

Existence and uniqueness of fixed point on closed ball in multiplicative $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -metric space

Mohamed Gamal^{1,*}, Fu-Gui Shi²

¹Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, South Valley University, Qena 83523, Egypt

²School of Mathematics and Statistics, Beijing Institute of Technology, Beijing 102488, China

Email: m_gamal29@sci.svu.edu.eg, fuguishi@bit.edu.cn

Abstract

In this article, we investigate some fixed point results satisfying a new generalized Δ -implicit contractive condition in ordered complete multiplicative $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -metric space. Also, some new definitions and fixed point theorems are presented in ordered complete multiplicative $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -metric space. Furthermore, some nontrivial and illustrative examples are given to validate our obtained results.

Keywords: Multiplicative $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -metric, closed ball, generalized Δ -implicit contraction, fixed point methodology.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 47H10, 55H02.

1. Introduction

Fixed point theory (**FPT**) plays a vivid, exciting and fundamental role in the field of functional analysis. S. Banach [5] presented a foundational principle and it becomes a vital tool in the field of metric fixed point with a lot of applications to ensure the existence and uniqueness of fixed point (**FP**). This theorem is called Banach fixed-point theorem (also is known as contractive mapping theorem or contraction mapping theorem). Due to its advantages, many authors showed different improvements and extensions of this theorem in various distance spaces (see [2, 4–6, 8–14, 16–22, 25, 27]).

Bashirov et al. [6] established the concept of multiplicative calculus, showed the foundational theorem of multiplicative calculus and studied some fundamental properties. After that, other properties in multiplicative metric space ($M^\circ M^\bullet S$) were studied and constructed in [7, 15]. In 2012, Özavsar et al. [24] displayed the definition of multiplicative contraction mappings on $M^\circ M^\bullet S$ in such a method that multiplicative triangle inequality is used instead of the usual triangular inequality and presented different existence results of **FP** beside

*Corresponding author: m_gamal29@sci.svu.edu.eg (M. Gamal),

various topological characteristics of $M^\circ M^\bullet S$. Also, many researchers studied fixed point theorems in multiplicative metric space using weak commutative mappings, locally contractive mappings, $\mathcal{E.A}$ -property, compatible-type mappings and generalized contraction mappings with cyclic (α, β) -admissible mapping respectively, for more illustrations (see [2, 3, 17, 26, 28]). In 2016, Nagpal et al. [23] introduced the concept of multiplicative generalized metric space and studied the notion of weakly commuting, compatible maps and its variants, weakly compatible, weakly compatible with properties $(\mathcal{C}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{R})$ and $(\mathcal{E.A})$ in the same space.

According to this orientation, the major purpose of this article is to prove some new fixed point theorems satisfying a new generalized Δ -implicit contraction on a closed ball in ordered complete multiplicative \mathbf{G}_M -metric space ($M^\circ \mathbf{G}_M - M^\bullet S$). Eventually, we prove some nontrivial examples to support new results.

2. Preliminary

Now, we recall some well-known notations and definitions that will be used in our subsequent discussion.

Definition 2.1. [5] Let \mathcal{P} be a mapping on a nonempty set \mathcal{Z} . Then a point $\check{\nu} \in \mathcal{Z}$ is called a **FP** of \mathcal{P} if $\mathcal{P}\check{\nu} = \check{\nu}$.

Definition 2.2. [6] Let a non-empty set \mathcal{Z} and $\zeta_M : \mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a function satisfying the following properties:

$$(\zeta_1) \quad \zeta_M(\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}) \geq 1, \quad \forall \check{\nu}, \check{\omega} \in \mathcal{Z};$$

$$(\zeta_2) \quad \zeta_M(\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}) = 1 \quad \text{iff} \quad \check{\nu} = \check{\omega};$$

$$(\zeta_3) \quad \zeta_M(\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}) = \zeta_M(\check{\omega}, \check{\nu}) \quad (\text{symmetry});$$

$$(\zeta_4) \quad \zeta_M(\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}) \leq \zeta_M(\check{\nu}, \check{\vartheta}) \cdot \zeta_M(\check{\vartheta}, \check{\omega}) \quad \forall \check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta} \in \mathcal{Z} \quad (\text{multiplicative triangle inequality}).$$

Then, ζ_M is a multiplicative metric on \mathcal{Z} and the pair (\mathcal{Z}, ζ_M) is a $M^\circ M^\bullet S$.

Definition 2.3. [23] Suppose \mathcal{Z} be a non-empty set and $\mathbf{G}_M : \mathcal{Z}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a function satisfying the following conditions:

$$(\mathbf{G}_{M_1}) \quad \mathbf{G}_M(\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta}) = 1 \quad \text{if} \quad \check{\nu} = \check{\omega} = \check{\vartheta};$$

$$(\mathbf{G}_{M_2}) \quad 1 < \mathbf{G}_M(\check{\nu}, \check{\nu}, \check{\omega}) \quad \forall \check{\nu}, \check{\omega} \in \mathcal{Z} \quad \text{with} \quad \check{\nu} \neq \check{\omega};$$

$$(\mathbf{G}_{M_3}) \quad \mathbf{G}_M(\check{\nu}, \check{\nu}, \check{\omega}) \leq \mathbf{G}_M(\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta}) \quad \forall \check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta} \in \mathcal{Z} \quad \text{with} \quad \check{\omega} \neq \check{\vartheta};$$

$$(\mathbf{G}_{M_4}) \quad \mathbf{G}_M(\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta}) = \mathbf{G}_M(\check{\nu}, \check{\vartheta}, \check{\omega}) = \mathbf{G}_M(\check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta}, \check{\nu}) = \dots \quad (\text{symmetry});$$

$$(\mathbf{G}_{M_5}) \quad \mathbf{G}_M(\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta}) \leq \mathbf{G}_M(\check{\nu}, \check{\tau}, \check{\tau}) \cdot \mathbf{G}_M(\check{\tau}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta}) \quad \forall \check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta}, \check{\tau} \in \mathcal{Z}, \quad (\text{rectangular inequality}).$$

Then, the function \mathbf{G}_M is called a multiplicative generalized metric or, more accurately, multiplicative \mathbf{G}_M -metric on \mathcal{Z} and the pair $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathbf{G}_M)$ is a $M^\circ \mathbf{G}_M - M^\bullet S$.

Definition 2.4. Suppose $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}})$ be a $M^\circ \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}} - M^\bullet S$ then for $\check{\nu}_0 \in \mathcal{Z}$, the $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -ball with centre $\check{\nu}_0$ and radius γ ($\gamma > 0$) is,

$$\overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)} = \{\varrho \in \mathcal{Z} : \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \varrho, \varrho) \leq \gamma\}.$$

Example 2.5. Let (\mathcal{Z}, d) be a $M^\circ M^\bullet S$ and $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{Z}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is defined by $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta}) = d(\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}) \cdot d(\check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta}) \cdot d(\check{\vartheta}, \check{\nu}) \quad \forall \check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta} \in \mathcal{Z}$. Then, $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a multiplicative $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -metric on \mathcal{Z} and $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is called $M^\circ \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}} - M^\bullet S$.

Example 2.6. Assume that (\mathcal{Z}, d) be a usual metric space and $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{Z}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is defined by $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta}) = e^{d(\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}) + d(\check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta}) + d(\check{\vartheta}, \check{\nu})} \quad \forall \check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta} \in \mathcal{Z}$. Thus, $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a multiplicative $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -metric on \mathcal{Z} and $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}})$ is called $M^\circ \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}} - M^\bullet S$.

Definition 2.7. [1] Suppose (\mathcal{Z}, \leq) be a poset. Then, $\check{\omega}, \check{\rho} \in \mathcal{Z}$ are called comparable if $\check{\omega} \leq \check{\rho}$ or $\check{\rho} \leq \check{\omega}$ holds.

Proposition 2.8. [23] Let $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}})$ be a $M^\circ \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}} - M^\bullet S$. Then, for all $\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta}, \check{\tau} \in \mathcal{Z}$, the following properties are satisfying:

- (1) $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta}) = 1$ if $\check{\nu} = \check{\omega} = \check{\vartheta}$;
- (2) $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta}) \leq \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}, \check{\tau}, \check{\tau}) \cdot \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\omega}, \check{\tau}, \check{\tau}) \cdot \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\vartheta}, \check{\tau}, \check{\tau})$;
- (3) $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta}) \leq \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}, \check{\nu}, \check{\omega}) \cdot \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}, \check{\nu}, \check{\vartheta})$;
- (4) $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\omega}) \leq \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}^2(\check{\omega}, \check{\nu}, \check{\nu})$.

Lemma 2.9. [23] Let $\{\check{\nu}_k\}$ be a sequence in a $M^\circ \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}} - M^\bullet S$ $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}})$. If the sequence $\{\check{\nu}_k\}$ is multiplicative $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -convergent then it is multiplicative $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -Cauchy ($M^\circ \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}} - C^\bullet$) sequence.

Lemma 2.10. [23] Let $\{\check{\nu}_k\}$ be a sequence in a $M^\circ \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}} - M^\bullet S$ $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}})$. The sequence $\{\check{\nu}_k\}$ in \mathcal{Z} is multiplicative $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -convergent to $p \in \mathcal{Z}$ iff $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_k, p, p) \rightarrow 1$, as $k \rightarrow +\infty$.

3. Main Results

Now, we present our main theorem in ordered complete multiplicative $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -metric space.

Theorem 3.1. Let $(\mathcal{L}, \leq, \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}})$ be an ordered complete $M^\circ \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}} - M^\bullet S$. Suppose the mapping $\mathring{\mathcal{F}} : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ with $\eta \in [0, 1)$ and $\gamma > 0$, satisfying the following,

$$\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\omega}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\vartheta})} \leq \left[\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta})} \right]^\eta, \quad (3.1)$$

and

$$\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_0) \leq (1 - \eta)\gamma, \quad (3.2)$$

for $\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta} \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$. If for a non-increasing (**non – inc**) sequence $\{\check{\nu}_n\} \rightarrow s$ implies that $s \preceq \check{\nu}_n$. Then, there is a point $\check{\nu}^*$ in $\overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ such that $\check{\nu}^* = \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*$ and $\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*) = 1$. Furthermore, if for any two points $\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}$ in $\overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ and there exists a point $t \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ such that $t \preceq \check{\nu}$ and $t \preceq \check{\omega}$, that is every two points in $\overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ has a lower bound (**LB**). Then, a point $\check{\nu}^*$ is unique in \mathcal{L} .

Proof. Let $\check{\nu}_0$ be any arbitrary point in \mathcal{L} and picard sequence $\check{\nu}_{j+1} = \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_j \preceq \check{\nu}_j$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. From Ineq. (3.2), we get

$$\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_1) \leq (1 - \eta) \gamma \leq \gamma,$$

implying thereby that $\check{\nu}_1 \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$. By multiplicative triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_2, \check{\nu}_2)} &\leq \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_1)} \cdot \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_2, \check{\nu}_2)} \\ &= \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_1)} \cdot \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_1, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_1)} \\ &\leq \left[\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_1)} \right]^{1 + \eta}, \end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_2, \check{\nu}_2) &\leq \left[\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_0) \right]^{1 + \eta} \\ &\leq \left[(1 - \eta) \gamma \right]^{1 + \eta} \leq \gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Then, $\check{\nu}_2 \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$. Consider $\check{\nu}_3, \check{\nu}_4, \dots, \check{\nu}_q$ for every $q \in \mathbb{N}$. Taking Ineq. (3.1) in consideration, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_q, \check{\nu}_{q+1}, \check{\nu}_{q+1})} &= \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_{q-1}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_q, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_q)} \leq \left[\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_{q-1}, \check{\nu}_q, \check{\nu}_q)} \right]^\eta \\ &\leq \left[\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_{q-2}, \check{\nu}_{q-1}, \check{\nu}_{q-1})} \right]^{\eta^2} \\ &\vdots \\ &\leq \left[\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_1)} \right]^{\eta^q}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Using Ineq. (3.1) and Ineq. (3.3), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_{q+1}, \check{\nu}_{q+1})} &\leq \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_1)} \cdot \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_2, \check{\nu}_2)} \cdot \dots \cdot \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_q, \check{\nu}_{q+1}, \check{\nu}_{q+1})} \\ &\leq \left[\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_1)} \right]^{1 + \eta + \dots + \eta^q}, \end{aligned}$$

that becomes as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_{q+1}, \check{\nu}_{q+1}) &\leq \left[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_0) \right]^{\frac{1-\eta^{q+1}}{1-\eta}} \\ &\leq \left[(1-\eta)\gamma \right]^{\frac{1-\eta^{q+1}}{1-\eta}} \leq \gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\check{\nu}_{q+1} \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$. Thus, $\check{\nu}_j \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Consequently, Ineq. (3.3) convert to

$$\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_j, \check{\nu}_{j+1}, \check{\nu}_{j+1})} \leq \left[\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_1)} \right]^{\eta^j}. \quad (3.4)$$

From Ineq. (3.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_j, \check{\nu}_{j+k}, \check{\nu}_{j+k})} \\ &\leq \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_j, \check{\nu}_{j+1}, \check{\nu}_{j+1})} \cdot \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_{j+1}, \check{\nu}_{j+2}, \check{\nu}_{j+2})} \cdot \dots \cdot \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_{j+k-1}, \check{\nu}_{j+k}, \check{\nu}_{j+k})} \\ &\leq \left[\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_1)} \right]^{\eta^j} \frac{1-\eta^k}{1-\eta} \rightarrow 1, \quad j \rightarrow +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

This means the sequence $\{\check{\nu}_j\}$ is a $M^\circ \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}} - C^\bullet$ sequence in $(\overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}, \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}})$.

Furthermore, there exists $\check{\nu}^* \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ with

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_j, \check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*)} = \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}_j, \check{\nu}_j)} = 1. \quad (3.5)$$

Now, assume that $\check{\nu}^* \preceq \check{\nu}_j \preceq \check{\nu}_{j-1}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}^*, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*)} &\leq \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}_j, \check{\nu}_j)} \cdot \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_j, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*)} \\ &= \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}_j, \check{\nu}_j)} \cdot \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_{j-1}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*)} \\ &\leq \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}_j, \check{\nu}_j)} \cdot \left[\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_{j-1}, \check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*)} \right]^\eta \\ &\leq \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}_j, \check{\nu}_j)} \cdot \left[\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_{j-1}, \check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*)} \right]^\eta \right) = 1, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Then, $\check{\nu}^* = \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*$. By a similar method, $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*) = 1$ and hence, $\mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^* = \check{\nu}^*$. Now,

$$\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*)} = \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*)} \leq \left[\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*)} \right]^\eta,$$

which is a contradiction, since $\eta \in [0, 1)$. Thus, $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*) = 1$.

Uniqueness:

Consider $\check{\omega}^*$ be another point in $\overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ such that $\check{\omega}^* = F\check{\omega}^*$. If $\check{\nu}^*$ and $\check{\omega}^*$ are comparable, then

$$\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\omega}^*, \check{\omega}^*)} = \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathring{F}\check{\nu}^*, \mathring{F}\check{\omega}^*, \mathring{F}\check{\omega}^*)} \leq \left[\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\omega}^*, \check{\omega}^*)} \right]^\eta,$$

which is contradiction that tend us to

$$\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\omega}^*, \check{\omega}^*) = 1 \quad \text{implies} \quad \check{\nu}^* = \check{\omega}^*.$$

Similarly, we can prove $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\omega}^*, \check{\omega}^*, \check{\nu}^*) = 1$.

On the other hand, If $\check{\nu}^*$ and $\check{\omega}^*$ are not comparable then there is a point $t \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ which is the **LB** of $\check{\nu}^*$ and $\check{\omega}^*$ that is $t \preceq \check{\nu}^*$ and $t \preceq \check{\omega}^*$. Furthermore, by argument $\check{\nu}^* \preceq \check{\nu}_n$ as $\check{\nu}_n \rightarrow \check{\nu}^*$. Thus, $t \preceq \check{\nu}^* \preceq \check{\nu}_n \preceq \dots \preceq \check{\nu}_0$.

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{F}t, \mathring{F}t)} &\leq \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_1)} \cdot \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_1, \mathring{F}t, \mathring{F}t)} \\ &= \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{F}\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{F}\check{\nu}_0)} \cdot \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathring{F}\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{F}t, \mathring{F}t)} \\ &\leq \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{F}\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{F}\check{\nu}_0)} \cdot \left[\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, t, t)} \right]^\eta, \end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{F}t, \mathring{F}t) &\leq \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{F}\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{F}\check{\nu}_0) \cdot \left[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, t, t) \right]^\eta \\ &\leq (1 - \eta) \gamma \cdot [(1 - \eta) \gamma]^\eta \quad (\text{by Ineq. (3.1) and Ineq. (3.2)}) \\ &\leq \gamma, \end{aligned}$$

where $\check{\nu}_0, t \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ and this means that $\mathring{F}t \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$.

Now, we show that $\mathring{F}^j t \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ by using mathematical induction. Suppose $\mathring{F}^2 t, \mathring{F}^3 t, \dots, \mathring{F}^q t \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ for all $q \in \mathbb{N}$. As $\mathring{F}^q t \preceq \mathring{F}^{q-1} t \preceq \dots \preceq t \preceq \check{\nu}^* \preceq \check{\nu}_n \preceq \dots \preceq \check{\nu}_0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_{q+1}, \mathring{F}^{q+1}t, \mathring{F}^{q+1}t)} &= \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathring{F}\check{\nu}_q, \mathring{F}(\mathring{F}^q t), \mathring{F}(\mathring{F}^q t))} \\ &\leq \left[\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_q, \mathring{F}^q t, \mathring{F}^q t)} \right]^\eta \leq \dots \leq \left[\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{F}^q t, \mathring{F}^q t)} \right] \eta^{q+1}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_{q+1}, \mathring{F}^{q+1}t, \mathring{F}^{q+1}t) \leq \left[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, t, t) \right] \eta^{q+1}. \quad (3.6)$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\mathcal{F}}^{q+1} t, \check{\mathcal{F}}^{q+1} t) &\leq \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_1) \cdots \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_q, \check{\nu}_{q+1}, \check{\nu}_{q+1}) \cdot \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_{q+1}, \check{\mathcal{F}}^{q+1} t, \check{\mathcal{F}}^{q+1} t) \\
&\leq \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_1) \cdots \left[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_1) \right]^{\eta^q} \cdot \left[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, t, t) \right]^{\eta^{q+1}} \\
&\leq \left[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_1) \right]^{1 + \eta + \dots + \eta^q} \cdot \left[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, t, t) \right]^{\eta^{q+1}} \\
&\leq \left[(1 - \eta) \gamma \right]^{\frac{1 - \eta^{q+1}}{1 - \eta}} \cdot \left[(1 - \eta) \gamma \right]^{\eta^{q+1}} \\
&\leq \left[(1 - \eta) \gamma \right]^{\frac{1 - \eta^{q+2}}{1 - \eta}} \leq \gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

It means that $\check{\mathcal{F}}^{q+1} t \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_{\gamma}(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ and so $\check{\mathcal{F}}^j t \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_{\gamma}(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Further

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\omega}^*, \check{\omega}^*) \\
&\leq \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\mathcal{F}}^j \check{\nu}^*, \check{\mathcal{F}}^{j-1} t, \check{\mathcal{F}}^{j-1} t) \cdot \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\mathcal{F}}^{j-1} t, \check{\mathcal{F}}^j \check{\omega}^*, \check{\mathcal{F}}^j \check{\omega}^*) \\
&= \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\mathcal{F}}(\check{\mathcal{F}}^{j-1} \check{\nu}^*), \check{\mathcal{F}}(\check{\mathcal{F}}^{j-2} t), \check{\mathcal{F}}(\check{\mathcal{F}}^{j-2} t)) \cdot \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\mathcal{F}}(\check{\mathcal{F}}^{j-2} t), \check{\mathcal{F}}(\check{\mathcal{F}}^{j-1} \check{\omega}^*), \check{\mathcal{F}}(\check{\mathcal{F}}^{j-1} \check{\omega}^*)) \\
&\leq \left[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\mathcal{F}}^{j-1} \check{\nu}^*, \check{\mathcal{F}}^{j-2} t, \check{\mathcal{F}}^{j-2} t) \right]^{\eta} \cdot \left[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\mathcal{F}}^{j-2} t, \check{\mathcal{F}}^{j-1} \check{\omega}^*, \check{\mathcal{F}}^{j-1} \check{\omega}^*) \right]^{\eta} \\
&\vdots \\
&\leq \left[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\mathcal{F}} t, \check{\mathcal{F}} t) \right]^{\eta^j} \cdot \left[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\mathcal{F}} t, \check{\omega}^*, \check{\omega}^*) \right]^{\eta^j} \longrightarrow 1, \quad j \longrightarrow +\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\omega}^*, \check{\omega}^*) = 1 \implies \check{\nu}^* = \check{\omega}^*$. By a similar method, we get

$$\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\omega}^*, \check{\omega}^*, \check{\nu}^*) = 1 \text{ implies } \check{\omega}^* = \check{\nu}^*.$$

Therefore, a point $\check{\nu}^*$ is unique in \mathcal{L} .

Corollary 3.2. *Let $(\mathcal{L}, \preceq, \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}})$ be an ordered complete $M^{\circ} \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}} - M^{\bullet} S$. Suppose the mapping $\check{\mathcal{F}} : \mathcal{L} \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}$ with $\eta \in [0, 1)$ and $\gamma > 0$ satisfying the following,*

$$\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}, \check{\mathcal{F}}\check{\omega}, \check{\mathcal{F}}\check{\vartheta}) \leq \left[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta}) \right]^{\eta}, \quad (3.7)$$

for $\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta} \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_{\gamma}(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$, with the condition (3.2).

If for a **non-inc** sequence $\{\check{\nu}_n\} \longrightarrow s$ implies that $s \preceq \check{\nu}_n$. Then, there is a point $\check{\nu}^*$ in $\overline{\mathcal{B}_{\gamma}(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ such that $\check{\nu}^* = \check{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*$ and $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*) = 1$. Furthermore, if for any two points $\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}$ in $\overline{\mathcal{B}_{\gamma}(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ then there exists a point $t \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_{\gamma}(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ such that $t \preceq \check{\nu}$ and $t \preceq \check{\omega}$, that is every two points in $\overline{\mathcal{B}_{\gamma}(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ has a **LB**. Then, a point $\check{\nu}^*$ is unique.

Example 3.3. Consider $\mathcal{L} = \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$ with $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{L}^3 \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}$ be a multiplicative $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -metric on \mathcal{L} is defined as follow:

$$\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta}) = e^{|\check{\nu} - \check{\omega}| + |\check{\omega} - \check{\vartheta}| + |\check{\vartheta} - \check{\nu}|}.$$

Also, let $\mathring{\mathcal{F}} : \mathcal{L} \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}$ be defined as

$$\mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu} = \begin{cases} \frac{\check{\nu}}{4} & \text{if } \check{\nu} \in \left[0, \frac{1}{3}\right); \\ \check{\nu} - \frac{1}{3} & \text{if } \check{\nu} \in \left[\frac{1}{3}, \infty\right). \end{cases}$$

For $\check{\nu}_0 = \frac{1}{3}$, $\gamma = \frac{11}{2}$, $\eta = \frac{5}{8}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)} = \left[0, \frac{11}{2}\right]$, we have

$$(1 - \eta)\gamma = \frac{33}{16} = 2.0625,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_0) &= \mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}\left(\frac{1}{3}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\frac{1}{3}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\frac{1}{3}\right) = \mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}\left(\frac{1}{3}, 0, 0\right) \\ &= e^{2/3} = 1.9477 \\ &\leq (1 - \eta)\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Step 1: If $\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta} \in \left[0, \frac{1}{3}\right) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)} = \left[0, \frac{11}{2}\right]$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\omega}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\vartheta}) &= e^{\frac{1}{4}(|\check{\nu}-\check{\omega}|+|\check{\omega}-\check{\vartheta}|+|\check{\vartheta}-\check{\nu}|)} \\ &\leq e^{\frac{5}{8}(|\check{\nu}-\check{\omega}|+|\check{\omega}-\check{\vartheta}|+|\check{\vartheta}-\check{\nu}|)} = [\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(x, y, z)]^\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Step 2: If $\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta} \in \left[\frac{1}{3}, \infty\right)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}x, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}y, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}z) &= e^{|\check{\nu}-\check{\omega}|+|\check{\omega}-\check{\vartheta}|+|\check{\vartheta}-\check{\nu}|} \\ &\geq e^{\frac{5}{8}(|\check{\nu}-\check{\omega}|+|\check{\omega}-\check{\vartheta}|+|\check{\vartheta}-\check{\nu}|)} = [\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta})]^\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, the contractive condition doesn't satisfy in \mathcal{L} and is satisfied in $\overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$. Hence, all the conditions of Corollary 3.2 is verified in case of $\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta} \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$.

Since every $M^\circ \mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M} - M^\bullet S$ generates $M^\circ MS$, we get the following corollaries.

Corollary 3.4. *Let $(\mathcal{L}, \preceq, d_\mathcal{M})$ be an ordered complete multiplicative $d_\mathcal{M}$ -metric space $(M^\circ d_\mathcal{M} - M^\bullet S)$. Suppose the mapping $\mathring{\mathcal{F}} : \mathcal{L} \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}$ with $\eta \in [0, 1)$ and $\gamma > 0$ satisfying the following,*

$$\sqrt[m]{d_\mathcal{M}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\omega})} \leq \left[\sqrt[m]{d_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}, \check{\omega})} \right]^\eta, \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$d_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_0) \leq (1 - \eta)\gamma, \quad (3.9)$$

for $\check{\nu}, \check{\omega} \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$. If for a **non - inc** sequence $\{\check{\nu}_n\} \longrightarrow s$ implies that $s \preceq \check{\nu}_n$. Then, there exists a point $\check{\nu}^*$ in $\overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ such that $\check{\nu}^* = \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*$ and $d_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*) = 1$. Furthermore, if for any two points $\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}$ in $\overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ then there is a point $t \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ such that $t \preceq \check{\nu}$ and $t \preceq \check{\omega}$, that is every two points in $\overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ has a **LB**. Then, $\check{\nu}^*$ is a unique point in \mathcal{L} .

Corollary 3.5. Consider $(\mathcal{L}, \preceq, d_{\mathcal{M}})$ be an ordered complete $M^\circ d_{\mathcal{M}} - M^\bullet S$. Suppose the mapping $\mathring{F} : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ with $\eta \in [0, 1)$ and $\gamma > 0$ satisfying the following,

$$d_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathring{F}\check{\nu}, \mathring{F}\check{\omega}) \leq [d_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}, \check{\omega})]^\eta, \quad (3.10)$$

for $\check{\nu}, \check{\omega} \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$, with the condition (3.9).

If for a **non – inc** sequence $\{\check{\nu}_n\} \rightarrow s$ implies that $s \preceq \check{\nu}_n$. Then, there is a point $\check{\nu}^*$ in $\overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ such that $\check{\nu}^* = \mathring{F}\check{\nu}^*$ and $d_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*) = 1$. Furthermore, if for any two points $\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}$ in $\overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ then there exists a point $t \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ such that $t \preceq \check{\nu}$ and $t \preceq \check{\omega}$, that is every two points in $\overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ has a **LB**. Then, a fixed point $\check{\nu}^*$ is unique.

Theorem 3.6. Let $(\mathcal{L}, \preceq, \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}})$ be an ordered complete $M^\circ \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}} - M^\bullet S$. Suppose the mapping $\mathring{F} : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ with $\eta \in [0, 1)$ and $\gamma > 0$ satisfying the following,

$$\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathring{F}\check{\nu}, \mathring{F}\check{\omega}, \mathring{F}\check{\vartheta})} \leq \mathcal{M}, \quad (3.11)$$

since

$$\mathcal{M} = \left[\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta})}, \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}, \mathring{F}\check{\nu}, \mathring{F}\check{\nu})}, \\ \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\omega}, \mathring{F}\check{\omega}, \mathring{F}\check{\omega})}, \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}, \mathring{F}\check{\omega}, \mathring{F}\check{\omega})}, \\ \sqrt[m]{\min \{ \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\vartheta}, \mathring{F}\check{\nu}, \mathring{F}\check{\nu}), \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}, \check{\vartheta}, \check{\vartheta}) \}} \end{array} \right\} \right]^\eta,$$

and

$$\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{F}\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{F}\check{\nu}_0) \leq (1 - \eta) \gamma, \quad (3.12)$$

for $\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta} \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$. If for a **non – inc** sequence $\{\check{\nu}_n\}$ in $\overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ and $\{\check{\nu}_n\} \rightarrow v$ implies that $v \preceq \check{\nu}_n$. Then, there exists a unique fixed point $\check{\nu}^*$ such that $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*) = 1$ and $\check{\nu}^* = \mathring{F}\check{\nu}^*$.

Proof. Consider an arbitrary point $\check{\nu}_0$ in \mathcal{L} . and a picard sequence $\check{\nu}_{q+1} = \mathring{F}\check{\nu}_q \preceq \check{\nu}_q$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. From inequality (3.12), we find

$$\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_1) \leq (1 - \eta) \gamma \leq \gamma,$$

for all $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Now, from inequalities (3.12), we obtain $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_1) \leq \gamma$ and $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_2, \check{\nu}_2) \leq \gamma$, which tends to $\check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_2 \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$. Similarly $\check{\nu}_3, \dots, \check{\nu}_q \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ for all $q \in \mathbb{N}$. Now,

$$\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_q, \check{\nu}_{q+1}, \check{\nu}_{q+1})} = \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathring{F}\check{\nu}_{q-1}, \mathring{F}\check{\nu}_q, \mathring{F}\check{\nu}_q)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \left[\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_{q-1}, \check{\nu}_q, \check{\nu}_q)}, \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_{q-1}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_{q-1}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_{q-1})}, \\ \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_q, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_q, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_q)}, \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_{q-1}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_q, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_q)}, \\ \sqrt[m]{\min \{ \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_q, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_{q-1}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_{q-1}), \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_{q-1}, \check{\nu}_q, \check{\nu}_q) \}} \end{array} \right\} \right]^{\eta} \\
&\leq \left[\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_{q-1}, \check{\nu}_q, \check{\nu}_q)}, \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_{q-1}, \check{\nu}_q, \check{\nu}_q)}, \\ \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_q, \check{\nu}_{q+1}, \check{\nu}_{q+1})}, \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_{q-1}, \check{\nu}_{q+1}, \check{\nu}_{q+1})}, \\ \sqrt[m]{\min \{ \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_q, \check{\nu}_q, \check{\nu}_q), \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_{q-1}, \check{\nu}_q, \check{\nu}_q) \}} \end{array} \right\} \right]^{\eta} \\
&\leq \left[\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_{q-1}, \check{\nu}_q, \check{\nu}_q)}, \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_{q-1}, \check{\nu}_q, \check{\nu}_q)}, \\ \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_q, \check{\nu}_{q+1}, \check{\nu}_{q+1})}, \\ \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_{q-1}, \check{\nu}_q, \check{\nu}_q)} \cdot \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_q, \check{\nu}_{q+1}, \check{\nu}_{q+1})}, 1 \end{array} \right\} \right]^{\eta}, \text{ (using } (G_{M_1}) \text{ and } (G_{M_5}) \text{)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Implying thereby,

$$\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_q, \check{\nu}_{q+1}, \check{\nu}_{q+1})} \leq \left[\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_{q-1}, \check{\nu}_q, \check{\nu}_q)} \cdot \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_q, \check{\nu}_{q+1}, \check{\nu}_{q+1})} \right]^{\eta},$$

that is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_q, \check{\nu}_{q+1}, \check{\nu}_{q+1}) &\leq \left[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_{q-1}, \check{\nu}_q, \check{\nu}_q) \right]^{\mu} \\
&\leq \left[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_{q-2}, \check{\nu}_{q-1}, \check{\nu}_{q-1}) \right]^{\mu^2} \\
&\vdots \\
&\leq \left[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_1) \right]^{\mu^q},
\end{aligned}$$

where $0 < \mu = \frac{\eta}{1-\eta} < \frac{1}{2}$. Taking Ineq. (3.11) and Ineq. (3.12) in consideration, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_{q+1}, \check{\nu}_{q+1}) &\leq \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_1) \cdot \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_2, \check{\nu}_2) \cdot \cdots \cdot \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_q, \check{\nu}_{q+1}, \check{\nu}_{q+1}) \\
&\leq \left[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_1) \right]^{\frac{1-\mu^{q+1}}{1-\mu}} \\
&\leq \left[(1-\eta)\gamma \right]^{\frac{1-\mu^{q+1}}{1-\mu}} \leq \gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, $\check{\nu}_{q+1} \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$. Thus, $\check{\nu}_j \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Now, Ineq. (3.13) became

$$\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_j, \check{\nu}_{j+1}, \check{\nu}_{j+1}) \leq \left[\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_1) \right]^{\mu^j}. \quad (3.14)$$

From Ineq. (3.14), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_j, \check{\nu}_{j+k}, \check{\nu}_{j+k}) &\leq \mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_j, \check{\nu}_{j+1}, \check{\nu}_{j+1}) \cdot \mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_{j+1}, \check{\nu}_{j+2}, \check{\nu}_{j+2}) \cdot \cdots \cdot \mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_{j+k-1}, \check{\nu}_{j+k}, \check{\nu}_{j+k}) \\ &\leq \left[\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_1) \right]^{\mu^j} \frac{1 - \mu^k}{1 - \mu} \longrightarrow 1, \quad j \longrightarrow +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that the sequence $\{\check{\nu}_j\}$ is a $M^\circ \mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M} - C^\bullet$ sequence in $(\overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}, \mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M})$. Then, there exists $\check{\nu}^* \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ with (3.5) is verified.

Now, suppose that $\check{\nu}^* \leq \check{\nu}_j \leq \check{\nu}_{j-1}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}^*, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*)} &\leq \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}_j, \check{\nu}_j)} \cdot \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_j, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*)} \\ &= \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}_j, \check{\nu}_j)} \cdot \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_{j-1}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*)} \\ &\leq \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}_j, \check{\nu}_j)} \cdot \left[\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_{j-1}, \check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*)} \right]^\eta \\ &\leq \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}_j, \check{\nu}_j)} \cdot \left[\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}_{j-1}, \check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*)} \right]^\eta \right) = 1, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Then, $\check{\nu}^* = \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*$. By a similar method, $\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*) = 1$ and hence $\mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^* = \check{\nu}^*$. Now,

$$\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*)} = \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*)} \leq \left[\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*)} \right]^\eta$$

which is a contradiction, since $\eta \in [0, 1)$. Thus, $\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*, \check{\nu}^*) = 1$.

Uniqueness:

Suppose $\check{\omega}^*$ be another point in $\overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ such that $\check{\omega}^* = \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\omega}^*$. If $\check{\nu}^*$ and $\check{\omega}^*$ are comparable, then

$$\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\omega}^*, \check{\omega}^*)} = \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}^*, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\omega}^*, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\omega}^*)} \leq \left[\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\omega}^*, \check{\omega}^*)} \right]^\eta,$$

which is contradiction that tend us to

$$\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\omega}^*, \check{\omega}^*) = 1 \quad \text{implies} \quad \check{\nu}^* = \check{\omega}^*.$$

Similarly, we can prove $\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\omega}^*, \check{\omega}^*, \check{\nu}^*) = 1$.

On the other hand, If $\check{\nu}^*$ and $\check{\omega}^*$ are not comparable then there exists a point $t \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ which is the **LB** of $\check{\nu}^*$ and $\check{\omega}^*$ that is $t \preceq \check{\nu}^*$ and $t \preceq \check{\omega}^*$. Furthermore, by argument $\check{\nu}^* \preceq \check{\nu}_n$ as $\check{\nu}_n \longrightarrow \check{\nu}^*$. Thus, $t \preceq \check{\nu}^* \preceq \check{\nu}_n \preceq \dots \preceq \check{\nu}_0$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}t, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}t)} &\leq \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_1)} \cdot \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_1, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}t, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}t)} \\
&= \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_0)} \cdot \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}t, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}t)} \\
&\leq \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_0)} \cdot \left[\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, t, t)} \right]^\eta,
\end{aligned}$$

that is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}t, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}t) &\leq \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_0) \cdot \left[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, t, t) \right]^\eta \\
&\leq (1 - \eta) \gamma \cdot \left[(1 - \eta) \gamma \right]^\eta \quad (\text{by Ineq. (3.12)}) \\
&\leq \gamma,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\check{\nu}_0, t \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ and this means that $\mathring{\mathcal{F}}t \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$.

Now, we prove that $\mathring{\mathcal{F}}^j t \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ by using mathematical induction. Suppose $\mathring{\mathcal{F}}^2 t, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}^3 t, \dots, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}^q t \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ for all $q \in \mathbb{N}$. As $\mathring{\mathcal{F}}^q t \preceq \mathring{\mathcal{F}}^{q-1} t \preceq \dots \preceq t \preceq \check{\nu}^* \preceq \check{\nu}_n \preceq \dots \preceq \check{\nu}_0$, then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_{q+1}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}^{q+1}t, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}^{q+1}t)} &= \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_q, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}^q t), \mathring{\mathcal{F}}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}^q t))} \\
&\leq \left[\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_q, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}^q t, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}^q t)} \right]^\eta \leq \dots \leq \left[\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}^q t, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}^q t)} \right]^{\eta^{q+1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_{q+1}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}^{q+1}t, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}^{q+1}t) \leq \left[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, t, t) \right]^{\eta^{q+1}}. \quad (3.15)$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}^{q+1}t, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}^{q+1}t) &\leq \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_1) \cdot \dots \cdot \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_q, \check{\nu}_{q+1}, \check{\nu}_{q+1}) \cdot \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_{q+1}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}^{q+1}t, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}^{q+1}t) \\
&\leq \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_1) \cdot \dots \cdot \left[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_1) \right]^{\eta^q} \cdot \left[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, t, t) \right]^{\eta^{q+1}} \\
&\leq \left[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \check{\nu}_1, \check{\nu}_1) \right]^{1 + \eta + \dots + \eta^q} \cdot \left[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, t, t) \right]^{\eta^{q+1}} \\
&\leq \left[(1 - \eta) \gamma \right]^{\frac{1 - \eta^{q+1}}{1 - \eta}} \cdot \left[(1 - \eta) \gamma \right]^{\eta^{q+1}} \\
&\leq \left[(1 - \eta) \gamma \right]^{\frac{1 - \eta^{q+2}}{1 - \eta}} \leq \gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\mathring{\mathcal{F}}^{q+1}t \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ and so $\mathring{\mathcal{F}}^j t \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\omega}^*, \check{\omega}^*) &\leq \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}^j \check{\nu}^*, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}^{j-1}t, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}^{j-1}t) \cdot \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}^{j-1}t, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}^j \check{\omega}^*, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}^j \check{\omega}^*) \\
&= \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}^{j-1} \check{\nu}^*), \mathring{\mathcal{F}}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}^{j-2}t), \mathring{\mathcal{F}}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}^{j-2}t)) \cdot \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}^{j-2}t), \mathring{\mathcal{F}}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}^{j-1} \check{\omega}^*), \mathring{\mathcal{F}}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}^{j-1} \check{\omega}^*)) \\
&\leq \left[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}^{j-1} \check{\nu}^*, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}^{j-2}t, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}^{j-2}t) \right]^\eta \cdot \left[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}^{j-2}t, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}^{j-1} \check{\omega}^*, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}^{j-1} \check{\omega}^*) \right]^\eta \\
&\vdots \\
&\leq \left[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}^*, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}t, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}t) \right]^{\eta^j} \cdot \left[\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}t, \check{\omega}^*, \check{\omega}^*) \right]^{\eta^j} \longrightarrow 1, \quad j \longrightarrow +\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}^*, \check{\omega}^*, \check{\omega}^*) = 1 \implies \check{\nu}^* = \check{\omega}^*$. Similarly,

$$\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\omega}^*, \check{\omega}^*, \check{\nu}^*) = 1 \text{ implies } \check{\omega}^* = \check{\nu}^*.$$

Therefore, a point $\check{\nu}^*$ is unique in \mathcal{L} .

As illustrated, Theorem 3.1 considers a corollary to Theorem 3.6.

Example 3.7. Consider $\mathcal{L} = \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$ with $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{L}^3 \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}$ be a multiplicative $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -metric on \mathcal{L} is defined by

$$\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta}) = e^{|\check{\nu}-\check{\omega}|+|\check{\omega}-\check{\vartheta}|+|\check{\vartheta}-\check{\nu}|}.$$

Also, let the mapping $\mathring{\mathcal{F}} : \mathcal{L} \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}$ be defined as

$$\mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu} = \begin{cases} \frac{\check{\nu}}{2} & \text{if } \check{\nu} \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right) \cap \mathcal{L}; \\ \check{\nu} - \frac{1}{4} & \text{if } \check{\nu} \in \left[\frac{1}{2}, \infty\right) \cap \mathcal{L}, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\mathcal{M} = \left[\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta}), \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu})}, \\ \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\omega}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\omega}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\omega}), \sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\omega}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\omega})}, \\ \sqrt[m]{\min \{ \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\vartheta}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}), \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}, \check{\vartheta}, \check{\vartheta}) \}} \end{array} \right\} \right]^{\eta}.$$

For $\check{\nu}_0 = \frac{1}{3}$, $\gamma = \frac{11}{2}$, $\eta = \frac{5}{8}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{B}_{\gamma}(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)} = \left[0, \frac{11}{2}\right]$, we have

$$(1 - \eta)\gamma = \frac{33}{16} = 2.0625,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}(\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_0, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}_0) &= \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\frac{1}{3}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\frac{1}{3}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\frac{1}{3}\right) = \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{6}\right) \\ &= e^{1/3} = 1.3956 \\ &\leq (1 - \eta)\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Step 1: If $\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta} \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right) \cap \mathcal{L} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)} = \left[0, \frac{11}{2}\right]$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\nu}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\omega}, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}\check{\vartheta})} &= \sqrt[m]{e^{\frac{1}{2}(|\check{\nu}-\check{\omega}|+|\check{\omega}-\check{\vartheta}|+|\check{\vartheta}-\check{\nu}|)}} \\
&\leq \left[\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sqrt[m]{e^{|\check{\nu}-\check{\omega}|+|\check{\omega}-\check{\vartheta}|+|\check{\vartheta}-\check{\nu}|}}, \sqrt[m]{e^{|\check{\nu}|}}, \\ \sqrt[m]{e^{|\check{\omega}|}}, \sqrt[m]{e^{|\check{\omega}-2\check{\nu}|}}, \\ \sqrt[m]{\min\{e^{|\check{\nu}-2\check{\vartheta}|}, e^2|\check{\nu}-\check{\vartheta}|\}} \end{array} \right\} \right]^\eta \\
&= \left[\sqrt[m]{e^{|\check{\nu}-\check{\omega}|+|\check{\omega}-\check{\vartheta}|+|\check{\vartheta}-\check{\nu}|}} \right]^\eta \\
&= \left[\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta})} \right]^\eta.
\end{aligned}$$

Step 2: If $\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta} \in \left[\frac{1}{2}, \infty\right) \cap \mathcal{L}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt[m]{\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{M}(\mathring{\mathcal{F}}x, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}y, \mathring{\mathcal{F}}z)} &= \sqrt[m]{e^{|\check{\nu}-\check{\omega}|+|\check{\omega}-\check{\vartheta}|+|\check{\vartheta}-\check{\nu}|}} \\
&\geq \left[\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sqrt[m]{e^{|\check{\nu}-\check{\omega}|+|\check{\omega}-\check{\vartheta}|+|\check{\vartheta}-\check{\nu}|}}, \sqrt[m]{e^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \\ \sqrt[m]{e^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \sqrt[m]{e^2|\check{\nu}-\check{\omega}+\frac{1}{4}|}}, \\ \sqrt[m]{\min\{e^2|\check{\vartheta}-\check{\nu}+\frac{1}{4}|, e^2|\check{\nu}-\check{\vartheta}|\}} \end{array} \right\} \right]^\eta \\
&= \left[\sqrt[m]{e^{|\check{\nu}-\check{\omega}|+|\check{\omega}-\check{\vartheta}|+|\check{\vartheta}-\check{\nu}|}} \right]^\eta \\
&= \left[\sqrt[m]{e^{|\check{\nu}-\check{\omega}|+|\check{\omega}-\check{\vartheta}|+|\check{\vartheta}-\check{\nu}|}} \right]^{5/8}.
\end{aligned}$$

Clearly, the contractive condition doesn't verify in $\left[\frac{1}{2}, \infty\right) \cap \mathcal{L}$ and is verified in $\overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$. Hence, all the assertions of Theorem 3.6 is satisfied in case of $\check{\nu}, \check{\omega}, \check{\vartheta} \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_\gamma(\check{\nu}_0, \gamma)}$.

4. Conclusions

In this article, we achieve some fixed point results satisfying a generalized Δ -implicit contractive conditions in the context of ordered complete multiplicative $\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}}$ -metric space $(M^\circ \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{M}} - M^\bullet S)$. Our results are considered a generalization and extension to the results in the literature. Some new definitions and examples are introduced in such spaces. Moreover, some examples are given to validate our obtained new results.

References

- [1] M. Abbas, S. Z. Nemeth, Finding solutions of implicit complementarity problems by isotonicity of metric projection, *Nonlinear Anal.*, 75 (2012), 2349–2361.
- [2] M. Abbas, B. Ali, Y. I. Suleiman, Common fixed points of locally contractive mappings in multiplicative metric spaces with application, *Int. J. Math. Math. Sci.*, 2015 (2015), 1–7.
- [3] A. A. N. Abdou, Common fixed point results for compatible-type mappings in multiplicative metric spaces, *J. Nonlinear Sci. Appl.*, 9 (2016), 2244–2257.
- [4] U. Ali, T. Kamran, A. Kurdi, Fixed point in b -multiplicative metric spaces, *UPB Sci. Bull., Ser. A.*, 79 (3) (2017), 15–20.
- [5] S. Banach, Sur les opérations dans les ensembles abstraits et leur application aux équations itegrales, *Fundam. Math.*, 3 (1992), 133–181.
- [6] A. E. Bashirov, E. M. Kurpamar, A. Özyapici, Multiplicative calculus and its applications, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 337 (2008), 36–48.
- [7] A. E. Bashirov, E. Misirli, Y. Tandoğdu, A. Özyapici, On modeling with multiplicative differential equations, *Appl. Math. J. Chin. Univ. Ser. B.*, 26 (2011), 425–438.
- [8] S. Bhatt, S. Chaukiyal, R. C. Dimri, A common fixed point theorem for weakly compatible maps in complex valued metric spaces, *Int. J. Math. Sci. Appl.*, 1 (2011), 1385–1389.
- [9] F. Bojor, Fixed point theorems for Reich type contraction on metric spaces with a graph, *Nonlinear Anal.*, 75 (2012), 3895–3901.
- [10] M. Boriceanu, Fixed point theory for multivalued generalized contraction on a set with two b -metrics, *Stud. Univ. Babeş-Bolyai, Math.*, 3 (2009), 1–14.
- [11] D. Butnariu, Fixed point for fuzzy mapping, *Fuzzy Sets & Syst.*, 7 (1982), 191–207.

- [12] P. Debnath, N. Konwa, S. Radenović, *Metric Fixed Point Theory, Applications in Science, Engineering and Behavioural Sciences, Forum for Interdisciplinary Mathematics*, Springer 2021.
- [13] T. Došenović, M. Postolache, S. Radenović, On multiplicative metric spaces: Survey, *Fixed Point Theory Appls.*, 2016 (2016), 1–17.
- [14] T. Došenović, S. Radenović, Multiplicative metric spaces and contractions of rational type, *Adv. Theor. Nonlin. Anal. Appl.*, 2 (2018), 195–201.
- [15] L. Florack, H. V. Assen, Multiplicative calculus in biomedical image analysis, *J. Math. Imaging Vis.*, 42 (2012), 64–75.
- [16] F. Gu, Y. J. Cho, Common fixed points results for four maps satisfying ϕ -contractive condition in multiplicative metric spaces, *Fixed Point Theory Appls.*, 2015 (2015), 1–19.
- [17] X. He, M. Song, D. Chen, Common fixed points for weak commutative mappings on a multiplicative metric space, *Fixed Point Theory Appls.*, 2014 (2014), 1–9.
- [18] N. Hussain, J.R. Roshan, V. Paravench, M. Abbas, Common fixed point results for weak contractive mappings in ordered dislocated b -metric space with applications, *J. Inequal. Appls.*, 2013 (2013), 1–21.
- [19] J. Jachymski, The contraction principle for mappings on a metric space with a graph, *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.*, 136 (2008), 1359–1373.
- [20] K. Jain, J. Kaur, Some fixed point results in b -metric spaces and b -metric-like spaces with new contractive mappings, *Axioms*, 10 (2021), 1–15.
- [21] Y. Jiang, F. Gu, Common coupled fixed point results in multiplicative metric spaces and applications, *J. Nonlinear Sci. Appl.*, 10 (2017), 1881–1895.
- [22] S. M. Kang, P. Kumar, S. Kumar, P. Nagpal, S. K. Garg, Common fixed points for compatible mappings and its variants in multiplicative metric spaces, *Int. J. Pure Appl. Math.*, 102 (2015), 383–406.
- [23] P. Nagpal, S. Kumar, S. K. Garg, Fixed point results in multiplicative generalized metric spaces, *Adv. Fixed Point Theory*, 6 (2016), 352–386.
- [24] M. Özavsar, A. C. Çevikel, Fixed points of multiplicative contraction mappings on multiplicative metric spaces, *J. Eng. Tech. Appl. Sci.*, 2 (2017), 65–79.
- [25] Y. Piao, Unique fixed points for four non-continuous mappings satisfying Ψ -contractive condition on non-complete multiplicative metric Spaces, *Adv. Fixed Point Theory*, 9 (2019), 135–145.

- [26] V. Srinivas, T. Tirupathi, K. Mallaiah, A fixed point theorem using EA property on multiplicative metric space, *J. Math. Comput. Sci.*, 10 (2020), 1788–1800.
- [27] V. Todorčević, *Harmonic Quasiconformal Mappings and Hyperbolic Type Metrics*, Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2019.
- [28] O. Yamaod, W. Sintunavarat, Some fixed point results for generalized contraction mappings with cyclic (α, β) -admissible mapping in multiplicative metric spaces, *J. inequal. appl.*, 2014 (2014), 1–15.