Generalization of Singh's Common Fixed Point Theorem

J.Jeyachristy Priskillal, G.Sheeba Merlin

Abstract— In this article, I generalize Singh's common fixed point theorem for compatible mappings in fuzzy metric spaces. Examples are given to support the results proved herein.

Index Terms— fuzzy metric space; compatible mapping; common fixed point.

I. INTRODUCTION

The author defined intuitionistic (ψ,η) contractive mapping in [6]. Using the definition of ψ , we gave a common fixed point theorem. The generalization of the commuting mapping concept is compatible mapping which is introduced by Gerald Jungck[3]. This concept was generalized to fuzzy metric spaces by Mishra et al.[7]. Vasuki[13] proved a fuzzier version of the result of Pant[8]. She proved a common fixed point theorem using R-weakly commuting. Further, some Mathematicians proved common fixed point theorem for compatible mappings[11],[12],[10]. In the year 2000, Singh[1] proved a common fixed point result for two compatible pairs of maps in fuzzy metric spaces as follows:

Let A,B,S and T be self-mappings of a complete fuzzy metric space (X,M,*) with a * b = min(a, b) satisfy the following conditions:

- (I) $BX \subset SX, AX \subset TX$,
- (II) A,S and B,T are compatible,
- (III) S and T are continuous,
- $(IV)M(Au,Bv,kt) \ge min\{M(Su,Tv,t), M(Au,Su,t),$

 $M(Bv,Tv,t),M(Su,Bv,2t),M(Au,Tv,t)\}$, for all $u,v \in X$, t > 0 and $k \in (0,1)$.

Then A,B,S and T have a unique common fixed point. In our paper [6], ψ is defined as follows,

Let Ψ be the class of all mappings $\psi : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ such that

- (i) ψ is non-decreasing and $\lim_{s \to \infty} \psi^n(s) = 1, \forall s \in (0,1];$
- (ii) $\psi(s) > s, \forall s \in (0,1);$
- (iii) $\psi(1) = 1$;

Example 1.1. [6] Define $\psi: [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]$ by

 $\psi(s) = \frac{2s}{s+1}, \forall s \in [0,1].$

 $\psi^{2}(s) = \frac{4s}{3s+1}, \psi^{3}(s) = \frac{8s}{7s+1}, ...,$

$$\psi^{n}(s) = \frac{2^{n} s}{(2^{n} - 1)s + 1}, \forall s \in [0, 1].$$

Revised Manuscript Received on April 12, 2019.

Dr. J.Jeyachristy Priskillal, School of Maritime Studies, Vels Institute of Technology, Sciences and Advanced Studies, Chennai-600127, T.N, India.

Dr. G.Sheeba Merlin, Department of Mathematics, Karunya Institute of Technology and Sciences, Coimbatore, T.N, India.

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \psi^{n}(s) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{2^{n} s}{(2^{n} - 1)s + 1} = 1, \forall s \in (0, 1].$$

Clearly, $\psi(s) > s$, $\forall s \in (0,1)$ and $\psi(1) = 1$.

II. PRELIMINARIES

Definition 2.1. [9] A binary operation * : [0,1] × [0,1] → [0,1] is called t-norm if the following conditions hold:

- (a) * is associative and commutative;
- (b) a * 1 = a, $\forall a \in [0,1]$;
- (c) a * b \leq c * d whenever a \leq c and b \leq d, \forall a,b,c,d \in [0,1].

If * is continuous then it is called a continuous t-norm.

Definition 2.2.[5] Let X be an arbitrary set, * be a continuous t-norm, and M be fuzzy sets on $X^2 \times (0,\infty)$. Consider the following conditions \forall u, v, w \in X and t > 0,

- (i) M(u,v,0) = 0;
- (ii) M(u,v,t) = 1 if and only if u = v;
- (iii) M(u,v,t) = M(v,u,t);
- (iv) $M(u,w,t+s) \ge M(u,v,t) * M(v,w,s)$;
- (v) $M(u,v,t):(0,\infty) \to [0,1]$ is left continuous;

The pair (M,*) is called fuzzy metric on X. The triple (X,M,*) is called a fuzzy metric space.

Example 2.3. [2] Let (X,d) be a metric space. Denote $a*b = ab, \forall a,b \in [0,1]$ and let M_d be fuzzy set on $X \times X \times (0,+\infty)$ defined as follows:

$$M_d(u,v,t) = \frac{t}{t + d(u,v)}$$
, $\forall t > 0$, then $(X,M_d,*)$ is a fuzzy

metric space.

Definition 2.4. [4] Let (X,M,*) be a fuzzy metric space. A sequence $\{u_n\}$ in X is called

(a) convergent to a point $u \in X$ if and only if $\lim_{n\to\infty}$

 $M(u_n,u,t) = 1, \forall t > 0,$

(b) Cauchy if $\lim_{n\to\infty} M(u_n, u_{n+p}, t) = 1, \forall t > 0$ and p > 0.

Definition 2.5. [4] A fuzzy metric space is said to be complete if every Cauchy sequence in X is convergent.

Definition 2.6. [7] In a fuzzy metric space (X,M,*), two self mappings A and B are said to be compatible if \lim

 $M(ABu_n, BAu_n, t) = 1$ whenever u_n is a sequence in X such that $\lim_{n \to \infty} Au_n = \lim_{n \to \infty} Bu_n = w$ for some $w \in X$.

Lemma 2.7. [8] If A and B are compatible mappings on a fuzzy metric space X and Au_n , $Bu_n \to w$ for some w in X (u_n being a sequence in X) then $ABu_n \to Bw$ provided B is continuous (at w).



GENERALIZATION OF SINGH'S COMMON FIXED POINT THEOREM

III. MAIN RESULTS

Proposition 3.1. Let A and B be compatible mappings of a fuzzy metric space (X,M,*) into itself. If Aw = Bw for some

 $w \in X$, then ABw = BAw.

Proof. Suppose that $\{u_n\}$ is a sequence in X defined by $u_n = w_n = 1,2,...$ for some $w \in X$ and Aw = Bw.

Then we have $Au_n, Bu_n \to Aw$ as $n \to \infty$.

Since A and B are compatible mapping,

$$M(ABw,BAw,t) = \lim_{n \to \infty} M(ABu_n,BAu_n,t) = 1.$$

Hence, we have ABw = BAw.

Since Aw = Bw, we have ABw = BAw.

Theorem 3.2. Let A.B.S and T be self-mappings of a complete fuzzy metric space (X,M,*) with a * b = min(a, b)satisfy the following conditions:

- $BX \subset SX, AX \subset TX,$ (I)
- (II)A,S and B,T are compatible,
- (III)One of A,B,S and T is continuous,
- (IV) $M(Au,Bv,t) \ge \psi [\min\{M(Su,Tv,t),M(Au,Su,t),$ M(Bv,Tv,t),

M(Su,Bv,2t),M(Au,Tv,t)],

for all $u,v \in X$ and t > 0.

Then A,B,S and T have a unique common fixed point. *Proof.* Consider a point $u_0 \in X$.

Since $BX \subset SX$ and $AX \subset TX$, We can define a sequence $\{v_n\}$ in X as follows:

there exists $u_1 \in X$ such that $Au_0 = Tu_1 = v_0$.

there exists $u_2 \in X$ such that $Bu_1 = Su_2 = v_1$.

there exists $u_{2n+1} \in X$ such that $Au_{2n} = Tu_{2n+1} = v_{2n}$.

there exists $u_{2n+2} \in X$ such that $Bu_{2n+1} = Su_{2n+2} = v_{2n+1}$.

Now, for all t > 0,

 $M(v_{2n}, v_{2n+1}, t) = M(Au_{2n}, Bu_{2n+1})$

 $\geq \psi [\min \{M(Su_{2n}, Tu_{2n+1}, t), M(Au_{2n}, Su_{2n}, t), \}$

 $M(Bu_{2n+1}, Tu_{2n+1}, t), M(Su_{2n}, Bu_{2n+1}, 2t),$

$$\begin{split} M(Au_{2n}, Tu_{2n+1}, t)\}] \\ = \psi[\min\{M(v_{2n-1}, v_{2n}, t), M(v_{2n}, v_{2n-1}, t), \\ M(v_{2n+1}, v_{2n}, t), M(v_{2n-1}, v_{2n+1}, 2t), \\ M(v_{2n}, v_{2n}, t)\}] \\ = \psi[\min\{M(v_{2n-1}, v_{2n}, t), M(v_{2n+1}, v_{2n}, t), \\ [M(v_{2n-1}, v_{2n}, t) * M(v_{2n}, v_{2n+1}, t)], 1\}] \\ = \psi[M(v_{2n-1}, v_{2n}, t), M(v_{2n}, v_{2n+1}, t)] \end{split}$$

 $= \psi[\min\{M(v_{2n-1},v_{2n},t),M(v_{2n},v_{2n+1},t)\}].$

Since $\psi(s) > s$, for all $s \in (0,1)$,

 $M(v_{2n}, v_{2n+1}, t) \ge \psi(M(v_{2n}, v_{2n+1}, t)) > M(v_{2n}, v_{2n+1}, t)$ which is a contradiction.

Therefore, $M(v_{2n}, v_{2n}+1, t) \ge \psi(M(v_{2n-1}, v_{2n}, t))$.

That is, $M(v_n, v_{n+1}, t) \ge \psi(M(v_{n-1}, v_n, t)).$

Continuing this process, we can get

 $M(v_n, v_{n+1}, t) \ge \psi(M(v_{n-1}, v_n, t)) \ge \psi^2(M(v_{n-2}, v_{n-1}, t)) \ge \cdots$ $\geq \psi^n(M(v_1,v_0,t)).$

That is, $M(v_n, v_{n+1}, t) \ge \psi^n(M(v_1, v_0, t))$.

Taking limit as $n \to \infty$ and $\lim \psi^n(s) = 1$, for all $s \in$

(0,1],

lim $M(v_n, v_{n+1}, t) = 1$.

Similarly, we can prove

 $M(v_{n+1},v_{n+2},t) \ge \psi^n(M(v_2,v_1,t)).$

 $\lim M(v_{n+1}, v_{n+2}, t) = 1.$

Now for all p > 0,

$$M(v_n, v_{n+p}, t) \ge M(v_n, v_{n+1}, \frac{t}{p}) * ... * M(v_{n+p-1}, v_{n+p}, \frac{t}{p}).$$

Taking limit $n \to \infty$, we have,

$$\begin{split} \lim_{n \to \infty} M(v_n, v_{n+p}, t) &\geq \lim_{n \to \infty} M(v_n, v_{n+1}, \frac{t}{p}) * \dots * \\ &\lim_{n \to \infty} M(v_{n+p-1}, v_{n+p}, \frac{t}{p}) \\ &\geq 1 * \dots * 1 \end{split}$$

That is, $\lim_{n\to\infty} M(v_n, v_{n+p}, t) = 1$.

Hence, $\{v_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in X.

Since (X,M,*) is a complete fuzzy metric space, there exists $w \in X$ such that $\lim_{n \to \infty} M(v_n, w, t) = 1$, for each t > 0.

Since $Au_{2n} = Tu_{2n+1} = v_{2n}$ and $Bu_{2n+1} = Su_{2n+2} = v_{2n+1}$ are subsequences of $\{v_n\}$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}Au_{2n}=\lim_{n\to\infty}Tu_{2n+1}=\lim_{n\to\infty}Bu_{2n+1}=\lim_{n\to\infty}Su_{2n+2}=w.$$

Case 1. Suppose A is continuous, since A and S are compatible and by Lemma 2.7, AAu_{2n} and SAu_{2n} converges to Aw as

 $n \to \infty$.

Consider,

$$M(AAu_{2n},Bu_{2n+1},t) \ge \psi[\min\{M(SAu_{2n},Tu_{2n+1},t), M(AAu_{2n},SAu_{2n},t),$$

 $M(Bu_{2n+1}, Tu_{2n+1}, t),$

 $M(SAu_{2n},Bu_{2n+1},2t),M(AAu_{2n},Tu_{2n+1},t)\}].$

Taking limit as $n \to \infty$, we get

 $M(Aw,w,t) \ge \psi[\min\{M(Aw,w,t), M(Aw,Aw,t), M(w,w,t),$ M(Aw,w,2t), M(Aw,w,t)

> $= \psi[\min\{M(Aw,w,t),M(Aw,w,2t),1\}]$ $= \psi(M(Aw,w,t)).$

That is, $M(Aw,w,t) \ge \psi(M(Aw,w,t))$.

Since $\psi(s) \ge s$ for all $s \in (0,1]$, it is possible only when M(Aw,w,t) = 1.

That is, Aw = w.

Since $AX \subset TX$ and hence there exists a point $x \in X$ such that w = Aw = Tx.

We claim that w = Bx.

 $M(AAu_{2n},Bx,t) \ge \psi[\min\{M(SAu_{2n},Tx,t),$

$$M(AAu_{2n},SAu_{2n},t), M(Bx,Tx,t), M(SAu_{2n},Bx,2t), M(AAu_{2n},Tx,t)\}].$$

Takin limit as $n \to \infty$, we get

$$M(Aw,Bx,t)$$
 \geq

 $\psi[\min\{M(Aw,Aw,t),M(Aw,Aw,t),M(Bx,Aw,t),$

M(Aw,Bx,2t),M(Aw,Aw,t)].

That M(w,Bx,t)is. $\psi[\min\{1,1,M(Bx,w,t),M(w,Bx,2t),1\}]$

 $= \psi[M(w,Bx,t)].$

That is, $M(w,Bx,t) \ge \psi[M(w,Bx,t)]$.

It is possible only when M(w,Bx,t) = 1. That is, w = Bx.

Since B and T are compatible and Bx = Tx,

by Proposition 3.1, BTx = TBx and Tw = TBx = BTx =Bw.

M(Aw,Sw,t),

M(Aw,Sw,t),

```
Also we have.
                                                                                                           Since AX \subset TX and hence there exists a point z \in X such
    M(Au2n,Bw,t) \ge \psi [\min \{M(Su_{2n},Tw,t), M(Au_{2n},Su_{2n},t),
                                                                                                       that w = Aw = Tz.
                               M(Bw,Tw,t),
                                                                                                           We claim that w = Bz.
    M(Su_{2n},Bw,2t),M(Au_{2n},Tw,t)\}].
                                                                                                           M(w,Bz,t) = M(Aw,Bz,t)
    Taking limit as n \to \infty, we get
                                                                                                                                          \psi[\min\{M(Sw,Tz,t),
    M(w,Bw,t)
                                       \psi[\min\{M(w,Bw,t),
                                                                              M(w,w,t),1,
                                                                                                           M(Bz,Tz,t),
    M(w,Bw,2t),
                                                                                                                                            M(Sw,Bz,2t),M(Aw,Tz,t)].
                                      M(w,Bw,t)
                                                                                                                             \geq \psi[\min\{M(w,w,t),M(w,w,t),M(Bz,w,t),
                      = \psi[M(w,Bw,t)].
                                                                                                                                          M(w,Bz,2t),1}].
    That is, M(w,Bw,t) \ge \psi[M(w,Bw,t)].
                                                                                                                                         = \psi[M(w,Bz,t)].
    It is possible only when M(w,Bw,t) = 1.
                                                                                                           That is, M(w,Bz,t) \ge \psi[M(w,Bz,t)].
    That is w = Bw = Tw.
                                                                                                           It is possible only when M(w,Bz,t) = 1. That is, w = Bz.
                                                                                                           Since B and T are compatible and Bz = Tz, by
    Since BX \subset SX, there exists a point y \in X such that
    w = Bw = Sv.
                                                                                                       Proposition 3.1, BTz = TBz and Tw = TBz = BTz = Bw.
    We claim that w = Av.
                                                                                                           Also, we claim that w = Bw.
                                                                                                           M(w,Bw,t) = M(Aw,Bw,t)
    M(Ay,w,t) = M(Ay,Bw,t)
                                   \psi[\min\{M(Sy,Tw,t),
                                                                              M(Ay,Sy,t),
                                                                                                                                          \psi[\min\{M(Sw,Tw,t),
                      \geq
    M(Bw,Tw,t),
                                                                                                           M(Bw,Tw,t),
                                    M(Sy,Bw,2t), M(Ay,Tw,t)
                                                                                                                                             M(Sw,Bw,2t),M(Aw,Tw,t)].
    Taking limit as n \to \infty, we get
                                                                                                                              \geq \psi[\min\{M(w,Bw,t),M(w,w,t),1,M(w,Bw,2t),
    M(Ay,w,t) \ge \psi[\min\{M(w,w,t), M(Ay,w,t), 1, M(w,w,2t),
                                                                                                                                             M(w,Bw,t)].
                                    M(Ay,w,t)
                                                                                                                              = \psi[M(w,Bw,t)].
                      \geq \psi[M(Ay,w,t)]
                                                                                                           That is, M(w,Bw,t) \ge \psi[M(w,Bw,t)].
                                                                                                           It is possible only when M(w,Bw,t) = 1. That is, w = Bw.
                                                                                                           Hence w = Aw = Sw = Bw = Tw. Therefore, w is a
    Since \psi(t) > t for all t \in (0,1) and \psi(1) = 1, M(Ay, w, t) =
                                                                                                       common fixed point of A,B,S and T.
1. That is, Ay = w.
    Since A and S are compatible and Ay = Sy, by
                                                                                                            Case 4. Similarly, we can prove when T is continuous.
Proposition 3.1, ASy = Say and hence Sw = SAy = ASy =
                                                                                                       Uniqueness:
                                                                                                           Suppose w<sub>1</sub> is also a common fixed point of A,B,S and T.
    Hence, w = Bw = Tw = Aw = Sw.
                                                                                                           M(w,w_1,t) = M(Aw,Bw_1,t)
    Therefore, w is a common fixed point of A,B,S and T.
                                                                                                                            \geq \psi[\min\{M(Sw,Tw_1,t),M(Aw,Sw,t),
    Case 2. Similarly, we can prove when B is continuous.
                                                                                                                                    M(Bw_1,Tw_1,t),
    Case 3. Suppose S is continuous, since A and S are
                                                                                                           M(Sw,Bw_1,2t),M(Aw,Tw_1,t)
compatible and by Lemma 2.7, SSu<sub>2n</sub> and ASu<sub>2n</sub> converges
                                                                                                                            = \psi[\min\{M(w,w_1,t), M(w,w,t), M(w_1,w_1,t),
to Sw as
                                                                                                                                         M(w,w_1,2t), M(w,w_1,t)
    n \to \infty.
                                                                                                                            =\psi[M(w,w_1,t)].
    Consider.
                                                                                                           That is, M(w,w_1,t) \ge \psi[M(w,w_1,t)]
    M(ASu_{2n},Bu_{2n+1},t) \geq \psi[min\{M(SSu_{2n},Tu_{2n+1},t),
                                                                                                           This is possible only when M(w,w_1,t) = 1. That is, w =
                                       M(ASu_{2n},SSu_{2n},t),
                                                                                                       w<sub>1</sub>. Hence the proof.
    M(Bu_{2n+1}, Tu_{2n+1}, t),
                                                                                                            Example 3.3. Let X = (-\infty, \infty) with the metric d defined by
                                                                                                       d(u,v) = |u - v|, define M(u,v,t) = \frac{t}{t + d(u,v)}, for all u,v \in
    M(SSu_{2n},Bu_{2n+1},2t),M(ASu_{2n},Tu_{2n+1},t)]
    Taking limit as n \to \infty, we get
    M(Sw,w,t) \ge \psi[\min\{M(Sw,w,t), M(Sw,Sw,t), M(w,w,t),
                                                                                                       X and t > 0. Note that, (X,M,*) where a * b = min(a,b) is a
                                     M(Sw,w,2t), M(Sw,w,t)
                                                                                                       complete fuzzy metric space.
                      = \psi[\min\{M(Sw,w,t),M(Sw,w,2t),1\}]
                                                                                                                      The maps A,B,S,T:X\to X is defined by
                      = \psi(M(Sw,w,t)).
                                                                                                           A(u) = \frac{2+u}{3}, B(u) = 3 - 2u, S(u) = 2 - u and T(u) = u.
    That is, M(Sw, w, t) \ge \psi(M(Sw, w, t)).
    Since \psi(s) \ge s for all s \in (0,1], it is possible only when
   M(Sw, w,t) = 1. That is, Sw = w.
                                                                                                          Let u_n = (1 - \frac{1}{-}).
   Now, we claim that w = Aw.
    M(Aw,Bu_{2n+1},t) \ge \psi[\min\{M(Sw,Tu_{2n+1},t),M(Aw,Sw,t),
                                                                                                           Now, we verify that A,S is compatible.
                                M(Bu_{2n+1},Tu_{2n+1},t),M(Sw,Bu_{2n+1},2t),
                                   M(Aw,Tu_{2n+1},t)\}]
    Taking limit as n \to \infty, we get
    M(Aw, w, t) \ge \psi[\min\{M(w, w, t), M(w, w, t)
                                     M(w,w,2t), M(w,w,t)}]
                       \geq \psi[1]
    Since \psi(t) > t for all t \in (0,1) and \psi(1) = 1, M(w,Aw,t) =
```



1. That is, Aw = w.

GENERALIZATION OF SINGH'S COMMON FIXED POINT THEOREM

$$\begin{split} \lim_{n\to\infty} M(ASu_n, SAu_n, t) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} M(A2 - u_n, S2 + u_n \ 3, t) \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} M(\frac{4 - u_n}{3}, \frac{4 - u_n}{3}, t) \\ &= 1. \end{split}$$

 $\lim_{n\to\infty} M(ASu_n, SAu_n, t) = 1.$

Also
$$\lim_{n \to \infty} Au_n = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{2 + u_n}{3} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{2 + (1 - \frac{1}{n})}{3} = 1.$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} Su_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \ 2-u_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} 2-(1-\frac{1}{n}) = 1.$$

Therefore, A and S are compatible mapping.

Similarly, we can verify that B and T are compatible. Also

 $BX \subset SX$ and $AX \subset TX$ and T is continuous.

Define the map
$$\psi: (0,1] \to (0,1]$$
 by $\psi(s) = \frac{2s}{s+1}$ for each

 $s \in (0,1]$. Now, we verify that

 $M(Au,Bv,t) \ge \psi[\min\{M(Su,Tv,t),M(Au,Su,t),M(Bv,Tv,t),M(Su,Bv,2t),M(Au,Tv,t)\}], \text{ for all } u,v$

 $\in X$.

Consider the following:

Suppose u = 4 and v = 10.

 $M(A4,B10,t) \ge \psi [\min \{M(S4,T10,t), M(A4,S4,t), \}]$

M(B10,T10,t),M(S4,B10,2t),

M(A4,T10,t)

if
$$M(2,-17,t) \ge \psi[\min\{M(-2,10,t), M(2,-2,t),M(-17,10,t), \}]$$

$$M(-2,-17,2t),M(2,10,t)$$

That is if
$$\frac{t}{t+15} \ge \psi[\min\{\frac{t}{t+12}, \frac{t}{t+4}, \frac{t}{t+27}, \frac{t}{t+7.5}, \frac{t}{t+15}\}]$$

That is if
$$\frac{t}{t+15} \ge \psi \left[\frac{t}{t+27} \right]$$

That is if
$$\frac{t}{t+15} \ge \frac{t}{t+13.5}$$

That is if $15 \ge 13.5$.

Similarly, we can verify, for all $u, v \in (-\infty, \infty)$.

All the conditions of the previous theorem are verified.

Then, 1 is the unique fixed point.

Hence, A,B,S and T have the common fixed point in X.

REFERENCES

- Bijendra Singh and M.S. Chauhan, "Common fixed points of Compatible maps in fuzzy metric spaces", Fuzzy sets and systems 115(3)(2000), 471-475.
- A. George and P. Veeramani, "On some results in fuzzy metric spaces", Fuzzy sets and systems 64(3)(1994), 395-399.
- 3. Gerald Jungck, "Compatible mappings and common fixed points", International journal of Mathematics and Mathematical sciences 9(4)(1986), 771-779.
- 4. M. Grabiec, "Fixed points in fuzzy metric spaces", Fuzzy sets and Systems 27(3)(1988), 385-389.
- 5. Ivan Kramsoil and Jiri Michalek, "Fuzzy metrics and statistical metric Spaces", Kybernetica 11(5)(1975), 336-344.

- J. Jeyachristy Priskillal and P. Thangavelu, "Intuitionistic fuzzy (ψ,η)-contractive mapping and fixed points", Journal of Analysis and Number Theory 5(2)(2017), 1-4.
- S.N. Mishra, Nilima Sharma and S.L Singh, "Common fixed points of maps on fuzzy metric spaces", International journal of Mathematics and Mathematical sciences 17(2)(1994), 253-258
- 8. R.P. Pant, "Common fixed points of noncomputing mappings", Journal of Mathematical analysis and applications 188(2)(1994), 436-440.
- 9. B. Schweizer and A. Sklar, "Statistical metric spaces", Pacific journal of Mathematics 10(1)(1960), 385-389.
- 10. K.P.R. Sedghi, Rao and N. Shobe, "A common fixed point theorem for six weakly compatible maps in M-fuzzy metric space"s, Iranian journal of fuzzy systems 5(2)(2008), 49-62.
- G. Song, "Comments on: a common fixed point theorem in a fuzzy metric space", Fuzzy sets and systems 135(2003), 409-413.
- 12. Sushil Sharma, Common fixed point theorems in fuzzy metric spaces, Fuzzy sets and systems 127(3)(2002), 345-352.
- R. Vasuki, Common fixed points for R-weakly commuting maps in fuzzy metric spaces, Indian journal of pure and applied Mathematics 30(4)(1999), 419-423.

