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1. Introduction

The study of fixed and common fixed points of mappings satisfying a certain metrical contractive conditions attracted many researchers. Let \((X, d)\) be a metric space. A mapping \(T: X \rightarrow X\) is a contraction if \(d(Tx, Ty) \leq kd(x, y),\) for all \(x, y \in X,\) where \(0 \leq k < 1\). The Banach’s contraction mapping principle appeared in explicit form in Banach’s thesis in 1922 [3]. Since its simplicity and usefulness, it has become a very popular tool in solving existence problems in many branches of mathematical analysis. Banach contraction principle has been extended in many different directions; see [7-18]. Sessa [20] initiated the notion of weakly commuting. Then Jungck
generalized this idea, first to compatible mappings [8] and then to weakly compatible mappings [9]. Here it may be pointed out that a pair of self mappings without coincidence point is also weakly compatible as the requirement of weak compatibility is met out vacuously. But such pairs are uninteresting in common fixed point considerations as opposed to a pair of weakly compatible mappings with at least one coincidence point which one may term as nontrivial weakly compatible pair. In an attempt to coin a proper generalization of nontrivial weakly compatible pair, Al-Thagafi and Shahzad [2] introduced the notion of occasionally weakly compatible pair (abbreviated as OWC in the sequel). Abbas and Rhoades [1] proved some common fixed point theorems for occasionally weakly compatible mappings satisfying a generalized contractive condition.

The notion of modular spaces, as a generalization of metric spaces, was introduced by Nakano [17] and was intensively developed by Koshi and Shimogaki [11], Yamamuro [22] and others. The main idea behind this new concept is the physical interpretation of the modular. Informally speaking whereas a metric on a set represent finite nonnegative distances between two points of the set, a modular on a set attributes a non negative (possibly, infinite valued) ‘field of (generalized) velocities’: to each ‘time’ $\lambda > 0$ (the absolute value of), an average velocity $\omega_\lambda(x,y)$ is associated in such way that in order to cover the ‘distance’ between points $x, y \in X$, it takes time $\lambda$ to move from $x$ to $y$ with velocity $\omega_\lambda(x,y)$. A lot of mathematicians are interested fixed points of modular spaces. Further the most complete development of these theories are due to Luxemburg [12], Musielk and Orlicz [13], Mazur [16], Turpin [21] and there collaborators.

In 2008, Chistyakov [4] introduced the notion of modular metric spaces generated by F-modular and developed the theory of this space. In 2010 Chistyakov [5] defined the notion of modular on an arbitrary set and develop the theory of metric spaces generated by modular such that called the modular metric spaces. Recently, Mongkolkeha et al. [14, 15] has introduced some notions and established some fixed point results in modular metric spaces. In this paper, we study and prove the existence of fixed point theorems for contraction mappings in modular metric spaces and generalized the result of Mongkolkeha et al. [14, 15] and Rahimpoor et al. [19].

2. Preliminaries
We will start with a brief recollection of basic concepts and facts in modular spaces and modular metric spaces (see [4, 5, 6]).
**Definition 2.1.** Let $X$ be a vector space over $\mathbb{R}$ (or $\mathbb{C}$). A functional $\rho : X \to [0, \infty]$ is called a modular if for arbitrary $x$ and $y$, elements of $X$ satisfying the following three conditions:

(A.1) $\rho(x) = 0$ if and only if $x = 0$.

(A.2) $\rho(\alpha x) = \rho(x)$ for all scalar $\alpha$ with $|\alpha| = 1$;

(A.3) $\rho(\alpha x + \beta y) \leq \rho(x) + \rho(y)$, whenever $\alpha, \beta \geq 0, \alpha + \beta = 1$.

If we replace (A.3) by

(A.4) $\rho(\alpha x + \beta y) \leq \alpha^s \rho(x) + \beta^s \rho(y)$, for $\alpha, \beta \geq 0, \alpha^s + \beta^s = 1$ with any $s \in (0,1]$,

then the modular $\rho$ is called $s$-convex modular, and if $s = 1$, $\rho$ is called a convex modular.

If $\rho$ is modular in $X$, then the set defined by

$$X_\rho = \{x \in X : \rho(\lambda x) \to 0 \text{ as } \lambda \to 0^+\}$$

(2.1)

is called a modular space. $X_\rho$ is a vector subspace of $X$ it can be equipped with an $F$-norm defined by setting $\|x\|_\rho = \inf \{\lambda > 0 : \rho(\frac{x}{\lambda}) \leq \lambda\}, \quad x \in X_\rho$.

(2.2)

In addition, if $\rho$ is convex, then the modular space $X_\rho$ coincides with

$$X_\rho^* = \{x \in X : \exists \lambda = \lambda(x) > 0 \text{ such that } \rho(\lambda x) < \infty\}$$

(2.3)

and the functional $\|x\|_\rho^* = \inf \{\lambda > 0 : \rho(\frac{x}{\lambda}) \leq 1\}$ is an ordinary norm on $X_\rho^*$ which is equivalent to $\|x\|_\rho$(see [13]).

Let $X$ be a non empty set, $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$ and due to the disparity of the arguments, function $\omega : (0, \infty) \times X \times X \to [0, \infty]$ will be written as $\omega_\lambda(x, y) = \omega(\lambda x, y)$ for all $\lambda > 0$ and $x, y \in X$.

**Definition 2.2.** Let $X$ be a non empty set. A function $\omega : (0, \infty) \times X \times X \to [0, \infty]$ is said to be a metric modular on $X$ if it satisfies the following three axioms:

(i) given $x, y \in X, \omega_\lambda(x, y) = 0$ for all $\lambda > 0$ if and only if $x = y$;

(ii) $\omega_\lambda(x, y) = \omega_\lambda(y, x)$ for all $\lambda > 0$ and $x, y \in X$;

(iii) $\omega_{\lambda+\mu}(x, y) \leq \omega_\lambda(x, z) + \omega_\mu(z, y)$ for all $\lambda, \mu > 0$ and $x, y, z \in X$.

If instead of (i), we have only the condition

(i') $\omega_\lambda(x, x) = 0$ for all $\lambda > 0$ and $x \in X$, then $\omega$ is said to be a (metric) pseudo modular on $X$ and if $\omega$ satisfies (i') and

(i_n) given $x, y \in X$, if there exists a number $\lambda > 0$, possibly depending on $x$ and $y$, such that $\omega_\lambda(x, y) = 0$, then $x = y$, with this condition $\omega$ is called a strict modular on $X$.

A modular (pseudo modular, strict modular) $w$ on $X$ is said to be convex if, instead of (iii), we replace the following condition:
(iv) for all \( \lambda > 0, \mu > 0 \) and \( x, y, z \in X \) it satisfies the inequality
\[
\omega_{\lambda+\mu}(x, y) = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda+\mu} \omega_\lambda(x, z) + \frac{\mu}{\lambda+\mu} \omega_\mu(z, y)
\]
for all \( \lambda, \mu > 0 \) and \( x, y, z \in X \).

Clearly, if \( \omega \) is a strict modular, then \( \omega \) is a modular, which in turn implies \( \omega \) is a pseudo modular on \( X \), and similar implications hold for convex \( \omega \). The essential property of a (pseudo) modular \( \omega \) on a set \( X \) is a following given \( x, y \in X \), the function \( 0 < \lambda \rightarrow \omega_\lambda(x, y) \in \mathbb{R} \) is non increasing on \( (0, \infty) \). In fact, if \( 0 < \mu < \lambda \), then (iii), (i') and (ii) imply
\[
\omega_\lambda(x, y) \leq \omega_{\lambda-\mu}(x, x) + \omega_\mu(y, y) = \omega_\mu(x, y)
\]
(2.4)

It follows that at each point \( \lambda > 0 \) the right limit \( \omega_{\lambda+\varepsilon}(x, y) := \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0^+} \omega_{\lambda+\varepsilon}(x, y) \) and the left limit \( \omega_{\lambda-\varepsilon}(x, y) := \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0^-} \omega_{\lambda-\varepsilon}(x, y) \) exist in \( [0, \infty) \) and the following two inequalities hold:
\[
\omega_{\lambda+\varepsilon}(x, y) \leq \omega_\lambda(x, y) \leq \omega_{\lambda-\varepsilon}(x, y)
\]
(2.5)

From [4, 5], we know that, if \( x_0 \in X \), the set
\[
X_\omega = \{ x \in X : \lim_{\lambda \to \infty} \omega_\lambda(x, x_0) = 0 \}
\]
is a metric space, called a modular space, whose metric is given by
\[
d^0_\omega(x, y) = \inf\{ \lambda > 0 : \omega_\lambda(x, y) \leq \lambda \} \text{ for all } x, y \in X_\omega.
\]

Moreover, if \( \omega \) is convex, the modular set \( X_\omega \) is equal to
\[
X^*_\omega = \{ x \in X : \exists \lambda = \lambda(x) > 0 \text{ such that } \omega_\lambda(x, x_0) < \infty \}
\]
and metrizable by \( d^*_\omega(x, y) = \inf\{ \lambda > 0 : \omega_\lambda(x, y) \leq 1 \} \text{ for all } x, y \in X^*_\omega \).

We know that if \( X \) is a real linear space, \( \rho : X \rightarrow [0, \infty) \) and
\[
\omega_\lambda(x, y) = \rho\left(\frac{x-y}{\lambda}\right) \text{ for all } \lambda > 0 \text{ and } x, y \in X,
\]
(2.6)
then \( \rho \) is modular (convex modular) on \( X \) in the sense of (A.1) - (A.4) if and only if \( \omega \) is metric modular (convex metric modular, respectively) on \( X \). On the other hand, if \( \omega \) satisfy the following two conditions:

(i) \( \omega_\lambda(\mu x, 0) = \omega_{\lambda/\mu}(x, 0) \) for all \( \lambda, \mu > 0 \) and \( x \in X \),

(ii) \( \omega_\lambda(x + z, y + z) = \omega_\lambda(x, y) \) for all \( \lambda > 0 \) and \( x, y, z \in X \), if we set \( \rho(x) = \omega_1(x, 0) \) with (2.6) holds, where \( x \in X \), then

(a) \( X_\rho = X_\omega \) is a linear subspace of \( X \) and the functional \( \| x \|_\rho = d^0_\omega(x, 0), x \in X_\rho \), is an F-norm on \( X_\rho \).
(b) If $\omega$ is convex, $X_\omega^* \equiv X_\omega^*(0) = X_\omega$ is a linear subspace of $X$ and the functional $\|x\|_\omega = d_\omega(x, 0), x \in X_\omega^*$, is a norm on $X_\omega^*$.

Similar assertions hold if replace the word modular by pseudo modular. If $\omega$ is metric modular in $X$, we called the set $X_\omega$ is modular metric space.

By the idea of property in metric spaces and modular spaces, we defined the following:

**Definition 2.3.**[14] Let $X_\omega$ be a modular metric space.

1. The sequence $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $X_\omega$ is said to be convergent to $x \in X_\omega$ if $\omega(x_n, x) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ for all $\lambda > 0$.

2. The sequence $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $X_\omega$ is said to be Cauchy if $\omega(x_m, x_n) \to 0$ as $m, n \to \infty$ for all $\lambda > 0$.

3. A subset $C$ of $X_\omega$ is said to be closed if the limit of the convergent sequence of $C$ always belong to $C$.

4. A subset $C$ of $X_\omega$ is said to be complete if any Cauchy sequence in $C$ is a convergent sequence and its limit in $C$.

5. A subset $C$ of $X_\omega$ is said to be bounded if for all $\lambda > 0$

   $$\delta_\omega(C) = \sup\{\omega(x, y); x, y \in C\} < \infty.$$  

We recall the following definitions in metric spaces.

**Definition 2.4.** Let $X$ be a set, $f, g$ self maps of $X$. A point $x$ in $X$ is called a coincidence point of $f$ and $g$ iff $fx = gx$. We shall call $w = fx = gx$, a point of coincidence of $f$ and $g$.

**Definition 2.5.** Two maps $S$ and $T$ are said to be weakly compatible if they commute at coincidence points.

Al -Thagafi and Shahzad [2] gave a proper generalization of nontrivial weakly compatible maps which have a coincidence point.

**Definition 2.6.**[2] Two self maps $f$ and $g$ of a set $X$ are occasionally weakly compatible (owc) iff there is a point $x$ in $X$ which is a coincidence point of $f$ and $g$ at which $f$ and $g$ commute.

We also use the following lemma from Jungck and Rhoades[10].

**Lemma 2.1.**[10] Let $X$ be a set. Let $f, g$ be owc self maps of $X$. If $f$ and $g$ have a unique point of coincidence, $w := fx = gx$, then $w$ is a unique common fixed point of $f$ and $g$.

Thus we define the above definitions in modular metric spaces as follows:
Definition 2.7. Let $X_\omega$ be a modular metric space. Let $f, g$ self maps of $X_\omega$. A point $x$ in $X_\omega$ is called a coincidence point of $f$ and $g$ iff $fx = gx$. We shall call $w = fx = gx$ a point of coincidence of $f$ and $g$.

Definition 2.8. Let $X_\omega$ be a modular metric space. Two maps $S$ and $T$ of $X_\omega$ are said to be weakly compatible if they commute at coincidence points.

Definition 2.9. Let $X_\omega$ be a modular metric space. Two self maps $f$ and $g$ of $X_\omega$ are occasionally weakly compatible (owc) iff there is a point $x$ in $X_\omega$ which is a coincidence point of $f$ and $g$ at which $f$ and $g$ commute.

Lemma 2.2. Let $X_\omega$ be a modular metric space and $f, g$ owe self maps of $X_\omega$. If $f$ and $g$ have a unique point of coincidence, $w := fx = gx$, then $w$ is a unique common fixed point of $f$ and $g$.

The purpose of this paper is to prove some common fixed point theorems for owc mappings satisfying generalized contraction in modular metric spaces which generalizes several results from the literature. In process, our results generalize several fixed point theorems in following respects.

(i) The class of spaces is widened from the class of metric spaces to the class of modular metric spaces.

(iii) The condition on completeness/compactness of the space is completely relaxed.

(iv) The condition of weak compatibility is weakened to OWC.

(v) The condition of the required containment of the ranges of the involved mappings is not essential.

(vi) The condition of continuity of the involved mappings is also relaxed.

3. Main results

Theorem 3.1. Let $X_\omega$ be a modular metric space and $I, J, R, S, T, U : X_\omega \to X_\omega$ be self mapping of $X_\omega$ such that the pairs $(SR, I)$ and $(TU, J)$ are occasionally weakly compatible. Suppose there exists numbers $a, b, c, d \in [0,1)$ with at least one of $a, b, c, d > 0$ such that the following assertion for all $x, y \in X_\omega$ and $\lambda > 0$ hold:

(3.1.1) $(a + b + c + 2d) < 1$; for all $0 \leq a, b, c, d < 1$;

(3.1.2) $\omega_\lambda(SRx, TUy) \leq a\omega_\lambda(Ix, Jy) + b\omega_\lambda(SRx, Ix) + c\omega_\lambda(TUy, Jy) + d[\omega_\lambda(SRx, Jy) + \omega_\lambda(TUy, Ix)];$

(3.1.3) $\omega_\lambda(SRx, TUy) < \infty.$
Then SR, TU, I and J have a common fixed point in \( X_\omega \). Furthermore if the pairs (S,R), (S,I), (R,I),(T,J),(T,U), (U,J) are commuting pairs of mappings then I, J, R, S, T and U have a unique common fixed point in \( X_\omega \).

**Proof.** Since the pair (SR, I) and (TU, J) are occasionally weakly compatible then there exists \( \epsilon X_\omega \): \( SRu = Ju \) and \( Jv = TVv \). Moreover; \( SR(Iu) = I(SRu) \) and \( TU(Jv) = J(TUv) \).

Now we can assert that \( SRu = TVv \), if not then by (3.1.2)

\[
\omega_2(SRu,TVv) \leq a\omega_2(Iu,Jv) + b \omega_2(SRu,Iu) + c \omega_2(TUv,Jv) + d[\omega_2(SRu,Jv) + \omega_2(TUv,Iu)]
\]

Hence \( \omega_2(SRu,TVv) \leq a\omega_2(Iu,Jv) + b \omega_2(Iu,Iu) + c \omega_2(Jv,Jv) + d[\omega_2(Iu,Jv) + \omega_2(Iu,Iu)] \),

Then by lemma 2.2, \( w \) is a unique common fixed point of \( SR \) and \( I \).

Thus from equation (3.2) and (3.3) it follows that

\[
\omega_2(SRu,TVv) \leq a\omega_2(Iu,Jv) + d[\omega_2(Iu,Jv) + \omega_2(Iu,Iu)]
\]

Moreover, if there is another point \( z \) such that \( SRz = Iz \), and using condition (3.1.2)

\[
\omega_2(SRz,TVv) \leq a\omega_2(Iz,Jv) + b \omega_2(SRz,Iz) + c \omega_2(TUv,Jv) + d[\omega_2(SRz,Jv) + \omega_2(TUv,Iz)]
\]

By definition of metric modular and the inequality (2.4)

\[
\omega_2(SRz,TVv) \leq (a + d)\omega_2(Iu,Jv) + d \omega_2(Iu,Iu)
\]

or \( (1 - a - 2d)\omega_2(SRz,TVv) \leq 0 \), which is a contradiction.

Hence \( SRu = TVv \) and thus \( SRu = Ju = TU = Jv \).

Moreover, if there is another point \( z \) such that \( SRz = Iz \), and using condition (3.1.2)

\[
\omega_2(SRz,TVv) \leq a\omega_2(Iz,Jv) + b \omega_2(SRz,Iz) + c \omega_2(TUv,Jv) + d[\omega_2(SRz,Jv) + \omega_2(TUv,Iz)]
\]

or \( (1 - a - 2d)\omega_2(SRz,TVv) \leq 0 \), which is contradiction.

Hence we get \( SRz = Iz = TUv = Jv \).

Thus from equation (3.2) and (3.3) it follows that \( SRz = SRu \). This implies \( z = u \).

Hence, \( w = SR = Ju \) for some \( w \in X_\omega \) is the unique point of coincidence of SR and I.

Then by lemma 2.2, \( w \) is a unique common fixed point of SR and I.

Hence \( SRw = lw = w \).

Similarly, there is another common fixed point \( w^* \in X_\omega : w^* = TUw^* = Jw^* \).

For the uniqueness, suppose \( w^*_1 \neq w^* \), then by (3.1.2) we have

\[
\omega_2(SRw,\overline{TUw^*}) \leq a\omega_2(Iw,Jw^*) + b \omega_2(SRw,Iz) + c \omega_2(TUw^*,Jw^*) + d[\omega_2(SRw,Jw^*) + \omega_2(TUw,Iw)]
\]

we get \( \omega_2(w,w^*) \leq (a + 2d)\omega_2(w,w^*) \), which is contradiction. Hence \( w = w^* \).
Hence \( w \) is a unique common fixed point of \( SR, TU, I \) and \( J \).

Furthermore, if we take pairs \( (S, R), (S, I), (R, I), (T, J), (T, U), (U, J) \) are commuting pairs then

\[
Sw = S(SRw) = S(RS)w = SR(Sw)
\]

\[
Sw = S(Iw) = S(RS)w = I(Sw)
\]

\[
Rw = R(SRw) = RS(Rw) = SR(Rw)
\]

\[
Rw = R(Iw) = (Rw),
\]

this shows that \( Sw \) and \( Rw \) is common fixed point of \((SR, I)\) and this gives

\[
SRw = Sw = Rw = Iw = w .
\]

Similarly, we have

\[
TUw = Tw = Uw = Jw = w .
\]

Hence, \( w \) is a unique common fixed point of \( S, R, I, J, T, U \).

**Corollary 3.1.** Let \( X_\omega \) be a modular metric space and \( I, J, S \) and \( T: X_\omega \to X_\omega \) be self mapping of \( X_\omega \) such that the pairs \((S, I)\) and \((T, J)\) are occasionally weakly compatible. Suppose there exists numbers \( a, b, c, d \in [0,1) \) with at least one of \( a, b, c, d > 0 \) such that the following assertion for all \( x, y \in X_\omega \) and \( \lambda > 0 \) hold:

\[
(a + b + c + 2d) < 1; \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq a, b, c, d < 1;
\]

\[
\omega_2(Sx, Ty) \leq a\omega_1(Ix, Jy) + b\omega_0(Sx, Ix) + c\omega_2(Ty, Jy) + d[\omega_1(Sx, Jy) + \omega_2(Ty, Ix)];
\]

\[
\omega_2(Sx, Ty) < \infty .
\]

Then \( S, T, I \) and \( J \) have a unique common fixed point in \( X_\omega \).

**Proof.** If we put \( R = U = Ix_\omega \) where \( Ix_\omega \) is an identity mapping on \( X_\omega \), the result follows from theorem 3.1.

**Corollary 3.2.** Let \( X_\omega \) be a modular metric space and \( S \) and \( T: X_\omega \to X_\omega \) be self mapping of \( X_\omega \) such that the \( S \) and \( T \) are occasionally weakly compatible. Suppose there exists numbers \( a, b, c, d \in [0,1) \) with at least one of \( a, b, c, d > 0 \) such that the following assertion for all \( x, y \in X_\omega \) and \( \lambda > 0 \) hold:

\[
(a + b + c + 2d) < 1; \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq a, b, c, d < 1;
\]

\[
\omega_2(Tx, Ty) \leq a\omega_1(Sx, Sy) + b\omega_0(Sx, Tx) + c\omega_2(Sy, Ty) + d[\omega_1(Sx, Ty) + \omega_2(Sy, Tx)];
\]

\[
\omega_2(Sx, Ty) < \infty .
\]

Then \( S \) and \( T \) have a unique common fixed point in \( X_\omega \).

**Proof.** If we put \( I = J = S \), and \( S = T \) in (3.2.2) the result follows from theorem 3.1.

**Remark 1.** The theorem 3.1 remains true if the inequality (3.1.1), (3.1.2) are replaced by the following inequality-
(i) $\omega_2(SRx, TUy) \leq a\omega_1(Ix, Jy) + b\omega_2(SRx, Ix) + c\omega_3(TUy, Jy) + d\omega_3(SRx, Jy) + e\omega_2(TUy, Ix)$;
with $(a + b + c + d + e) < 1$; for all $0 \leq a, b, c, d, e < 1$;

(ii) $\omega_2(SRx, TUy) \leq a\omega_1(Ix, Jy) + b[\omega_3(SRx, Ix) + \omega_1(TUy, Jy)] + c[\omega_3(SRx, Jy) + \omega_2(TUy, Ix)]$;
with $(a + 2b + 2c) < 1$; for all $0 \leq a, b, c < 1$;

(iii) We consider a function $\varphi : R^+ \rightarrow R^+$ satisfying $0 < \varphi(t) < t$ and $\lim_{t \to 0} \varphi^n(t) = 0$, for each $t > 0$

$\omega_2(SRx, TUy) \leq \varphi[\max(\omega_1(Ix, Jy), \omega_3(SRx, Jy), \omega_3(TUy, Ix), \frac{1}{2}(\omega_3(SRx, Ix) + \omega_3(TUy, Jy)))]$

**Remark 2.** If in sequel, in conditions (i), (ii), and (iii) of remark 1, we put $R = U =$ identity mapping, we obtain the results for four mappings $S, T, I$ and $J$.

**Conclusion.** Some common fixed point theorem for six self mappings in modular metric space for occasionally weakly compatible mappings has been establish, which improves and extends similar known results in the existing literature of fixed point theory. The main result in theorem 3.1 and corollaries 3.1 and 3.2 are new in modular metric spaces.
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