving a two variable function of type *A*. We have also defined non-expansive self-mapping with respect to φ, where $\varphi:[0,\infty)\to[0,\infty)$ is a mapping is satisfying certain condition given in section 3 and using this concept we have also obtained some results on fixed point.

PRELIMINARIES:

In this section we recall some basic definitions and results of non- Archimedean probabilistic metric space. For more details we refer the reader to [1], [4], [5] and [6].

Definition: 1.1 [1] A non- Archimedean probabilistic metric space is an ordered pair (*X*, *F*), X a non empty set and $F: X\times X\to L$ a map such that,

$$(i) F_{p,q}(x)=1,\forall\ x>0 \text{ iff } p=q,$$

$$(ii) F_{p,q}(0)=0,$$

$$(iii) F_{p,q}(x)=F_{q,p}(x),$$

and $$(iv) F_{p,q}(x)=1,\ F_{q,r}(y)=1\Rightarrow F_{p,r}(\max\{x,y\})=1,$$

where *L* is the set of all distribution functions and $F_{p,q}(x)$ is the value of the function $F_{p,q}=F(p,q)\in L$ at $x\in R$.

Definition: 1.2 [1], [4] A non- Archimedean Menger probabilistic metric space is a triple (*X*, *F*, *t*), where (*X*, *F*) is a non- Archimedean probabilistic metric space and *t* is a t- norm such that,

$F_{p,r}(\max\{x,y\}\geq t(F_{p,q}(x),F_{q,r}(y))\ \forall\ p,q,r\in X$ and $x,y\geq 0$.

Corresponding author: Piyush Kumar Tripathi, *E-mail: piyush.tripathi2007@gmail.com

Definition: 1.3 Let $\Omega=\{g: g:[0,1]\to[0,\infty]$ is continuous, strictly decreasing s.t $g(1)=0, g(0)<\infty\}$ is a set of functions. A probabilistic metric space is said to be of type C_g if $g\in\Omega$ such that,

$$g\left(F_{p,q}(x)\right)\le g\left(F_{p,r}(x)\right)+g\left(F_{r,q}(x)\right)\ \forall\ p,q,r\in X \text{ and } x\ge 0.$$

NOTE: Throughout this paper we consider (*X, F, t*) a complete non- Archimedean Menger probabilistic metric space of type C_g .

In 1984 M.S. Khan, M. Swaleh and S. Sessa [7] gave the notion of altering distance between two points and proved fixed point theorems using this altering distance.

Definition: 1.4 [7] An altering distance is a mapping $\phi:[0,\infty)\to[0,\infty)$ Such that,

(a) ϕ is increasing and continuous, and
(b) $\phi(x)=0$ iff $x=0$.

Choudhury and Dutta [2] extended this idea to the functions of two variables which satisfy the condition of the type *A*. Following is the definition and example given in [2] which may be termed as altering distance of two variables.

Definition: 1.5 [2] A function $\phi: R^+\times R^+\to R^+$ is said to be of the type *A* if

(a) ϕ is continuous and monotonic increasing in both the arguments, and
(b) $\phi(0,0)=0$ and $\phi(\varepsilon,0)=0\Rightarrow\varepsilon=0$.

In the above definition the term used "monotonic increasing" in both the arguments Means

$a\le b\Rightarrow\phi(a,c)\le\phi(b,c)$ and $a\le b\Rightarrow\phi(c,a)\le\phi(c,b)$, for all *c*.

Following Remark and examples are given in [2].

Remark: 1.1 $\phi(\varepsilon,\varepsilon)=0\ \Rightarrow\varepsilon=0$ because, $\phi(\varepsilon,0)\le\phi(\varepsilon,\varepsilon)=0\ \Rightarrow\phi(\varepsilon,0)=0\Rightarrow\varepsilon=0.$

Example: 1.1 $\phi: R^+\times R^+\to R^+$ is defined as,

$$(i)\ \phi(a,b)=(a^p+b^q)^k,$$

$$(ii)\ \phi(a,b)=a^p.b^q+a^k,$$

where *p, q* and *k* are positive integers. Then ϕ is altering distance of two variables. Following lemma proved by Chang, [1] has been used by us in proving our results.

Lemma: 1.1 [4] Let $\{p_n\}$ be a sequence in *X* such that $\lim_{n\to\infty}F_{p_n,p_{n+1}}(x)=1$ for all $x>0.$ If the sequence $\{p_n\}$ is not a Cauchy sequence in *X*, then there exists $\varepsilon_0>0,\ t_0>0$ and two sequence $\{m_i\}$ and $\{n_i\}$ of positive integers such that,

$(i)\ m_i> n_i+1$ and $n_i\to\infty$ as $i\to\infty,$

$(ii)\ g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_i}}(t_0))>g(1-\varepsilon_0)$ and $g(F_{p_{m_i-1},p_{n_i}}(t_0))\le g(1-\varepsilon_0).$

Remark: 1.2 If sequence $\{p_n\}$ is not a Cauchy sequence and $\lim_{n\to\infty}g(F_{p_n,p_{n+1}}(x))=0.$

Then,

$$g(1-\varepsilon_0) < g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) \le g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{m_{i-1}}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{m_{i-1}},p_{n_i}}(t_0)). \text{ and } \lim_{i\to\infty} g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) = g(1-\varepsilon_0). \tag{1.1}$$

Again,

$$g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) \le g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{m_{i-1}}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{m_{i-1}},p_{n_{i-1}}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{n_{i-1}},p_{n_i}}(t_0))$$

and

$$g(F_{p_{m_{i-1}},p_{n_{i-1}}}(t_0)) \le g(F_{p_{m_{i-1}},p_{m_i}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{n_i},p_{n_{i-1}}}(t_0)).$$

Hence,

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} g(F_{p_{m_{i-1}},p_{n_{i-1}}}(t_0)) = g(1-\varepsilon_0) \tag{1.2}$$

Also,

$$g(F_{p_{n_{i-1}},p_{m_{i+1}}}(t_0)) \le g(F_{p_{n_{i-1}},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{n_i},p_{m_i}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{m_{i+1}}}(t_0))$$

and

$$g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) \le g(F_{p_{n_i},p_{n_{i-1}}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{n_{i-1}},p_{m_{i+1}}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{m_{i+1}},p_{m_i}}(t_0)).$$

Therefore, from (1), (2) we have,

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} g(F_{p_{n_{i-1}},p_{m_{i+1}}}(t_0)) = g(1-\varepsilon_0) \ldots \tag{1.3}$$

Lastly,

$$g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) \le g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_{i-1}}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{n_{i-1}},p_{n_i}}(t_0))$$

and

$$g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_{i-1}}}(t_0)) \le g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{n_i},p_{n_{i-1}}}(t_0)).$$

Hence from (1), (2) we have

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_{i-1}}}(t_0)) = g(1-\varepsilon_0) \tag{1.5}$$

2. MAIN RESULTS

In this section a unique fixed point theorem in complete non–Archimedean Menger space for a class of self mappings satisfying certain inequality involving function of two variables has been derived.

Theorem: 2.1 Suppose (X, F; t) is a complete non- Archimedean Menger probabilistic metric space.
Let $T : X \to X$ be a self mapping on X satisfying,

$$\phi\Big(g(F_{Tp,Tq}(x), g(F_{p,Tp}(x)\Big) + \phi\Big(g(F_{q,Tq}(x), g(F_{q,T^2p}(x)\Big) \le \phi\Big(g(F_{p,q}(x), g(F_{p,Tp}(x)\Big) + \beta\phi\Big(g(F_{q,Tq}(x), g(F_{q,Tp}(x)\Big) \tag{2.1}$$

where $0 < \alpha < 1$, $0 < \beta \le 1$ and ϕ is a function of the type A. Then there exists unique fixed point of T in X.

Proof: In fact using the condition (1) we shall get a Cauchy sequence in X whose limit point will turn out to be unique fixed point of T. Following is the procedure for finding the Cauchy sequence in X.

Picking $p_0 \in X$, we construct a sequence $\{p_n\}$ inductively as
$p_n = Tp_{n-1}$, (n = 1, 2, 3 . . .).

Putting $q = Tp$ in (2.1) we get,

$$\phi\Big(g(F_{Tp,T^2p}(x)), g(F_{p,Tp}(x)\Big) + \phi\Big(g(F_{Tp,T^2p}(x)), g(F_{Tp,T^2p}(x)\Big)$$
$$\leq \alpha\phi\Big(g(F_{p,Tp}(x)), g(F_{p,Tp}(x)\Big) + \beta\Big(g(F_{Tp,T^2p}(x)), g(F_{Tp,Tp}(x)\Big) \tag{2.2}$$

Since, $0 < \beta \leq 1$ hence from (3) we get,

$$\beta\phi\Big(g(F_{Tp,T^2p}(x)),0\Big) \leq \beta\phi\Big(g(F_{Tp,T^2p}(x)), g(F_{Tp,T^2p}(x)\Big) \leq \phi\Big(g(F_{Tp,T^2p}(x)), g(F_{Tp,T^2p}(x)\Big),$$

hence,

$$\phi\Big(g(F_{Tp,T^2p}(x)), g(F_{p,Tp}(x)\Big) \leq \alpha\phi\Big(g(F_{p,Tp}(x)), g(F_{p,Tp}(x)\Big)$$
$$\leq \phi\Big(g(F_{p,Tp}(x)), g(F_{p,Tp}(x)\Big) \tag{2.3}$$

i.e. $\phi\Big(g(F_{Tp,T^2p}(x)), g(F_{p,Tp}(x)\Big) \leq \phi\Big(g(F_{p,Tp}(x)), g(F_{p,Tp}(x)\Big)$ (2.4)

or $g(F_{Tp,T^2p}(x)) \leq g(F_{p,Tp}(x))$ (2.5)

Putting $p = p_{n-1}$ in (2.5) we get,

$$g(F_{p_n,p_{n+1}}(x)) \leq g(F_{p_{n-1},p_n}(x)) \tag{2.6}$$

This shows that the sequence $\{g(F_{p_n,p_{n+1}}(x))\}$ is monotonic decreasing and bounded below. So,

$$g(F_{p_n,p_{n+1}}(x)) \to a \in X \text{ as } n \to \infty \tag{2.7}$$

Again putting $p = p_{n-1}$ in (2.4) we get,

$$\phi(g(F_{p_n,p_{n+1}}(x)), g(F_{p_{n-1},p_n}(x)) \leq \alpha\phi(g(F_{p_{n-1},p_n}(x)), g(F_{p_{n-1},p_n}(x)).$$

Making $n \to \infty$ and using continuity of ϕ we get,

$$\phi(a,a) \leq \alpha\phi(a,a).$$

Since $0 < \alpha < 1$, therefore $\phi(a,a) = 0$, otherwise, $\phi(a,a) < \phi(a,a)$, so from the remark 1.1, $a = 0$.Therefore,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} g(F_{p_n,p_{n+1}}(x)) = 0. \tag{2.8}$$

Next we show that $\{p_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Suppose, on the contrary, $\{p_n\}$ is not a Cauchy sequence. Then by Lemma 1.1 there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $t_0 > 0$ and sets of positive integer $\{m_i\},\{n_i\}$ such that,

(i) $m_i > n_i + 1$ and $n_i \to \infty$ as $i \to \infty$,

(ii) $g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) > g(1-\varepsilon_0)$ and $g(F_{p_{m_{i-1}},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) \leq g(1-\varepsilon_0)$. (2.9)

Now,

$$g(1-\varepsilon_0) < g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) \leq g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{m_{i-1}}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{m_{i-1}},p_{n_i}}(t_0)).$$

Making $i \to \infty$,

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) = g(1-\varepsilon_0) \tag{2.10}$$

Again,

$$g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) \le g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{m_{i-1}}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{m_{i-1}},p_{n_{i-1}}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{n_{i-1}},p_{n_i}}(t_0))$$

and

$$g(F_{p_{m_{i-1}},p_{n_{i-1}}}(t_0)) \le g(F_{p_{m_{i-1}},p_{m_i}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{n_i},p_{n_{i-1}}}(t_0)).$$

Hence

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} g(F_{p_{m_{i-1}},p_{n_{i-1}}}(t_0)) = g(1-\varepsilon_0) \tag{2.11}$$

Also,

$$g(F_{p_{n_{i-1}},p_{m_{i+1}}}(t_0)) \le g(F_{p_{n_{i-1}},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{n_i},p_{m_i}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{m_i+1}}(t_0))$$

and

$$g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) \le g(F_{p_{n_i},p_{n_{i-1}}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{n_{i-1}},p_{m_{i+1}}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{m_{i+1}},p_{m_i}}(t_0)).$$

Therefore from (2.8), (2.10) we have,

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} g(F_{p_{n_{i-1}},p_{m_{i+1}}}(t_0)) = g(1-\varepsilon_0) \tag{2.12}$$

Thus,

$$g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) \le g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_{i-1}}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{n_{i-1}},p_{n_i}}(t_0))$$

and

$$g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_{i-1}}}(t_0)) \le g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{n_i},p_{n_{i-1}}}(t_0)).$$

Making $i \to \infty$ and noting (2.8), (2.10), we have,

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_{i-1}}}(t_0)) = g(1-\varepsilon_0) \tag{2.13}$$

Now putting $p = p_{m_{i-1}}$, $q = p_{n_{i-1}}$ and $x = t_0 > 0$ in (2.1) we get,

$$\phi(g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_i}}(t_0)), g(F_{p_{m_{i-1}},p_{m_i}}(t_0))) + \phi(g(F_{p_{n_{i-1}},p_{n_i}}(t_0)), g(F_{p_{n_{i-1}},p_{m_{i+1}}}(t_0)))$$

$$\le \alpha\phi(g(F_{p_{m_{i-1}},p_{n_{i-1}}}(t_0)), g(F_{p_{m_{i-1}},p_{m_i}}(t_0))) + \beta\phi(g(F_{p_{n_{i-1}},p_{n_i}}(t_0)), g(F_{p_{n_{i-1}},p_{m_i}}(t_0))).$$

Making $i \to \infty$ using (8), (10) – (13) and the continuity of ϕ, we get,

$$\phi(g(1-\varepsilon_0),0)) + \phi(0, g(1-\varepsilon_0))) \le \alpha\phi(g(1-\varepsilon_0),0)) + \beta\phi(0, g(1-\varepsilon_0))).$$

Since $0 < \beta \le 1$, $\beta\phi(0, g(1-\varepsilon_0))) \le \phi(0, g(1-\varepsilon_0))$, it follows that,

$$\phi(g(1-\varepsilon_0),0)) \le \alpha\phi(g(1-\varepsilon_0),0)).$$

This is possible only when $\phi(g(1-\varepsilon_0),0)) = 0$ (follows from the condition on α, ε and g). Therefore $\{p_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence.

Since (*X*, *F*; *t*) is complete so $\{p_n\} \to z \in X$. Putting $q = z$, $p = p_n$ in (1), we get,

$$\phi\left(g(F_{p_{n+1},Tz}(x)), g(F_{p_n,p_{n+1}}(x))\right) + \phi\left(g(F_{z,Tz}(x)), g(F_{z,p_{n+2}}(x))\right)$$

$$\le \alpha\phi\left(g(F_{p_n,z}(x)), g(F_{p_n,p_{n+1}}(x))\right) + \beta\phi\left(g(F_{z,Tz}(x)), g(F_{z,p_{n+1}}(x))\right).$$

Making $i \to \infty$,

$$\phi\left(g(F_{z,Tz}(x)),0\right)+\phi\left(g(F_{z,Tz}(x)),0\right)$$

$$\leq \alpha\phi(0,0)+\beta\phi\left(g(F_{z,Tz}(x)),0\right).$$

Since $0<\beta\leq 1$, so, $\phi\left(g(F_{z,Tz}(x)),0\right)\leq \alpha\phi(0,0)=0$

i. e. $\phi\left(g(F_{z,Tz}(x)),0\right)=0$ which implies that $g(F_{z,Tz}(x))=0$.

Therefore, $z=Tz$. Hence *z* is a fixed point of *T*.

For uniqueness, suppose z_1, z_2 are fixed points of T i.e. $Tz_1=z_1$ and $Tz_2=z_2$.

Putting $p=z_1$ and $q=z_2$ in (1) we get,

$$\phi\left(g(F_{z_1,z_2}(x)),g(F_{z_1,z_1}(x))\right)+\phi\left(g(F_{z_2,z_2}(x)),g(F_{z_2,z_1}(x))\right)$$

$$\leq \alpha\phi\left(g(F_{z_1,z_2}(x)),g(F_{z_1,z_2}(x))\right)+\beta\phi\left(g(F_{z_2,z_2}(x)),g(F_{z_2,z_1}(x))\right),$$

i.e.

$$\phi\left(g(F_{z_1,z_2}(x)),0\right)+\phi\left(0,g(F_{z_2,z_1}(x))\right)$$

$$\leq \alpha\phi\left(g(F_{z_1,z_2}(x)),0\right)+\beta\phi\left(0,g(F_{z_2,z_1}(x))\right).$$

Since $0<\beta\leq 1$ so we get $\phi\left(g(F_{z_1,z_2}(x)),0\right)\leq \alpha\phi\left(g(F_{z_1,z_2}(x)),0\right)$. Since $0<\alpha<1$,

hence $\phi\left(g(F_{z_1,z_2}(x)),0\right)<\phi\left(g(F_{z_1,z_2}(x)),0\right)$. This is possible only when $z_1=z_2$.

Therefore *T* has unique fixed point.

3. MAIN RESULTS

In this section we have introduced the concept of non- expansiveness of a self mapping with respect to φ, using which we have proved two theorems in non- Archimedean Menger probabilistic metric space of type C_g.

Definition: 3.1 Suppose (*X*, *F*; *t*) is a non- Archimedean probabilistic space and *f* is a self mapping defined on *X*. Then *f* is said to be non expansive with respect to φ if $g(F_{fp,fq}(x))\leq \varphi(g(F_{p,q}(x)))$, $\forall\ x>0$, where φ is a function on $[0,\infty)$ such that it is upper semi continuous from the right and $\varphi(t)<t$ for all $t>0$ [4].

We need the following Lemma proved by Cho, Ha and Chang [2].

Lemma: 3.1 [1], [4]. If $\varphi:[0,\infty)\to[0,\infty)$ is a function such that φ is upper semi continuous from the right and $\varphi(t)<t$ for all $t>0$, then

(a) For all $t\geq 0$, $\lim_{n\to\infty}\varphi^n(t)=0$, where $\varphi^n(t)$ is the n-th iteration of $\varphi(t)$.

(b) If $\{t_n\}$ is a non-decreasing sequence of real numbers and

$t_{n+1}\leq \varphi(t_n),\ n=1,2,\ \ldots,$

then $\lim_{n\to\infty} t_n = 0$. In particular, if $t \le \varphi(t)$ for all $t \ge 0$, then $t = 0$.

Theorem: 3.1 Suppose (*X*, *F*; *t*) is a non- Archimedean Menger probabilistic metric space of type C_g and *f* a self mapping on *X* such that *f* is non expansive with respect to φ. Then there exists a unique fixed point of *f*.

Proof: Picking $P_0 \in X$, we construct a sequence $\{P_n\}$ inductively as $P_n = fp_{n-1}$.

Now,

$$g(F_{p_n,p_{n+1}}(x)) = g(F_{fp_{n-1},fp_n}(x)) \le \varphi\Big(g(F_{p_{n-1},p_n}(x)\Big).$$

Hence by lemma 3.1,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} g(F_{p_n,p_{n+1}}(x)) = 0.$$

Next we prove that $\{P_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence.

If, on the contrary, $\{P_n\}$ is not a Cauchy sequence, then by Lemma 1.1 there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $t_0 > 0$ and sets of positive integer $\{m_i\},\{n_i\}$ such that,

(i) $m_i > n_i + 1$ and $n_i \to \infty$ as $i \to \infty$

(ii) $g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) > g(1-\varepsilon_0)$ and $g(\ F_{p_{m_i-1},p_{n_i}}(t_0) \le g(1-\varepsilon_0)$

Now since $\quad g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) \le g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{m_i-1}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{m_i-1},p_{n_i}}(t_0)),$

hence,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) = g(1-\varepsilon_0).$$

Again,

$$g(1-\varepsilon_0) < g(F_{p_{m_i}p_{n_i}}(t_0)) \le g(F_{p_{n_i}p_{n_i+1}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{n_i+1}p_{m_i}}(t_0)),$$

making $i \to \infty$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} g(F_{p_{m_i}p_{n_i+1}}(t_0)) = g(1-\varepsilon_0)$$

i.e. $g(F_{p_{m_i}p_{n_i+1}}(t_0)) = g(F_{p_{n_i}p_{m_i-1}}(t_0)) \le \varphi(g(F_{p_{n_i}p_{m_i-1}}(t_0))$

again making $i \to \infty$,

$$g(1-\varepsilon_0) \le \varphi(g(1-\varepsilon_0)) < g(1-\varepsilon_0)$$

i.e. $g(1-\varepsilon_0) < g(1-\varepsilon_0)$, a contradiction.

Hence, $\{P_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Since (*X*, *F*; *t*) is complete so $\{p_n\} \to z \in X$.

Now,

$$g(F_{fz,p_{n+1}}(x)) = g(F_{fz,fp_n}(x)) \le \varphi(g(F_{z,p_n}(x))) \text{ as } n \to \infty$$

$$g(F_{fz,z}(x)) \le \varphi(g(F_{z,z}(x))),$$

i.e. $g(F_{fz,z}(x))=0$, so $z=fz$. Thus z is a fixed point of f.For uniqueness, suppose z, z' are fixed points of f. Then

$$g(F_{z,z'}(x)) = g(F_{fz,fz'}(x)) \le \varphi(g(F_{z,z'}(x))),$$

i.e. $g(F_{z,z'}(x)) < g(F_{z,z'}(x))$, which is possible only if $z = z'$. This proves the uniqueness.

Theorem: 3.2 Let (*X*, *F*; *t*) be a complete non- Archimedean Menger probabilistic metric space and $f : X \to X$ a self mapping satisfying for all $p, q \in X$,

$$g(F_{fp,fq}(x)) \le \varphi(\max\{g(F_{p,q}(x)), g(F_{p,fp}(x)), g(F_{q,fq}(x)), g(F_{q,fp}(x))\}), \forall x > 0.$$

Then *f* has a unique fixed point.

Proof: Picking $p_0 \in X$, we construct a sequence $\{P_n\}$ inductively as $P_n = fp_{n-1}$,

n = 1, 2… Then,

$$g(F_{p_n,p_{n+1}}(x)) \le \varphi(\max\{g(F_{p_{n-1},p_n}(x)), g(F_{p_{n-1},p_n}(x)), g(F_{p_n,p_{n+1}}(x)), g(F_{p_n,p_n}(x))\})$$

i.e. $g(F_{p_n,p_{n+1}}(x)) \le \varphi(\max\{g(F_{p_{n-1},p_n}(x)), g(F_{p_n,p_{n+1}}(x))\})$.

If $g(F_{p_{n-1},p_n}(x)) \le g(F_{p_n,p_{n+1}}(x))$, then by Lemma 3.1, $\lim_{n\to\infty} g(F_{p_n,p_{n+1}}(x)) = 0.$

Again, if $g(F_{p_{n-1},p_n}(x)) \ge g(F_{p_n,p_{n+1}}(x))$ then $g(F_{p_n,p_{n+1}}(x)) \le \varphi(g(F_{p_{n-1},p_n}(x)))$, hence by Lemma 3.1, $\lim_{n\to\infty} g(F_{p_n,p_{n+1}}(x)) = 0.$

Next we claim that $\{P_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence, otherwise, if $\{P_n\}$ is not Cauchy Sequence, then by 1.1 $\exists\, \varepsilon_0 > 0$, $t_0 > 0$ and sets of positive integer $\{m_i\}, \{n_i\}$ such that,

(i) $m_i > n_i + 1$ and $n_i \to \infty$ as $i \to \infty$,

and (ii) $g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) > g(1-\varepsilon_0)$ and $g(F_{p_{m_{i-1}},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) \le g(1-\varepsilon_0)$.

Now,

$$g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) \le g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{m_i-1}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{m_i-1},p_{n_i}}(t_0))$$

i.e. $g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) \le g(1-\varepsilon_0) + g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{m_i-1}}(t_0))$, as $i \to \infty$

or $\lim_{i\to\infty} g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) = g(1-\varepsilon_0)$.

Also,

$$g(1-\varepsilon_0) < g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) \le g(F_{p_{n_i},p_{n_i+1}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{n_i+1},p_{m_i}}(t_0)), \text{ hence}$$

$$g(1-\varepsilon_0) = \lim_{i\to\infty} g(F_{p_{n_i+1},p_{m_i}}(t_0)),$$

i.e. $g(F_{p_{n_i+1},p_{m_i}}(t_0)) = g(F_{fp_{n_i},fp_{m_i-1}}(t_0))$

$$\leq \varphi(\max\{g(F_{p_{n_i},p_{m_i-1}}(t_0)), g(F_{p_{n_i+1},p_{n_i}}(t_0)), g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{m_i-1}}(t_0)), g(F_{p_{m_i-1},p_{n_i+1}}(t_0))\})$$

or $g(F_{p_{n_i+1},p_{m_i}}(t_0)) \leq \varphi(\max\{g(F_{p_{n_i},p_{m_i-1}}(t_0)), g(F_{p_{n_i+1},p_{n_i}}(t_0)), g(F_{p_{m_i},p_{m_i-1}}(t_0)), (g(F_{p_{m_i-1},p_{n_i}}(t_0)) + g(F_{p_{n_i+1},p_{n_i}}(t_0)))\})$.

Hence $g(1-\varepsilon_0) \leq \varphi(\max\{g(1-\varepsilon_0), g(1-\varepsilon_0)\})$ (by taking limit)

i.e. $g(1-\varepsilon_0) \leq \varphi(g(1-\varepsilon_0))$ i.e. $g(1-\varepsilon_0) < g(1-\varepsilon_0)$.

This is not possible. Hence $\{P_n\}$ is Cauchy sequence. Since $(X, F; t)$ is complete, $\{p_n\} \to z \in X$. We claim that $z = fz$, otherwise, if $z \neq fz$, then

$$g(F_{fz,p_{n+1}}(x)) = g(F_{fz,fp_n}(x)) \leq \varphi(\max\{g(F_{z,p_n}(x)), g(F_{z,fz}(x)), g(F_{p_n,p_{n+1}}(x)), g(F_{p_n,fz}(x))\}),$$

i.e. $g(F_{fz,z}(x)) \leq \varphi(\{g(F_{z,z}(x)), g(F_{z,fz}(x)), g(F_{z,z}(x)), g(F_{z,fz}(x))\})$ (by taking limit as $n \to \infty$)

i.e. $g(F_{fz,z}(x)) \leq \varphi(g(F_{z,fz}(x)) < g(F_{z,fz}(x))$.

This is not possible, hence $z = fz$, i.e. z is a fixed point of f. For uniqueness suppose z, z' are fixed points of f. Then

$$g(F_{z,z'}(x)) = g(F_{fz,fz'}(x)) \leq \varphi(\{g(F_{z,z'}(x)), g(F_{z,z}(x)), g(F_{z',z'}(x)), g(F_{z',z}(x))\})$$

i.e. $g(F_{z,z'}(x)) \leq \varphi(g(F_{z,z'}(x))) < g(F_{z,z'}(x))$, which is possible only if $z = z'$.

This proves the uniqueness.

REFERENCES:

[1] Chang S. S., Cho Y. J., Kang S. M. *Probabilistic metric spacs and nonlinearoperator theory*, Sichuan Univ. Press, Chengdu, China, (1994).

[2] Chaudhary B.S. and Dutta P.N. *A unified fixed point theorem in metric space involving a true variable function*, Filomat 14 (2000), 43-48.

[3] Cho Y. J., Park K. S. and Chang S. S. *Fixed point theorems in metric spaces and probabilistic metric spaces*, Internat. J. Math. Math. Sci. 19 (1996), 243-12.

[4] Cho Y. J., Ha K. S. and Chang S. S. *Common fixed point theorems for compatible mappings of type (A) in non-Archimedean Menger PM-spaces*, Math. Japon. 46 (1) (1997), 169-179.

[5] Hadžić O. *A note on I. Istrătescu's* fixed *point theorem in non-Archimedean Menger probabilistic spaces*, Bull. Math. Soc. Sci. Math. Rep. Soc. Roum. T 24 (72) 3 (1980), 277-280.

[6] Istrătescu I. *On some fixed point theorem for mapping on non-Archimedean probabilistic metric space*, Seminarul de Teoria probabilitatiler si applicatii 73 (1985), 1-11.

[7] Khan M. S., Swaleh M. and Sessa S. *Fixed point theorem by altering distance between two points*, Bull Austral. Soc. 2 (1984), 1-9.

****

