



Available online at <http://scik.org>
J. Math. Comput. Sci. 2022, 12:168
<https://doi.org/10.28919/jmcs/7437>
ISSN: 1927-5307

COMMON FIXED POINT THEOREM FOR FOUR SELF MAPS USING AN INTEGRAL TYPE CONTRACTIVE CONDITION IN A S-METRIC SPACE

A. SRINIVAS*, V. KIRAN

Department of Mathematics, Osmania University, Hyderabad- 500007, India

Copyright © 2022 the author(s). 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, by employing a contractive condition of integral type, we obtain a unique common fixed point for four weakly compatible self maps of a S-metric space which satisfy common limit range property.

Keywords: fixed point; weakly compatibility; common limit range property; S-metric space.

2010 AMS Subject Classification: 54H25, 47H10.

1. INTRODUCTION

Gerald Jungck [6] introduced the concept of compatibility to generalize the notion of commutative property. Further Jungck and Rhoades [7] proposed weakly compatibility of mappings. Also they proved that for a pair of mappings compatibility always implies weakly compatibility but not conversely.

To prove common fixed point theorems, Sintunavarat et al [14] initiated common limit range (CLR) property.

Several authors Dhage, Gahler, Sedghi, Mustafa [2,3,4,8,13] generalized the notion of metric space by introducing 2-metric space, D^* -metric spaces and G-metric spaces.

*Corresponding author

E-mail address: srinivas.arugula08@gmail.com

Received April 16, 2022

Shaban Sedghi et al [12] proposed S-metric space as further generalization of metric spaces. This concept of S-metric spaces generated lot of interest among many researches.

In this paper, we prove a common fixed point theorem for four weakly compatible self maps of S-metric space satisfying common limit range property along with an integral type contractive condition [1]. Our result generalizes the results already proved in literature [15]. A suitable example is provided to validate our theorem.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Definition 2.1. [12] Let M be non empty set. A function $S : M^3 \longrightarrow [0, \infty)$ is said to be an S-metric on M , if for each $v, \omega, \vartheta, \rho \in M$

1. $S(v, \omega, \vartheta) \geq 0$
2. $S(v, \omega, \vartheta) = 0 \Leftrightarrow v = \omega = \vartheta$
3. $S(v, \omega, \vartheta) \leq S(v, v, \rho) + S(\omega, \omega, \rho) + S(\vartheta, \vartheta, \rho)$

Then (M, S) is called an S-metric space.

Lemma 2.1. [10] In a S-metric space we have $S(v, v, \omega) = S(\omega, \omega, v)$ for all $v, \omega \in M$

Definition 2.2. [11] Let (M, S) be a S- metric space.

- (a) A sequence (v_n) in M converge to v if $S(v_n, v_n, v) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ then for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $n \geq n_0, S(v_n, v_n, v) < \varepsilon$ and we denote this by writing $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_n = v$.
- (b) A sequence (v_n) be a Cauchy sequence if for each $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $S(v_n, v_n, v_m) < \varepsilon$ for each $n, m \geq n_0$.
- (c) By a complete S-metric space we mean a S-metric space in which every Cauchy sequence is convergent.

Lemma 2.2. [11] In a S-metric space (M, S) , if there exist two sequences (v_n) and (ω_n) such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_n = v$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega_n = \omega$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S(v_n, v_n, \omega_n) = S(v, v, \omega)$

Definition 2.3. [7] The self mappings E, F of a S-metric space (M, S) are called weakly compatible if $EFv = FEv$ whenever $Ev = Fv$ for any v in M .

Definition 2.4. [9] In a S-metric space (M,S) , the two pairs of self mappings (E,G) and (F,H) on M are said to satisfy common (E.A)-property if there exist two sequences (v_n) and (ω_n) in M such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E v_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G v_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F \omega_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H \omega_n = \tau, \text{ where } \tau \in M.$$

Definition 2.5. [14] In a S-metric space (M,S) , the two pairs of self mappings (E,G) and (F,H) on M are said to satisfy common limit range property with respect to G and H , denoted by (CLR_{GH}) if there exists two sequences (v_n) and (ω_n) in M such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E v_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G v_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F \omega_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H \omega_n = \tau, \text{ where } \tau \in G(M) \cap H(M).$$

Remark 2.1. Throughout this paper $\varphi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a Lebesgue integrable function which is summable on compact subset of $[0, \infty)$ with $\int_0^\varepsilon \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha > 0$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$.

3. MAIN RESULTS

Now we state our main theorem.

Theorem 3.1. In a S-metric space (M,S) , suppose E,F,G,H are self mappings of M satisfying the following conditions

(i) The pairs (E,G) and (F,H) are weakly compatible

(ii) The pairs (E,G) and (F,H) share (CLR_{GH}) -property

$$(iii) \int_0^{S(Ev, Ev, F\omega)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha \leq \lambda \int_0^{S(F\omega, F\omega, H\omega)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha + \mu \int_0^{S(Ev, Ev, Gv)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha + \mu \int_0^{S(Gv, Gv, H\omega)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha$$

where $\lambda, \mu > 0$ with $\lambda + \mu < 1$

then E,F,G and H have a unique common fixed point in M .

Proof. From the (CLR_{GH}) -property of the pairs (E,G) and (F,H) , we have two sequences (v_n) and (ω_n) in M such that

$$(1) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E v_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G v_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F \omega_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H \omega_n = \tau, \text{ where } \tau \in G(M) \cap H(M)$$

Also there exists a point $\eta \in M$ such that $G\eta = \tau$, from (1), we have

$$(2) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E v_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G v_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F \omega_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H \omega_n = \tau = G\eta$$

We now claim that $E\eta = \tau$, if $E\eta \neq \tau$ then $S(E\eta, E\eta, \tau) > 0$

keeping $\nu = \eta$ and $\omega = \omega_n$ in condition (iii) of the Theorem 3.1 we get

$$(3) \quad \int_0^{S(E\eta, E\eta, F\omega_n)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha \leq \lambda \int_0^{\frac{S(F\omega_n, F\omega_n, H\omega_n)[1 + S(E\eta, E\eta, G\eta)]}{[1 + S(G\eta, G\eta, H\omega_n)]}} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha + \mu \int_0^{S(G\eta, G\eta, H\omega_n)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha$$

on passing to the limits

$$\int_0^{S(E\eta, E\eta, \tau)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha \leq \lambda \int_0^{\frac{S(\tau, \tau, \tau)[1 + S(E\eta, E\eta, \tau)]}{[1 + S(\tau, \tau, \tau)]}} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha + \mu \int_0^{S(\tau, \tau, \tau)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha$$

$$(4) \quad \int_0^{S(E\eta, E\eta, \tau)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha = 0$$

giving that $S(E\eta, E\eta, \tau) = 0$

leading to a contradiction to the fact that $S(E\eta, E\eta, \tau) > 0$

proving $E\eta = \tau$

$$(5) \quad \text{Giving } G\eta = E\eta = \tau$$

Also $H\zeta = \tau$. Again from (1) we obtain

$$(6) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E\nu_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G\nu_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F\omega_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H\omega_n = \tau = H\zeta$$

We now claim that $F\zeta = \tau$. For if $F\zeta \neq \tau$ then $S(F\zeta, F\zeta, \tau) > 0$

on taking $\nu = \nu_n$ and $\omega = \zeta$ in condition (iii) of the Theorem 3.1, we obtain

$$(7) \quad \int_0^{S(E\nu_n, E\nu_n, F\zeta)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha \leq \lambda \int_0^{\frac{S(F\zeta, F\zeta, H\zeta)[1 + S(E\nu_n, E\nu_n, G\nu_n)]}{[1 + S(G\nu_n, G\nu_n, H\zeta)]}} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha + \mu \int_0^{S(G\nu_n, G\nu_n, H\zeta)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha$$

on passing to the limits

$$\int_0^{S(\tau, \tau, F\zeta)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha \leq \lambda \int_0^{\frac{S(F\zeta, F\zeta, \tau)[1 + S(\tau, \tau, \tau)]}{[1 + S(\tau, \tau, \tau)]}} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha + \mu \int_0^{S(\tau, \tau, \tau)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha$$

$$\int_0^{S(\tau, \tau, F\zeta)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha \leq \lambda \int_0^{S(F\zeta, F\zeta, \tau)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha + 0$$

$$(8) \quad (1 - \lambda) \int_0^{S(F\zeta, F\zeta, \tau)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha \leq 0$$

which gives $S(F\zeta, F\zeta, \tau) = 0$

Again leading to a contradiction to the fact that $S(F\zeta, F\zeta, \tau) > 0$

proving $F\zeta = \tau$

$$(9) \quad \text{Therefore } F\zeta = H\zeta = \tau$$

Further, we obtain

$$(10) \quad E\eta = G\eta = F\zeta = H\zeta = \tau$$

Now we established τ is a common fixed point of E, F, G and H.

$$\text{clearly } GE\eta = EG\eta$$

from which we get

$$(11) \quad G\tau = E\tau$$

and

$$HF\zeta = FH\zeta$$

$$(12) \quad H\tau = F\tau$$

we have $E\tau = \tau$, For if $E\tau \neq \tau$ then $S(E\tau, E\tau, \tau) > 0$

substituting $\nu = \tau$ and $\omega = \zeta$ in condition (iii) of the Theorem 3.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{S(E\tau, E\tau, F\zeta)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha &\leq \lambda \int_0^{\frac{S(F\zeta, F\zeta, H\zeta)[1 + S(E\tau, E\tau, G\tau)]}{[1 + S(G\tau, G\tau, H\zeta)]}} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha \\ &\quad + \mu \int_0^{S(G\tau, G\tau, H\zeta)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha \\ \int_0^{S(E\tau, E\tau, \tau)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha &\leq \lambda \int_0^{\frac{S(\tau, \tau, \tau)[1 + S(E\tau, E\tau, E\tau)]}{[1 + S(E\tau, E\tau, \tau)]}} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha + \mu \int_0^{S(E\tau, E\tau, \tau)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha \\ \int_0^{S(E\tau, E\tau, \tau)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha &\leq \mu \int_0^{S(E\tau, E\tau, \tau)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha \end{aligned}$$

$$(13) \quad (1 - \mu) \int_0^{S(E\tau, E\tau, \tau)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha \leq 0$$

which gives $S(E\tau, E\tau, \tau) = 0$

contradicting the fact that $S(E\tau, E\tau, \tau) > 0$

proving $E\tau = \tau$

$$(14) \quad \text{therefore } G\tau = E\tau = \tau$$

similarly, we can prove that

$$(15) \quad F\tau = H\tau = \tau$$

from(14) and (15), it follows that

$$(16) \quad E\tau = F\tau = G\tau = H\tau = \tau$$

proving τ is a common fixed point of E,F,G and H.

For if $\zeta (\zeta \neq \tau)$ is in M such that

$$E\zeta = F\zeta = G\zeta = H\zeta = \zeta$$

Then on taking $\nu = \tau$ and $\omega = \zeta$ in condition (iii) of the Theorem 3.1, we get

$$\int_0^{S(E\tau, E\tau, F\zeta)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha \leq \lambda \int_0^{\frac{S(F\zeta, F\zeta, H\zeta)[1 + S(E\tau, E\tau, G\tau)]}{[1 + S(G\tau, G\tau, H\zeta)]}} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha + \mu \int_0^{S(G\tau, G\tau, H\zeta)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha$$

$$\int_0^{S(\tau, \tau, \zeta)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha \leq \lambda \int_0^{\frac{S(\zeta, \zeta, \zeta)[1 + S(\tau, \tau, \tau)]}{[1 + S(\tau, \tau, \zeta)]}} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha + \mu \int_0^{S(\tau, \tau, \zeta)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha$$

$$(17) \quad (1 - \mu) \int_0^{S(\tau, \tau, \zeta)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha \leq 0$$

giving $S(\tau, \tau, \zeta) = 0$

from which it follows that $\tau = \zeta$

proving that E,F,G and H have a unique common fixed point in M. □

As an illustration we have the following example.

Example 1. Let $M = [0, 2]$ be a S-metric space with $S(v, \omega, \vartheta) = |v - \vartheta| + |\omega - \vartheta|$, where $v, \omega, \vartheta \in M$ and E, F, G and H be self maps on M, defined by

$$E(v) = \begin{cases} 1, & v \in [0, 1], \\ \frac{1}{3}, & v \in (1, 2]. \end{cases} \quad F(v) = \begin{cases} 1, & v \in [0, 1], \\ \frac{1}{2}, & v \in (1, 2]. \end{cases}$$

$$G(v) = \begin{cases} 1, & v \in [0, 1], \\ \frac{3}{4}, & v \in (1, 2]. \end{cases} \quad H(v) = \begin{cases} 1, & v \in [0, 1], \\ \frac{3}{2}, & v \in (1, 2]. \end{cases}$$

Also take $\varphi(\alpha) = 3\alpha^2$ for $\alpha \in [0, \infty)$

Let (v_n) and (ω_n) be sequences in M with $v_n = \frac{n}{n+1}$ and $\omega_n = \frac{n}{n+2}$, where $n \geq 1$, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E v_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E\left(\frac{n}{n+1}\right) = 1 = E(1)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G v_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G\left(\frac{n}{n+1}\right) = 1 = G(1)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F \omega_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F\left(\frac{n}{n+2}\right) = 1 = F(1)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H \omega_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H\left(\frac{n}{n+2}\right) = 1 = H(1)$$

thus $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E v_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G v_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F \omega_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H \omega_n = 1$ and $1 \in G(M) \cap H(M)$

proving (E,G) and (F,H) satisfy (CLR_{GH}) -property.

Now we verify condition (iii) of Theorem 3.1 in different cases.

Case(i). Let $v, \omega \in [0, 1]$

then $E v = G v = F \omega = H \omega = 1$ and from (iii)

$$\int_0^{S(Ev, Ev, F\omega)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha = \int_0^{S(1,1,1)} 3\alpha^2 d\alpha = 0$$

$$\lambda \int_0^{\frac{S(F\omega, F\omega, H\omega)[1 + S(Ev, Ev, Gv)]}{[1 + S(Gv, Gv, H\omega)]}} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha + \mu \int_0^{S(Gv, Gv, H\omega)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha$$

$$\lambda \int_0^{\frac{S(1,1,1)[1 + S(1,1,1)]}{[1 + S(1,1,1)]}} 3\alpha^2 d\alpha + \mu \int_0^{S(1,1,1)} 3\alpha^2 d\alpha = 0$$

therefore

$$\int_0^{S(Ev, Ev, F\omega)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha = \lambda \int_0^{\frac{S(F\omega, F\omega, H\omega)[1 + S(Ev, Ev, Gv)]}{[1 + S(Gv, Gv, H\omega)]}} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha + \mu \int_0^{S(Gv, Gv, H\omega)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha$$

case(ii). Let $v, \omega \in (1, 2]$

then $Ev = \frac{1}{3}, Gv = \frac{3}{4}, F\omega = \frac{1}{2}, H\omega = \frac{3}{2}$ and from (iii)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{S(Ev, Ev, F\omega)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha &= \int_0^{S(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2})} 3\alpha^2 d\alpha = \frac{1}{27} \\ \lambda \int_0^{\frac{S(F\omega, F\omega, H\omega)[1 + S(Ev, Ev, Gv)]}{[1 + S(Gv, Gv, H\omega)]}} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha + \mu \int_0^{S(Gv, Gv, H\omega)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha \\ &= \lambda \int_0^{\frac{S(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2})[1 + S(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{3}{4})]}{[1 + S(\frac{3}{4}, \frac{3}{4}, \frac{3}{2})]}} 3\alpha^2 d\alpha + \mu \int_0^{S(\frac{3}{4}, \frac{3}{4}, \frac{3}{2})} 3\alpha^2 d\alpha = \lambda \int_0^{\frac{22}{15}} 3\alpha^2 d\alpha + \mu \int_0^{\frac{3}{2}} 3\alpha^2 d\alpha \\ &= \lambda \frac{10648}{3375} + \mu \frac{27}{8} \end{aligned}$$

since $\lambda, \mu > 0$ with $\lambda + \mu < 1$

therefore

$$\int_0^{S(Ev, Ev, F\omega)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha < \lambda \int_0^{\frac{S(F\omega, F\omega, H\omega)[1 + S(Ev, Ev, Gv)]}{[1 + S(Gv, Gv, H\omega)]}} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha + \mu \int_0^{S(Gv, Gv, H\omega)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha$$

Case(iii). Let $v \in [0, 1]$ and $\omega \in (1, 2]$

then $Ev = 1, Gv = 1, F\omega = \frac{1}{2}, H\omega = \frac{3}{2}$ and from (iii)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{S(Ev, Ev, F\omega)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha &= \int_0^{S(1, 1, \frac{1}{2})} 3\alpha^2 d\alpha = 1 \\ \lambda \int_0^{\frac{S(F\omega, F\omega, H\omega)[1 + S(Ev, Ev, Gv)]}{[1 + S(Gv, Gv, H\omega)]}} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha + \mu \int_0^{S(Gv, Gv, H\omega)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{S(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2})[1 + S(1, 1, 1)]}{[1 + S(1, 1, \frac{3}{2})]} 3\alpha^2 d\alpha + \mu \int_0^{S(1, 1, \frac{3}{2})} 3\alpha^2 d\alpha = \lambda \int_0^2 3\alpha^2 d\alpha + \mu \int_0^1 3\alpha^2 d\alpha \\
& = \lambda 8 + \mu
\end{aligned}$$

since $\lambda, \mu > 0$ with $\lambda + \mu < 1$

thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^{S(Ev, Ev, F\omega)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha \leq & \lambda \int_0^{\frac{S(F\omega, F\omega, H\omega)[1 + S(Ev, Ev, Gv)]}{[1 + S(Gv, Gv, H\omega)]}} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha \\
& + \mu \int_0^{S(Gv, Gv, H\omega)} \varphi(\alpha) d\alpha
\end{aligned}$$

Any λ, μ satisfying conditions obtained in case (ii) and case(iii) with $\lambda, \mu > 0$ and $\lambda + \mu < 1$ will work here.

Similarly we can check condition (iii) of Theorem 3.1 in case if $\omega \in [0, 1]$ and $v \in (1, 2]$. Hence condition (iii) is satisfied in various cases.

Observe that 1 is the unique common fixed point of E,F,G,H.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The author(s) declare that there is no conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Branciari, A fixed point theorem for mappings satisfying a general contractive condition of integral type, *Int. J. Math. Math. Sci.* 29 (2002), 531-536.
- [2] B.C. Dhage, Generalized metric space and mappings with fixed point, *Bull. Calcutta. Math. Soc.* 84 (1992), 329-336.
- [3] S. Gahler, 2-metrische Raume and ihre topologische struktur, *Math. Nachr.* 26 (1963), 115-148.
- [4] S. Gahler, Zur geometric 2-metriche raume, *Rev. Roum. Math. Pures Appl.* 11 (1966), 665-667.
- [5] G. Jungck, Commuting maps and fixed points, *Amer. Math. Mon.* 83 (1976), 261-263.
- [6] G. Jungck, Compatible mappings and fixed points, *Int. J. Math. Sci.* 9 (1986), 771-779.
- [7] G. Jungck, B.E. Rhoades, Fixed point for set valued function without continuity, *Indian J. Pure Appl. Math.* 293 (1998), 227-238.

- [8] Z. Mustafa, B. Sims, A new approach to generalized metric spaces, *J. Nonlinear Convex Anal.* 7 (2006), 289-297.
- [9] Y. Liu, J. Wu, Z. Li, Common fixed points of single-valued and multi-valued maps, *Int. J. Math. Math. Sci.* 19 (2005), 3045-3055.
- [10] S. Sedghi, I. Altun, N. Shobe, M.A. Salahshour, Some properties of S-metric spaces and fixed point results, *Kyungpook Math. J.* 54 (2014), 113-122.
- [11] S. Sedghi, N.V. Dung, Fixed point theorems on S-metric spaces, *Mat. Vesn.* 66 (2014), 113-124.
- [12] S. Sedghi, N. Shobe, A. Aliouche, A generalization of fixed point theorems in S-metric spaces, *Mat. Vesn.* 64 (2012), 258-266.
- [13] S. Sedghi, N. Shobe, H. Zhou, A common fixed point theorem in D^* -metric spaces, *Fixed point Theory Appl.* 2007 (2007), 027906.
- [14] W. Sintunavarat, P. Kumam, Common fixed point theorem for a pair of weakly compatible mappings in fuzzy metric space, *J. Appl. Math.* 2011 (2011), 637958.
- [15] S. Varsha, Common fixed point theorems satisfying a contractive condition of integral type, *Electron. J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 8 (2020), 244-250.