



Available online at <http://scik.org>

Adv. Fixed Point Theory, 7 (2017), No. 1, 144-154

ISSN: 1927-6303

## FIXED POINT THEOREMS UNDER F-CONTRACTION IN ULTRAMETRIC SPACE

GINISWAMY<sup>1</sup>, JEYANTHI C.<sup>2,\*</sup>, MAHESHWARI P. G.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Mathematics, PES College of Science, Arts and Commerce, Mandya-571401, India

<sup>2</sup> Department of Mathematics, Teresian College, Mysore-560011, India

<sup>3</sup>Department of Mathematics, Government First Grade College, Vijayanagar, Bangalore-560104, India

Copyright © 2017 Giniswamy, Jeyanthi and Maheshwari. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

**Abstract.** In this paper, we establish some results on coincidence and common fixed points for a single-valued map, a pair of single-valued maps and of single-valued map with a multi-valued map in an Ultrametric space which satisfy F-contraction. Our theorems generalize and extent the theorems of Mishra and Pant[Generalization of some fixed point theorems in ultrametric spaces, Adv. Fixed Point Theory, 4(1)(2014), 41- 47], thereby generalizes some known results in the existing literature.

**Keywords:** coincidence point; fixed point; F-contraction; spherically complete and coincidentally commuting.

**2010 AMS Subject Classification:** 47H10, 54H25.

### 1. Introduction

Gajic[2] studied the fixed point theorem of contractive type maps on a spherically complete ultrametric space which is a generalization of the Banach fixed point theorem and later in 2002[3], he generalized [2] to a multi-valued map. Later in 2007, Rao et al.[9] proved some coincidence point theorems for three and four self maps in the Ultrametric space. In

---

\*Corresponding author

Received December 9, 2015

2008, Rao and Kishore[8] proved some common fixed point theorems for a pair of maps of Jungck type on a spherically complete ultrametric space. And one of the recent generalization of the Banach Contraction Principle for single-valued maps on a complete metric space called F-contraction was introduced by Wardowski[11]. Following Wardowski, Minak et al.[6], Cosentino and Vetro[4], Piri and Kumam[7] generalized this F-contraction to Hardy-Roger type and Suzuki type F-contraction. In [1] Altun et al. extend the F-contraction from single-valued maps to multi-valued maps.

In this paper we use the F-contraction for a single-valued map, a pair of single-valued maps and of single-valued map with multi-valued maps in an ultrametric space and prove some fixed point theorems.

## 2. Preliminaries

We denote the class of all nonempty compact subsets of  $X$  by  $C(X)$  and for  $A, B \in C(X)$ , the Hausdorff metric induced by  $d$  is defined by

$$H(A, B) = \max\left\{\sup_{x \in A} d(x, B), \sup_{y \in B} d(y, A)\right\}$$

where  $d(x, A) = \inf\{d(x, y) : y \in A\}$

**Definition 1.1.**[10] Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space. If the metric  $d$  satisfies strong triangle inequality  $d(x, y) \leq \max\{d(x, z), d(z, y)\}$ , for all  $x, y, z$  in  $X$ , then  $d$  is called an ultra metric on  $X$  and  $(X, d)$  is called an ultra metric space.

**Definition 1.2.**[10] An ultra metric space is said to be spherically complete if every shrinking collection of balls in  $X$  has a non empty intersection.

**Definition 1.3.** Let  $(X, d)$  be an ultra metric space, an element  $x \in X$  is said to be a coincidence point of a multi-valued map  $g : X \rightarrow C(X)$  and a single-valued map  $T : X \rightarrow X$  if  $Tx \in gx$ .

**Definition 1.4.**[8] Let  $(X, d)$  be an ultra metric space. Let  $g : X \rightarrow C(X)$  be a multi-valued map and  $T : X \rightarrow X$  be a single-valued map then  $g$  and  $T$  are said to be coincidentally commuting at  $z \in X$  if  $Tz \in gz$  implies  $Tgz \subseteq gTz$ .

Let  $\mathbb{R}$  be the set of all real numbers and  $\mathcal{F}$  be the set of all functions  $F : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying the following conditions:

- (a)  $F$  is strictly increasing, that is, for all  $\alpha, \beta \in (0, +\infty)$  if  $\alpha < \beta$  then  $F(\alpha) < F(\beta)$ .
- (b) For each sequence  $\{\alpha_n\}$  of positive numbers, the following holds:  
 $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n = 0$  if and only if  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(\alpha_n) = -\infty$ .
- (c) There exist  $k \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0^+} (\alpha^k F(\alpha)) = 0$ .

**Definition 1.5.**[11] Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space. A self map  $T$  on  $X$  is an  $F$ -contraction, if  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  and there exist  $\tau > 0$  such that

$$(1) \quad d(Tx, Ty) > 0 \Rightarrow \tau + F(d(Tx, Ty)) \leq F(d(x, y))$$

for all  $x, y \in X$ .

### 3. Main results

In this section, we prove the existence of coincidence point and fixed point for a single-valued map and a pair of single-valued maps.

**Theorem 3.1.** Let  $(X, d)$  be a spherically complete ultra metric space and let  $T : X \rightarrow X$  be a single-valued map such that

$$(2) \quad d(Tx, Ty) > 0 \Rightarrow \tau + F(d(Tx, Ty)) \leq F(\max\{d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty)\})$$

for all  $x, y \in X$  where  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ ,  $\tau > 0$ . Then  $T$  has a unique fixed point.

**Proof.** For  $\alpha \in X$ , let  $B_\alpha = B(\alpha, d(\alpha, T\alpha))$  denote the closed sphere with center at  $\alpha$  and radius  $d(\alpha, T\alpha)$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the collection of these spheres for all  $\alpha \in X$ . Then the relation  $B_\alpha \leq B_\beta$  if and only if  $B_\beta \subseteq B_\alpha$  is a partial order on  $\mathcal{A}$ .

Now, consider a totally ordered subfamily  $\mathcal{A}_1$  of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Since  $(X, d)$  is spherically complete, we

have  $\bigcap_{B_\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_1} B_\alpha = B \neq \phi$ .

Let  $\beta \in B$  and  $B_\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_1$ . If  $x \in B_\beta$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, \beta) &\leq d(\beta, T\beta) \\ &\leq \max\{d(\beta, \alpha), d(\alpha, T\beta)\} \\ &\leq \max\{d(\beta, \alpha), d(\alpha, T\alpha), d(T\alpha, T\beta)\} \\ &= \max\{d(\alpha, T\alpha), d(T\alpha, T\beta)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Case:1 If  $d(T\alpha, T\beta) \leq d(\alpha, T\alpha)$  then  $d(x, \beta) \leq d(\alpha, T\alpha)$ .

Case:2 If  $d(a, T\alpha) \leq d(T\alpha, T\beta)$  then

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, \beta) &\leq d(\beta, T\beta) \leq d(T\alpha, T\beta) \\ &< \max\{d(\alpha, \beta), d(\alpha, T\alpha), d(\beta, T\beta)\} \quad \text{from(2)} \\ &= \max\{d(\alpha, T\alpha), d(\beta, T\beta)\} \end{aligned}$$

If  $d(\beta, T\beta) \leq d(\alpha, T\alpha)$  then  $d(x, \beta) \leq d(\alpha, T\alpha)$ . And if  $d(\alpha, T\alpha) \leq d(\beta, T\beta)$  then  $d(\beta, T\beta) < d(\beta, T\beta)$ , a contradiction. Therefore  $d(x, \beta) \leq d(\alpha, T\alpha)$  for  $x \in B_\beta$ .

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, \alpha) &\leq \max\{d(x, \beta), d(\beta, \alpha)\} \\ &\leq \max\{d(x, \beta), d(\alpha, T\alpha)\} = d(a, T\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $d(x, \alpha) \leq d(\alpha, T\alpha)$ . Thus,  $x \in B_\alpha$ . Hence  $B_\beta \subseteq B_\alpha$  for any  $B_\alpha$  in  $\mathcal{A}_1$ . Thus  $B_\beta$  is the upper bound for the family  $\mathcal{A}_1$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  and hence by Zorn's lemma  $\mathcal{A}$  has a maximum element say  $B_z$  for some  $z \in X$ .

Now to prove that  $z = Tz$ . Suppose that  $z \neq Tz$ .

Using (2)

$$\begin{aligned} \tau + F(d(Tz, T^2z)) &\leq F(\max\{d(z, Tz), d(Tz, T^2z), d(z, T^2z)\}) \\ &\leq F(\max\{d(z, Tz), d(Tz, T^2z)\}) \end{aligned}$$

which implies  $F(d(Tz, T^2z)) < F(d(z, Tz))$  and since F is a increasing function,

$$(3) \quad d(Tz, T^2z) < Fd(z, Tz).$$

Now if  $y \in B_{Tz}$ , then  $d(y, Tz) \leq d(Tz, T^2z) < d(z, Tz)$ .

And  $d(y, z) \leq \max\{d(y, Tz), d(Tz, z)\} = d(z, Tz)$  which implies  $y \in B_z$ . Hence  $B_{Tz} \subseteq B_z$ .

Since  $d(z, Tz) > d(Tz, T^2z)$  implies  $z \notin B_{Tz}$ . Therefore  $B_{Tz} \not\subseteq B_z$ . This is a contradiction to the maximality of  $B_z$ . Hence  $z = Tz$ ,  $z$  is the common fixed point of  $T$ .

Uniqueness: Let  $w$  be a different fixed point. By(2) for  $w \neq z$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau + F(d(z, w)) &= \tau + F(d(Tz, Tw)) \leq F(\max\{d(z, w), d(z, Tz), d(w, Tw)\}) \\ &= F(d(z, w)) \end{aligned}$$

which implies  $F(d(z, w)) < F(d(z, w))$ , that is,  $d(z, w) < d(z, w)$ , a contradiction. Therefore  $w = z$ , hence  $z$  is the unique common fixed point of  $T$ .

**Corollary 3.2.** *Theorem 3.1 holds if the F-contraction (2) is replaced by*

$$(4) \quad \begin{aligned} d(Tx, Ty) > 0 \Rightarrow \tau + F(d(Tx, Ty)) &\leq F(\max\{d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty), d(x, Ty), \\ &d(y, Tx)\}) \forall x, y \in X. \end{aligned}$$

**Proof.** By strong triangle inequality, we have that  $d(x, Ty) \leq \max\{d(x, y), d(y, Ty)\}$  and  $d(y, Tx) \leq \max\{d(y, x), d(x, Tx)\}$ . Hence we conclude that (4) implies (2).

**Theorem 3.3.** Let  $(X, d)$  be a spherically complete Ultra metric space. If  $T$  and  $S$  are single-valued maps on  $X$  satisfying

- (i)  $T(X) \subseteq S(X)$ ,
- (ii)  $d(Tx, Ty) > 0 \Rightarrow \tau + F(d(Tx, Ty)) \leq F(\max\{d(Sx, Sy), d(Sx, Tx), d(Sy, Ty)\})$ , for all  $x, y \in X, x \neq y$  where  $F \in \mathcal{F}, \tau > 0$ .

then there exists  $z \in X$  such that  $Sz = Tz$ . Further if  $T$  and  $S$  are coincidentally commuting at  $z$  then  $z$  is the unique common fixed point of  $T$  and  $S$ .

**Proof.** For  $\alpha \in X$ , let  $B_\alpha = B(S\alpha, d(S\alpha, T\alpha))$  denote the closed sphere with center at  $S\alpha$  and radius  $d(S\alpha, T\alpha)$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the collection of these spheres for all  $\alpha \in X$ . Then the relation  $B_\alpha \leq B_\beta$  if and only if  $B_\beta \subseteq B_\alpha$  is a partial order on  $\mathcal{A}$ .

Now, consider a totally ordered subfamily  $\mathcal{A}_1$  of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Since  $(X, d)$  is spherically complete, we have  $\bigcap_{B_\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_1} B_\alpha = B \neq \phi$ .

Let  $S\beta \in B$  and  $B_\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_1$ . Then  $S\beta \in B_\alpha$ . Hence  $d(S\beta, S\alpha) \leq d(S\alpha, T\alpha)$ .

Using (ii)

$$\begin{aligned}\tau + F(d(T\alpha, T\beta)) &\leq F(\max\{d(S\alpha, S\beta), d(S\alpha, T\alpha), d(S\beta, T\beta)\}) \\ F(d(T\alpha, T\beta)) &< F(\max\{d(S\alpha, S\beta), d(S\alpha, T\alpha), d(S\beta, T\beta)\}).\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$(5) \quad d(T\alpha, T\beta) < \max\{d(S\alpha, S\beta), d(S\alpha, T\alpha), d(S\beta, T\beta)\}.$$

If  $\alpha = \beta$  then  $B_\alpha = B_\beta$ . Let  $\alpha \neq \beta$  and  $x \in B_\beta$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}d(x, S\beta) &\leq d(S\beta, T\beta) \\ &\leq \max\{d(S\beta, S\alpha), d(S\alpha, T\beta)\} \\ &\leq \max\{d(S\beta, S\alpha), d(S\alpha, T\alpha), d(T\alpha, T\beta)\} \\ &= \max\{d(S\alpha, T\alpha), d(T\alpha, T\beta)\} \\ &< \max\{d(S\alpha, S\beta), d(S\alpha, T\alpha), d(S\beta, T\beta)\} \quad \text{from (5)}\end{aligned}$$

Thus  $d(x, S\beta) \leq d(S\alpha, T\alpha)$ .

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}d(x, S\alpha) &\leq \max\{d(x, S\beta), d(S\beta, S\alpha)\} \\ &\leq d(S\alpha, T\alpha).\end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $x \in B_\alpha$ . Hence  $B_\beta \subseteq B_\alpha$  for any  $B_\alpha$  in  $\mathcal{A}_1$ . Thus  $B_\beta$  is the upper bound for the family  $\mathcal{A}_1$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  and hence by Zorn's lemma  $\mathcal{A}$  has a maximum element say  $B_z$  for some  $z \in X$ .

Now to prove that  $Sz = Tz$ . Suppose that  $Sz \neq Tz$ .

Since  $Tz \in TX \subseteq SX$ , there exists a  $w \in X$  such that  $Tz = Sw$ . Clearly  $z \neq w$ .

Consider,

$$\begin{aligned}\tau + F(d(Sw, Tw)) &= \tau + F(d(Tz, Tw)) \\ &< F(\max\{d(Sz, Sw), d(Sz, Tz), d(Sw, Tw)\}) \\ &= F(d(Sz, Sw))\end{aligned}$$

which implies  $F(d(Sw, Tw)) < F(d(Sz, Sw))$ . Thus  $d(Sw, Tw) < d(Sz, Sw)$ . Hence  $Sz \notin B_w$ .

Therefore  $B_z \not\subseteq B_w$ . This is a contradiction to the maximality of  $B_z$ . Hence  $Sz = Tz$ .

Since  $S$  and  $T$  are coincidentally commuting at  $z$ ,  $S^2z = S(Sz) = S(Tz) = T(Sz) = T^2z$ .

Now to show that  $Sz = z$ . Suppose  $Sz \neq z$ , then we have,

$$\begin{aligned}\tau + F(d(TSz, Tz)) &< F(\max\{d(S^2z, Sz), d(S^2z, TSz), d(Sz, Tz)\}) \\ &= F(d(STz, Tz)).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have  $F(d(TSz, Tz)) < F(d(STz, Tz))$ , which gives  $(d(TSz, Tz)) < (d(STz, Tz))$ , a contradiction. Hence  $Sz = z$ . Thus  $z = Sz = Tz$ , therefore  $z$  is the common fixed point of  $S$  and  $T$ .

Uniqueness: Let  $w$  be a different fixed point. For  $w \neq z$  we have,

$$\begin{aligned}\tau + F(d(z, w)) &= \tau + F(d(Tz, Tw)) \\ &\leq F(\max\{d(Sz, Sw), d(Sz, Tz), d(Sw, Tw)\}) \\ F(d(z, w)) &< F(\max\{d(Sz, Sw), d(Sz, Tz), d(Sw, Tw)\}) \\ &= F(d(z, w))\end{aligned}$$

which implies  $d(z, w) < d(z, w)$  a contradiction. Therefore  $w = z$ . Hence  $z$  is the unique common fixed point of  $S$  and  $T$ .

**Corollary 3.4.** *Theorem 3.3 holds if the condition (ii) of theorem 3.3 is replaced by generalized condition*

$$(6) \quad d(Tx, Ty) > 0 \Rightarrow \tau + F(d(Tx, Ty)) \leq F(\max\{d(Sx, Sy), d(Sx, Tx), d(Sy, Ty), d(Sx, Ty), d(Sy, Tx)\}) \forall x, y \in X.$$

**Proof.** By strong triangle inequality we have  $d(Sx, Ty) \leq \max\{d(Sx, Sy), d(Sy, Ty)\}$  and  $d(Sy, Tx) \leq \max\{d(Sy, Sx), d(Sx, Tx)\}$ . Hence (6) implies condition(ii) of theorem 3.3.

**Remark 3.5.** Taking  $S = I$  Identity map in Theorem 3.3, we obtain Theorem 3.1.

Now we prove the existence of coincidence point and fixed point for a single-valued map and a multi-valued map, an extension of the Theorem 3.3.

**Theorem 3.6.** Let  $(X, d)$  be a spherically complete Ultra metric space. If  $T : X \rightarrow X$  is a single-valued map and  $g : X \rightarrow C(X)$  is a multi-valued map satisfying  $gx \subseteq TX$  for all  $x \in X$

and

$$(7) \quad H(gx, gy) > 0 \Rightarrow \tau + F(H(gx, gy)) \leq F(\max\{d(Tx, Ty), d(Tx, gx), d(Ty, gy)\})$$

for all  $x, y \in X$  where  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ ,  $\tau > 0$ , then there exists  $z \in X$  such that  $Tz \in gz$ . Further if  $d(Tx, Tu) \leq H(gTy, gu)$  for all  $x, y, u \in X$  with  $Tx \in gy$  and  $T$  and  $g$  are coincidentally commuting at  $z$  then  $Tz$  is the unique common fixed point of  $T$  and  $g$ .

**Proof.** For  $\alpha \in X$ , let  $B_\alpha = B(T\alpha, d(T\alpha, g\alpha))$  denote the closed sphere with center at  $T\alpha$  and radius  $d(T\alpha, g\alpha)$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the collection of these spheres for all  $\alpha \in X$ . Then the relation  $B_\alpha \leq B_\beta$  if and only if  $B_\beta \subseteq B_\alpha$  is a partial order on  $\mathcal{A}$ .

Now, consider a totally ordered subfamily  $\mathcal{A}_1$  of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Since  $(X, d)$  is spherically complete, we have  $\bigcap_{B_\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_1} B_\alpha = B \neq \emptyset$ .

Let  $T\beta \in B$  and  $B_\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_1$ . Then  $T\beta \in B_\alpha$ . Hence  $d(T\beta, T\alpha) \leq d(T\alpha, g\alpha)$ .

If  $\alpha = \beta$  then  $B_\alpha = B_\beta$ . Let  $\alpha \neq \beta$  and  $x \in B_\beta$ . Then  $d(x, T\beta) \leq d(T\beta, g\beta)$ . Since  $g\alpha$  is compact, there exists  $v \in g\alpha$  such that  $d(T\alpha, v) = d(T\alpha, g\alpha)$ .

Using (7),

$$\begin{aligned} \tau + F(H(g\alpha, g\beta)) &\leq F(\max\{d(T\alpha, T\beta), d(T\alpha, g\alpha), d(T\beta, g\beta)\}) \\ &\leq F(\max\{d(T\alpha, g\alpha), d(T\beta, g\beta)\}) \\ F(H(g\alpha, g\beta)) &< F(\max\{d(T\alpha, g\alpha), d(T\beta, g\beta)\}) \end{aligned}$$

which implies  $H(g\alpha, g\beta) < \max\{d(T\alpha, g\alpha), d(T\beta, g\beta)\}$

Consider,

$$\begin{aligned} d(T\beta, g\beta) &= \inf_{c \in g\beta} d(T\beta, c) \\ &\leq \max\{d(T\beta, T\alpha), d(T\alpha, v), \inf_{c \in g\beta} d(v, c)\} \\ &\leq \max\{d(T\alpha, g\alpha), d(g\alpha, g\beta)\} \\ &< \max\{d(T\alpha, g\alpha), d(T\beta, g\beta)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $d(T\beta, g\beta) < d(T\alpha, g\alpha)$ .



Now,

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, T\alpha) &\leq \max\{d(x, T\beta), d(T\beta, T\alpha)\} \\ &\leq \max\{d(T\beta, g\beta), d(T\alpha, g\alpha)\} \\ &= d(T\alpha, g\alpha) \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $x \in B_\alpha$ . Hence  $B_\beta \subseteq B_\alpha$  for any  $B_\alpha$  in  $\mathcal{A}_1$ . Thus  $B_\beta$  is the upper bound for the family  $\mathcal{A}_1$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  and hence by Zorn's lemma  $\mathcal{A}$  has a maximum element say  $B_z$  for some  $z \in X$ .

Now to prove that  $Tz \in gz$ . Suppose that  $Tz \notin gz$ .

Since  $gz$  is compact, there exists  $k \in gz$  such that  $d(Tz, gz) = d(Tz, k)$ . Since  $gx \subseteq TX$ , there exists a  $w \in X$  such that  $k = Tw$ . Therefore  $d(Tz, gz) = d(Tz, Tw)$ . Clearly  $z \neq w$ .

Using (7)

$$\begin{aligned} \tau + F(H(gz, gw)) &\leq F(\max\{d(Tz, Tw), d(Tz, gz), d(Tw, gw)\}) \\ F(H(gz, gw)) &< F(\max\{d(Tz, Tw), d(Tz, gz), d(Tw, gw)\}) \end{aligned}$$

which implies  $H(gz, gw) < \max\{d(Tz, Tw), d(Tz, gz), d(Tw, gw)\}$ .

Consider,

$$\begin{aligned} d(Tw, gw) &\leq H(gz, gw) \\ &< \max\{d(Tz, Tw), d(Tz, gz), d(Tw, gw)\} \\ &= d(Tz, Tw). \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $d(Tw, gw) < d(Tz, Tw)$  which implies  $Tz \notin B_w$ . Therefore  $B_z \not\subseteq B_w$ . This is a contradiction to the maximality of  $B_z$ . Hence  $Tz \in gz$ .

Consider,  $d(Tz, T^2z) = d(Tz, TTz) \leq H(gTz, gTz) = 0$  which implies  $TTz = Tz$ . Thus  $Tz = TTz \in Tgz \subseteq gTz$ . Hence  $Tz$  is the common fixed point of  $T$  and  $g$ .

Uniqueness: Let  $Tw$  be a another fixed point such that  $Tz \neq Tw$ .

Using (7)

$$\begin{aligned} \tau + F(H(gTz, gw)) &\leq F(\max\{d(TTz, Tw), d(TTz, gTz), d(Tw, gw)\}) \\ F(H(gTz, gw)) &< F(\max\{d(TTz, Tw), d(TTz, gTz), d(Tw, gw)\}) \end{aligned}$$

Which implies  $H(gTz, gw) < \max\{d(TTz, Tw), d(TTz, gTz), d(Tw, gw)\}$ .

Now consider,

$$\begin{aligned} d(Tz, Tw) &\leq H(gTz, gw) \\ &< \max\{d(TTz, Tw), d(TTz, gTz), d(Tw, gw)\} \\ &< d(Tz, Tw) \end{aligned}$$

which implies  $d(Tz, Tw) < d(Tz, Tw)$ , a contradiction. Therefore  $Tz = Tw$ . Hence  $Tz$  is the unique common fixed point of  $T$  and  $g$ .

**Corollary 3.7.** *If the condition (ii) in the Theorem 3.6 is replaced by*

$$(8) \quad \begin{aligned} H(gx, gy) > 0 \Rightarrow \tau + F(H(gx, gy)) &\leq F(\max\{d(Tx, Ty), d(Tx, gx), d(Ty, gy), d(Tx, gy), \\ &d(Ty, gx)\}) \forall x, y \in X \end{aligned}$$

*then the Theorem 3.6 holds.*

**Proof.**

By strong triangle inequality, we have  $d(Tx, gy) \leq \max\{d(Tx, Ty), d(Ty, gy)\}$  and  $d(Ty, gx) \leq \max\{d(Ty, Tx), d(Tx, gx)\}$ , which gives that (8) implies (7).

### Conflict of Interests

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interests.

### REFERENCES

- [1] I. Altun, G. Minak, H. Dağ, Multivalued F-contractions on complete metric spaces, *J. Nonlinear and Convex Anal.* 16(4) (2015), 639-666.
- [2] L. Gajic, On ultrametric space, *Novi. Sad. J. Math.*, 31(2001), 69-71.
- [3] L. Gajic, A multivalued fixed point theorem in ultrametric spaces, *Matematički Vesnik* 54(3-4)(2002), 89-91.
- [4] M. Cosentino, P. Vetro, Fixed point results for F-contractive mappings of Hardy-Rogers-type, *Filomat* 28(4)(2014), 715-722.
- [5] S. N. Mishra, R. Pant, Generalization of some fixed point theorems in ultrametric spaces, *Adv. Fixed Point Theory* 4(1)(2014), 41-47.
- [6] G. Minak, A. Helvac, I. Altun, Ćirić type generalized F-contractions on complete metric spaces and fixed point results, *Filomat* 28(6)(2014), 1143-1151.
- [7] H. Piri, P. Kumam, Some fixed point theorems concerning F-contraction in complete metric spaces, *Fixed Point Theory and Appl.* 2014(2014), Article ID 210.

- [8] K. P. R. Rao, G. N. V. Kishore, Common fixed point theorems in ultrametric spaces, *J. of Math.* 40(2008), 31-35.
- [9] K. P. R. Rao, G. N. V. Kishore, T. Ranga Rao, Some coincidence point theorems in ultrametric spaces, *Intl. J. of Math. Anal.* 18(1)(2007), 897-902.
- [10] A. C. M. Van Roovij, *Non Archimedean Functional Analysis* Marcel Dekker, New York,(1978).
- [11] D. Wardowski, Fixed points of a new type of contractive mappings in complete metric spaces, *Fixed Point Theory and Appl.* 2012(2012), Article ID 94.