



On Some Fixed Point Results for Cyclic (α, β) -admissible Almost z -Contraction in Metric-Like Space with Simulation Function

Snehlata Mishra¹, Anil Kumar Dubey*² , Urmila Mishra³  and R.P. Dubey¹

¹Department of Mathematics Dr.C.V. Raman University, Kargi Road Kota, Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh), India

²Department of Mathematics, Bhilai Institute of Technology, Bhilai House, Durg (Chhattisgarh), India

³Department of Mathematics, Vishwavidyalaya Engineering College, Lakhanpur-Ambikapur (Chhattisgarh), India

*Corresponding author: anilkumardby70@gmail.com

Received: September 3, 2021

Accepted: November 13, 2021

Abstract. In this paper, we present some fixed point results in the setting of metric-like space by defining a cyclic (α, β) -admissible almost z -contraction embedded in simulation function. Suitable examples are also established to verify the validity of the results obtained.

Keywords. Metric-like space, Fixed point, Simulation function, Cyclic (α, β) -admissible almost z -contraction

Mathematics Subject Classification (2020). 54H25, 47H10

Copyright © 2022 Snehlata Mishra, Anil Kumar Dubey, Urmila Mishra and R.P. Dubey. *This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.*

1. Introduction

As generalizations of standard metric spaces, metric-like spaces were considered first by Hitzler and Seda [12] under the name of dislocated metric spaces. After then Amini-Harandi [3] proved some fixed point theorems in the class of metric-like space. Very recently many authors proved fixed point results in the setting of metric-like spaces (e.g, see [5–7, 15, 17]). Also, Khojasteh *et al.* [14] introduced the notion of z -contraction by defining the concept of simulation functions. They unified the some existing metric fixed point results. Then various authors studied in this direction [2, 4, 11, 16, 18].

Alizadeh *et al.* [1] introduced the concept of cyclic (α, β) -admissible mapping and proved some new fixed point theorems which generalize and extend some recent results in the literature. By using this concept, they [15, 16] proved several fixed point theorems with different type contractive conditions. Berinde [9, 10] extended the class of contractive mapping, introducing the notion of almost contractions and proved that every almost contraction mapping defined on a complete metric space has at least one fixed point. Subsequently, Babu *et al.* [8] demonstrated that almost contraction type mappings have a unique fixed point under conditions that present the notion of B-almost contraction. Also, Isik *et al.* [13] proved fixed point theorems for almost z -contraction with an application.

In this paper, we consider some simulation functions to show the existence of fixed points of cyclic (α, β) -admissible almost z -contraction in metric-like space. Furthermore, we also give some examples to illustrate the main results. We modify and generalize the results of Isik *et al.* [13], and Qawaqneh [15].

Let us recall some notations and definitions, we will need in the sequel. Throughout this paper, we assume the symbols \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{N} as a set of real numbers and a set of natural numbers respectively.

2. Basic Facts and Definitions

Definition 2.1 ([3]). Let X be a non empty set. A function $\sigma : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is said to be a metric-like (or a dislocated metric) on X , if for any $x, y, z \in X$ the following conditions hold:

$$(\sigma_1) \quad \sigma(x, y) = 0 \Rightarrow x = y;$$

$$(\sigma_2) \quad \sigma(x, y) = \sigma(y, x);$$

$$(\sigma_3) \quad \sigma(x, z) \leq \sigma(x, y) + \sigma(y, z).$$

The pair (X, σ) is called a metric-like space. Then a metric-like on X satisfies all conditions of a metric except that $\sigma(x, x)$ may be positive for $x \in X$. Each metric-like σ on X generates a topology τ_σ on X , whose base is the family of open σ -balls, then for all $x \in X$ and $\epsilon > 0$

$$B_\sigma(X, \epsilon) = \{y \in X : \sigma(x, y) - \sigma(x, x) < \epsilon\}.$$

Now, let (X, σ) be a metric-like space. A sequence $\{x_n\}$ in the metric-like space (X, σ) converges to a point $x \in X$ if and only if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(x_n, x) = \sigma(x, x).$$

Let (X, σ) be metric-like space, and let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a continuous mapping. Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x \Rightarrow \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T(x_n) = T(x).$$

A sequence $\{x_n\}$ is Cauchy in (X, σ) , if and only if $\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(x_m, x_n)$ exists and is finite. Moreover, the metric-like space (X, σ) is called complete, if and only if for every Cauchy sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X , there exists $x \in X$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \sigma(x_n, x) = \sigma(x, x) = \lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(x_n, x_m).$$

It is clear that every metric space and partial metric space is a metric-like space but the converse is not true.

Example 2.2. Let $X = \{0, 1\}$ and $\sigma(x, y) = \begin{cases} 2, & \text{if } x = y = 0; \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$

Then (X, σ) is a metric-like space. It is neither a partial metric space ($\sigma(0, 0) \not\leq \sigma(0, 1)$) nor a metric space ($\sigma(0, 0) = 2 \neq 0$).

Remark 2.3. A subset A of a metric-like space (X, σ) is bounded if there is a point $b \in X$ and a positive constant k such that $\sigma(a, b) \leq k$ for all $a \in A$.

Remark 2.4 ([3]). Let $X = \{0, 1\}$ such that $\sigma(x, y) = 1$ for each $x, y \in X$ and let $x_n = 1$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then it is easy to see that $x_n \rightarrow 0$ and $x_n \rightarrow 1$ and so in metric-like space, the limit of a convergence sequence is not necessarily unique.

The following Lemma is useful to prove our results.

Lemma 2.5 ([3,9]). Let (X, σ) be a metric-like space. Let $\{x_n\}$ be a sequence in X such that $x_n \rightarrow x$, where $x \in X$ and $\sigma(x, y) = 0$. Then for all $y \in X$ we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(x_n, y) = \sigma(x, y)$.

Definition 2.6 ([14]). A function $\zeta : [0, \infty) \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called a simulation function if ζ satisfies the following conditions:

(ζ_1) $\zeta(0, 0) = 0$.

(ζ_2) $\zeta(t, s) < s - t$, for all $t, s > 0$.

(ζ_3) If $\{t_n\}$ and $\{s_n\}$ are sequences in $(0, \infty)$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = l \in (0, \infty)$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \zeta(t_n, s_n) < 0$.

The following unique fixed point theorem is established by Khojasteh *et al.* in [14].

Theorem 2.7. Let (X, d) be a metric space and $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a z -contraction with respect to a simulation function ζ , that is

$$\zeta(d(Tx, Ty), d(x, y)) \geq 0$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Then T has a unique fixed point.

It is worth mentioning that the Banach contraction is an example of z -contractions by defining $\zeta : [0, \infty) \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ via $\zeta(t, s) = \lambda s - t$, for all $s, t \in [0, \infty)$, where $\lambda \in [0, 1)$.

Argoubi *et al.* [4] modified Definition 2.6 as follows.

Definition 2.8 ([4]). A simulation function is a function $\zeta : [0, \infty) \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that satisfies the following conditions:

(i) $\zeta(t, s) < s - t$, for all $t, s > 0$;

- (ii) if $\{t_n\}$ and $\{s_n\}$ are sequences in $(0, \infty)$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = l \in (0, \infty)$, then $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \zeta(t_n, s_n) < 0$.

It is clear that any simulation function in the sense of Khojasteh *et al.* [14, Definition 2.6] is also a simulation function in the sense of Argoubi *et al.* [4, Definition 2.8]. The converse is not true.

Example 2.9 ([4]). Define a function $\zeta : [0, \infty) \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\zeta(t, s) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } (s, t) = (0, 0), \\ \lambda s - t, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\lambda \in (0, 1)$. Then ζ is a simulation function in the sense of Argoubi *et al.* [4].

In the sense of Definition 2.6, some other examples of simulation functions are given below:

(i) $\zeta(t, s) = cs - t$, for all $t, s \in [0, \infty)$, where $c \in [0, 1)$,

(ii) $\zeta(t, s) = s - \phi(s) - t$, for all $t, s \in [0, \infty)$,

where $\phi : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a lower semi-continuous function such that $\phi(t) = 0$ if and only if $t = 0$.

Definition 2.10 ([1]). Let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a mapping and $\alpha, \beta : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be two functions. We say that f is a cyclic (α, β) -admissible mapping if:

(1) $\alpha(x) \geq 1$ for some $x \in X \Rightarrow \beta(f(x)) \geq 1$.

(2) $\beta(x) \geq 1$ for some $x \in X \Rightarrow \alpha(f(x)) \geq 1$.

Definition 2.11 ([9, 10]). Let (X, d) be a metric space. A self mapping T on X is called an almost contraction if there are constants $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and $\theta \geq 0$ such that

$$d(Tx, Ty) \leq \lambda d(x, y) + \theta d(y, Tx), \quad \text{for all } x, y \in X.$$

Definition 2.12 ([8]). Let (X, d) be a metric space. A self mapping T on X is called an B -almost contraction if there are constants $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and $\theta \geq 0$ such that

$$d(Tx, Ty) \leq \lambda d(x, y) + \theta N(x, y), \quad \text{for all } x, y \in X,$$

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

3. Main Results

In this section, we present the class of cyclic (α, β) -admissible almost z -contraction mapping and prove some fixed point theorems on complete metric-like space with simulation function.

Theorem 3.1. Let (X, σ) be a complete metric-like space and $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a cyclic (α, β) -admissible almost z -contraction mapping with respect to a ζ simulation function if there exist $\psi : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ with $\psi(t) < t$ such that

$$\zeta(\psi(\sigma(Tx, Ty)), \psi(\sigma(x, y) + \theta N(x, y))) \geq 0, \quad (3.1)$$

for all $x, y \in X$ satisfying $\alpha(x)\beta(y) \geq 1$ where

$$N(x, y) = \min\{\sigma(x, Tx), \sigma(y, Ty), \sigma(x, Ty), \sigma(y, Tx)\} \text{ and } \theta \geq 0.$$

Assume that,

- (1) there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $\alpha(x_0) \geq 1$ and $\beta(x_0) \geq 1$,
- (2) T is continuous, or
- (3) if $\{x_n\} \subseteq X$ such that $x_n \rightarrow x$ and $\beta(x_n) \geq 1$ for all n , then $\beta(x) \geq 1$.

Then T has a fixed point $u \in X$ such that $\sigma(u, u) = 0$. Moreover, if $\alpha(x) \geq 1$ and $\beta(y) \geq 1$, for all $x, y \in \text{Fix}(T)$, then T has a unique fixed point.

Proof. Since T is a cyclic (α, β) -admissible mapping and $\alpha(x_0) \geq 1$ then $\beta(x_1) = \beta(Tx_0) \geq 1$ which implies that $\alpha(Tx_1) = \alpha(x_2) \geq 1$. By continuing this method, we have $\alpha(x_{2n}) \geq 1$ and $\beta(x_{2n-1}) \geq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Again, since T is cyclic (α, β) -admissible mapping and $\beta(x_0) \geq 1$, we have $\beta(x_{2n}) \geq 1$ and $\alpha(x_{2n-1}) \geq 1$, then we deduce

$$\alpha(x_n) \geq 1 \text{ and } \beta(x_n) \geq 1, \tag{3.2}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Equivalently, $\alpha(x_{n-1})\beta(x_n) \geq 1$. Applying (3.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\zeta(\psi(\sigma(Tx_{n-1}, Tx_n)), \psi(\sigma(x_{n-1}, x_n) + \theta N(x_{n-1}, x_n))) \\ &= \zeta(\psi(\sigma(x_n, x_{n+1})), \psi(\sigma(x_{n-1}, x_n) + \theta N(x_{n-1}, x_n))) \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Since,

$$\begin{aligned} N(x_{n-1}, x_n) &= \min\{\sigma(x_{n-1}, Tx_{n-1}), \sigma(x_n, Tx_n), \sigma(x_{n-1}, Tx_n), \sigma(x_n, Tx_{n-1})\} \\ &= \min\{\sigma(x_{n-1}, x_n), \sigma(x_n, x_{n+1}), \sigma(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1}), \sigma(x_n, x_n)\} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

From (3.3), we have

$$\zeta(\psi(\sigma(x_n, x_{n+1})), \psi(\sigma(x_{n-1}, x_n))) \geq 0. \tag{3.4}$$

If $\sigma(x_n, x_{n+1}) = 0$ for some n , then $x_n = x_{n+1} = Tx_n$, that is x_n is a fixed point of T and so the proof is finished. Therefore, we suppose that $x_n \neq x_{n+1}$ for all $n \geq 0$. Now, we shall show that $\sigma(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq \sigma(x_{n-1}, x_n)$. Now from (3.4) and by (ζ_2) , we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \zeta(\psi(\sigma(x_n, x_{n+1})), \psi(\sigma(x_{n-1}, x_n))) \\ &< \psi(\sigma(x_{n-1}, x_n)) - \psi(\sigma(x_n, x_{n+1})), \end{aligned}$$

by using the properties of ψ , we get

$$\sigma(x_{n+1}, x_n) < \sigma(x_{n-1}, x_n).$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\sigma(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq \sigma(x_{n-1}, x_n), \tag{3.5}$$

for all $n \geq 1$ which implies that $\{\sigma(x_n, x_{n+1})\}$ is non increasing sequence, so there exists $r \geq 0$ such that

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

Suppose that $r > 0$. By the properties of ψ , (3.4), (3.5) and the condition (ζ_3)

$$0 \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \zeta(\psi(\sigma(x_n, x_{n+1})), \psi(\sigma(x_{n-1}, x_n))) < 0,$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore $r = 0$. This implies that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(x_n, x_{n+1}) = 0. \quad (3.6)$$

Again, we show that $\{x_n\}$ is Cauchy sequence in (X, σ) , i.e.,

$$\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(x_n, x_m) = 0. \quad (3.7)$$

Suppose on the contrary that is $\{x_n\}$ is not a Cauchy sequence. Then there exist $\epsilon > 0$ for which we can assume subsequences $\{x_{m(k)}\}$ and $\{x_{n(k)}\}$ of $\{x_n\}$ with $m(k) > n(k) > k$ such that for every k ,

$$\sigma(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}) \geq \epsilon. \quad (3.8)$$

This means that

$$\sigma(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)-1}) < \epsilon. \quad (3.9)$$

By the triangular inequality and using (3.8) and (3.9), we get

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

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the above inequalities and by using (3.7) and (3.8), we have

$$\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}) = \epsilon. \quad (3.10)$$

Since

$$\sigma(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}) \leq \sigma(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)+1}) + \sigma(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{n(k)})$$

and

$$\sigma(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)+1}) \leq \sigma(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)+1}) + \sigma(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)}),$$

then by letting the limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$ in above inequalities and using (3.6) and (3.10), we deduce that

$$\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)}) = \epsilon. \quad (3.11)$$

Similarly, one can easily show that

$$\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)+1}) = \lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)+1}) = \epsilon. \quad (3.12)$$

Again since T is a cyclic (α, β) -admissible almost z -contraction mapping and

$$\alpha(x_{n(k)})\beta(x_{m(k)}) \geq 1,$$

then

$$N(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}) = \min\{\sigma(x_{n(k)}, x_{n(k)+1}), \sigma(x_{m(k)}, x_{m(k)+1}), \sigma(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)+1}), \sigma(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)+1})\}$$

taking $n \rightarrow \infty$ and using (3.6), (3.10) and (3.11), we obtain

$$\lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} N(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)}) = \epsilon. \tag{3.13}$$

If $x_n = x_m$ for some $n < m$, then $x_n = Tx_n = Tx_m = x_{m+1}$ and since $\{\sigma(x_n, x_{n+1})\}$ is non increasing sequence then

$$0 < \sigma(x_n, x_{n+1}) = \sigma(x_m, x_{m+1}) < \sigma(x_{m-1}, x_m) < \dots < \sigma(x_n, x_{n+1})$$

which is a contradiction. Then $x_n \neq x_m$ for all $n < m$. From condition (ζ_2) , we have

$$0 \leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \zeta(\psi(\sigma(x_{n(k)+1}, x_{m(k)+1})), \psi(\sigma(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)})) + \theta N(x_{n(k)}, x_{m(k)})) < 0,$$

which is a contradiction, due to our assumption, so $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Since (X, σ) is complete, there exists $u \in X$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(x_n, u) = \sigma(u, u) = \lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(x_n, x_m) = 0. \tag{3.14}$$

Now, if T is continuous, we obtain from (3.14)

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(x_{n+1}, Tu) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(Tx_{n+1}, Tu) = \sigma(Tu, Tu) = 0. \tag{3.15}$$

Using Lemma 2.5 and (3.15), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(x_n, Tu) = \sigma(u, Tu). \tag{3.16}$$

Combining (3.15) and (3.16), we deduce that $\sigma(Tu, u) = \sigma(Tu, Tu)$. That is $Tu = u$. Assume that condition (3) is hold, that is $\alpha(x_n)\beta(u) \geq 1$. From (3.1), we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq & \zeta(\psi(\sigma(x_{n+1}, Tu)), \psi(\sigma(x_n, u) + \theta N(x_n, u))) \\ & = \zeta(\psi(\sigma(Tx_n, Tu)), \psi(\sigma(x_n, u) + \theta N(x_n, u))), \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} N(x_n, u) &= \min\{\sigma(x_n, Tx_n), \sigma(u, Tu), \sigma(x_n, Tu), \sigma(u, Tx_n)\} \\ &= \min\{\sigma(x_n, x_{n+1}), \sigma(u, u), \sigma(x_n, u), \sigma(u, x_{n+1})\} = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

From (3.17), (3.18) and (ζ_2) , we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq & \zeta(\psi(\sigma(Tx_n, Tu)), \psi(\sigma(x_n, u))) \\ & \leq \psi(\sigma(x_n, u)) - \psi(\sigma(Tx_n, Tu)) < 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since ψ is strictly increasing, we have $\sigma(u, Tu) < (u, Tu)$, which is not possible and hence $\sigma(u, Tu) = 0$, that is $Tu = u$ and so u is a fixed point of T . Now, we shall show that the uniqueness of fixed point of u . Let v be another fixed point of T . Since $\alpha(u)\beta(v) \geq 1$, it follows from (3.1) that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq & \zeta(\psi(\sigma(Tu, Tv)), \psi(\sigma(u, v) + \theta N(u, v))) \\ & = \zeta(\psi(\sigma(u, v)), \psi(\sigma(u, v) + \theta N(u, v))), \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} N(u, v) &= \min\{\sigma(u, Tu), \sigma(v, Tv), \sigma(u, Tv), \sigma(v, Tu)\} \\ &= \min\{\sigma(u, u), \sigma(v, v), \sigma(u, v), \sigma(v, u)\} = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

From (3.19) and (3.20), we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \zeta(\psi(\sigma(u, v)), \psi(\sigma(u, v))) \\ &< \psi(\sigma(u, v)) - \psi(\sigma(u, v)). \end{aligned}$$

Since ψ is strictly increasing, we have $\sigma(u, v) < \sigma(u, v)$, which is a contradiction. Hence $u = v$ that is T has a unique fixed point. \square

Corollary 3.2. Let (X, σ) be a complete metric-like space and $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a cyclic (α, β) -admissible z -contraction mapping with respect to ζ simulation function if there exist $\psi : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ with $\psi(t) < t$ such that

$$\zeta(\psi(\sigma(Tx, Ty)), \psi(\sigma(x, y))) \geq 0, \quad (3.21)$$

for all $x, y \in X$ satisfying $\alpha(x)\beta(y) \geq 1$. Assume that

- (1) there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $\alpha(x_0) \geq 1$ and $\beta(x_0) \geq 1$,
- (2) T is continuous, or
- (3) if $\{x_n\} \subseteq X$ such that $x_n \rightarrow x$ and $\beta(x_n) \geq 1$ for all n , then $\beta(x) \geq 1$.

Then T has a unique fixed point.

Proof. The rest of proof follows from Theorem 3.1 by considering cyclic (α, β) -admissible z -contraction mapping that is $N(x, y) = 0$. \square

Corollary 3.3. Let (X, σ) be a complete metric-like space and $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a cyclic (α, β) -admissible z -contraction mapping with respect to ζ simulation function if there exist $\psi : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ with $\psi(t) < t$ such that

$$\zeta(\psi(\alpha(x)\beta(y)\sigma(Tx, Ty)), \psi(\sigma(x, y))) \geq 0, \quad (3.22)$$

for all $x, y \in X$ satisfying $\alpha(x)\beta(y) \geq 1$. Assume that

- (1) there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $\alpha(x_0) \geq 1$ and $\beta(x_0) \geq 1$,
- (2) T is continuous, or
- (3) if $\{x_n\} \subseteq X$ such that $x_n \rightarrow x$ and $\beta(x_n) \geq 1$ for all n , then $\beta(x) \geq 1$.

Then T has a unique fixed point.

Proof. The rest of proof follows from Theorem 3.1 by considering cyclic (α, β) -admissible z -contraction mapping that is $N(x, y) = 0$ and $\alpha(x)\beta(y) \geq 1$. \square

Example 3.4. Let $X = [0, \infty)$ endowed with the metric-like $\sigma(x, y) = x^2 + y^2$. Consider the mapping $T : X \rightarrow X$ given by

$$T(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{x^2}{2}, & \text{if } x \in [0, 1], \\ x + 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that (X, σ) is complete metric-like space. Define mappings $\alpha, \beta : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ by

$$\alpha(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x \in [0, 1], \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$\beta(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x \in [0, 1], \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $\zeta(t, s) = \frac{s}{1+s} - t$ for all $s, t \geq 0$ and $\psi(t) = t$. Note that T is a cyclic (α, β) -admissible. In fact, let $x, y \in X$ such that $\alpha(x) \geq 1$ and $\beta(y) \geq 1$. By definition of α and β this implies that $x, y \in [0, 1]$.

Thus $\beta(T(x)) \geq 1$, $\alpha(T(y)) \geq 1$. Now, if $\{x_n\} \subset X$ such that $\beta(x_n) \geq 1$ and $x_n \rightarrow x$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, $x_n \in [0, 1]$ hence $x \in [0, 1]$, i.e., $\beta(x) \geq 1$.

Let $\alpha(x)\beta(y) \geq 1$. Then $x, y \in [0, 1]$ and so we have

$$\psi(\sigma(Tx, Ty)), \psi(\sigma(x, y) + \theta N(x, y)) = \sigma(Tx, Ty), (\sigma(x, y) + \theta N(x, y)). \tag{3.23}$$

Hence $\theta \geq 0$ and

$$N(x, y) = \min\{\sigma(x, Tx), \sigma(y, Ty), \sigma(x, Ty), \sigma(y, Tx)\}$$

$$= \min\left\{\left(x^2 + \frac{x^4}{4}\right), \left(y^2 + \frac{y^4}{4}\right), \left(x^2 + \frac{y^4}{4}\right), \left(y^2 + \frac{x^4}{4}\right)\right\}.$$

Since $x, y \in [0, 1]$

$$N(x, y) = 0. \tag{3.24}$$

From (3.23) and (3.24), we have

$$\psi(\sigma(Tx, Ty)), \psi(\sigma(x, y) + \theta N(x, y)) = \sigma(Tx, Ty), \sigma(x, y).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta(\psi(\sigma(Tx, Ty)), \psi(\sigma(x, y) + \theta N(x, y))) &= \zeta(\sigma(Tx, Ty), \sigma(x, y)) \\ &= \frac{\sigma(x, y)}{1 + \sigma(x, y)} - \sigma(Tx, Ty) \\ &= \frac{x^2 + y^2}{1 + x^2 + y^2} - \left(\frac{x^4}{4} + \frac{y^4}{4}\right) \\ &= \frac{x^2 + y^2}{1 + x^2 + y^2} - \frac{x^4 + y^4}{4} \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

So, the hypothesis of Corollary 3.2 hold and therefore, T has a unique fixed point $x = 0$.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, we have presented some fixed point results for cyclic (α, β) -admissible almost z -contraction mapping in metric like space via simulation function. Our results are generalization of many existing results in the literature. Finally, we show one example to support the obtained results.

Acknowledgments

The authors are thankful to the learned referee for his/her deep observations and their suggestions, which greatly helped us to improve the paper significantly.

Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Authors' Contributions

All the authors contributed significantly in writing this article. The authors read and approved the final manuscript.

References

- [1] S.A. Alizadeh, F. Moradlou and P. Salimi, Some fixed point results for (α, β) - (ψ, φ) -contractive mappings, *Filomat* **28**(3) (2014), 635 – 647, DOI: 10.2298/FIL1403635A.
- [2] H.H. Alsulami, E. Karapınar, F. Khojasteh and A.-F. Roldán-López-de-Hierro, A proposal to the study of contractions in quasi-metric spaces, *Discrete Dynamics in Nature and Society* **2014** (2014), Article ID 269286, 10 pages, DOI: 10.1155/2014/269286.
- [3] A. Amini-Harandi, Metric-like spaces, partial metric spaces and fixed points, *Fixed Point Theory and Applications* **2012** (2012), Article number: 204, URL: <http://www.fixedpointtheoryandapplications.com/content/2012/1/204>.
- [4] H. Argoubi, B. Samet and C. Vetro, Nonlinear contractions involving simulation functions in a metric space with a partial order, *Journal of Nonlinear Sciences and Applications* **8**(6) (2015), 1082 – 1094, DOI: 10.22436/jnsa.008.06.18.
- [5] H. Aydi and A. Felhi, Best proximity points for cyclic Kannan-Chatterjea-Ćirić type contractions on metric-like spaces, *Journal of Nonlinear Sciences and Applications* **9**(5) (2016), 2458 – 2466, DOI: 10.22436/jnsa.009.05.45.
- [6] H. Aydi, A. Felhi and H. Afshari, New Geraghty type contractions on metric-like spaces, *Journal of Nonlinear Sciences and Applications* **10**(2) (2017), 780 – 788, DOI: 10.22436/jnsa.010.02.38.
- [7] H. Aydi, A. Felhi and S. Sahmim, Fixed points of multivalued nonself almost contractions in metric-like spaces, *Mathematical Sciences* **9** (2015), 103 – 108, DOI: 10.1007/s40096-015-0156-7.
- [8] G.V.R. Babu, M.L. Sandhya and M.V.R. Kameswari, A note on a fixed point theorem of Berinde on weak contractions, *Carpathian Journal of Mathematics* **24**(1) (2008), 8 – 12, URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43996834>.
- [9] V. Berinde, Approximating fixed Point of weak contractions using the Picard iteration, *Nonlinear Analysis Forum* **9**(1) (2004), 43 – 53.
- [10] V. Berinde, General constructive fixed point theorems for Ćirić-type almost contractions in metric spaces, *Carpathian Journal of Mathematics* **24**(2) (2018), 10 – 19, URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43996855>.
- [11] A. Felhi, H. Aydi and D. Zhang, Fixed points for α -admissible contractive mappings via simulation functions, *Journal of Nonlinear Sciences and Application* **9**(10) (2016), 5544 – 5560, DOI: 10.22436/jnsa.009.10.05.

- [12] P. Hitzler and A.K. Seda, Dislocated topologies, *Journal of Electrical Engineering* **51**(12) (2000), 1 – 12, URL: <https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/cse/15>.
- [13] H. Isik, N.B. Gungor, C. Park and S.Y. Jang, Fixed point theorems for almost z -contractions with an application, *Mathematics* **6**(3) (2018), 37, DOI: 10.3390/math6030037.
- [14] F. Khojasteh, S. Shukla and S. Radenović, A new approach to the study of fixed point theorems for simulation functions, *Filomat* **29**(6) (2015), 1189 – 1194, DOI: 10.2298/FIL1506189k.
- [15] H. Qawaqneh, New contraction embedded with simulation function and cyclic (α, β) -admissible in metric like spaces, *International Journal of Mathematics and Computer Science* **15**(4) (2020), 1029 – 1044, URL: <http://ijmcs.future-in-tech.net/15.4/R-HaithamQawaqneh.pdf>.
- [16] H. Qawaqneh, M.S.M. Noorani, W. Shatanawi, K. Abodayeh and H. Alsamir, Fixed point for mappings under contractive condition based on simulation functions and cyclic (α, β) -admissibility, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis* **9**(1) (2018), 38 – 51, URL: www.ilirias.com/jma/repository/docs/JMA9-1-4.pdf.
- [17] H.A. Qawaqneh, M.S. Noorani and W. Shatanawi, Fixed point for results for Geraghty type generalized F-contraction for weak α -admissible mapping in metric-like spaces, *European Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics* **11**(3) (2018), 702 – 716, DOI: 10.29020/nybg.ejpam.v11i3.3294.
- [18] A.F. Roldán-López-de-Hierro, E. Karapinar, C. Roldán-López-de-Hierro and J. Martínez-Moreno, Coincidence point theorems on metric spaces via simulation functions, *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics* **275**(2015), 345 – 355, DOI: 10.1016/j.cam.2014.07.011.

