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Abstract
In this paper, we prove several fixed point results for mappings of Caristi type in the setting of $G$–metric spaces.

1 Introduction

The class of $G$–metric spaces introduced by Z. Mustafa and B. Sims (See [7]) was to provide a new class of generalized metric spaces and to extend the fixed point theory for a variety of mappings. Moreover, many theorems were proved in this new setting with most of them recognizable as counterparts of well-known metric space theorems (See [6], [8], [9]).

Caristi’s fixed point theorem provides a generalization of Banach’s contraction mapping principle (See [2]). Due to the importance of Caristi’s fixed point theorem, it has been improved, generalized, extended and used in many application (See [1], [3], [4], [5]). In this paper, we prove several fixed point results for mappings of Caristi type in the setting of $G$–metric spaces.

$^0$2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 47H10, 54E50.
Key words and phrases. Caristi’s Fixed Point Theorem; G-Metric Spaces; Lower semi-Continuous Functions.
Definition 1 ([7]) A \( G \)-metric space is a pair \((X, G)\), where \( X \) is a nonempty set, and \( G \) is a nonnegative real-valued function defined on \( X \times X \times X \) such that for all \( x, y, z, a \in X \), we have:

1. **(G1)** \( G(x, y, z) = 0 \) if \( x = y = z \);
2. **(G2)** \( 0 < G(x, x, y) \), for all \( x, y \in X \), with \( x \neq y \);
3. **(G3)** \( G(x, x, y) \leq G(x, y, z) \), for all \( x, y, z \in X \), with \( z \neq y \);
4. **(G4)** \( G(x, y, z) = G(p\{x, z, y\}) \) (symmetry in all three variables);
5. **(G5)** \( G(x, y, z) \leq G(x, a, a) + G(a, y, z) \), (rectangle inequality).

The function \( G \) is called a \( G \)-metric on \( X \).

Definition 2 ([7]) A sequence \((x_n)\) in a \( G \)-metric space \( X \) is said to converge if there exists \( x \in X \) such that \( \lim_{n,m \to \infty} G(x_n, x_m, x) = 0 \), and one say that the sequence \((x_n)\) is \( G \)-convergent to \( x \).

Proposition 3 ([7]) Let \( X \) be \( G \)-metric space. Then the following statements are equivalent.

1. \((x_n)\) is \( G \)-convergent to \( x \).
2. \( G(x_n, x_n, x) \to 0 \), as \( n \to \infty \).
3. \( G(x_n, x, x) \to 0 \), as \( n \to \infty \).
4. \( G(x_m, x_n, x) \to 0 \), as \( m, n \to \infty \).

In a \( G \)-metric space \( X \), a sequence \((x_n)\) is said to be \( G \)-Cauchy if given \( \varepsilon > 0 \), there is \( N_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( G(x_n, x_m, x_l) < \varepsilon \), for all \( n, m, l \geq N_\varepsilon \).

Proposition 4 ([7]) In a \( G \)-metric space \( X \), the following statements are equivalent.

1. The sequence \((x_n)\) is \( G \)-Cauchy.
2. For every \( \varepsilon > 0 \), there exists \( N_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( G(x_n, x_m, x_m) < \varepsilon \), for all \( n, m \geq N \).
Definition 5 ([7]) Let \((X, G)\) and \((X', G')\) be two \(G\)-metric spaces, and let \(f : (X, G) \to (X', G')\) be a function, then \(f\) is said to be \(G\)-continuous at a point \(a \in X\) if and only if, given \(\varepsilon > 0\), there exists \(\delta > 0\) such that \(x, y \in X\); and \(G(a, x, y) < \delta\) implies \(G'(f(a), f(x), f(y)) < \varepsilon\).

A function \(f\) is \(G\)-continuous on \(X\) if it is \(G\)-continuous at all \(a \in X\).

Proposition 6 ([7]) Let \((X, G)\) and \((X', G')\) be two \(G\)-metric spaces. Then a function \(f : (X, G) \to (X', G')\) is \(G\)-continuous at a point \(x \in X\) if and only if it is \(G\)-sequentially continuous at \(x\); that is, whenever \((x_n)\) is \(G\)-convergent to \(x\) we have \((f(x_n))\) is \(G\)-convergent to \(f(x)\).

A \(G\)-metric space \((X, G)\) is called symmetric \(G\)-metric space if \(G(x, y, y) = G(y, x, x)\) for all \(x, y \in X\), and called nonsymmetric if it is not symmetric.

Proposition 7 ([7]) Let \(X\) be a \(G\)-metric space, then the function \(G(x, y, z)\) is jointly continuous in all three of its variables. A \(G\)-metric space \(X\) is said to be complete if every \(G\)-Cauchy sequence in \(X\) is \(G\)-convergent in \(X\).

Definition 8 With \(M\) we indicate the space of functions \(\rho\), where

1. \(\rho : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)\) is strictly increasing, continuous and concave,
2. \(\rho(0) = 0\).

Lemma 9 Let \((X, G)\) be a complete \(G\)-metric space and let \(\rho \in M\). Then \((X, \rho \circ G)\) is a complete \(G\)-metric space.

Proof. First let us prove that \(\rho\) is subadditive. To do so, let \(x, y \in [0, \infty)\) and set \(k = \frac{\rho(x)}{\rho(x) + \rho(y)}\). Then since \(\rho\) is increasing, we have

\[
\rho(x + y) = \rho\left(\frac{k}{k}x + \frac{1-k}{1-k}y\right) \leq \max\{\rho\left(\frac{x}{k}\right), \rho\left(\frac{y}{1-k}\right)\}.
\]

Since \(\rho\) is concave and \(\rho(0) = 0\), we have

\[
\rho(x) = \rho\left(\frac{k}{k}x\right) = \rho\left(\frac{k}{k}x + (1-k), 0\right) \geq k\rho\left(\frac{1}{k}x\right) + (1-k)\rho(0) = k\rho\left(\frac{1}{k}x\right).
\]
which implies that $\frac{1}{k}\rho(x) \geq \rho(\frac{1}{k}x)$. Similarly $\frac{1}{1-k}\rho(y) \geq \rho(\frac{1}{1-k}x)$. Therefore,

$$\rho(x + y) \leq \max\{\rho(\frac{x}{k}), \rho(\frac{y}{1-k})\} \leq \max\{\frac{1}{k}\rho(x), \frac{1}{1-k}\rho(y)\} \leq \rho(x) + \rho(y).$$

This completes the proof that $\rho$ is subadditive. Now to prove that $\rho \circ G$ defines $G$-metric on $X$, we let $x, y, z, a \in X$. Then

G1) Since $\rho$ is strictly increasing and $\rho(0) = 0$ then $\rho \circ G(x, y, z) = 0$ implies $G(x, y, z) = 0$ which means $x = y = z$;

G2) Since $0 < G(x, x, y)$; with $x \neq y$ and $\rho$ is strictly increasing with $\rho(0) = 0$, then $0 < \rho \circ G(x, x, y)$; with $x \neq y$;

G3) Since $G(x, x, y) \leq G(x, y, z)$, with $z \neq y$ and $\rho$ is strictly increasing then $\rho \circ G(x, x, y) \leq \rho \circ G(x, y, z)$, with $z \neq y$;

G4) Since $G(x, y, z) = G(p\{x, z, y\})$ and $\rho$ is strictly increasing(injective) then $\rho \circ G(x, y, z) = \rho \circ G(p\{x, z, y\})$ (symmetry in all three variables); ■

G5) Since $G(x, y, z) \leq G(x, a, a) + G(a, y, z)$ and $\rho$ is strictly increasing and subadditive then

$$\rho \circ G(x, y, z) \leq \rho(G(x, a, a) + G(a, y, z)) \leq \rho \circ G(x, a, a) + \rho \circ G(a, y, z),$$

which proves that $\rho \circ G$ defines $G$-metric on $X$. We still need to prove that $(X, \rho \circ G)$ is complete, so let $\{x_n\}$ be a Cauchy sequence in $(X, \rho \circ G)$. Then $\lim_{n,m \to \infty} \rho \circ G(x_n, x_m, x_m) = 0$. Since $\rho$ is continuous and strictly increasing with $\rho(0) = 0$, we have $\rho(\lim_{n,m \to \infty} G(x_n, x_m, x_m)) = 0$. This implies

$$\lim_{n,m \to \infty} G(x_n, x_m, x_m) = 0,$$

which means that $\{x_n\}$ is Cauchy sequence in the complete $G$-metric space $(X, G)$. Therefore, there exists $x^* \in X$ such that $\{x_n\}$ $G$-converges to $x^* \in X$. Hence $\lim_{n \to \infty} G(x_n, x^*, x^*) = 0$, which implies $\rho(\lim_{n \to \infty} G(x_n, x^*, x^*)) = \rho(0) = 0$. By continuity of $\rho$, we have $\lim_{n \to \infty} \rho(G(x_n, x^*, x^*)) = 0$, which implies $\{x_n\}$ is $\rho \circ G$-convergent in $(X, \rho \circ G)$. This completes the proof of Lemma 9.

**Definition 10** With $\mathcal{L}(X)$ we indicate the space of functions $\phi$, where $\phi : X \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is lower semi-continuous.

**Remark 11** Let $(X, G)$ be a $G$-metric space and $\phi \in \mathcal{L}(X)$. Define $\preceq$ on $X$ by

$$x \preceq y \iff G(x, y, y) \leq \phi(x) - \phi(y) \ \forall x, y \in X,$$
then \((X, G, \preceq)\) is partially ordered \(G\)-metric space. In fact, \(\forall x, y, z \in X\) the following conditions are satisfied

\begin{enumerate}
\item[i)] since \(0 = G(x, x, x) \leq \phi(x) - \phi(x) = 0\), we have that \(x \preceq x\)
\item[ii)] if \(x \preceq y\) and \(y \preceq x\), then \(0 \leq G(x, y, y) \leq \phi(x) - \phi(y) = -(\phi(y) - \phi(x)) \leq -G(y, x, x) \leq 0\). This implies that \(G(x, y, y) = G(y, x, x) = 0\). Hence, \(x = y\).
\item[iii)] if \(x \preceq y\) and \(y \preceq z\), then
\[
G(x, z, z) \leq G(x, y, y) + G(y, z, z) \quad \text{by rectangle inequality}
\]
\[
\leq \phi(x) - \phi(y) + \phi(y) - \phi(z)
\]
\[
= \phi(x) - \phi(z),
\]
which implies \(x \preceq z\).
\end{enumerate}

\section{Main Results}

In this section, we introduce several fixed point results for mappings of Caristi type in the setting of \(G\)-metric spaces. We use the existence of a maximal element to prove Caristi’s fixed point theorem in the setting of \(G\)-metric spaces.

\textbf{Theorem 12} Let \((X, G, \preceq)\) be a partially ordered \(G\)-metric space with \(\preceq\) as defined in Remark 11. Then the following statements are equivalent:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[1)] Any selfmapping \(T\) on \(X\) satisfies \(G(x, Tx, Tx) \leq \phi(x) - \phi(Tx)\) has a fixed point.
\item[2)] \(X\) has a maximal element.
\end{enumerate}

\textbf{Proof.} 1 \(\implies\) 2) Suppose that \(T : X \to X\) has a fixed point, say \(x^*\), and \(x_1 \preceq x_2 \preceq \ldots\) be a chain in \(X\). Fix \(x_j\), then \(G(x_j, x^*, x^*) = G(x_j, Tx^*, Tx^*) \leq \phi(x_j) - \phi(Tx^*) = \phi(x_j) - \phi(x^*)\) which implies that \(x_j \preceq x^*\). Hence \(X\) has \(x^*\) as the maximal element.

2 \(\implies\) 1) Suppose \(X\) has \(x^*\) as a maximal element, then \(Tx^* \preceq x^*\). Since \(T\) satisfies \(G(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) \leq \phi(x^*) - \phi(Tx^*)\) which implies that \(x^* \preceq Tx^*\). Therefore, \(Tx^* = x^*\). \(\blacksquare\)
Theorem 13 Let $(X, G, \preceq)$ be a partially ordered complete $G$–metric space, $\phi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a lower semi-continuous and $T : X \rightarrow X$ be selfmapping satisfying the inequality; $G(x, Tx, Tx) \leq \phi(x) - \phi(Tx)$. Then $T$ has a fixed point.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{x_t : t \in \Delta\} \subseteq X$ be any chain in $X$ and let $\{t_n\}$ be any increasing sequence of elements of $\Delta$. We prove first that $\phi(\mathcal{C})$ is a decreasing net. To do so, let $c_t$ and $c_s$ be any pair of elements in $\mathcal{C}$ with $x_t \preceq x_s$ for $t, s \in \Delta$. Then $G(x_t, x_s, x_s) \leq \phi(x_t) - \phi(x_s)$, which implies that $\phi(x_s) \leq \phi(x_t) - G(x_t, x_s, x_s)$. Therefore, $\{\phi(x_t)\}_{t \in \Delta}$ is a decreasing net of positive real numbers. Thus $\inf\{\phi(x_t) : t \in \Delta\}$ exists by completeness property of $\mathbb{R}$. Now choose $\{t_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ to be an increasing sequence of $\Delta$ such that $\lim_{n \to \infty} \phi(x_{t_n}) = \inf\{\phi(x_t) : t \in \Delta\}$. Then $\{x_{t_n}\}$ is $G$–Cauchy since for $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$G(x_{t_n}, x_{t_m}, x_{t_m}) \leq \phi(x_{t_n}) - \phi(x_{t_m}). \quad (1)$$

Thus passing to the limit in the inequality (1) implies $G(x_{t_n}, x_{t_m}, x_{t_m}) = 0$ as $n, m \to \infty$. Since $(X, G, \preceq)$ is $G$–complete then there exists $x^* \in X$ such that $\{x_{t_n}\}$ converges to $x^*$. To prove that $x^*$ is an upper bound of the set $\mathcal{C}$, let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ since $\{x_{t_n}\}$ converges to $x^*$ and $\{x_{t_n}\}$ is increasing imply $x_{t_n} \preceq x^* \ \forall n \geq 1$. Therefore,

$$G(x_{t_n}, x^*, x^*) = \lim_{m \to \infty} G(x_{t_n}, x_{t_m}, x_{t_m}) \leq \phi(x_{t_n}) - \lim_{m \to \infty} \phi(x_{t_m}) \leq \phi(x_{t_n}) - \lim_{m \to \infty} \phi(x_{t_m}) \leq \phi(x_{t_n}) - \phi(x^*).$$

Then $\phi(x^*) \leq \phi(x_{t_n}) \ \forall n \geq 1$ which implies that $\phi(x^*) \leq \inf\{\phi(x_t) : t \in \Delta\}$. Hence $x_t \preceq x^* \ \forall t \in \Delta$ since $\phi$ is decreasing which means that $x^*$ is an upper bound of the chain $\mathcal{C}$. Therefore Zorn’s lemma implies that $(X, \preceq)$ has a maximal element. By Theorem 12 any selfmapping $T : X \rightarrow X$ satisfies the inequality $G(x, Tx, Tx) \leq \phi(x) - \phi(Tx)$ has a fixed point. \qed

Corollary 14 Let $(X, G)$ be a partially ordered $G$–metric space. Suppose $f : X \rightarrow X$ is any function and $T : X \rightarrow X$ be $G$–continuous. If there exists a real number $r < 0$ such that for all $x \in X$

$$G(f(x), Tf(x), Tf(x)) \leq G(x, Tx, Tx) + rG(x, f(x), f(x)),$$
then $f$ has a fixed point.

**Proof.** Define $\phi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ by $\phi(x) = \frac{G(x, Tx, Tx)}{r}$. Then the lower semi-continuity of $\phi$ follows from the $G$-continuity of $T$. Now

$$G(f(x), Tf(x), Tf(x) = -r\phi(f(x)) \leq -r\phi(x) + rG(x, f(x), f(x)).$$

Then

$$\phi(f(x)) \leq \phi(x) - G(x, f(x), f(x)),$$

which implies

$$G(x, f(x), f(x)) \leq \phi(x) - \phi(f(x)).$$

Define $\preceq$ on $X$ by

$$x \preceq y \iff G(x, y, y) \leq \phi(x) - \phi(y) \ \forall x, y \in X.$$ 

Then by Theorem 13, there exists $x^* \in X$ such that $f(x^*) = x^*$. □

**Corollary 15** Let $(X, G)$ be a complete $G$-metric space and let $\rho \in \mathcal{M}$. Then $(X, \rho \circ G)$ is a complete $G$-metric space. Then any selfmapping $T$ on $X$ satisfies $\rho \circ G(x, Tx, Tx) \leq \phi(x) - \phi(Tx)$ has a fixed point.

**Corollary 16** Let $(X, G)$ be a complete $G$-metric space and let $\rho \in \mathcal{M}$. Suppose $f : X \rightarrow X$ is any function and $T : X \rightarrow X$ is $G$-continuous. If for all $x \in X$

$$G(f(x), Tf(x), Tf(x) \leq G(x, Tx, Tx) - \rho \circ G(x, f(x), f(x)).$$

Then $f$ has a fixed point.

**Proof.** Define $\phi(x) = \rho^{-1} \circ G(x, Tx, Tx)$. Then lower semi-continuity of $\phi$ follows from the $G$-continuity of $T$ and continuity of $\rho^{-1}$. Now

$$G(f(x), Tf(x), Tf(x) = \rho(\phi(f(x))) \leq \rho(\phi(x)) - \rho \circ G(x, f(x), f(x)).$$

Then

$$\rho(\phi(f(x))) \leq \rho(\phi(x)) - \rho \circ G(x, f(x), f(x)),$$

By the subadditivity of $\rho$, the above inequality becomes

$$\rho(\phi(f(x)) + G(x, f(x), f(x)) \leq \rho(\phi(f(x)) + \rho \circ G(x, f(x), f(x)) \leq \rho(\phi(x)).$$
Now since $\rho$ is increasing, we obtain
\[ \phi(f(x)) + G(x, f(x), f(x)) \leq \phi(x). \]

Hence
\[ G(x, f(x), f(x)) \leq \phi(x) - \phi(f(x)). \]

Define $\preceq$ on $X$ by
\[ x \preceq y \iff G(x, y, y) \leq \phi(x) - \phi(y) \forall x, y \in X. \]

Then by Theorem 13 there exists $x^* \in X$ such that $f(x^*) = x^*$. ■

**Corollary 17** Let $(X, G)$ be a complete $G$–metric space and suppose $f : X \to X$ is any function and $T : X \to X$ is $G$–continuous. If there exist a real number $r < 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $x, y \in X$
\[ G(f(x), T f(x), T^n f(x)) \leq G(x, T x, T^n x) + r G(x, f(x), f(x)) \]
then $f$ has a fixed point.

**Proof.** Define $\phi : X \to \mathbb{R}^+$ by $\phi(x) = \frac{-G(x, T x, T^n x)}{r}$. Then lower semi-continuity of $\phi$ follows from the $G$–continuity of $T$. Then
\[
-r \phi(f(x)) = G(x, T f(x), T^n f(x)) \\
\leq -r \phi(x) + r G(x, f(x), f(x)).
\]

Then we obtain
\[ G(x, f(x), f(x)) \leq \phi(x) - \phi(f(x)). \]

Define $\preceq$ on $X$ by
\[ x \preceq y \iff G(x, y, y) \leq \phi(x) - \phi(y) \forall x, y \in X. \]

Then by Theorem 13 there exists $x^* \in X$ such that $f(x^*) = x^*$.

**Corollary 18** Let $(X, G)$ be a complete $G$–metric space and let $\rho \in \mathcal{M}$. Suppose $f : X \to X$ is any function and $T : X \to X$ is $G$–continuous. If there exist $\rho \in \mathcal{M}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $x \in X$
\[ G(f(x), T f(x), T^n f(x)) \leq G(x, T x, T^n x) - \rho \circ G(x, f(x), f(x)), \]
then $f$ has a fixed point.
The following theorem gives a natural generalization of Caristi type mapping in the setting of $G$–metric spaces.

**Theorem 19** Let $(X, G)$ be a complete $G$–metric space. Suppose $T : X \rightarrow X$ is $G$–continuous. If there exists $\phi_y \in \mathcal{L}(X)$ for all $y \in X$ such that for all $x \in X$

$$G(Tx, T^2x, Ty) \leq \phi_y(x) - \phi_y(Tx),$$

then $T$ has a fixed point.

**Proof.** Fix $x_0 \in X$ and let $x_n = T^nx_0$ $n = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$. Then

$$G(x_n, x_{n+1}, Ty) = G(Tx_{n-1}, Tx_n, Ty) = G(Tx_{n-1}, T^2x_{n-1}, Ty) \leq \phi_y(x_{n-1}) - \phi_y(Tx_{n-1}) = \phi_y(x_{n-1}) - \phi_y(x_n).$$

Then for each $y \in X$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} G(x_n, x_{n+1}, Ty) = G(x_1, x_2, Ty) + G(x_2, x_3, Ty) + \ldots + G(x_n, x_{n+1}, Ty) \leq \phi_y(x_0) - \phi_y(x_1) + \phi_y(x_1) - \phi_y(x_2) + \ldots - \phi_y(x_{n-1}) + \phi_y(x_{n-1}) - \phi_y(x_n) \leq \phi_y(x_0) - \phi_y(x_n) \leq \phi_y(x_0) + C,$$

where $C > 0$, which implies that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} G(x_n, x_{n+1}, Ty) \leq \phi_y(x_0) + C < \infty.$$

Then $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} G(x_n, x_{n+1}, Ty)$ is a convergent series. Hence $\lim_{n \to \infty} G(x_n, x_{n+1}, Ty) = 0$. Therefore,

$$G(x_n, x_m, x_m) \leq G(x_n, Ty, Ty) + G(Ty, x_m, x_m) \leq G(x_n, x_m, Ty) + G(x_n, x_m, Ty) \leq 2 \sum_{j=n}^{m} G(x_j, x_{j+1}, Ty) \to 0 \text{ as } m, n \to \infty.$$
which implies that \( \{x_n\} \) is Cauchy in complete \( G \)-metric space. That is, there exists \( x^* \in X \) such that \( \{x_n\} \) converges to \( x^* \). Now
\[
G(Tx^*, T^2x^*, x^*) = \lim_{n \to \infty} G(Tx_n, T^2x_n, x_n) = \lim_{n \to \infty} G(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}, x_n) = 0,
\]
which implies that \( x^* \) is a fixed point of \( T \). ■

**Corollary 20** Let \((X, G)\) be a complete \( G \)-metric space. Suppose \( T : X \to X \) is \( G \)-continuous and for all \( x \in X \)
\[
G(Tf(x), T^2f(x), Ty) \leq G(x, Tx, Ty) - G(f(x), f^2(x), Ty).
\]
Then \( f \) has a fixed point.

**Proof.** For each \( y \in X \), choose \( \phi_y(x) = G(x, Tx, Ty) \) then the result follows by applying Theorem 19 ■
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Abstract

In this paper, we generalize the notion of Meir-Keeler contraction condition in $M_b$-metric spaces. We prove some fixed point theorems for this class of contractions which enables us to extend and generalize the recent results of Gholmian and Khaneghir [2].

1 Introduction and preliminaries

First of all, we would like to mention that this work is inspired by the work of Gholmian and Khaneghir [2]. In 1922 Banach established one of the most important theorem in fixed point theory known as the "Banach contraction principle". Subsequently, many authors have extended this theorem in many different ways. For example, in 1969, Meir and Keeler [3] generalize the Banach’s theorem using the weakly uniformly strict contraction and proved the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.** Let $(X, d)$ be a complete metric space and $f$ a mapping of $X$ into itself satisfying the following condition:

$$\text{given } \epsilon > 0, \text{ there exists } \delta > 0 \text{ such that } \epsilon \leq d(x, y) < \epsilon + \delta \text{ implies } d(f(x), f(y)) < \epsilon.$$  

Then $f$ has a unique fixed point $\xi$. Moreover, For any $x \in X$, \( \lim_{n \to \infty} f^n(x) = \xi \).

The Theorem 1 has been extended in many different metric spaces under several contractive definitions, see [2], [5].

On the other hand, several types of generalized metric spaces are proposed and a series of fixed point theorems for various classes of mapping are obtained, see [4], [6], [8], [9], [10], [11], [12].

$M$-metric spaces was introduced by Asadi see [1], which is an extension of partial metric spaces. So, first we remind the reader of the definition of an $M$-metric spaces along with some other notations.
Notation 1. [1]
1. \( m_{x,y} := \min\{m(x,x), m(y,y)\} \)
2. \( M_{x,y} := \max\{m(x,x), m(y,y)\} \)

Definition 1. [1] Let \( X \) be a nonempty set, if the function \( m : X^2 \to R^+ \) satisfies the following conditions: for all \( x, y, z \in X \)

1. \( m(x, x) = m(y, y) = m(x, y) \) if and only if \( x = y \),
2. \( m_{x,y} \leq m(x, y) \),
3. \( m(x, y) = m(y, x) \),
4. \( m(x, y) - m_{x,y} \leq (m(x, z) - m_{x,z}) + (m(z, y) - m_{z,y}) \).

Then the pair \((X, m)\) is called an \( M \)-metric space.

Recently, Mlaiki et al. [7] developed the concept of \( M_b \)-metric spaces which extends the \( M \)-metric spaces and some fixed point theorems are established. Motivated by the properties of this original metric space, we introduce the notion of generalized Meir-Keeler contraction mappings in the \( M_b \)-metric spaces.

Now, let’s recall some definitions and notations of \( M_b \)-metric spaces.

Notation 2. [7]
1. \( m_{b x,y} := \min\{m_b(x,x), m_b(y,y)\} \)
2. \( M_{b x,y} := \max\{m_b(x,x), m_b(y,y)\} \)

Definition 2. [7] An \( M_b \)-metric space on a nonempty set \( X \) is a function \( m_b : X^2 \to R^+ \) that satisfies the following conditions, for all \( x, y, z \in X \) we have

1. \( m_b(x, x) = m_b(y, y) = m_b(x, y) \) if and only if \( x = y \),
2. \( m_{b x,y} \leq m_b(x, y) \),
3. \( m_b(x, y) = m_b(y, x) \),
4. There exists a real number \( s \geq 1 \) such that for all \( x, y, z \in X \) we have

\[
m_b(x, y) - m_{b x,y} \leq s [(m_b(x, z) - m_{b x,z}) + (m_b(z, y) - m_{b z,y})] - m_b(z, z).
\]

The number \( s \) is called the coefficient of the \( M_b \)-metric space \((X, m_b)\).

Now, we give an example of an \( M_b \)-metric which is not an \( M \)-metric space.

Example 1. [7] Let \( X = [0, \infty) \) and \( p > 1 \) be constant and \( m_b : X^2 \to [0, \infty) \) defined by for all \( x, y \in X \) we have

\[
m_b(x, y) = \max\{x, y\}^p + |x - y|^p.
\]

Note that \((X, m_b)\) is an \( M_b \)-metric with coefficient \( s = 2^p \). Now, we show that \((X, m_b)\) is not an \( M \)-metric space. Take \( x = 5 \), \( y = 1 \) and \( z = 4 \), we get \( m_b(x, y) - m_{b x,y} = 5^p + 4^p - 1 \) and \((m_b(x, z) - m_{b x,z}) + (m_b(z, y) - m_{b z,y}) = 5^p + 1 - 4^p + 4^p + 3^p - 1 = 5^p + 3^p \). Therefore,

\[
m_b(x, y) - m_{b x,y} > (m_b(x, z) - m_{b x,z}) + (m_b(z, y) - m_{b z,y}),
\]

as required.
Definition 3. [7] Let \((X, m_b)\) be a \(M_b\)-metric space. Then:

1) A sequence \(\{x_n\}\) in \(X\) converges to a point \(x\) if and only if
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} (m_b(x_n, x) - m_{b\delta n,x}) = 0.
\]

2) A sequence \(\{x_n\}\) in \(X\) is said to be \(m_b\)-Cauchy sequence if and only if
\[
\lim_{n,m \to \infty} (m_b(x_n, x_m) - m_{b\delta n,x_m}), \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \to \infty} (m_{b\delta n,x_n} - m_{b\delta n,x_m})
\]
exist and finite.

3) An \(M_b\)-metric space is said to be complete if every \(m_b\)-Cauchy sequence \(\{x_n\}\) converges to a point \(x\) such that
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} (m_b(x_n, x) - m_{b\delta n,x}) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \to \infty} (m_{b\delta n,x_n} - m_{b\delta n,x_m}) = 0.
\]

Definition 4. Each \(m_b\)-metric generates a topology \(\tau_{m_b}\) on \(X\) whose base is the family of open \(m_b\)-balls \(\{B_{m_b}(x, \varepsilon) : x \in X, \varepsilon > 0\}\) where \(B_{m_b}(x, \varepsilon) = \{y \in X \mid m_b(x, y) - m_{b\varepsilon} < \varepsilon\}\).

Definition 5. Let \(X\) be a nonempty set, \(T : X \to X\) be a mapping and \(\alpha : X \times X \to [0, \infty)\) be a function. Then, \(T\) is said to be \(\alpha\)-admissible if for all \(x, y \in X\) we have
\[
\alpha(x, y) \geq 1 \implies \alpha(Tx, Ty) \geq 1.
\]

Definition 6. A mapping \(T : X \to X\) is called triangular \(\alpha\)-admissible if it is \(\alpha\)-admissible and it satisfies the following condition:
\[
\alpha(x, y) \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha(y, z) \geq 1 \implies \alpha(x, z) \geq 1 \quad \text{where} \quad x, y, z \in X.
\]

Definition 7. Let \((X, m_b)\) be an \(m_b\)-metric space with coefficient \(s\), an \(\alpha\)-admissible mapping \(T : X \to X\) is said to be generalized Meir-Keeler contraction of type (I) if for every \(\varepsilon > 0\) there exists \(\delta > 0\) such that
\[
\varepsilon \leq \beta(m_b(x, y))M(x, y) < \varepsilon + \delta \implies \alpha(x, y)m_b(Tx, Ty) < \varepsilon
\]
where
\[
M(x, y) = \max\{m_b(x, y), m_b(Tx, x), m_b(Ty, y)\}, \quad \text{for all} \quad x, y \in \mathbb{N}
\]
and \(\beta : [0, \infty) \to (0, \frac{1}{s})\) is a given function.

Definition 8. Let \((X, m_b)\) be an \(m_b\)-metric space with coefficient \(s\). A triangular \(\alpha\)-admissible mapping \(T : X \to X\) is said to be generalized Meir-Keeler contraction of type (II) if for every \(\varepsilon > 0\) there exists \(\delta > 0\) such that
\[
\varepsilon \leq \beta(m_b(x, y))N(x, y) < \varepsilon + \delta \implies \alpha(x, y)m_b(Tx, Ty) < \varepsilon
\]
where
\[
N(x, y) = \max\{m_b(x, y), \frac{1}{2}[m_b(Tx, x) + m_b(Ty, y)]\}, \quad \text{for all} \quad x, y \in \mathbb{N}
\]
and \(\beta : [0, \infty) \to (0, \frac{1}{s})\) is a given function.

Remark 1. 1. Suppose that \(T : X \to X\) is a generalized Meir-Keeler contraction of type (I). Then
\[
\alpha(x, y)m_b(Tx, Ty) < \beta(m_b(x, y))M(x, y)
\]
for all \(x, y \in X\) when \(M(x, y) > 0\).

2. Note that for all \(x, y \in X\), we have \(N(x, y) \leq M(x, y)\).
2 Main Results

Theorem 2. Let \((X, m_b)\) be a complete \(M_b\) metric space and \(T: X \to X\) be a triangular \(\alpha\)-admissible mapping. Suppose that the following conditions hold:

(a) There exists \(x_0 \in X\) such that \(\alpha(x_0, Tx_0) \geq 1\), \(\alpha(Tx_0, x_0) \geq 1\).

(b) If \(\{x_n\}\) is a sequence in \(X\) that converges to \(z\) as \(n \to \infty\), and \(\alpha(x_n, x_m) \geq 1\) for all \(n, m \in \mathbb{N}\), then \(\alpha(x_n, z) \geq 1\) for all \(n \in \mathbb{N}\).

(c) If for each \(\epsilon > 0\) there exists \(\delta > 0\) such that

\[
2s\epsilon \leq m_b(y, Ty) \frac{1 + m_b(x, Tx)}{1 + M(x, y)} + N(x, y) < s(2\epsilon + \delta),
\]

then we have \(\alpha(x, y)m_b(Tx, Ty) < \epsilon\).

Then, \(T\) has a fixed point in \(X\).

Proof. Note that condition (c) implies that

\[
\alpha(x, y)m_b(Tx, Ty) < \frac{1}{2s} m_b(y, Ty) \frac{1 + m_b(x, Tx)}{1 + M(x, y)} + \frac{1}{2s} N(x, y).
\]

Let \(x_0 \in X\) that satisfies condition (a) and define the sequence \(\{x_n\}\) by \(x_1 = Tx_0\) and \(x_{n+1} = Tx_n\) for all \(n \in \mathbb{N}\). If there exists an \(n\) such that \(x_{n+1} = x_n\), then we are done. Without lost of generality, we may assume that \(x_{n+1} \neq x_n\) for all \(n \in \mathbb{N}\).

Since \(T\) is \(\alpha\)-admisible, we have \(\alpha(x_0, x_1) = \alpha(x_0, Tx_0) \geq 1\) and thus \(\alpha(Tx_0, Tx_1) = \alpha(x_1, x_2) \geq 1\). By repeating the same argument, we get \(\alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 1\), for all \(n \in \mathbb{N}\). Hence,

\[
m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) = m_b(Tx_n, Tx_{n+1}) \leq \alpha(x_n, x_{n+1})m_b(Tx_n, TTx_{n+1})
\leq \frac{1}{2s} m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) \frac{1 + m_b(x_n, x_{n+1})}{1 + M(x_n, x_{n+1})} + \frac{1}{2s} N(x_n, x_{n+1}).
\]

Note that \(M(x_n, x_{n+1}) = \max\{m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}), m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2})\}\). So, if \(M(x_n, x_{n+1}) = m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2})\) then we have

\[
m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) = m_b(Tx_n, Tx_{n+1}) \leq \alpha(x_n, x_{n+1})m_b(Tx_n, Tx_{n+1})
\leq \frac{1}{2s} m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) \frac{1 + m_b(x_n, x_{n+1})}{1 + m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2})} + \frac{1}{2s} m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2})
\leq \frac{1}{2s} m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) + \frac{1}{2s} m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2})
\leq \frac{1}{s} m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) \leq m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}),
\]

\[\]
which leads to a contradiction. Therefore, \( M(x_n, x_{n+1}) = m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) \). Also note that \( N(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq M(x_n, x_{n+1}) \) and hence

\[
\begin{align*}
m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) &< \frac{1}{2s} m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) \left( \frac{1 + m_b(x_n, x_{n+1})}{1 + m_b(x_n, x_{n+1})} \right) + \frac{1}{2s} m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{2s} m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) + \frac{1}{2s} m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2s} m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) + \frac{1}{2s} m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{s} m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}).
\end{align*}
\]

Therefore, \( m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) < m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) \) and thus the sequence \( \{m_b(x_n, x_{n+1})\} \) is a strictly decreasing positive sequence that converges to some number say \( r \geq 0 \). By Condition (c) in the hypothesis of the theorem, choose \( \epsilon = \frac{r}{s} \). Note that, \( \lim_{n \to \infty} [m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) + m_b(x_n, x_{n+1})] = 2r \). Hence, there exists \( N_0 \in \mathbb{N} \) such that

\[
2r < m_b(x_{N_0+1}, x_{N_0+2}) + m_b(x_{N_0}, x_{N_0+1}) < 2r + \delta.
\]

Therefore,

\[
2s\epsilon < m_b(x_{N_0+1}, x_{N_0+2}) + m_b(x_{N_0}, x_{N_0+1}) = m_b(x_{N_0+1}, T x_{N_0+1}) \left[ \frac{1 + m_b(x_{N_0}, T x_{N_0+1})}{1 + M(x_{N_0}, x_{N_0+1})} \right] + N(x_{N_0}, x_{N_0+1}) < 2s\epsilon + \delta < s(2\epsilon + \delta).
\]

Using the fact that \( \alpha(x_{N_0}, x_{N_0+1}) \geq 1 \) and condition (c), we deduce that

\[
m_b(x_{N_0+1}, x_{N_0+2}) \leq \alpha(x_{N_0}, x_{N_0+1}) m_b(T x_{N_0}, T x_{N_0+1}) \leq \epsilon = \frac{r}{s} \leq r.
\]

But we know that for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), \( r \leq m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) \) which leads to a contradiction. Thus \( r = 0 \); that is, \( \lim_{n \to \infty} m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) = m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) = 0 \). Now let \( \epsilon > 0 \) and \( \delta' = \min\{\delta, \epsilon, 1\} \). Since \( \lim_{n \to \infty} m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) = 0 \), there exists \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( m_b(x_m, x_{m+1}) < \frac{\delta'}{4} \), for all \( m \geq k \).

Let \( \eta = s(2\epsilon + \frac{\delta'}{2}) \) and consider the set

\[
B[x_k, \eta] = \{ x_i | i \geq k, m_b(x_i, x_k) - m_{bx_i,x_k} < \eta \}.
\]

We prove that \( T \) maps \( B[x_k, \eta] \) to itself. Let \( x_l \in B[x_k, \eta] \). Then we have \( m_b(x_l, x_k) - m_{bx_l,x_k} < \eta \). If \( l = k \), then we have \( T x_l = T x_k = x_{k+1} \in B[x_k, \eta] \). So we may assume that \( l > k \). Suppose that \( 2s\epsilon \leq m_b(x_l, x_k) \), so that

\[
2s\epsilon \leq m_b(x_l, x_k) - m_{bx_l,x_k} < \eta.
\]

Note \( m_b(x_l, x_k) \leq N(x_l, x_k) \). Hence, \( 2s\epsilon \leq m_b(x_l, x_k) \) and this implies that \( \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2s} m_b(x_l, x_k) \). Thus,

\[
\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2s} m_b(x_k, x_{k+1}) \left( \frac{1 + m_b(x_l, x_{l+1})}{1 + M(x_l, x_k)} \right) + \frac{1}{2s} N(x_l, x_k).
\]
Therefore,
\[
\frac{1}{2s}m_b(x_k, x_{k+1}) \frac{1 + m_b(x_l, x_{l+1})}{1 + M(x_l, x_k)} + \frac{1}{2s}N(x_l, x_k) < \epsilon + \frac{\delta'}{2},
\]
and this implies that
\[
2s\epsilon \leq m_b(x_k, Tx_k) \frac{1 + m_b(x_l, Tx_l)}{1 + M(x_l, x_k)} + N(x_l, x_k) < s(2\epsilon + \delta').
\]
Thus, by part (c) of the theorem, we have \(m_b(Tx_l, Tx_k) \leq \alpha(x_l, x_k)m_b(Tx_l, Tx_k) < \epsilon\). Therefore,
\[
m_b(Tx_l, x_k) - m_b(Tx_l, x_k) \leq m_b(Tx_l, x_k)
\leq s \left[ (m_b(Tx_l, Tx_k) - m_b(Tx_l, x_k)) + (m_b(Tx_l, x_k) - m_b(Tx_l, x_k)) \right]
\leq s \left[ m_b(Tx_l, x_k) + m_b(Tx_l, x_k) \right]
< s[\epsilon + \frac{\delta'}{4}]
< s[2\epsilon + \frac{\delta'}{2}]
\]
which implies that \(x_{l+1} \in B[x_k, \eta]\) as desired. Now assume that \(m_b(x_l, x_k) < 2s\epsilon\). Then we have
\[
m_b(Tx_l, x_k) - m_b(Tx_l, x_k) \leq m_b(Tx_l, x_k)
\leq s \left[ (m_b(Tx_l, Tx_k) - m_b(Tx_l, x_k)) + (m_b(Tx_l, x_k) - m_b(Tx_l, x_k)) \right]
\leq s \left[ m_b(Tx_l, x_k) + m_b(Tx_l, x_k) \right]
\leq s\alpha(x_l, x_k)m_b(Tx_l, Tx_k) + sm_b(Tx_l, x_k)
\leq s \left[ \frac{1}{2s}m_b(x_k, x_{k+1}) \frac{1 + m_b(x_l, x_{l+1})}{1 + M(x_l, x_k)} + \frac{1}{2s}N(x_l, x_k) \right] + sm_b(x_k+1, x_k)
\leq \frac{1}{2}m_b(x_k, x_{k+1}) + \frac{1}{2}(1 + m_b(x_l, x_k))\frac{1}{2}N(x_l, x_k) + sm_b(x_k+1, x_k)
\leq \frac{\delta'}{8} + \frac{m_b(x_k, x_{k+1})m_b(x_l, x_{l+1})}{2(1 + m_b(x_l, x_k))} + \frac{1}{2}N(x_l, x_k) + s\frac{\delta'}{4}.
\]
On the other hand, note that
\[
\frac{m_b(x_k, x_{k+1})}{1 + m_b(x_l, x_k)} \leq m_b(x_k, x_{k+1}) < \frac{\delta'}{4} < 1.
\]
Hence,
\[
m_b(Tx_l, x_l) - m_b(Tx_l, x_l) \leq m_b(Tx_l, x_k)
= \frac{\delta'}{8} + \frac{1}{2}m_b(x_l, x_{l+1}) + \frac{1}{2}N(Tx_l, x_k) + s\frac{\delta'}{4}
< \left[ \frac{\delta'}{8} + \frac{\delta'}{8} + s\epsilon \right] + s\frac{\delta'}{4}
\leq s(\frac{\delta'}{2} + 2\epsilon).
\]
Therefore, for all \( m > k \), we have

\[
m_b(x_m, x_k) - m_{b_{x_m, x_k}} < s \left( \frac{\delta'}{2} + 2\epsilon \right).
\]

Now, for every \( m, n \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( m > n > k \), we have

\[
m_b(x_m, x_n) - m_{b_{x_m, x_n}} \leq s \left( m_b(x_m, x_k) + m_b(x_k, x_n) \right) < s.s \left( \frac{\delta'}{2} + 2\epsilon \right)
\]

\[
= s^2 \left( 4\epsilon + \delta' \right) \leq 5s^2 \epsilon
\]

which implies that \( \lim_{n,m \to \infty} m_b(x_m, x_n) - m_{b_{x_m, x_n}} \) exists and finite. Using the same argument it is not difficult to show that \( \lim_{n,m \to \infty} M_b(x_m, x_n) - m_{b_{x_m, x_n}} \) exists and finite. Therefore, the sequence \( \{x_n\} \) is an \( m_b \)-Cauchy sequence and since \( X \) is complete, there exists \( u \in X \) such that \( \lim_{n \to \infty} M_b(x_n, u) - m_{b_{x_n, u}} = 0 \).

Finally, we show that is a fixed point for \( T \); that is \( Tu = u \).

\[
\begin{align*}
\lim_{n \to \infty} (M_{b_{x_n, u}} - m_{b_{x_n, u}}) &= 0 \\
\lim_{n \to \infty} (M_{b_{x_n+1, u}} - m_{b_{x_n+1, u}}) &= 0 \\
\lim_{n \to \infty} (M_{b_{Tx_n, u}} - m_{b_{Tx_n, u}}) &= 0 \\
M_b(Tu, u) - m_{b_{Tu, u}} &= 0
\end{align*}
\]

Then, \( M_{bTu, u} = m_{bTu, u} \), and similarly by the convergence of \( x_n \) we obtain that \( m_b(Tu, u) = m_{b_{Tu, u}} \), which implies that \( Tu = u \) as required.

**Definition 9.** Let \((X, m_b)\) be an \( m_b \)-metric space and let \( T \) be a self mapping on \( X \). \( T \) is called \( m_b \)-orbitally continuous if whenever

\[
\lim_{n \to +\infty} m_b(T^n x, z) = m_b(z, z) \Rightarrow \lim_{n \to +\infty} m_b(T^n T x, T z) = m_b(T z, T z) \forall x, z \in X.
\]

**Remark 2.** Note that, continuous mappings are \( m_b \)-orbitally continuous. But the converse is not necessary true, for example, consider the \( m_b \)-metric space defined by \( m_b(x, y) = |\max(x, y)|^q \) (\( q \geq 1 \)) for all \( x, y \in X \) where \( X = [0, 1] \) and the map \( T : X \to X \) defined by

\[
T = \begin{cases} 
\frac{x}{2} & \text{if } 0 \leq x < 1 \\
0 & \text{if } x = 1
\end{cases}
\]

It is not difficult to see that \( T \) is not continuous, but \( T \) is \( m_b \)-orbitally continuous.

**Theorem 3.** Let \((X, m_b)\) be a complete \( m_b \)-metric space with coefficient \( s \) and \( T : X \to T \) be a mapping. Suppose that the following conditions hold:
a) \( T \) is an \( m_b \)-orbitally continuous generalized Meir-Keeler contraction of type (I),

b) there exists \( x_0 \in X \) such that \( \alpha(x_0, Tx_0) \geq 1, \alpha(Tx_0, x_0) \geq 1, \)

c) if \( \{x_n\} \) is a sequence in \( X \) such that \( x_n \rightarrow z \) as \( n \rightarrow \infty \) and \( \alpha(x_n, x_m) \geq 1 \) for all \( n, m \in \mathbb{N} \), then \( \alpha(z, z) \geq 1, \)

d) \( s > 1 \) or \( \beta \) is a continuous function.

then, \( T \) has a fixed point in \( X \).

**Proof.** Let \( x_0 \in X \) be such that condition b) holds and define \( \{x_n\} \) in \( X \) so that \( x_1 = Tx_0, x_{n+1} = Tx_n \) \( \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \). Without lose of generality, we may suppose that \( x_{n+1} \neq x_n \) \( \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \cup 0 \). Since \( T \) is \( \alpha \)-admissible, then \( \alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 1 \) \( \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \).

As \( T \) is a generalized Meir-Keeler contraction of type (I), then by replacing \( x \) by \( x_n \) and \( y \) by \( y_n \) in (4), we observe that for every \( \epsilon > 0 \) there exists \( \delta > 0 \) such that

\[
\epsilon \leq \beta(m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}))M(x_n, x_{n+1}) < \epsilon + \delta \implies \alpha(x_n, x_{n+1})m_b(Tx_n, Tx_{n+1}) < \epsilon \tag{8}
\]

where

\[
M(x_n, x_{n+1}) = \max\{m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}), m_b(x_{n+2}, x_{n+1})\}. \tag{9}
\]

Next, we distinguish two following cases:

**Case 1.** Assume that \( M(x_n, x_{n+1}) = m_b(x_{n+2}, x_{n+1}) \).

In this case, equation (8) becomes

\[
\epsilon \leq \beta(m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}))m_b(x_{n+2}, x_{n+1}) < \epsilon + \delta \implies \alpha(x_n, x_{n+1})m_b(Tx_n, Tx_{n+1}) < \epsilon
\]

and using that \( \alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 1 \) \( \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \), we have

\[
m_b(Tx_n, Tx_{n+1})m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) < \epsilon \leq \beta(m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}))m_b(x_{n+2}, x_{n+1}).
\]

Then \( m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) < m_b(x_{n+2}, x_{n+1}) \) \( \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \) which gives a contradiction.

**Case 2.** Assume that \( M(x_n, x_{n+1}) = m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) \).

Since \( M(x_n, x_{n+1}) > 0 \) \( \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \) due to Remark 1, we get

\[
m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) \leq \alpha(x_n, x_{n+1})m_b(Tx_n, Tx_{n+1}) \leq \beta(m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}))m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) < \frac{1}{s}m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}). \tag{10}
\]

That is \( \{m_b(x_n, x_{n+1})\} \) is a strictly decreasing positive sequence in \( \mathbb{R}^+ \) and it converges to some \( r \geq 0 \). Let prove that \( r = 0 \).

Let be untrue, the we have \( r > 0 \). We assert that \( 0 < r \leq m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) \) \( \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \).

First, suppose that \( s > 1 \). Applying equation (10), we have

\[
m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) < \frac{1}{s}m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}).
\]

By taking the limit as \( n \) tends to infinity, we get \( r \leq \frac{1}{s}r < r \) which is a contradiction and so \( r = 0 \).

Next, suppose that \( \beta \) is a continuous function. We prove in the following claim that \( \{\beta(m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}))m_b(x_n, x_{n+1})\} \) is a strictly decreasing positive sequence in \( \mathbb{R}^+ \).
Claim 1. Let \( \beta : [0, \infty[ \rightarrow [0, \frac{1}{s}] \) a continuous function. Then, \( \{\beta(m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}))m_b(x_n, x_{n+1})\} \) is strictly decreasing positive sequence in \( \mathbb{R}^+ \).

First, note that

\[
\beta(m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}))m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) < m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) \\
\leq \alpha(x_n, x_{n+1})m_b(Tx_n, Tx_{n+1}) \\
< \beta(m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}))M(x_n, x_{n+1}).
\]

If \( M(x_n, x_{n+1}) = m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) \), we obtain
\[
\beta(m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}))m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) < \beta(m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}))m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}).
\]
If \( M(x_n, x_{n+1}) = m_b(x_{n+2}, x_{n+1}) \), we have \( m_b(x_{n+2}, x_{n+1}) < m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) \) (as \( m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) \) is a strictly decrementing). Then, \( \beta(m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}))m_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) < \beta(m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}))m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) \).

Thus, \( \{\beta(m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}))m_b(x_n, x_{n+1})\} \) is strictly decreasing positive sequence in \( \mathbb{R}^+ \) which prove our claim as desired.

From Claim 1, we have \( \{\beta(m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}))m_b(x_n, x_{n+1})\} \) converges to some \( r' \geq 0 \). We consider the two following cases:

Case 1. \( r' = 0 \)

Since \( \lim_{n \to \infty} m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) \neq 0 \) so we have
\[
\exists \epsilon > 0, \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \exists n_k \geq k, m_b(x_{n_k}, x_{n_{k+1}}) \geq \epsilon.
\]

Now, let \( \epsilon' > 0 \) be given. Since \( \lim_{n \to \infty} \beta(m_b(x_{n_k}, x_{n_{k+1}}))m_b(x_{n_k}, x_{n_{k+1}}) = 0 \).

Therefore, using (4), we derive
\[
\exists k' \in \mathbb{N}, \forall k \geq k', \epsilon \beta(m_b(x_{n_k}, x_{n_{k+1}})) \leq \beta(m_b(x_{n_k}, x_{n_{k+1}}))m_b(x_{n_k}, x_{n_{k+1}}) < \epsilon'.
\]

It enforces that \( \lim_{n \to \infty} \beta(m_b(x_{n_k}, x_{n_{k+1}})) = 0 \).

By continuity of \( \beta \), we obtain \( \beta(r) = 0 \implies r = 0 \) which is a contradiction.

Case 2. \( r' > 0 \)

We can distinguish two subcases: \( r < r' \) and \( r > r' \).

If \( r < r' \), then \( \beta(m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}))m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) < \frac{1}{s}m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) \) and by taking the limit as \( n \) tends to infinity we get \( r' \leq \frac{r}{s} \leq r \) which is a contradiction with \( r' > 0 \).

If \( r > r' \), let \( \delta > 0 \) be such that satisfying (4) whenever \( \epsilon = r' \). We know there exists \( N_0 \in \mathbb{N} \) such that
\[
r' \leq \beta(m_b(x_{N_0}, x_{N_0+1}))m_b(x_{N_0}, x_{N_0+1}) < r' + \delta.
\]

Thus
\[
r < m_b(x_{N_0+1}, x_{N_0+2}) \leq \alpha(x_{N_0}, x_{N_0+1})m_b(Tx_{N_0}, Tx_{N_0+1}) < r' \leq r
\]

which leads to contradiction with \( 0 < r \leq m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \).
Thus, \( r = 0 \) and so \( \lim_{n \to \infty} m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) \).

Next, we intend to show that the sequence \( \{x_n\} \) is an \( m_b \)-Cauchy sequence. For this purpose, we will prove that for every \( \epsilon > 0 \) there exists \( N \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( \lim_{n,m \to \infty} m_b(x_n, x_m) - m_{b x_{n,m}} < \infty \). We will prove that for every \( \epsilon > 0 \), there exists \( N \in \mathbb{N} \) such that

\[
m_b(x_l, x_{l+k}) - m_{b x_{l,l+k}} < \epsilon. \tag{11}\]

Since the sequence \( \{m_b(x_n, x_{n+1})\} \to 0, n \to \infty \), for every \( \delta > 0 \) there exists \( N \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( m_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) < \delta \) for all \( n \geq N \). Choose \( \delta < \epsilon \). We will prove equation (11) by using induction on \( k \).

- for \( k = 1 \), we have \( m_b(x_l, x_{l+1}) < \epsilon \Rightarrow m_b(x_l, x_{l+1}) - m_{b x_{l,l+1}} < \epsilon \) so, (11) it clearly holds for all \( l \geq N \) (due to the choice of \( \delta \)).
- Assume that the inequality (11) holds for some \( k = m \), that is \( m_b(x_l, x_{l+m}) - m_{b x_{l,l+m}} < \epsilon \) \( \forall l \geq N \).

For \( k = m + 1 \), we have to show that

\[
m_b(x_l, x_{l+m+1}) - m_{b x_{l,l+m+1}} < \epsilon \quad \forall l \geq N. \tag{12}\]

Employing condition (4) of the definition for the \( M_b \)-metric space, we get

\[
m_b(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m}) - m_{b x_{l-1,l+m}} < s[m_b(x_{l-1}, x_l) - m_{b x_{l-1,l}} + m_b(x_l, x_{l+m}) - m_{b x_{l,l+m}} - m_b(x_l, x_l)]
\leq s[m_b(x_{l-1}, x_l) + m_b(x_l, x_{l+m})]
\leq s[\delta + \epsilon] \quad \forall l \geq N.
\]

If \( \beta(m_b(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m}))m_b(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m}) \geq \epsilon \), then we deduce

\[
\epsilon \leq \beta(m_b(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m}))m_b(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m})
\leq \beta(m_b(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m}))M(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m})
= \beta(m_b(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m}))\max[m_b(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m}), m_b(x_{l-1}, x_{l-1}), m_b(x_{l+m+1}, x_{l+m})]
\leq \beta(m_b(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m}))\max[s(\delta + \epsilon), \delta, \delta]
< \delta + \epsilon.
\]

Using (8) with \( x = x_{l-1}, y = x_{l+m} \), we find

\[
\epsilon \leq \beta(m_b(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m}))M(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m}) < \epsilon + \delta,
\]
then

\[
\alpha(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m})m_b(Tx_{l-1}, Tx_{l+m}) < \epsilon
\]
which gives \( m_b(x_l, x_{l+m+1}) < \epsilon \). Hence, (8) holds for \( k = m + 1 \).

If \( \beta(m_b(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m}))m_b(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m}) < \epsilon \), then

\[
\beta(m_b(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m}))M(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m}) = \beta(m_b(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m}))\max[m_b(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m}), m_b(x_{l-1}, x_{l-1}), m_b(x_{l+m+1}, x_{l+m})]
< \beta(m_b(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m}))\max[m_b(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m}), \delta, \delta]
< \epsilon.
\]
From Remark 1, we get
\[ \alpha(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m}) m_b(Tx_{l-1}, Tx_{l+m}) < \beta(m_b(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m})) M(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m}) < \epsilon \]
then
\[ \alpha(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m}) m_b(x_l, x_{l+m+1}) < \epsilon. \]
So
\[ m_b(x_l, x_{l+m+1}) < \alpha(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m}) m_b(x_l, x_{l+m+1}) < \epsilon \]
that is (11) holds for \( k = m + 1 \).

Note that \( M(x_{l-1}, x_{l+m}) > 0 \), otherwise \( m_b(x_l, x_{l-1}) = 0 \) and hence \( x_l = x_{l-1} \), which is contradiction. Thus, \( m_b(x_l, x_{l+k}) < \epsilon \) \( \forall l \geq N \) and \( k \geq 1 \), it means
\[ m_b(x_n, x_m) < \epsilon \ \forall \ m \geq n \geq N. \quad (13) \]

Hence, it is easy to deduce that \( \{x_n\} \) is an \( m_b \)-Cauchy sequence. Since \( X \) is a complete \( m_b \)-metric space, there exists \( u \in X \) such that
\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} (M_{b_{x_n}, u} - m_{b_{x_n}, u}) = 0. \]

Now, we will show that \( Tu = u \) for any \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). We have
\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} (M_{b_{x_n}, u} - m_{b_{x_n}, u}) = 0 \]
\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} (M_{b_{x_{n+1}}, u} - m_{b_{x_{n+1}}, u}) = 0 \]
\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} (M_{b_T x_n, u} - m_{b_T x_n, u}) = 0 \]
\[ M_b(Tu, u) - m_{b_{Tu}, u} = 0 \]

Then, \( M_{b_T u, u} = m_{b_{Tu}, u} \), and similarly by the convergence we obtain that \( m_b(Tu, u) = m_{b_{Tu}, u} \), which implies that \( Tu = u \) as desired. \( \square \)

Next, we prove the same result for a self mapping \( T \) on \( X \) which is an \( m_b \)-orbitally continuous generalized Meir-Keeler contraction of type (II).

**Theorem 4.** Let \((X, m_b)\) be a complete \( m_b \)-metric space, \( T : X \to X \) be a mapping. Assume that the following conditions are satisfied:

a) \( T \) is an \( m_b \)-orbitally continuous generalized Meir-Keeler contraction of type (II),
b) there exists \( x_0 \in X \) such that \( \alpha(x_0, Tx_0) \geq 1, \alpha(Tx_0, x_0) \),
c) If \( \{x_n\} \) is a sequence in \( X \) such that \( x_n \to z \) as \( n \to \infty \) and \( \alpha(x_n, x_m) \geq 1 \) for all \( n, m \in \mathbb{N} \), then \( \alpha(z, z) \geq 1 \),
d) \( s > 1 \) or \( \beta \) is a continuous function, then \( T \) has a unique fixed point in \( X \).

**Proof.** By remark 1, we have \( N(x, y) \leq M(x, y) \). Hence, similarly to the proof of theorem 3, the result of our theorem will follow as desired. \( \square \)

**Theorem 5.** Let \((X, m_b)\) be a complete \( m_b \)-metric space with coefficient \( s \) and satisfies the following conditions:
a) if \( \{x_n\} \) is a sequence in \( X \) which converges to \( z \) with respect to \( \tau_{m_b} \) and satisfies 
\[ \alpha(x_{n+1}, x_n) \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 1 \]
for all \( n \), then there exists a subsequence \( \{x_{n_k}\} \) of \( \{x_n\} \) such that 
\[ \alpha(x_k, x_{n_k}) \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha(x_{n_k}, x_k) \geq 1 \]
for all \( k \).

b) \( T : X \rightarrow X \) is a generalized Meir-Keeler contraction of type (II),

c) there exists \( x_0 \in X \) such that 
\[ \alpha(x_0, Tx_0) \geq 1, \quad \alpha(Tx_0, x_0) \geq 1 \]

d) \( s > 1 \) or \( \beta \) is a continuous function then, \( T \) has a fixed point in \( X \).

Proof. By the proof of theorem 2, one can easily deduce that \( \{x_n\} \) defined by 
\[ x_1 = T x_0 \quad \text{and} \quad x_{n+1} = T x_n \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}) \]
converges to some \( z \in X \) with \( m_b(z, z) = 0 \), by condition a), there exist a subsequence \( \{x_{n_k}\} \) of \( \{x_n\} \) such that 
\[ \alpha(z, x_{n_k}) \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha(x_{n_k}, z) \geq 1 \]
for all \( k \).

Note that, if \( N(z, x_{n_k}) = 0 \), then \( T_z = z \) and we are done.

Now, by remark 1 for all \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) we have
\[ m_b(T_z, x_{n+1}) = m_b(T_z, Tx_n) \leq \alpha(z, x_n)m_b(T_z, T x_{n_k}) \]
\[ < \beta(m_b(z, x_{n_k}))N(z, x_{n_k}). \]

Taking the limit \( k \rightarrow \infty \) we obtain
\[ \lim_{k \to \infty} N(z, x_{n_k}) = \max\{0, \frac{1}{2} m_b(T_z, z)\} = \frac{1}{2} m_b(T_z, z). \]

Thus,
\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} m_b(T_z, x_{n+1}) \leq \frac{1}{2s} m_b(T_z, z). \]

Hence,
\[ m_b(T_z, z) \leq sm_b(T_z, x_{n_k+1}) + sm_b(x_{n_k+1}, z). \]

Taking the limit \( k \rightarrow \infty \) we obtain
\[ m_b(T_z, z) \leq \frac{1}{2} m_b(T_z, z). \]

which implies \( m_b(T_z, z) = 0 \), similarly we can show that \( M_{b,T_z,z} = 0 \) and therefore, \( T_z = z \) as desired.
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1. Introduction

1.1. \(S\)-metric spaces

Very recently, Sedghi et al.\(^1\) have introduced the notion of an \(S\)-metric space and proved that this notion is a generalization of a \(G\)-metric space and \(D^*\)-metric space. Also, they have proved some properties of an \(S\)-metric and some fixed point results for a self-map on \(S\)-metric spaces. After that, many interesting results were obtained by transporting certain results in metric spaces and known generalizes metric spaces to \(S\)-metric spaces, see (\([2]-[10]\)).

First, we recall the definition of an \(S\)-metric space and some useful notions and lemmas for the following discussion.

In the sequel, the letters \(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{R}^+\) and \(\mathbb{R}\) will denote the sets of positive integers, nonnegative real numbers and real numbers, respectively.

Definition 1.1. \(^1\) Let \(X\) be a nonempty set. An \(S\)-metric on \(X\) is a function \(S : X^3 \mapsto [0, \infty)\) that satisfies the following conditions for \(\forall x, y, z, a \in X\):

\((S1)\) \(S(x, y, z) = 0\) if and only if \(x = y = z\);

\((S2)\) \(S(x, y, z) \leq S(x, x, a) + S(y, y, a) + S(z, z, a)\).
The pair \((X, S)\) is called an \(S\)-metric space.

Immediate examples of such \(S\)-metric spaces are:

1. Let \(X = \mathbb{R}^+\) and \(\| \cdot \|\) be a norm on \(X\), then \(S(x, y, z) = \|2x + y - 3z\| + \|x - z\|\) is an \(S\)-metric on \(X\), for \(\forall x, y, z \in X\).

2. Let \(X\) be a nonempty set, \(d\) is ordinary metric on \(X\), the \(S_d(x, y, z) = d(x, z) + d(y, z)\) is an \(S\)-metric on \(X\), for \(\forall x, y, z \in X\).

Lemma 1.1. [1] Let \((X, S)\) be an \(S\)-metric space. Then

\[
S(x, x, z) \leq 2S(x, x, y) + S(y, y, z), \text{ and } S(x, x, z) \leq 2S(x, x, y) + S(z, z, y),
\]

for \(\forall x, y, z \in X\).

Lemma 1.2. [1] Let \((X, S)\) be an \(S\)-metric space. Then \(S(x, x, y) = S(y, y, x)\), for \(\forall x, y \in X\).

Lemma 1.3. Let \((X, S)\) be an \(S\)-metric space. Then, for \(\forall x, y, z \in X\), it follows that

1. \(S(x, y, x) \leq S(x, x, y)\).
2. \(S(x, y, x) \leq S(x, x, y)\).
3. \(S(x, y, z) \leq S(x, x, z) + S(y, y, z)\).
4. \(S(x, y, z) \leq S(y, y, z) + S(x, x, z)\).
5. \(S(x, y, z) \leq S(y, y, x) + S(z, z, x)\).
6. \(S(x, x, z) \leq \frac{3}{2}[S(x, y, z) + S(y, y, x)]\).
7. \(S(x, y, z) \leq \frac{3}{2}[S(x, x, y) + S(y, y, z) + S(z, z, x)]\).

Proof. It follows from (S2) and Lemma 1.2, one can easily obtain (1) – (5). Now, we prove (6) and (7) also hold true.

By Lemma 1.1 and Lemma 1.2, we have

\[
2S(x, x, z) = S(x, x, z) + S(z, z, x)
\]

\[
\leq [2S(x, x, y) + S(y, y, z)] + [2S(z, z, y) + S(x, x, y)]
\]

\[
= 3[S(y, y, z) + S(y, y, x)].
\]

Hence, \(S(x, x, z) \leq \frac{3}{2}[S(y, y, z) + S(y, y, x)]\). Then (6) holds true.

By virtue of (3) – (5) and Lemma 1.2, we have \(3S(x, y, z) = 2[S(x, x, y) + S(y, y, z) + S(z, z, x)]\), which implies (7) holds true.

Definition 1.2. [1] Let \((X, S)\) be an \(S\)-metric space.

1. A sequence \(\{x_n\} \subset X\) is said to convergent to \(x \in X\) if \(S(x_n, x, x) \to 0\) as \(n \to \infty\). That is, for each \(\epsilon > 0\), there exists \(n_0 \in \mathbb{N}\) such that for \(\forall n \geq n_0\), we have \(S(x_n, x, x) < \epsilon\).

2. A sequence \(\{x_n\} \subset X\) is said to be a Cauchy sequence if \(S(x_n, x_n, x_m) \to 0\) as \(n, m \to \infty\). That is, for each \(\epsilon > 0\), there exists \(n_0 \in \mathbb{N}\) such that for \(\forall n, m \geq n_0\), we have \(S(x_n, x_n, x_m) < \epsilon\), or for each \(\epsilon > 0\), there exists \(n_0 \in \mathbb{N}\) such that for \(\forall l, n \geq n_0\), we have \(S(x_l, x_m, x_n) < \epsilon\).
(3) The $S$–metric space $(X, S)$ is said to be complete if every Cauchy sequence is a convergent sequence.

(4) A mapping $T : X \mapsto X$ is said to be $S$–continuous if $\{Tx_n\}$ is $S$–convergent to $Tx$, where $\{x_n\}$ is an $S$–convergent sequence converging to $x$.

**Lemma 1.4.** [1] Let $(X, S)$ be an $S$–metric space. If there exist sequences $\{x_n\}$ and $\{y_n\}$ such that $x_n \to x$ and $y_n \to y$ as $n \to \infty$, then $S(x_n, x_n, y_n) \to S(x, x, y)$.

**Lemma 1.5.** [1] Let $(X, S)$ be an $S$–metric space. If the sequences $\{x_n\}$ in $X$ such that $x_n \to x$, then $x$ is unique.

### 1.2. The generalized Ulam-Hyers Stability

The stability problem of functional equations, originated from a question of Ulam [11], in 1940, concerns the stability of group homomorphism which stated as follows:

Let $G_1$ be a group and $G_2$ be a metric group with a metric $d(\cdot, \cdot)$. Given $\epsilon > 0$, does there exist $\delta > 0$ such that if a function $h : G_1 \mapsto G_2$ satisfies the inequality

$$d(h(xy), h(x)h(y)) < \delta,$$

then there is a homomorphism $H : G_1 \mapsto G_2$ with $d(h(x), H(x)) < \epsilon$, $\forall x \in G_1$? If the answer is affirmative, then we say that the equation of homomorphism $H(xy) = H(x)H(y)$ is stable. The first affirmative partial answer to the equation of Ulam for Banach spaces was given by Hyers [12] in 1941. Thereafter, this type of stability is called the Ulam-Hyers stability and has attracted attentions of many mathematicians.

In particular, Ulam-Hyers stability results in fixed point theory and remarkable results on the stability of certain classes of functional equation via fixed point approach have been studied densely, see ([13]-[16]).

**Definition 1.3.** Let $(X, S)$ be an $S$–metric space and $T : X \mapsto X$ be a mapping. By definition, the fixed point equation

$$x = Tx, \ x \in X$$

is said to be generalized Ulam-Hyers stable in the framework of an $S$–metric space if there exists an increasing operator $\varphi : [0, \infty) \mapsto [0, \infty)$, continuous at 0 and $\varphi(0) = 0$, such that for each $\epsilon > 0$ and an $\epsilon$–solution $w^* \in X$, that is

$$S(w^*, Tw^*, Tw^*) \leq \epsilon,$$

there is a solution $x^* \in X$ of the fixed point equation (1) such that

$$S(w^*, x^*, x^*) \leq \varphi(\epsilon).$$

If $\varphi(t) = ct, \forall t \geq 0$, where $c > 0$, then (1) is said to be Ulam-Hyers stable in the framework of an $S$–metric space.
1.3. The generalized $(\gamma - \psi)$–Meir-Keeler contractive mappings

In 1969, Meir and Keeler [17] established a fixed point theorem in a metric space $(X, d)$ for mappings satisfying the condition that for each $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta(\epsilon) > 0$ such that

$$\epsilon \leq d(x, y) < \epsilon + \delta \implies d(Tx, Ty) < \epsilon,$$

(4)

\forall x, y \in X. This condition is called the Meri-Keeler contractive (MKC, for short) type condition.

Since then, many authors extended and improved this condition and established fixed point results for new generalized conditions, see Maiti and Pal [18], Park and Rhoades [19], Mongkolkeha and Kuman [20] and so on. On the other hand, Samet et al. [21] introduced the concepts of $\alpha - \psi$–contractive mapping and $\alpha$–admissible mapping in metric spaces. Also they proved a fixed point theorem for $\alpha - \psi$ contractive mappings in complete metric spaces using the concept of $\alpha$–admissible mappings.

Motivated by Samet’s work, Latif et al. [22] introduced a new type of a generalized $(\alpha - \psi)$–Meir-Keeler contractive mapping and established some interesting theorems on the existence of fixed points for such mappings via admissible mappings.

Admissible mappings in the setting of $S$–metric spaces can be defined as follows.

**Definition 1.4.** A mapping $T : X \mapsto X$ is called $\gamma$–admissible if for $\forall x, y, z \in X$, we have

$$\gamma(x, y, z) \geq 1 \implies \gamma(Tx, Ty, Tz) \geq 1,$$

where, $\gamma : X^3 \mapsto [0, \infty)$ is a given function. If in addition,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\gamma(x, y, y) \geq 1 \\
\gamma(y, z, z) \geq 1
\end{array} \right.$$

implies $\gamma(x, z, z) \geq 1$, \forall $x, y, z \in X$. Then $T$ is called triangular $\gamma$–admissible.

**Example 1.1.** Let $X = [1, \infty)$ and $T : X \mapsto X$. Define $Tx = x^2$ and $\gamma(x, y, z) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
2, & \text{if } x \geq y \geq z; \\
0, & \text{otherwise}.
\end{array} \right.$

Then $T$ is $\gamma$–admissible.

**Definition 1.5.** We say that:

1. A sequence $\{x_n\}$ in $X$ is $(T, \gamma)$–orbital if $x_n = T^n x_0$ and $\gamma(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) \geq 1$, \forall $n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$.
2. $T$ is $\gamma$–orbital continuous if, for every $(T, \gamma)$–orbital sequence $\{x_n\}$ in $X$ such that $x_n \to x$ as $n \to \infty$, there exists a subsequence $\{x_{n_k}\}$ of $\{x_n\}$ such that $Tx_{n_k} \to Tx$ as $k \to \infty$.
3. $X$ is $(T, \gamma)$–regular if, for every $(T, \gamma)$–orbital sequence $\{x_n\}$ in $X$ such that $x_n \to x$ as $n \to \infty$, there exists a subsequence $\{x_{n_k}\}$ of $\{x_n\}$ such that $\gamma(x_{n_k}, x, x) \geq 1$, \forall $k \in \mathbb{N}$.
4. $X$ is $\gamma$–regular if, for every sequence $\{x_n\}$ in $X$ such that $x_n \to x$ as $n \to \infty$ and $\gamma(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) \geq 1$, \forall $n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$, there exists a subsequence $\{x_{n_k}\}$ of $\{x_n\}$ such that $\gamma(x_{n_k}, x, x) \geq 1$, \forall $k \in \mathbb{N}$.
5. $X$ is $(T, \gamma)$–limit if, for every sequence $\{x_n\}$ in $X$ such that $x_n \to x$ as $n \to \infty$ and $\gamma(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) \geq 1$, \forall $n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$, then $\gamma(x, Tx, Tx) \geq 1$.

**Remark 1.1.** (1) If $T$ is continuous, then $T$ is $\gamma$–orbital continuous (for any $\gamma$).
(2) If $X$ is $\gamma$–regular, then $X$ is also $(T, \gamma)$–regular (for any $\gamma$).
Lemma 1.6. Let $\gamma : X^3 \mapsto [0, \infty)$ and $T : X \mapsto X$ be $\gamma$-admissible with triangular admissibility. Assume that there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $\gamma(x_0, Tx_0, Tx_0) \geq 1$. Define a sequence $\{x_n\}$ by $x_n = T^n x_0$. Then $\gamma(x_m, x_n, x_n) \geq 1$, for $\forall m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m < n$.

Proof. Since there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $\gamma(x_0, Tx_0, Tx_0) \geq 1$, then from the definition of $\gamma$-admissibility, we deduce that $\gamma(x_0, x_0, x_0) = \gamma(Tx_0, Tx_0, Tx_0) \geq 1$.

By continuing this process, we get $\gamma(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) \geq 1$, $\forall n \in 0 \cup \mathbb{N}$.

Suppose that $m < n$. Since

$$\gamma(x_m, x_{m+1}, x_{m+1}) \geq 1$$

$$\gamma(x_{m+1}, x_{m+2}, x_{m+2}) \geq 1,$$

by the definition of triangular $\gamma$-admissibility, we deduce that $\gamma(x_m, x_{m+2}, x_{m+2}) \geq 1$. By continuing this process, we get $\gamma(x_m, x_n, x_n) \geq 1$, $\forall m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m < n$. $\square$

Let $\Psi$ stand for the family of nondecreasing functions $\psi : [0, \infty) \mapsto [0, \infty)$ satisfying conditions:

(P1) $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \psi^n(t) < \infty$, $\forall t > 0$, where $\psi^n$ is the $n^{th}$ iterate of $\psi$;

(P2) $\psi(0) = 0$.

Remark 1.2. For every function $\psi : [0, \infty) \mapsto [0, \infty)$ the following holds:

if $\psi$ is nondecreasing, then for each $t > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \psi^n(t) = 0 \Rightarrow \psi(t) < t \Rightarrow \psi(0) = 0.$$ 

Therefore, if $\psi \in \Psi$, then for every $t > 0$, $\psi(t) < t$ and $\psi$ is continuous at 0.

Definition 1.6. Let $(X, S)$ be an $S$-metric space and $T : X \mapsto X$. The mapping $T$ is called a $(\gamma - \psi)$-Meir-Keeler contractive mapping if there exist two functions $\psi \in \Psi$ and $\gamma : X^3 \mapsto [0, \infty)$ satisfying the following condition: for each $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta(\epsilon) > 0$ such that

$$\epsilon \leq \psi(S(x, y, y)) < \epsilon + \delta(\epsilon) \implies \gamma(x, y, y)S(Tx, Ty, Ty) < \epsilon, \forall x, y \in X.$$ 

Remark 1.3. It is easily shown that if $T : X \mapsto X$ is a $(\gamma - \psi)$-Meir-Keeler contractive mapping, then

$$\gamma(x, y, y)S(Tx, Ty, Ty) < \psi(S(x, y, y)),$$

$\forall x, y \in X$, when $x \neq y$.

Definition 1.7. Let $(X, S)$ be an $S$-metric space and $T : X \mapsto X$. The mapping $T$ is called a $(\gamma - \psi)$-Meir-Keeler contractive mapping of dim3 if there exist two functions $\psi \in \Psi$ and $\gamma : X^3 \mapsto [0, \infty)$ satisfying the following condition: for each $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta(\epsilon) > 0$ such that

$$\epsilon \leq \psi(S(x, y, z)) < \epsilon + \delta(\epsilon) \implies \gamma(x, Tx, Tx)\gamma(y, Ty, Ty)\gamma(z, Tz, Tz)S(Tx, Ty, Tz) < \epsilon.$$ 

Remark 1.4. It is easily shown that if $T : X \mapsto X$ is a $(\gamma - \psi)$-Meir-Keeler contractive mapping of dim3, then

$$\gamma(x, Tx, Tx)\gamma(y, Ty, Ty)\gamma(z, Tz, Tz)S(Tx, Ty, Tz) < \psi(S(x, y, z)),$$

$\forall x, y, z \in X$ when $x \neq y \neq z$. 
Definition 1.8. Let \((X, S)\) be an \(S\)–metric space and \(T : X \mapsto X\). The mapping \(T\) is called a generalized \((\gamma - \psi)\)–Meir-Keeler contractive mapping of type \(A\) if there exist two functions \(\psi \in \Psi\) and \(\gamma : X^3 \mapsto [0, \infty)\) satisfying the following condition: for each \(\epsilon > 0\) there exists \(\delta(\epsilon) > 0\) such that

\[
\epsilon \leq \psi(M_1(x, y)) < \epsilon + \delta(\epsilon) \implies \gamma(x, y, y)S(Tx, Ty, Ty) < \epsilon,
\]

where \(M_1(x, y) = \max\{S(x, y, y), S(x, Tx, Tx), S(y, Ty, Ty)\}, \forall x, y \in X\).

Definition 1.9. Let \((X, S)\) be an \(S\)–metric space and \(T : X \mapsto X\). The mapping \(T\) is called a generalized \((\gamma - \psi)\)–Meir-Keeler contractive mapping of type \(B\) if there exist two functions \(\psi \in \Psi\) and \(\gamma : X^3 \mapsto [0, \infty)\) satisfying the following condition: for each \(\epsilon > 0\) there exists \(\delta(\epsilon) > 0\) such that

\[
\epsilon \leq \psi(M_2(x, y)) < \epsilon + \delta(\epsilon) \implies \gamma(x, y, y)S(Tx, Ty, Ty) < \epsilon,
\]

where \(M_2(x, y) = \max\{S(x, y, y), \frac{1}{2}[S(x, Tx, Tx) + S(y, Ty, Ty)]\}, \forall x, y \in X\).

Remark 1.5. (1) It is obviously that \(M_2(x, y) \leq M_1(x, y), \forall x, y \in X\), where \(M_1(x, y), M_2(x, y)\) are defined in Definition 1.8 and Definition 1.9, respectively.

(2) Let \(T : X \mapsto X\) be a generalized \((\gamma - \psi)\)–Meir-Keeler contractive mapping of type \(A\) (resp., type \(B\)). Then \(\gamma(x, y, y)S(Tx, Ty, Ty) < \psi(M_1(x, y)), (\text{resp.,}\ \psi(M_2(x, y))), \forall x, y \in X\).

Definition 1.10. Let \((X, S)\) be an \(S\)–metric space and \(T : X \mapsto X\). The mapping \(T\) is called a generalized \((\gamma - \psi)\)–Meir-Keeler contractive mapping of \(\text{dim3}\) of type \(A\) if there exist two functions \(\psi \in \Psi\) and \(\gamma : X^3 \mapsto [0, \infty)\) satisfying the following condition: for each \(\epsilon > 0\) there exists \(\delta(\epsilon) > 0\) such that

\[
\epsilon \leq \psi(M'_1(x, y, z)) < \epsilon + \delta(\epsilon) \implies \gamma(x, Tx, Tx)\gamma(y, Ty, Ty)\gamma(z, Tz, Tz)S(Tx, Ty, Tz) < \epsilon,
\]

where

\[
M'_1(x, y, z) = \max\{S(x, y, y), S(y, z, z), S(z, x, x), S(x, Tx, Tx), S(y, Ty, Ty)S(z, Tz, Tz)\}, \forall x, y, z \in X.
\]

Definition 1.11. Let \((X, S)\) be an \(S\)–metric space and \(T : X \mapsto X\). The mapping \(T\) is called a generalized \((\gamma - \psi)\)–Meir-Keeler contractive mapping of \(\text{dim3}\) of type \(B\) if there exist two functions \(\psi \in \Psi\) and \(\gamma : X^3 \mapsto [0, \infty)\) satisfying the following condition: for each \(\epsilon > 0\) there exists \(\delta(\epsilon) > 0\) such that

\[
\epsilon \leq \psi(M'_2(x, y, z)) < \epsilon + \delta(\epsilon) \implies \gamma(x, Tx, Tx)\gamma(y, Ty, Ty)\gamma(z, Tz, Tz)S(Tx, Ty, Ty) < \epsilon,
\]

where

\[
M'_2(x, y, z) = \max\{S(x, y, y), S(y, z, z), S(z, x, x), \frac{1}{2}[S(x, Tx, Tx) + S(y, Ty, Ty)]\}, \frac{1}{2}[S(y, Ty, Ty) + S(z, Tz, Tz)], \frac{1}{2}[S(z, Tz, Tz) + S(x, Tx, Tx)]\}, \forall x, y, z \in X.
\]

Remark 1.6. (1) It is obviously that \(M'_2(x, y, z) \leq M'_1(x, y, z), \forall x, y, z \in X\), where \(M'_1(x, y, z), M'_2(x, y, z)\) are defined in Definition 1.10 and Definition 1.11, respectively.

(2) Let \(T : X \mapsto X\) be a generalized \((\gamma - \psi)\)–Meir-Keeler contractive mapping of \(\text{dim3}\) of type \(A\) (resp., type \(B\)). Then \(\gamma(x, Tx, Tx)\gamma(y, Ty, Ty)\gamma(z, Tz, Tz)S(Tx, Ty, Tz) < \psi(M'_1(x, y, z)), (\text{resp.,}\ \psi(M'_2(x, y, z))), \forall x, y, z \in X\).
2. Fixed point theorems for several types of \((\gamma - \psi)\)-Meir-Keeler contractive mappings in \(S\)-metric spaces

In this section, by introducing the class of \((\gamma - \psi)\)-Meir-Keeler contractive mapping and the classes of generalized \((\gamma - \psi)\)-Meir-Keeler contractive mappings, we study the existence and uniqueness of fixed points for these contractive mappings via \(\gamma\)-admissible mappings.

**Proposition 2.1.** Assume that \(T\) is \(\gamma\)-admissible and \((\gamma - \psi)\)-Meir-Keeler contractive. Let \(x, y \in X\) such that \(\gamma(x, y, y) \geq 1\). Then

\[
\gamma(T^n x, T^n y, T^n y) \geq 1, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N},
\]

the sequence \(\{S(T^n x, T^n y, T^n y)\}\) is non-increasing, bounded and \(S(T^n x, T^n y, T^n y) \to 0\) as \(n \to \infty\).

**Proof.** Since \(T\) is \(\gamma\)-admissible and \(\gamma(x, y, y) \geq 1\), then (5) follows directly by induction on \(n\).

Next, let \(n \in \mathbb{N}\). If \(T^n x \neq T^n y\), by (5) and Remark 1.3, it follows that

\[
S(T^{n+1} x, T^{n+1} y, T^{n+1} y) \leq \gamma(T^n x, T^n y, T^n y)S(T^{n+1} x, T^{n+1} y, T^{n+1} y)
\]

\[
= \gamma(T^n x, T^n y, T^n y)S(T(T^n x), T(T^n y), T(T^n y))
\]

\[
< \psi(S(T^n x, T^n y, T^n y))
\]

\[
< S(T^n x, T^n y, T^n y).
\]

Else, if \(T^n x = T^n y\), then \(S(T^n x, T^n y, T^n y) = S(T^{n+1} x, T^{n+1} y, T^{n+1} y)\).

Eventually, we conclude that \(\{S(T^n x, T^n y, T^n y)\}\) is a non-increasing and bounded sequence.

Hence, there exists \(r \in [0, \infty)\) such that \(\lim_{n \to \infty} S(T^n x, T^n y, T^n y) = r\).

In what follows, we will prove that \(r = 0\). Suppose, on the contrary, that \(r > 0\). Since \(T\) is a \((\gamma - \psi)\)-Meir-Keeler contractive mapping, for \(\epsilon = \psi(r) > 0\), there exists \(\delta > 0\) and a \(p \in \mathbb{N}\) such that

\[
\epsilon \leq \psi(S(T^p x, T^p y, T^p y)) < \epsilon + \delta \quad \text{implies} \quad \gamma(T^p x, T^p y, T^p y)S(T^{p+1} x, T^{p+1} y, T^{p+1} y) < \epsilon.
\]

By taking (5) into account, we get that

\[
S(T^{p+1} x, T^{p+1} y, T^{p+1} y) < \epsilon = \psi(r) < r,
\]

which is a contradiction, since \(r = \inf\{S(T^n x, T^n y, T^n y)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}\).

Consequently, we have \(\lim_{n \to \infty} S(T^n x, T^n y, T^n y) = 0\). \(\square\)

**Proposition 2.2.** Assume that \(T\) is \(\gamma\)-admissible and \((\gamma - \psi)\)-Meir-Keeler contractive of dim3. Let \(x, y, z \in X\) such that \(\gamma(x, Tx, Tx) \geq 1\), \(\gamma(y, Ty, Ty) \geq 1\), \(\gamma(z, Tz, Tz) \geq 1\). Then

\[
\gamma(T^n x, T^n y, T^n z) \geq 1, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N},
\]

the sequence \(\{S(T^n x, T^n y, T^n z)\}\) is non-increasing, bounded and \(S(T^n x, T^n y, T^n z) \to 0\) as \(n \to \infty\).

**Proof.** Using similar process to the proof of Proposition 2.1, one can safely draw the conclusion. \(\square\)

**Theorem 2.1.** Let \((X, S)\) be a complete \(S\)-metric space and \(T : X \mapsto X\) be a \((\gamma - \psi)\)-MKC mapping. Assume that

\((A1)\) \(T\) is \(\gamma\)-admissible;
(A2) there exists \( x_0 \in X \) such that \( \gamma(x_0, Tx_0, Tx_0) \geq 1 \); 

(A3) \( T \) is \( \gamma \)-orbital continuous.

Then, there exists \( x^* \in X \) such that \( Tx^* = x^* \).

**Proof.** Due to assumption (A2), there exists \( x_0 \in X \) such that \( \gamma(x_0, Tx_0, Tx_0) \geq 1 \). Define an iterative sequence \( \{x_n\} \) in \( X \) by \( x_{n+1} = Tx_n \), \( \forall n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N} \). Note that if \( x_{n_0} = x_{n_0+1} \) for some \( n_0 \), then \( x^* = x_{n_0} \) is a fixed point of \( T \). So we suppose that \( x_n \neq x_{n+1} \) for \( \forall n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N} \). Since \( T \) is \( \gamma \)-admissible, we have that

\[
\gamma(x_0, x_1, x_1) = \gamma(x_0, Tx_0, Tx_0) \geq 1 \Rightarrow \gamma(Tx_0, Tx_1, Tx_1) = \gamma(x_1, x_2, x_2) \geq 1.
\]

By induction, we get that

\[
\gamma(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) \geq 1, \quad \forall n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}.
\] (7)

From (7) together with the assumption of the theorem that \( T \) is a \( (\gamma - \psi) \)-MKC mapping, it follows that for \( \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \), we have that

\[
S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) = S(Tx_{n-1}, Tx_n, Tx_n) \\
\leq \gamma(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n)S(Tx_{n-1}, Tx_n, Tx_n) \\
\leq \psi(S(x_{n-1}, x_n)).
\]

Since \( \psi \in \Psi \), by induction, we have that

\[
S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) < \psi^n(S(x_0, x_1, x_1)), \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.
\] (8)

Using (S2) and (8), for \( \forall m, n \in \mathbb{N} \) with \( m < n \), we have that

\[
S(x_m, x_n, x_n) \leq 2 \sum_{k=m}^{n-2} S(x_k, x_{k+1}, x_{k+1}) + S(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n) \\
\leq 2 \sum_{k=m}^{n-2} \psi^k(S(x_0, x_1, x_1)) + \psi^{n-1}(S(x_0, x_1, x_1)).
\]

Since \( \psi \in \Psi \) and \( S(x_0, x_1, x_1) > 0 \), by Remark 1.2, we get that

\[
\lim_{m,n \to \infty} S(x_m, x_n, x_n) = 0.
\]

This implies that \( \{x_n\} \) is a Cauchy sequence in the \( S \)-metric space \((X, S)\).

As \((X, S)\) is complete, then there exists \( x^* \in X \) such that

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} S(x_n, x_n, x^*) = 0.
\] (9)

Since \( T \) is \( \gamma \)-orbital continuous, then there exists a subsequence \( \{x_{n_k}\} \) of \( \{x_n\} \) such that \( Tx_{n_k} \) converges to \( Tx^* \) as \( k \to \infty \). By the uniqueness of this limit, we get \( x^* = Tx^* \), that is \( x^* \) is a fixed point of \( T \).

**Theorem 2.2.** Let \((X, S)\) be a complete \( S \)-metric space and \( T : X \to X \) be a \( (\gamma - \psi) \)-MKC mapping of dim3. Assume that
(A1) $T$ is $\gamma$–admissible;
(A2) there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $\gamma(x_0, Tx_0, Tx_0) \geq 1$;
(A3) $T$ is $\gamma$–orbital continuous.

Then, there exists $x^* \in X$ such that $Tx^* = x^*$.

**Proof.** Due to assumption (A2), there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $\gamma(x_0, Tx_0, Tx_0) \geq 1$. Define an iterative sequence $\{x_n\}$ in $X$ by $x_{n+1} = Tx_n$ for all $n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$. Note that if $x_{n_0} = x_{n_0+1}$ for some $n_0$, then $x^* = x_{n_0}$ is a fixed point of $T$. So we suppose that $x_n \neq x_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$. Since $T$ is $\gamma$–admissible, we have that

$$
\gamma(x_0, x_1, x_1) = \gamma(x_0, Tx_0, Tx_0) \geq 1 \Rightarrow \gamma(Tx_0, Tx_1, Tx_1) = \gamma(x_1, x_2, x_2) \geq 1.
$$

By induction, we get that

$$
\gamma(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) \geq 1, \quad \forall n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}. \quad (10)
$$

From (10) together with the assumption of the theorem that $T$ is a $(\gamma - \psi)$–MKC mapping of dim3, it follows that for $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that

$$
S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) = S(Tx_{n-1}, Tx_n, Tx_n)
\leq \gamma(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n) \gamma(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) S(Tx_{n-1}, Tx_n, Tx_n)
\leq \psi(S(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n)).
$$

Since $\psi \in \Psi$, by induction, we have that

$$
S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) < \psi^n(S(x_0, x_1, x_1)), \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.
$$

Using Lemma 1.3 and (10), for $l, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $l < m < n$, we have that

$$
S(x_l, x_m, x_n) \leq S(x_l, x_1, x_1) + S(x_m, x_m, x_n)
\leq 2 \sum_{k=l}^{m-2} S(x_k, x_{k+1}, x_{k+1}) + S(x_{m-1}, x_m, x_m) + 2 \sum_{k=m}^{n-2} S(x_k, x_{k+1}, x_{k+1}) + S(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n)
\leq 2 \sum_{k=l}^{m-2} \psi^k(S(x_0, x_1, x_1)) + \psi^{m-1}(S(x_0, x_1, x_1)) + 2 \sum_{k=m}^{n-2} \psi^k(S(x_0, x_1, x_1)) + \psi^{n-1}(S(x_0, x_1, x_1)).
$$

Since $\psi \in \Psi$ and $S(x_0, x_1, x_1) > 0$, by Remark 1.2, we get that

$$
\lim_{l, m, n \to \infty} S(x_l, x_m, x_n) = 0.
$$

This implies that $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in the $S$–metric space $(X, S)$.

As $(X, S)$ is complete, then there exists $x^* \in X$ such that

$$
\lim_{n \to \infty} S(x_n, x_n, x^*) = 0.
$$

Since $T$ is $\gamma$–orbital continuous, then there exists a subsequence $\{x_{n_k}\}$ of $\{x_n\}$ such that $Tx_{n_k}$ converges to $Tx^*$ as $k \to \infty$. By the uniqueness of this limit, we get $x^* = Tx^*$, that is $x^*$ is a fixed point of $T$. \qed
In the next theorems, we replace the $\gamma$–orbital continuity of $T$ by a regularity condition or $(T – \gamma)$–limit condition over the $S$–metric spaces $(X, S)$.

**Theorem 2.3.** Let $(X, S)$ be a complete $S$–metric space and $T : X \mapsto X$ be a $(\gamma – \psi)$–MKC mapping. Assume that

(A1) $T$ is $\gamma$–admissible;

(A2) there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $\gamma(x_0, Tx_0, Tx_0) \geq 1$;

(A3) $(X, S)$ is $(T, \gamma)$–regular.

Then, there exists $x^* \in X$ such that $Tx^* = x^*$.

**Proof.** Following the line of the proof of Theorem 2.1, it follows that the sequence $\{x_n\}$ defined by $x_{n+1} = Tx_n, \forall n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$ is a Cauchy sequence in the complete $S$–metric space $(X, S)$, that is convergent to $x^* \in X$.

Since $\{x_n\}$ is a $(T, \gamma)$–orbital sequence, by (A3), there exists a subsequence $\{x_{n_k}\}$ of $\{x_n\}$ such that

$$\gamma(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*) \geq 1, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (11)$$

Using Remark 1.3 and (11), we have that

$$S(x_{n_k+1}, Tx^*, Tx^*) = S(Tx_{n_k}, Tx^*, Tx^*) \leq \gamma(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*)S(Tx_{n_k}, Tx^*, Tx^*) \leq \psi(S(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*)).$$

Letting $k \to \infty$, since $\psi$ is continuous at $t = 0$, it follows that $S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) = 0$, then $x^* = Tx^*$.

**Theorem 2.4.** Let $(X, S)$ be a complete $S$–metric space and $T : X \mapsto X$ be a $(\gamma – \psi)$–MKC mapping of dim3. Assume that

(A1) $T$ is $\gamma$–admissible;

(A2) there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $\gamma(x_0, Tx_0, Tx_0) \geq 1$;

(A3) $(X, S)$ is $(T, \gamma)$–limit.

Then, there exists $x^* \in X$ such that $Tx^* = x^*$.

**Proof.** Following the line of the proof of Theorem 2.1, it follows that the sequence $\{x_n\}$ defined by $x_{n+1} = Tx_n, \forall n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$ is a Cauchy sequence in the complete $S$–metric space $(X, S)$, that is convergent to $x^* \in X$.

By (A3), we have

$$\gamma(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) \geq 1. \quad (12)$$

Using Remark 1.4 and (12), we have that

$$S(x_{n+1}, Tx^*, Tx^*) = S(Tx_n, Tx^*, Tx^*) \leq \gamma(x_{n+1}, x^*)\gamma(x^*, Tx^*)\gamma(x^*, Tx^*)S(Tx_n, Tx^*, Tx^*) \leq \psi(S(x_n, x^*, x^*)).$$

Letting $n \to \infty$, since $\psi$ is continuous at $t = 0$, it follows that $S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) = 0$, then $x^* = Tx^*$.
Example 2.1. Let $X = [0, \infty)$ be an $S$–metric space with the $S$–metric defined by $S(x, y, z) = |x - z| + |y - z|$, $\forall x, y, z \in X$. For $\forall k > 1$, consider the self-mapping $T : X \mapsto X$ given by

$$T_x = \begin{cases} e^{x^{-1}}, & x \geq 1, \\ \frac{x^2}{4}, & 0 \leq x < 1. \end{cases}$$

Also, define $\gamma : X^3 \mapsto [0, 1]$ as

$$\gamma(x, y, z) = \begin{cases} 1, & x, y, z \in [0, 1), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$

Let $\psi(t) = \frac{t}{2}$ for $t \geq 0$.

Clearly, $T$ is not continuous at $x = 1$. Then we will claim that $T$ is a $(\gamma - \psi)$–MKC.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. Take $\delta = \epsilon$ and suppose that $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}|x - y| < \epsilon + \delta$, we want to show that $\gamma(x, y, y)S(Tx, Ty, Ty) < \epsilon$.

Suppose that $\gamma(x, y, y) = 1$, then $x, y \in [0, \infty)$ and $|x + y| < 2$. So $Tx = \frac{x^2}{4} \in [0, 1)$, $Ty = \frac{y^2}{4} \in [0, 1)$.

Hence, $S(Tx, Ty, Ty) = \frac{|x^2 - y^2|}{4} = \frac{|x+y||x-y|}{4} < \frac{|x-y|}{2} < \frac{\epsilon \delta}{2} < \epsilon$.

Also, $T$ is $\gamma$–admissible. To see that, let $x, y, z \in X$ such that $\gamma(x, y, z) \geq 1$, which implies that $x, y, z \in [0, 1)$. Due to the definitions of $\gamma$ and $T$, we have that

$$Tx = \frac{x^2}{4} \in [0, 1), \quad Ty = \frac{y^2}{4} \in [0, 1), \quad Tz = \frac{z^2}{4} \in [0, 1).$$

Hence, $\gamma(Tx, Ty, Ty) \geq 1$. Moreover, there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $\gamma(x_0, Tx_0, Tx_0) \geq 1$. Indeed, for any $x_0 \in [0, 1)$, we have $\gamma(x_0, \frac{x_0^2}{4}, \frac{x_0^2}{4}) \geq 1$.

Finally, let $\{x_n\}$ be a $\{T, \gamma\}$–orbital sequence such that $x_n \to x$ as $n \to \infty$. By the definition of $\gamma$, we have that $x_n \in [0, 1)$. Then there exists a subsequence $\{x_{n_k}\}$ of $\{x_n\}$ such that $\gamma(x_{n_k}, x, x) \geq 1$, $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}$.

So we conclude that all the hypotheses of Theorem 2.3 are fulfilled. In fact, 0 and 1 are two fixed points of $T$.

Example 2.2. Let $X = [0, \infty)$ be an $S$–metric space with the $S$–metric defined by $S(x, y, z) = |x - z| + |y - z|$, $\forall x, y, z \in X$. For $\forall k > 1$, consider the self-mapping $T : X \mapsto X$ given by

$$T_x = \begin{cases} xe^{-x}, & x \geq 1, \\ \frac{x^2}{4}, & 0 \leq x < 1. \end{cases}$$

Also, define $\gamma : X^3 \mapsto [0, 1]$ as

$$\gamma(x, y, z) = \begin{cases} 1, & x, y, z \in [0, 1), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$

Let $\psi(t) = \frac{t}{2}$ for $t \geq 0$.

Clearly, $T$ is not continuous at $x = 1$. Then we will claim that $T$ is a $(\gamma - \psi)$–MKC mapping of dim3.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. Take $\delta = \epsilon$ and suppose that $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}|x - y| < \epsilon + \delta$, we want to show that $\gamma(x, Tx, Tx)\gamma(y, Ty, Ty)\gamma(x, Tz, Tz)S(Tx, Ty, Tz) < \epsilon$.

Suppose that $\gamma(x, Tx, Tx) = \gamma(y, Ty, Ty) = \gamma(x, Tz, Tz) = 1$, then $x, y, z \in [0, 1)$ and $|x + y| < 2, |y + z| < 2$. So $Tx = \frac{x^2}{4} \in [0, 1)$, $Ty = \frac{y^2}{4} \in [0, 1)$, $Tz = \frac{z^2}{4} \in [0, 1)$. 
Hence,

\[
S(Tx, Ty, Tz) = \left| \frac{x^2}{4} - \frac{y^2}{4} \right| + \left| \frac{y^2}{4} - \frac{z^2}{4} \right|
\]

\[
= \left| \frac{x^2 - y^2}{4} \right| + \left| \frac{y^2 - z^2}{4} \right|
\]

\[
= \left| \frac{x + y}{2} \right| \left| x - y \right| + \left| \frac{y + z}{2} \right| \left| y - z \right|
\]

\[
< \frac{|x - y|}{2} + \frac{|y - z|}{2}
\]

\[
< \frac{\epsilon + \delta}{2} = \epsilon.
\]

Also, \(T\) is \(\gamma\)-admissible. To see that, let \(x, y, z \in X\) such that \(\gamma(x, y, z) \geq 1\), which implies that \(x, y, z \in [0, 1)\). Due to the definitions of \(\gamma\) and \(T\), we have that

\[
Tx = \frac{x^2}{4} \in [0, 1), \quad Ty = \frac{y^2}{4} \in [0, 1), \quad Tz = \frac{z^2}{4} \in [0, 1).
\]

Hence, \(\gamma(Tx, Ty, Tz) \geq 1\). Moreover, there exists \(x_0 \in X\) such that \(\gamma(x_0, Tx_0, Tx_0) \geq 1\). Indeed, for any \(x_0 \in [0, 1)\), we have \(\gamma(x_0, \frac{x_0^2}{4}, \frac{x_0^2}{4}) \geq 1\).

Finally, let \(\{x_n\}\) be a sequence such that \(x_n \to x\) as \(n \to \infty\) with \(\gamma(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) \geq 1\). By the definition of \(\gamma\), we have that \(x, Tx \in [0, 1)\). Then \(\gamma(x, Tx, Tx) \geq 1\).

So we conclude that all the hypotheses of Theorem 2.4 are fulfilled. In fact, 0 and 1 are two fixed points of \(T\).

Now, we propose the following conditions for the uniqueness of a fixed point of a \((\gamma - \psi)\)-MKC mapping and a \((\gamma - \psi)\)-MKC mapping of dim3. Let \(Fix(T)\) denote the set of fixed points of the mapping \(T\).

**Theorem 2.5.** Adding the condition \((U1)\) to the hypotheses of Theorem 2.1(resp.Theorem 2.3), we obtain the uniqueness of a fixed point \(T\).

**Proof.** Let \(u, v \in X\) be two fixed points of \(T\). By \((U1)\), there exists \(z \in X\) such that \(\gamma(u, z, z) \geq 1\) and \(\gamma(v, z, z) \geq 1\).

Since \(T\) is \(\gamma\)-admissible, we get by induction that

\[
\gamma(u, u, T^n z) \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma(v, v, T^n z) \geq 1, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.
\]

From (13), we have that

\[
S(u, u, T^n z) = S(Tu, Tu, T(T^{n-1} z))
\]

\[
\leq \gamma(u, u, T^{n-1} z)S(Tu, Tu, T(T^{n-1} z))
\]

\[
< \psi(S(u, u, T^{n-1} z)).
\]

Iteratively, we get

\[
S(u, u, T^n z) < \psi^n(S(u, u, z)).
\]
Letting $n \to \infty$, and since $\psi \in \Psi$, we have that
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} S(u, u, T^n z) = 0.
\] (14)

Similarly, we also can get
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} S(v, v, T^n z) = 0.
\] (15)

Combining (14) and (15), it follows that $T^n z \to u$ and $T^n z \to v$, as $n \to \infty$.

By Lemma 1.5, we get $u = v$, that is, fixed point of $T$ is unique.

As an alternative uniqueness condition for fixed points of $(\gamma - \psi)$–MKC mappings, we suggest the following hypothesis:

(U2) For $\forall x, y \in \text{Fix}(T)$, then $\gamma(x, y, y) \geq 1$.

**Theorem 2.6.** Adding the condition (U2) to the hypotheses of Theorem 2.1(resp. Theorem 2.3), we obtain the uniqueness of a fixed point $T$.

**Proof.** Let $u, v$ be two distinct fixed points of $T$. Then $\gamma(u, v, v) > 0$.

Due to the property of $\psi$, we get that
\[
\psi(S(u, v, v)) > 0.
\]

Let $\epsilon = \psi(S(u, v, v)) > 0$; then, for any $\delta > 0$, we find that
\[
\epsilon = \psi(S(u, v, v)) < \epsilon + \delta.
\]

Considering (U2) and the assumption of theorem that $T$ is a $(\gamma - \psi)$–MKC mapping, we obtain that
\[
S(u, v, v) \leq \gamma(u, v, v)S(Tu, Tv, Tv) < \psi(S(u, v, v)) < S(u, v, v),
\]
which is a contradiction. Then $u = v$. \hfill \square

As a uniqueness condition for fixed points of $(\gamma - \psi)$–MKC mappings of dim3, we suggest the following hypothesis:

(U3) For $\forall x \in \text{Fix}(T)$, then $\gamma(x, x, x) \geq 1$.

**Theorem 2.7.** Adding the condition (U3) to the hypotheses of Theorem 2.2(resp. Theorem 2.4), we obtain the uniqueness of a fixed point $T$.

**Proof.** Let $u, v$ be two distinct fixed points of $T$.

Due to the property of $\psi$, we get that $\psi(S(u, v, v)) > 0$.

Let $\epsilon = \psi(S(u, v, v)) > 0$; then, for any $\delta > 0$, we find that
\[
\epsilon = \psi(S(u, v, v)) < \epsilon + \delta.
\]

Considering (U3) and the assumption of theorem that $T$ is a $(\gamma - \psi)$–MKC mapping of dim3, we obtain that
\[
S(u, v, v) \leq \gamma(u, Tu, Tu)\gamma(v, Tv, Tv)\gamma(v, Tv, Tv)S(Tu, Tv, Tv) < \psi(S(u, v, v)) < S(u, v, v),
\]
which is a contradiction. Then $u = v$. \hfill \square
Theorem 2.8. Let \((X, S)\) be a complete \(S\)-metric space and \(T : X \mapsto X\) be a generalized \((\gamma - \psi)\)-MKC mapping of type \(A\). Assume also that:

(A1) \(T\) is triangular \(\gamma\)-admissible;

(A2) there exists \(x_0 \in X\) such that \(\gamma(x_0, Tx_0, Tx_0) \geq 1\);

(A3) \((X, S)\) is \((T, \gamma)\)-regular.

Then, there exists \(x^* \in X\) such that \(Tx^* = x^*\).

Proof. In view of assumption (A2), let \(x_0 \in X\) be such that \(\gamma(x_0, Tx_0, Tx_0) \geq 1\).

Define the sequence \(\{x_n\}\) in \(X\) by \(x_{n+1} = Tx_n, \forall n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}\). Without loss of generality, we assume that \(x_n \neq x_{n+1}, \forall n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}\), then

\[
S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) > 0, \quad \forall n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}.
\]  

(16)

Indeed, if there exists some \(n_0 \in \mathbb{N}\) such that \(x_{n_0} = x_{n_0+1}\), then the proof is complete, since \(x^* = x_{n_0+1} = Tx_{n_0} = Tx^*\). Since \(T\) is triangular \(\gamma\)-admissible, by Lemma 1.6, we have that

\[
\gamma(x_n, x_m, x_m) \geq 1, \quad \forall n, m \in \mathbb{N} \text{ with } n < m.
\]

(17)

Step1. We will prove that

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) = 0.
\]

(18)

Taking (16) and (17) into account together with the fact that \(T\) is generalized \((\gamma - \psi)\)-MKC mapping of type \(A\), for each \(n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}\), we get

\[
S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) = S(Tx_{n-1}, Tx_n, Tx_n)
\]

\[
\leq \gamma(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n)S(Tx_{n-1}, Tx_n, Tx_n)
\]

\[
\leq \psi(M_1(x_{n-1}, x_n))
\]

\[
< \psi(M_1(x_{n-1}, x_n)),
\]

where

\[
M_1(x_{n-1}, x_n) = \max\{S(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n), S(x_{n-1}, Tx_{n-1}, Tx_{n-1}), S(x_n, Tx_n, Tx_n)\}
\]

\[
= \max\{S(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n), S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1})\}.
\]

If \(M_1(x_{n-1}, x_n) = S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1})\). Since \(\psi\) is nondecreasing, from the inequality above, we have that

\[
S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) \leq \psi(S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1})) < S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}), \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N},
\]

which is a contradiction. Thus, \(M_1(x_{n-1}, x_n) = S(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n)\) and we also have that

\[
S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) \leq \psi(S(x_n, x_n, x_n)) < S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}), \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.
\]

(19)

So, we deduce that the sequence \(\{S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1})\}\) is non-increasing and bounded below by zero. Hence, there exists \(t \in [0, \infty)\) such that

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) = t.
\]

(20)
Iteratively, we derive from (19) that
\[ S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) \leq \psi^n(S(x_0, x_1, x_1)), \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \] (21)

On account of (21) and Remark 1.2, we obtain
\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) = 0. \] (22)

Step 2. We will show that \( \{x_n\} \) is a Cauchy sequence.

Suppose, on the contrary, that there exist \( \epsilon > 0 \) and a subsequence \( \{x_{n(i)}\} \) of \( \{x_n\} \) such that
\[ S(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i+1)}, x_{n(i+1)}) > 2\epsilon. \] (23)

First, we will show that the existence of \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( n(i) < k \leq n(i+1) \). Later, we will prove that for given \( \epsilon > 0 \) above, there exists \( \delta > 0 \) such that
\[ \frac{\epsilon}{2} < \psi(M_1(x_{n(i)}, x_k)) < \frac{\epsilon + \delta}{2}, \]

but
\[ \gamma(x_{n(i)}, x_k, x_k)S(Tx_{n(i)}, Tx_k, Tx_k) \geq \epsilon, \]

which contradicts (23), where \( M_1(x_{n(i)}, x_k) = \max\{S(x_{n(i)}, x_k, x_k), S(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i)+1}, x_{n(i)+1}), S(x_k, x_{k+1}, x_{k+1})\} \)

Let \( r = \min\{\epsilon, \frac{\delta}{2}\} \). Taking Step 1 into account, we will choose \( n_0 \in \mathbb{N} \) such that
\[ S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) < \frac{r}{8}, \] (24)

for all \( n > n_0 \). Let \( n(i) > n_0 \). According to our construction, we have \( n(i) \leq n(i+1) - 1 \).

If \( S(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i)+1}, x_{n(i)+1}) < \frac{\epsilon + r}{2} \), then by Lemma 1.1, we have
\[
S(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i)+1}, n_{n(i)+1}) \leq 2S(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i)+1}, n_{n(i)+1}) + S(x_{n(i)+1}, x_{n(i)+1}, n_{n(i)+1}) \\
\leq \epsilon + r + \frac{r}{8} \\
= \epsilon + \frac{7r}{8} \\
< 2\epsilon,
\]

which contradicts (23). Consequently, there exist values of \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( n(i) \leq k \leq n(i+1) \) and
\[ S(x_{n(i)}, x_k, x_k) > \frac{\epsilon + r}{2}. \]

Indeed, if \( S(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i)+1}, x_{n(i)+1}) \geq \frac{\epsilon + r}{2} \), then we have \( S(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i)+1}, x_{n(i)+1}) \geq \frac{r}{8} \), which contradicts (24).

Hence, we can choose the smallest integer \( k > n(i) \) such that
\[ S(x_{n(i)}, x_k, x_k) \geq \frac{\epsilon + r}{2}. \]

So, necessarily, we also have \( S(x_{n(i)}, x_{k-1}, x_{k-1}) < \frac{\epsilon + r}{2} \).

Therefore, we find that
\[
S(x_{n(i)}, x_k, x_k) \leq 2S(x_k, x_{k-1}, x_{k-1}) + S(x_{n(i)}, x_{k-1}, x_{k-1}) \\
< 2 \cdot \frac{r}{8} + \frac{\epsilon + r}{2} \\
= \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{3r}{4}.
\]
Hence, we get the following approximation:

\[
\frac{\epsilon + r}{2} \leq S(x_{n(i)}, x_k, x_k) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{3r}{4},
\]

for a integer \(k\) satisfying \(n(i) \leq k \leq n(i + 1)\).

On the other hand, the three terms of \(M_1(x_{n(i)}, x_k)\) are bounded above by \(\frac{\epsilon}{2} + r\), that is

\[
\begin{align*}
S(x_{n(i)}, x_k, x_k) &< \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{3r}{4} < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + r, \\
S(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i)+1}, x_{n(i)+1}) &< \frac{r}{8} < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + r, \\
S(x_k, x_{k+1}, x_{k+1}) &< \frac{r}{8} < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + r.
\end{align*}
\]

Combining these estimations presented above, we conclude that

\[
\psi(M_1(x_{n(i)}, x_k)) < M_1(x_{n(i)}, x_k) < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + r < \frac{\epsilon + \delta}{2}.
\]

Since \(T\) is generalized \((\gamma - \psi)\)-MKC mapping of type of \(A\) and it is \(\gamma\)-triangular admissible mapping, we have that

\[
S(x_{n(i)+1}, x_{k+1}, x_{k+1}) \leq \gamma(x_{n(i)}, x_k, x_k)S(x_{n(i)+1}, x_{k+1}, x_{k+1}) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}.
\]

At the same time, by Lemma 1.1, we have that

\[
\begin{align*}
S(x_{n(i)}, x_k, x_k) &\leq 2S(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i)+1}, x_{n(i)+1}) + S(x_{n(i)+1}, x_k, x_k) \\
&\leq 2S(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i)+1}, x_{n(i)+1}) + 2S(x_k, x_{k+1}, x_{k+1}) + S(x_{n(i)+1}, x_{k+1}, x_{k+1}) \\
&< 2 \cdot \frac{r}{8} + 2 \cdot \frac{r}{8} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \\
&= \frac{\epsilon + r}{2},
\end{align*}
\]

which contradicts (25).

Thus, claim (23) is false and the sequence \(\{x_n\}\) is a Cauchy sequence, that is

\[
\lim_{n,m \to \infty} S(x_n, x_m, x_m) = 0. \quad (26)
\]

Since \((X, S)\) is a complete \(S\)-metric space, then there exists \(x^* \in X\) such that

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} S(x_n, x^*, x^*) = \lim_{n,m \to \infty} S(x_n, x_m, x^*) = 0. \quad (27)
\]

We will prove that \(x^* = Tx^*.\) Suppose, on the contrary, that \(S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) > 0\).

From (27) and assumption (A3), there exists a subsequence \(\{x_{n_k}\}\) of \(\{x_n\}\) such that

\[
\gamma(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*) \geq 1, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (28)
\]

By using Lemma 1.1 and (28) together with the assumption of the theorem that \(T\) is a generalized \((\gamma - \psi)\)-MKC mapping of type \(A\), we get that

\[
\begin{align*}
S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) &\leq 2S(Tx_{n_k}, Tx^*, Tx^*) + S(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*) \\
&\leq 2\gamma(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*)S(Tx_{n_k}, Tx^*, Tx^*) + S(x_{n_k+1}, x^*, x^*) \\
&\leq \psi(M_1(x_{n_k}, x^*)) + S(x_{n_k+1}, x^*, x^*),
\end{align*}
\]
where, \( M_1(x_{n_k}, x^*) = \max\{S(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*), S(x_{n_k}, x_{n_k+1}, x_{n_k+1}), S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*)\} \). Suppose that \( M_1(x_{n_k}, x^*) = S(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*) \), then from the above inequality, we get that

\[
S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) \leq \psi(S(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*)) + S(x_{n_k+1}, x^*, x^*) < S(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*) + S(x_{n_k+1}, x^*, x^*).
\]

Taking \( k \to \infty \) in the inequality above, we have

\[
S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) < 2S(x^*, x^*) = 0,
\]

which is a contradiction. Next, we suppose that \( M_1(x_{n_k}, x^*) = S(x_{n_k}, x_{n_k+1}, x_{n_k+1}) \), then we have that

\[
S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) \leq \psi(S(x_{n_k}, x_{n_k+1}, x_{n_k+1})) + S(x_{n_k+1}, x^*, x^*) < S(x_{n_k}, x_{n_k+1}, x_{n_k+1}) + S(x_{n_k+1}, x^*, x^*).
\]

Taking \( k \to \infty \) in the inequality above, this implies that

\[
S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) < \lim\limits_{k \to \infty} [S(x_{n_k}, x_{n_k+1}, x_{n_k+1}) + S(x_{n_k+1}, x^*, x^*)] = 0,
\]

which is again a contradiction. Finally, we suppose that \( M_1(x_{n_k}, x^*) = S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) \), then we obtain that

\[
S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) < \psi(S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*)) + S(x_{n_k+1}, x^*, x^*). \tag{29}
\]

Letting \( k \to \infty \) in (29), we get that

\[
S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) < \psi(S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*)) + S(x^*, x^*, x^*) < S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) + S(x^*, x^*, x^*) = S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*),
\]

so we also have a contradiction. Thus, we have \( S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) = 0 \), and by (S1) in Definition 1.1, we have \( x^* = Tx^* \).

**Theorem 2.9.** Let \((X, S)\) be a complete \(S\)-metric space and \(T : X \to X\) be a generalized \((\gamma - \psi)\)-MKC mapping of dim3 of type \(A\). Assume also that:

(A1) \(T\) is triangular \(\gamma\)-admissible;

(A2) there exists \(x_0 \in X\) such that \(\gamma(x_0, Tx_0, Tx_0) \geq 1\);

(A3) \((X, S)\) is \((T, \gamma)\)-limit.

Then, there exists \(x^* \in X\) such that \(Tx^* = x^*\).

**Proof.** In view of assumption (A2), let \(x_0 \in X\) be such that \(\gamma(x_0, Tx_0, Tx_0) \geq 1\). Define the sequence \(\{x_n\}\) in \(X\) by \(x_{n+1} = Tx_n\), for all \(n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}\). Without loss of generality, we assume that \(x_n \neq x_{n+1}\), for \(\forall n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}\), then

\[
S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) > 0, \quad \forall n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}. \tag{30}
\]
Indeed, if there exists some \( n_0 \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( x_{n_0} = x_{n_0 + 1} \), then the proof is complete, since \( x^* = x_{n_0 + 1} =Tx_{n_0} = Tx^* \). Since \( T \) is triangular \( \gamma \)-admissible, by Lemma 1.6, we have that
\[
\gamma(x_m, x_n, x_m) \geq 1, \quad \forall m, n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ with } m < n. \tag{31}
\]

Step 1. We will prove that
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) = 0.
\]
Taking (30) and (31) into account together with the fact that \( T \) is generalized \((\gamma - \psi)\)-MKC mapping of dim 3 of type \( A \), for each \( n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N} \), we get
\[
S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) = S(Tx_{n-1}, Tx_n, Tx_n)
\]
\[
\leq \gamma(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n)\gamma(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1})\gamma(x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1})S(Tx_{n-1}, Tx_n, Tx_n)
\]
\[
\leq \psi(M'_1(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n))
\]
\[
< M'_1(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n),
\]
where
\[
M'_1(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n) = \max\{S(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n), S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1})S(x_n, x_n, x_{n-1})
\]
\[
S(x_{n-1}, Tx_{n-1}, Tx_{n-1}), S(x_n, Tx_n, Tx_n), S(x_n, Tx_n, Tx_n)\}
\[
= \max\{S(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n), S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1})\}.\]

If \( M'_1(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n) = S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) \). Since \( \psi \) is nondecreasing, from the inequality above, we have that
\[
S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) \leq \psi(S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1})) < S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}), \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N},
\]
which is a contradiction. Thus, \( M'_1(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n) = S(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n) \) and we also have that
\[
S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) \leq \psi(S(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n)) < S(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n), \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{32}
\]

So, we deduce that the sequence \( \{S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1})\} \) is non-increasing and bounded below by zero. Hence, there exists \( t \in [0, \infty) \) such that
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) = t.
\]

Iteratively, we derive from (32) that
\[
S(x_{n}, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) \leq \psi^n(S(x_0, x_1, x_1)), \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{33}
\]

On account of (33) and Remark 1.2, we obtain
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) = 0.
\]

Step 2. We will show that \( \{x_n\} \) is a Cauchy sequence.
We will prove that for each \( \epsilon > 0 \), there exists \( n_0 \in \mathbb{N} \) such that for \( \forall m, n \geq n_0 \),
\[
S(x_m, x_m, x_n) < \epsilon. \tag{34}
\]
Taking Step1 into account, for each \( \epsilon > 0 \), we can choose \( n_0 \in \mathbb{N} \) such that
\[
S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) < \frac{\epsilon - \psi(\epsilon)}{2}, \forall n \geq n_0.
\] (35)

We prove (34) by induction on \( n \). (34) holds for \( m = n \) and \( n = n + 1 \) by using (35) and the fact that \( \frac{\epsilon - \psi(\epsilon)}{2} < \epsilon \). Assume (34) holds for \( n = k \). For \( n = k + 1 \), we have
\[
S(x_m, x_{k+1}, x_{k+1}) \leq 2S(x_m, x_{m+1}, x_{m+1}) + S(x_{m+1}, x_{k+1}, x_{k+1}) \\
\leq \epsilon - \psi(\epsilon) + \psi(S(x_m, x_k, x_k)) \\
\leq \epsilon - \psi(\epsilon) + \psi(\epsilon) \\
= \epsilon.
\]

By induction on \( n \), we conclude that (34) holds for all \( n \geq m \geq n_0 \). So \( \{x_n\} \) is a Cauchy sequence that is
\[
\lim_{n,m \to \infty} S(x_n, x_m, x_m) = 0.
\]

Since \((X, S)\) is a complete \(-\)metric space, then there exists \( x^* \in X \) such that
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} S(x_n, x^*, x^*) = \lim_{n,m \to \infty} S(x_n, x_m, x^*) = 0.
\]

We will prove that \( x^* = Tx^* \). Suppose, on the contrary, that \( S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) > 0 \). From assumption (A3), we have that
\[
\gamma(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) \geq 1, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.
\]

By using Lemma 1.1 and above inequality together with the assumption of the theorem that \( T \) is a generalized \((\gamma - \psi)\)-MKC mapping of dim3 of type A, we get that
\[
S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) \leq 2S(Tx_{nk}, Tx^*, Tx^*) + S(Tx_{nk}, x^*, x^*) \\
\leq 2\gamma(x_{nk}, Tx_{nk}, Tx_{nk})\gamma(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*)\gamma(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*)S(Tx_{nk}, Tx^*, Tx^*) + S(x_{nk+1}, x^*, x^*) \\
\leq 2\psi(M'_1(x_{nk}, x^*, x^*)) + S(x_{nk+1}, x^*, x^*),
\]
where, \( M'_1(x_{nk}, x^*, x^*) = \max\{S(x_{nk}, x^*, x^*), S(x_{nk}, x_{nk+1}, x_{nk+1}), S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*)\} \). Suppose that \( M'_1(x_{nk}, x^*, x^*) = S(x_{nk}, x^*, x^*) \), then from the above inequality, we get that
\[
S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) \leq 2\psi(S(x_{nk}, x^*, x^*)) + S(x_{nk+1}, x^*, x^*) \\
< 2S(x_{nk}, x^*, x^*) + S(x_{nk+1}, x^*, x^*).
\]

Taking \( k \to \infty \) in the inequality above, we have
\[
S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) < 3S(x^*, x^*, x^*) = 0,
\]
which is a contradiction.

Next, we suppose that \( M'_1(x_{nk}, x^*, x^*) = S(x_{nk}, x_{nk+1}, x_{nk+1}) \), then we have that
\[
S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) \leq \psi(S(x_{nk}, x_{nk+1}, x_{nk+1}')) + S(x_{nk+1}, x^*, x^*) \\
< S(x_{nk}, x_{nk+1}, x_{nk+1}) + S(x_{nk+1}, x^*, x^*).
\]

Taking \( k \to \infty \) in the inequality above, this implies that
\[
S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) < \lim_{k \to \infty} [S(x_{nk}, x_{nk+1}, x_{nk+1}) + S(x_{nk+1}, x^*, x^*)] = 0,
\]
which is again a contradiction.
Finally, we suppose that $M'_1(x_{n_k}, x^*) = S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*)$, then we obtain that
\[
S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) < \psi(S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*)) + S(x_{n_k+1}, x^*, x^*).
\]
Letting $k \to \infty$ in above inequality, we get that
\[
S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) < \psi(S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*)) + S(x^*, x^*, x^*)
\]
\[
< S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) + S(x^*, x^*, x^*)
\]
\[
= S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*),
\]
so we also have a contradiction. Thus, we have $S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) = 0$, and by (S1) in Definition 1.1, we have $x^* = Tx^*$.  

\[\square\]

**Example 2.3.** Let $X = [0, \infty)$ and $S(x, y, z) = |x - y| + |x - z|, \forall x, y, z \in X$. Then $(X, S)$ is a complete $S$–metric space.

Define $T : X \mapsto X$ and $\gamma : X^3 \mapsto [0, \infty)$ as follow:
\[
T_x= \begin{cases}
 kx - (k - 1), & k > 1, \ x \geq 1; \\
 \frac{x}{3}, & x \in [0, 1)
\end{cases}
\]
\[
\gamma(x, y, z) = \begin{cases}
 1, & \text{if } x, y, z \in [0, 1); \\
 0, & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}
\]

Let $\psi(t) = \frac{t}{4}, t \geq 0$.

We first show that $T$ is a triangular $\gamma$–admissible mapping. Let $x, y, z \in X$, if $\gamma(x, y, z) \geq 1$, the $x, y, z \in [0, 1)$. On the other hand, for $\forall x, y, z \in [0, 1)$, we have $Tx = \frac{x}{3} \in [0, 1)$, $Ty = \frac{y}{3} \in [0, 1)$, $Tz = \frac{z}{3} \in [0, 1)$. It follows that $\gamma(Tx, Ty, Tz) \geq 1$. Also, if $\gamma(x, y, y) \geq 1$ and $\gamma(y, y, z) \geq 1$, then $x, y, z \in [0, 1)$ and hence $\gamma(x, z, z) \geq 1$. Thus, the first assertion holds. Notice that $\gamma(0, 0, 0) = 1$.

Next, if $\{x_n\}$ is a $(T, \gamma)$–orbital sequence such that $x_n \to x$ as $n \to \infty$. By the definition of $\gamma$, we have that $x_n \in [0, 1)$ and $x \in [0, 1)$. Then there exists a subsequence $\{x_{n_k}\}$ of $\{x_n\}$ such that $\gamma(x_{n_k}, x) \geq 1, \forall k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Finally, we will show that $T$ is generalized $(\gamma - \psi)$–MKC mapping of type $A$.

If $\gamma(x, y, y) = 0$, it is obviously to verify the assertion.

If $\gamma(x, y, y) \neq 0$, it follows that $x, y \in [0, 1)$ and $\gamma(x, y, y) = 1$.

For $\epsilon > 0$,

Case 1. If $M_1(x, y) = 2|x - y|$, taking $\delta = \epsilon$, then $\epsilon \leq \psi(M_1(x, y)) = |x - y| < 2\epsilon$ implies that
\[
\gamma(x, y, y)S(Tx, Ty, Ty) = \frac{|x - y|}{2} < \epsilon.
\]

Case 2. If $M_1(x, y) = \frac{3|x|}{2}$, taking $\delta = \frac{\epsilon}{4}$, then $\epsilon \leq \psi(M_1(x, y)) = \frac{3|x|}{4} < \epsilon + \frac{\epsilon}{4}$ implies that
\[
\gamma(x, y, y)S(Tx, Ty, Ty) = \frac{1}{2}(|x - y| \leq \frac{1}{2}(|x| + |y|) < \frac{1}{2}(|x| + |x|) = |x| < \epsilon.
\]

Case 3. If $M_1(x, y) = \frac{3|y|}{2}$, taking $\delta = \frac{\epsilon}{4}$, then $\epsilon \leq \psi(M_1(x, y)) = \frac{3|y|}{4} < \epsilon + \frac{\epsilon}{4}$ implies that
\[
\gamma(x, y, y)S(Tx, Ty, Ty) = \frac{1}{2}(|x - y| \leq \frac{1}{2}(|x| + |y|) < \frac{1}{2}(|y| + |y|) = |y| < \epsilon.
\]

Therefore, conditions of Theorem 2.8 hold and $T$ has a fixed point. Indeed, $x^* = 0$ and $x^* = 1$ are two fixed points.

In what follows, we present an existence theorem for fixed point of a generalized $(\gamma - \psi)$–MKC mapping of type $B$ and a generalized $(\gamma - \psi)$–MKC mapping of dims3 of type $B$. Taking Remark 1.5 and Remark 1.6 into account, we observe that the proof of this theorem is similar to the proof of Theorem 2.8 and Theorem 2.9.

**Theorem 2.10.** Let $(X, S)$ be a complete $S$–metric space and $T : X \mapsto X$ be a generalized $(\gamma - \psi)$–MKC mapping of type $B$. Assume also that:
(A1) $T$ is triangular $\gamma-$admissible;

(A2) there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $\gamma(x_0, Tx_0, Tx_0) \geq 1$;

(A3) $(X, S)$ is $(T, \gamma)-$regular.

Then, there exists $x^* \in X$ such that $Tx^* = x^*$.

**Theorem 2.11.** Let $(X, S)$ be a complete $S-$metric space and $T : X \mapsto X$ be a generalized $(\gamma - \psi)-$MKC mapping of dim3 of type $B$. Assume also that:

(A1) $T$ is triangular $\gamma-$admissible;

(A2) there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $\gamma(x_0, Tx_0, Tx_0) \geq 1$;

(A3) $(X, S)$ is $(T, \gamma)-$limit.

Then, there exists $x^* \in X$ such that $Tx^* = x^*$.

**Definition 2.1.** Let $(X, S)$ be an $S-$metric space and $T : X \mapsto X$. The mapping $T$ is called a generalized $(\gamma - \psi)-$Meir-Keeler contractive mapping of type $C$ if there exist two functions $\psi \in \Psi$ and $\gamma : X^3 \mapsto [0, \infty)$ satisfying the following condition: for each $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta(\epsilon) > 0$ such that

$$\epsilon \leq \psi(M_3(x, y)) < \epsilon + \delta(\epsilon) \implies \gamma(x, y, y)S(Tx, Ty, Ty) < \epsilon,$$

where $M_3(x, y) = \max\{S(x, y, y), S(x, Tx, Tx), S(y, Ty, Ty), \frac{1}{6}[S(x, Ty, Ty) + S(y, Tx, Tx)]\}, \forall x, y \in X$.

**Theorem 2.12.** Let $(X, S)$ be a complete $S-$metric space and $T : X \mapsto X$ be a generalized $(\gamma - \psi)-$MKC mapping of type $C$. Assume also that:

(A1) $T$ is triangular $\gamma-$admissible;

(A2) there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $\gamma(x_0, Tx_0, Tx_0) \geq 1$;

(A3) $(X, S)$ is $(T, \gamma)-$regular.

Then, there exists $x^* \in X$ such that $Tx^* = x^*$.

**Proof.** In view of assumption (A2), let $x_0 \in X$ be such that $\gamma(x_0, Tx_0, Tx_0) \geq 1$.

Define the sequence $\{x_n\}$ in $X$ by $x_{n+1} = Tx_n, \forall n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$.

Since $T$ is triangular $\gamma-$admissible, by Lemma 1.6, we have that

$$\gamma(x_n, x_m, x_m) \geq 1, \forall n, m \in \mathbb{N} \text{ with } n < m.$$

If there exists some $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x_{n_0} = x_{n_0+1}$, then the proof is complete, since $x^* = x_{n_0+1} = Tx_0 = Tx^*$. For this, we assume that $x_n \neq x_{n+1}, \forall n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$, then

$$S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) > 0, \forall n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (37)

Step1. We will prove that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (38)
Taking (36) and (38) into account together with the fact that \( T \) is generalized \((\gamma - \psi)\)-MKC mapping of type \( C \), for each \( n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N} \), we get

\[
S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) = S(Tx_{n-1}, Tx_n, Tx_n) \\
\leq \gamma(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n)S(Tx_{n-1}, Tx_n, Tx_n) \\
\leq \psi(M_3(x_{n-1}, x_n)) \\
< \psi(M_3(x_{n-1}, x_n)),
\]

where

\[
M_3(x_{n-1}, x_n) = \max\{S(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n), S(x_{n-1}, Tx_{n-1}, Tx_{n-1}), S(x_n, Tx_n, Tx_n), \\
\frac{1}{8}[S(x_{n-1}, Tx_n, Tx_n) + S(x_n, Tx_{n-1}, Tx_{n-1})]\}
\]

\[
= \max\{S(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n), S(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_{n+1}), \frac{1}{8}[S(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) + S(x_n, x_n, x_n)]\}.
\]

Regarding Lemma 1.1, we estimate the last term in the expression of \( M_3(x_{n-1}, x_n) \) as follows:

\[
\frac{1}{8}[S(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) + S(x_n, x_n, x_n)] \\
= \frac{1}{8}S(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) \\
\leq \frac{1}{8}[2S(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n) + S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1})] \\
= \frac{1}{4}S(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n) + \frac{1}{8}S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) \\
\leq \max\{S(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}), S(x_n, x_n, x_n)\}.
\]

Consequently, we get that

\[
M_3(x_{n-1}, x_n) = \max\{S(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n), S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1})\}. \tag{39}
\]

Let us consider the two cases. If \( M_3(x_{n-1}, x_n) = S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) \). Since \( \psi \) is nondecreasing, then we have that

\[
S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) \leq \psi(S(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1})) < S(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}), \tag{40}
\]

which is a contradiction. Thus, \( M_3(x_{n-1}, x_n) = S(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n) \) and we also have that

\[
S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) \leq \psi(S(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n)) < S(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n), \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{41}
\]

So, we derive that the sequence \( \{S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1})\} \) is non-increasing and bounded below by zero. Hence, there exists \( t \in [0, \infty) \) such that

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) = t. \tag{42}
\]

Recursively, we deduce from (41) that

\[
S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) \leq \psi^n(S(x_0, x_1, x_1)), \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{43}
\]

On account of (43) and Remark 1.2, we obtain

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) = 0. \tag{44}
\]
Step 2. We will show that \( \{x_n\} \) is a Cauchy sequence.
Suppose, on the contrary, that there exist \( \epsilon > 0 \) and a subsequence \( \{x_{n(i)}\} \) of \( \{x_n\} \) such that

\[
S(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i+1)}, x_{n(i+1)}) > 2\epsilon.
\]  
(45)

First, we will show that the existence of \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( n(i) < k \leq n(i + 1) \). Later, we will prove that for given \( \epsilon > 0 \) above, there exists \( \delta > 0 \) such that

\[
\frac{\epsilon}{2} < \psi(M_3(x_{n(i)}, x_k)) < \frac{\epsilon + \delta}{2},
\]

but

\[
\gamma(x_{n(i)}, x_k) S(Tx_{n(i)}, Tx_k, Tx_k) \geq \epsilon,
\]

which contradicts (45), where

\[
M_3(x_{n(i)}, x_k) = \max\{S(x_{n(i)}, x_k, x_k), S(x_{n(i)}, Tx_{n(i)}, Tx_k), S(x_k, Tx_k, Tx_k),
\]

\[
\frac{1}{8}[S(x_{n(i)}, Tx_k, Tx_k) + S(x_k, Tx_{n(i)}, Tx_{n(i)})].
\]

Let \( r = \min\{\epsilon, \frac{\delta}{2}\} \). Taking Step 1 into account, we will choose \( n_0 \in \mathbb{N} \) such that

\[
S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) < \frac{r}{8},
\]

(46)

for all \( n > n_0 \). Let \( n(i) > n_0 \). According to our construction, we have \( n(i) \leq n(i + 1) - 1 \).

If \( S(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i+1)-1}, x_{n(i+1)-1}) < \frac{\epsilon + r}{4} \), then by Lemma 1.1, we have

\[
S(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i+1)}, x_{n(i+1)}) \leq 2S(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i+1)-1}, x_{n(i+1)-1}) + S(x_{n(i+1)-1}, x_{n(i+1)}, x_{n(i+1)})
\]

\[
\leq \epsilon + r + \frac{r}{8}
\]

\[
= \epsilon + \frac{7r}{8}
\]

\[
< 2\epsilon,
\]

which contradicts (45). Therefore, there exist values of \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( n(i) \leq k \leq n(i + 1) \) and

\[
S(x_{n(i)}, x_k, x_k) > \frac{\epsilon + r}{4}.
\]

Indeed, if \( S(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i)+1}, x_{n(i)+1}) \geq \frac{\epsilon + r}{4} \), then we have \( S(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i)+1}, x_{n(i)+1}) \geq \frac{\epsilon}{8} \), which contradicts (46).

Hence, we can choose the smallest integer \( k > n(i) \) such that

\[
S(x_{n(i)}, x_k, x_k) \geq \frac{\epsilon + r}{2}.
\]

So, necessarily, we also have \( S(x_{n(i)}, x_{k-1}, x_{k-1}) < \frac{\epsilon + r}{2} \).

Therefore, we find that

\[
S(x_{n(i)}, x_k, x_k) \leq 2S(x_k, x_{k-1}, x_{k-1}) + S(x_{n(i)}, x_{k-1}, x_{k-1})
\]

\[
< 2 \cdot \frac{r}{8} + \frac{\epsilon + r}{2}
\]

\[
= \frac{\epsilon + 3r}{4}.
\]

Hence, we get the following approximation:

\[
\frac{\epsilon + r}{2} \leq S(x_{n(i)}, x_k, x_k) \leq \frac{\epsilon + 3r}{4},
\]

(47)
for a integer \( k \) satisfying \( n(i) \leq k \leq n(i+1) \).

On the other hand, the first three terms of \( M_3(x_{n(i)}, x_k) \) are bounded above by \( \frac{\epsilon}{2} + r \), that is

\[
S(x_{n(i)}, x_k, x_k) < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{3r}{4} < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + r.
\]

\[
S(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i)+1}, x_{n(i)+1}) < \frac{r}{8} < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + r.
\]

\[
S(x_k, x_{k+1}, x_{k+1}) < \frac{r}{8} < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + r.
\]

Eventually, the last term of \( M_3(x_{n(i)}, x_k) \) can be estimated as follows:

\[
\frac{1}{8}[S(x_{n(i)}, Tx_k, Tx_k) + S(x_k, Tx_{n(i)}, Tx_{n(i)})]
\leq \frac{1}{8}[2S(x_{n(i)}, x_k, x_k) + S(x_k, x_{k+1}, x_{k+1}) + 2S(x_{n(i)}, x_k, x_k) + S(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i)+1}, x_{n(i)+1})]
\leq \frac{1}{8}[4S(x_{n(i)}, x_k, x_k) + S(x_k, x_{k+1}, x_{k+1}) + S(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i)+1}, x_{n(i)+1})]
< \frac{\epsilon}{4} + \frac{3r}{8} + \frac{r}{32}
= \frac{\epsilon}{4} + \frac{13r}{32}
< \frac{\epsilon}{2} + r.
\]

Combing these estimations presented above, we conclude that

\[
\psi(M_3(x_{n(i)}, x_k)) < M_3(x_{n(i)}, x_k) < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + r < \frac{\epsilon + \delta}{2}.
\]

Since \( T \) is generalized \((\gamma - \psi)\)-MKC mapping of type of \( C \) and it is \( \gamma \)-triangular admissible mapping, we have that

\[
S(x_{n(i)+1}, x_{k+1}, x_{k+1}) \leq \gamma(x_{n(i)}, x_k, x_k)S(x_{n(i)+1}, x_{k+1}, x_{k+1}) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}.
\]

At the same time, by Lemma 1.1, we have that

\[
S(x_{n(i)}, x_k, x_k) \leq 2S(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i)+1}, x_{n(i)+1}) + S(x_{n(i)+1}, x_k, x_k)
\leq 2S(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i)+1}, x_{n(i)+1}) + 2S(x_k, x_{k+1}, x_{k+1}) + S(x_{n(i)+1}, x_{k+1}, x_{k+1})
< 2 \cdot \frac{r}{8} + 2 \cdot \frac{r}{8} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}
= \frac{\epsilon + r}{2},
\]

which contradicts (47).

Thus, claim (45) is false and the sequence \( \{x_n\} \) is a Cauchy sequence, that is

\[
\lim_{n,m \to \infty} S(x_n, x_m, x_m) = 0.
\]  

(48)

Since \((X, S)\) is a complete \(S\)-metric space, then there exists \( x^* \in X \) such that

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} S(x_n, x^*, x^*) = \lim_{n,m \to \infty} S(x_n, x_m, x^*) = 0.
\]

We will prove that \( x^* = Tx^* \). Suppose, on the contrary, that \( S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) > 0 \).

From (42) and assumption (A3), there exists a subsequence \( \{x_{n_k}\} \) of \( \{x_n\} \) such that

\[
\gamma(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*) \geq 1, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.
\]

(49)
By using Lemma 1.1 and (48) together with the assumption of the theorem that \( T \) is a generalized \((\gamma - \psi) - \text{MKC}\) mapping of type \( C \), we get that

\[
S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) \leq 2S(Tx_{n_k}, Tx^*, Tx^*) + S(Tx_{n_k}, x^*, x^*) \\
\leq 2\gamma(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*)S(Tx_{n_k}, Tx^*, Tx^*) + S(x_{n_k+1}, x^*, x^*) \\
\leq \psi(M_3(x_{n_k}, x^*)) + S(x_{n_k+1}, x^*, x^*),
\]

where,

\[
M_3(x_{n_k}, x^*) = \max\{S(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*), S(x_{n_k}, x_{n_k+1}, x_{n_k+1}), S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*), \\
\frac{1}{8}[S(x_{n_k}, Tx^*, Tx^*) + S(x^*, x_{n_k+1}, x_{n_k+1})]\}.
\]

Notice that as \( S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) > 0 \), then we have that \( M_3(x_{n_k}, x^*) > 0 \).

From Lemma 1.1, it follows that

\[
\frac{1}{8}[S(x_{n_k}, Tx^*, Tx^*) + S(x^*, x_{n_k+1}, x_{n_k+1})] \\
\leq \frac{1}{8}[2S(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*) + S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) + 2S(x^*, x_{n_k}, x_{n_k}) + S(x_{n_k}, x_{n_k+1}, x_{n_k+1})] \\
= \frac{1}{2}S(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*) + \frac{1}{8}S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) + \frac{1}{8}S(x_{n_k}, x_{n_k+1}, x_{n_k+1}) \\
\leq \max\{S(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*), S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*), S(x_{n_k}, x_{n_k+1}, x_{n_k+1})\}.
\]

By the above inequality, we have that

\[
M_3(x_{n_k}, x^*) = \max\{S(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*), S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*), S(x_{n_k}, x_{n_k+1}, x_{n_k+1})\}.
\]

Suppose that \( M_3(x_{n_k}, x^*) = S(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*) \), then, we get that

\[
S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) \leq \psi(S(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*)) + S(x_{n_k+1}, x^*, x^*) \\
< S(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*) + S(x_{n_k+1}, x^*, x^*).
\]

Taking \( k \to \infty \) in the inequality above, we have

\[
S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) < 2S(x^*, x^*, x^*) = 0,
\]

which is a contradiction.

Next, we suppose that \( M_3(x_{n_k}, x^*) = S(x_{n_k}, x_{n_k+1}, x_{n_k+1}) \), then we have that

\[
S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) \leq \psi(S(x_{n_k}, x_{n_k+1}, x_{n_k+1})) + S(x_{n_k+1}, x^*, x^*) \\
< S(x_{n_k}, x_{n_k+1}, x_{n_k+1}) + S(x_{n_k+1}, x^*, x^*).
\]

Taking \( k \to \infty \) in the inequality above, this implies that

\[
S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) < \lim_{k \to \infty} [S(x_{n_k}, x_{n_k+1}, x_{n_k+1}) + S(x_{n_k+1}, x^*, x^*)] = 0,
\]

which is again a contradiction.

Finally, we suppose that \( M_3(x_{n_k}, x^*) = S(x^*,Tx^*,Tx^*) \), then we obtain that

\[
S(x^*,Tx^*,Tx^*) < \psi(S(x^*,Tx^*,Tx^*)) + S(x_{n_k+1}, x^*, x^*) < S(x^*,Tx^*,Tx^*) + S(x_{n_k+1}, x^*, x^*).
\]
Letting \( k \to \infty \) in above inequality, we get that
\[
S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) < S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) + S(x^*, x^*, x^*) = S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*)
\]
so we also have a contradiction. Thus, we have \( S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) = 0 \), and by (S1) in Definition 1.1, we have \( x^* = Tx^* \).

**Definition 2.2.** Let \((X, S)\) be an \( S \)-metric space and \( T : X \to X \). The mapping \( T \) is called a generalized \((\gamma - \psi)\)-Meir-Keeler contractive mapping of dim3 of type C if there exist two functions \( \psi \in \Psi \) and \( \gamma : X^3 \to [0, \infty) \) satisfying the following condition: for each \( \epsilon > 0 \) there exists \( \delta(\epsilon) > 0 \) such that
\[
\epsilon \leq \psi(M_3'(x, y, z)) < \epsilon + \delta(\epsilon) \quad \text{implies} \quad \gamma(x, Tx, Tx)\gamma(y, Ty, Ty)\gamma(z, Tz, Tz)S(Tx, Ty, Tz) < \epsilon,
\]
where
\[
M_3'(x, y, z) = \max\{S(x, y, y), S(y, z, z), S(z, x, x), S(x, Tx, Tx), S(y, Ty, Ty), S(z, Tz, Tz),
\]
\[
\frac{1}{8}[S(x, Ty, Ty) + S(y, Tx, Tx)], \frac{1}{8}[S(y, Tz, Tz) + S(z, Ty, Ty)]
\]
\[
\frac{1}{8}[S(z, Tx, Tx) + S(x, Tz, Tz)]
\]
\( \forall x, y, z \in X \).

**Theorem 2.13.** Let \((X, S)\) be a complete \( S \)-metric space and \( T : X \to X \) be a generalized \((\gamma - \psi)\)-MKC mapping of dim3 of type C. Assume also that:

(A1) \( T \) is \( \gamma \)-admissible;

(A2) there exists \( x_0 \in X \) such that \( \gamma(x_0, Tx_0, Tx_0) \geq 1 \);

(A3) \((X, S)\) is \((T, \gamma)\)-limit.

Then, there exists \( x^* \in X \) such that \( Tx^* = x^* \).

**Proof.** In view of assumption (A2), let \( x_0 \in X \) be such that \( \gamma(x_0, Tx_0, Tx_0) \geq 1 \). Define the sequence \( \{x_n\} \) in \( X \) by \( x_{n+1} = Tx_n \), for all \( n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N} \).

Since \( T \) is triangular \( \gamma \)-admissible, by Lemma 1.6, we have that
\[
\gamma(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) \geq 1, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.
\]
(50)

If there exists some \( n_0 \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( x_{n_0} = x_{n_0+1} \), then the proof is complete, since \( x^* = x_{n_0+1} = Tx_{n_0} = Tx^* \). For this, we assume that \( x_n \neq x_{n+1} \), for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), then
\[
S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) > 0, \quad \forall n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}.
\]
(51)

Step1. We will prove that
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) = 0.
\]
Taking (50) and (51) into account together with the fact that $T$ is generalized $(\gamma-\psi)$–MKC mapping of dim 3 of type $C$, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we get

$$S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) = S(Tx_{n-1}, Tx_n, Tx_n)$$

$$\leq \gamma(x_{n-1}, x_n)\gamma(x_n, x_{n+1})\gamma(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2})S(Tx_{n-1}, Tx_n, Tx_n)$$

$$\leq \psi(M'_3(x_{n-1}, x_n))$$

$$< M'_3(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n),$$

where

$$M'_3(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n) = \max\{S(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n), S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}), S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}), S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}), S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}), S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}), S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}), S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1})\},$$

$$= \max\{S(x_{n-1}, x_n), S(x_n, x_{n+1}), 1/8[S(x_n, x_{n+1}) + S(x_n, x_{n+1})], 1/8[S(x_n, x_{n+1}) + S(x_n, x_{n+1})]\}$$

$$= \max\{S(x_{n-1}, x_n), S(x_n, x_{n+1}), 1/8[S(x_n, x_{n+1}) + S(x_n, x_{n+1})]\}.$$

Regarding Lemma 1.1, we estimate the last term in the expression of $M'_3(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n)$ as follows:

$$\frac{1}{8}[S(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) + S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+2})]$$

$$= \frac{1}{8}S(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1}, x_{n+2})$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{8}[2S(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n) + S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1})]$$

$$= \frac{1}{4}S(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n) + \frac{1}{8}S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1})$$

$$\leq \max\{S(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}), S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1})\}.$$

Consequently, we get that

$$M'_3(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n) = \max\{S(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n), S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1})\}.$$

Let us consider the two cases. If $M'_3(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n) = S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1})$. Since $\psi$ is nondecreasing, then we have that

$$S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) \leq \psi(S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1})) < S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}),$$

which is a contradiction. Thus, $M'_3(x_{n-1}, x_n, x_n) = S(x_n, x_n, x_n)$ and we also have that

$$S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) \leq \psi(S(x_n, x_n, x_n)) < S(x_n, x_n, x_n), \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (52)$$

So, we derive that the sequence $\{S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1})\}$ is non-increasing and bounded below by zero. Hence, there exists $t \in [0, \infty)$ such that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) = t.$$

Recursively, we deduce from (52) that

$$S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) \leq \psi^n(S(x_0, x_1), x_1), \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (53)$$
On account of (53) and Remark 1.2, we obtain

\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) = 0. \]

Step2. We will show that \( \{x_n\} \) is a Cauchy sequence.
We will prove that for each \( \epsilon > 0 \), there exists \( n_0 \in \mathbb{N} \) such that for \( \forall m, n \geq n_0, \)

\[ S(x_m, x_m, x_n) < \epsilon. \] (54)

Taking Step1 into account, for each \( \epsilon > 0 \), we can choose \( n_0 \in \mathbb{N} \) such that

\[ S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) < \frac{\epsilon - \psi(\epsilon)}{2}, \forall n \geq n_0. \] (55)

We prove (54) by induction on \( n \). (54) holds for \( m = n \) and \( n = n + 1 \) by using (55) and the fact that \( \frac{\epsilon - \psi(\epsilon)}{2} < \epsilon \). Assume (54) holds for \( n = k \). For \( n = k + 1 \), we have

\[ S(x_m, x_{k+1}, x_{k+1}) \leq 2S(x_m, x_{m+1}, x_{m+1}) + S(x_{m+1}, x_{k+1}, x_{k+1}) \]
\[ \leq \epsilon - \psi(\epsilon) + \psi(S(x_m, x_k, x_k)) \]
\[ \leq \epsilon - \psi(\epsilon) + \psi(\epsilon) \]
\[ = \epsilon. \]

By induction on \( n \), we conclude that (54) holds for all \( n \geq m \geq n_0 \). So \( \{x_n\} \) is a Cauchy sequence that is

\[ \lim_{n,m \to \infty} S(x_n, x_m, x_m) = 0. \]

Since \( (X, S) \) is a complete \( S \)-metric space, then there exists \( x^* \in X \) such that

\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} S(x_n, x^*, x^*) = \lim_{n,m \to \infty} S(x_n, x_m, x^*) = 0. \]

We will prove that \( x^* = Tx^* \). Suppose, on the contrary, that \( S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) > 0 \).
From assumption (A3), we have that

\[ \gamma(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) \geq 1, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}. \]

By using Lemma 1.1 and above inequality together with the assumption of the theorem that \( T \) is a generalized \( (\gamma - \psi) \)-MKC mapping of dim3 of type C,

\[ S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) \leq 2S(Tx_{n_k}, Tx^*, Tx^*) + S(Tx_{n_k}, x^*, x^*) \]
\[ \leq 2\gamma(x_{n_k}, Tx_{n_k}, Tx_{n_k})\gamma(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*)\gamma(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*)S(Tx_{n_k}, Tx^*, Tx^*) + S(x_{n_k+1}, x^*, x^*) \]
\[ \leq \psi(M_3(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*)) + S(x_{n_k+1}, x^*, x^*), \]
where,

\[ M_3(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*) = \max\{S(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*), S(x^*, x^*, x^*), S(x^*, x_{n_k}, x_{n_k}), S(x_{n_k}, x_{n_k+1}, x_{n_k+1}), \]
\[ S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*), S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*), S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*), \]
\[ \frac{1}{8}[S(x_{n_k}, Tx^*, Tx^*) + S(x^*, x_{n_k+1}, x_{n_k+1})]. \]
Finally, we suppose that
\[ \psi(x_k, x^*, x^*) + S(x^*, x_{n_k+1}, x_{n_k+1}) \]
which is again a contradiction.

Taking \( k \to \infty \) in the inequality above, we have
\[ S(x^*, x_k, x^*) < 2S(x^*, x^*) = 0, \]
which is a contradiction.

Next, we suppose that \( M_3(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*) = S(x_{n_k}, x_{n_k+1}, x_{n_k+1}) \), then we have that
\[ S(x^*, x_k, x^*) \leq \psi(S(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*)) + S(x_{n_k+1}, x^*, x^*) \]
\[ < S(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*) + S(x_{n_k+1}, x^*, x^*). \]

Taking \( k \to \infty \) in the inequality above, this implies that
\[ S(x^*, x_k, x^*) < \lim_{k \to \infty} [S(x_{n_k}, x_{n_k+1}, x_{n_k+1}) + S(x_{n_k+1}, x^*, x^*)] = 0, \]
which is again a contradiction.

Finally, we suppose that \( M_3(x_{n_k}, x^*, x^*) = S(x^*, x_k, x^*) \), then we obtain that
\[ S(x^*, x_k, x^*) < \psi(S(x^*, x_k, x^*)) + S(x_{n_k+1}, x^*, x^*) < S(x^*, x^*, x^*) + S(x_{n_k+1}, x^*, x^*). \]

Letting \( k \to \infty \) in above inequality, we get that
\[ S(x^*, x_k, x^*) < S(x^*, x^*, x^*) + S(x^*, x^*, x^*) \]
\[ = S(x^*, x^*, x^*), \]
so we also have a contradiction. Thus, we have \( S(x^*, x^*, x^*) = 0 \), and by \( (S1) \) in Definition 1.1, we have \( x^* = x_k \).

In what follows, we propose the condition for the uniqueness of a fixed point of a generalized \((\gamma - \psi)\)-MKC of type C mappings:

\((U1')\) For \( \forall x^*, y^* \in Fix(T) \), there exists \( z^* \in X \) such that \( \gamma(x^*, z^*, z^*) \geq 1 \), \( \gamma(y^*, z^*, z^*) \geq 1 \) and \( \gamma(z^*, Tz^*, Tz^*) \geq 1 \).

\((U2')\) Let \( x^*, y^* \in Fix(T) \). If there exists a sequence \( \{x_n\} \) in \( X \) such that \( \gamma(x^*, x_n, x_n) \geq 1 \), \( \gamma(y^*, x_n, x_n) \geq 1 \), then \( S(x_n, x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) \leq \inf \{S(x^*, x_n, x_n), S(y^*, x_n, x_n)\} \).
Theorem 2.14. Adding conditions \((U1'), (U2')\) to the statements of Theorem 2.12, one has that \(T\) has the unique fixed point.

Proof. Let \(x^*, y^*\) be two distinct fixed points of \(T\). Form condition \((U1')\), there exists \(z^* \in X\) such that
\[
\gamma(x^*, z^*, z^*) \geq 1, \quad \gamma(y^*, z^*, z^*) \geq 1, \quad \gamma(z^*, Tz^*, Tz^*) \geq 1.
\]
Owing to the fact that \(T\) is triangular \(\gamma\)–admissible and \(\gamma(z^*, Tz^*, Tz^*) \geq 1\), we have
\[
\gamma(Tz^*, T^2z^*, T^2z^*) \geq 1.
\]
Inductively, we find
\[
\gamma(T^{n-1}z^*, T^nz^*, T^n z^*) \geq 1, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.
\]
Since \(\gamma(x^*, z^*, z^*) \geq 1\) and \(\gamma(z^*, Tz^*, Tz^*) \geq 1\), then by the triangular \(\gamma\)–admissibility of \(T\), we have
\[
\gamma(x^*, Tz^*, Tz^*) \geq 1.
\]
Again, since \(\gamma(x^*, Tz^*, Tz^*) \geq 1\) and \(\gamma(Tz^*, T^2z^*, T^2z^*) \geq 1\), we derive
\[
\gamma(x^*, T^2z^*, T^2z^*) \geq 1.
\]
Inductively, we get
\[
\gamma(x^*, T^nz^*, T^n z^*) \geq 1, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{56}
\]
In the similar way, we also have that
\[
\gamma(y^*, T^nz^*, T^n z^*) \geq 1, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{57}
\]
Define an iterative sequence \(\{z_n\}\) by \(z_{n+1} = Tz_n, \forall n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}\) and \(z_0 = z^*\).
Step1. We will prove that \(\lim_{n \to \infty} S(x^*, z_n, z_n) = 0\).
By (56) and the statement of the theorem that \(T\) is generalized \((\gamma - \psi)\)–MKC mapping of type \(C\), we have
\[
S(x^*, z_{n+1}, z_{n+1}) \leq \gamma(x^*, z_n, z_n)S(Tx^*, Tz_n, Tz_n) \\
\leq \psi(M_3(x^*, z_n)).
\]
If \(\psi(M_3(x^*, z_n)) = 0\), then
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} S(x^*, z_n, z_n) = 0.
\]
Now, suppose that \(\psi(M_3(x^*, z_n)) > 0\), then \(M_3(x^*, z_n) > 0\).
Since \(T\) is a generalized \((\gamma - \psi)\)–MKC mapping of type \(C\), we get
\[
S(x^*, z_{n+1}, z_{n+1}) \leq \gamma(x^*, z_n, z_n)S(Tx^*, Tz_n, Tz_n) \\
\leq \psi(M_3(x^*, z_n)) \\
< M_3(x^*, z_n),
\]
where $M_3(x^*, z_n) = \max\{S(x^*, z_n, z_n), S(x^*, T x^*, T x^*), S(z_n, T z_n, T z_n), \frac{1}{8}[S(x^*, T z_n, T z_n) + S(z_n, T x^*, T x^*)]\}$. Taking $(U2')$ and Lemma 1.1 into account, we have

$$M_3(x^*, z_n) = S(x^*, z_n).$$

Thus, $S(x^*, z_{n+1}, z_{n+1}) < S(x^*, z_n, z_n)$. Letting $n \to \infty$ in the inequality above, we obtain

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} S(x^*, z_{n+1}, z_{n+1}) < \lim_{n \to \infty} S(x^*, z_n, z_n),$$

which is a contradiction. Then,

$$M_3(x^*, z_n) = S(x^*, z_n, z_n) = 0.$$

Hence, we get that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} S(x^*, z_n, z_n) = 0.$$

Step 2. We will prove that $\lim_{n \to \infty} S(y^*, z_n, z_n) = 0$.

In a analogous way of Step 1., we can complete the proof of $\lim_{n \to \infty} S(y^*, z_n, z_n) = 0$.

By Lemma 1.1,

$$S(x^*, y^*, y^*) \leq 2S(x^*, z_n, z_n) + S(y^*, z_n, z_n).$$

Letting $n \to \infty$ in the above inequality, we get

$$S(x^*, y^*, y^*) = 0,$$

therefore, we have $x^* = y^*$. $\square$

As a uniqueness condition for fixed points of $(\gamma - \psi)$–MKC mappings of dim3 of type C, we suggest the following hypothesis:

$(U3')$ For $\forall x^*, y^* \in \text{Fix}(T)$, $\gamma(x^*, x^*, x^*) \geq 1$, $\gamma(y^*, y^*, y^*) \geq 1$.

**Theorem 2.15.** Adding condition $(U3')$ to the statements of Theorem 2.13, one has that $T$ has the unique fixed point.

**Proof.** Let $x^*, y^*$ be two distinct fixed points of $T$. Form condition $(U3')$

$$\gamma(x^*, x^*, x^*) \geq 1, \gamma(y^*, y^*, y^*) \geq 1. \quad (58)$$

By (58) and the statement of the theorem that $T$ is generalized $(\gamma - \psi)$–MKC mapping of dim3 of type C, we have

$$S(x^*, y^*, y^*) \leq \gamma(x^*, T x^*, T x^*)\gamma(y^*, T y^*, T y^*)\gamma(y^*, T y^*, T y^*)S(T x^*, T y^*, T y^*) \leq \psi(M_3(x^*, y^*, y^*)) < M_3(x^*, y^*, y^*).$$

but

$$M_3(x^*, y^*, y^*) = \max\{S(x^*, y^*, y^*), S(y^*, y^*, y^*), S(y^*, x^*, x^*), S(x^*, T x^*, T x^*), S(y^*, T y^*, T y^*),$$

$$S(y^*, T y^*, T y^*), \frac{1}{8}[S(x^*, T y^*, T y^*) + S(y^*, T x^*, T x^*),$$

$$\frac{1}{8}[S(y^*, T y^*, T y^*) + S(y^*, T y^*, T y^*)], \frac{1}{8}[S(y^*, T x^*, T x^*) + S(x^*, T y^*, T y^*)]\}$$

$$= S(x^*, y^*, y^*).$$
so,

\[ S(x^*, y^*, y^*) < S(x^*, y^*, y^*) \]

which is again a contradiction. Therefore, we have \( x^* = y^* \).

\[ \square \]

3. Generalized Ulam-Hyers Stability for MKC mappings

In the following section, by introducing the generalized Ulam-Hyers stability in the framework of \( S \)-metric spaces, we study the stability for MKC mappings.

**Theorem 3.1.** Let \( (X, S) \) be a complete \( S \)-metric and \( T : X \to X \) be a self-mapping. Suppose that all the hypotheses of Theorem 2.12 hold. In addition, assume that

(A1) the function \( \beta : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty), \beta(r) = r - \psi(r) \) is strictly increasing and onto.

(A2) for any \( \epsilon \)-solution \( w^* \in X \) of (2), one has \( \gamma(w^*, x^*, x^*) \geq 1 \), where \( x^* \in Fix(T) \).

Then, the fixed point problem (1) is generalized Ulam-Hyers stable.

**Proof.** From the conclusion of Theorem 2.12, it follows that there exists \( x^* \in Fix(T) \) such that \( S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) = 0 \). Let \( \epsilon > 0 \) and \( w^* \) be a \( \epsilon \)-solution of (2).

From (A2), we have \( \gamma(x^*, w^*, w^*) \geq 1 \). Since \( T \) is triangular \( \gamma \)-admissible, we can obtain that

\[ \gamma(Tx^*, Tw^*, Tw^*) = \gamma(x^*, Tw^*, Tw^*) \geq 1. \]

Thus, we also get that

\[ S(x^*, w^*, w^*) = S(Tx^*, w^*, w^*) \]
\[ \leq S(Tx^*, Tw^*, Tw^*) + 2S(w^*, Tw^*, Tw^*) \]
\[ \leq \gamma(Tx^*, Tw^*, Tw^*)S(Tx^*, Tw^*, Tw^*) + 2S(w^*, Tw^*, Tw^*) \]
\[ < \psi(M_3(x^*, w^*)) + 2\epsilon, \]

where \( M_3(x^*, w^*) = \max\{S(x^*, w^*, w^*), S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*), S(w^*, Tw^*, Tw^*), \frac{1}{8} [S(x^*, Tw^*, Tw^*) + S(w^*, Tx^*, Tx^*)] \} \).

We also get

\[ \frac{1}{8} [S(x^*, Tw^*, Tw^*) + S(w^*, Tx^*, Tx^*)] \]
\[ \leq \frac{1}{8} [2S(x^*, w^*, w^*) + S(w^*, Tw^*, Tw^*) + 2S(w^*, x^*, x^*) + S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*)] \]
\[ = \frac{1}{8} [4S(x^*, w^*, w^*) + S(w^*, Tw^*, Tw^*)] \]
\[ = \frac{1}{2} S(x^*, w^*, w^*) + \frac{1}{8} S(w^*, Tw^*, Tw^*) \]
\[ \leq \frac{1}{2} S(x^*, w^*, w^*) + \frac{1}{8} \epsilon \]
\[ < \max\{S(x^*, w^*, w^*), \epsilon\}. \]

From the inequality above, we have that

\[ M_3(x^*, w^*) < \max\{S(x^*, w^*, w^*), \epsilon\}. \]

It is obviously that if \( S(x^*, w^*, w^*) < \epsilon \), then the proof is complete.

Suppose that \( \max\{S(x^*, w^*, w^*), \epsilon\} = S(x^*, w^*, w^*) \). Then, we have

\[ M_3(x^*, w^*) < S(x^*, w^*, w^*). \]
So, we can deduce that
\[ S(x^*, w^*, w^*) \leq \psi(S(x^*, w^*)) + 2\epsilon, \]
\[ S(x^*, w^*, w^*) - \psi(S(x^*, w^*)) \leq 2\epsilon. \]

From assumption (A1), we get that
\[ \beta(S(x^*, w^*, w^*)) \leq 2\epsilon. \]
Hence, \( S(x^*, w^*, w^*) \leq \beta^{-1}(2\epsilon) \).

Therefore, (1) is generalized Ulam-Hyers stable.

**Theorem 3.2.** Let \((X, S)\) be a complete \(S\)-metric and \(T : X \to X\) be a self-mapping. Suppose that all the hypotheses of Theorem 2.13 hold. In addition, assume that

(A1) the function \( \beta : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty), \beta(r) = r - \psi(r) \) is strictly increasing and onto.

(A2) for any \( \epsilon \)-solution \( w^* \in X \) of (2), one has \( \gamma(w^*, x^*, x^*) \geq 1 \), where \( x^* \in Fix(T) \).

Then, the fixed point problem (1) is generalized Ulam-Hyers stable.

**Proof.** From the conclusion of Theorem 2.13, it follows that there exists \( x^* \in Fix(T) \) such that \( S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) = 0 \). Let \( \epsilon > 0 \) and \( w^* \) be a \( \epsilon \)-solution of (2).

From (A2), we have \( \gamma(x^*, w^*, w^*) \geq 1 \). Since \( T \) is triangular \( \gamma \)-admissible, we can obtain that \( \gamma(Tx^*, Tw^*, Tw^*) = \gamma(x^*, Tw^*, Tw^*) \geq 1 \).

Thus, we also get that
\[ S(x^*, w^*, w^*) = S(Tx^*, w^*, w^*) \]
\[ \leq S(Tx^*, Tw^*, Tw^*) + 2S(w^*, Tw^*, Tw^*) \]
\[ \leq \gamma(Tx^*, Tw^*, Tw^*)S(Tx^*, Tw^*, Tw^*) + 2S(w^*, Tw^*, Tw^*) \]
\[ < \psi(M_3(x^*, w^*, w^*)) + 2\epsilon, \]

where
\[ M_3(x^*, w^*) = \max\{S(x^*, w^*, w^*), S(w^*, w^*, w^*), S(w^*, x^*, x^*), \]
\[ S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*), S(w^*, Tw^*, Tw^*), \frac{1}{8}[S(x^*, Tw^*, Tw^*) + S(w^*, Tx^*, Tx^*]) \]
\[ \frac{1}{8}[S(w^*, Tw^*, Tw^*) + S(w^*, Tw^*, Tw^*)], \frac{1}{8}[S(w^*, Tx^*, Tx^*) + S(x^*, Tw^*, Tw^*)]\}
\[ = \max\{S(x^*, w^*, w^*), S(w^*, Tw^*, Tw^*), \frac{1}{8}[S(x^*, Tw^*, Tw^*) + S(w^*, Tx^*, Tx^*)]\}. \]

We also get
\[ \frac{1}{8}[S(x^*, Tw^*, Tw^*) + S(w^*, Tx^*, Tx^*)] \]
\[ \leq \frac{1}{8}[2S(x^*, w^*, w^*) + S(w^*, Tw^*, Tw^*) + 2S(w^*, x^*, x^*) + S(x^*, Tx^*, Tx^*)] \]
\[ = \frac{1}{8}[4S(x^*, w^*, w^*) + S(w^*, Tw^*, Tw^*)] \]
\[ = \frac{1}{2}S(x^*, w^*, w^*) + \frac{1}{8}S(w^*, Tw^*, Tw^*) \]
\[ \leq \frac{1}{2}S(x^*, w^*, w^*) + \frac{1}{8} \epsilon \]
\[ < \max\{S(x^*, w^*, w^*), \epsilon\}. \]
From the inequality above, we have that
\[ M'(x^*, w^*, w^*) < \max\{S(x^*, w^*, w^*), \epsilon\}. \]
It is obviously that if \( S(x^*, w^*, w^*) < \epsilon \), then the proof is complete.
Suppose that \( \max\{S(x^*, w^*, w^*), \epsilon\} = S(x^*, w^*, w^*) \). Then, we have
\[ M'(x^*, w^*, w^*) < S(x^*, w^*, w^*). \]
So, we can deduce that
\[ S(x^*, w^*, w^*) \leq \psi(S(x^*, w^*, w^*)) + 2\epsilon, \]
\[ S(x^*, w^*, w^*) - \psi(S(x^*, w^*, w^*)) \leq 2\epsilon. \]

From assumption (A1), we get that
\[ \beta(S(x^*, w^*, w^*)) \leq 2\epsilon. \]

Hence, \( S(x^*, w^*, w^*) \leq \beta^{-1}(2\epsilon) \).
Therefore, (1) is generalized Ulam-Hyers stable.

**Corollary 3.1.** Let \((X, S)\) be a complete \(S\)-metric and \(T : X \to X\) be a self-mapping. Suppose that all the hypotheses of Theorem 2.8(resp., Theorem 2.10) hold. In addition, assume that

(A1) the function \( \beta : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty) \), \( \beta(r) = r - \psi(r) \) is strictly increasing and onto.

(A2) for any \( \epsilon \)-solution \( w^* \in X \) of (2), one has \( \gamma(w^*, x^*, x^*) \geq 1 \), where \( x^* \in Fix(T) \).

Then, the fixed point problem (1) is generalized Ulam-Hyers stable.

**Proof.** The proof is an analog of the proof of Theorem 3.1.

**Corollary 3.2.** Let \((X, S)\) be a complete \(S\)-metric and \(T : X \to X\) be a self-mapping. Suppose that all the hypotheses of Theorem 2.9(resp., Theorem 2.11) hold. In addition, assume that

(A1) the function \( \beta : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty) \), \( \beta(r) = r - \psi(r) \) is strictly increasing and onto.

(A2) for any \( \epsilon \)-solution \( w^* \in X \) of (2), one has \( \gamma(w^*, x^*, x^*) \geq 1 \), where \( x^* \in Fix(T) \).

Then, the fixed point problem (1) is generalized Ulam-Hyers stable.

**Proof.** The proof is an analog of the proof of Theorem 3.2.
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Abstract

We analyze the oscillatory behavior of solutions to a nonlinear second-order neutral
delay dynamic equation with a nonpositive neutral coefficient under the assumptions that
allow applications to Emden–Fowler type dynamic equations. New theorems complement
and improve related contributions to the subject. An example is included.

Keywords: Oscillation, second-order delay dynamic equation, neutral type equation,
Emden–Fowler type equation.
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1 Introduction

In this paper, we study the oscillation of a class of second-order neutral dynamic equations

\[ [r(t)(z^\Delta(t))^\alpha]^{\Delta} + q(t)f(x(\delta(t))) = 0. \]  \hspace{1cm} (1.1)

Here \( t \in [t_0, \infty)_\tau \), \( \alpha \geq 1 \) is a quotient of odd natural numbers, and \( z(t) = x(t) - p(t)x(\tau(t)) \). The increasing
interest in oscillation of solutions to various classes of equations is motivated by their applications in natural
sciences, engineering, and control; see, for instance, [1–30] and the references cited therein. Analysis of qualitative
properties of (1.1) is important not only for the sake of further development of the oscillation theory, but
for practical reasons too. As a matter of fact, a particular case of (1.1), an Emden–Fowler dynamic equation

\[ [r(t)(x^\Delta(t))^\alpha]^{\Delta} + q(t)x^\beta(\delta(t)) = 0, \]

has applications in mathematical, theoretical, and chemical physics; see Li and Rogovchenko [15–18].

Throughout the paper, we assume that the following assumptions are satisfied:
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\( H_1 \) \( r \in C_{rd}([t_0, \infty)_T, (0, \infty)), \int_{t_0}^{\infty} r^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}(t)\Delta t = \infty, R(t) = \int_{t_1}^{t} r^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}(s)\Delta s, \) where \( t_1 \in [t_0, \infty)_T \) is sufficiently large;

\( H_2 \) \( p, q \in C_{rd}([t_0, \infty)_T, \mathbb{R}), 0 \leq p(t) \leq p_0 < 1, q(t) \geq 0, \) and \( q(t) \) is not identically zero for large \( t; \)

\( H_3 \) \( \tau, \delta \in C_{rd}([t_0, \infty)_T, \mathbb{T}), \tau(t) \leq t, \delta(t) \leq t, \) and \( \lim_{t \to \infty} \tau(t) = \lim_{t \to \infty} \delta(t) = \infty; \)

\( H_4 \) \( f \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}), uf(u) > 0 \) for all \( u \neq 0, \) and there exists a positive constant \( k \) such that \( f(u)/u^3 \geq k \) for all \( u \neq 0, \) where \( \beta \geq \alpha \) is a quotient of odd natural numbers.

By a solution to (1.1) we mean a function \( x \in C_{rd}[T_x, \infty)_T, T_x \in [t_0, \infty)_T, \) such that \( r(z(t)) \in C_{rd}[T_x, \infty)_T \) and \( x \) satisfies (1.1) on \( [T_x, \infty)_T. \) We consider only those solutions \( x \) of (1.1) which satisfy \( \sup \{|x(t)| : t \in [T, \infty)_T\} > 0 \) for all \( T \in [T_x, \infty)_T \) and assume that (1.1) possesses such solutions. As usual, a solution of (1.1) is said to be oscillatory if it is not of the same sign eventually; otherwise, it is called nonoscillatory.

Recently, a great deal of interest in oscillatory properties of solutions to various classes of equations with nonnegative neutral coefficients has been shown; see, for instance, [2, 4, 5, 14–17, 19, 20, 22, 27, 28] and the references cited therein. However, there are relatively fewer results for equations with nonpositive neutral coefficients; see [3, 4, 7, 13, 21, 23–25, 29]. In the papers by Arul and Shobha [3] and Li et al. [21], a particular case of (1.1), a neutral differential equation

\[ [r(t)(z(t'))^\alpha]' + q(t)f(x(\delta(t))) = 0 \]

was studied. Seghar et al. [23] investigated the neutral difference equation

\[ \Delta(a_n \Delta(x_n - p_n x_{n-k})) + q_n f(x_{n-i}) = 0. \]

Bohner and Li [7] and Karpuz [13] established oscillation results for neutral dynamic equations

\[ (r(t)z^\Delta(t))^{p-2}z^\Delta(t) + q(t)|x(\delta(t))|^{p-2}x(\delta(t)) = 0, \quad z(t) = x(t) - p(t)x(\tau(t)) \]

and

\[ (x(t) - p(t)x(\tau(t)))^{\alpha \Delta} + q(t)x(\delta(t)) = 0, \]

whereas Zhang et al. [29] explored (1.1) assuming that \( \alpha = \beta. \)

It should be noted that research in this paper was strongly motivated by the paper [29]. Our principal goal is to analyze the oscillatory behavior of solutions to (1.1) in the case where \( \beta \geq \alpha. \) As customary for papers on oscillation, all functional inequalities are supposed to hold eventually. Without loss of generality, we can deal only with positive solutions of (1.1).

## 2 Main results

For the proofs of our oscillation criteria we need the following lemmas. The first lemma is extracted from the monograph by Bohner and Peterson [9, Theorem 1.93], and the latter lemmas can be obtained by similar techniques to those used in [3, 21].

**Lemma 2.1.** Assume that \( v : \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{R} \) is strictly increasing and \( \tilde{T} := v(T) \) is a time scale. Let \( y : \tilde{T} \to \mathbb{R}. \) If \( v^\Delta(t) \) and \( \tilde{y}^\Delta(v(t)) \) exist for \( t \in \mathbb{T}^s, \) then

\[ (y(v(t)))^\Delta = \tilde{y}^\Delta(v(t))v^\Delta(t). \]

**Lemma 2.2.** Let \( x \) be a positive solution of (1.1). Then \( x \) has the following two possible cases:

\( (I) \) \( z(t) > 0, \quad z^\Delta(t) > 0, \quad (r(t)(z^\Delta(t))^\alpha)^\Delta \leq 0; \)

\( (II) \) \( z(t) < 0, \quad z^\Delta(t) > 0, \quad (r(t)(z^\Delta(t))^\alpha)^\Delta \leq 0 \)

for \( t \in [t_1, \infty)_T, \) where \( t_1 \in [t_0, \infty)_T \) is sufficiently large.
Lemma 2.3. Let \( x \) be a positive solution of (1.1) and assume that the corresponding \( z \) has property (II) of Lemma 2.2. Then
\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} x(t) = 0.
\]

Lemma 2.4. If \( x \) is a positive solution of (1.1) such that case (I) of Lemma 2.2 is satisfied, then \( x(t) \geq z(t) \) and \( z(t)/R(t) \) is strictly decreasing for large \( t \).

Theorem 2.1. Assume that \( \delta([t_0, \infty)_T) = [\delta(t_0), \infty)_T \) and \( \delta^\Delta(t) > 0 \). If for any \( M > 0 \),
\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} \left[ Q(t) + \alpha \int_{t}^{\infty} \delta^\Delta(s) r^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\delta(s)) Q^\Delta(t) r^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\delta(s)) \Delta s \right]^{\alpha} > 1,
\]
where \( Q(t) = kM^{\beta-\alpha} \int_{t}^{\infty} q(u) \Delta u, \) then solutions of (1.1) are either oscillatory or converge to zero as \( t \to \infty \).

Proof. Let \( x \) be a nonoscillatory solution of (1.1) such that \( x(t) > 0, x(\tau(t)) > 0, \) and \( x(\delta(t)) > 0 \) for \( t \in [t_1, \infty)_T \). It follows from Lemma 2.2 that \( z \) satisfies either (I) or (II) for \( t \in [t_1, \infty)_T \).

Case 1. Suppose first that \( z \) satisfies case (I). By virtue of the definition of \( z \),
\[
x(t) = z(t) + p(t)x(\tau(t)) \geq z(t)
\]
and so we can write (1.1) in the form
\[
[r(t)(\Delta(t))^\alpha]^{\Delta} \leq -kq(t)z^\beta(\delta(t)).
\]

Defining the Riccati transformation
\[
\nu(t) = \frac{r(t)(\Delta(t))^\alpha}{z^\alpha(\delta(t))},
\]
then \( \nu(t) > 0 \) and there exists a constant \( M > 0 \) such that
\[
\nu^\Delta(t) = \left[ \frac{r(t)(\Delta(t))^\alpha}{z^\alpha(\delta(t))} \right]^\Delta + \left[ \frac{r(t)(\Delta(t))^\alpha}{z^\alpha(\delta(t))} \right] \frac{1}{z^\alpha(\delta(t))} \geq -kM^{\beta-\alpha}q(t) - a\delta^\Delta(t)\nu(\sigma(t)) z^{\Delta(\delta(t))/z(\delta(\sigma(t)))}. \tag{2.3}
\]

Taking into account that \( \nu^\Delta(\sigma(t)) = r^{\frac{1}{2}}(\sigma(t))z^{\Delta(\sigma(t))/z(\delta(\sigma(t)))}, r(t)(\Delta(t))^\alpha \leq 0, \) and \( \delta(t) \leq t \leq \sigma(t), \) we conclude that
\[
\frac{z^{\Delta(\delta(t))}}{z^{\Delta(\sigma(t))}} \geq \frac{\nu^\Delta(\sigma(t))}{r^{\frac{1}{2}}(\delta(t))}. \tag{2.4}
\]

Combining (2.3) and (2.4), we arrive at
\[
\nu^\Delta(t) \leq -kM^{\beta-\alpha}q(t) - a\delta^\Delta(t)r^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\delta(t))\nu^{\frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha}}(\sigma(t)). \tag{2.5}
\]

Integrating (2.5) from \( t \) to \( s \), we deduce that
\[
\nu(s) - \nu(t) \leq -kM^{\beta-\alpha} \int_{t}^{s} q(u) \Delta u - \alpha \int_{t}^{s} \delta^\Delta(u)r^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\delta(u))\nu^{\frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha}}(\sigma(u)) \Delta u,
\]
which yields
\[
\nu(t) \geq kM^{\beta-\alpha} \int_{t}^{s} q(u) \Delta u + \alpha \int_{t}^{s} \delta^\Delta(u)r^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\delta(u))\nu^{\frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha}}(\sigma(u)) \Delta u. \tag{2.6}
\]

Passing to the limit as \( s \to \infty \), we have
\[
\nu(t) \geq Q(t) + \alpha \int_{t}^{\infty} \delta^\Delta(u)r^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\delta(u))Q^{\Delta(\sigma(u))} \Delta u. \tag{2.7}
\]

An application of (2.6) implies that
\[
\nu(t) \geq Q(t) + \alpha \int_{t}^{\infty} \delta^\Delta(u)r^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\delta(u))Q^{\Delta(\sigma(u))} \Delta u.
\]
By virtue of (2.2), we conclude that
\[
\frac{1}{\nu(t)} = \frac{1}{v(t)} \left( \frac{z^\Delta(t)}{z^\Delta(t)} \right)^{\alpha}
= \frac{1}{v(t)} \left( \frac{z(t_2)+ \int_{t_2}^{\infty} r^\Delta(s)z^\Delta(s)r^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}(s)\Delta s}{z^\Delta(t)} \right)^{\alpha}
\geq \frac{1}{v(t)} \left( \frac{r^\Delta(t)z^\Delta(t) \int_{t_2}^{\infty} r^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}(s)\Delta s}{z^\Delta(t)} \right)^{\alpha},
\]
that is,
\[
\nu(t) \left( \int_{t_2}^{\infty} r^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}(s)\Delta s \right)^{\alpha} \leq 1. \tag{2.8}
\]

Using (2.7) and (2.8), we deduce that
\[
\limsup_{t \to \infty} \left[ Q(t) + \alpha \int_{t}^{\infty} \delta^\Delta(s)r^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}(s)Q(t+1)(\Delta(s)) \right] \left( \int_{t_2}^{\infty} r^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}(s)\Delta s \right)^{\alpha} \leq 1,
\]
which contradicts (2.1).

Case 2. Suppose now that \( z \) satisfies case \( (II) \). It follows from Lemma 2.3 that \( \lim_{t \to \infty} x(t) = 0 \). This completes the proof.

**Theorem 2.2.** If there exists a positive function \( \beta \in C^1_{\tau}(\mathbb{R}) \) such that for all sufficiently large \( t_1 \in [t_0, \infty) \), for some \( t_2 \in [t_1, \infty) \), and for any \( M > 0 \),
\[
\int_{t_2}^{\infty} \left[ kM^\beta q(s)\beta(s) \left( \frac{R(s)}{R(t)} \right)^{\alpha} - \frac{1}{\alpha+1} \frac{(\beta^\delta(s))^{\alpha+1}r(s)}{\beta^\delta(s)} \right] \Delta s = \infty, \tag{2.9}
\]
then conclusion of Theorem 2.1 remains intact.

**Proof.** Assume that \( x \) is a nonoscillatory solution of (1.1) on \([t_0, \infty)\) that satisfies \( x(t) > 0 \), \( x(\tau(t)) > 0 \), and \( x(\delta(t)) > 0 \) for \( t \in [t_1, \infty) \). By virtue of Lemma 2.2, \( z \) satisfies either \( (I) \) or \( (II) \) for \( t \in [t_1, \infty) \).

Case 1. Suppose that \( z \) satisfies case \( (I) \). Define the Riccati transformation
\[
\omega(t) = \beta(t) \frac{r(t)(z^\Delta(t))^{\alpha}}{z^\alpha(t)}.
\]
Then \( \omega(t) > 0 \) and there exists a constant \( M > 0 \) such that
\[
\omega^\Delta(t) = \left[ r(t)(z^\Delta(t))^{\alpha} \right]^\Delta \frac{\beta(t)}{z^\alpha(t)} + \left[ r(t)(z^\Delta(t))^{\alpha} \right]^\sigma \frac{\beta(t)}{z^\alpha(t)} \leq -kM^\beta q(t)\beta(t) \frac{z^\alpha(\delta(t))}{z^\alpha(t)} + \frac{\beta^\Delta(t)}{\beta(\sigma(t))} \omega(\sigma(t)) - \frac{\beta(t)}{\beta^{\alpha+1}(\sigma(t))} \frac{z^\alpha(t)}{z(\sigma(t))} \omega(\sigma(t)) \leq -kM^\beta q(t)\beta(t) \frac{z^\alpha(\delta(t))}{z^\alpha(t)} + \frac{\beta^\Delta(t)}{\beta(\sigma(t))} \omega(\sigma(t)) - \frac{\beta(t)}{\beta^{\alpha+1}(\sigma(t))} \frac{z^\alpha(t)}{z(\sigma(t))} \omega(\sigma(t)).
\]

In view of Lemma 2.4, we obtain
\[
\omega^\Delta(t) \leq -kM^\beta q(t)\beta(t) \left( \frac{R(\delta(t))}{R(t)} \right)^{\alpha} + \frac{\beta^\Delta(t)}{\beta(\sigma(t))} \omega(\sigma(t)) - \frac{\beta(t)}{\beta^{\alpha+1}(\sigma(t))} \frac{z^\alpha(t)}{z(\sigma(t))} \omega(\sigma(t)). \tag{2.10}
\]

Applying the inequality
\[
B \omega - A \omega^{\alpha+1} \leq \frac{\alpha^\alpha}{(\alpha+1)^{\alpha+1}} \frac{B^{\alpha+1}}{A^{\alpha}}, \quad A > 0
\]
with
\[
B = \frac{\beta^\Delta(t)}{\beta(\sigma(t))} \quad \text{and} \quad A = \frac{\beta(t)}{\beta^{\alpha+1}(\sigma(t))} \frac{z^\alpha(t)}{z(\sigma(t))} \omega(\sigma(t)).
\]
and using (2.10), we deduce that
\[
\omega^\Delta(t) \leq -kM^{\beta-\alpha}q(t)\beta(t)\left(\frac{R(\delta(t))}{R(t)}\right)^\alpha + \frac{1}{(\alpha+1)^{\alpha+1}}\frac{(\beta^\Delta(t))^{\alpha+1}r(t)}{\beta^\alpha(t)}.
\]
(2.11)
Integrating (2.11) from \(t_2\) (\(t_2 \in [t_1, \infty)\)) to \(t\), we arrive at
\[
\int_{t_2}^{t} \left[ kM^{\beta-\alpha}q(s)\beta(s)\left(\frac{R(\delta(s))}{R(s)}\right)^\alpha - \frac{1}{(\alpha+1)^{\alpha+1}}\frac{(\beta^\Delta(s))^{\alpha+1}r(s)}{\beta^\alpha(s)} \right] ds \leq \omega(t_2),
\]
which contradicts (2.9).

Case 2. If \(z\) satisfies case (II), then \(\lim_{t \to \infty} x(t) = 0\) due to Lemma 2.3. The proof is complete.

\[\Box\]

Remark 2.1. On the basis of Theorem 2.2, one can obtain Philos-type oscillation criteria for equation (1.1). The details are left to the reader.

Example 2.1. For \(t \in [1, \infty)\), consider the second-order superlinear Emden–Fowler neutral delay dynamic equation
\[
\left(x(t) - \frac{1}{3}x\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)\right)^{\Delta \Delta} + \frac{\gamma}{t}x^\beta\left(\frac{t}{4}\right) = 0, \quad \beta > 1, \quad \gamma > 0.
\]
(2.12)
Let \(\beta(t) = 1\). It follows from Theorem 2.2 that every solution \(x\) of equation (2.12) is either oscillatory or satisfies \(\lim_{t \to \infty} x(t) = 0\).

Remark 2.2. For a class of second-order neutral delay dynamic equations (1.1), we derived two new oscillation results which complement and improve those obtained by Zhang et al. [29]. A distinguishing feature of our criteria is that we do not impose specific restriction \(\alpha = \beta\). Since the sign of the derivative \(z^\Delta\) is not known, it is difficult to establish sufficient conditions which ensure that every solution \(x\) of (1.1) is just oscillatory and does not satisfy \(\lim_{t \to \infty} x(t) = 0\). Neither is it possible to use the technique exploited in this paper for proving that all solutions of (1.1) approach zero at infinity. As mentioned in the paper by Zhang et al. [29], it would be of interest to study (1.1) in the case where \(\int_{t_0}^{\infty} r^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}}(t)\Delta t < \infty\).
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Abstract

In a group decision making (GDM) situation with qualitative settings and complex environments, experts may require intervals with corresponding possibility values, rather than only interval-valued hesitant fuzzy sets (IVHFSs) or probability-hesitant fuzzy sets (P-HFSs), to express their preferences. In this paper, in line with such situations, probability-interval valued hesitant fuzzy sets (P-IVHFSs) are presented to address GDM problems with hesitant fuzzy intervals and the corresponding possibility values. A P-IVHFS can serve as an extension of both a P-HFS and an IVHFS. As important tools in GDM, P-IVHFSs can describe the actual preferences of decision-makers and better reflect their uncertainty, hesitancy, and inconsistency, thus enhancing the modeling abilities of HFSs. Firstly, the concept of P-IVHFSs is defined, and then some properties of P-IVHFSs are presented. Furthermore, probability-interval valued hesitant fuzzy preference relations (P-IVHFPRs) are defined and the consistency of P-IVHFPRs is discussed. Then, based on related research, a decomposition method is developed to deal with the consistency of P-IVHFPRs. Finally an example is provided to illustrate the proposed approach.
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Decision making, Fuzzy sets, P-IVHFS, Preference relation, Consistency

1. Introduction

Torra initiated the notable concept of HFSs, which represented a new generalization for fuzzy sets, as this method permits an element to have not just one but a set of several possible membership values. Consequently, HFSs can describe the hesitancy experienced by decision makers (DMs) in the decision-making process. As a result of this innovation, the HFS has attracted an increasing amount of attention in academia since its introduction. In recent years, there have been a number of developments regarding the theory of HFSs. For example, Xu and Xia defined the concept of the hesitant fuzzy element (HFE), which can be considered to be the basic unit of a HFS. Moreover, Rodríguez et al. proposed the hesitant fuzzy linguistic term set to deal with linguistic decision making. Chen et al. extended HFSs to IVHFSs, which represent the membership degrees of an element to a set with several possible interval values. Farhadinia proposed a series of score functions for HFSs and Wei, Zhang, Yu, and Ai et al. studied their aggregation operators. Farhadinia, Xu and Xia, Peng et al., and Chen et al. discussed the information measures of HFSs. Wang et al. studied the interval-valued hesitant fuzzy linguistic set, which can serve as an extension of both a linguistic term set and an interval-valued hesitant fuzzy set. Finally, Wu and Xu presented the concept of possibility distribution for a hesitant fuzzy linguistic term set and Zhu and Xu extended HFSs to P-HFSs.

* Corresponding author. Tel: +86 28 85418191; Fax: +86 28 85415143.
E-mail address: xujiuping@scu.edu.cn (J. Xu)
In group decision making (GDM) problems with fuzzy preference relations, some of the experts’ preference properties are often assumed and it is desirable to avoid contradictions or, in other words, inconsistent opinions. One of these properties is associated with the pairwise comparison transitivity between any three alternatives. For fuzzy preference relations, the transitivity has been modeled in many different ways depending on the role of the preference intensities. The purpose of consistency control is to measure the level of consistency of each individual preference relation so as to identify the expert, alternative and preference values that are the most inconsistent within the GDM problem. This inconsistency identification is also used to suggest possible new consistent preference values.

In the process of GDM, preference relations are very popular tools for expressing the DM’s preferences when they compare a set of alternatives. Various types of preference relations have been suggested for different environments. For example, Orlovsky proposed the concept of fuzzy preference relations, and Xu introduced the concept of interval fuzzy preference relations to express uncertainty and vagueness. In many practical decision making problems, due to a lack of available information, it may be difficult for DMs to quantify their opinions precisely with a crisp number; however they can be represented by an interval number within [0, 1]. This means that it is vital to introduce the concept of IVHFSs, which permit the membership degrees of an element to a given set to have some different interval values. Chen et al. introduced interval-valued hesitant preference relations and their applications to GDM. Moreover, Farhadinia discussed the information measures of IVHFSs and Wang et al. developed interval-valued hesitant fuzzy linguistic sets, and discussed their applications in multi-criteria decision-making problems.

However, in a GDM situation with qualitative settings and in complex environments, experts may require intervals with corresponding possibility values rather than only IVHFSs or P-HFSs, to express their preferences. Consider the following case for example: the DMs of a large organization discuss the membership of $x$ into a set $A$; forty percent of them want to assign values between 0.3 and 0.4, while the remaining sixty percent wish to assign values between 0.5 and 0.6. At this point, interval numbers with probability values can be used, i.e., $[0.3, 0.4] (40\%)$, $[0.5, 0.6] (60\%)$, or $[0.3, 0.4] (0.4), [0.5, 0.6] (0.6)$, to represent the preferences of the large organization. In accordance with such cases, in this paper, P-IVHFSs are presented to address GDM problems with hesitant fuzzy intervals and the corresponding possibility values. A P-IVHFS can serve as an extension of both a P-HFS and an IVHFS. Furthermore, as a powerful tool in GDM, P-IVHFSs can describe the actual preferences of decision-makers flexibly and better reflect their uncertainty, hesitancy, and inconsistency, and thus enhance the modeling abilities of HFSs. The consistency of preference relations has become a research topic of great interest in recent years. For example, Liao et al. defined the concept of the multiplicative consistent hesitant fuzzy preference relation. Furthermore, Wu and Xu developed separate consistency and consensus processes to deal with the hesitant fuzzy linguistic preference relations of individual rationality and group rationality. Zhu and Xu proposed the concept of the probability-hesitant fuzzy preference relation. As mentioned earlier, to date there has been a great deal of research into preference relations and interval preference relations. Nevertheless, in a probability-interval valued hesitant fuzzy environment, it is still not known how to calculate or improve the consistency of preference relations. Therefore, this study focuses on resolving this problem.

In this paper, based on the P-HFS and IVHFS, a definition of P-IVHFS is provided, and the relationship between the P-HFS, IVHFS and P-IVHFS is illustrated. Furthermore, motivated by the comparison method of HFEs, the comparison method of P-IVHFEs is defined. Additionally, inspired by the operations of IVHFEs, the complement, union and intersection and operational laws of P-IVHFEs are provided. Moreover, based on related studies, the definition of P-IVHFPRs is also provided. Subsequently, the consistency of P-IVHFPRs is discussed, using the multiplicative transitivity to verify the consistency of a P-IVHFPR. Finally, based on the method in a hesitant fuzzy environment, some definitions related to multiplicative consistent P-
IVHFPRs are provided, and a decomposition method to repair the consistency of P-IVHFPRs is proposed.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, some concepts and properties associated with the topic are briefly reviewed. In Section 3, P-IVHFSs are proposed and some of their properties are discussed. In Section 4, P-IVHFPRs are proposed and in Section 5, the consistency of P-IVHFPRs is discussed. In Section 6, based on the multiplicative consistency of hesitant fuzzy preference relations, a decomposition method to deal with the consistency of P-IVHFPRs is proposed. Finally an example is provided to illustrate the algorithm.

2. Preliminaries

In this section, some concepts and properties associated with the topic are briefly reviewed.

**Definition 1.** Let \( \tilde{a} = [a^L, a^U] = \{x | a^L \leq x \leq a^U\} \), and then \( \tilde{a} \) is called an interval number. For convenience, interval numbers are sometimes also called interval values. In particular, if \( a^L = a^U \), \( \tilde{a} \) is a real number. If \( a^L \geq 0 \), then \( \tilde{a} \) is called a positive interval number.

For any two positive interval numbers \( \tilde{a} = [a^L, a^U], \tilde{b} = [b^L, b^U] \) and \( \lambda \geq 0, \delta > 0 \), then

1. \( \tilde{a} = \tilde{b} \) if \( a^L = b^L \) and \( a^U = b^U \);
2. \( \tilde{a} + \tilde{b} = [a^L + b^L, a^U + b^U] \);
3. \( \tilde{a} \cdot \tilde{b} = [a^L \cdot b^L, a^U \cdot b^U] \);
4. \( \lambda \tilde{a} = [\lambda a^L, \lambda a^U] \);
5. \( \tilde{a}^\delta = [a^L, a^U]^{\delta} = ([a^L]^\delta, [a^U]^\delta) \);
6. \( \delta \tilde{a} = [\delta a^L, \delta a^U] = [\min\{\delta a^L, \delta a^U\}, \max\{\delta a^L, \delta a^U\}] \).

**Definition 2.** [29] Let \( \tilde{a}_1 = [a_1^L, a_1^U] \) and \( \tilde{a}_2 = [a_2^L, a_2^U] \) be two interval numbers, and \( \text{len}(\tilde{a}_1) = a_1^U - a_1^L \), \( \text{len}(\tilde{a}_2) = a_2^U - a_2^L \), then the degree of possibility of \( \tilde{a}_1 \geq \tilde{a}_2 \) is defined as follows:

\[
p(\tilde{a}_1 \geq \tilde{a}_2) = \max\{1 - \max\{ \frac{a_2^L - a_1^L}{\text{len}(\tilde{a}_1) + \text{len}(\tilde{a}_2)}, 0 \}, 0\} \tag{1}
\]

Similarly, the degree of possibility of \( \tilde{a}_2 \geq \tilde{a}_1 \) is defined as follows:

\[
p(\tilde{a}_2 \geq \tilde{a}_1) = \max\{1 - \max\{ \frac{a_1^L - a_2^L}{\text{len}(\tilde{a}_1) + \text{len}(\tilde{a}_2)}, 0 \}, 0\} \tag{2}
\]

Based on Definition 2, the following results hold:

1. \( 0 \leq p(\tilde{a}_1 \geq \tilde{a}_2) \leq 1, \ 0 \leq p(\tilde{a}_2 \geq \tilde{a}_1) \leq 1 \).
2. \( p(\tilde{a}_1 \geq \tilde{a}_2) + p(\tilde{a}_2 \geq \tilde{a}_1) = 1 \). Especially, \( p(\tilde{a}_1 \geq \tilde{a}_1) = p(\tilde{a}_2 \geq \tilde{a}_2) = 1 \).

**Definition 3.** [15, 16] Let \( X \) be a universal set, a hesitant fuzzy set (HFS) on \( X \) is in terms of a function that when applied to \( X \) returns a subset of \([0, 1]\).

To be easily understood, the HFS can be expressed by a mathematical symbol [21]:

\[
\tilde{A} = \left\{ \langle x, \tilde{h}_A(x) \rangle \mid x \in X \right\}
\]

where \( \tilde{h}_A(x) \) is a set of some values in \([0, 1]\), denoting the possible membership degrees of the element \( x \in X \) to the set \( \tilde{A} \). \( \tilde{h}_A(x) \) is called a hesitant fuzzy element (HFE) and \( \Theta \) the set of all HFEs [22].

For three HFEs \( h, h_1 \) and \( h_2 \), Torra and Narukawa [15, 16] defined the corresponding complement, union and intersection, namely

1. \( h^c = \cup_{\gamma \in h} \{1 - \gamma\} \);
2. \( h_1 \cup h_2 = \cup_{\gamma_1 \in h_1, \gamma_2 \in h_2} \max\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\} \);
3. \( h_1 \cap h_2 = \cap_{\gamma_1 \in h_1, \gamma_2 \in h_2} \min\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\} \).
Operational laws on the HFEs \( h, h_1 \) and \( h_2 \) have been given as follows [22]:

1. \( h^\lambda = \bigcup_{\gamma \in h} \{ \gamma^\lambda \}, \lambda > 0 \);
2. \( \lambda h = \bigcup_{\gamma \in h} \{ 1 - (1 - \gamma)^\lambda \}, \lambda > 0 \);
3. \( h_1 \oplus h_2 = \bigcup_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in h_1} \{ \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \}; \)
4. \( h_1 \otimes h_2 = \bigcup_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in h_2} \{ \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \}. \)

**Definition 4.** [2] Let \( X \) be a universal set, and \( D[0,1] \) be the set of all closed subintervals of \([0,1]\). An interval-valued hesitant fuzzy set (IVHFS) on \( X \) is

\[
\hat{A} = \left\{ (x_i, \hat{h}_A(x_i)) \mid x_i \in X, i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \right\}
\]

where \( \hat{h}_A(x_i) : X \rightarrow D[0,1] \) denotes all possible interval-valued membership degrees of the element \( x_i \in X \) to the set \( \hat{A} \). For convenience, we call \( \hat{h}_A(x_i) \) an interval-valued hesitant fuzzy element (IVHFE), which is denoted by

\[
\hat{h}_A(x_i) = \left\{ \tilde{\gamma} \mid \tilde{\gamma} \in \hat{h}_A(x_i) \right\}
\]

Here \( \tilde{\gamma} = [\tilde{\gamma}^L, \tilde{\gamma}^U] \) is an interval number. \( \tilde{\gamma}^L = \inf \tilde{\gamma} \) and \( \tilde{\gamma}^U = \sup \tilde{\gamma} \) represent the lower and upper limits of \( \tilde{\gamma} \), respectively. When the lower and upper limits of the interval numbers are identical, IVHFS reduces to HFS [15]. Namely HFS is a special case of IVHFS.

**Example 1.** Let \( X = \{ x_1, x_2 \} \) be a universal set, and the two IVHFEs \( \tilde{h}_A(x_1) = \{ [0.1, 0.3], [0.4, 0.5] \} \) and \( \tilde{h}_A(x_2) = \{ [0.1, 0.2], [0.4, 0.6], [0.7, 0.8] \} \) denote the membership degrees of \( x_i (i = 1, 2) \) to the set \( \hat{A} \). \( \hat{A} \) is an IVHFS, where

\[
\hat{A} = \{ (x_1, [0.1, 0.3], [0.4, 0.5]), (x_2, [0.1, 0.2], [0.4, 0.6], [0.7, 0.8]) \}
\]

**Definition 5.** [2] For an IVHFE \( \tilde{h} \), \( s(\tilde{h}) = \frac{1}{t_\tilde{h}} \sum_{\tilde{\gamma} \in \tilde{h}} \tilde{\gamma} \) is called the score function of \( \tilde{h} \) where \( t_\tilde{h} \) is the number of the interval values in \( \tilde{h} \), and \( s(\tilde{h}) \) is an interval value belonging to \([0,1] \). For two IVHFEs \( \tilde{h}_1 \) and \( \tilde{h}_2 \), if \( s(\tilde{h}_1) \geq s(\tilde{h}_2) \), then \( \tilde{h}_1 \geq \tilde{h}_2 \).

**Definition 6.** [2] For three IVHFEs \( h, h_1 \) and \( h_2 \), the corresponding complement, union and intersection and operational laws have been given as follows. If \( \tilde{\gamma}^L = \tilde{\gamma}^U \), then the following operations reduce to those of HFEs:

1. \( h^c = \{ [1 - \tilde{\gamma}^U, 1 - \tilde{\gamma}^L] \mid \tilde{\gamma} \in h \}; \)
2. \( h_1 \cup h_2 = \{ \max(\tilde{\gamma}_1^L, \tilde{\gamma}_2^L), \max(\tilde{\gamma}_1^U, \tilde{\gamma}_2^U) \} \mid \tilde{\gamma}_1 \in h_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2 \in h_2 \}; \)
3. \( h_1 \cap h_2 = \{ \min(\tilde{\gamma}_1^L, \tilde{\gamma}_2^L), \min(\tilde{\gamma}_1^U, \tilde{\gamma}_2^U) \} \mid \tilde{\gamma}_1 \in h_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2 \in h_2 \}; \)
4. \( h^\lambda = \{ (\tilde{\gamma}^L)^\lambda, (\tilde{\gamma}^U)^\lambda \} \mid \tilde{\gamma} \in h \}, \lambda > 0; \)
5. \( \lambda h = \{ [1 - (1 - \tilde{\gamma})^\lambda, 1 - (1 - \tilde{\gamma}^U)^\lambda] \mid \tilde{\gamma} \in h \}, \lambda > 0; \)
6. \( h_1 \oplus h_2 = \{ [\tilde{\gamma}_1^L + \tilde{\gamma}_2^L - \tilde{\gamma}_1^L \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_2^L, \tilde{\gamma}_1^U + \tilde{\gamma}_2^U - \tilde{\gamma}_1^U \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_2^U] \} \tilde{\gamma}_1 \in h_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2 \in h_2 \}; \)
7. \( h_1 \otimes h_2 = \{ [\tilde{\gamma}_1^L \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_2^L, \tilde{\gamma}_1^U \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_2^U] \} \tilde{\gamma}_1 \in h_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2 \in h_2 \}. \)

3. **P-IVHFS**

Inspired by the P-HFS [19, 37] and IVHFS [2], the definition of a P-IVHFS is provided.
Definition 7. Let $X$ be a universal set, and $D[0,1]$ be the set of all closed subintervals of $[0,1]$. A P-IVHFS on $X$ is

$$
\tilde{A} = \left\{ x_i, \tilde{h}_A(x_i, p_{ij}) \mid x_i \in X, i = 1, 2, \ldots, n, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m_i \right\}
$$

where $\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} p_{ij} = 1$, $m_i$ denotes the number of the interval values in $\tilde{h}_A(x_i, p_{ij})$, $p_{ij}$ denotes the corresponding probability of the $j$th interval value in $\tilde{h}_A(x_i, p_{ij})$, and $\tilde{h}_A(x_i, p_{ij}) : X \rightarrow D[0,1]$ denotes all possible interval-valued membership degrees of the element $x_i \in X$ to the set $\tilde{A}$. For convenience, $\tilde{h}_A(x_i, p_{ij})$ is called a probability-interval valued hesitant fuzzy element (P-IVHFE), which is denoted by

$$
\tilde{h}_A(x_i, p_{ij}) = \left\{ \tilde{\gamma} \in \tilde{h}_A(x_i, p_{ij}) \right\}
$$

Here $\tilde{\gamma}$ is an interval number with a corresponding possibility. For simplicity, P-IVHFE can be denoted by $\tilde{h}_i$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots$. A P-IVHFE is the basic unit of a P-IVHFS, and the former can be considered as a special case of the latter. The relationship between a P-IVHFE and a P-IVHFS is similar to that between an IVHFE and an IVHFS [2].

Suppose that $\gamma^L = \inf \tilde{\gamma}$ and $\gamma^U = \sup \tilde{\gamma}$ represent the lower and upper limits of $\tilde{\gamma}$, respectively. When the lower and upper limits of the interval numbers are identical, the interval numbers are reduced to crisp numbers, and a P-IVHFS is reduced to a P-HFS. Thus, a P-HFS is a special case of a P-IVHFS. Meanwhile, it is clear that without the probability description $p_{ij}$, that is the probability values $p_{ij}$ ($j = 1, 2, \ldots$) are identical, a P-IVHFE is reduced to an IVHFE, and a P-IVHFS is reduced to an IVHFS. Thus, an IVHFE is a special case of a P-IVHFE, and an IVHFS is a special case of a P-IVHFS.

Example 2. Let $X = \{x_1, x_2\}$ be a universal set, and the two P-IVHFEs

$$
\tilde{h}_1(x_1, p_{11}) = \{(0.2, 0.3)(p_{11} = 0.4), [0.5, 0.6](p_{12} = 0.6)\}
$$

$$
\tilde{h}_2(x_2, p_{22}) = \{(0.1, 0.2)(p_{21} = 0.3), [0.3, 0.5](p_{22} = 0.5), [0.6, 0.7](p_{23} = 0.2)\}
$$

denote the membership degrees of $x_i$ ($i = 1, 2$) to the set $\tilde{A}$. $\tilde{A}$ is a P-IVHFS, where

$$
\tilde{A} = \left\{ \langle x_1, \{(0.2, 0.3)(p_{11} = 0.4), [0.5, 0.6](p_{12} = 0.6)\} \rangle, \langle x_2, \{(0.1, 0.2)(p_{21} = 0.3), [0.3, 0.5](p_{22} = 0.5), [0.6, 0.7](p_{23} = 0.2)\} \rangle \right\}
$$

Based on the comparison method of HFEs [21], the following comparison method of P-IVHFEs is defined:

Definition 8. For a P-IVHFE, $s(\tilde{h}) = \sum_{\gamma \in \tilde{h}} \gamma p_\gamma$ is called the score of $\tilde{h}$, where $p_\gamma$ is the corresponding probability of $\gamma$. It is clear that $s(\tilde{h})$ is also an interval number.

Then by Eqs. (1) and (2), we can get the possibilities of $s(\tilde{h}_1) \geq s(\tilde{h}_2)$ and $s(\tilde{h}_2) \geq s(\tilde{h}_1)$, namely $p(h_1 \geq h_2)$ and $p(h_2 \geq h_1)$.

If $p(s(\tilde{h}_1) \geq s(\tilde{h}_2)) > 0.5$, then $\tilde{h}_1$ is superior to $\tilde{h}_2$, and thus $\tilde{h}_1$ is superior to $\tilde{h}_2$, denoted by $\tilde{h}_1 > \tilde{h}_2$ or $\tilde{h}_2 < \tilde{h}_1$.

If $p(s(\tilde{h}_1) \geq s(\tilde{h}_2)) < 0.5$, then $\tilde{h}_2$ is superior to $\tilde{h}_1$, and thus $\tilde{h}_2$ is superior to $\tilde{h}_1$, denoted by $\tilde{h}_2 > \tilde{h}_1$ or $\tilde{h}_1 < \tilde{h}_2$.

In particular, if $p(s(\tilde{h}_1) \geq s(\tilde{h}_2)) = 0.5$, then $\tilde{h}_1$ is indifferent to $\tilde{h}_2$, denoted by $\tilde{h}_1 \sim \tilde{h}_2$.

Example 3. In Example 2, for the two P-IVHFEs

$$
\tilde{h}_1 = \{(0.2, 0.3)(p_{11} = 0.4), [0.5, 0.6](p_{12} = 0.6)\}
$$

$$
\tilde{h}_2 = \{(0.1, 0.2)(p_{21} = 0.3), [0.3, 0.5](p_{22} = 0.5), [0.6, 0.7](p_{23} = 0.2)\}
$$

according to Definition 1, we have

$$
s(\tilde{h}_1) = [0.2, 0.3] \times 0.4 + [0.5, 0.6] \times 0.6 = [0.38, 0.48]
$$
\[ s(\bar{h}_2) = [0.1, 0.2] \times 0.3 + [0.3, 0.5] \times 0.5 + [0.6, 0.7] \times 0.2 = [0.3, 0.45] \]

Using Definition 2, we obtain
\[ p(s(\bar{h}_1) \geq s(\bar{h}_2)) = \max\{1 - \max\{ \frac{0.45 - 0.38}{0.15 + 0.1}, 0 \}, 0 \} = 0.72 \]

which indicates that \( \bar{h}_1 > \bar{h}_2 \).

To be easily formulated, a P-IVHFE can be denoted by \( \tilde{h} = \{[\tilde{\gamma}_1^L, \tilde{\gamma}_1^U](p_{\tilde{\gamma}_1^L, \tilde{\gamma}_1^U}) \mid \tilde{\gamma}_1 \in \tilde{h} \} \),

for simplicity, denoted by \( \tilde{h} = \{[\tilde{\gamma}_1^L, \tilde{\gamma}_1^U](p_{\tilde{\gamma}_1}) \mid \tilde{\gamma}_1 \in \tilde{h} \} \), where \( p_{\tilde{\gamma}_1^L, \tilde{\gamma}_1^U} \) (or \( p_{\tilde{\gamma}_1} \)) denotes the corresponding probability value of \([\tilde{\gamma}_1^L, \tilde{\gamma}_1^U] \) (i.e., \( \tilde{\gamma}_1 \)). Based on the operations of IVHFEs [2], the complement, union and intersection and operational laws of P-IVHFEs can be provided as follows:

**Definition 9.** Let \( \tilde{h} \), \( \tilde{h}_1 \) and \( \tilde{h}_2 \) be three P-IVHFEs, then

1. \( \tilde{h}^c = \{[1 - \tilde{\gamma}_1^L, 1 - \tilde{\gamma}_1^U](p_{\tilde{\gamma}_1}) \mid \tilde{\gamma}_1 \in \tilde{h} \}; \)
2. \( \tilde{h}_1 \cup \tilde{h}_2 = \{[\max(\tilde{\gamma}_1^L, \tilde{\gamma}_2^L), \max(\tilde{\gamma}_1^U, \tilde{\gamma}_2^U)](p_{\tilde{\gamma}_1 \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_2}) \mid \tilde{\gamma}_1 \in \tilde{h}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2 \in \tilde{h}_2 \}; \)
3. \( \tilde{h}_1 \cap \tilde{h}_2 = \{[\min(\tilde{\gamma}_1^L, \tilde{\gamma}_2^L), \min(\tilde{\gamma}_1^U, \tilde{\gamma}_2^U)](p_{\tilde{\gamma}_1 \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_2}) \mid \tilde{\gamma}_1 \in \tilde{h}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2 \in \tilde{h}_2 \}; \)
4. \( \tilde{h}^\lambda = \{[(\tilde{\gamma}_1^L)^\lambda, (\tilde{\gamma}_1^U)^\lambda](p_{\tilde{\gamma}_1}) \mid \tilde{\gamma}_1 \in \tilde{h} \}; \)
5. \( \lambda \tilde{h} = \{[1 - (1 - \tilde{\gamma}_1^L)^\lambda, 1 - (1 - \tilde{\gamma}_1^U)^\lambda](p_{\tilde{\gamma}_1}) \mid \tilde{\gamma}_1 \in \tilde{h} \}, \lambda > 0; \)
6. \( \tilde{h}_1 \oplus \tilde{h}_2 = \{[\tilde{\gamma}_1^L + \tilde{\gamma}_2^L - \tilde{\gamma}_1^L \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_2^L, \tilde{\gamma}_1^U + \tilde{\gamma}_2^U - \tilde{\gamma}_1^U \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_2^U](p_{\tilde{\gamma}_1 \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_2}) \mid \tilde{\gamma}_1 \in \tilde{h}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2 \in \tilde{h}_2 \}; \)
7. \( \tilde{h}_1 \odot \tilde{h}_2 = \{[\tilde{\gamma}_1^L \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_2^L, \tilde{\gamma}_1^U \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_2^U](p_{\tilde{\gamma}_1 \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_2}) \mid \tilde{\gamma}_1 \in \tilde{h}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2 \in \tilde{h}_2 \}. \)

It is clear that without the probability description \( p_{ij} \), that is the probability values \( p_{ij} (j = 1, 2, \cdots) \) are identical, then the operational laws of P-IVHFEs are reduced to those of the IVHFEs.

**Theorem 1.** When IVHFEs are extended to P-IVHFEs, the following operational laws [2] still are true in the P-IVHFS environment. Let \( \tilde{h} \), \( \tilde{h}_1 \) and \( \tilde{h}_2 \) be three P-IVHFEs, then

1. \( \tilde{h}_1 \oplus \tilde{h}_2 = \tilde{h}_2 \oplus \tilde{h}_1; \)
2. \( \tilde{h}_1 \otimes \tilde{h}_2 = \tilde{h}_2 \otimes \tilde{h}_1; \)
3. \( \lambda(\tilde{h}_1 \oplus \tilde{h}_2) = \lambda \tilde{h}_1 \oplus \lambda \tilde{h}_2, \lambda > 0; \)
4. \( (\tilde{h}_1 \otimes \tilde{h}_2)^\lambda \neq \tilde{h}_1^\lambda \otimes \tilde{h}_2^\lambda, \lambda > 0; \)
5. \( \lambda_1 \tilde{h} \oplus \lambda_2 \tilde{h} = (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)\tilde{h}, \lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0; \)
6. \( \tilde{h}^{\lambda_1} \otimes \tilde{h}^{\lambda_2} = \tilde{h}^{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)}, \lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0. \)
7. \( \tilde{h}_1^c \cup \tilde{h}_2^c = (\tilde{h}_1 \cap \tilde{h}_2)^c; \)
8. \( \tilde{h}_1^c \cap \tilde{h}_2^c = (\tilde{h}_1 \cup \tilde{h}_2)^c; \)
9. \( (\tilde{h}^c)^\lambda = (\lambda \tilde{h})^c; \)
10. \( \lambda(\tilde{h}^c) = (\tilde{h}^\lambda)^c; \)
11. \( \tilde{h}_1^c \oplus \tilde{h}_2^c = (\tilde{h}_1 \odot \tilde{h}_2)^c; \)
12. \( \tilde{h}_1^c \otimes \tilde{h}_2^c = (\tilde{h}_1 \oplus \tilde{h}_2)^c. \)

Since they can be proven analogously, like those in an IVHFS environment, they are just listed without any proof. Meanwhile, according to Definition 9, the following operational laws also hold:
Theorem 2. Let \( \tilde{h}, \tilde{h}_1 \) and \( \tilde{h}_2 \) be three P-IVHFES, then

\[
(1) (\tilde{h} \cup \tilde{h}_1) \cap \tilde{h}_2 = \tilde{h} \cup (\tilde{h}_1 \cup \tilde{h}_2);
(2) (\tilde{h} \cap \tilde{h}_1) \cap \tilde{h}_2 = \tilde{h} \cap (\tilde{h}_1 \cap \tilde{h}_2);
(3) (\tilde{h} \oplus \tilde{h}_1) \oplus \tilde{h}_2 = \tilde{h} \oplus (\tilde{h}_1 \oplus \tilde{h}_2);
(4) (\tilde{h} \otimes \tilde{h}_1) \otimes \tilde{h}_2 = \tilde{h} \otimes (\tilde{h}_1 \otimes \tilde{h}_2).
\]

Proof. In the following, only (3) is proven; others can be obtained directly by Definition 9.

Suppose that

\[
\tilde{h} = \{([\tilde{\gamma}^L_r, \tilde{\gamma}^U_r](p_{\gamma^L}) \mid \tilde{\gamma} \in \tilde{h}) ; \tilde{h}_1 = \{([\tilde{\gamma}_1^L \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_1^U](p_{\gamma_1^L}) \mid \tilde{\gamma}_1 \in \tilde{h}_1) ; \tilde{h}_2 = \{([\tilde{\gamma}_2^L \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_2^U](p_{\gamma_2^L}) \mid \tilde{\gamma}_2 \in \tilde{h}_2) \}
\]

then according to Definition 9,

\[
\tilde{h} \oplus \tilde{h}_1 = \{([\tilde{\gamma}^L + \tilde{\gamma}_1^L \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_1^U, \tilde{\gamma}^U + \tilde{\gamma}_1^U \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_1^L](p_{\gamma_1^L} \cdot p_{\gamma_1^U}) \mid \tilde{\gamma} \in \tilde{h}, \tilde{\gamma}_1 \in \tilde{h}_1 \}
\]

is obtained, therefore,

\[
(\tilde{h} \oplus \tilde{h}_1) \oplus \tilde{h}_2 = \{([\tilde{\gamma}^L + \tilde{\gamma}_1^L \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_1^U \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_2^L + \tilde{\gamma}_2^U \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_1^U \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_2^L, \tilde{\gamma}^U + \tilde{\gamma}_1^U \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_2^U \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_1^U \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_2^L) \mid \tilde{\gamma} \in \tilde{h}, \tilde{\gamma}_1 \in \tilde{h}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2 \in \tilde{h}_2 \}
\]

Likewise,

\[
\tilde{h} \oplus (\tilde{h}_1 \oplus \tilde{h}_2) = \{([\tilde{\gamma}^L + \tilde{\gamma}_1^L \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_1^U \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_2^L + \tilde{\gamma}_2^U \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_1^U \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_2^L, \tilde{\gamma}^U + \tilde{\gamma}_1^U \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_2^U \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_1^U \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_2^L) \mid \tilde{\gamma} \in \tilde{h}, \tilde{\gamma}_1 \in \tilde{h}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2 \in \tilde{h}_2 \}
\]

can be obtained. Therefore, we have

\[
(\tilde{h} \oplus \tilde{h}_1) \oplus \tilde{h}_2 = \tilde{h} \oplus (\tilde{h}_1 \oplus \tilde{h}_2)
\]

which completes the proof. \(\square\)

4. P-IVHFPRs and Consistency

In this section, we present P-IVHFPRs and discuss their consistency.

4.1. P-IVHFPRs

In the GDM process, preference relations are very popular tools for expressing the DM’s preferences when they compare a set of alternatives. Various types of preference relations have been given for different environments [2].

In order to represent preference relations more objectively, suppose that DMs are allowed to provide several possible interval fuzzy preference values and the associated probability values when they compare two alternatives, then we get the following P-IVHFPR:
Definition 10. Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\}$ be a universal set. A P-IVHFE on $X$ is denoted by a matrix $\tilde{R} = (\tilde{h}_{ij})_{n \times n} \subset X \times X$, where $\tilde{h}_{ij} = \{\tilde{h}_{ij}(p_{ij}), t = 1, 2, \ldots, m_{ij}\}$ is a P-IVHFE, indicating all possible degrees to which $x_i$ is preferred to $x_j$ and the corresponding probability values with $m_{ij}$ representing the number of intervals in the P-IVHFE. In addition, $\tilde{h}_{ij}$ should satisfy

\[
\inf \tilde{h}_{ij}^{(t)} + \sup \tilde{h}_{ij}^{(m_{ij}+1-t)} = \sup \tilde{h}_{ij}^{(t)} + \inf \tilde{h}_{ij}^{(m_{ij}+1-t)},
\]

\[
\tilde{h}_{ii} = \{(0.5, 0.5)(p = 1)\}, \quad i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, n
\]

where we arrange the intervals in $\tilde{h}_{ij}$ in an increasing order, and let $\tilde{h}_{ij}^{(t)}$ be the $t$th smallest interval in $\tilde{h}_{ij}$. $\inf \tilde{h}_{ij}^{(t)}$ and $\sup \tilde{h}_{ij}^{(t)}$ denote the lower and upper limits of $\tilde{h}_{ij}^{(t)}$ respectively, $p_{ij}^{(t)}$ and $p_{ij}^{(m_{ij}+1-t)}$ denote the corresponding values of $\tilde{h}_{ij}^{(t)}$ and $\tilde{h}_{ij}^{(m_{ij}+1-t)}$ respectively, $p = 1$ denotes the corresponding value is equal to 1.

Example 4. The following matrix in which every element is a P-IVHFE can represent a probability-interval valued hesitant fuzzy preference relation:

\[
\tilde{R}_e = (\tilde{h}_{ij})_{3 \times 3} = \begin{pmatrix}
\{(0.5, 0.5)(1)\} & \{(0.4, 0.5)(0.6), (0.7, 0.8)(0.4)\} & \{(0.5, 0.6)(1)\} \\
\{(0.2, 0.3)(0.4), (0.5, 0.6)(0.6)\} & \{(0.5, 0.5)(1)\} & \{(0.3, 0.4)(0.2), (0.5, 0.7)(0.5)\}, \{(0.8, 0.9)(0.3)\} \\
\{(0.4, 0.5)(1)\} & \{(0.1, 0.2)(0.3), (0.3, 0.5)(0.5)\} & \{(0.6, 0.7)(0.2)\}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

where $\tilde{h}_{ij}$ denotes the group preference degree that the alternative $x_i$ is superior to the alternative $x_j$.

Motivated by [2, 35], it can be explained how the elements in the matrix are obtained. Take $\tilde{h}_{23}$ as an example. Since $\tilde{h}_{23}$ represents all possible probability-interval valued preference degrees to which $x_3$ is preferred to $x_2$, its values come from $\tilde{h}_{23}^{1} = [0.1, 0.2], \tilde{h}_{23}^{2} = [0.3, 0.5], \tilde{h}_{23}^{3} = [0.6, 0.7]$ which is provided by a DM. The DM is sure that the preference value is the interval $[0.1, 0.2]$ with a probability of 30%, and the interval $[0.3, 0.5]$ with a probability of 50%, and the interval $[0.6, 0.7]$ with a probability of 20%. Therefore, the $\tilde{h}_{23}$ can be denoted by $\{[0.1, 0.2](0.3), [0.3, 0.5](0.5), [0.6, 0.7](0.2)\}$. Similarly the symmetric element of $\tilde{h}_{23}$, i.e., $\tilde{h}_{32}$ can be denoted by $\{[0.3, 0.4](0.2), [0.5, 0.7](0.5), [0.8, 0.9](0.3)\}$. Other symmetric elements $\tilde{h}_{ij}$ and $\tilde{h}_{ji}$ in $\tilde{R}_e$ are obtained in an analogous way, and satisfy the complementary properties defined in Eq.(3). In addition, when $i = j$, $\tilde{h}_{ij}$ represents the preference degree to which $x_i$ is preferred to itself; namely, it is preferred equally , therefore $\tilde{h}_{ii} = \{(0.5, 0.5)(1)\}(i = 1, 2, 3)$. Through the above procedure, the aforementioned matrix $\tilde{R}_e$ is obtained.

4.2. The Consistency of P-IVHFPSS

Cardinal consistency is a stronger concept than ordinal consistency. In the analytic hierarchy process, Saaty [13] first addressed the issue of consistency, and developed the notions of perfect consistency and acceptable consistency. Ordinal consistency is based on the notion of transitivity, meaning that if $A$ is preferred to $B$ and $B$ is preferred to $C$, it perceives $A$ to be preferred to $C$, which is normally referred to as weak transitivity [4, 26]. The weak transitivity is the minimum requirement condition to ensure that the hesitant fuzzy preference relation is consistent. There are further two conditions, named additive transitivity and multiplicative transitivity [14] which are more restrictive than weak transitivity and can imply reciprocity. Even though both additive transitivity and multiplicative transitivity can be used to measure consistency, the additive consistency may produce infeasible results [27]. Thus, the multiplicative transitivity is also used to verify the consistency of a P-IVHFP.

Let $U = (u_{ij})_{n \times n}$, where $u_{ij}$ denotes a ratio of preference intensity for the alternative $A_i$ to that for $A_j$. Then the condition of multiplicative transitivity can be rewritten as follows:

\[
u_{ij}u_{jk}u_{ki} = u_{ik}u_{kj}u_{ji}
\]
Under the assumption of reciprocity, and in the case where \((u_{ik}, u_{kj}) \notin \{(0,1),(1,0)\}\), Eq.(4) can be expressed as follows [4]:

\[ u_{ij} = \frac{u_{ik}u_{kj}}{u_{ik}u_{kj} + (1 - u_{ik})(1 - u_{kj})} \tag{5} \]

in the case where \((u_{ik}, u_{kj}) \in \{(0,1),(1,0)\}\), stipulating \(u_{ij} = 0\).

Based on the multiplicative consistency of hesitant fuzzy preference relations, and using a decomposition method, the following definition is obtained:

**Definition 11.** Let \(\tilde{R} = (\tilde{h}_{ij})_{n \times n}\) be a P-IVHFPR on a fixed set \(X = \{x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_n\}\) and \(\tilde{h}_{ij} = \{\tilde{h}_{ij}^t(p_i^t), t = 1, 2, \cdots, m_{ij}\}\) be a P-IVHFE; suppose that \(\tilde{h}_{ij} = [\#\tilde{h}_{ij}^t(x), \tilde{h}_{ij}^t(x)]\), where \(\#\tilde{h}_{ij}^t(x)\) is the left endpoint of \(\tilde{h}_{ij}^t\), and \(\tilde{h}_{ij}^t(x)\) is the right endpoint of \(\tilde{h}_{ij}^t\), let

\[
\tilde{R}^A = [\tilde{R}_{ij}^t(p_i^t)]_{n \times n} = \begin{cases} 
\{0.5(1)\} & \{\#\tilde{h}_{ij}^t(p_i^t)\} & \cdots & \{\#\tilde{h}_{kn}^t(p_i^t)\} \\
\{\#\tilde{h}_{21}^t(p_i^t)\} & \{0.5(1)\} & \cdots & \{\#\tilde{h}_{2n}^t(p_i^t)\} \\
\cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\
\{\#\tilde{h}_{n1}^t(p_i^t)\} & \{\#\tilde{h}_{n2}^t(p_i^t)\} & \cdots & \{0.5(1)\} 
\end{cases}
\]

namely, \(\tilde{R}_{ij}^t = \begin{cases} 
\#\tilde{h}_{ij}^t, & \text{if } i < j, \\
0.5, & \text{if } i = j, \\
\tilde{h}_{ij}^t, & \text{if } i > j
\end{cases}\), which means if \(i < j\), taking the left endpoint of \(\tilde{h}_{ij}^t\), while if \(i > j\), taking the right endpoint of \(\tilde{h}_{ij}^t\). And let

\[
\tilde{R}^B = [\tilde{r}_{ij}^t(p_i^t)]_{n \times n} = \begin{cases} 
\{0.5(1)\} & \{\tilde{h}_{12}^t(p_i^t)\} & \cdots & \{\tilde{h}_{1n}^t(p_i^t)\} \\
\{\#\tilde{h}_{21}^t(p_i^t)\} & \{0.5(1)\} & \cdots & \{\#\tilde{h}_{2n}^t(p_i^t)\} \\
\cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\
\{\#\tilde{h}_{n1}^t(p_i^t)\} & \{\#\tilde{h}_{n2}^t(p_i^t)\} & \cdots & \{0.5(1)\} 
\end{cases}
\]

which means if \(i < j\), taking the right endpoint of \(\tilde{h}_{ij}^t\), while if \(i > j\), taking the left endpoint of \(\tilde{h}_{ij}^t\), namely,

\[
\tilde{r}_{ij}^t = \begin{cases} 
\tilde{h}_{ij}^t, & \text{if } i < j, \\
0.5, & \text{if } i = j, \\
\#\tilde{h}_{ij}^t, & \text{if } i > j
\end{cases}
\]

for convenience, \(\tilde{R}^A\) and \(\tilde{R}^B\) are called the decomposition of \(\tilde{R}\), while \(\tilde{R}\) is the composition of \(\tilde{R}^A\) and \(\tilde{R}^B\). Then \(\tilde{R} = (\tilde{h}_{ij})_{n \times n}\) is multiplicative consistent if and only if \(\tilde{R}^A\) and \(\tilde{R}^B\) are both multiplicative consistent, i.e., the following two conditions are satisfied simultaneously:

1. \(\tilde{R}^A_{ij} = \begin{cases} 
0, & \text{if } (\tilde{R}_{ik}, \tilde{R}_{kj}) \in \{((0, 1), (1, 0)), (1, 0), (0, 1)\} \\
\frac{\tilde{R}_{ik}^{(s)}p_{ik}^{(s)}p_{kj}^{(s)}}{\tilde{R}_{ik}^{(s)}p_{ik}^{(s)}p_{kj}^{(s)} + (1 - \tilde{R}_{ik}^{(s)})(1 - p_{ik}^{(s)})(1 - p_{kj}^{(s)})}, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}\)

for all \(i \leq k \leq j\), i.e., \(\tilde{R}^A_{ij} = \begin{cases} 
\frac{\tilde{R}_{ik}^{(s)}p_{ik}^{(s)}p_{kj}^{(s)}}{\tilde{R}_{ik}^{(s)}p_{ik}^{(s)}p_{kj}^{(s)} + (1 - \tilde{R}_{ik}^{(s)})(1 - p_{ik}^{(s)})(1 - p_{kj}^{(s)})}, & \text{if } (\tilde{R}_{ik}, \tilde{R}_{kj}) \in \{((0, 1), (1, 0)), (1, 0), (0, 1)\} \\
0, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}\)

2. \(\tilde{R}^B_{ij} = \begin{cases} 
0, & \text{if } (\tilde{R}_{ik}, \tilde{R}_{kj}) \in \{((0, 1), (1, 0)), (1, 0), (0, 1)\} \\
\frac{p_{ik}^{(s)}p_{kj}^{(s)}}{p_{ik}^{(s)}p_{kj}^{(s)} + (1 - p_{ik}^{(s)})(1 - p_{kj}^{(s)})}, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}\)

for all \(i \leq k \leq j\), i.e., \(\tilde{R}^B_{ij} = \begin{cases} 
p_{ik}^{(s)}p_{kj}^{(s)}, & \text{if } (\tilde{R}_{ik}, \tilde{R}_{kj}) \in \{((0, 1), (1, 0)), (1, 0), (0, 1)\} \\
0, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}\)
where \( \tilde{R}_{ij}^{s} \), \( R_{ik}^{\sigma(s)} \) and \( \tilde{R}_{kj}^{s} \) are the sth smallest values in \( \tilde{R}_{ij} \), \( R_{ik}^{\sigma(s)} \) and \( \tilde{R}_{kj}^{s} \) respectively; \( p_{ij}^{\sigma(s)} \), \( p_{ik}^{\sigma(s)} \) and \( p_{kj}^{\sigma(s)} \) are their corresponding probability values, respectively; \( \tilde{r}_{ij}^{s} \), \( R_{ik}^{\sigma(s)} \) and \( \tilde{r}_{kj}^{s} \) are the sth smallest values in \( \tilde{r}_{ij} \), \( R_{ik}^{\sigma(s)} \) and \( \tilde{r}_{kj}^{s} \) respectively; and \( p_{ij}^{\sigma(s)} \), \( p_{ik}^{\sigma(s)} \) and \( p_{kj}^{\sigma(s)} \) are their corresponding probability values, respectively.

If without the probability description and \( \#h_{ik}^{t} = \#h_{kj}^{t} = \#h_{kj}^{t} \), then Definition 11 is reduced to that of a hesitant fuzzy preference relation.

It can be proven that any P-IVHFR \( \hat{R} = (h_{ij})_{2 \times 2} \) is multiplicative consistent.

By extending the definitions in a hesitant fuzzy environment, the following definitions in a probability-interval valued hesitant fuzzy environment are obtained:

**Definition 12.** Let \( \hat{R} = (h_{ij})_{n \times n} \) be a P-IVHFR on a fixed set \( X = \{x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{n}\} \) and \( \bar{h}_{ij} = \{h_{ij}^{t}(\tilde{p}_{ij}^{t})\}, t = 1, 2, \ldots, m_{ij} \) be a P-IVHE in which \( m_{ij} \) represents the number of intervals suppose that \( h_{ij}^{t} = (\#h_{ij}^{t}(x), \#h_{ij}^{t}(x)) \), let

\[
\tilde{R}_{ij}^{s} = \begin{cases} 
0.5(1) & \#h_{12}^{t}(p_{12}^{t}) \\
\#h_{12}^{t}(p_{12}^{t}) & \#h_{21}^{t}(p_{21}^{t}) \\
\#h_{21}^{t}(p_{21}^{t}) & 0.5(1) \\
\#h_{n1}^{t}(p_{n1}^{t}) & \#h_{n2}^{t}(p_{n2}^{t}) \\
\#h_{n2}^{t}(p_{n2}^{t}) & 0.5(1) 
\end{cases}
\]

\[
\tilde{R}_{ij}^{s} = \begin{cases} 
0.5(1) & \#h_{12}^{t}(p_{12}^{t}) \\
\#h_{12}^{t}(p_{12}^{t}) & \#h_{21}^{t}(p_{21}^{t}) \\
\#h_{21}^{t}(p_{21}^{t}) & 0.5(1) \\
\#h_{n1}^{t}(p_{n1}^{t}) & \#h_{n2}^{t}(p_{n2}^{t}) \\
\#h_{n2}^{t}(p_{n2}^{t}) & 0.5(1) 
\end{cases}
\]

then we call \( \hat{R} \) a perfect multiplicative consistent P-IVHFR, if \( \hat{R} \) is the composition of \( \tilde{R}_{ij}^{s} \) and \( \tilde{R}_{ij}^{s} \), \( \tilde{R}_{ij}^{s} = (\tilde{R}_{ij}(\tilde{p}_{ij}^{t})), \tilde{R}_{ij}^{s} = (\tilde{R}_{ij}(\tilde{p}_{ij}^{t})), \) and

\[
\tilde{R}_{ij}^{s}(x) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{1-j} \sum_{k=i+1}^{j} \frac{\tilde{R}_{ik}^{s}(x)\tilde{R}_{kj}^{s}(x)}{R_{ik}^{\sigma(s)}(x)(1-R_{ik}^{\sigma(s)}(x))}, & i+1 < j \\
\tilde{R}_{ij}^{s}(x), & i+1 = j \\
0.5, & i = j \\
1 - \tilde{R}_{ij}^{s}(x), & i > j
\end{cases}
\]

\[
\tilde{R}_{ij}^{s}(x) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{1-j} \sum_{k=i+1}^{j} \frac{\tilde{R}_{ik}^{s}(x)\tilde{R}_{kj}^{s}(x)}{R_{ik}^{\sigma(s)}(x)(1-R_{ik}^{\sigma(s)}(x))}, & i+1 < j \\
\tilde{R}_{ij}^{s}(x), & i+1 = j \\
0.5, & i = j \\
1 - \tilde{R}_{ij}^{s}(x), & i > j
\end{cases}
\]

where \( \tilde{R}_{ij}^{s}(x), \tilde{R}_{ik}^{s}(x), \tilde{R}_{kj}^{s}(x), \tilde{R}_{ij}^{s}(x), \tilde{R}_{kj}^{s}(x) \) denote the sth smallest values in \( \tilde{R}_{ij}(x), \tilde{R}_{ik}(x), \tilde{R}_{kj}(x), \tilde{R}_{ij}(x), \tilde{R}_{kj}(x) \) respectively, and \( s = 1, 2, \ldots, l, l = \max(m_{ik}, m_{kj}) \), in which \( m_{ik}, m_{kj} \) represent the number of intervals in \( h_{ik} \) and \( h_{kj} \) respectively.

If the two endpoints of the intervals are considered, the two corresponding probability-hesitant fuzzy preference relations are multiplicative consistent, thus it is believed that the P-IVHPR is multiplicative consistent.

**Definition 13.** Let \( \hat{R} = (h_{ij})_{n \times n}, \hat{R}_{ij}^{A}, \hat{R}_{ij}^{B}, \hat{R}_{ij}^{A}, \hat{R}_{ij}^{B} \) be as before, then we call \( \hat{R} = (h_{ij})_{n \times n} \) an acceptable multiplicative consistent P-IVHPR if

\[
\begin{cases} 
d(\hat{R}_{ij}^{A}, \hat{R}_{ij}^{A}) < \theta_{0} \\
d(\hat{R}_{ij}^{B}, \hat{R}_{ij}^{B}) < \theta_{0}
\end{cases}
\]
where \( d(\tilde{R}^A, \tilde{R}^A) \) is the distance measure between \( \tilde{R}^A \) and \( \tilde{R}^A \), \( d(\tilde{R}^B, \tilde{R}^B) \) is the distance measure between \( \tilde{R}^B \) and \( \tilde{R}^B \). \( d(\tilde{R}^A, \tilde{R}^A) \) and \( d(\tilde{R}^B, \tilde{R}^B) \) can be calculated by the following Eqs. (8) and (9). \( \theta_0 \) is the consistency level. We usually take \( \theta_0 = 0.1 \) in practice.

### 4.3. An Iterative Algorithm for Improving the Consistency of P-IVHFPR

In general, the P-IVHFPR constructed by the decision maker often has an unacceptable multiplicative consistency which means \( d(\tilde{R}^A, \tilde{R}^A) \geq \theta_0 \) or \( d(\tilde{R}^B, \tilde{R}^B) \geq \theta_0 \). At this time, it is necessary to adjust the elements in the P-IVHFPR in order to improve the consistency. Based on the algorithm in a hesitant fuzzy environment [9], An iterative algorithm is proposed as follows to repair the consistency of the P-IVHFPR.

**An Iterative Algorithm for Improving the Consistency of P-IVHFPR**

**Input:** P-IVHFPR \( \tilde{R} = (\tilde{R}_{ij})_{n \times n}; k \), the number of iterations; \( \delta \), the step size, \( 0 \leq \lambda = k\delta \leq 1 \); \( \theta_0 \), the consistency level. Hereby we take \( \theta_0 = 0.1 \).

**Output:** P-IVHFPR \( \tilde{R}^{(k)} \), with satisfactory consistency.

**Step 1.** Let \( k = 1 \), and construct a perfect multiplicative consistent P-IVHFPR \( \bar{R} \), where \( \bar{R} \) is the composition of \( \tilde{R}^A \) and \( \tilde{R}^B \); \( \bar{R}^A = (R_{ij}(x))_{n \times n}, \tilde{R}^B = (\tilde{R}_{ij}(x))_{n \times n} \). \( \bar{R}^A \) and \( \tilde{R}^B \) are defined in Definition 12.

**Step 2.** Calculate the deviations \( d(\tilde{R}^{(k)}A, \tilde{R}^A) \) and \( d(\tilde{R}^{(k)}B, \tilde{R}^B) \). Eqs. (8) and (9) are given as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
    d_{Ham} \min_g(R^{(k)}A, R^A) &= \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left[ \frac{m_{ij}}{\sum_{s=1}^{m_{ij}} (R_{ij}^{(k)}(s) - R_{ij}^A(s))} \right] \quad \text{(8)} \\
    d_{Ham} \min_g(R^{(k)}B, R^B) &= \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left[ \frac{m_{ij}}{\sum_{s=1}^{m_{ij}} (R_{ij}^{(k)}(s) - R_{ij}^B(s))} \right] \\
\end{align*}
\]

or

\[
\begin{align*}
    d_{Euclidean}(R^{(k)}A, R^A) &= \left[ \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left( \sum_{s=1}^{m_{ij}} \left( R_{ij}^{(k)}(s) - R_{ij}^A(s) \right) \right)^2 \right]^{1/2} \quad \text{(9)} \\
    d_{Euclidean}(R^{(k)}B, R^B) &= \left[ \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left( \sum_{s=1}^{m_{ij}} \left( R_{ij}^{(k)}(s) - R_{ij}^B(s) \right) \right)^2 \right]^{1/2} \\
\end{align*}
\]

where \( R_{ij}^{(k)}(s), \tilde{R}_{ij}^A(s), \tilde{R}_{ij}^B(s) \) are the sth smallest values in \( \tilde{R}^{(k)} \), \( \tilde{R}^A, \bar{R}^B \) respectively. \( \tilde{R}^{(k)}A \) and \( \tilde{R}^{(k)}B \) are the resolution of \( \tilde{R}^{(k)} \). \( \tilde{R}^A \) and \( \tilde{R}^B \) are the resolution of \( \bar{R} \), which is the corresponding perfect multiplicative relation of \( \tilde{R} \). If \( d(\tilde{R}^{(k)}A, \tilde{R}^A) < \theta_0 \) and \( d(\tilde{R}^{(k)}B, \tilde{R}^B) < \theta_0 \), then go to Step 4; Otherwise, go to Step 3.

**Step 3.** Repair the inconsistent multiplicative P-IVHFPR, transforming \( \tilde{R}^{(k)}A \) to \( \tilde{R}^{(k)}A \) and \( \tilde{R}^{(k)}B \) to \( \tilde{R}^{(k)}B \) by using the following equations. We give Eqs. (10) and (11).

\[
\begin{align*}
    \tilde{R}_{ij}^{(k)}(s) &= \left( \frac{R_{ij}^{(k)}(s)}{R_{ij}^A(s)} \right)^{1-\lambda} \tilde{R}_{ij}^A(s) \\
    \tilde{R}_{ij}^{(k)}(s) &= \left( \frac{R_{ij}^{(k)}(s)}{R_{ij}^B(s)} \right)^{1-\lambda} \tilde{R}_{ij}^B(s) \\
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \tilde{R}_{ij}^{(k)}(s), \tilde{R}_{ij}^A(s), \tilde{R}_{ij}^B(s) \) are the sth smallest values in \( \tilde{R}_{ij}, \tilde{R}_{ij}^A, \tilde{R}_{ij}^B \) respectively. \( \tilde{R}_{ij}^{(k)}(s), \tilde{R}_{ij}^A(s), \tilde{R}_{ij}^B(s) \) are the sth smallest values in \( \tilde{R}_{ij}, \tilde{R}_{ij}^A, \tilde{R}_{ij}^B \) respectively. Let \( R^{(k+1)}A = \tilde{R}^{(k)}A \), \( R^{(k+1)}B = \tilde{R}^{(k)}B \) and \( k = k + 1 \), then go to Step 2.
Step 4. Output $\hat{R}^{(k)}$.

Step 5. End.

From the calculation process, it can be seen that the iterative process is convergent; for example when we take $\lambda = 1$. Therefore, only the steps are listed without providing any proof.

5. An Illustrative Example and Discussion

In this section, an example is used to illustrate the algorithm.

5.1. Illustrative Example

A large project of Jiudianxia reservoir operation [2, 25] is employed to demonstrate the validity of our approach. The reservoir is designed for many purposes, such as power generation, irrigation, total water supply for industry, agriculture, residents and environment. Because of different requirements for the partition of the amount of water, four reservoir operation schemes $x_1$, $x_2$, $x_3$ and $x_4$ are suggested.

- $x_1$: maximum plant output, enough supply of water used in the Tao River basin, higher and lower supply for society and economy;
- $x_2$: maximum plant output, enough supply of water used in the Tao River basin, higher and lower supply for society and economy;
- $x_3$: maximum plant output, enough supply of water used in the Tao River basin, higher and lower supply for society and economy, total supply for ecosystem and environment, whose 50% is used for flushing sands at low water period;
- $x_4$: maximum plant output, enough supply of water used in the Tao River basin, higher and lower supply for society and economy, total supply for ecosystem and environment, whose 50% is used for flushing sands at low water period.

To select the best scheme, the government assigns a large consultancy organization to evaluate four competing schemes. Due to uncertainties, the DMs give their preference information regarding alternatives in the form of interval values with probabilities. Take schemes $x_1$ and $x_2$ as an example; the DMs evaluate the degrees to which $x_1$ is preferred to $x_2$, where 40% give a rating of $[0.2, 0.3]$ and the remaining 60% give $[0.5, 0.6]$. Assume that these DMs in the consultancy firm cannot be persuaded each other to change their minds, the preference information that $x_1$ is preferred to $x_2$ provided by the organization can be considered as a P-IVHF, i.e., $\{[0.2, 0.3]([0.4], [0.5, 0.6])(0.6)\}$. The preference information of the organization is listed as a P-IVHFPR $\hat{R}$.

$$\hat{R} = (\hat{h}_{ij})_{4 \times 4}$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix}
{[0.5,0.6]([1])} & {[0.4,0.5]([0.6],[0.7,0.8])(0.4)} \\
{[0.2,0.3]([0.4],[0.5,0.6])(0.6)} & {[0.5,0.5]([1])} \\
{[0.4,0.5]([1])} & {[0.3,0.4]([1])} \\
{[0.5,0.6]([1])} & {[0.3,0.5]([0.6],[0.5,0.6])(0.4)} \\
{[0.6,0.7]([1])} & {[0.4,0.5]([0.4],[0.5,0.7])(0.6)} \\
{[0.5,0.5]([1])} & {[0.1,0.2]([0.3],[0.3,0.5])(0.5), [0.6,0.7])(0.2)} \\
{[0.3,0.4]([0.2],[0.5,0.7])(0.5), [0.8,0.9])(0.3)} & {[0.5,0.5]([1])} \end{bmatrix}$$

To get the optimal alternative, the following steps are adopted.

Step 1. First of all, let $k = 1$ and construct the perfect multiplicative consistent P-IVHFPR $\hat{R}^k$.

By Definition 12, we get

$$\hat{R}^k = \begin{bmatrix}
{[0.5]([1])} & {[0.4,0.6,0.7]([0.4])} & {[0.5]([1])} & {[0.4]([1])} \\
{[0.3]([0.4],[0.6,0.6])} & {[0.5]([1])} & {[0.6]([1])} & {[0.4,0.4,0.5,0.6]} \\
{[0.5]([1])} & {[0.4]([1])} & {[0.5]([1])} & {[0.1,0.3,0.3]([0.5], 0.6,0.2)} \\
{[0.6]([1])} & {[0.5,0.6,0.6]([0.4])} & {[0.4,0.2,0.7]([0.5], 0.9,0.3]} & {[0.5]([1])} \end{bmatrix}$$
Therefore, according to Eq. (6), we have

$$\hat{R}^{(1)}_{13} = \frac{\hat{R}^{(1)}_{12} \hat{R}^{(1)}_{23}}{\hat{R}^{(1)}_{12} \hat{R}^{(1)}_{23} + (1-\hat{R}^{(1)}_{12}) (1-\hat{R}^{(1)}_{23})} = 0.4 \times 0.6 = 0.5$$

$$\sigma^{(1)}_{13} = 0.6$$

$$\hat{R}^{(2)}_{13} = \frac{\hat{R}^{(2)}_{12} \hat{R}^{(2)}_{23}}{\hat{R}^{(2)}_{12} \hat{R}^{(2)}_{23} + (1-\hat{R}^{(2)}_{12}) (1-\hat{R}^{(2)}_{23})} = 0.7 \times 0.6 = 0.778$$

$$\sigma^{(2)}_{13} = 0.4$$

where $\hat{R}_{23}$, i.e., $\{0.6(1)\}$ can be regarded as $\{0.6(0.6), 0.6(0.4)\}$. So,

$$\hat{R}_{13} = \{0.5(0.6), 0.778(0.4)\}$$

hence,

$$\hat{R}_{31} = \{0.222(0.4), 0.5(0.6)\}$$

Analogously, by Eq. (6), we have

$$\hat{R}^{(s)}_{14} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\hat{R}^{(s)}_{12} \hat{R}^{(s)}_{24}}{\hat{R}^{(s)}_{12} \hat{R}^{(s)}_{24} + (1-\hat{R}^{(s)}_{12}) (1-\hat{R}^{(s)}_{24})} + \frac{\hat{R}^{(s)}_{13} \hat{R}^{(s)}_{34}}{\hat{R}^{(s)}_{13} \hat{R}^{(s)}_{34} + (1-\hat{R}^{(s)}_{13}) (1-\hat{R}^{(s)}_{34})} \right)$$

for $s = 1, 2, \ldots$

Similar to the previous method to deal with P-IVHFE $\{0.6(1)\}$, in order to facilitate observing the probability values, $\hat{R}_{34} = \{0.1(0.3), 0.3(0.5), 0.6(0.2)\}$ can be regarded as, or in other words,

$$\hat{R}_{34} = \{0.1(0.3), 0.3(0.5), 0.6(0.2)\} = \{0.1(0.3), 0.3(0.1), 0.3(0.2), 0.3(0.2), 0.6(0.2)\}$$

Similarly,

$$\hat{R}_{12} = \{0.4(0.6), 0.7(0.4)\} = \{0.4(0.3), 0.4(0.1), 0.4(0.2), 0.70(0.2), 0.7(0.2)\}$$

$$\hat{R}_{24} = \{0.4(0.4), 0.5(0.6)\} = \{0.4(0.3), 0.4(0.1), 0.5(0.2), 0.5(0.2), 0.5(0.2)\}$$

$$\hat{R}_{13} = \{0.5(1)\} = \{0.5(0.3), 0.5(0.1), 0.5(0.2), 0.5(0.2), 0.5(0.2)\}$$

therefore,

$$\hat{R}^{(1)}_{14} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\hat{R}^{(1)}_{12} \hat{R}^{(1)}_{24}}{\hat{R}^{(1)}_{12} \hat{R}^{(1)}_{24} + (1-\hat{R}^{(1)}_{12}) (1-\hat{R}^{(1)}_{24})} + \frac{\hat{R}^{(1)}_{13} \hat{R}^{(1)}_{34}}{\hat{R}^{(1)}_{13} \hat{R}^{(1)}_{34} + (1-\hat{R}^{(1)}_{13}) (1-\hat{R}^{(1)}_{34})} \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{0.4 \times 0.4}{0.4 \times 0.4 + (1-0.4) \times (1-0.4)} + \frac{0.5 \times 0.1}{0.5 \times 0.1 + (1-0.5) \times (1-0.1)} \right)$$

$$= 0.204$$

$$\sigma^{(1)}_{14} = 0.3$$

Similarly, we have

$$\hat{R}^{(2)}_{14} = 0.304, \quad \sigma^{(2)}_{14} = 0.1$$

$$\hat{R}^{(3)}_{14} = 0.35, \quad \sigma^{(3)}_{14} = 0.2$$

$$\hat{R}^{(4)}_{14} = 0.5, \quad \sigma^{(4)}_{14} = 0.2$$

$$\hat{R}^{(5)}_{14} = 0.65, \quad \sigma^{(5)}_{14} = 0.2$$
thus,

\[ \tilde{R}_{14} = \{0.204(0.3), 0.304(0.1), 0.35(0.2), 0.5(0.2), 0.65(0.2)\} \]
\[ \tilde{R}_{41} = \{0.35(0.2), 0.5(0.2), 0.65(0.2), 0.696(0.1), 0.796(0.3)\} \]

Analogously, we get

\[ \tilde{R}_{24} = \{0.143(0.3), 0.391(0.5), 0.692(0.2)\} \]
\[ \tilde{R}_{42} = \{0.308(0.2), 0.609(0.5), 0.857(0.3)\} \]

hence,

\[
\tilde{R}^A = \begin{bmatrix}
\{0.5(1)\} & \{0.4(0.6), 0.7(0.4)\} \\
\{0.3(0.4), 0.6(0.6)\} & \{0.5(1)\} \\
\{0.22(0.4), 0.5(0.6)\} & \{0.4(1)\}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\tilde{R}^B = \begin{bmatrix}
\{0.5(1)\} & \{0.5(0.6), 0.8(0.4)\} \\
\{0.2(0.4), 0.5(0.6)\} & \{0.5(1)\} \\
\{0.097(0.4), 0.3(0.6)\} & \{0.3(1)\}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

In the similar way, according to Eq.(7), we can obtain

\[
\tilde{R}^A = \begin{bmatrix}
\{0.5(1)\} & \{0.5(0.6), 0.8(0.4)\} \\
\{0.2(0.4), 0.5(0.6)\} & \{0.5(1)\} \\
\{0.097(0.4), 0.3(0.6)\} & \{0.3(1)\}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

**Step 2.** Calculate the deviations \(d(\tilde{R}^{(k)}A, \tilde{R}^A)\) and \(d(\tilde{R}^{(k)}B, \tilde{R}^B)\).

Using Eq.(8), we get

\[
d_{Ham\text{-}min\_g}(\tilde{R}^A, \tilde{R}^A) = \frac{1}{(n-1)(m-2)} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left| R_{ij}^{(k)} - \tilde{R}_{ij}^{(s)} \right| \frac{1}{p_{ij}^{(s)}}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{6} \left[ (|0.5 - 0.5| \times 0.6 + |0.5 - 0.778| \times 0.4) + (|0.204 - 0.4| \times 0.3 + |0.304 - 0.4| \times 0.1
+ |0.35 - 0.4| \times 0.2 + |0.5 - 0.4| \times 0.2 + |0.65 - 0.4| \times 0.2) + (|0.143 - 0.4| \times 0.3
+ |0.391 - 0.4| \times 0.1 + |0.391 - 0.5| \times 0.4 + |0.692 - 0.5| \times 0.2) + (|0.5 - 0.222| \times 0.4
+ |0.5 - 0.5| \times 0.6) + (|0.35 - 0.6| \times 0.2 + |0.5 - 0.6| \times 0.1 + |0.65 - 0.6| \times 0.2
+ |0.696 - 0.6| \times 0.1 + |0.796 - 0.6| \times 0.3) + (|0.308 - 0.5| \times 0.2 + |0.609 - 0.5| \times 0.4
+ |0.609 - 0.6| \times 0.1 + |0.857 - 0.6| \times 0.3)\right]
\]

\[= \frac{0.8092}{6} = 0.135 > \theta_0 = 0.1 \]

Analogously, by Eq.(8), we can obtain

\[
d_{Ham\text{-}min\_g}(\tilde{R}^B, \tilde{R}^B) = \frac{0.9152}{6} = 0.153 > \theta_0 = 0.1 \]

Therefore, \(\tilde{R}^A\) and \(\tilde{R}^B\) are both not multiplicative consistent P-IVHFPR. \(\tilde{R}^A\) and \(\tilde{R}^B\) need to be repaired by Eqs.(10) and (11).

**Step 3.** Repair the inconsistent multiplicative P-IVHFPR.
Let \( p \) be the normalized Hamming distance.

**Step 5.**

Output \( \tilde{R} \) if the normalized Hamming distances are less than the consistency level 0.1, so \( R \) is the repaired multiplicative P-IVHFPR of \( \tilde{R} \).

Using Definition 8, let \( p_{ij} = p(\tilde{R}_{ij}^{(2)} \geq R_{ij}^{(2)}) \), then we get the following complementary matrix:

\[
P = \begin{bmatrix}
0.5 & 1 & 1 & 0.454 \\
0 & 0.5 & 1 & 0.554 \\
0 & 0 & 0.5 & 0 \\
0.546 & 0.446 & 1 & 0.5
\end{bmatrix}
\]

If critical value \( \lambda \) is allowed to be an appropriate value, such as a value between the largest and the second largest value of \( p_{ij} \), \( i, j = 1, 2, 3, 4 \) (not including 1), e.g., \( \lambda = 0.55 \), and

\[
\tilde{p}_{ij} = \begin{cases} 
1, & \text{if } p_{ij} \geq \lambda, \\
0, & \text{if } p_{ij} < \lambda
\end{cases}
\]
then further we get

\[
P = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\]

According to \( \tilde{p} \), we have

\[
x_1 \succ x_2, x_1 \succ x_3, x_2 \succ x_3, x_2 \succ x_4, x_4 \succ x_3
\]

namely,

\[
x_1 \succ x_2 \succ x_4 \succ x_3
\]

which indicates that the first scheme is the most desirable according to the opinion of the large consultancy firm.

5.2. Discussion and Comparison

Having carefully analyzed the calculation process and results, the following conclusions can be drawn:

(1) Since there are probability values in a probability-interval valued hesitant fuzzy environment, after the multiplications, there are decimals which are not the integer multiples of 0.1 in the calculated results, such as 0.696, 0.857, 0.391 \cdots. If one searches the relevant documents on interval-valued preference relations, it can be found that this inevitably happens in the calculation process. Therefore, future research could try and explain this phenomenon.

(2) It can be seen that there are overlapping intervals in the calculated results. Such as a P-IVHFE,

\[
\tilde{R}_{12}^{(2)} = \{[0.238, 0.423](0.2), [0.315, 0.53](0.2), [0.393, 0.635](0.2), [0.465, 0.669](0.1), [0.581, 0.745](0.3)\}
\]

where between the intervals [0.238, 0.423] and [0.315, 0.53], there is an overlapping interval [0.315, 0.423]. To deal with this problem, without a loss of generality, it is assumed that all the interval values have a uniform distribution, then they can be changed into an equivalent expression in which the intervals are not overlapping. For example, as for \( \tilde{R}_{12}^{(2)} \), we have

\[
\tilde{R}_{12}^{(2)} = \{[0.238, 0.423](0.2) = [0.238, 0.315](0.2 \times 0.423 - 0.238), [0.315, 0.393](0.2 \times 0.393 - 0.315), [0.393, 0.423](0.2 \times 0.423 - 0.393)\}
\]

In a similar way, we get

\[
[0.315, 0.53](0.2) = \{[0.315, 0.393](0.073), [0.393, 0.465](0.067), [0.465, 0.53](0.060)\}
\]

\[
[0.393, 0.635](0.2) = \{[0.393, 0.465](0.059), [0.465, 0.581](0.096), [0.581, 0.635](0.045)\}
\]

\[
[0.465, 0.669](0.1) = \{[0.465, 0.581](0.057), [0.581, 0.669](0.043)\}
\]

therefore,

\[
\tilde{R}_{12}^{(2)} = \{[0.238, 0.315](0.083), [0.315, 0.393](0.084 + 0.073), [0.393, 0.465](0.033 + 0.067 + 0.059), [0.465, 0.581](0.060 + 0.096 + 0.057), [0.581, 0.745](0.045 + 0.043 + 0.3)\}
\]

\[
= \{[0.238, 0.315](0.083), [0.315, 0.393](0.157), [0.393, 0.465](0.159), [0.465, 0.581](0.213), [0.581, 0.745](0.388)\}
\]

There are not any overlapping intervals in this new expression.
It can be seen from the above example that P-IVHFPRs are useful in resolving large GDM problems, because they express intuitively the uncertain and hesitant preference information provided by each DM in a decision-making organization. This differs from the approach of interval-valued fuzzy sets for GDM, where the opinions of the DMs based on a pairwise comparison of alternatives, are first aggregated and, correspondingly, only the average interval-valued preference information is obtained. However, the use of P-IVHFPRs does not need to perform such an aggregation and, hence, provides a more comprehensive description of the opinions of these DMs [2]. In the above example, if the probability-interval valued preference information is firstly aggregated at the beginning of the calculation, with regard to the probability values as the corresponding weights, using Definition 8, e.g.,

\[ s(\tilde{h}_{12}) = ([0.4, 0.5](0.6), [0.7, 0.8](0.4)) \]
\[ = [0.4 \times 0.6 + 0.7 \times 0.4, 0.5 \times 0.6 + 0.8 \times 0.4] = [0.52, 0.62] \]

then we get

\[ \tilde{R} = ([\tilde{h}_{ij}])_{4 \times 4} \]
\[ = \begin{bmatrix}
[0.5, 0.5](1) & [0.4, 0.5](0.6), [0.7, 0.8](0.4) \\
[0.2, 0.3](0.4), [0.5, 0.6](0.6) & [0.5, 0.5](1) \\
[0.4, 0.5](1) & [0.3, 0.4](1) \\
[0.5, 0.6](1) & [0.3, 0.5](0.6), [0.5, 0.6](0.4) \\
[0.5, 0.6](1) & [0.4, 0.5](1) \\
[0.6, 0.7](1) & [0.4, 0.5](0.4), [0.5, 0.7](0.6) \\
[0.5, 0.5](1) & [0.1, 0.2](0.3), [0.3, 0.5](0.5), [0.6, 0.7](0.2) \\
[0.3, 0.4](0.2), [0.5, 0.7](0.5), [0.8, 0.9](0.3) & [0.5, 0.5](1)
\end{bmatrix} \]
\[
\rightarrow [s(\tilde{h}_{ij})]_{4 \times 4} = \begin{bmatrix}
0.5 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0.5 & 1 & 0.75 \\
0 & 0 & 0.5 & 0 \\
1 & 0.25 & 1 & 0.5
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Further, in the same way as before, let \( p_{ij} = (s(\tilde{h}_{ij}) \geq s(\tilde{h}_{ji})) \), then the following complementary matrix is obtained:

\[
p' = \begin{bmatrix}
0.5 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0.5 & 1 & 0.75 \\
0 & 0 & 0.5 & 0 \\
1 & 0.25 & 1 & 0.5
\end{bmatrix}
\]

indicating that

\[
x_1 \succ x_2, x_1 \succ x_3, x_2 \succ x_3, x_2 \succ x_4, x_4 \succ x_1, x_4 \succ x_3
\]

which is heavily inconsistent. Let

\[
p'_{ij} = \begin{cases}
1, & \text{if } p'_{ij} \geq \lambda, \\
0, & \text{if } p'_{ij} < \lambda
\end{cases}
\]

Only when we let critical value \( \lambda > 0.75 \), can a consistent result be obtained. At this time,

\[
\tilde{P}' = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 1 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\]

which indicates that

\[
x_1 \succ x_2, x_1 \succ x_3, x_2 \succ x_3, x_4 \succ x_1, x_4 \succ x_3
\]
namely,
\[ x_4 \succ x_1 \succ x_2 \succ x_3 \]

From the results of the calculations, one can find a difference in the ranking results derived in these two approaches. The reason is that for each decision-making organization composed of multiple DMs, a group’s preference value is obtained by aggregating (namely, averaging) individual preference values. Such an aggregation actually amounts to implementing a transformation of P-IVHFEs into an interval-valued fuzzy number. As a result, it leads to the loss of information, which affects the final ranking results. Thus, the comparison clearly shows the benefits of the proposed GDM approach based on P-IVHFPRs [2].

Compared with that in a hesitant fuzzy environment, this method’s implementation could be far more sophisticated in a probability-interval valued hesitant fuzzy environment, but has led to some new problems. For example, in order to get the equivalent expression in which the intervals are not overlapping, it is assumed that all the interval values have a uniform distribution. If they are not have a uniform distribution, but some other type, e.g., a normal distribution, it is not known what would happen. Therefore this should be a topic for future research.

In spite of what has been mentioned above, compared with P-HFSs, IVHFSs and a possibility-hesitant fuzzy linguistic term set, P-IVHFSs can describe the actual preferences of decision-makers and better reflect their uncertainty, hesitancy, and inconsistency, and thus enhance the modeling abilities of HFSs. The proposed method using P-IVHFSs has the following advantages.

First, compared with P-HFSs, P-IVHFSs can better depict uncertainty.

Second, compared with IVHFSs, P-IVHFSs can depict hesitancy more accurately and differentiatate intervals according to their possibilities.

Third, compared with a possibility-hesitant fuzzy linguistic term set, P-IVHFSs can express the evaluation information more flexibly. Possibility-hesitant fuzzy linguistic term sets can therefore be regarded as a special case of P-IVHFSs.

Although the representation of P-IVHFSs looks complex, they can depict fuzzy information clearly and retain the completeness of original data or the inherent thoughts of decision-makers, which is a prerequisite of guaranteeing the accuracy of final outcomes. Additionally, as far as the applicability of P-IVHFSs is concerned, decision-makers can make a trade-off between the features of P-IVHFSs and the relative computational cost. Moreover, the complexity and amount of computation can be clearly reduced with the assistance of programming software [17].

6. Conclusion

In this paper, P-HFSs and IVHFSs have been extended to P-IVHFSs. As an important tool in GDM, P-IVHFSs can describe the actual preferences of decision-makers and better reflect their uncertainty, hesitancy, and inconsistency, and thus enhance the modeling abilities of HFSs. Based on related research, a decomposition method has been proposed to deal with the consistency of P-IVHFPRs. A simulated example has also been provided to illustrate the use of the proposed approach. The main contributions of this paper are summarized as follows.

(1) The concept of P-IVHFSs has been defined and some desirable properties of P-IVHFSs have been discussed. P-IVHFSs are a natural development to manage the possible preferences in decision making following the introduction of P-HFSs and IVHFSs.

(2) P-IVHFPRs have been proposed and the consistency of P-IVHFPRs has been discussed, using the multiplicative transitivity to verify the consistency of a P-IVHFP. Moreover, a decomposition method has been proposed to deal with the consistency of P-IVHFPRs.

(3) Based on the multiplicative consistency of hesitant fuzzy preference relations, an iterative algorithm has been proposed for improving the consistency of P-IVHFP.

In future research, the developed theoretical structure could be extended to the probability distributions of preferences on the intervals. Another potential area of research would be to analyze the hesitant fuzzy information in P-IVHFPRs.
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ABSTRACT

In this article we study the existence of solutions and some of their qualitative behavior of the following rational nonlinear difference equation

\[ x_{n+1} = \frac{ax_{n-(2k+1)}}{b + cx_{n-k}x_{n-(2k+1)}}, \quad n = 0, 1, ... \]

where \( a, b \) and \( c \) are real numbers, \( k \) is a non-negative integer number and the initial conditions \( x_{-2k-1}, x_{-2k}, ..., x_{-1}, x_0 \) are arbitrary non-negative real numbers. Also, the solutions of some special cases of the equation under consideration will be obtained.
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1. INTRODUCTION

During the last decade, the research on difference equations has been increasing. The fact that difference equations demonstrate themselves as mathematical models representing some real life phenomena is a significant reason of this concern. For example, the are used in probability theory, economics, genetics in biology, geometry, electrical network, quanta in radiation, psychology, sociology, etc. Actually, no doubt that the difference equations play and will play a remarkable role in applicable analysis and in mathematics generally.

Recently, many authors’ attention was on studying the global attractivity, boundedness character, periodicity and the solution form of nonlinear difference equations. Now, we write some results in this area: Cinar [3–4] obtained the solutions of the following difference equations

\[ x_{n+1} = \frac{x_{n-1}}{1 + x_n x_{n-1}}, \quad x_{n+1} = \frac{x_{n-1}}{1 + x_n x_{n-1}}. \]

Cinar et al. [5] discussed the solutions and attractivity of the difference equation

\[ x_{n+1} = \frac{x_{n-3}}{1 + x_n x_{n-1} x_{n-2} x_{n-3}}. \]

Elabbasy et al. [8–9] looked at the global stability, periodicity character and derive the solution of some special cases of the following difference equations

\[ x_{n+1} = \frac{bx_n}{cx_n - dx_{n-1}}, \quad x_{n+1} = \frac{\alpha x_{n-k}}{\beta + \gamma \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} x_{n-i}}. \]

Elsayed [13] examined the behavior and found the form of solution of the nonlinear difference equation

\[ x_{n+1} = ax_{n-1} + \frac{bx_n x_{n-1}}{cx_n + dx_{n-2}}. \]
In [2], Belhannache et al. investigated the global behavior of the solutions of the difference equation

\[ x_{n+1} = \frac{A + Bx_{n-2k-1}}{C + D_{k} \prod_{i=1}^{k} x_{n-2i}}. \]

Karatas et al. [29] achieved the solution of the following difference equation

\[ x_{n+1} = \frac{ax_{n-(2k+2)}}{-a + \prod_{i=0}^{2k+2} x_{n-i}}. \]

In [35] Simsek and Abdullayev found the solution of the recursive sequence

\[ x_{n+1} = \frac{x_{n-(2k+3)}}{a \prod_{i=1}^{k} x_{n-(k+1)i-k}}. \]

Other related results on rational difference equations can be found in the references. [1-52].

Our aim in this paper is to investigate the dynamics of the solution of the following nonlinear difference equation of higher order

\[ x_{n+1} = \frac{ax_{n-(2k+1)}}{b + cx_{n-k}x_{n-(2k+1)}}, \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots, \] (1)

where \( a, b \) and \( c \) are real numbers, \( k \) is a non-negative integer number and the initial conditions \( x_{-2k-1}, x_{-2k}, \ldots, x_{-1}, x_{0} \) are arbitrary non-negative real numbers. Also, we obtain the solutions of some special cases of Eq.(1).

Suppose that \( I \) is an interval of real numbers and let \( f : I^{k+1} \rightarrow I \), be a continuously differentiable function. Then for every set of initial conditions \( x_{-k}, x_{-k+1}, \ldots, x_{0} \in I \), the difference equation

\[ x_{n+1} = f(x_{n}, x_{n-1}, \ldots, x_{n-k}), \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots, \] (2)

has a unique solution \( \{x_{n}\}_{n=-k}^{\infty} \).

**Definition 1.** (Equilibrium Point)

A point \( \tau \in I \) is called an equilibrium point of Eq.(2) if \( \tau = f(\tau, \tau, \ldots, \tau) \). That is, \( x_{n} = \tau \) for \( n \geq 0 \), is a solution of Eq.(2), or equivalently, \( \tau \) is a fixed point of \( f \).

**Definition 2.** (Periodicity)

A sequence \( \{x_{n}\}_{n=-k}^{\infty} \) is said to be periodic with period \( p \) if \( x_{n+p} = x_{n} \) for all \( n \geq -k \).

**Definition 3.** (Stability)

(i) The equilibrium point \( \tau \) of Eq.(2) is locally stable if for every \( \epsilon > 0 \), there exists \( \delta > 0 \) such that for all \( x_{-k}, x_{-k+1}, \ldots, x_{-1}, x_{0} \in I \) with

\[ |x_{-k} - \tau| + |x_{-k+1} - \tau| + \ldots + |x_{0} - \tau| < \delta, \]

we have

\[ |x_{n} - \tau| < \epsilon \quad \text{for all} \quad n \geq -k. \]

(ii) The equilibrium point \( \tau \) of Eq.(2) is locally asymptotically stable if \( \tau \) is locally stable solution of Eq.(2) and there exists \( \gamma > 0 \), such that for all \( x_{-k}, x_{-k+1}, \ldots, x_{-1}, x_{0} \in I \) with

\[ |x_{-k} - \tau| + |x_{-k+1} - \tau| + \ldots + |x_{0} - \tau| < \gamma, \]

we have \( \lim_{n \to \infty} x_{n} = \tau \).

(iii) The equilibrium point \( \tau \) of Eq.(2) is a global attractor if for all \( x_{-k}, x_{-k+1}, \ldots, x_{-1}, x_{0} \in I \), we have \( \lim_{n \to \infty} x_{n} = \tau \).

(iv) The equilibrium point \( \tau \) of Eq.(2) is globally asymptotically stable if \( \tau \) is locally stable, and \( \tau \) is also a global attractor of Eq.(2).
The equilibrium point $\bar{x}$ of Eq.(2) is unstable if $\bar{x}$ is not locally stable.

The linearized equation of Eq.(2) about the equilibrium $\bar{x}$ is the linear difference equation

$$y_{n+1} = \sum_{i=0}^{k} \frac{\partial f(\bar{x},\ldots,\bar{x})}{\partial x_{n-i}} y_{n-i}.$$  

(3)

Theorem A [32]: Assume that $p_i \in R$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$ and $k \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$. Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} |p_i| < 1,$$

is a sufficient condition for the asymptotic stability of the difference equation

$$x_{n+k} + p_1x_{n+k-1} + \ldots + p_kx_n = 0, \ n = 0, 1, \ldots.$$  

2. DYNAMICS OF SOLUTIONS OF EQ.(1)

In this section we look at some qualitative behavior of Eq.(1) such as local stability, periodicity and boundedness character of solutions of Eq.(1) when the constants $a$, $b$ and $c$ are positive real numbers.

2.1. Local Stability of the Equilibrium Points

We now investigate the local stability character of the solutions of Eq.(1).

The equilibrium points of Eq.(1) are given by the relation $\bar{x} = \frac{a}{b + cx}$, which gives

$$\bar{x} = 0 \ or \ \bar{x} = \sqrt{\frac{a - b}{c}}.$$  

Note that if $a > b$, then Eq.(1) has a unique positive equilibrium point.

Let $f : (0, \infty)^2 \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be a function defined by

$$f(u, v) = \frac{au}{b + cuv}.$$  

(4)

Therefore it follows that

$$\frac{\partial f(u, v)}{\partial u} = \frac{ab}{(b + cuv)^2}, \ \frac{\partial f(u, v)}{\partial v} = \frac{-acu^2}{(b + cuv)^2}.$$  

Theorem 2.1. The following statements are true:

(1) If $a \leq b$, then $\bar{x} = 0$ is the only equilibrium point of Eq.(1) and it is locally stable.

(2) If $a > b$, then the equilibrium points $\bar{x} = 0$ and $\bar{x} = \sqrt{\frac{a - b}{c}}$ of Eq.(1) are unstable.

Proof. (1) If $a \leq b$, then we see from Eq.(4) that

$$\frac{\partial f(0, 0)}{\partial u} = \frac{a}{b}, \ \frac{\partial f(0, 0)}{\partial v} = 0.$$  

Then the linearized equation associated with Eq.(1) about $\bar{x} = 0$ is

$$y_{n+1} = \frac{a}{b}y_{n-2k-1} = 0,$$  

(5)

and whose characteristic equation is

$$\lambda^{2k+2} - \frac{a}{b} = 0.$$  

(6)
It follows by Theorem A that, Eq.(5) is asymptotically stable. Then the equilibrium point \( \bar{x} = 0 \) of Eq.(1) is locally stable.

(2) Assume that \( a > b \). (i) At \( \bar{x} = 0 \) it follows again from Eq.(6) and Theorem A that \( \bar{x} = 0 \) is unstable.

(ii) At \( \bar{x} = \sqrt{\frac{a-b}{c}} \) we see from Eq.(4) that

\[
\frac{\partial f(\bar{x}, \bar{x})}{\partial u} = \frac{b}{a}, \quad \frac{\partial f(\bar{x}, x)}{\partial v} = -\frac{(a-b)}{a}.
\]

Then the linearized equation of Eq.(1) about \( \bar{x} = \sqrt{\frac{a-b}{c}} \) is

\[
y_{n+1} + \frac{a-b}{a} y_{n-k} - \frac{b}{a} y_{n-2k-1} = 0,
\]

and whose characteristic equation is

\[
\lambda^{2k+2} + \frac{a-b}{a} \lambda^{k+1} - \frac{b}{a} = 0.
\]

Therefore \( \lambda^{k+1} = -1 \) or \( \lambda^{k+1} = \frac{b}{a} \). Then it follows by Theorem A that the equilibrium point \( \bar{x} = \sqrt{\frac{a-b}{c}} \) of Eq.(1) is unstable. The proof is complete.

2.2. Existence of Period \((2k+2)\) Solutions

In this section we look at the existence of period \((2k+2)\) solutions of Eq.(1).

**Remark:** The initial values \( \{x_{-2k-1}, x_{-2k}, x_{-2k+1}, ..., x_{-1}, x_0\} \) of Eq.(1) have not to be equal zero at the same time, otherwise Eq.(1) will have only the zero solution.

In the sequel we assume that any element of the set \( \{x_{-2k-1}, x_{-2k}, x_{-2k+1}, ..., x_{-1}, x_0\} \) doesn’t equal zero.

**Theorem 2.2.** Eq.(1) has positive prime period \((2k+2)\) solutions if and only if

\[
(b + cA_i - a) = 0,
\]

where \( A_i = x_{-k+i}x_{-2k-1+i} \) \((for \ i = 0, 1, 2, ..., k)\) and \( A_{k+1+i} = A_i \).

**Proof.** Firstly, we suppose that there exists a prime period \((2k+2)\) solution of Eq.(1) of the form

\[
..., x_{-2k-1}, x_{-2k}, x_{-2k+1}, ..., x_{-1}, x_0, x_{-2k-1}, x_{-2k}, x_{-2k+1}, ..., x_{-1}, x_0, ...
\]

That is \( x_{N+1} = x_{N-2k-1} \) for \( N \geq 0 \). We now will show that (9) holds. We see from Eq.(1) that

\[
x_{-2k-1} = x_1 = \frac{ax_{-2k-1}}{b+cA_0}, \quad x_{-2k} = x_2 = \frac{ax_{-2k}}{b+cA_1}, \quad x_{-2k+1} = x_3 = \frac{ax_{-2k+1}}{b+cA_2}, ..., \\
x_{-k-2} = x_k = \frac{ax_{-k-2}}{b+cA_{k-1}}, \quad x_{-k-1} = x_{k+1} = \frac{ax_{-k-1}}{b+cA_k}, \\
x_{-k} = x_{k+2} = \frac{ax_{-k}}{b+cA_k+1}, \quad x_{-2} = x_{2k} = \frac{ax_{-2}}{b+cA_{2k-1}} = \frac{ax_{-2}}{b+cA_{2k}}, \\
x_{-1} = x_{2k+1} = \frac{ax_{-1}}{b+cA_{2k+1}} = \frac{ax_{0}}{b+cA_{2k+1}} = \frac{ax_{0}}{b+cA_k}.
\]

Then it is easy to see that

\[
x_{-2k-1}(b+cA_0) = ax_{-2k-1} \Rightarrow x_{-2k-1}(b+cA_0-a) = 0, \\
x_{-2k}(b+cA_1) = ax_{-2k} \Rightarrow x_{-2k}(b+cA_1-a) = 0, \\
x_{-2k+1}(b+cA_2) = ax_{-2k+1} \Rightarrow x_{-2k+1}(b+cA_2-a) = 0, ..., \\
x_{-1}(b+cA_{k-1}) = ax_{-1} \Rightarrow x_{-1}(b+cA_{k-1}-a) = 0, \\
x_0(b+cA_k) = ax_0 \Rightarrow x_0(b+cA_k-a) = 0.
\]
Since \( x_j \neq 0 \) for all \(-2k+1 \leq j \leq 0\), then Condition (9) is satisfied.

Secondly, we suppose that (9) is true. We will prove that Eq.(1) has a prime period \((2k+2)\) solution. It follows from Eq.(1) and Eq.(9) that

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{a x_{n-2k-1}}{b + c A_0} &= x_{-2k-1}, & x_2 &= \frac{a x_{-2k}}{b + c A_1}, & x_3 &= \frac{a x_{-2k+1}}{b + c A_2} = x_{-2k+1}, \\
\frac{a x_{n-k-2}}{b + c A_{k-1}} &= x_{-k-2}, & x_{k+1} &= \frac{a x_{-k-1}}{b + c A_k}, & x_{k+2} &= \frac{a x_{-k}}{b + c A_{k+1}} = x_{-k}, \\
\frac{a x_{n-2k}}{b + c A_{2k-1}} &= x_{-2}, & x_{2k+1} &= \frac{a x_{-2}}{b + c A_{2k}} = x_{-1}, & x_{2k+2} &= \frac{a x_0}{b + c A_{2k+1}} = x_0,
\end{align*}
\]

which completes the proof.

### 2.3. Boundedness and Global Stability of Solutions

Here we examine the boundedness nature of the solutions of Eq.(1). In addition, we deal with the global stability of the equilibrium point \( \mathbf{\pi} = 0 \).

**Theorem 2.3.** Every solution of Eq.(1) is bounded.

**Proof.** Let \( \{x_n\}_{n=-2k-1}^{\infty} \) be a solution of Eq.(1), we have to look at the following two cases

1. If \( a \leq b \). It follows from Eq.(1) that

\[
x_{n+1} = \frac{a x_n - (2k+1)}{b + c x_{n-k}} \leq \frac{a x_n - (2k+1)}{b} \leq x_{n-(2k+1)}.
\]

Then the subsequences \( \{x_{(2k+2)n-2k-1}\}_{n=0}^{\infty}, \{x_{(2k+2)n-2k}\}_{n=0}^{\infty}, \{x_{(2k+2)n-2k+1}\}_{n=0}^{\infty}, \{x_{(2k+2)n}\}_{n=0}^{\infty} \) are decreasing and so are bounded from above by

\[
\mathbf{M} = \max \left\{ x_{-2k-1}, x_{-2k}, x_{-2k+1}, \ldots, x_{-1}, x_0, \sqrt{\frac{a}{c}} \right\}.
\]

2. If \( a > b \). For the sake of contradiction, we suppose that there exists a subsequence \( \{x_{(2k+2)n-2k-1}\}_{n=0}^{\infty} \) and it is not bounded from above. Then we obtain from Eq.(1), for sufficiently large \( n \), that

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} x_{(2k+2)n+1} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{a x_{(2k+2)n} - (2k+1)}{b + c x_{(2k+2)n-k} x_{(2k+2)n-2k+1}} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{a}{c x_{(2k+2)n-k}}.
\]

It follows that the limit of the right hand side of \((10)\) is bounded which is a contradiction, and so the proof of the theorem is complete.

**Theorem 2.4.** If \( a \leq b \), then every solution of Eq.(1) converges to the equilibrium point \( \mathbf{\pi} = 0 \).

**Proof.** It was shown in Theorem 2.1 that \( \mathbf{\pi} = 0 \) is local stable and then it suffices to show that \( \mathbf{\pi} = 0 \) is global attractor of the solutions of Eq.(1).

We claim that each one of the subsequences \( \{x_{(2k+2)n-2k-1}\}_{n=0}^{\infty}, \{x_{(2k+2)n-2k}\}_{n=0}^{\infty}, \{x_{(2k+2)n-2k+1}\}_{n=0}^{\infty}, \{x_{(2k+2)n}\}_{n=0}^{\infty} \) has limit equal to zero. For the sake of contradiction, suppose that there exists a subsequence \( \{x_{(2k+2)n-2k-1}\}_{n=0}^{\infty} \) with limit doesn’t zero. Now we see from Eq.(1) that

\[
b x_{(2k+2)n+1} + c x_{(2k+2)n-k} x_{(2k+2)n-2k+1} = a x_{(2k+2)n-2k+1},
\]

or

\[
x_{(2k+2)n-2k+1} = \frac{b x_{(2k+2)n+1}}{a - c x_{(2k+2)n+1} x_{(2k+2)n-k}}.
\]

Now it follows from the boundedness of the solution that

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} x_{(2k+2)n-2k+1} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{b x_{(2k+2)n+1}}{a - c x_{(2k+2)n+1} x_{(2k+2)n-k}} < \frac{b M}{a - c M^2} < 0,
\]

where \( M \geq \sqrt{\frac{a}{c}} \) which is a contradiction and this completes the proof of the theorem.
Numerical Examples

For confirming the results of this section, we present some numerical examples which show the behavior of solutions of Eq.(1). See Figures 1, 2 and 3 below.

Figure 1: $a = 3$, $b = 2$, $c = 5$, $k = 2$, $x_{-5} = 0.4$, $x_{-4} = 0.2$, $x_{-3} = 13$, $x_{-2} = 9$, $x_{-1} = 7$, $x_0 = 5$.

Figure 2: $a = 10$, $b = 6$, $c = 2$, $k = 3$, $x_{-7} = 4$, $x_{-6} = 7$, $x_{-5} = 2/9$, $x_{-4} = -6$, $x_{-3} = 0.5$, $x_{-2} = 2/7$, $x_{-1} = 9$, $x_0 = -2/6$. 
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Figure 3: $a = 3$, $b = 7$, $c = 9$, $k = 2$, $x_{-5} = 4$, $x_{-4} = 1.7$, $x_{-3} = 3$, $x_{-2} = 1.9$, $x_{-1} = 9$, $x_0 = 3$.

3. THE SOLUTIONS FORM OF SOME SPECIAL CASES OF EQ.(1)

Our goal in this section is to find a specific form of the solutions of some special cases of Eq.(1) and give numerical examples in each case when the constants $a$, $b$ and $c$ are integer numbers.

3.1. On the Difference Equation $x_{n+1} = \frac{x_{n-(2k+1)}}{1+x_{n-k}x_{n-(2k+1)}}$

In this section we obtain the solution of the following equation

$$x_{n+1} = \frac{x_{n-(2k+1)}}{1+x_{n-k}x_{n-(2k+1)}}, \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots, \tag{11}$$

where the initial values are arbitrary non zero real numbers with $x_{-k+i}x_{-2k-1+i} \neq 1$ (for $i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, k$).

**Theorem 3.1.** Let $\{x_n\}_{n=-2k-1}^\infty$ be a solution of Eq.(11). Then for $n = 1, 2, \ldots$

$$x_{(2k+2)n-2k-1} = \frac{x_{-2k-1}}{(-1+x_{-k}x_{-2k-1})^n}, \quad x_{(2k+2)n-2k} = \frac{x_{-2k}}{(-1+x_{-k+1}x_{-2k})^n},$$

$$x_{(2k+2)n-2k+1} = \frac{x_{-2k+1}}{(-1+x_{-k+2}x_{-2k+1})^n}, \quad \ldots,$$

$$x_{(2k+2)n-k-1} = \frac{x_{-k-1}}{(-1+x_0x_{-k-1})^n}, \quad x_{(2k+2)n-k} = x_k(-1+x_{-k}x_{-2k-1})^n, \quad \ldots,$$

$$x_{(2k+2)n-k+1} = x_{k+1}(-1+x_{-k+1}x_{-2k})^n, \quad \ldots,$$

$$x_{(2k+2)n-1} = x_{-1}(-1+x_{-1}x_{-k})^n, \quad x_{(2k+2)n} = x_0(-1+x_0x_{-k+1})^n.$$

**Proof:** For $n = 1$ the result holds. Now suppose that $n > 1$ and that our assumption holds for $n - 1$. That is,

$$x_{(2k+2)n-4k-3} = \frac{x_{-2k-1}}{(-1+x_{-k}x_{-2k-1})^{n-1}}, \quad x_{(2k+2)n-4k-2} = \frac{x_{-2k}}{(-1+x_{-k+1}x_{-2k})^{n-1}},$$

$$x_{(2k+2)n-4k-1} = \frac{x_{-2k+1}}{(-1+x_{-k+2}x_{-2k+1})^{n-1}}, \quad \ldots,$$

$$x_{(2k+2)n-3k-3} = \frac{x_{-k-1}}{(-1+x_0x_{-k-1})^{n-1}}, \quad x_{(2k+2)n-3k-2} = x_k(-1+x_{-k}x_{-2k-1})^{n-1},$$

$$x_{(2k+2)n-3k-1} = x_{k+1}(-1+x_{-k+1}x_{-2k})^{n-1}, \quad \ldots,$$
\[ x^{(2k+2)n-2k-3} = x_{-1} \left(-1 + x_{-1} x_{-k-2}\right)^{n-1}, \quad x^{(2k+2)n-2k-2} = x_0 \left(-1 + x_0 x_{-k-1}\right)^{n-1}. \]

Now, it follows from Eq.(11) that
\[ x^{(2k+2)n-2k-1} = \frac{x^{(2k+2)n-(4k+3)}}{1 + x^{(2k+2)n-2k-2}} x_{-k-1} \]
\[ = \frac{-1 + x_{-k} x_{-2k-1}}{-1 + x_{-k} x_{-2k-1}} \left(-1 + x_{-1} x_{-k-2}\right)^{n-1} \]
\[ = \frac{x_{-2k-1}}{-1 + x_{-k} x_{-2k-1}} \left(-1 + x_{-1} x_{-k-2}\right)^{n-1}. \]

Hence, we have
\[ x^{(2k+2)n-2k-1} = \frac{x_{-2k-1}}{-1 + x_{-k} x_{-2k-1}}. \]

Also, we see from Eq.(11) that
\[ x^{(2k+2)n-k-1} = \frac{x^{(2k+2)n-(3k+3)}}{1 + x^{(2k+2)n-2k-2}} x_{-k-1} \]
\[ = \frac{-1 + x_{-k} x_{-2k-1}}{-1 + x_{-k} x_{-2k-1}} \left(-1 + x_{-1} x_{-k-2}\right)^{n-1} \]
\[ = \frac{x_{-k-1}}{-1 + x_{-k} x_{-2k-1}} \left(-1 + x_{-1} x_{-k-2}\right)^{n-1}. \]

Thus
\[ x^{(2k+2)n-k-1} = \frac{x_{-k-1}}{-1 + x_{-k} x_{-2k-1}}. \]

Similarly
\[ x^{(2k+2)n-1} = x_{-1} \left(-1 + x_{-1} x_{-k-2}\right)^{n-1}. \]

Then, we get
\[ x^{(2k+2)n-1} = x_{-1} \left(-1 + x_{-1} x_{-k-2}\right)^{n-1}. \]

Similarly, one can obtain the other relations. Thus, the proof is completed.

Note that the equilibrium points of Eq.(11) are given by the equation \( \bar{x} = \frac{x}{1+x^2} \). Then we have \( \bar{x}(\bar{x}^2 - 2) = 0 \). Thus Eq.(11) has the equilibrium points 0, \( \sqrt{2} \), \( -\sqrt{2} \).

**Theorem 3.2.** The following statements are true:

(a) If \( x^{(2k+2)n-k-1+i} \neq 2 \) for \( i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, k \), then all the solutions of Eq.(11) are unbounded.

(b) Eq.(11) has a periodic solutions of period \( (2k+2) \) iff \( x^{(2k+2)n-2k-1+i} = 2 \) for \( i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, k \) and will be the form \( \{x_{-2k-1}, x_{-2k}, \ldots, x_{-1}, x_0, x_{-2k-1}, x_{-2k}, \ldots, x_{-1}, x_0, \ldots\} \).

**Proof:** (a) The proof in this case follows directly from the form of the solution as given in Theorem 3.1.

(b) First suppose that there exists a prime period \( (2k+2) \) solution of Eq.(11) of the form
\[ x_{-2k-1}, x_{-2k}, \ldots, x_{-1}, x_0, x_{-2k-1}, x_{-2k}, \ldots, x_{-1}, x_0, \ldots. \]
Then we see from the form of solution of Eq. (11) that
\[
\begin{align*}
x_{-2k-1} &= \frac{x_{-2k-1}}{(-1 + x_{-k}x_{-2k-1})^n}, \\
x_{-2k+1} &= \frac{x_{-2k+1}}{(-1 + x_{-k+2}x_{-2k+1})^n}, \\
x_{-k-1} &= \frac{x_{-k-1}}{(-1 + x_{-k+1}x_{-2k-1})^n}, \\
x_{-k+1} &= \frac{x_{-k+1}}{(-1 + x_{-k+1}x_{-2k+1})^n}, \\
x_{-1} &= x_{-1}(-1 + x_{-k}x_{-2k-1})^n, \\
x_0 &= x_0(-1 + x_{0}x_{-k-1})^n,
\end{align*}
\]

Then
\[
\begin{align*}
x_{-k}x_{-2k-1} &= x_{-k+1}x_{-2k} = x_{-k+2}x_{-2k+1} = \ldots = x_{-k}x_{-2k-1} = -1 + x_{-k}x_{-2k-1} = \\
x_{-k}x_{-2k-1} &= x_{-k+1}x_{-2k} = \ldots = x_{0}x_{-k-1} = 2,
\end{align*}
\]
or \(x_{-k+i}x_{-2k-1} = 2\) (for \(i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, k\)).

Second suppose that
\[
\begin{align*}
x_{-k}x_{-2k-1} &= x_{-k+1}x_{-2k} = x_{-k+2}x_{-2k+1} = \ldots = x_{-k}x_{-2k-1} = \\
x_{-k}x_{-2k-1} &= x_{-k+1}x_{-2k} = \ldots = x_{0}x_{-k-1} = 2.
\end{align*}
\]

Then we see from Eq. (11) that
\[
\begin{align*}
x_{(2k+2)n-2k-1} &= x_{-2k-1}, \\
x_{(2k+2)n-2k} &= x_{-2k}, \\
x_{(2k+2)n-2k+1} &= x_{-2k+1}, \\
x_{(2k+2)n-k-1} &= x_{-k-1}, \\
x_{(2k+2)n-k} &= x_{-k}, \\
x_{(2k+2)n-k+1} &= x_{-k+1}, \\
x_{(2k+2)n-1} &= x_{-1}, \\
x_{(2k+2)n} &= x_{0}.
\end{align*}
\]

Thus we have a period \((2k + 2)\) solution and the proof is complete.

In the following we give some numerical examples to confirm the obtained results for Eq. (11). See Figures 4 and 5 below.

Figure 4: \(k = 2, x_{-5} = 2.4, x_{-4} = -6.2, x_{-3} = 4, x_{-2} = 0.9, x_{-1} = 0.7, x_{0} = 0.5\).
In this section we get the solution form of the difference equation

\[
x_{n+1} = \frac{x_n - (2k+1)}{1 - x_n - k x_n - (2k+1)},
\]

where the initial values are arbitrary non-zero real numbers.

**Theorem 3.3.** Let \( \{x_n\}_{n=-2k-1}^{\infty} \) be a solution of Eq.(12). Then for \( n = 1, 2, \ldots \)

\[
x_{(2k+2)n-2k-1} = x_{-2k-1} \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \left( \frac{1 - 2ix_{-k} x_{-2k-1}}{1 - (2i + 1) x_{-k} x_{-2k-1}} \right),
\]

\[
x_{(2k+2)n-2k} = x_{-2k} \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \left( \frac{1 - 2ix_{-k-1} x_{-2k}}{1 - (2i + 1) x_{-k-1} x_{-2k}} \right),
\]

\[
x_{(2k+2)n-k-1} = x_{-k-1} \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \left( \frac{1 - 2ix_0 x_{-k-1}}{1 - (2i + 1) x_0 x_{-k-1}} \right),
\]

\[
x_{(2k+2)n-1} = x_{-1} \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \left( \frac{1 - (2i + 1) x_{-1} x_{-k}}{1 - (2i + 2) x_{-1} x_{-k}} \right),
\]

**Proof:** For \( n = 1 \) the result holds. Now suppose that \( n > 1 \) and that our assumption holds for \( n - 1 \). That is;

\[
x_{(2k+2)n-4k-3} = x_{-4k-3} \prod_{i=0}^{n-2} \left( \frac{1 - 2ix_{-k} x_{-2k-1}}{1 - (2i + 1) x_{-k} x_{-2k-1}} \right),
\]

\[
x_{(2k+2)n-4k-2} = x_{-4k-2} \prod_{i=0}^{n-2} \left( \frac{1 - 2ix_{-k-1} x_{-2k}}{1 - (2i + 1) x_{-k-1} x_{-2k}} \right),
\]

\[
x_{(2k+2)n-3k-3} = x_{-3k-3} \prod_{i=0}^{n-2} \left( \frac{1 - 2ix_0 x_{-k-1}}{1 - (2i + 1) x_0 x_{-k-1}} \right),
\]

\[
x_{(2k+2)n-3k-2} = x_{-3k-2} \prod_{i=0}^{n-2} \left( \frac{1 - (2i + 1) x_{-k} x_{-2k-1}}{1 - (2i + 2) x_{-k} x_{-2k-1}} \right),
\]

\[
x_{(2k+2)n-3k-1} = x_{-3k-1} \prod_{i=0}^{n-2} \left( \frac{1 - (2i + 1) x_{-1} x_{-k}}{1 - (2i + 2) x_{-1} x_{-k}} \right),
\]

\[
x_{(2k+2)n-2k-3} = x_{-2k-3} \prod_{i=0}^{n-2} \left( \frac{1 - (2i + 1) x_{-2k-1}}{1 - (2i + 2) x_{-2k-1}} \right),
\]

\[
x_{(2k+2)n-2k-2} = x_{-2k-2} \prod_{i=0}^{n-2} \left( \frac{1 - (2i + 1) x_{-2k} x_{-1}}{1 - (2i + 2) x_{-2k} x_{-1}} \right).
\]
Now, it follows from Eq.(12) that

\[ x_{(2k+2)n-2k-1} = \frac{x_{(2k+2)n-(4k+3)}}{1 - x_{(2k+2)n-3k-2}(2k+2)n-(4k+3)} \]

\[ = \frac{x_{-2k-1} \prod_{i=0}^{n-2} \left( \frac{1 - (2i + 1)x_{-k}x_{-2k-1}}{1 - (2i + 1)x_{-k}x_{-2k-1}} \right)}{1 - x_{-k} \prod_{i=0}^{n-2} \left( \frac{1 - (2i + 1)x_{0}x_{-k-1}}{1 - (2i + 1)x_{0}x_{-k-1}} \right)} \]

\[ = \frac{x_{-2k-1} \prod_{i=0}^{n-2} \left( \frac{1 - (2i + 1)x_{k}x_{-2k-1}}{1 - (2i + 1)x_{k}x_{-2k-1}} \right)}{1 - x_{0} \prod_{i=0}^{n-2} \left( \frac{1 - (2i + 1)x_{0}x_{-k-1}}{1 - (2i + 1)x_{0}x_{-k-1}} \right)} \]

Hence, we have

\[ x_{(2k+2)n-2k-1} = x_{-2k-1} \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \left( \frac{1 - 2ix_{-k}x_{-2k-1}}{1 - (2i + 1)x_{-k}x_{-2k-1}} \right). \]

Similarly

\[ x_{(2k+2)n-k-1} = \frac{x_{(2k+2)n-(3k+3)}}{1 - x_{(2k+2)n-2k-2}(2k+2)n-(3k+3)} \]

\[ = \frac{x_{-k-1} \prod_{i=0}^{n-2} \left( \frac{1 - 2ix_{0}x_{-k-1}}{1 - (2i + 1)x_{0}x_{-k-1}} \right)}{1 - x_{0} \prod_{i=0}^{n-2} \left( \frac{1 - 2ix_{0}x_{-k-1}}{1 - (2i + 1)x_{0}x_{-k-1}} \right)} \]

\[ = \frac{x_{-k-1} \prod_{i=0}^{n-2} \left( \frac{1 - 2ix_{0}x_{-k-1}}{1 - (2i + 1)x_{0}x_{-k-1}} \right)}{1 - x_{0} \prod_{i=0}^{n-2} \left( \frac{1 - 2ix_{0}x_{-k-1}}{1 - (2i + 1)x_{0}x_{-k-1}} \right)} \]

Hence, we have

\[ x_{(2k+2)n-k-1} = x_{-k-1} \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \left( \frac{1 - 2ix_{0}x_{-k-1}}{1 - (2i + 1)x_{0}x_{-k-1}} \right). \]

Similarly, we can easily get the other relations. Thus, the proof is completed.

**Theorem 3.4.** Eq.(12) has the unique equilibrium point \( \bar{\sigma} = 0 \).

**Proof:** For the equilibrium points of Eq.(12), we can write \( \bar{\sigma} = \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{1 - \bar{\sigma}} \). Then we have \( \bar{\sigma}^2 = 0 \). Thus the equilibrium point of Eq.(12) is \( \bar{\sigma} = 0 \).

The following figures show the behavior of the solutions of Eq.(12) with a fixed order and some numerical values of the initial values.
Notice: The proofs of the theorems in the following section are similar to that are presented in the previous sections and so they will be omitted.

3.3. On the Difference Equation

$$x_{n+1} = \frac{x_{n-(2k+1)}}{-1 - x_{n-k}x_{n-(2k+1)}}$$

Here we obtain the form of the solutions of the following equation

$$x_{n+1} = \frac{x_{n-(2k+1)}}{-1 - x_{n-k}x_{n-(2k+1)}}, \quad n = 0, 1, ..., \tag{13}$$

where the initial values are arbitrary non zero real numbers with $x_{-k+i}x_{2k-1-i} \neq -1$ (for $i = 0, 1, 2, ..., k$).
Theorem 3.6. Let \( \{x_n\}_{n=-2k-1}^{\infty} \) be a solution of Eq. (13). Then for \( n = 1, 2, \ldots \)

\[
x(2k+2)n-2k-1 = \frac{(-1)^n x_{-2k-1}}{(1 + x_{-k}x_{-2k-1})}, \quad x(2k+2)n-2k = \frac{(-1)^n x_{-2k}}{(1 + x_{-k+1}x_{-2k})},
\]

\[
x(2k+2)n-2k+1 = \frac{(-1)^n x_{-2k+1}}{(1 + x_{-k+2}x_{-2k+1})}, \quad \ldots,
\]

\[
x(2k+2)n-k-1 = \frac{(-1)^n x_{-k-1}}{(1 + x_0 x_{-k-1})}, \quad x(2k+2)n-k = (-1)^n x_{-k} (1 + x_{-k} x_{-2k-1})^n,
\]

\[
x(2k+2)n-k+1 = (-1)^n x_{-k+1} (1 + x_{-k+1} x_{-2k})^n, \quad \ldots,
\]

\[
x(2k+2)n-1 = (-1)^n x_{-1} (1 + x_{-1} x_{-2})^n, \quad x(2k+2)n = (-1)^n x_0 (1 + x_0 x_{-k-1})^n.
\]

Theorem 3.6. Eq. (13) has a unique equilibrium point which is zero.

Theorem 3.7. Let \( \{x_n\}_{n=-2k-1}^{\infty} \) be a solution of Eq. (13). Then the following statements are true:

1. If \( x_{-k+i} x_{-2k-1+i} \neq -2 \) (for \( i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, k \)), Then \( \{x_n\}_{n=-2k-1}^{\infty} \) is unbounded.

2. Eq. (13) has a periodic solutions of period \( 2(k + 2) \) if \( x_{-k+i} x_{-2k-1+i} = -2 \) (for \( i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, k \)) and will be take the form \( \{x_{-2k-1}, x_{-2k}, \ldots, x_{-1}, x_0, x_{-2k-1}, x_{-2k}, \ldots, x_{-1}, x_0, \ldots \} \).

Acknowledgements

This Project was funded by the Deanship of Scientific Research (DSR) at King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia under grant no. G–214–130–38. The authors, therefore, acknowledge with thanks DSR for technical and financial support. Last, but not least, sincere appreciations are dedicated to all our colleagues in the Faculty of Science for their nice wishes.

REFERENCES


3. C. Cinar, On the positive solutions of the difference equation \( x_{n+1} = \frac{x_{n-1}}{1+x_n x_{n-1}} \), Appl. Math. Comp., 150 (2004), 21-24.

4. C. Cinar, On the difference equation \( x_{n+1} = \frac{x_{n-1}}{1+x_n x_{n-1}} \), Appl. Math. Comp., 158 (2004), 813-816.

5. C. Cinar, R. Karatas and I. Yalcinkaya, On solutions of the difference equation \( x_{n+1} = \frac{x_{n-3}}{-1+x_n x_{n-1} x_{n-2} x_{n-3}} \), Mathematica Bohemica, 132 (3) (2007), 257-261.


8. E. M. Elabbasy, H. El-Metwally and E. M. Elsayed, On the difference equation \( x_{n+1} = a x_n - \frac{b x_n}{x_{n-1} x_{n-2}}, \) Adv. Differ. Equ., Volume 2006 (2006), Article ID 82579.1-10.

9. E. M. Elabbasy, H. El-Metwally and E. M. Elsayed, On the solutions equations \( x_{n+1} = \frac{\alpha x_{n-1} + \beta}{\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} x_{n-i}}, \) J. Conc. Appl. Math., 5(2) (2007), 101-113.

29. R. Karatas and C. Cinar, On the solutions of the difference equation $x_{n+1} = \frac{ax_n - (2k+2)}{-a + \prod_{i=0}^{k} x_{n-i}}$, Int. J. Contemp. Math. Sciences, 2 (13) (2007), 1505-1509.
35. D. Simsek and F. Abdullayev, On the recursive sequence $x_{n+1} = \frac{x_n - (4k+3)}{1 + \prod_{i=0}^{t} x_{n-(k+1)t-k}}$, Journal of Mathematical Sciences, 6 (222) (2017), 376–387.


45. J. Williams, On a class of nonlinear max-type difference equations, Cogent Mathematics, 3 (1) (2016), No. 1269597, 1-11.


Extremal solutions for a coupled system of nonlinear fractional differential equations with p-Laplacian operator
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Abstract. This paper studies the existence of extremal solutions for nonlinear fractional differential coupled systems with p-Laplacian operator. The monotone iterative method combined with lower and upper solutions is applied. As an application, an example is presented to illustrate the main result.
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1. Introduction

In recent years, fractional differential equations have been of great interest due to the intensive development of the theory of fractional calculus itself and its applications. The study of coupled systems involving fractional-order differential equation is also very significant as such systems appear in a variety of problems of applied nature, especially in bioscience. For details and examples the reader is referred to the papers [1 – 4] and the reference therein.

In addition, much effort has been made towards the study of the existence of solutions for fractional differential equations involving the p-Laplacian operator based on different fractional derivatives[5 – 9]. In [10], Li and Lin considered a Hadamard fractional boundary value problem with p-Laplacian operator as below:

\[
\begin{align*}
D^\beta(\varphi_p(D^\alpha x(t))) &= f(t, x(t)), \quad 0 < t < e, \\
x(1) &= x'(1) = x'(e) = 0, D^\alpha x(1) = D^\alpha x(e) = 0
\end{align*}
\]

where \(2 < \alpha \leq 3, 1 < \beta \leq 2, \varphi_p(s) = |s|^{p-2}s, p > 1, \) and \(f : [1, e] \times [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)\) is a positive continuous function. By using the Leray-Schauder type alternative and the Guo
Krasnoselskii fixed point theorem, the existence and the uniqueness of the positive solutions were established.

To best of our knowledge, only few papers considered the method of upper and lower solutions for a coupled system of fractional p-Laplacian equation. Motivated by [11 – 12], in this paper, we use the monotone iterative technique, combined with the method of upper and lower solution to study the coupled system of fractional differential equations with p-Laplacian operator, which is given by

\[
\begin{align*}
D^\beta(\phi_p(D^\alpha x(t))) &= f(t, x(t), y(t), D^\alpha x(t), D^\alpha y(t)), \\
D^\beta(\phi_p(D^\alpha y(t))) &= g(t, y(t), x(t), D^\alpha y(t), D^\alpha x(t)), \\
D^\alpha x(t)|_{t=0} &= 0, \\
D^\alpha y(t)|_{t=0} &= 0, \\
\end{align*}
\tag{1.1}
\]

where \( J = [0, 1], f, g \in C(J \times R^4, R), \) \( r_1, r_2 \in R \) and \( r_1 \leq r_2, D^\alpha, D^\beta \) are the standard Riemann-Liouville fractional derivatives, satisfying \( 0 < \alpha, \beta < 1, 1 < \alpha + \beta < 2, \phi_p(t) = |t|^{p-2}t, p > 1, \) is the p-Laplacian operator and \( (\phi_p)^{-1} = \phi_q, \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1. \)

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we give some necessary definitions and lemmas. In section 3, the main result and proof are given. Finally, an example is presented to illustrate the main result.

2. Preliminaries

In this section, we establish some preliminary results that will be used in the next section to attain existence results for the nonlinear system (1.1)

Let \( C[0, 1] \) denote the Banach space of continuous functions from \( [0, 1] \) into \( R \) with the norm \( \|u\|_C = \max_{t \in [0, 1]} |u(t)|. \) Denote \( C_{1-\alpha}[0, 1] \) by

\[ C_{1-\alpha}[0, 1] = \{ x \in C(0, 1) : t^{1-\alpha}x \in C[0, 1] \}. \]

Then, \( C_{1-\alpha}[0, 1] \) is a Banach spaces with the norm \( \|x\|_{1-\alpha} = \|t^{1-\alpha} x(t)\|_C. \) It is clear that \( C[0, 1] := C_0[0, 1] \subset C_{1-\alpha}[0, 1] \) with \( \|x\|_{C_{1-\alpha}} \leq \|x\|_C \) for \( 0 < \alpha \leq 1 \) and \( C_{1-\alpha}[0, 1] \subset L[0, 1] \) (note \( L[0, 1] \) is the space of Lebesgue integrable functions defined on \( [0, 1] \)). Denote \( C^\alpha[0, 1] \) by

\[ C^\alpha[0, 1] = \{ x(t) \subset C[0, 1] : (D^\alpha x)(t) \subset C[0, 1] \text{ and } D^\alpha x(t)|_{t=0} = 0 = 0 \} \]

**Lemma 2.1:** Let \( 0 < \beta < 1, \sigma \in C[0, 1], M \geq 0 \) and \( M\Gamma(1-\beta) < 1, \) then the problem

\[
\begin{align*}
D^\beta u(t) + Mu(t) &= \sigma(t), \\
\quad u(0) &= 0,
\end{align*}
\tag{2.1}
\]

has a unique solution.

**Proof.** Equation (2.1) is equivalent to the following integral equation

\[ u(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\beta)} \int_0^t \left( t-s \right)^{\beta-1} \left( \sigma(s) - Mu(s) \right) ds, \quad \forall \ t \in J \]
Let
\[ Au(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\beta)} \int_0^t (t-s)^{\beta-1}(\sigma(s) - Mu(s))ds, \quad \forall \ t \in J \]

By \( M \geq 0 \) and \( M\Gamma(1-\beta) < 1 \), for any \( u, v \in C[0,1] \), we have
\[
\|Au(t) - Av(t)\|_C \leq \frac{M}{\Gamma(\beta)} \int_0^t (t-s)^{\beta-1}ds \|u-v\|_C
\]
\[
\leq \frac{M}{\Gamma(\beta)\beta} \|u-v\|_C
\]
\[
< \frac{1}{\Gamma(\beta)} \cdot \frac{1}{\beta} \cdot \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\beta)} \|u-v\|_C
\]
\[
= \frac{\sin \Pi \beta}{\Pi \beta} \|u-v\|_C
\]
\[
< \|u-v\|_C
\]

So
\[
\|Au - Av\|_C < \|u-v\|_C.
\]

By the Banach fixed point theorem, the operator \( A \) has a unique fixed point. That is (2.1) has a unique solution.

**Lemma 2.2:** Let \( 0 < \alpha < 1 \), \( h \in C_{1-\alpha}[0,1] \), then the problem
\[
\begin{cases}
D^\alpha x(t) = h(t), & \quad t \in (0,1], \\
\left.t^{1-\alpha}x(t)\right|_{t=0} = r
\end{cases}
\]
has a unique solution
\[
x(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-s)^{\alpha-1}h(s)ds + rt^{\alpha-1}.
\]

**Proof.** The conclusion is obvious, so we omit it.

**Lemma 2.3:** Assume that \( 0 < \alpha, \beta < 1 \), \( x(t), y(t) \in C^\alpha[0,1] \), \( \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in C[0,1] \), \( M, N \) be nonnegative constants, satisfying \( M \geq N \) and \((M+N)\Gamma(1-\beta) < 1\), then the following fractional differential system
\[
\begin{cases}
D^\beta(\phi_p(D^\alpha x(t))) = \sigma_1(t) - M\phi_p(D^\alpha x(t)) - N\phi_p(D^\alpha y(t)), \\
D^\beta(\phi_p(D^\alpha y(t))) = \sigma_2(t) - M\phi_p(D^\alpha y(t)) - N\phi_p(D^\alpha x(t)) \\
D^\alpha x(t)|_{t=0} = 0, & \quad t^{1-\alpha}x(t)|_{t=0} = r_1, \\
D^\alpha y(t)|_{t=0} = 0, & \quad t^{1-\alpha}y(t)|_{t=0} = r_2.
\end{cases}
\]
has a unique solution in \( C^\alpha[0,1] \times C^\alpha[0,1] \).

**Proof.** Let
\[
\phi_p(D^\alpha x(t)) = \frac{u(t)+v(t)}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_p(D^\alpha y(t)) = \frac{u(t)-v(t)}{2}, \quad \forall \ t \in [0,1].
\]

Using (2.3), we have that
\[
\begin{cases}
D^\beta u(t) = \sigma_1(t) + \sigma_2(t) - (M+N)u(t) \\
u(t)|_{t=0} = \phi_p(D^\alpha x(t))|_{t=0} + \phi_p(D^\alpha y(t))|_{t=0} = 0
\end{cases}
\]
and
\[
\begin{align*}
D^\beta v(t) &= \sigma_1(t) - \sigma_2(t) - (M - N)v(t) \\
v(t)|_{t=0} &= \phi_p(D^\alpha x(t))|_{t=0} - \phi_p(D^\alpha y(t))|_{t=0} = 0,
\end{align*}
\] (2.5)

Since, \(M, N\) are nonnegative constants, and \(M \geq N\), we have
\[
(M - N)\Gamma(1 - \beta) \leq (M + N)\Gamma(1 - \beta) < 1. \tag{2.6}
\]

In view of \(x(t), y(t) \in C^\alpha[0,1]\), we have \(D^\alpha x(t), D^\alpha y(t) \in C[0,1]\). By (2.6) and Lemma 2.1, we know that (2.4) and (2.5) have a unique solution. In consequence, \(\phi_p(D^\alpha x(t))\) and \(\phi_p(D^\alpha y(t))\) are also unique. That is
\[
\phi_p(D^\alpha x(t)) = \omega_1(t) \in C[0,1], \quad \phi_p(D^\alpha y(t)) = \omega_2(t) \in C[0,1],
\]
then,
\[
D^\alpha x(t) = \phi_q(\omega_1(t)), \quad D^\alpha y(t) = \phi_q(\omega_2(t)).
\]

In view of the initial condition \(t^{1-\alpha}x(t)|_{t=0} = r_1, \quad t^{1-\alpha}y(t)|_{t=0} = r_2\), we obtain
\[
\begin{align*}
D^\alpha x(t) &= \phi_q(\omega_1(t)), & t \in [0,1] \\
D^\alpha y(t) &= \phi_q(\omega_2(t)), & t \in [0,1] \\
t^{1-\alpha}x(t)|_{t=0} &= r_1, \\
t^{1-\alpha}y(t)|_{t=0} &= r_2,
\end{align*}
\] (2.7)

Let
\[
x(t) = \frac{p(t) + q(t)}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad y(t) = \frac{p(t) - q(t)}{2}.
\]

Using (2.7), we have
\[
\begin{align*}
D^\alpha p(t) &= \phi_q(\omega_1(t)) + \phi_q(\omega_2(t)), & t \in (0,1] \\
t^{1-\alpha}p(t)|_{t=0} &= r_1 + r_2,
\end{align*}
\] (2.8)

and
\[
\begin{align*}
D^\alpha q(t) &= \phi_q(\omega_1(t)) - \phi_q(\omega_2(t)), & t \in (0,1] \\
t^{1-\alpha}q(t)|_{t=0} &= r_1 - r_2,
\end{align*}
\] (2.9)

By Lemma 2.2, we know that both (2.8) and (2.9) have a unique solution in \(C^\alpha[0,1]\). Hence, \(x\) and \(y\) are unique too.

**Lemma 2.4:** Let \(0 < \beta < 1\), \(M\) be nonnegative constant and \(w \in C[0,1]\) satisfies
\[
\begin{align*}
D^\beta w(t) + Mw(t) &\geq 0, & 0 < t < 1, \\
w(0) &\geq 0,
\end{align*}
\]
then, \(w(t) \geq 0, \quad \forall \ t \in [0,1]\).

**Proof.** We assume that \(w(t) \geq 0\) is not true. Then there exist \(t^*, \ t_\ast \in (0,1]\) such that \(w(t^*) = 0, \ w(t_\ast) < 0\) and \(w(t) \geq 0, \ \forall \ t \in (0, t^*), \ w(t) < 0, \ \forall \ t \in (t^*, t_\ast)\). Since \(M \geq 0\), we have \(D^\beta w(t) \geq 0, \ \forall \ t \in (t^*, t_\ast)\). This together with \(D^\beta w(t) = \frac{d}{dt}t^{1-\beta}w(t)\) implies \(t^{1-\beta}w(t)\) is nondecreasing on \((t^*, t_\ast)\).
Hence, for any \( t \in (t^*, t_*) \), we get
\[
I^{1-\beta}w(t) - I^{1-\beta}w(t^*) \geq 0.
\]
On the other hand
\[
I^{1-\beta}w(t) - I^{1-\beta}w(t^*) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\beta)} \int_0^t (t-s)^{-\beta}w(s)ds - \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\beta)} \int_0^{t^*} (t^*-s)^{-\beta}w(s)ds
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\beta)} \int_0^t [(t-s)^{-\beta} - (t^*-s)^{-\beta}]w(s)ds + \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\beta)} \int_{t^*}^t (t-s)^{-\beta}w(s)ds
\]
\[
< 0, \quad \forall t \in (t^*, t_*),
\]
which is a contradiction. Thus the conclusion of Lemma 2.4 holds.

**Lemma 2.5:** If \( x(t) \in C_{1-\alpha}[0,1] \) satisfies
\[
\begin{align*}
D^\alpha x(t) & \geq 0, \quad t \in (0,1], \\
t^{1-\alpha}x(t)|_{t=0} & \geq 0,
\end{align*}
\]
then \( x(t) \geq 0 \), for \( t \in (0,1] \).

**Proof.** By Lemma 2.2, we know that problem (2.10) has a unique solution
\[
x(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-s)^{\alpha-1}h(s)ds + rt^{\alpha-1}
\]
Let \( h(t) \geq 0 \) and \( r \geq 0 \), then we obtain (2.10) and the conclusion of lemma 2.5.

**Lemma 2.6:** Let \( M, N \) be nonnegative constants, and \( M \geq N \). If \( u, v \in C[0,1] \) satisfy the inequalities
\[
\begin{align*}
D^\beta u(t) & \geq -Mu(t) + Nv(t), \quad t \in [0,1] \\
D^\beta v(t) & \geq -Mv(t) + Nu(t), \quad t \in [0,1] \\
u(t)|_{t=0} & \geq 0, \\
v(t)|_{t=0} & \geq 0
\end{align*}
\]
then \( u(t) \geq 0, \quad v(t) \geq 0, \quad \forall t \in [0,1] \).

**Proof.** Let \( p(t) = u(t) + v(t), \quad \forall t \in [0,1] \). Then by (2.11), we have
\[
\begin{align*}
D^\beta p(t) & \geq -(M-N)p(t), \quad t \in [0,1] \\
p(t)|_{t=0} & \geq 0
\end{align*}
\]
Thus, by (2.12) and Lemma 2.4, we have that
\[
p(t) \geq 0, \quad \forall t \in [0,1] \quad \text{i.e.} \quad u(t) + v(t) \geq 0, \quad \forall t \in [0,1].
\]

Next, we show that \( u(t) \geq 0, \quad v(t) \geq 0, \quad \forall t \in [0,1] \).

Using (2.11) and (2.13), we find that
\[
\begin{align*}
D^\beta u(t) & \geq -(M+N)u(t), \quad t \in [0,1] \\
u(t)|_{t=0} & \geq 0
\end{align*}
\]
which, in view of (2.14) and Lemma 2.4, yield \( u(t) \geq 0, \ \forall \ t \in [0, 1] \). In a similar manner, it can be shown that \( v(t) \geq 0, \ \forall \ t \in [0, 1] \).

3. Main Results

In this section, we prove the existence of extremal solutions of nonlinear system (1.1). For convenience, we list the following conditions:

\((H_1)\): There exist \( x_0, y_0 \in C^\alpha[0, 1] \) and \( x_0(t) \leq y_0(t) \) such that
\[
\begin{align*}
D^\alpha(x_0(t)) &\leq f(t, x_0(t), y_0(t), D^\alpha x_0(t), D^\alpha y_0(t)), & t \in [0, 1], \\
D^\alpha x_0(t) &\leq 0, & t \in [0, 1], \\
D^\alpha(y_0(t)) &\geq g(t, y_0(t), x_0(t), D^\alpha y_0(t), D^\alpha x_0(t)), & t \in [0, 1], \\
D^\alpha y_0(t) &\geq 0, & t \in [0, 1],
\end{align*}
\]

\((H_2)\): There exist nonnegative constant \( M, N \) satisfying \( M \geq N \) and \( (M + N)\Gamma(1 - \beta) < 1 \), such that
\[
\begin{align*}
f(t, x(t), y(t), D^\alpha x(t), D^\alpha y(t)) &\leq M[\phi_p(D^\alpha x(t)) - \phi_p(D^\alpha y(t))] + N[\phi_p(D^\alpha y(t)) - \phi_p(D^\alpha y(t))] \\
g(t, x(t), y(t), D^\alpha x(t), D^\alpha y(t)) &\leq M[\phi_p(D^\alpha x(t)) - \phi_p(D^\alpha y(t))] + N[\phi_p(D^\alpha y(t)) - \phi_p(D^\alpha y(t))]
\end{align*}
\]

where \( x_0(t) \leq x \leq y \leq y_0(t) \), \( x_0(t) \leq y \leq y_0(t) \), and
\[
\begin{align*}
f(t, x(t), y(t), D^\alpha x(t), D^\alpha y(t)) &\leq g(t, x(t), y(t), D^\alpha x(t), D^\alpha y(t)) \\
D^\alpha y(t) &\leq M[\phi_p(D^\alpha x(t)) - \phi_p(D^\alpha y(t))] + N[\phi_p(D^\alpha x(t)) - \phi_p(D^\alpha y(t))]
\end{align*}
\]

with \( x_0(t) \leq x \leq y \leq y_0(t) \).

**Theorem 3.1:** Suppose that conditions \((H_1)\) and \((H_2)\) hold. Then there is \((x^*, y^*) \in [x_0, y_0] \times [x_0, y_0] \) an extremal solution of the nonlinear problem (1.1). Moreover, there exist monotone iterative sequences \( \{x_n\}, \{y_n\} \subset C^\alpha \) such that \( x_n \to x^*, y_n \to y^*(n \to \infty) \) uniformly on \( t \in (0, 1) \), and
\[
x_0 \leq x_1 \leq \cdots \leq x_n \leq \cdots \leq x^* \leq y^* \leq \cdots \leq y_n \leq \cdots \leq y_0,
\]

moreover, we have
\[
D^\alpha x_0 \leq D^\alpha x_1 \leq \cdots \leq D^\alpha x_n \leq \cdots \leq D^\alpha x^* \leq D^\alpha y^* \leq \cdots \leq D^\alpha y_n \leq \cdots \leq D^\alpha y_1 \leq D^\alpha y_0.
\]

where
\[
[x_0, y_0] = \{x \in C^\alpha[0, 1] : x_0(t) \leq x(t) \leq y_0(t), t \in [0, 1]\}
\]

**Proof.** For any \( x_{n-1}, y_{n-1} \in C^\alpha[0, 1], \ n \geq 1 \), we define
\[
\begin{align*}
\sigma_n^x(t) &= f(t, x_{n-1}(t), y_{n-1}(t), D^\alpha x_{n-1}(t), D^\alpha y_{n-1}(t)) + M\phi_p(D^\alpha x_{n-1}(t)) + N\phi_p(D^\alpha y_{n-1}(t)), \\
\sigma_n^y(t) &= g(t, y_{n-1}(t), x_{n-1}(t), D^\alpha y_{n-1}(t), D^\alpha x_{n-1}(t)) + M\phi_p(D^\alpha y_{n-1}(t)) + N\phi_p(D^\alpha x_{n-1}(t)),
\end{align*}
\]
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and consider (2.3) as follows

\[
\begin{align*}
D^3(\phi_p(D^\alpha x_n(t))) &= \sigma_1^\alpha(t) - M \phi_p(D^\alpha x_n(t)) - N \phi_p(D^\alpha y_n(t)) \quad t \in (0, 1], \\
D^3(\phi_p(D^\alpha y_n(t))) &= \sigma_2^\alpha(t) - M \phi_p(D^\alpha y_n(t)) - N \phi_p(D^\alpha x_n(t)) \quad t \in (0, 1], \\
D^\alpha x_n(t)|_{t=0} &= 0, \quad t^{1-\alpha}x_n(t)|_{t=r_1} = r_1, \\
D^\alpha y_n(t)|_{t=0} &= 0, \quad t^{1-\alpha}y_n(t)|_{t=0} = r_2.
\end{align*}
\]

(3.1)

In view of Lemma 2.3, the problem (3.1) has a unique solution in \(C^\alpha[0, 1] \times C^\alpha[0, 1]\).

Now, we show that \(x_n(t), \{y_n(t)\}\) satisfy the relation

\[
x_{n-1} \leq x_n \leq y_n \leq y_{n-1}, \text{ and } D^\alpha x_{n-1} \leq D^\alpha x_n \leq D^\alpha y_n \leq D^\alpha y_{n-1}, \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots
\]

(3.2)

Let \(u(t) = \phi_p(D^\alpha x_1(t)) - \phi_p(D^\alpha x_0(t)), \ v(t) = \phi_p(D^\alpha y_0(t)) - \phi_p(D^\alpha y_1(t))\).

Thus, by condition (3.1) and (H1), we have

\[
\begin{align*}
D^3 u(t) &\geq -M u(t) + N v(t), \\
D^3 v(t) &\geq -M v(t) + N u(t), \\
u(t)|_{t=0} = \phi_p(D^\alpha x_1(t))|_{t=0} - \phi_p(D^\alpha x_0(t))|_{t=0} = 0, \\
v(t)|_{t=0} = \phi_p(D^\alpha y_0(t))|_{t=0} - \phi_p(D^\alpha y_1(t))|_{t=0} = 0.
\end{align*}
\]

Thus, in view of Lemma 2.6, we have that \(\phi_p(D^\alpha x_1(t)) \geq \phi_p(D^\alpha x_0(t)), \ \phi_p(D^\alpha y_0(t)) \geq \phi_p(D^\alpha y_1(t)), \ \forall t \in [0, 1]\). Since \(\Phi_p(x)\) is nondecreasing, we have \(D^\alpha x_1(t) \geq D^\alpha x_0(t), \ D^\alpha y_0(t) \geq D^\alpha y_1(t), \ \forall t \in [0, 1]\).

Let \(\epsilon(t) = x_1(t) - x_0(t), \ \theta(t) = y_0(t) - y_1(t)\). It follows from (3.1) and (H1), we have

\[
\begin{align*}
D^\alpha \epsilon(t) &\geq 0, \quad t \in [0, 1], \\
t^{1-\alpha} \epsilon(t)|_{t=0} &\geq 0
\end{align*}
\]

(3.3)

and

\[
\begin{align*}
D^\alpha \theta(t) &\geq 0, \quad t \in [0, 1], \\
t^{1-\alpha} \theta(t)|_{t=0} &\geq 0
\end{align*}
\]

(3.4)

By Lemma 2.5, we have \(x_1(t) \geq x_0(t), \ y_0(t) \geq y_1(t), \ \forall t \in [0, 1]\).

Now we put \(w(t) = \phi_p(D^\alpha y_1(t)) - \phi_p(D^\alpha x_1(t))\). Applying (3.1) and (H1), we obtain

\[
\begin{align*}
D^3 w(t) &= D^3(\phi_p(D^\alpha y_1(t))) - D^3(\phi_p(D^\alpha x_1(t))) \\
&= g(t, y_0(t), x_0(t), D^\alpha y_0(t), D^\alpha x_0(t)) + M \phi_p(D^\alpha y_0(t)) + N \phi_p(D^\alpha x_0(t)) - M \phi_p(D^\alpha y_1(t)) \\
&\quad - M \phi_p(D^\alpha x_1(t)) - f(t, x_0(t), y_0(t), D^\alpha x_0(t), D^\alpha y_0(t)) - M \phi_p(D^\alpha x_0(t)) - N \phi_p(D^\alpha y_0(t)) \\
&\quad + M \phi_p(D^\alpha x_1(t)) + N \phi_p(D^\alpha y_1(t)) \\
&\geq - M[\phi_p(D^\alpha y_0(t)) - \phi_p(D^\alpha x_0(t))] - N[\phi_p(D^\alpha x_0(t)) - \phi_p(D^\alpha y_0(t))] + M \phi_p(D^\alpha y_0(t)) \\
&\quad + N \phi_p(D^\alpha x_0(t)) - M \phi_p(D^\alpha y_1(t)) - N \phi_p(D^\alpha x_1(t)) - M \phi_p(D^\alpha x_0(t)) - N \phi_p(D^\alpha y_0(t)) \\
&\quad + M \phi_p(D^\alpha x_1(t)) + N \phi_p(D^\alpha y_1(t)) \\
&= -(M - N)w(t).
\end{align*}
\]

Also, \(w(t)|_{t=0} = \phi_p(D^\alpha y_1(t))|_{t=0} - \phi_p(D^\alpha x_1(t))|_{t=0} = 0\). In view of Lemma 2.4, we have that \(w(t) \geq 0, \ \forall t \in J\). Thus we have the relation \(\phi_p(D^\alpha x_1(t)) \leq \phi_p(D^\alpha y_1(t))\). That is
In view of Lemma 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6, we obtain
\[ u \] we will prove that (3
\[ H \]
By (\ref{eq:2.5}), we obtain
\[ \phi \]
From the above, by induction, it is not difficult to prove that
\[ x_0 \leq x_1 \leq \cdots \leq x_n \leq y_n \leq \cdots \leq y_1 \leq y_0. \]
and
\[ D^\alpha x_0 \leq D^\alpha x_1 \leq \cdots \leq D^\alpha x_n \leq \cdots \leq D^\alpha y_n \leq \cdots \leq D^\alpha y_1 \leq D^\alpha y_0. \]
Applying the standard arguments, it is easy to show \( \{x_n\} \) and \( \{y_n\} \) are uniformly bounded and equi-continuous in \([x_0, y_0]\). By Arzela-Ascoli theorem, we have
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} x_n(t) = x^*(t), \quad \lim_{n \to \infty} y_n(t) = y^*(t), \quad \forall \ t \in [0, 1]
\]
and
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} D^\alpha x_n(t) = D^\alpha x^*(t), \quad \lim_{n \to \infty} D^\alpha y_n(t) = D^\alpha y^*(t), \quad \forall \ t \in [0, 1]
\]
and the limit function \( x^* \) and \( y^* \) satisfy (1.1). Moreover, \( x^*, y^* \in [x_0, y_0] \). Taking the limits \( n \to \infty \) in (3.1), we find that \((x^*, y^*)\) is a solution of problem (1.1) in \([x_0, y_0] \times [x_0, y_0]\).

Finally, we show that \((x^*, y^*)\) is an extremal solution of the system (1.1). Assume that \((x, y) \in [x_0, y_0] \times [x_0, y_0] \) is any solution for the problem (1.1), that is
\[
\begin{align*}
D^\beta (\phi_p(D^\alpha x(t))) &= f(t, x(t), y(t), D^\alpha x(t), D^\alpha y(t)), \quad t \in [0, 1], \\
D^\alpha x(t)|_{t=0} &= 0, \quad \frac{D^{1-\alpha} x(t)|_{t=0}}{\Gamma(\alpha)} = r_1, \\
D^\beta (\phi_p(D^\alpha y(t))) &= g(t, y(t), x(t), D^\alpha y(t), D^\alpha x(t)), \quad t \in [0, 1], \\
D^\alpha y(t)|_{t=0} &= 0, \quad \frac{D^{1-\alpha} y(t)|_{t=0}}{\Gamma(\alpha)} = r_2,
\end{align*}
\]
(3.5)
Applying (3.1), (3.5), \((H_2)\), Lemma 2.5 and 2.6, we have
\[
x_n \leq x, \ y_n \leq y, \quad D^\alpha x_n \leq D^\alpha x, \quad D^\alpha y \leq D^\alpha y_n, \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots
\]
(3.6)
Taking the limit \( n \to \infty \) in (3.6), we have \( x^* \leq x, \ y \leq y^* \). The proof is complete.

**Example:** Consider the following problem
\[
\begin{align*}
D^{\frac{3}{2}} (\phi_4(D^{\frac{1}{2}} x(t))) &= \frac{1}{6 \Gamma(1-\frac{1}{2})} x^{\frac{1}{2}}(t)[D^{\frac{1}{2}} x(t)]^{\frac{1}{4}} - y^3(t) \left[D^{\frac{3}{2}} y(t) - \frac{2\Gamma(\frac{7}{4})}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{4})} t^{\frac{1}{4}}\right]^3, \quad t \in (0, 1], \\
D^{\frac{1}{2}} (\phi_4(D^{\frac{1}{2}} y(t))) &= \frac{1}{6 \Gamma(1-\frac{1}{2})} y^{\frac{1}{2}}(t)[D^{\frac{1}{2}} y(t)]^{\frac{1}{4}} - x^3(t) \left[D^{\frac{3}{2}} x(t) - \frac{2\Gamma(\frac{7}{4})}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{4})} t^{\frac{1}{4}}\right]^3, \quad t \in (0, 1], \\
D^\frac{1}{2} x(t)|_{t=0} &= 0, \quad \frac{D^{1-\frac{1}{2}} x(t)|_{t=0}}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{2})} = 0, \\
D^\frac{1}{2} y(t)|_{t=0} &= 0, \quad \frac{D^{1-\frac{1}{2}} y(t)|_{t=0}}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{2})} = 0,
\end{align*}
\]
(3.7)
where \( \alpha = \frac{1}{2}, \ \beta = \frac{1}{2}, \ p = 4 \) and
\[
\begin{align*}
f(t, x(t), y(t), D^{\frac{1}{2}} x(t), D^{\frac{1}{2}} y(t)) &= \frac{1}{6 \Gamma(1-\frac{1}{2})} x^{\frac{1}{2}}[D^{\frac{1}{2}} x(t)]^{\frac{1}{4}} - y^3 \left[D^{\frac{3}{2}} y(t) - \frac{2\Gamma(\frac{7}{4})}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{4})} t^{\frac{1}{4}}\right]^3, \\
g(t, y(t), x(t), D^{\frac{1}{2}} y(t), D^{\frac{1}{2}} x(t)) &= \frac{1}{6 \Gamma(1-\frac{1}{2})} y^{\frac{1}{2}}[D^{\frac{1}{2}} y(t)]^{\frac{1}{4}} - x^3 \left[D^{\frac{3}{2}} x(t) - \frac{2\Gamma(\frac{7}{4})}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{4})} t^{\frac{1}{4}}\right]^3.
\end{align*}
\]
Take \( x_0(t) = \frac{1}{4} t^{\frac{3}{2}}, \ y_0(t) = 2 t^{\frac{3}{2}} \), then \( D^{\frac{3}{2}} x_0(t) = \frac{1}{2} \Gamma(\frac{5}{2}) t, \ D^{\frac{3}{2}} y_0(t) = \frac{2 \Gamma(\frac{7}{4})}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{4})} t^{\frac{1}{4}} \). It is not difficult to show that \((H_1)\) holds.

Since the function \( \sqrt[3]{x} + x^3 \) is monotone increasing for \( x \in R \), we obtain
\[
\begin{align*}
f(t, x(t), y(t), D^{\frac{1}{2}} x(t), D^{\frac{1}{2}} y(t)) - f(t, x(t), y(t), D^{\frac{1}{2}} x(t), D^{\frac{1}{2}} y(t)) &= \frac{1}{6 \Gamma(1-\frac{1}{2})} [x(t)]^{\frac{1}{2}}[D^{\frac{1}{2}} x(t)]^{\frac{1}{4}} - (y(t))^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[D^{\frac{3}{2}} y(t) - \frac{2\Gamma(\frac{7}{4})}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{4})} t^{\frac{1}{4}}\right]^3 - \frac{1}{6 \Gamma(1-\frac{1}{2})} [x(t)]^{\frac{1}{2}}[D^{\frac{1}{2}} x(t)]^{\frac{1}{4}} \\
&= y^3(t) \left[D^{\frac{3}{2}} y(t) - \frac{2\Gamma(\frac{7}{4})}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{4})} t^{\frac{1}{4}}\right]^3,
\end{align*}
\]
\[ \begin{align*}
&\leq \frac{1}{6\Gamma(1 - \frac{2}{3})} \sqrt{2}[(D_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}}x(t))^\frac{1}{3} - (D_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}}x(t))^\frac{1}{3}] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{6\Gamma(1 - \frac{2}{3})} \sqrt{2}[(D_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}}x(t))^3 - (D_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}}x(t))^3] \\
&= \frac{1}{6\Gamma(1 - \frac{2}{3})} \sqrt{2}[\Phi_{\frac{1}{4}}(D_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}}x(t)) - \Phi_{\frac{1}{4}}(D_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}}x(t))]
\end{align*} \]

where \( x_0(t) \leq x(t) \leq y_0(t) \), and \( x_0(t) \leq y(t) \leq y_0(t) \).

Note \( M = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{6\Gamma(1 - \frac{2}{3})}, N = 0 \) and
\[ (M + N)\Gamma(1 - \frac{2}{3}) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{6} < 1, \]
thus the condition \((H_2)\) holds. Therefore, there exist monotone iterative sequence \( \{x_n\} \) and \( \{y_n\} \), which converge uniformly to solutions of fractional problem (3.7) in \([x_0, y_0]\) by Theorem 3.1.
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Abstract

In this paper, the authors investigate the growth and zeros of the solutions and the coefficients of higher order linear differential equations with entire coefficients of $[p, q] - \varphi$ order, where $p, q$ are positive integers and satisfy $p \geq q \geq 1$. The theorems that we obtain extend and improve many previous results.
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1. Introduction and Results

In this paper, we shall assume that readers are familiar with the fundamental results and the standard notations of the Nevanlinna’s theory of meromorphic functions and the theory of complex linear differential equations (e.g. [9,14]). The theory of complex linear differential equations has been developed since 1960s. Many authors have investigated the complex linear differential equations

$$f^{(k)}(z) + A_{k-1}(z)f^{(k-1)}(z) + \cdots + A_0(z)f(z) = 0$$ (1.1)

and

$$f^{(k)}(z) + A_{k-1}(z)f^{(k-1)}(z) + \cdots + A_0(z)f(z) = F(z)$$ (1.2)

and achieved many valuable results when the coefficients $A_0(z), \cdots, A_{k-1}(z), F(z)(k \geq 2)$ in (1.1) and (1.2) are entire functions of finite order or finite iterate order (e.g. [1-2, 4-7, 13, 14]). In 2010, J. Tu and his co-authors investigated the complex oscillation properties of solutions of (1.1) and (1.2) when the coefficients in (1.1) or (1.2) are entire functions of $[p, q]$—order (see [21]). In the following, we introduce some notations about $[p, q]$—order, where $p, q$ are positive integers
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and satisfy \( p \geq q \geq 1 \). For \( r \in (0, +\infty) \), we define \( \exp_r r = e^r \) and \( \exp_{i+1} r = \exp(\exp_i r) \), \( i \in \mathbb{N} \) and for all sufficiently large \( r \), we define \( \log_r r = \log r \) and \( \log_{i+1} r = \log(\log_i r) \), \( i \in \mathbb{N} \). Especially, we have \( \exp_0 r = r = \log_0 r \) and \( \exp_{-1} r = \log_1 r \). Secondly, we denote the linear measure and the logarithmic measure of a set \( E \subset (1, +\infty) \) by \( mE = \int_E dt \) and \( mE = \int_E \frac{dt}{1+t} \).

**Definition 1.1.** ([12,15,16]) If \( f(z) \) is a meromorphic function, the \([p, q] \)-order of \( f(z) \) is defined by

\[
\sigma_{[p, q]}(f) = \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_p T(r, f)}{\log_q r},
\]

especially if \( f(z) \) is an entire function, the \([p, q] \)-order of \( f(z) \) is defined by

\[
\sigma_{[p, q]}(f) = \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_p T(r, f)}{\log_q r} = \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_{p+1} M(r, f)}{\log_q r}.
\]

**Definition 1.2.** ([15,16]) The \([p, q] \)-exponent of convergence of the (distinct) zero-sequence of \( f(z) \) are respectively defined by

\[
\lambda_{[p, q]}(f) = \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_p n(r, \frac{1}{f})}{\log_q r} = \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_p N(r, \frac{1}{f})}{\log_q r},
\]

\[
\overline{\lambda}_{[p, q]}(f) = \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_p \pi(r, \frac{1}{f})}{\log_q r} = \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_p \overline{N}(r, \frac{1}{f})}{\log_q r}.
\]

In recent years, many authors investigated the equations (1.1) and (1.2) with entire coefficients or meromorphic coefficients of \([p, q] \)-order (e.g. [3, 11, 15, 16]) and obtain the following results.

**Theorem A.** ([15]) Let \( A_j (z) (j = 0, 1, \cdots, k-1) \) be entire functions satisfying \( \max\{\sigma_{[p, q]}(A_j) \mid j \neq 0 \} < \sigma_{[p, q]}(A_0) < \infty \). Then every nontrivial solution \( f(z) \) of (1.1) satisfies \( \sigma_{[p+1, q]}(f) = \sigma_{[p, q]}(A_0) \).

**Theorem B.** ([15]) Let \( F(z) \neq 0, A_j (z) (j = 0, 1, \cdots, k-1) \) be entire functions satisfying \( \max\{\sigma_{[p, q]}(A_j), \sigma_{[p+1, q]}(F) \mid j = 1, \cdots, k-1 \} < \sigma_{[p, q]}(A_0) \). Then every solution \( f(z) \) of (1.2) satisfies

\[
\overline{\lambda}_{[p+1, q]}(f) = \lambda_{[p+1, q]}(f) = \sigma_{[p+1, q]}(f) = \sigma_{[p, q]}(A_0),
\]

with at most one exceptional solution \( f_0 \) satisfying \( \sigma_{[p+1, q]}(f_0) < \sigma_{[p, q]}(A_0) \).

**Theorem C.** ([15]) Let \( F(z) \neq 0, A_j (z) (j = 0, \cdots, k-1) \) be entire functions, and let \( f(z) \) be a solution of (1.2) satisfying \( \max\{\sigma_{[p, q]}(A_j), \sigma_{[p, q]}(F) \mid j = 0, 1, \cdots, k-1 \} < \sigma_{[p, q]}(f) \). Then \( \overline{\lambda}_{[p, q]}(f) = \lambda_{[p, q]}(f) = \sigma_{[p, q]}(f) \).

On the basis of Definitions 1.1 and 1.2, some researchers introduce the notations of \([p, q] - \varphi (r) \) order of entire functions or analytic functions in [17, 18, 19], where \( p, q \) are positive integers and satisfy \( p \geq q \geq 1 \).
Proposition 1.6. \( \phi \) order, we suppose that

\[
\sigma_{[p,q]}(f, \varphi) = \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_p T(r, f)}{\log_q \varphi(r)}; \quad \mu_{[p,q]}(f, \varphi) = \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_p T(r, f)}{\log_q \varphi(r)}.
\]  

(1.7)

Similar with Definition 1.3, we can also define \([p,q] - \varphi(r)\) exponent of convergence of (distinct) zero-sequence of an entire function \(f(z)\).

Definition 1.4. ([17]) The \([p,q] - \varphi(r)\) exponent of convergence of (distinct) zero-sequence of an entire function \(f(z)\) are respectively defined by

\[
\lambda_{[p,q]}(f, \varphi) = \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_p n(r, \frac{1}{f})}{\log_q \varphi(r)}; \quad \lambda_{[p,q]}(f, \varphi) = \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_p \pi(r, \frac{1}{f})}{\log_q \varphi(r)}.
\]  

(1.8)

Remark 1.5. If \(\varphi(r) = r\), the Definitions 1.1-1.2 are special cases of Definitions 1.3-1.4.

In order to get similar results with Theorems A–C by replacing \([p,q] - \varphi(r)\) order with \([p,q] - \varphi(r)\) order, we suppose that \(\varphi(r)\) has the following properties without special instructions:

Proposition 1.6. Suppose that \(\varphi(r) : [0, +\infty) \to (0, +\infty)\) is a non-decreasing unbounded continuous function and satisfies (i) \(\lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_{p+1} r}{\log_{\varphi(r)} r} = 0\), (ii) \(\lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_{p+\varphi(r)} r}{\log_{\varphi(r)} r} = 1\) for some \(\alpha > 1\).

Proposition 1.7. ([17]) If \(\varphi(r)\) satisfies the above two conditions (i) – (ii) in Proposition 1.6: (i) then for any entire function \(f(z)\), we have

\[
\sigma_{[p,q]}(f, \varphi) = \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_p T(r, f)}{\log_q \varphi(r)} = \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_p M(r, f)}{\log_q \varphi(r)};
\]

\[
\mu_{[p,q]}(f, \varphi) = \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_p T(r, f)}{\log_q \varphi(r)} = \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_p M(r, f)}{\log_q \varphi(r)}.
\]

(ii) then for any meromorphic function \(f(z)\), we have

\[
\lambda_{[p,q]}(f, \varphi) = \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_p n(r, \frac{1}{f})}{\log_q \varphi(r)} = \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_p N(r, \frac{1}{f})}{\log_q \varphi(r)};
\]

\[
\lambda_{[p,q]}(f, \varphi) = \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_p \pi(r, \frac{1}{f})}{\log_q \varphi(r)} = \frac{\log_p \pi(r, \frac{1}{f})}{\log_q \varphi(r)}.
\]

In this paper, we investigate the growth and zeros of solutions of (1.1) and (1.2) with entire coefficients of \([p,q] - \varphi(r)\) order and obtain the following results.
Theorem 1.8. Let $A_j(z) \ (j = 0, 1, \cdots, k - 1)$ be entire functions satisfying \( \max\{\sigma_{[p,q]}(A_j, \varphi)\}_{j = 1, 2, \cdots, k - 1} < \sigma_{[p,q]}(A_0, \varphi) < \infty \). Then every solution $f(z) \neq 0$ of (1.1) satisfies $\sigma_{[p,q]}(f, \varphi) = \sigma_{[p,q]}(A_0, \varphi)$.

Theorem 1.9. Let $F(z) \neq 0, A_j(z) (j = 0, \cdots, k - 1)$ be entire functions, and let $f(z)$ be a solution of (1.2) satisfying $\max\{\sigma_{[p,q]}(A_j, \varphi), \sigma_{[p,q]}(F, \varphi)\}_{j = 0, \cdots, k - 1} < \sigma_{[p,q]}(f, \varphi)$. Then $\lambda_{[p,q]}(f, \varphi) = \lambda_{[p,q]}(F, \varphi) = \sigma_{[p,q]}(f, \varphi)$.

Theorem 1.10. Let $F(z) \neq 0, A_j(z) \ (j = 0, 1, \cdots, k - 1)$ be entire functions satisfying $\max\{\sigma_{[p,q]}(A_j, \varphi), \sigma_{[p+1,q]}(F, \varphi)\}_{j = 1, \cdots, k - 1} < \sigma_{[p,q]}(A_0, \varphi)$. Then every solution $f(z)$ of (1.2) satisfies $\lambda_{[p+1,q]}(f, \varphi) = \lambda_{[p+1,q]}(F, \varphi) = \sigma_{[p+1,q]}(f, \varphi) = \sigma_{[p,q]}(A_0, \varphi)$, with at most one exceptional solution $f_0$ satisfying $\sigma_{[p+1,q]}(f_0, \varphi) < \sigma_{[p,q]}(A_0, \varphi)$.

Remark 1.11. The above Theorems 1.8-1.10 generalize and extend Theorems A-C and some previous results.

2. Preliminary Lemmas

Lemma 2.1. ([10,14]) Let $f(z)$ be a transcendental entire function, and let $z$ be a point with $|z| = r$ at which $|f(z)| = M(r, f)$. Then for all $|z| = r$ outside a set $E_1$ of $r$ of finite logarithmic measure, we have

$$f^{(j)}(z) = \left(\frac{v_f(r)}{z}\right)^j (1 + o(1)) \quad (j \in \mathbb{N}),$$

where $v_f(r)$ is the central index of $f(z)$, $E_1 \subset (1, +\infty)$ is a set of $r$ of finite logarithmic measure or finite linear measure in this paper, not necessarily the same at each occurrence.

Lemma 2.2. ([7,14]) Let $g : [0, +\infty) \to R$ and $h : [0, +\infty) \to R$ be monotone increasing functions such that $g(r) \leq h(r)$ outside of an exceptional set $E_1 \subset [1, +\infty)$ of finite logarithmic measure or finite linear measure. Then for any $d > 1$, there exists $r_0 > 0$ such that $g(r) \leq h(dr)$ for all $r > r_0$.

Lemma 2.3.([17]) Let $f(z)$ be an entire function satisfying $\sigma_{[p,q]}(f, \varphi) = \sigma_1$ and $\mu_{[p,q]}(f, \varphi) = \mu_1$. Then

$$\lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_p v_f(r)}{\log_q \varphi(r)} = \sigma_1, \quad \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_p v_f(r)}{\log_q \varphi(r)} = \mu_1.$$

Lemma 2.4. Let $f(z)$ be an entire function of $[p,q] - \varphi(r)$ order satisfying $\sigma_{[p,q]}(f, \varphi) = \sigma_2$, where $\varphi(r)$ only satisfies $\lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_q \varphi(\alpha r)}{\log_q \varphi(r)} = 1$ for some $\alpha > 1$. Then there exists a set $E_2 \subset (1, +\infty)$ having infinite logarithmic measure such that for all $r \in E_2$, we have

$$\lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_p T(r, f)}{\log_q \varphi(r)} = \sigma_2 \quad (r \in E_2).$$
Proof. By Definition 1.3, there exists an increasing sequence \( \{r_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \) tending to \( \infty \) satisfying \((1 + \frac{1}{n})r_n < r_{n+1}\) and 
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log_p T(r_n, f)}{\log_q \varphi(r_n)} = \sigma_{[p,q]}(f, \varphi) = \sigma_2,
\]
there exists an \( n_1 (\in \mathbb{N}) \) such that for \( n \geq n_1 \) and for any \( r \in E_2 = \bigcup_{n=n_1}^\infty [r_n, (1 + \frac{1}{n})r_n] \), we have 
\[
\frac{\log_p T(r_n, f)}{\log_q \varphi((1 + \frac{1}{n})r_n)} \leq \frac{\log_p T(r, f)}{\log_q \varphi(r)}.
\]
By (2.1), for all \( r \in E_2 \), we have 
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log_p T(r_n, f)}{\log_q \varphi(r_n)} \cdot \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log_q \varphi(r_n)}{\log_q \varphi((1 + \frac{1}{n})r_n)} \leq \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_p T(r, f)}{\log_q \varphi(r)}.
\]
By (2.12) and \( \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_q \varphi(\alpha r)}{\log_q \varphi(r)} = 1 \ (\alpha > 1) \), for all \( r \in E_2 \), we have 
\[
\lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_p T(r, f)}{\log_q \varphi(r)} \geq \sigma_2.
\]
On the other hand, by Definition 1.3, for all \( r \in E_2 \), we have 
\[
\lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_p T(r, f)}{\log_q \varphi(r)} \leq \sigma_2.
\]
By (2.3) and (2.4), for any \( r \in E_2 \), we have 
\[
\lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log_p T(r, f)}{\log_q \varphi(r)} = \sigma_2.
\]
where \( m_2 E_2 = \sum_{n=n_1}^\infty \int_{r_n}^{(1 + \frac{1}{n})r_n} \frac{dt}{T} = \sum_{n=n_1}^\infty \log(1 + \frac{1}{n}) = \infty. \)

By Lemma 2.4, it is easy to obtain the following Lemma 2.5.

Lemma 2.5. Let \( f_1(z), f_2(z) \) be entire functions of \([p,q] - \varphi(r)\) order satisfying \( \sigma_{[p,q]}(f_1, \varphi) > \sigma_{[p,q]}(f_2) \). Then there exists a set \( E_3 \subset (1, +\infty) \) having infinite logarithmic measure such that for all \( r \in E_3 \), we have 
\[
\lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{T(r, f_2)}{T(r, f_1)} = 0 \ (r \in E_3).
\]

Lemma 2.6. ([8]) Let \( f(z) \) be a transcendental meromorphic function, and let \( \beta > 1 \) be a given constant, for any given \( \varepsilon > 0 \), there exist a set \( E_1 \subset (1, +\infty) \) that has finite logarithmic measure
and a constant $B > 0$ that depends only on $\beta$ and $(i,j)$ ($i, j$ are integers with $0 \leq i < j$) such that for all $|z| = r \notin [0, 1] \cup E_1$, we have
\[
\left| \frac{f^{(j)}(z)}{f^{(i)}(z)} \right| \leq B \left[ \frac{T(\beta r, f)}{r} (\log \beta r) \log T(\beta r, f) \right]^{j-i}.
\]

3. Proofs of Theorems 1.8 - 1.10

Proof of Theorem 1.8. We divide the proof into two parts.

(i) Set $\sigma_{[p,q]}(A_0, \varphi) = \sigma_3$, first, we prove that every solution of (1.1) satisfies $\sigma_{[p+1,q]}(f, \varphi) \leq \sigma_3$. It is easy to know that equation (1.1) has no polynomial solutions under the assumptions. If $f(z)$ is a transcendental solution of (1.1), by (1.1), we get

By (3.1)-(3.3), for all $z$ satisfying
\[
\max \{\sigma_{[p,q]}(A_j, \varphi) \mid j = 0, 1, \cdots, k-1\} \leq \sigma_3, \quad \text{for any given } \varepsilon > 0 \text{ and for sufficiently large } r, \text{ we have}
\]

By Lemma 2.1, there exists a set $E_1 \subset (1, +\infty)$ having finite logarithmic measure such that for all $z$ satisfying $|z| = r \notin [0, 1] \cup E_1$ and $|f(z)| = M(r, f)$, we have

By (3.1)-(3.3), for all $z$ satisfying $|z| = r \notin [0, 1] \cup E_1$ and $|f(z)| = M(r, f)$, we get

By (3.4) and Lemma 2.2, there exists some $\alpha_1$ ($1 < \alpha_1 < \alpha$) and $r \geq r_0$, we have
\[
\varphi(r) \leq k \alpha_1 r \exp_{[p+1]}\{(\sigma_3 + \varepsilon) \log q \varphi(\alpha_1 r)\}.
\]

By Lemma 2.3 and the Proposition 1.6, we have $\sigma_{[p+1,q]}(f, \varphi) \leq \sigma_3$.

(ii) On the other hand, if $f \not\equiv 0$, (1.1) can be written
\[
-A_0 = \frac{f^{(k)}(z)}{f(z)} + \cdots + A_j \frac{f^{(j)}(z)}{f(z)} + \cdots + A_1 \frac{f'(z)}{f(z)}.
\]

By (3.6), we get
\[
m(r, A_0) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} m(r, A_j) + \sum_{j=1}^{k} m \left( r, \frac{f^{(k)}}{f} \right) + \log k.
\]
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Since $\max\{\sigma_{[p,q]}(A_j, \varphi)|j = 1, 2, \cdots, k - 1\} < \sigma_3$ and by Lemma 2.5, there exists a set $E_2 \subset (1, +\infty)$ with infinite logarithmic measure such that for all $z$ satisfying $|z| = r \in E_2$, we have

$$\lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log p(m(r, A_0))}{\log q(\varphi(r))} = \sigma_3, \quad \frac{m(r, A_j)}{m(r, A_0)} \to 0 \quad (r \in E_2, j = 1, \cdots, k - 1).$$

(3.8)

By the lemma of logarithmic derivative, we have

$$m\left( r, \frac{f^{(j)}}{f} \right) = O\{\log rT(r, f)\} \quad (r \notin E_1).$$

(3.9)

By (3.7)-(3.9), for all sufficiently large $r \in E_2 \setminus E_1$, we have

$$\frac{1}{2} m(r, A_0) \leq O\{\log rT(r, f)\}.$$

Hence by Proposition 1.6, we have $\sigma_{[p+1,q]}(f, \varphi) \geq \sigma_3$. Therefore, every solution $f(z) \neq 0$ of (1.1) satisfies $\sigma_{[p+1,q]}(f, \varphi) = \sigma_{[p,q]}(A_0, \varphi)$.

**Proof of Theorem 1.9.** Proof. If $f(z) \neq 0$, by (1.2), we get

$$\frac{1}{f} = \frac{1}{F} \left( \frac{f^{(k)}}{f} + A_{k-1} \frac{f^{(k-1)}}{f} + \cdots + A_0 \right),$$

(3.10)

it is easy to see that if $f(z)$ has a zero at $z_0$ of order $\alpha (\alpha > k)$, and $A_0, \cdots, A_{k-1}$ are analytic at $z_0$, then $F$ must have a zero at $z_0$ of order $\alpha - k$, hence

$$n\left( r, \frac{1}{f} \right) \leq k n\left( r, \frac{1}{F} \right),$$

(3.11)

and

$$N\left( r, \frac{1}{f} \right) \leq k N\left( r, \frac{1}{F} \right).$$

(3.12)

By the lemma of logarithmic derivative and (3.10), we have

$$m\left( r, \frac{1}{f} \right) \leq m\left( r, \frac{1}{F} \right) + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} m(r, A_j) + O\{\log T(r, f) + \log r\} \quad (r \notin E_1).$$

(3.13)

By (3.12), (3.13), we get

$$T(r, f) \leq k N\left( r, \frac{1}{f} \right) + T(r, F) + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} T(r, A_j) + O\{\log T(r, f)\} \quad (r \notin E_1).$$

(3.14)
λ}

Since \( \max \{ \sigma_{p,q}(F, \varphi), \sigma_{p,q}(A_j, \varphi) \mid j = 0, 1, \cdots, k - 1 \} < \sigma_{p,q}(f, \varphi) \), by Lemma 2.5, there exists a set \( E_3 \subset (1, +\infty) \) having infinite logarithmic measure such that

\[
\max \left\{ \frac{T(r, F)}{T(r, f)}, \frac{T(r, A_j)}{T(r, f)} \right\} \to 0 \quad (r \in E_3, j = 0, \cdots, k - 1).
\]  

(3.15)

Since for all sufficiently large \( r \), we have

\[
\log T(r, f) = o\{T(r, f)\}.
\]  

(3.16)

By (3.14)-(3.16), for all \( |z| = \rho \in E_3 \setminus E_1 \), we have

\[
(1 - o(1)) T(r, f) \leq O\left\{ N\left( r, \frac{1}{7} \right) \right\} + O\{\log r\}.
\]  

(3.17)

By Definition 1.4 and Proposition 1.7 and (3.17), we get

\[
\sigma_{p,q}(f, \varphi) \leq \lambda_{p,q}(f, \varphi).
\]  

(3.18)

Since \( \sigma_{p,q}(f, \varphi) \geq \lambda_{p,q}(f, \varphi) \), and by (3.18), we have

\[
\lambda_{p,q}(f, \varphi) = \lambda_{p,q}(f, \varphi) = \sigma_{p,q}(f, \varphi).
\]  

Proof of Theorem 1.10. We assume that \( f \) is a solution of (1.2). By the elementary theory of differential equations, all the solutions of (1.2) are entire functions and have the form

\[
f = f^* + C_1 f_1 + C_2 f_2 + \cdots + C_k f_k,
\]  

where \( C_1, \cdots, C_k \) are complex constants, \( \{f_1, \cdots, f_k\} \) is a solution base of (1.1), \( f^* \) is a solution of (1.2) and has the form

\[
f^* = D_1 f_1 + D_2 f_2 + \cdots + D_k f_k,
\]  

(3.19)

where \( D_1, \cdots, D_k \) are certain entire functions satisfying

\[
D'_j = F \cdot G_j(f_1, \cdots, f_k) \cdot W(f_1, \cdots, f_k)^{-1} \quad (j = 1, \cdots, k),
\]  

(3.20)

where \( G_j(f_1, \cdots, f_k) \) are differential polynomials in \( f_1, \cdots, f_k \) and their derivatives with constant coefficients, and \( W(f_1, \cdots, f_k) \) is the Wronskian of \( f_1, \cdots, f_k \). By Theorem 1.8, we have

\[
\sigma_{p+1,q}(f_j, \varphi) = \sigma_{p,q}(A_0, \varphi) (j = 1, 2, \cdots, k),
\]  

then by (3.19) and (3.20), we get

\[
\sigma_{p+1,q}(f, \varphi) = \max\{\sigma_{p+1,q}(f_j, \varphi), \sigma_{p+1,q}(F, \varphi) \mid j = 1, \cdots, k \} \leq \sigma_{p,q}(A_0, \varphi).
\]  

We affirm that (1.2) can only possess at most one exceptional solution \( f_0 \) satisfying \( \sigma_{p+1,q}(f_0, \varphi) < \sigma_{p,q}(A_0, \varphi) \). In fact, if \( f_* \) is another solution satisfying \( \sigma_{p+1,q}(f_*, \varphi) < \sigma_{p,q}(A_0, \varphi) \), then \( \sigma_{p+1,q}(f_0 - f_*, \varphi) < \sigma_{p,q}(A_0, \varphi) \). But \( f_0 - f_* \) is a solution of (1.1), this contradicts Theorem 1.8. Then \( \sigma_{p+1,q}(f, \varphi) = \sigma_{p,q}(A_0, \varphi) \) holds for all solutions of (1.2) with at most one exceptional solution \( f_0 \) satisfying \( \sigma_{p+1,q}(f_0, \varphi) < \sigma_{p,q}(A_0, \varphi) \). By Theorem 1.9, we get that

\[
\lambda_{p+1,q}(f, \varphi) = \lambda_{p+1,q}(f, \varphi) = \sigma_{p+1,q}(f, \varphi)
\]  

holds for all solutions satisfying \( \sigma_{p+1,q}(f, \varphi) = \sigma_{p,q}(A_0, \varphi) \) with at most one exceptional solution \( f_0 \) satisfying \( \sigma_{p+1,q}(f_0, \varphi) < \sigma_{p,q}(A_0, \varphi) \).
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The authors introduce the concept of the generalized $\lambda_{\phi m}$-MT-preinvex functions and discover a new $k$-fractional integral identity concerning twice differentiable preinvex mappings defined on $(\phi, m)$-invex set. By using this identity, we establish the right-sided new Hermite-Hadamard type inequalities for the generalized $\lambda_{\phi m}$-MT-preinvex mappings via $k$-fractional integrals. The new $k$-fractional integral inequalities are also applied to some special means.
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1 Introduction

Let $f : I \subseteq \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a convex mapping on the interval $I$ of real numbers and $u, v \in I$ with $u < v$. Then the following well-know Hermite-Hadamard inequality holds

$$f\left(\frac{u + v}{2}\right) \leq \frac{1}{v - u} \int_{u}^{v} f(x)dx \leq \frac{f(u) + f(v)}{2}. \quad (1.1)$$

This inequality is one of the famous results for convex functions.

Many researchers generalized and extended the inequalities (1.1) involving a variety of convex functions one can see [8, 9, 12, 15, 20, 22, 40, 41] and the references mentioned in these papers.
In 2013, Sarikaya et al. [32] considered the following Hermite-Hadamard type inequalities via Riemann-Liouville fractional integrals.

**Theorem 1.1** Let \( f : [u, v] \to \mathbb{R} \) be a positive function along with \( 0 \leq u < v \) and let \( f \in L^1[u, v] \). Suppose \( f \) is a convex function on \([u, v], \) then the subsequent inequalities for fractional integrals hold:

\[
\frac{f(u + v)}{2} \leq \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + 1)}{2(v-u)^\alpha} \left[ J^\alpha_{u^+} f(v) + J^\alpha_{v^-} f(u) \right] \leq \frac{f(u) + f(v)}{2},
\]

where the symbols \( J^\alpha_{u^+} f \) and \( J^\alpha_{v^-} f \) denote respectively the left-sided and right-sided Riemann-Liouville fractional integrals of the order \( \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+ \) defined by

\[
J^\alpha_{u^+} f(x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_u^x (x-t)^{\alpha-1} f(t) dt, \quad u < x
\]

and

\[
J^\alpha_{v^-} f(x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_x^v (t-x)^{\alpha-1} f(t) dt, \quad x < v.
\]

Here, \( \Gamma(\alpha) \) is the gamma function and its definition is \( \Gamma(\alpha) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\mu} \mu^{\alpha-1} d\mu. \)

Due to the wide applications of Riemann-Liouville fractional Hermite-Hadamard type inequalities in mathematical analysis, many researchers extended Hermite-Hadamard inequality for different classes of convex functions. For example, see for convex mappings [7, 10, 16, 17, 29], for \( m \)-convex mappings [37] and \((s, m)\)-convex mappings [3], for \( h \)-preinvex mappings [13], for harmonically convex mappings [18], for preinvex mappings [25, 31] and the references mentioned in these papers.

Also in [4], Anastassiou presented a complete theory with respect to fractional differentiation inequalities.

In 2012, Mubeen and Habibullah [24] introduced a new fractional integral that generalizes the Riemann-Liouville fractional integrals.

**Definition 1.1** ([24]) Let \( f \in L^1[a, b] \), then \( k \)-Riemann-Liouville fractional integrals \( kJ^\mu_{a^+} f(x) \) and \( kJ^\mu_{b^-} f(x) \) of order \( \mu > 0 \) are defined by

\[
kJ^\mu_{a^+} f(x) = \frac{1}{k\Gamma_k(\mu)} \int_a^x (x-t)^{\frac{\mu}{k}-1} f(t) dt, \quad (0 \leq a < x < b)
\]

and

\[
kJ^\mu_{b^-} f(x) = \frac{1}{k\Gamma_k(\mu)} \int_x^b (t-x)^{\frac{\mu}{k}-1} f(t) dt, \quad (0 < a < x < b),
\]

respectively, where \( k > 0 \) and \( \Gamma_k(\mu) \) is the \( k \)-gamma function given as \( \Gamma_k(\mu) = \int_0^\infty t^{\mu-1} e^{-\frac{k}{t}} dt. \)

Note that \( \Gamma_k(\mu + k) = \mu \Gamma_k(\mu) \) and \( kJ^0_{a^+} f(x) = kJ^0_{b^-} f(x) = f(x). \)

The notion of \( k \)-Riemann-Liouville fractional integral is an significant extension of Riemann-Liouville fractional integrals. It is stressed that for \( k \neq 1 \) the properties of \( k \)-Riemann-Liouville fractional integrals are quite dissimilar from those of general Riemann-Liouville fractional integrals. For this, the \( k \)-Riemann-Liouville fractional integrals have aroused the interest of many researchers. Properties and integral inequalities concerning this operator can refer to [1][2][6][33][34][38] and the references mentioned in these papers.

Let us evoke some basic definitions as follows.
Definition 1.2 \([5]\) A set \(K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n\) is said to be \(\text{invex set respecting the mapping } \eta : K \times K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\) if \(x + \eta(y, x) \in K\) for any \(x, y \in K\) and \(t \in [0, 1]\).

Definition 1.3 \([39]\) A function \(f\) defined on the \(\text{invex set } K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n\) is said to be \(\text{preinvex with respect to } \eta\), if

\[
f(x + t\eta(y, x)) \leq (1 - t)f(x) + tf(y), \quad \forall \ x, y \in K, t \in [0, 1].
\]

Definition 1.4 \([27]\) Let \(x \in K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n\) and let \(\phi : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\) be a continuous function. Then the set \(K\) is said to be \(\phi\)-\(\text{convex at } x\) respecting \(\phi\), if

\[
x + \lambda e^{i\phi}(y - x) \in K, \quad \forall \ x, y \in K, \lambda \in [0, 1].
\]

Definition 1.5 \([26]\) A set \(K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n\) is called \(\phi\)-\(\text{invex at } x\) with respect to \(\phi(\cdot)\), if there a continuous function \(\phi(\cdot) : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\) and a bifunction \(\eta(\cdot, \cdot) : K \times K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n\), such that

\[
x + \lambda e^{i\phi}(y, x) \in K, \quad \forall \ x, y \in K, t \in [0, 1].
\]

Definition 1.6 \([11]\) A set \(K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n\) is said to be \(m\)-\(\text{invex with respect to the mapping } \eta : K \times K \times (0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n\) for some fixed \(m \in (0, 1]\), if \(m x + t\eta(y, x, m) \in K\) holds for each \(x, y \in K\) and any \(t \in [0, 1]\).

Definition 1.7 \([27]\) The function \(f\) on the \(\phi\)-\(\text{convex set } K\) is said to be \(\phi\)-\(\text{convex with respect to } \phi\), if

\[
f(x + \lambda e^{i\phi}(y - x)) \leq (1 - \lambda)f(x) + \lambda f(y), \quad \forall \ x, y \in K, \lambda \in [0, 1]. \tag{1.3}
\]

Definition 1.8 \([42]\) The function \(f\) defined on the \(\phi\)-\(\text{invex set } K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n\) is said to be \(\phi\)-\(\text{MT-preinvex, if it is nonnegative and for } \forall \ x, y \in K\) and \(t \in (0, 1)\) satisfies the following inequality

\[
f(x + te^{i\phi}(y, x)) \leq \frac{\sqrt{1 - t}}{2\sqrt{t}} f(x) + \frac{\sqrt{t}}{2\sqrt{1 - t}} f(y). \tag{1.4}
\]

Definition 1.9 \([28]\) A function: \(I \subseteq \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\) is said to be \(m\)-\(\text{MT-convex, if } f\) is positive and for all \(x, y \in I\), and \(t \in (0, 1)\), with \(m \in [0, 1]\), satisfies the following inequality

\[
f(tx + m(1 - t)y) \leq \frac{\sqrt{t}}{2\sqrt{1 - t}} f(x) + m \frac{\sqrt{1 - t}}{2\sqrt{t}} f(y). \tag{1.5}
\]

Definition 1.10 \([14]\) A function: \(I \subseteq \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\) is said to be \(\lambda\)-\(\text{MT-convex function, if } f\) is positive and for all \(x, y \in I\), \(\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]\) and \(t \in (0, 1)\), satisfies the following inequality

\[
f(tx + (1 - t)y) \leq \frac{\sqrt{t}}{2\sqrt{1 - t}} f(x) + \frac{(1 - \lambda)\sqrt{1 - t}}{2\lambda\sqrt{t}} f(y). \tag{1.6}
\]

Clearly, when choosing \(m = 1\) and \(\lambda = \frac{1}{2}\) in Definition 1.9 and Definition 1.10, respectively, the function \(f\) reduces to \(\text{MT-convex function in } [35]\). For some significant integral inequalities in association with \(\text{MT-convex functions}, one can see [19, 23, 30, 36]\) and the references therein.

The main purpose of this paper is to introduce the class of generalized \(\lambda_{\phi m}\)-\(\text{MT-preinvex functions on } (\phi, m)\)-\(\text{invex and to prove a } k\)-fractional integral identity. By using this identity, we establish the right-sided new Hadamard-type inequalities for the generalized \(\lambda_{\phi m}\)-\(\text{MT-preinvex functions via } k\)-Riemann-Liouville fractional integrals. These inequalities can be viewed as generalization of recent results that appeared in Refs. [30] and [42].
2 New definitions and a lemma

As one can see, the definitions of the ϕ-invex and m-invex have similar configurations. This observation leads us to generalized these concepts. Firstly, the so-called ‘(ϕ, m)-invex’ may be introduced as follows.

**Definition 2.1** A set $K_{ϕm} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be (ϕ, m)-invex with respect to a continuous function $ϕ(\cdot) : K_{ϕm} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and the mapping $η : K_{ϕm} \times K_{ϕm} \times (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, for some fixed $m \in (0, 1)$, if $mx + te^iϕ(y, x, m) \in K_{ϕm}$ holds for any $x, y \in K_{ϕm}$ and $t \in (0, 1)$.

Let us note that:
- if $ϕ = 0$, then we get the definition of an $m$-invex set,
- if the mapping $η(y, x, m)$ with $m = 1$ reduces to $η(y, x)$, then we obtain the definition of a $ϕ$-invex set,
- if $ϕ = 0$ and $η(y, x, m) = y - mx$ with $m = 1$, then we obtain the definition of a convex set.

Now we define the concept of generalized $λ_{ϕm}$-MT-preinvex functions.

**Definition 2.2** Let $K_{ϕm} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is a (ϕ, m)-invex set with respect to $η$ and $ϕ$. A function $f : K_{ϕm} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be generalized $λ_{ϕm}$-MT-preinvex, according to $η$ and $ϕ$, and $∀ x, y \in K_{ϕm}, t \in (0, 1)$ and $λ \in (0, 1]$, along with some fixed $m \in (0, 1]$ satisfies the coming inequality

$$f(mx + te^iϕ(y, x, m)) \leq \frac{m(1 - λ)\sqrt{1 - t}}{2λ\sqrt{1 - t}}f(x) + \frac{\sqrt{t}}{2\sqrt{1 - t}}f(y).$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.1)

Let us note that:
- if the mapping $η(y, x, m)$ with $m = 1$ degenerates into $η(y, x)$, then we obtain the definition of $ϕ$-MT-preinvex function,
- if the mapping $η(y, x, m)$ with $m = 1$ degenerates into $η(y, x)$ and $λ = \frac{1}{2}$, then we obtain the definition of $ϕ$-MT-preinvex function,
- if $ϕ = 0$, the mapping $η(y, x, m) = y - mx$, and $λ = \frac{1}{2}$, then we obtain the definition of $m$-MT-convex function,
- if $ϕ = 0$ and the mapping $η(y, x, m) = y - mx$ with $m = 1$, then we obtain the definition of $λ$-MT-convex function,
- if $ϕ = 0$, the mapping $η(y, x, m) = y - mx$ with $m = 1$, and $λ = \frac{1}{2}$, then we obtain the definition of MT-convex function.

Before presenting our main results, we prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.1** Let $K_{ϕm} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be a (ϕ, m)-invex subset respecting $ϕ(\cdot)$ and $η : K_{ϕm} \times K_{ϕm} \times (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $a, b \in K_{ϕm}$ with $η(b, a, m) > 0$ and some fixed $m \in (0, 1]$. Suppose that $f : K_{ϕm} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a twice differentiable mapping such that $f'' \in L[ma, ma + e^iϕ(b, a, m)]$, we have the following identity via $k$-fractional integral with $k, α > 0$ holds:

$$R_f(α, k; ϕ, η, m, a, b) = \frac{(e^iϕ(b, a, m))^2}{2} \int_0^1 \frac{1 - t^{\frac{α}{k} + 1} - (1 - t)^{\frac{α}{k} + 1}}{\frac{α}{k} + 1} f''(ma + te^iϕ(b, a, m)) \, dt,$$

where

$$R_f(α, k; ϕ, η, m, a, b) := \frac{f(ma) + f(ma + e^iϕ(b, a, m))}{2} - \frac{Γ_κ(α + k)}{2k(2e^iϕ(b, a, m))^\frac{1}{k}} \times \left[kJ_{ma}^\alpha f(ma + e^iϕ(b, a, m)) + kJ_{(ma + e^iϕ(b, a, m))}^\alpha f(ma)\right].$$
Proof. Set
\[ I^* = \frac{(e^i\phi \eta(b, a, m))^2}{2} \int_0^1 1 - t^{\frac{\alpha}{k} + 1} - \frac{(1 - t)^{\frac{\alpha}{k} + 1}}{2} f''(ma + te^i\phi \eta(b, a, m)) dt. \]

Since \(a, b \in K_m\) and \(K_m\) is an \((\phi, m)\)-invex subset respecting \(\phi\) and \(\eta\), for \(\forall t \in (0, 1)\), we have \(ma + te^i\phi \eta(b, a, m) \in K_m\). Integrating by parts, we have
\[ I^* = \frac{(e^i\phi \eta(b, a, m))^2}{2} \left[ \frac{1 - t^{\frac{\alpha}{k} + 1} - \frac{(1 - t)^{\frac{\alpha}{k} + 1}}{2}}{(\frac{\alpha}{k} + 1)} f'(ma + te^i\phi \eta(b, a, m)) \right]_0^1 \]
\[ - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \frac{(\frac{\alpha}{k} + 1)(1 - t^{\frac{\alpha}{k} + 1})}{(\frac{\alpha}{k} + 1)} f'(ma + te^i\phi \eta(b, a, m)) dt \]
\[ = \frac{(e^i\phi \eta(b, a, m))^2}{2} \left[ \frac{t^{\frac{\alpha}{k} + 1} - \frac{(1 - t)^{\frac{\alpha}{k} + 1}}{2}}{e^i\phi \eta(b, a, m))^{2}} f'(ma + te^i\phi \eta(b, a, m)) \right]_0^1 \]
\[ - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \frac{\alpha t^{\frac{\alpha}{k} + 1} + (\frac{\alpha}{k} + 1)(1 - t)^{\frac{\alpha}{k} + 1}}{e^i\phi \eta(b, a, m))^{2}} f'(ma + te^i\phi \eta(b, a, m)) \]
\[ = f(ma) + f(ma + te^i\phi \eta(b, a, m)) - \frac{\alpha}{2k} \left[ \int_0^1 \left( t^{\frac{\alpha}{k} + 1} + (1 - t)^{\frac{\alpha}{k} + 1} \right) f'(ma + te^i\phi \eta(b, a, m)) dt \right]. \]

Using the reduction formula \(\Gamma_k(\alpha + k) = \alpha \Gamma_k(\alpha) (\alpha > 0)\), we have
\[ \frac{\alpha}{2k} \int_0^1 t^{\frac{\alpha}{k} - 1} f'(ma + te^i\phi \eta(b, a, m)) dt = \frac{\Gamma_k(\alpha + k)}{2k(e^i\phi \eta(b, a, m))^{2}} f'(ma + te^i\phi \eta(b, a, m)) - f(ma) \]
and
\[ \frac{\alpha}{2k} \int_0^1 (1 - t)^{\frac{\alpha}{k} - 1} f'(ma + te^i\phi \eta(b, a, m)) dt = \frac{\Gamma_k(\alpha + k)}{2k(e^i\phi \eta(b, a, m))^{2}} f'(ma + te^i\phi \eta(b, a, m)). \]

Thus, we obtain conclusion (2.2).

Remark 2.1. If we put \(k = 1\) in Lemma 2.1, then we have:
(a) for the mapping \(\eta(b, a, m)\) with \(m = 1\) reduces to \(\eta(b, a)\), we obtain Lemma 3.1 in [13];
(b) for \(\alpha = 1 = m\) with the mapping \(\eta(b, a, m)\) reduces to \(\eta(b, a)\), we obtain Lemma 2.3 in [42];
(c) for \(\phi = 0\), \(\alpha = 1 = m\) with the mapping \(\eta(b, a, m) = b - ma\), we obtain Lemma 1.3 in [37].

3 Main results

Using Lemma 2.1, we now state the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1 Let \(A_0 = \mathbb{R}_0\) be an open \((\phi, m)\)-invex subset respecting \(\phi(\cdot)\) and \(\eta : A_0 \times A_0 \times (0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}_0\), \(a, b \in A_0\) with \(\eta(b, a, m) > 0\), \(\lambda \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]\) and some fixed \(m \in (0, 1]\). If \(f : A_0 \to \mathbb{R}\) is a twice differentiable mapping such that \(f'' \in L[ma, ma + e^i\phi \eta(b, a, m)]\) and \(|f''|^q\) for \(q \geq 1\) is generalized \(\lambda_0\)-MT-preinvex on \(A_0\) and \(x \in [ma, ma + e^i\phi \eta(b, a, m)]\), then we have the following inequality for \(k\)-fractional integrals with \(k, \alpha > 0\)
\[ \left| R_f(a, k; \phi, \eta, m, a, b) \right| \leq \frac{k(e^i\phi \eta(b, a, m))^2}{2(\alpha + k)} \left[ \frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \Gamma(q(\frac{\alpha}{k} + 1) + \frac{1}{2})}{2 \Gamma(q(\frac{\alpha}{k} + 1) + 1)} \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} \left\{ \frac{m(1 - \lambda)}{\lambda} |f''(a)|^q + |f''(b)|^q \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}. \]
To prove the third inequality above, we use the following inequality

\[
\left| R_f(\alpha, k; \phi, \eta, m, a, b) \right| \leq \frac{(e^{i\phi}g(b, a, m))^2}{2} \int_0^1 \left| 1 - t^{\frac{\pi}{2} + 1} - (1 - t)^{\frac{\pi}{2} + 1} \right| f''(ma + te^{i\phi}g(b, a, m)) dt \\
\leq \frac{(e^{i\phi}g(b, a, m))^2}{2(\frac{\pi}{2} + 1)} \left( \int_0^1 1 dt \right)^{1 - \frac{1}{q}} \\
\times \left\{ \int_0^1 \left( 1 - t^{\frac{\pi}{2} + 1} - (1 - t)^{\frac{\pi}{2} + 1} \right) \left| f''(ma + te^{i\phi}g(b, a, m)) \right|^q dt \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \\
\leq \frac{k(e^{i\phi}g(b, a, m))^2}{2(\alpha + k)} \left\{ \int_0^1 \left( 1 - t^q(\frac{\pi}{2} + 1) - (1 - t)^q(\frac{\pi}{2} + 1) \right) \left| f''(ma + te^{i\phi}g(b, a, m)) \right|^q dt \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}.
\]

To prove the third inequality above, we use the following inequality

\[
\left( 1 - (1 - t)^{\frac{\pi}{2} + 1} - t^{\frac{\pi}{2} + 1} \right) \leq 1 - (1 - t)^q(\frac{\pi}{2} + 1) - t^q(\frac{\pi}{2} + 1),
\]

for any \( t \in (0, 1) \), which follows from

\[
(A - B)^q \leq A^q - B^q,
\]

for any \( A > B \geq 0 \) and \( q \geq 1 \).

Since \( |f''(t)| \) is generalized \( \lambda_{\phi m} \)-preinvex on \( A_{\phi m} \), it follows that

\[
\int_0^1 \left( 1 - t^q(\frac{\pi}{2} + 1) - (1 - t)^q(\frac{\pi}{2} + 1) \right) \left| f''(ma + te^{i\phi}g(b, a, m)) \right|^q dt \\
\leq \int_0^1 \left( 1 - t^q(\frac{\pi}{2} + 1) - (1 - t)^q(\frac{\pi}{2} + 1) \right) \left\{ \frac{m(1 - \lambda)}{2} \sqrt{\frac{1 - t}{t}} |f''(a)|^q + \frac{\sqrt{1 - t}}{2} |f''(b)|^q \right\} dt \\
= \frac{m(1 - \lambda)}{\lambda} \left\{ \pi - 1 - \frac{1}{2} \beta \left( q \left( \frac{\alpha}{k} + 1 \right) + \frac{3}{2}, 2 \right) - \frac{1}{2} \beta \left( \frac{1}{2}, q \left( \frac{\alpha}{k} + 1 \right) + \frac{3}{2} \right) \right\} |f''(a)|^q \\
+ \left\{ \pi - 1 - \frac{1}{2} \beta \left( q \left( \frac{\alpha}{k} + 1 \right) + \frac{3}{2}, 2 \right) - \frac{1}{2} \beta \left( \frac{3}{2}, q \left( \frac{\alpha}{k} + 1 \right) + \frac{3}{2} \right) \right\} |f''(b)|^q \\
= \left\{ \frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \Gamma(q \left( \frac{\alpha}{k} + 1 \right) + \frac{3}{2})}{2 \Gamma(q \left( \frac{\alpha}{k} + 1 \right) + 1)} \right\} \left\{ \frac{m(1 - \lambda)}{\lambda} |f''(a)|^q + |f''(b)|^q \right\}.
\]

Here, we utilize the following fact that

\[
\int_0^1 \frac{\sqrt{1 - t}}{2 \sqrt{t}} dt = \int_0^1 \frac{\sqrt{1 - t}}{2 \sqrt{t}} dt = \frac{1}{2} \beta \left( \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2} \right) = \frac{\pi}{4},
\]

\[
\int_0^1 t^q(\frac{\pi}{2} + 1) \left( 1 - t \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} dt = \beta \left( q \left( \frac{\alpha}{k} + 1 \right) + \frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \right)
\]

and

\[
\int_0^1 (1 - t)^q(\frac{\pi}{2} + 1) - t^q(\frac{\pi}{2} + 1) dt = \beta \left( \frac{3}{2}, q \left( \frac{\alpha}{k} + 1 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \right).
\]
where the beta function
\[
\beta(x, y) = \int_0^1 t^{x-1}(1-t)^{y-1}dt = \frac{\Gamma(x)\Gamma(y)}{\Gamma(x+y)}, \quad \forall \ x, y > 0.
\]

Hence, the proof is completed.

We now discuss some special cases of Theorem 3.1.

**Corollary 3.1** In Theorem 3.1, if \( q = 1 \), then we have
\[
\left| R_f(a, k; \phi, \eta, m, a, b) \right| \leq \frac{k(e^{i\phi}\eta(b, a, m))^2}{2(\alpha + k)} \left[ \frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{\sqrt{\pi\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha}{k} + \frac{3}{2}\right)}}{2\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha}{k} + 2\right)} \right] \left\{ \frac{m(1 - \lambda)}{\lambda} |f''(a)| + |f''(b)| \right\}.
\]

**Corollary 3.2** In Theorem 3.1, if we take \( \lambda = \frac{1}{2} \), \( q = 1 \) and the mapping \( \eta(b, a, m) \) with \( m = 1 \) degenerates into \( \eta(b, a) \), then we have the following inequality for \( \phi \)-MT-preinvex functions
\[
\left| f(a) + f\left( a + e^{i\phi}\eta(b, a) \right) \right| \leq \frac{k(e^{i\phi}\eta(b, a))^2}{2(\alpha + k)} \left[ \frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{\sqrt{\pi\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha}{k} + \frac{3}{2}\right)}}{2\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha}{k} + 2\right)} \right] \left\{ |f''(a)| + |f''(b)| \right\}.
\]

**Remark 3.1** In Corollary 3.2, if we put \( \phi = 0 \) and \( \eta(b, a) = b - a \), then we have the preceding inequality for MT-preinvex functions
\[
\left| f(a) + f(b) \right| \leq \frac{\Gamma_k(\alpha + k) |J_{a+}f(b) + J_{b-}f(a)|}{2k(b-a)^2} \left( \frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{\sqrt{\pi\Gamma(\frac{\alpha}{k} + \frac{3}{2})}}{2\Gamma(\frac{\alpha}{k} + 2)} \right) \left\{ |f''(a)| + |f''(b)| \right\}.
\]

Especially if we take \( k = 1 \) and \( \alpha = 1 \), we have
\[
\left| f(a) + f(b) \right| \leq \frac{\pi(b-a)^2}{64} \left\{ |f''(a)| + |f''(b)| \right\}.
\]

**Corollary 3.3** In Theorem 3.1, if \( |f''(x)| \leq M, \lambda = \frac{1}{2} \) and \( \eta(b, a, m) \) with \( m = 1 \) degenerates into \( \eta(b, a) \), then we have the forthcoming inequality for \( \phi \)-MT-preinvex functions
\[
\left| f(a) + f\left( a + e^{i\phi}\eta(b, a) \right) \right| \leq \frac{kM(e^{i\phi}\eta(b, a))^2}{2(\alpha + k)} \left[ \frac{\pi}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{\pi\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha}{k} + 1\right) + \frac{1}{2}}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha}{k} + 1\right) + 1} \right] \left\{ |f''(a)| + |f''(b)| \right\}.
\]

Especially if we take \( \alpha = 1, q = 1 \) and \( k = 1 \), we get
\[
\left| f(a) + f\left( a + e^{i\phi}\eta(b, a) \right) \right| \leq \frac{M\pi(e^{i\phi}\eta(b, a))^2}{32}, \quad (3.3)
\]
which is the result given in [32], Theorem 2.5. Obviously, if we choose \( \phi = 0 \) and \( \eta(b, a) = b - a \) in (3.3), then we obtain the result given in [30], Theorem 2.1.
Now, we are ready to prove our second theorem.

**Theorem 3.2** Suppose that all the assumptions of Theorem 3.2 are satisfied, then we have the following inequality

\[
|R_f(\alpha, k; \phi, \eta, m, a, b)| \leq \frac{k(e^{\phi}\eta(b, a, m))^2}{2(\alpha + k)} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha + 2k}\right)^{1 - \frac{1}{q}} \left[\frac{\pi}{4} - \sqrt{\pi\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha}{k} + \frac{3}{2}\right)} \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} \left[\frac{m(1 - \lambda)}{\lambda} |f''(a)|^q + |f''(b)|^q \right]^{\frac{1}{q}}.
\]

**Proof.** Using Lemma 2.1 and the Hölder’s integral inequality for \( q \geq 1 \), we get

\[
|R_f(\alpha, k; \phi, \eta, m, a, b)| \leq \frac{(e^{\phi}\eta(b, a, m))^2}{2(\alpha + k)} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha + 2k}\right)^{1 - \frac{1}{q}} \left\{ \int_0^1 \left(1 - t^{\frac{\alpha}{k}} - (1 - t)^{\frac{3}{2}}\right) \left|f''(ma + te^{\phi}\eta(b, a, m))\right|^q dt \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}
\]

\[
\times \left\{ \int_0^1 \left(1 - t^{\frac{\alpha}{k}} - (1 - t)^{\frac{3}{2}}\right) \left|f''(ma + te^{\phi}\eta(b, a, m))\right|^q dt \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}
\]

\[
= \frac{k(e^{\phi}\eta(b, a, m))^2}{2(\alpha + k)} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha + 2k}\right)^{1 - \frac{1}{q}} \left\{ \int_0^1 \left(1 - t^{\frac{\alpha}{k}} - (1 - t)^{\frac{3}{2}}\right) \left|f''(ma + te^{\phi}\eta(b, a, m))\right|^q dt \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}.
\]

By the generalized \( \lambda_{\phi_m}-MT \)-preinvexity of \( |f''|^q \) on \( A_{\phi_m} \) for \( q \geq 1 \), we have

\[
\int_0^1 \left(1 - t^{\frac{\alpha}{k}} - (1 - t)^{\frac{3}{2}}\right) \left|f''(ma + te^{\phi}\eta(b, a, m))\right|^q dt \leq \frac{m(1 - \lambda)}{\lambda} \sqrt{1 - t} \int f''(a)|^q + \frac{\sqrt{1 - t} |f''(b)|^q dt}
\]

\[
= \frac{m(1 - \lambda)}{\lambda} \left[\frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{1}{2} \beta\left(\frac{\alpha}{k} + \frac{3}{2}\right) - \frac{1}{2} \beta\left(\frac{3}{2} + \frac{\alpha}{k}\right)\right] |f''(a)|^q
\]

\[
+ \frac{\pi}{4} \left[\frac{1}{2} \beta\left(\frac{5}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\right) - \frac{1}{2} \beta\left(\frac{3}{2} + \frac{\alpha}{k}\right)\right] |f''(b)|^q
\]

\[
= \left[\frac{\pi}{4} - \sqrt{\pi\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha}{k} + \frac{3}{2}\right)} \right] \left[\frac{m(1 - \lambda)}{\lambda} |f''(a)|^q + |f''(b)|^q \right].
\]

Hence, the proof is completed.

Let us discuss some special cases of Theorem 3.2.

**Corollary 3.4** In Theorem 3.2 if the mapping \( \eta(b, a, m) \) with \( m = 1 \) degenerates into \( \eta(b, a) \), then we obtain the following inequality for \( \lambda_{\phi}-MT \)-preinvex functions

\[
\left|f(a) + f(a + e^{\phi}\eta(b, a)) \right| \leq \frac{k\Gamma(\alpha + k)}{2k(e^{\phi}\eta(b, a))^2} \left[ kJ_{(a + e^{\phi}\eta(b, a))}^\alpha f(a + e^{\phi}\eta(b, a)) + kJ_{(a + e^{\phi}\eta(b, a))}^\alpha f(a) \right]
\]

\[
\leq \frac{k(e^{\phi}\eta(b, a))^2}{2(\alpha + k)} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha + 2k}\right)^{1 - \frac{1}{q}} \left[\frac{\pi}{4} - \sqrt{\pi\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha}{k} + \frac{3}{2}\right)} \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} \left[\frac{m(1 - \lambda)}{\lambda} |f''(a)|^q + |f''(b)|^q \right]^{\frac{1}{q}}.
\]
Corollary 3.5 In Theorem 3.2, if \( \phi = 0 \), \( \lambda = \frac{1}{2} \) and \( \eta(b, a, m) = b - ma \) with \( m = 1 \), then we have the following inequality for MT-convex functions:

\[
\left| f(a) + f(b) - \frac{\Gamma_k(a + k)}{2k(b - a)^\frac{1}{k}} \left[ kJ^\alpha_a f(b) + kJ^\alpha_b f(a) \right] \right| \leq \frac{k(b - a)^2}{2(\alpha + k)} \left( \frac{\alpha}{\alpha + 2k} \right)^{1 - \frac{q}{2}} \left[ \frac{\pi}{4} - \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \right] \left( \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{k} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \right)^\frac{1}{q}. \]

Corollary 3.6 In Theorem 3.3, if \( |f''(x)| \leq M, \lambda = \frac{1}{2} \) and \( \eta(b, a, m) \) with \( m = 1 \) degenerates into \( \eta(b, a) \), then we have the following inequality for \( \phi \)-MT-preinvex functions:

\[
\left| f(a) + f(a + e^{i\phi} \eta(b, a)) - \frac{1}{e^{i\phi} \eta(b, a)} \int_a^{a + e^{i\phi} \eta(b, a)} f(x) dx \right| \leq \frac{M(e^{i\phi} \eta(b, a))^2}{2 \left( \frac{1}{6} \right)^{1 - \frac{q}{2}} \left( \frac{\pi}{16} \right)^\frac{1}{q},}
\]

which is the result given in \[32\], Theorem 2.15. Clearly, if we put \( \phi = 0 \) and \( \eta(b, a) = b - a \) in \(3.5\), we obtain the result given in \[30\], Theorem 2.4.

A different approach leads to the following results.

**Theorem 3.3** Let \( A_{\phi m} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_0 \) be an open \((\phi, m)\)-invex subset respecting \( \phi(\cdot) \) and \( \eta : A_{\phi m} \times (0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_0 \), \( a, b \in A_{\phi m} \) with \( \eta(b, a, m) > 0 \), and let \( f : A_{\phi m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) be a twice differentiable mapping such that \( f'' \in L[ma, ma + e^{i\phi} \eta(b, a, m)] \). If \( |f''(x)| \) is generalized \( \phi \)-MT-preinvex on \( A_{\phi m}, \lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{2}], m \in (0, 1], q = \frac{p}{p-1}, p \geq 2, \lambda \neq p > 1 \) and \( x \in [ma, ma + e^{i\phi} \eta(b, a, m)] \), then we have the following inequality for \( k \)-fractional integrals with \( k, \alpha > 0 \):

\[
\left| R_f(\alpha, k; \phi, \eta, m, a, b) \right| \leq \frac{k(e^{i\phi} \eta(b, a, m))^2}{2(\alpha + k)} \left( \frac{p(\alpha + k) - k}{p(\alpha + k)} \right)^\frac{1}{p} \left( \frac{\pi}{4} \left( \frac{m(1 - \lambda)}{\lambda} \right) \left| f''(a) \right|^q + \left| f''(b) \right|^q \right)^\frac{1}{q}. \]

**Proof.** Using Lemma 2.1 and Hölder’s integral inequality leads to

\[
\left| R_f(\alpha, k; \phi, \eta, m, a, b) \right| \leq \frac{(e^{i\phi} \eta(b, a, m))^2}{2} \left| \int_0^1 \frac{1 - t^{\frac{q}{k} + 1} - (1 - t)^{\frac{q}{k} + 1}}{(\frac{q}{k} + 1)^q} \left| f''(ma + te^{i\phi} \eta(b, a, m)) \right| dt \right| \leq \frac{k(e^{i\phi} \eta(b, a, m))^2}{2(\alpha + k)} \left\{ \int_0^1 \left( 1 - t^{\frac{q}{k} + 1} - (1 - t)^{\frac{q}{k} + 1} \right)^p dt \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \left\{ \int_0^1 \left| f''(ma + te^{i\phi} \eta(b, a, m)) \right|^q dt \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}.
\]
In Theorem 3.3, if we put Corollary 3.8, then we have the following inequality for $\phi$-
MT-preinvex functions

$$
\int_0^1 \left( 1 - (1 - t)p^{(\frac{m}{2} + 1)} - t p^{(\frac{m}{2} + 1)} \right) dt \leq \frac{k(e^{i\phi} \eta(b, a, m))^2}{2(\alpha + k)} \left\{ \int_0^1 \left( \frac{m(1 - \lambda) \sqrt{1 - t}}{2\lambda \sqrt{t}} |f''(a)|^q + \frac{\sqrt{t}}{2\sqrt{1 - t}} |f''(b)|^q \right) dt \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \times \left\{ \int_0^1 \left( \frac{p(\alpha + k) - k}{p(\alpha + k) + k} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left[ \frac{\pi}{4} \left( \frac{m(1 - \lambda)}{\lambda} |f''(a)|^q + |f''(b)|^q \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}.
$$

To prove the third inequality above, we use the same inequality (3.2) as Theorem 3.1, the generalized $\phi_{\alpha m}$-MT-preinvexity of $|f''|^q$ on $A_{\phi m}$ for $q > 1$, and the following fact

$$
\int_0^1 \left( 1 - (1 - t)p^{(\frac{m}{2} + 1)} - t p^{(\frac{m}{2} + 1)} \right) dt = \frac{p(\alpha + k) - k}{p(\alpha + k) + k}.
$$

This ends the proof of Theorem 3.3.

Let us point out some special cases of Theorem 3.3.

**Corollary 3.7** In Theorem 3.3, if the mapping $\eta(b, a, m)$ with $m = 1$ degenerates into $\eta(b, a)$ and $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$, then we have the following inequality for $\phi$-MT-preinvex functions

$$
\left| f(a) + f(a + e^{i\phi} \eta(b, a)) - \frac{\Gamma_k(\alpha + k)}{2k(e^{i\phi} \eta(b, a))^\frac{1}{p}} \left[ kJ_{a_+}^\alpha f(a + e^{i\phi} \eta(b, a)) + kJ_{b-}^\alpha f(a) \right] \right| \leq \frac{k(e^{i\phi} \eta(b, a))^2}{2(\alpha + k)} \left( \frac{p(\alpha + k) - k}{p(\alpha + k) + k} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left[ \frac{\pi}{4} \left( \frac{m(1 - \lambda)}{\lambda} |f''(a)|^q + |f''(b)|^q \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{q}}.
$$

**Corollary 3.8** In Theorem 3.3, if we put $\phi = 0$ and $\eta(b, a, m) = b - ma$ with $m = 1$, then we have the following inequality for $\lambda$-MT-convex functions

$$
\left| f(a) + f(b) - \frac{\Gamma_k(\alpha + k)}{2k(b - a)^\frac{1}{p}} \left[ kJ_{a_+}^\alpha f(b) + kJ_{b-}^\alpha f(a) \right] \right| \leq \frac{k(b - a)^2}{2(\alpha + k)} \left( \frac{p(\alpha + k) - k}{p(\alpha + k) + k} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left[ \frac{\pi}{4} \left( \frac{1 - \lambda}{\lambda} |f''(a)|^q + |f''(b)|^q \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{q}}.
$$

Especially if we take $k = 1$ and $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$, we have

$$
\left| f(a) + f(b) - \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + 1)}{2(b - a)^\frac{1}{p}} \left[ J_{a_+}^\alpha f(b) + J_{b-}^\alpha f(a) \right] \right| \leq \frac{(b - a)^2}{2(\alpha + 1)} \left( \frac{p(\alpha + 1) - 1}{p(\alpha + 1) + 1} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left[ \frac{\pi}{4} \left( |f''(a)|^q + |f''(b)|^q \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{q}}.
$$

**Corollary 3.9** In Theorem 3.3, if $|f''(x)| \leq M$, $\phi = 0$, $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$ and the mapping $\eta(b, a, m) = b - ma$ with $m = 1$, then we have the following inequality for MT-convex functions

$$
\left| f(a) + f(b) - \frac{\Gamma_k(\alpha + k)}{2k(b - a)^\frac{1}{p}} \left[ kJ_{a_+}^\alpha f(b) + kJ_{b-}^\alpha f(a) \right] \right| \leq \frac{kM(b - a)^2}{2(\alpha + k)} \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left( \frac{p(\alpha + k) - k}{p(\alpha + k) + k} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.
$$
Using Lemma 2.1 and Hölder’s inequality, we have

\[ \frac{1}{b-a} \int_a^b f(x)dx \leq \frac{M(b-a)^2}{4} \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left( \frac{2p-1}{2p+1} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}. \]

Finally, we are in a position to present the following result.

**Theorem 3.4** Suppose that the assumptions of Theorem 3.3 are satisfied, then we have the following inequality

\[ |R_f(a, k; \phi, \eta, m, a, b)| \leq \frac{k(e^{i\phi}\eta(b, a, m))^2}{2(\alpha + k)} \left[ \int_0^1 \frac{1}{t^{\alpha+1} - (1-t)^{\alpha+1}} \right]^{\frac{q-1}{q}} \times \left[ \frac{\pi}{4} - \sqrt{\pi} \Gamma \left( p \left( \frac{\alpha}{2} + 1 + \frac{1}{2} \right) \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} \left[ m(1-\lambda) |f''(a)|^q + |f''(b)|^q \right]^{\frac{1}{q}}. \]

**Proof.** Using Lemma 2.1 and Hölder’s inequality, we have

\[ |R_f(a, k; \phi, \eta, m, a, b)| \leq \frac{(e^{i\phi}\eta(b, a, m))^2}{2(\alpha + k)} \left[ \int_0^1 \left( 1 - t^{\frac{\alpha}{2}+1} - (1-t)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}+1} \right) \right]^{\frac{q-1}{q}} \times \left[ \frac{\pi}{4} - \sqrt{\pi} \Gamma \left( p \left( \frac{\alpha}{2} + 1 + \frac{1}{2} \right) \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} \left[ m(1-\lambda) |f''(a)|^q + |f''(b)|^q \right]^{\frac{1}{q}}. \]

By the generalize \( \lambda_{\phi m} - MT \)-preinexivity of \( |f''|^q \) on \( A_{\phi m} \) for \( q > 1 \), we have

\[ \int_0^1 \left( 1 - t^{p(\frac{\alpha}{2}+1)} - (1-t)^{p(\frac{\alpha}{2}+1)} \right) \left| f''(ma + te^{i\phi}\eta(b, a, m)) \right|^q dt \]

\[ \leq \int_0^1 \left( 1 - t^{p(\frac{\alpha}{2}+1)} - (1-t)^{p(\frac{\alpha}{2}+1)} \right) \left( \frac{m(1-\lambda)\sqrt{1-t}}{2\sqrt{1-t}} |f''(a)|^q + \frac{\sqrt{1-t}}{2\sqrt{1-t}} |f''(b)|^q \right) dt \]

\[ = \frac{m(1-\lambda)}{\lambda} \left[ \frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{1}{2} \beta \left( p \left( \frac{\alpha}{k} + 1 \right) + \frac{3}{2} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \beta \left( \frac{1}{2}, p \left( \frac{\alpha}{k} + 1 \right) + \frac{3}{2} \right) \right] |f''(a)|^q \]

\[ + \left[ \frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{1}{2} \beta \left( p \left( \frac{\alpha}{k} + 1 \right) + \frac{3}{2} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \beta \left( \frac{3}{2}, p \left( \frac{\alpha}{k} + 1 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \right) \right] |f''(b)|^q \]

\[ = \left[ \frac{\pi}{4} - \sqrt{\pi} \Gamma \left( p \left( \frac{\alpha}{2} + 1 + \frac{1}{2} \right) \right) \right] \left[ \frac{m(1-\lambda)}{\lambda} |f''(a)|^q + |f''(b)|^q \right]. \]
Also
\[
\int_0^1 \left(1 - t \left(\frac{2 + (q - p)}{q - k}\right) - (1 - t) \left(\frac{2 + (q - p)}{q - k} \right)\right)\, dt = \frac{(q - p)\alpha - pk + k}{(q - p)\alpha + 2qk - pk - k}.
\] (3.10)

Utilizing (3.9) and (3.10) in (3.8), we deduce the inequality (3.7). This completes the proof of Theorem 3.4 as well.

We next discuss some special cases of Theorem 3.4.

**Corollary 3.10** In Theorem 3.4, if the mapping \(\eta(b, a, m)\) with \(m = 1\) degenerates into \(\eta(b, a)\), then we obtain the following inequality for \(J_\phi\)-MT-preinvex functions
\[
\left| f(a) + f\left(a + e^{i\phi}\eta(b, a)\right) \right| \leq \frac{\Gamma_k(\alpha + k)}{2k(e^{i\phi}\eta(b, a) + k)^{\frac{1}{k}}} \left[ kJ_{\alpha}^a f(a + e^{i\phi}\eta(b, a)) + kJ_{\alpha}^b f(a) \right]
\]
\[
\leq \frac{k(e^{i\phi}\eta(b, a))^{\frac{1}{k}}}{2(\alpha + k)} \left[ (q - p)\alpha - pk + k \right]^{\frac{1}{k}} \left[ \frac{(q - p)\alpha + 2qk - pk - k}{(q - p)\alpha + 2qk - pk - k} \right]^{\frac{1}{k}}
\]
\[
\times \left[ \frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{\sqrt{\pi}(p(\frac{1}{2}) + 1) + \frac{1}{2}}{2\Gamma(p(\frac{1}{2}) + 1 + 1)} \right] \left[ \frac{(1 - \lambda)}{\lambda} \left| f''(a) |^q + | f''(b) |^q \right| \right]^\frac{1}{q}.
\]

**Corollary 3.11** In Theorem 3.4, if we put \(\phi = 0\) and \(\eta(b, a, m) = b - ma\) with \(m = 1\), then we obtain the following inequality for \(J_\phi\)-MT-convex functions
\[
\left| f(a) + f(b) \right| \leq \frac{\Gamma_k(\alpha + k)}{2k(b - a)^{\frac{1}{k}}} \left[ kJ_{\alpha}^a f(b) + kJ_{\alpha}^b f(a) \right]
\]
\[
\leq \frac{k(b - a)^{\frac{1}{k}}}{2(\alpha + k)} \left[ (q - p)\alpha - pk + k \right]^{\frac{1}{k}} \left[ \frac{(q - p)\alpha + 2qk - pk - k}{(q - p)\alpha + 2qk - pk - k} \right]^{\frac{1}{k}}
\]
\[
\times \left[ \frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{\sqrt{\pi}(p(\frac{1}{2}) + 1) + \frac{1}{2}}{2\Gamma(p(\frac{1}{2}) + 1 + 1)} \right] \left[ \frac{(1 - \lambda)}{\lambda} \left| f''(a) |^q + | f''(b) |^q \right| \right]^\frac{1}{q}.
\]

Especially if we take \(k = 1\) and \(\lambda = \frac{1}{2}\), then we have the following inequality for \(J_\phi\)-convex functions
\[
\left| f(a) + f(b) \right| \leq \frac{\Gamma_k(\alpha + 1)}{2(b - a)^{\frac{1}{k}}} \left[ J_{\alpha}^a f(b) + J_{\alpha}^b f(a) \right]
\]
\[
\leq \frac{(b - a)^{\frac{1}{k}}}{2(\alpha + 1)} \left[ (q - p)\alpha - p + 1 \right]^{\frac{1}{k}} \left[ \frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{\sqrt{\pi}(p(\alpha + 1) + 1) + \frac{1}{2}}{2\Gamma(p(\alpha + 1) + 1)} \right] \left[ \left| f''(a) |^q + | f''(b) |^q \right| \right]^\frac{1}{q}.
\]

**Corollary 3.12** In Theorem 3.4, if \(f''(x) \leq M\), \(\phi = 0\), \(\lambda = \frac{1}{2}\) and the mapping \(\eta(b, a, m) = b - ma\) with \(m = 1\), then we have the following inequality for \(J_\phi\)-MT-convex functions
\[
\left| f(a) + f(b) \right| \leq \frac{\Gamma_k(\alpha + k)}{2k(b - a)^{\frac{1}{k}}} \left[ kJ_{\alpha}^a f(b) + kJ_{\alpha}^b f(a) \right]
\]
\[
\leq \frac{kM(b - a)^{\frac{1}{k}}}{2(\alpha + k)} \left[ (q - p)\alpha - pk + k \right]^{\frac{1}{k}} \left[ \frac{\pi}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{\pi}(p(\frac{1}{2}) + 1) + \frac{1}{2}}{\Gamma(p(\frac{1}{2}) + 1 + 1)} \right] \left[ \left| f''(a) |^q + | f''(b) |^q \right| \right]^\frac{1}{q}.
\]
4 Applications to special means

We begin this section by considering some particular means for two positive real numbers \(a, b\) and for this purpose we recall the following well-known means:

- **Arithmetic mean**: \(A := A(a, b) = \frac{a + b}{2},\)
- **Geometric mean**: \(G := G(a, b) = \sqrt{ab},\)
- **Harmonic mean**: \(H := H(a, b) = \frac{2ab}{a + b},\)
- **Power mean**: \(P_r := P_r(a, b) = \left(\frac{a^r + b^r}{2}\right)^\frac{1}{r}, r \geq 1,\)
- **Identric mean**: \(I(a, b) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{r} \left(\frac{b^r}{a^r}\right)^\frac{1}{r}, & a \neq b, \\ a, & a = b, \end{cases}\)
- **Logarithmic mean**: \(L(a, b) = \begin{cases} \frac{b - a}{\ln b - \ln a}, & a \neq b, \\ a, & a = b, \end{cases}\)

**Generalized mean**: \(L_p := L_p(a, b) = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{b^{p+1} - a^{p+1}}{(p+1)(b-a)}\right)^\frac{1}{p}, & p \neq 0, -1, \text{ and } a \neq b, \\ L(a, b), & p = -1 \text{ and } a \neq b, \\ I(a, b), & p = 0 \text{ and } a \neq b, \\ a, & a = b. \end{cases}\)

Clearly, \(L_p\) is monotonic nondecreasing over \(p \in \mathbb{R}\), with \(L_{-1} := L\) and \(L_0 := I\). In particular, we have \(H \leq G \leq L \leq I \leq A.\)

Let \(0 < a < b, \lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]\) and let \(M := M(a, b) := [a + \eta(b, a)] \times [a, a + \eta(b, a)] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+,\) which is one of the above mentioned means, one can obtain various inequalities for these means.

Now, if \(\eta(b, a, m)\) with \(m=1\) degenerates into \(\eta(b, a)\) and \(\eta(b, a) := M(b, a),\) for \(\phi = 0\) in (3.1), (3.4), (3.6) and (3.7), we have the following interesting inequalities concerning the above means

\[
|R_f(\alpha, k; 0, \eta, 1, a, b)| \leq \frac{kM^2}{2(\alpha + k)} \left(\frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \Gamma(q(\frac{\alpha}{2} + 1) + \frac{1}{2})}{2 \Gamma(q(\frac{\alpha}{2} + 1) + 1)}\right)^\frac{1}{2} \left\{\frac{(1 - \lambda)}{\lambda} |f''(a)|^q + |f''(b)|^q\right\}^\frac{1}{2},
\]

(4.1)

\[
|R_f(\alpha, k; 0, \eta, 1, a, b)| \leq \frac{kM^2}{2(\alpha + k)} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha + 2k}\right)^{1 - \frac{1}{q}} \left(\frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \Gamma(q(\frac{\alpha}{2} + 3) + \frac{3}{2})}{2 \Gamma(q(\frac{\alpha}{2} + 2) + 3)}\right)^\frac{1}{2} \left\{\frac{(1 - \lambda)}{\lambda} |f''(a)|^q + |f''(b)|^q\right\}^\frac{1}{2},
\]

(4.2)

\[
|R_f(\alpha, k; 0, \eta, 1, a, b)| \leq \frac{kM^2}{2(\alpha + k)} \left(\frac{p(\alpha + k) - k}{p(\alpha + k)}\right)^{1 - \frac{1}{q}} \left(\frac{\pi}{4} \left(\frac{(1 - \lambda)}{\lambda} |f''(a)|^q + |f''(b)|^q\right\right)^\frac{1}{2},
\]

(4.3)
and

\[
\left| R_f(\alpha, k; 0, \eta, 1, a, b) \right| \leq \frac{kM^2}{2(\alpha + k)} \left\{ \frac{(q - p)\alpha - pk + k}{(q - p)\alpha + 2qk - pk - k} \right\}^{\frac{q-1}{q}} \times \left[ \frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \Gamma(p(\frac{\alpha}{k} + 1) + \frac{1}{2})}{2\Gamma(p(\frac{\alpha}{k} + 1) + 1)} \right]^\frac{1}{q} \left\{ \frac{1 - \lambda}{\lambda} \left| f''(a) \right|^q + \left| f''(b) \right|^q \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}},
\]

(4.4)

where

\[
\left| R_f(\alpha, k; 0, \eta, 1, a, b) \right| = \frac{f(a) + f(a + M(a, b))}{2} - \frac{\Gamma_k(\alpha + k)}{2kM^2(\alpha, b)} \times \left[ kJ^\alpha_{a+} f(a + M(b, a)) + kJ^\alpha_{(a+M(b, a))} f(a) \right].
\]

Letting \( M = A, G, H, P_r, I, L, L_p \) in (4.1), (4.2), (4.3) and (4.4), we also get the required inequalities, and the more details are left to the reader to explore.
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Some generalizations of operator inequalities for positive linear map

Chaojun Yang and Fangyan Lu

Abstract:

We generalize some inequalities for positive unital linear map as follows: Let $A, B$ be positive operators on a Hilbert space with $0 < m \leq A \leq m' < M \leq B \leq M'$. Then for every positive unital linear map $\Phi$, $\mu \in [0, 1]$ and $p > 0$,

$$\Phi^p(A\nabla_\mu B + 2rMm(A^{-1}\nabla B^{-1} - A^{-1}B^{-1})) \leq \alpha^p\Phi^p(A^\sharp_\mu B)$$

and

$$\Phi^p(A\nabla_\mu B + 2rMm(A^{-1}\nabla B^{-1} - A^{-1}B^{-1})) \leq \alpha^p(\Phi(A)^\sharp_\mu\Phi(B))^p$$

where $r = \min\{\mu, 1 - \mu\}$, $h' = \frac{M'}{m'}$ and $\alpha = \max\left\{\frac{(M+m)^2}{4MmK(\sqrt{h'}, 2)} \cdot \frac{(M+m)^2}{4\Phi(MmK(\sqrt{h'}, 2))}\right\}$. Furthermore, we give a squaring reversed Karcher mean inequality involving positive linear map.

1. Introduction

Through this paper, let $m, m', M, M'$ be scalars. Other capital letters denote general elements of the $C^*$-algebra $B(H)$ of all bounded linear operators on a complex separable Hilbert space $(H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$. The Kantorovich constant is defined by $K(h, 2) = \frac{(h+1)^2}{4h}$ for $h > 0$. We write $A \geq 0$ ($A > 0$) to mean the self-adjoint operator $A$ is positive (strictly positive). The partial order $A \leq B$ is defined as $B - A \geq 0$.

For each $\mu \in [0, 1]$, the weighted arithmetic mean $\nabla_\mu$ and weight geometric mean $^\sharp_\mu$ for strictly positive operator $A$ and $B$ are defined below:

$$A\nabla_\mu B = (1 - \mu)A + \mu B \quad \text{and} \quad A^\sharp_\mu B = A^{\frac{1}{2}}(A^{-\frac{1}{2}}BA^{-\frac{1}{2}})^\mu A^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

When $\mu = \frac{1}{2}$ we write $A\nabla B$ and $A^\sharp B$ for brevity, respectively.

A linear map $\Phi : B(H) \to B(H)$ is called positive (strictly positive) if $\Phi(A) \geq 0$ ($\Phi(A) > 0$) whenever $A \geq 0$ ($A > 0$), and $\Phi$ is said to be unital if $\Phi(I) = I$.

The arithmetic-geometric mean for positive operator $A$ and $B$ states

$$\frac{A + B}{2} \geq A^\sharp B.$$

In [8], Lin give a reversed arithmetic-geometric mean inequality involving a positive linear map

$$\Phi\left(\frac{A + B}{2}\right) \leq \frac{(M+m)^2}{4Mm}\Phi(A^\sharp B) \quad (1)$$

where $0 < m \leq A, B \leq M$ and $\Phi$ is a positive unital linear map.
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Lin [8] gave a $p$-th powering

$$\omega^{\frac{p}{2}}$$

The Karcher mean satisfies the following properties:

**Proposition 1.1.**

(i) (consistency with scalars) $\Lambda(\omega; A) = A_1^{\omega_1} \cdots A_n^{\omega_n}$ if the $A_i$ is commute.

(ii) (self duality) $\Lambda(\omega; A_1^{-1}, \cdots, A_n^{-1})^{-1} = \Lambda(\omega; A_1, \cdots, A_n)$.

(iii) (AGH weighted mean inequalities) $(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i A_i^{-1})^{-1} \leq \Lambda(\omega; A_1, \cdots, A_n) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i A_i$.

(iv) $\Phi(\Lambda(\omega; A)) \leq \Lambda(\omega; \Phi(A))$ for any positive unital linear map $\Phi$.

(v) (monotonicity) If $B_i \leq A_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, then $\Lambda(\omega; B) \leq \Lambda(\omega; A)$.

As mentioned in the abstract, we shall give refinements of inequalities (6) and (7), along with presenting a reversed Karcher mean inequality related to (iv) in Proposition 1.1 and a squaring version thereafter.

**2. Main Results**
Lemma 2.1. (Choi inequality.) [5] Let \( \Phi \) be a unital positive linear map, then

(i) when \( A > 0 \) and \(-1 \leq p \leq 0\), then \( \Phi(A)^p \leq \Phi(A^p)\), in particular, \( \Phi(A)^{-1} \leq \Phi(A^{-1}) \);

(ii) when \( A \geq 0 \) and \( 0 \leq p \leq 1\), then \( \Phi(A)^p \geq \Phi(A^p)\);

(iii) when \( A \geq 0 \) and \( 1 \leq p \leq 2\), then \( \Phi(A)^p \leq \Phi(A^p)\).

Lemma 2.2. [1] Let \( \Phi \) be a unital positive linear map and \( A, B \) be positive operators. Then for \( \alpha \in [0, 1] \)

\[
\Phi(A^\alpha B) \leq \Phi(A)^\alpha \Phi(B).
\]

Lemma 2.3. [3] Let \( A, B \geq 0 \). Then the following norm inequality holds:

\[
\|AB\| \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \|A + B\|^2.
\]

Lemma 2.4. [2] Let \( A, B \geq 0 \). Then for \( 1 \leq r < +\infty \),

\[
\|A^r + B^r\| \leq \|(A + B)^r\|.
\]

Lemma 2.5. [5] (L-H inequality) If \( 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1 \), \( A, B \geq 0 \) and \( A \geq B \), then \( A^\alpha \geq B^\alpha \).

Lemma 2.6. [9] For two operators \( A, B \geq 0 \) and \( 1 < h \leq A^{-\frac{1}{2}} BA^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq h' \) or \( 0 < h' \leq A^{-\frac{1}{2}} BA^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq h < 1 \), we have

\[
A\nabla_\mu B - 2r(A\nabla B - A^\mu B) \geq K(\sqrt{h}, 2) R A^\mu_{\mu} B
\]

for all \( \mu \in [0, 1] \), where \( r = \min \{\mu, 1 - \mu\} \) and \( R = \min \{2r, 1 - 2r\} \).

Lemma 2.7. Let \( 0 < m \leq A \leq m' < M' \leq B \leq M \), then

\[
A^{-1}\nabla_\mu B^{-1} - 2r(A^{-1}\nabla B^{-1} - A^{-1} A^\mu B^{-1}) \geq K(\sqrt{h'}, 2) R A^{-1} A^\mu B^{-1}
\]

for all \( \mu \in [0, 1] \), where \( r = \min \{\mu, 1 - \mu\} \), \( h' = \frac{M'}{m'} \) and \( R = \min \{2r, 1 - 2r\} \).

Proof. Since \( 0 < m \leq A \leq m' < M' \leq B \leq M \), we have \( 0 < \frac{m}{M} \leq (A^{-1})^{-\frac{1}{2}} (B^{-1}) (A^{-1})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{m'}{M'} < 1 \). Thus by Lemma 2.6 we have

\[
A^{-1}\nabla_\mu B^{-1} - 2r(A^{-1}\nabla B^{-1} - A^{-1} A^\mu B^{-1}) \geq K(\sqrt{h'}, 2) R A^{-1} A^\mu B^{-1}
\]

where \( K(\sqrt{h'}, 2) = K(\sqrt{\frac{1}{h'}}, 2) \).

Theorem 2.8. Let \( 0 < m \leq A \leq m' < M' \leq B \leq M \), \( \Phi \) be a positive unital linear map on \( B(\mathcal{H}) \), \( \mu \in [0, 1] \) and \( p > 0 \), we have

\[
\Phi^p(A\nabla_\mu B + 2r M m(A^{-1}\nabla B^{-1} - A^{-1} A^\mu B^{-1})) \leq \alpha^p \Phi^p(A^\mu_{\mu} B)
\]

and

\[
\Phi^p(A\nabla_\mu B + 2r M m(A^{-1}\nabla B^{-1} - A^{-1} A^\mu B^{-1})) \leq \alpha^p (\Phi(A)^\mu_{\mu} \Phi(B))^p
\]
where \( r = \min \{ \mu, 1 - \mu \} \), \( h' = \frac{M'}{m'} \) and \( \alpha = \max \left\{ \frac{(M + m)^2}{4MmK(\sqrt{p'}, 2)^R}, \frac{(M + m)^2}{4MmK(\sqrt{p'}, 2)^R} \right\} \).

**Proof.** By \( m \leq A \leq m' \leq B \leq M \) we have

\[
A + MmA^{-1} \leq M + m \quad \text{and} \quad B + MmB^{-1} \leq M + m.
\]

Thus we have

\[
(1 - \mu)A + (1 - \mu)MmA^{-1} \leq (1 - \mu)(M + m) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu B + \mu MmB^{-1} \leq \mu(M + m).
\]

By (10) we obtain

\[
A\nabla_{\mu}B + MmA^{-1}\nabla_{\mu}B^{-1} \leq M + m.
\]

By Lemma 2.7 we have

\[
A^{-1}\nabla_{\mu}B^{-1} - 2r(A^{-1}\nabla B^{-1} - A^{-1}zB^{-1}) \geq K(\sqrt{R'}, 2)^R A^{-1}z_{\mu}B^{-1}
\]

Compute

\[
||\Phi(A\nabla_{\mu}B + 2rMm(A^{-1}\nabla B^{-1} - A^{-1}zB^{-1}))K(\sqrt{R'}, 2)^RMm\Phi^{-1}(A^z_{\mu}B)||
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{4}||\Phi(A\nabla_{\mu}B + 2rMm(A^{-1}\nabla B^{-1} - A^{-1}zB^{-1})) + K(\sqrt{R'}, 2)^RMm\Phi^{-1}(A^z_{\mu}B)||^2
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{4}||\Phi(A\nabla_{\mu}B + 2rMm(A^{-1}\nabla B^{-1} - A^{-1}zB^{-1})) + K(\sqrt{R'}, 2)^RMm\Phi^{-1}(A^z_{\mu}B)||^2
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{4}||\Phi(A\nabla_{\mu}B + 2rMm(A^{-1}\nabla B^{-1} - A^{-1}zB^{-1})) + K(\sqrt{R'}, 2)^RMm\Phi^{-1}(A^{-1}z_{\mu}B^{-1})||^2
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{4}||\Phi(A\nabla_{\mu}B) + Mm\Phi(A^{-1}\nabla_{\mu}B)||^2,
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{4}(M + m)^2
\]

where the first inequality is derived by Lemma 2.3, the second one is derived by Lemma 2.1, the third one is derived by (12) and the last one is derived by (11).

Therefore

\[
||\Phi(A\nabla_{\mu}B + 2rMm(A^{-1}\nabla B^{-1} - A^{-1}zB^{-1}))\Phi^{-1}(A^z_{\mu}B)|| \leq \frac{(M + m)^2}{4MmK(\sqrt{R'}, 2)^R}.
\]

Hence

\[
\Phi^2(A\nabla_{\mu}B + 2rMm(A^{-1}\nabla B^{-1} - A^{-1}zB^{-1})) \leq \left( \frac{(M + m)^2}{4MmK(\sqrt{R'}, 2)^R} \right)^2 \Phi^2(A^z_{\mu}B).
\]

If \( 0 < p \leq 2 \), then \( 0 < \frac{p}{2} \leq 1 \). Therefore by the L-H inequality we get

\[
\Phi^p(A\nabla_{\mu}B + 2rMm(A^{-1}\nabla B^{-1} - A^{-1}zB^{-1})) \leq \left( \frac{(M + m)^2}{4MmK(\sqrt{R'}, 2)^R} \right)^p \Phi^p(A^z_{\mu}B).
\]

Now we obtain inequality (8) for \( 0 < p \leq 2 \).

Next we prove (9) for \( 0 < p \leq 2 \). Through
Since Remark 2.9.

Corollary 2.10. Let $0 < m \leq A \leq m' < M' \leq B \leq M$, $µ \in [0, 1]$ and $p > 0$, we have

where the second inequality is obtained by Lemma 2.2. Hence we get inequality (9) for $0 < p \leq 2$.

Next, put $p > 2$. We can obtain

where the second inequality is obtained by Lemma 2.4.

Therefore, we get inequality (8) for $p > 2$. Likewise, we have

where the second inequality is obtained by Lemma 2.4.

Remark 2.9. Since \[ \frac{(M+m)^2}{4MmK(\sqrt{r'}, 2)^R} \leq \frac{(M+m)^2}{4Mm} \] and \[ \frac{(M+m)^2}{4pMmK(\sqrt{r'}, 2)^R} \leq \frac{(M+m)^2}{4pMm} \], so under a stronger condition as Theorem 2.8, we see (8) and (9) are refinements of (6) and (7), respectively.
\[
(A\nabla_\mu B + 2rMm(A^{-1}\nabla B^{-1} - A^{-1}\nabla B^{-1}))^p \leq \alpha^p (A^\#_\mu B)^p
\]

where \( r = \min \{\mu, 1 - \mu\} \), \( h' = \frac{M'}{m'} \) and \( \alpha = \max \left\{ \frac{(M+m)^2}{4MmK(\sqrt{h'}2)^R}, \frac{(M+m)^2}{4\sqrt{h'}mK(\sqrt{h'}2)^R} \right\} \).

**Proof.** Put \( \Phi(A) = A \) for all \( A \in B(\mathcal{H}) \) in Theorem 2.3, then we get the desired result.

**Theorem 2.11.** Let \( \Phi \) be a strictly unital positive linear map, \( 0 < m \leq A_i \leq M \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \), \( \omega = (\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_n) \) be a probability vector, \( t \in [-1, 0) \). Then we have

\[
\Lambda(\omega; \Phi(A)) \leq \frac{(m+M)^2}{4mM} \Phi(\Lambda(\omega; A)).
\] (13)

**Proof.** By Proposition 1.1 and \( 0 < m \leq A_i \leq M \) we have

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i A_i + Mm(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i A_i^{-1}) \leq M + m.
\]

First we show

\[
(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i A_i)^2 \leq \left( \frac{(m+M)^2}{4mM} \right)^2 (\sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i A_i^{-1})^{-2}.
\]

This inequality equals to

\[
\| \sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i A_i \sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i A_i^{-1} \| \leq \frac{(M+m)^2}{4Mm}.
\]

Note that

\[
\| (\sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i A_i) Mm(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i A_i^{-1}) \|
\leq \frac{1}{4} \| \sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i A_i + Mm(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i A_i^{-1}) \|^2
\leq \frac{1}{4} (M + m)^2.
\]

Use Lemma 2.5 we get

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i A_i \leq \frac{(m+M)^2}{4mM} (\sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i A_i^{-1})^{-1}.
\] (14)

Thus by Proposition 1.1 and (14) we get

\[
\Lambda(\omega; \Phi(A)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i \Phi(A_i) = \Phi(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i A_i) \leq \frac{(m+M)^2}{4mM} \Phi((\sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i A_i^{-1})^{-1}) \leq \frac{(m+M)^2}{4mM} \Phi(\Lambda(\omega; A)).
\]

**Remark 2.12.** Since \( \Phi(\Lambda(\omega; A)) \leq \Lambda(\omega; \Phi(A)) \) for any positive unital linear map, we get a reversed version of this inequality by Theorem 2.11.

Next we give a squaring version of inequality (13).

**Theorem 2.13.** Suppose all the assumptions of Theorem 2.11 be satisfied. Then

\[
(\Lambda(\omega; \Phi(A)))^2 \leq \psi \Phi(\Lambda(\omega; A))
\]
where \( \psi = \begin{cases} \frac{K(M, 2)^2(M+m)^2}{4Mm} & \text{for } m \leq t_0, \\ \frac{K(M, 2)(M+m)^2-M}{m} & \text{for } m \geq t_0 \end{cases} \), \( t_0 = \frac{2Mm}{K(M, 2)(M+m)} \) and \( K(M, 2) = \frac{(M+m)^2}{4Mm} \).

**Proof.** According to the assumption one can see that
\[
m \leq \Phi(\Lambda(\omega; \theta)) \leq M
\] (15)
and
\[
m \leq \Lambda(\omega; \Phi(\theta)) \leq M
\] (16)
inequality (15) implies
\[
\Phi^2(\Lambda(\omega; \theta)) \leq (M + m)\Phi(\Lambda(\omega; \theta)) - Mm,
\]
and inequality (16) give us
\[
\Lambda^2(\omega; \Phi(\theta)) \leq (M + m)\Lambda(\omega; \Phi(\theta)) - Mm.
\]
Hence
\[
\Phi^{-1}(\Lambda(\omega; \theta))\Lambda^2(\omega; \Phi(\theta))\Phi^{-1}(\Lambda(\omega; \theta)) \\
\leq \Phi^{-1}(\Lambda(\omega; \theta))((M + m)\Lambda(\omega; \Phi(\theta)) - Mm)\Phi^{-1}(\Lambda(\omega; \theta)) \\
\leq (K(M, 2)(M + m)\Phi(\Lambda(\omega; \theta)) - Mm)\Phi^{-2}(\Lambda(\omega; \theta))
\] (17)
where the second inequality is derived by Theorem 2.11.

Consider the real function \( f(t) \) on \((0, \infty)\) defined as
\[
f(t) = \frac{K(M, 2)(M+m)t-Mm}{t^2}.
\]
As a matter of fact, the inequality (17) implies that
\[
\Phi^{-1}(\Lambda(\omega; \theta))\Lambda^2(\omega; \Phi(\theta))\Phi^{-1}(\Lambda(\omega; \theta)) \leq \max_{m \leq t \leq M} f(t).
\]
Notice that
\[
f(m) \geq f(M)
\]
and
\[
f'(t) = \frac{2Mm-K(M, 2)(M+m)t}{t^3}.
\]
The function has an maximum point on
\[
t_0 = \frac{2Mm}{K(M, 2)(M+m)}
\]
with the maximum value
\[
f(t_0) = \frac{K(M, 2)^2(M+m)^2}{4Mm}.
\]
Whence
\[
\max_{m \leq t \leq M} f(t) = \begin{cases} f(t_0) & \text{for } m \leq t_0 \\ f(m) & \text{for } m \geq t_0. \end{cases}
\]
Notice that
\[ f(m) = K \frac{(M+2)(M+m)-M}{m}. \]

This completes the proof.
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Abstract: In this paper, the notions of locally and globally small Riemann sums modifications with respect to a fuzzy-number-valued functions in $E^n$ are introduced and studied. The basic properties and characterizations are presented. In particular, it is proved that a fuzzy-number-valued functions in $E^n$ is Henstock ($H$) integrable on $[a, b]$ if and only if it has ($LSRS$), and also it is proved that a fuzzy-number-valued functions in $E^n$ is Henstock ($H$) integrable on $[a, b]$ if and only if it has ($GSRS$).
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1 Introduction

Since the concept of fuzzy sets was firstly introduced by Zadeh in 1965 [12], it has been studied extensively from many different aspects of the theory and applications, such as fuzzy topology, fuzzy analysis, fuzzy decision making and fuzzy logic, information science and so on.

The locally and globally small Riemann sums have been introduced by many authors from different points of views including [2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9]. In 1986, Schurle characterized the Lebesgue integral in ($LSRS$) (locally small Riemann sums) property [8]. The ($LSRS$) property has been used to characterized the Perron ($P$) integral on $[a, b]$ [9]. By considering the equivalency between the ($P$) integral and the Henstock-Kurzweil ($HK$) integral, the ($LSRS$) property has been used to characterized the ($HK$) integral on $[a, b]$ [6].

The ($LSRS$) property brought a research to have global characterization on the Riemann sums of an ($HK$) integrable function on $[a, b]$. This research has been done by considering the following fact: Every ($HK$) integrable function on $[a, b]$ is measurable, however, there is no guarantee the boundedness of the function. A measurable function $f$ is ($HK$) integrable on $[a, b]$ depends on it behaves on the set of $x$ in which $|f(x)|$ is large, i.e. $|f(x)| \geq N$ for some $N$. This fact has been characterized in ($GSRS$) (globally small Riemann sums) property [6]. The ($GSRS$) property involves one characteristic of the primitive of an ($HK$) integrable function. That is the primitive of the ($HK$) integral on $[a, b]$ is ACG (generalized strongly absolutely continuous) on $[a, b]$. This is not a simple concept. In 2015, Indrati [5] introduced a countably Lipschitz condition of a function which is simpler than the ACG, and proved that the ($HK$) integrable function or it’s primitive could be characterized in countably Lipschitz condition. Also, by considering the characterization of the ($HK$) integral in the ($GSRS$) property, it showed that the relationship between ($GSRS$) property and countably Lipschitz condition of an ($HK$) integrable function on $[a, b]$.

In 2018, Hamid et al. [2] investigated locally and globally small Riemann sums for fuzzy-number-valued functions and proved two main theorems: (1) A fuzzy-number-valued functions $\tilde{f}(x)$ is Henstock integrable on $[a, b]$ if and only if $\tilde{f}(x)$ has ($LSRS$). (2) A fuzzy-number-valued functions $\tilde{f}(x)$ is Henstock integrable on $[a, b]$ if and only if $\tilde{f}(x)$ has ($GSRS$).

*Corresponding author. Tel.: +8613218977118. E-mail address: muawya.ebrahim@gmail.com, mowia-84@hotmail.com (M.E. Hamid).
In this paper, we generalize locally and globally small Riemann sums from fuzzy-valued functions to $n$-dimensional fuzzy-numbers by means of support function. The notions of locally small Riemann sums for $n$-dimensional fuzzy-number-valued functions are presented and discussed. Finally, we provide a characterizations of globally small Riemann sums in $n$-dimensional fuzzy-number-valued functions.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows, in Section 2 we shall review the relevant concepts and properties of fuzzy-number-valued functions in $E^n$ and the definition of Henstock integrals for fuzzy-number-valued functions in $E^n$. Section 3 is devoted to discussing the support function characterizations of locally small Riemann sums and Henstock integral for fuzzy-number-valued functions in $E^n$. In section 4 we shall investigate the support function characterizations of globally small Riemann sums and Henstock integral for fuzzy-number-valued functions in $E^n$. The last section provides the Conclusions.

2 Preliminaries

In this paper the close interval $[a, b]$ denotes a compact interval on $R$. The set of intervals-point $\{(a_1, b_1), \ldots, (a_k, b_k)\}$ is called a division of $[a, b]$ that is $\xi_1, \xi_2, \ldots, \xi_k \in [a, b]$, intervals $\left[ a_1, b_1 \right], \left[ a_2, b_2 \right], \ldots, \left[ a_k, b_k \right]$ are non-intersect and $\bigcup_{i=1}^{k} [a_i, b_i] = [a, b]$. Marking the division of $[a, b]$ as $P = \{ (a_1, b_1), (a_2, b_2), \ldots, (a_k, b_k) \}$, shortening as $P = \{ [u, v]; \xi \} \, [7]$.

Definition 2.1 [4, 6] Let $\delta : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a positive real-valued function. $P = \{ [x_{i-1}, x_i]; \xi_i \}$ is said to be a $\delta$-fine division, if the following conditions are satisfied:

1. $a = x_0 < x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_n = b$;
2. $\xi_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i] \subseteq \left( \xi_i - \delta(\xi_i), \xi_i + \delta(\xi_i) \right) (i = 1, 2, \ldots, n)$.

For brevity, we write $P = \{ [u, v]; \xi \}$, where $[u, v]$ denotes a typical interval in $P$ and $\xi$ is the associated point of $[u, v]$.

Definition 2.2 [11] $E^n$ is said to be a fuzzy number space if $E^n = \{ u : R^n \rightarrow [0, 1] : u \text{ satisfies (1)-(4) below} \}$:

1. $u$ is normal, i.e., there exists a $x_0 \in R^n$ such that $u(x_0) = 1$;
2. $u$ is a convex fuzzy set, i.e., $u(rx + (1-r)y) \geq \min(u(x), u(y)), \, x, y \in R^n, \, r \in [0, 1]$;
3. $u$ is upper semi-continuous;
4. $[u]^0 = \{ x \in R^n : u(x) > 0 \}$ is compact, for $0 < r \leq 1$, denote $[u]^r = \{ x : x \in R^n \text{ and } u(x) \geq r \}$, $[u]^0 = \bigcup_{r \in (0,1]} [u]^r$.

Form (1)-(4), it follows that for any $u \in E^n$ and $r \in (0, 1]$ the $r$-level set $[u]^r$ is a compact convex set. For any $u, v \in E^n$

$$D(u, v) = \sup_{r \in [0,1]} d([u]^r, [v]^r),$$

where $d$ is Hausdorff metric. It is well known that $(E^n, d)$ is an metric space [11]. The norm of fuzzy number $u \in E^n$ is defined by

$$\|u\| = D(u, 0) = \sup_{a \in [u]^0} |a|,$$

where the $\| \cdot \|$ is norm on $E^n$, $0$ is fuzzy number on $E^n$ and $0 = \chi_0$.

Definition 2.3 [11] For $A \in P_q(R^n)$, $x \in S^{n-1}$, define the support function of $A$ as $\sigma(x, A) = \sup_{y \in A} \langle y, x \rangle$, where $S^{n-1}$ is the unit sphere of $R^n$, i.e., $S^{n-1} = \{ x \in R^n : \|x\| = 1 \}$, $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the inner product in $R^n$.

Definition 2.4 [10] A fuzzy-number-valued function $\tilde{f} : [a, b] \rightarrow E^n$ is said to be Henstock integrable to $\tilde{A} \in E^n$ if for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a function $\delta(t) > 0$ such that for any $\delta$-fine division $P = \{ [u, v]; \xi \}$ of $[a, b]$, we have

$$D(\sum_{a}^{b} \tilde{f}(\xi)(v-u), \tilde{A}) < \varepsilon,$$

where the sum $\sum$ is understood to be over $P$ and we write $(FH) \int_{a}^{b} \tilde{f}(t)dt = \tilde{A}$, and $\tilde{f}(t) \in FH[a, b]$. 
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Lemma 2.1 [11] If \( u, v \in E^n \), \( k \in R \), for any \( r \in [0,1] \), we have

\[
[u + v]^r = [u]^r + [v]^r, \quad [ku]^r = k[u]^r. \tag{2.4}
\]

Lemma 2.2 [11] Suppose \( u \in E^n \), then

1. \( u^*(r, x + y) \leq u^*(r, x) + u^*(r, y) \),
2. \( u, v \in E^n, \; r \in [0, 1] \), then

\[
d([u]^r, [v]^r) = \sup_{x \in S^{n-1}} |u^*(r, x) - v^*(r, x)|, \tag{2.5}
\]

(3) \( (u + v)^*(r, x) = u^*(r, x) + v^*(r, x) \),
(4) \( (ku)^*(r, x) = ku^*(r, x), \; k \geq 0 \).

Lemma 2.3 [1, 11] Given \( u, v \in E^n \) the distance \( D : E^n \times E^n \rightarrow [0, +\infty) \) between \( u \) and \( v \) is defined by the equation

\[
D(u, v) = \sup_{r \in [0,1]} d([u]^r, [v]^r),
\]

1. \( (E^n, D) \) is a complete metric space,
2. \( D(u + w, v + w) = D(u, v) \),
3. \( D(u + v, w + e) \leq D(u, w) + D(v, e) \),
4. \( D(kv, k) = |k|D(u, v), k \in R \),
5. \( D(u + v, 0) \leq D(u, 0) + D(v, 0) \),
6. \( D(u + v, w) \leq D(u, w) + D(v, w) \).

Where \( u, v, w, e, 0 \in E^n, \; 0 = X((0)) \).

Lemma 2.4 [1] If \( \tilde{f} : [a, b] \rightarrow E^n \), then the following statements are equivalent:

1. \( \tilde{f} \) is \((FH)\) integrable.
2. \( f^*(\xi)(r, x) \) is \((RH)\) integrable for any \( r \in [0, 1] \) uniformly, i.e., for every \( \varepsilon > 0 \) there is a \( \delta(\xi) > 0 \) which is independent of \( r \in [0, 1] \), such that for any \( \delta\)-fine division \( P = \{[u, v]; \xi\} \) and \( r \in [0, 1] \) we have

\[
|\sum f^*(\xi)(r, x)(v - u) - A^*(r, x)| < \varepsilon. \tag{2.6}
\]

3 Support function characterizations of locally small Riemann sums and Henstock integral for fuzzy-number-valued functions in \( E^n \)

In this section, we define the locally small Riemann sums for fuzzy-number-valued functions in \( n\)-dimensional and investigate their properties. We start with the following definition.

Definition 3.1 A fuzzy-number-valued function \( \tilde{f} : [a, b] \rightarrow E^n \) is said to have locally small Riemann sums or \((LSRS)\) if for every \( \varepsilon > 0 \) there is a \( \delta(\xi) > 0 \) such that for every \( t \in [a, b] \), we have

\[
||\sum \tilde{f}(\xi)(v - u)||_{E^n} < \varepsilon, \tag{3.1}
\]

whenever \( P = \{[u, v]; \xi\} \) is a \( \delta\)-fine division of an interval \( C \subset (t - \delta(t), t + \delta(t)), t \in C \) and \( \Sigma \) sums over \( P \). (Where \( C = [y, z] \)).

The following Theorem 3.1 shows that \( \tilde{f} \) has \((LSRS)\) is equal to the type of it’s support functions.

Theorem 3.1 Let \( \tilde{f} : [a, b] \rightarrow E^n \) be a fuzzy-number-valued function, the support-function-wise \( f^*(\xi)(r, x) \) of \( \tilde{f} \) has locally small Riemann sums or \((LSRS)\) if and only if for every \( \varepsilon > 0 \), there is a \( \delta(\xi) > 0 \) such that for every \( t \in [a, b] \), we have

\[
|\sum f^*(\xi)(r, x)(v - u)| < \varepsilon, \tag{3.2}
\]

uniformly for any \( r \in [0, 1] \) and \( x \in S^{n-1} \), whenever \( P = \{[u, v]; \xi\} \) is a \( \delta\)-fine division of an interval \( C \subset (t - \delta(t), t + \delta(t)), t \in C \) and \( \Sigma \) sums over \( P \).
Proof Let \( \tilde{0} \in E^n \) denote the \((FH)\) integral of \( \tilde{f} \) on \([a, b]\). Given \( \varepsilon > 0 \) there is a \( \delta(\xi) > 0 \) such that for any \( \delta\)-fine division \( P = \{[u, v]; \xi\} \) of \([a, b]\), we have

\[
D \left( \sum_{\xi} \tilde{f}(\xi)(v-u), \tilde{0} \right) < \varepsilon.
\]

That is

\[
\sup_{r \in [0,1]} d \left( \left( \sum_{\xi} \tilde{f}(\xi)(v-u) \right)^{\ast}, \tilde{0} \right) < \varepsilon.
\]

By Lemma 2.2 we have

\[
\sup_{r \in [0,1]} \sup_{x \in S^{n-1}} \left| \left( \sum_{\xi} \tilde{f}(\xi)(v-u) \right)^{\ast}(r, x) - \sigma(x, 0) \right| < \varepsilon.
\]

Furthermore, by \( \sigma(x, A) = \sup_{y \in A} \), we have

\[
\sup_{r \in [0,1]} \sup_{x \in S^{n-1}} \left| \sum_{\xi} \tilde{f}(\xi)(r, x)(v-u) - \sigma(x, 0) \right| < \varepsilon.
\]

Hence, for any \( r \in [0,1], x \in S^{n-1} \) and for any \( \delta\)-fine division \( P \) we have

\[
\left| \sum_{\xi} \tilde{f}(\xi)(r, x)(v-u) \right| < \varepsilon.
\]

Where \( \sigma(x, 0) = 0 \).

This completes the proof. \( \square \)

Lemma 3.1 (Henstock Lemma). Let \( \tilde{f} : [a, b] \rightarrow E^n \) be a fuzzy-number-valued function and Henstock integrable to \( \tilde{A} \). Then, the support-function-wise \( f^{\ast}(\xi)(r, x) \) of \( \tilde{f} \) on \([a, b]\) is Henstock integrable to \( A^{\ast}(r, x) \) uniformly for any \( r \in [0,1], x \in S^{n-1} \) and \( \tilde{A} \in E^n \), i.e., for every \( \varepsilon > 0 \) there is a positive function \( \delta(\xi) > 0 \), for \( \delta\)-fine division \( P = \{[u, v]; \xi\} \) of \([a, b]\) and for any \( x \in S^{n-1} \), we have

\[
\left| \sum_{\xi} f^{\ast}(\xi)(r, x)(v-u) - A^{\ast}(r, x) \right| < \varepsilon.
\]

Furthermore, for any sum of parts \( \sum_{\xi} \) from \( \sum \) we have

\[
\left| \sum_{\xi} f^{\ast}(\xi)(r, x)(v-u) - A^{\ast}(r, x) \right| < \varepsilon.
\]

Proof Let \( \tilde{A} \in E^n \) denote the \((FH)\) integral of \( \tilde{f} \) on \([a, b]\). Given \( \varepsilon > 0 \) there is a \( \delta(\xi) > 0 \) such that for any \( \delta\)-fine division \( P = \{[u, v]; \xi\} \) of \([a, b]\), we have

\[
D \left( \sum_{\xi} \tilde{f}(\xi)(v-u), \tilde{A} \right) < \varepsilon.
\]

That is

\[
\sup_{r \in [0,1]} d \left( \left( \sum_{\xi} \tilde{f}(\xi)(v-u) \right)^{\ast}, \tilde{A} \right) < \varepsilon.
\]

By Lemma 2.2 we have

\[
\sup_{r \in [0,1]} \sup_{x \in S^{n-1}} \left| \left( \sum_{\xi} \tilde{f}(\xi)(v-u) \right)^{\ast}(r, x) - A^{\ast}(r, x) \right| < \varepsilon.
\]

Furthermore, by \( A^{\ast}(r, x) = \sup_{y \in A^{\ast}} \), we have

\[
\sup_{r \in [0,1]} \sup_{x \in S^{n-1}} \left| \sum_{\xi} f^{\ast}(\xi)(r, x)(v-u) - A^{\ast}(r, x) \right| < \varepsilon.
\]

Hence, for any \( r \in [0,1], x \in S^{n-1} \) and for any \( \delta\)-fine division \( P \) we have

\[
\left| \sum_{\xi} f^{\ast}(\xi)(r, x)(v-u) - A^{\ast}(r, x) \right| < \varepsilon.
\]

For proof

\[
\left| \sum_{\xi} f^{\ast}(\xi)(r, x)(v-u) - A^{\ast}(r, x) \right| < \varepsilon,
\]

the proof is similar to the Theorem 3.7 in [6].

This completes the proof. \( \square \)

Hamid et al. [2] showed that if a fuzzy-number-valued functions \( \tilde{f}(x) \) is Henstock integrable on \([a, b]\) then \( \tilde{f}(x) \) has \( LSRS \). In next Theorem, we prove the above result to \( n \)-dimensional fuzzy-number-valued functions, which is an extension of the above result of Muawya et al. [2].
Theorem 3.2 Let $\tilde{f} : [a, b] \to E^n$ be a fuzzy-number-valued function. If $\tilde{f}$ is Henstock integrable to $\tilde{F}([a, b])$, then $\tilde{f}$ has LSRS.

**Proof** Since $\tilde{f}$ is Henstock integrable to $\tilde{F}([a, b])$, by Theorem 3.1 the support-function-wise $f^*(\xi)(r, x)$ of $\tilde{f}$ on $[a, b]$ is Henstock integrable to $F^*([a, b])(r, x)$ uniformly for any $r \in [0, 1]$, $x \in S^{n-1}$, i.e., for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a positive function $\delta(\xi) > 0$, for $\delta$-fine division $P = \{[u, v]; \xi\}$ of $[a, b]$ and for any $x \in S^{n-1}$, we have

$$|\sum f^*(\xi)(r, x)(v - u) - F^*([a, b])(r, x)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$  

(3.15)

For each $t \in [a, b]$, there is a closed interval $C = [y, z] \subset (t - \delta(t), t + \delta(t))$ such that

$$|F^*([y, z])(r, x)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$  

(3.16)

According to Henstock lemma, for each $t \in [a, b]$ and $\delta$-fine division $P = \{[u, v]; \xi\}$ of $C \subset (t - \delta(t), t + \delta(t))$, we have

$$|\sum f^*(\xi)(r, x)(v - u)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. $$

This completes the proof.

Lemma 3.2 Let $\tilde{f} : [a, b] \to E^n$ be a fuzzy-number-valued function. If $\tilde{f}$ is (FH) integrable with the $\tilde{F}$ as primitive then for each number $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a positive function $\delta(\xi) > 0$, such that for any $[u, v] \subset [a, b]$ with $v - u < \delta(\xi)$, we have

$$\|\tilde{F}([u, v])\|_{E^n} = \|(FH)\tilde{f}\|_{E^n} < \varepsilon.$$  

(3.17)

**Proof** The continuity follows from Lemma 3.1 and the following inequality:

$$\|\tilde{F}(t) - \tilde{F}(\xi)\|_{E^n} < \|\tilde{F}(t) - \tilde{F}(\xi) - \tilde{F}(\xi)(t - \xi)\|_{E^n} + \|\tilde{F}(\xi)(t - \xi)\|_{E^n} < \varepsilon.$$  

We only need set $\delta(\xi) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2\|\tilde{f}\|_{E^n} + 1}$. This completes the proof.

Theorem 3.3 Let a fuzzy-number-valued function $\tilde{f} : [a, b] \to E^n$ has LSRS, then $\tilde{f}$ is (FH) integrable on $[a, b]$.

**Proof** Given any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $P = \{([a, b], \xi)\} = \{(a_1, b_1), \xi_1), (a_2, b_2), \xi_2), \cdots, (a_n, b_n), \xi_n))$ is a $\delta$-fine partition of $[a, b]$. For each $i (i = 1, 2, \cdots, n)$ there is a positive function $\delta_i$ with $P_i = \{([u_i, v_i], \xi_i)\}$ is a $\delta_i$-fine partition of $[a_i, b_i]$. Since $\tilde{f}$ has LSRS on $[a_i, b_i]$, then we have

$$\|\sum_{P_i} \tilde{f}(\xi)(v - u)\|_{E^n} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2n}.$$  

(3.18)

Taken $\eta = \max\{\delta(\xi), \xi \in [a, b]\}$, according to the Lemma 3.2 we have

$$\|\tilde{F}([a_i, b_i])\|_{E^n} = \|(FH)\tilde{f}\|_{E^n} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2n}.$$  

(3.19)

Therefore, for any $\delta_i$-fine partition $P_i = \{([u_i, v_i], \xi_i)\}$ of $[a_i, b_i]$, we have

$$\|\sum_{P_i} \tilde{f}(\xi)(v - u), \tilde{F}([a_i, b_i])\|_{E^n} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2n} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2n} = \frac{\varepsilon}{n}.$$  

for each $i$.

Subsequently taken $\delta^*(\xi) = \min\{\delta(\xi), \delta_i(\xi)\}$, then $P = \bigcup_{i=1}^n P_i$ denote $\delta^*$-fine partition of $[a, b]$. Therefore we have

$$\|\sum_{P} \tilde{f}(\xi)(v - u), \tilde{F}([a, b])\|_{E^n} < \frac{n \cdot \varepsilon}{n} = \varepsilon.$$  

Then $\tilde{f}$ is FH integral on $[a, b]$. This completes the proof.
4 Support function characterizations of globally small Riemann sums and Henstock integral for fuzzy-number-valued functions in $E^n$

The main purpose in this part is to introduce the concept of globally small Riemann sums for fuzzy-number-valued functions in $n$-dimensional and discuss their properties. We begin with the following definition.

**Definition 4.1** A fuzzy-number-valued function $\tilde{f} : [a, b] \to E^n$ is said to be have globally small Riemann sums or (GSRS) if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a positive integer $N$ such that for every $n \geq N$ there is a $\delta_n(\xi) > 0$ and for every $\delta_n$-fine division $P = \{[u, v] ; \xi\}$ of $[a, b]$, we have

$$\| \sum_{\|\tilde{f}(\xi)\|_{E^n} > n} \tilde{f}(\xi)(v-u)\|_{E^n} < \varepsilon,$$

where the $\sum$ is taken over $P$ and for which $\|\tilde{f}(\xi)\|_{E^n} > n$.

The following Theorem 4.1 shows that $\tilde{f}$ has (GSRS) is equal to the type of it’s support functions.

**Theorem 4.1** Let $\tilde{f} : [a, b] \to E^n$ be a fuzzy-number-valued function, the support-function-wise $f^*(\xi)(r, x)$ of $\tilde{f}$ has globally small Riemann sums or (GSRS) if and only if for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a positive integer $N$ such that for every $n \geq N$ there is a $\delta_n(\xi) > 0$ and for every $\delta_n$-fine division $P = \{[u, v] ; \xi\}$ of $[a, b]$, we have

$$\left| \sum_{|f^*(\xi)(r, x)| > n} f^*(\xi)(r, x)(v-u) \right| < \varepsilon,$$

uniformly for any $r \in [0, 1]$ and $x \in S^{n-1}$, where the $\sum$ is taken over $P$ and for which $|f^*(\xi)(r, x)| > n$.

**Proof** First, we can prove the following statements are equivalent:

1. $\|\tilde{f}(\xi)\|_{E^n} > n$.
2. $|f^*(\xi)(r, x)| > n$.

In fact

$$\|\tilde{f}(\xi)\|_{E^n} > n = \sup_{r \in [0, 1]} d([\tilde{f}(\xi)]^r, [0]^r) = \sup_{r \in [0, 1]} \sup_{x \in S^{n-1}} |f^*(\xi)(r, x)|.$$ 

Second, let $\bar{0} \in E^n$ denote the $(FH)$ integral of $\tilde{f}$ on $[a, b]$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a positive integer $N$ such that for every $n \geq N$ there is a $\delta_n(\xi) > 0$ and for every $\delta_n$-fine division $P = \{[u, v] ; \xi\}$ of $[a, b]$, we have

$$D(\sum_{\|\tilde{f}(\xi)\|_{E^n} > n} \tilde{f}(\xi)(v-u), \bar{0}) < \varepsilon.$$ 

That is

$$\sup_{r \in [0, 1]} d([\tilde{f}(\xi)]^r, [0]^r) \left| \sum_{|f^*(\xi)(r, x)| > n} f^*(\xi)(r, x)(v-u) \right| < \varepsilon.$$ 

By Lemma 2.2 we have

$$\sup_{r \in [0, 1]} \sup_{x \in S^{n-1}} \left| \sum_{|f^*(\xi)(r, x)| > n} f^*(\xi)(r, x)(v-u) \right| - \sigma(x, 0) \| < \varepsilon.$$ 

Furthermore, by $\sigma(x, A) = \sup_{y \in A} \{y, x\}$, we have

$$\sup_{r \in [0, 1]} \sup_{x \in S^{n-1}} \left| \sum_{|f^*(\xi)(r, x)| > n} f^*(\xi)(r, x)(v-u) \right| - \sigma(x, 0) \| < \varepsilon.$$ 

Hence, for any $r \in [0, 1]$, $x \in S^{n-1}$ and for any $\delta$-fine division $P$ we have

$$\left| \sum_{|f^*(\xi)(r, x)| > n} f^*(\xi)(r, x)(v-u) \right| < \varepsilon.$$
Theorem 4.2 Let $\tilde{f} : [a, b] \to E^n$ be a fuzzy-number-valued function. If $\tilde{f}$ has GSRS then $\tilde{f}$ is Henstock integrable on $[a, b]$.

Proof Because $\tilde{f}$ has GSRS, then by Theorem 4.1 for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a positive integer $N$ such that for every $n \geq N$ there is a $\delta_n(\varepsilon) > 0$ and for every $\delta_n$-fine division $P = \{[u, v]; \xi\}$ of $[a, b]$, we have

$$|\sum_{|f^*(\xi)(r, x)(v-u)| > n} f^*(\xi)(r, x)(v-u)| < \varepsilon. \quad (4.8)$$

uniformly for any $r \in [0, 1]$ and $x \in S^{n-1}$, where the $\sum$ is taken over $P$ and for which $|f^*(\xi)(r, x)| > n$.

For each two $\delta$-fine divisions $P_1 = \{[u_1, v_1]; \xi_1\}, P_2 = \{[u_2, v_2]; \xi_2\}$ of $[a, b]$, we have

$$|\sum_{|f^*(\xi_1)(r, x)(v_1-u_1)|} f^*(\xi_1)(r, x)(v_1-u_1) - \sum_{|f^*(\xi_2)(r, x)(v_2-u_2)|} f^*(\xi_2)(r, x)(v_2-u_2)| \leq \sum_{|f^*(\xi_1)(r, x)| > n} f^*(\xi_1)(r, x)(v_1-u_1) + \sum_{|f^*(\xi_2)(r, x)| > n} f^*(\xi_2)(r, x)(v_2-u_2)$$

$$\leq \sum_{|f^*(\xi_1)(r, x)| > n} f^*(\xi_1)(r, x)(v_1-u_1) + \sum_{|f^*(\xi_2)(r, x)| > n} f^*(\xi_2)(r, x)(v_2-u_2)$$

$$+ \sum_{|f^*(\xi_2)(r, x)| > n} f^*(\xi_2)(r, x)(v_2-u_2) < 4\varepsilon.$$ 

According to the properties of Cauchy, $\tilde{f}$ is Henstock integrable on $[a, b]$.

This completes the proof. \qed

Theorem 4.3 Given a fuzzy-number-valued function $\tilde{f} : [a, b] \to E^n$, for each $r \in [0, 1]$ and $x \in S^{n-1}$ defined the support function $f^*_n(\xi)(r, x)$ of $\tilde{f}$ by the formula:

$$f^*_n(\xi)(r, x) = \begin{cases} f^*(\xi)(r, x), & \xi \in [a, b] \\ 0, & \text{others} \end{cases} \quad \text{if } |f^*(\xi)(r, x)| \leq n,$$

A fuzzy-number-valued function $\tilde{f}$ is Henstock integrable if and only if $\tilde{f}$ has GSRS and $\tilde{F}_n([a, b]) \to \tilde{F}([a, b])$ as $n \to \infty$. (Where $\tilde{F}([a, b])$ and $\tilde{F}_n([a, b])$ the integral of $\tilde{f}$ and $\tilde{f}_n$ respectively).

Proof First we shall prove the necessity. Because a fuzzy-number-valued function $\tilde{f}$ is Henstock integrable on $[a, b]$ uniformly for any $r \in [0, 1]$ and $x \in S^{n-1}$, i.e., for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a positive function $\delta^*$, for $\delta^*$-fine division $P = \{[u, v]; \xi\}$ of $[a, b]$, we have

$$|\sum_{|f^*(\xi)(r, x)| > n} f^*(\xi)(r, x)(v-u) - F^*([a, b])(r, x)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \quad (4.9)$$

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a positive function $\delta_n$, for $\delta_n$-fine division $P = \{[u, v]; \xi\}$ of $[a, b]$, we have

$$|\sum_{|f^*_n(\xi)(r, x)| > n} f^*_n(\xi)(r, x)(v-u) - F^*_n([a, b])(r, x)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \quad (4.10)$$

for each $r \in [0, 1]$ and $x \in S^{n-1}$.

Because $\{F^*_n([a, b])(r, x)\}$ converge to $F^*([a, b])(r, x)$ of $[a, b]$ then there is a positive number $N$ so if $n \geq N$ we have

$$|F^*_n([a, b])(r, x) - F^*([a, b])(r, x)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \quad (4.11)$$

For $n \geq N$, defined a positive function $\delta$ on $[a, b]$ by the formula:

$$\delta(\xi) = \min\{\delta^*(\xi), \delta_n(\xi)\}. \quad (4.12)$$
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Therefor, for each \( \delta \)-fine division \( P = \{[u,v];\xi\} \) of \([a,b]\), we have

\[
\left| \sum_{|f^*(\xi)(r,x)|>n} f^*(\xi)(r,x)(v-u) \right| = \left| \sum_{|f^*(\xi)(r,x)|>n} f^*(\xi)(r,x)(v-u) - \sum_{|f^*(\xi)(r,x)|\leq n} f^*(\xi)(r,x)(v-u) \right| \leq \left| \sum_{|f^*(\xi)(r,x)|>n} f^*(\xi)(r,x)(v-u) \right| + \left| \sum_{|f^*(\xi)(r,x)|\leq m} f^*(\xi)(r,x)(v-u) \right| + \left| \sum_{|f^*(\xi)(r,x)|>m} f^*(\xi)(r,x)(v-u) \right| < 3\varepsilon.
\]

Then \( \tilde{f} \) has GSRS.

Second we shall prove the sufficiency. Because \( \tilde{f} \) has GSRS, then by Theorem 4.1 for every \( \varepsilon > 0 \), there exists a positive integer \( N \) such that for every \( n > N \) there is a \( \delta_n(\xi) > 0 \) and for every \( \delta_n \)-fine division \( P = \{[u,v];\xi\} \) of \([a,b]\), we have

\[
\left| \sum_{|f^*(\xi)(r,x)|>n} f^*(\xi)(r,x)(v-u) \right| < \varepsilon,
\]

uniformly for any \( r \in [0,1] \) and \( x \in S^{n-1} \), where the \( \sum \) is taken over \( P \) and for which \( |f^*(\xi)(r,x)| > n \).

Note that \( \tilde{f}_n \), is Henstock integrable on \([a,b]\) for all \( n \). Choose \( N \) so that whenever \( n, m \geq N \) we have

\[
|F^*_n([a,b])(r,x) - F^*_m([a,b])(r,x)| < \varepsilon.
\]

Then for \( n, m \geq N \) and a suitably chosen \( \delta \)-fine division \( P = \{[u,v];\xi\} \), we have

\[
|F^*_n([a,b])(r,x) - F^*_m([a,b])(r,x)| \leq |F^*_n([a,b])(r,x) - \sum_{|f^*(\xi)(r,x)|\leq m} f^*(\xi)(r,x)(v-u)| + |\sum_{|f^*(\xi)(r,x)|>m} f^*(\xi)(r,x)(v-u)| + |\sum_{|f^*(\xi)(r,x)|>n} f^*(\xi)(r,x)(v-u)| < 4\varepsilon.
\]

That is, \( \{F^*_n([a,b])(r,x)\} \) converge to \( F^*([a,b])(r,x) \), as \( n \to \infty \). Again, for suitably chosen \( N \) and \( \delta(\xi) \) and for every \( \delta \)-fine division \( P = \{[u,v];\xi\} \), we have

\[
\left| \sum_{|f^*(\xi)(r,x)|>n} f^*(\xi)(r,x)(v-u) - F^*([a,b])(r,x) \right| \leq \left| \sum_{|f^*(\xi)(r,x)|>n} f^*(\xi)(r,x)(v-u) - F^*_n([a,b])(r,x) \right| + \left| F^*_n([a,b])(r,x) - F^*([a,b])(r,x) \right| \leq \left| \sum_{|f^*(\xi)(r,x)|>n} f^*(\xi)(r,x)(v-u) \right| + \left| \sum_{|f^*(\xi)(r,x)|>N} f^*(\xi)(r,x)(v-u) \right| + \left| F^*_n([a,b])(r,x) - F^*([a,b])(r,x) \right| < 3\varepsilon.
\]

That is, \( \tilde{f} \) is Henstock integrable on \([a,b]\).

This completes the proof.

5 conclusions

This paper introduces, first of all, the generalization of locally and globally small Riemann sums from fuzzy-valued functions to \( n \)-dimensional fuzzy-numbers by means of support function. In addition, the concept of locally small Riemann sums for \( n \)-dimensional fuzzy-number-valued functions is presented and discussed. Finally, an important result of this paper is a characterizations of globally small Riemann sums for \( n \)-dimensional fuzzy-number-valued functions.
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Abstract

By applying Krasnoselskii’s and O’Regan’s fixed point theorems, in this paper, we study the existence of solutions for a coupled system consisting from Langevin fractional differential equations of Riemann-Liouville type subject to the generalized nonlocal integral boundary conditions. Examples illustrating our results are also presented.
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1 Introduction

In this paper we concentrate on the study of existence of solutions for a coupled system of Langevin fractional differential equations of Riemann-Liouville type subject to the generalized nonlocal integral boundary conditions of the form

\begin{equation}
\begin{cases}
&D^{p_1}(D^{p_2} + \lambda_1)x(t) = f(t, x(t), y(t)), \quad 0 < t < T, \\
&D^{q_1}(D^{q_2} + \lambda_2)y(t) = g(t, x(t), y(t)), \quad 0 < t < T, \\
x(0) = 0, \quad x(\eta) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i I^{\gamma_i}x(\xi_i), \\
y(0) = 0, \quad y(\kappa) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \beta_j I^{\phi_j}y(\zeta_j),
\end{cases}
\end{equation}

where $D^\chi$ is the Riemann-Liouville fractional derivative of order $\chi \in \{p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2\}$, $\mu_i I^{\gamma_i}, \delta_j I^{\phi_j}$ are the Katugampola fractional integrals of orders $\gamma_i, \phi_j > 0$, respectively, $\xi_i, \zeta_j \in (0, T)$ and $\alpha_i, \beta_j \in \mathbb{R}$ for

\textsuperscript{*}Corresponding author
Fractional differential equations arise in many engineering and scientific disciplines as the mathematical modeling of systems and processes in the fields of physics, chemistry, control theory, biology, economics, etc. A comprehensive study of fractional calculus and its applications is introduced in several books (see [1]-[3]). Initial and boundary value problems of nonlinear fractional differential equations and inclusions have been addressed by several researchers. For some recent results on fractional differential equations we refer in a series of papers ([4]-[12]).

In fractional calculus, the fractional derivatives are defined via fractional integrals. There are several known forms of the fractional integrals which have been studied extensively for their applications. Two of the most known fractional integrals are the Riemann-Liouville and the Hadamard fractional integral. A new fractional integral, called generalized Riemann-Liouville fractional integral, which generalizes the Riemann-Liouville and the Hadamard integrals into a single form, was introduced in [13]. The corresponding fractional derivatives were introduced in [14]. This integral is now known as ”Katugampola fractional integral” see for example [15, pp 15, 123]. For some recent work with this new operator, for example, see [16]-[17] and the references cited therein.

The Langevin equation (first formulated by Langevin in 1908) is found to be an effective tool to describe the evolution of physical phenomena in fluctuating environments [18]. For some new developments on the fractional Langevin equation in physics, see, for example, [19]-[23]. For recent results on Langevin equations with different kinds of boundary conditions we refer to [24]-[28] and the references therein.

Recently in [16], we have studied the existence and the uniqueness of solutions of a class of boundary value problems for fractional Langevin equations of Riemann-Liouville type with generalized nonlocal integral boundary conditions. Here we extend the results of [16], to a coupled system of Langevin fractional differential equations of Riemann-Liouville type subject to the generalized nonlocal integral boundary conditions. Usually in the literature the Banach’s contraction mapping principle is used to prove he existence and the uniqueness of solutions, and he existence of solutions is proved via Leray-Schauder alternative. Here we apply Krasnoselskii’s and O’Regan’s fixed point theorems. To the best of our knowledge this is the first paper using Krasnoselskii’s and O’Regan’s fixed point theorems to prove the existence of solutions for coupled systems.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we will present some useful preliminaries and some auxiliary lemmas. In Section 3, we establish the main existence results by using Krasnoselskii’s and O’Regan’s fixed point theorems. Examples illustrating our results are presented in the final Section 4.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce some notations and definitions of fractional calculus [1, 2] and present preliminary results needed in our proofs later.

**Definition 2.1** [2] The Riemann-Liouville fractional integral of order $p > 0$ of a continuous function $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$J^p f(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(p)} \int_0^t (t-s)^{p-1} f(s) ds,$$

provided the right-hand side is point-wise defined on $(0, \infty)$, where $\Gamma$ is the gamma function defined by $\Gamma(p) = \int_0^\infty e^{-s}s^{p-1} ds$.

**Definition 2.2** [2] The Riemann-Liouville fractional derivative of order $p > 0$ of a continuous function $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$D^p f(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(n-p)} \left( \frac{d}{dt} \right)^n \int_0^t (t-s)^{n-p-1} f(s) ds,$$

where $n = \lfloor p \rfloor + 1,$ $\lfloor p \rfloor$ denotes the integer part of a real number $p$, provided the right-hand side is point-wise defined on $(0, \infty)$. 
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all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m, f, g : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are continuous functions and $\lambda_1, \lambda_2$ are given constants.
ON SYSTEMS OF FRACTIONAL LANGEVIN EQUATIONS . . .

Lemma 2.3 [2] Let \( p > 0 \) and \( x \in C(0, T) \cap L(0, T) \). Then the fractional differential equation \( D^p x(t) = 0 \) has a unique solution \( x(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i t^{p-1} \), and the following formula holds: \( J^p D^p x(t) = x(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i t^{p-1} \), where \( c_i \in \mathbb{R} \), \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \), and \( n - 1 \leq p < n \).

Lemma 2.4 ([2], page 71) Let \( \alpha > 0, \beta > 0 \) and \( a \geq 0 \). Then the following properties hold:

\[
J^\alpha(x-a)^{\beta-1}(t) = \frac{\Gamma(\beta)}{\Gamma(\beta + \alpha)}(t-a)^{\beta+\alpha-1}
\]

Definition 2.5 [14] The generalized (Katugampola) fractional integral of order \( q > 0 \) and \( \rho > 0 \), of a function \( f \), for all \( 0 < t < \infty \), is defined as

\[
\mathcal{I}_t^\rho f(t) = \frac{\rho^{1-q}}{\Gamma(q)} \int_0^t \frac{s^{\rho-1} f(s)}{(t-s)^{1-q}} \, ds,
\]

provided the right-hand side is point-wise defined on \( (0, \infty) \).

Lemma 2.6 [16] Let constants \( \rho, q > 0 \) and \( p > 0 \). Then the following formula holds

\[
\mathcal{I}_t^\rho \mathcal{I}_t^q f(t) = \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{p+q}{p}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{p+q+\rho}{p}\right)} \mathcal{I}_t^{p+q} f(t).
\]

For convenience to prove our results, we set constants

\[
\Omega_1 = \frac{\Gamma(p_1)}{\Gamma(p_1 + p_2)} \rho^{p_1+p_2-1},
\]

\[
\Omega_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\alpha_i \Gamma(p_1)}{\Gamma(p_1 + p_2)} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{p_1+p_2+\mu_i-1}{\mu_i}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{p_1+p_2+\mu_i+\gamma_i-1}{\mu_i}\right)} \frac{\xi_i^{p_1+p_2+\mu_i-1}}{\mu_i^\Omega}, \tag{4}
\]

\[
\Omega = \Omega_2 - \Omega_1 \neq 0, \tag{5}
\]

and

\[
\Psi_1 = \frac{\Gamma(q_1)}{\Gamma(q_1 + q_2)} \kappa^{q_1+q_2-1}, \tag{6}
\]

\[
\Psi_2 = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{\beta_j \Gamma(q_1)}{\Gamma(q_1 + q_2)} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{q_1+q_2+\delta_j-1}{\delta_j}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{q_1+q_2+\delta_j\phi_j+\delta_j-1}{\delta_j}\right)} \frac{\xi_j^{q_1+q_2+\delta_j-1}}{\delta_j^\phi} \tag{7}
\]

\[
\Psi = \Psi_2 - \Psi_1 \neq 0. \tag{8}
\]

Lemma 2.7 Let \( \Omega, \Psi \neq 0, 0 < p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2 \leq 1, \mu_i, \gamma_i > 0, \delta_j, \phi_j > 0, \eta, \kappa, \xi_i, \zeta_j \in (0, T), \alpha_i, \beta_j \in \mathbb{R} \) for all \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, n, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m \) and \( h, g \in C([0, T], \mathbb{R}) \). Then the problem

\[
D^{p_1}(D^{p_2} + \lambda_1) x(t) = h(t), \quad 0 < t < T, \tag{9}
\]

\[
D^{q_1}(D^{q_2} + \lambda_2) y(t) = g(t), \quad 0 < t < T, \tag{10}
\]

\[
x(0) = 0, \quad x(\eta) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \xi_i^{p_1} x(\xi_i), \tag{11}
\]

\[
y(0) = 0, \quad y(\kappa) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \beta_j \delta_j \zeta_j^{q_1} y(\zeta_j), \tag{12}
\]

has a unique solution given by

\[
x(t) = \frac{\Gamma(p_1)}{\Gamma(p_1 + p_2)} \Omega \left[ J^{p_1+p_2} h(\eta) - \lambda_1 J^{p_2} x(\eta) \right].
\]
Applying Lemma c for which give
and
\[ y(t) = \frac{\Gamma(q_1)}{\Gamma(q_1 + q_2)} \Gamma^{q_1+q_2-1}(\kappa) - \beta_j \phi_j \left( J^{q_1+q_2}g(s) - \lambda_2 J^{q_2}y(s) \right) (\zeta_i) + J^{q_1+q_2}g(t) - \lambda_2 J^{q_2}y(t). \]

**Proof.** Applying Lemma 2.3 to the equations (9) and (10), we obtain
\[ (D^{p_2} + \lambda_1)x(t) = J^{p_1}h(t) + c_1 t^{p_1-1}, \quad \text{and} \quad (D^{q_2} + \lambda_2)y(t) = J^{q_1}g(t) + d_1 t^{q_1-1}, \]
which give
\[ x(t) = J^{p_1+p_2}h(t) - \lambda_1 J^{p_2}x(t) + c_1 \frac{\Gamma(p_1)}{\Gamma(p_1 + p_2)} t^{p_1+p_2-1} + c_2 t^{p_2-1}, \]
\[ y(t) = J^{q_1+q_2}g(t) - \lambda_2 J^{q_2}y(t) + d_1 \frac{\Gamma(q_1)}{\Gamma(q_1 + q_2)} t^{q_1+q_2-1} + d_2 t^{q_2-1}, \]
for \( c_1, c_2, d_1, d_2 \in \mathbb{R} \). It is easy to see that the conditions \( x(0) = 0, y(0) = 0 \) imply that \( c_2 = 0, d_2 = 0 \). Thus
\[ x(t) = J^{p_1+p_2}h(t) - \lambda_1 J^{p_2}x(t) + c_1 \frac{\Gamma(p_1)}{\Gamma(p_1 + p_2)} t^{p_1+p_2-1}, \]
\[ y(t) = J^{q_1+q_2}g(t) - \lambda_2 J^{q_2}y(t) + d_1 \frac{\Gamma(q_1)}{\Gamma(q_1 + q_2)} t^{q_1+q_2-1}. \]
Taking the generalized fractional integral of order \( \mu_i > 0, \gamma_i > 0 \), to (13) and \( \phi_j > 0, \delta_j > 0 \) to (14), we have
\[ \mu_i J^\gamma_i x(t) = \mu_i J^\gamma_i (J^{p_1+p_2}h(s) - \lambda_1 J^{p_2}x(s)) (t) + c_1 \frac{\Gamma(p_1)}{\Gamma(p_1 + p_2)} \frac{(p_1+p_2+\mu_i-1)}{\mu_i} t^{p_1+p_2+\mu_i-1}, \]
and
\[ \delta_j J^\phi_j y(t) = \delta_j J^\phi_j (J^{q_1+q_2}g(s) - \lambda_2 J^{q_2}y(s)) (t) + d_1 \frac{\Gamma(q_1)}{\Gamma(q_1 + q_2)} \frac{(q_1+q_2+\delta_j-1)}{\delta_j} t^{q_1+q_2+\delta_j-1}. \]
Using the second condition of (11), (12) to (15), (16) respectively, we get
\[ J^{p_1+p_2}h(\eta) - \lambda_1 J^{p_2}x(\eta) + c_1 \Omega_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \mu_i J^\gamma_i (J^{p_1+p_2}h(s) - \lambda_1 J^{p_2}x(s)) (\xi_i) + c_1 \Omega_2, \]
and
\[ J^{q_1+q_2}g(\kappa) - \lambda_2 J^{q_2}y(\kappa) + d_1 \Psi_1 = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \beta_j \delta_j J^\phi_j (J^{q_1+q_2}g(s) - \lambda_2 J^{q_2}y(s)) (\zeta_j) + d_1 \Psi_2. \]
Solving the above equations for finding constants \( c_1, d_1 \), we obtain
\[ c_1 = \frac{1}{\Omega} \left[ J^{p_1+p_2}h(\eta) - \lambda_1 J^{p_2}x(\eta) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \mu_i J^\gamma_i (J^{p_1+p_2}h(s) - \lambda_1 J^{p_2}x(s)) (\xi_i) \right], \]
and
\[ d_1 = \frac{1}{\Psi} \left[ J^{q_1+q_2}g(\kappa) - \lambda_2 J^{q_2}y(\kappa) - \sum_{j=1}^{m} \beta_j \delta_j J^\phi_j (J^{q_1+q_2}g(s) - \lambda_2 J^{q_2}y(s)) (\zeta_j) \right]. \]
Substituting the constants \( c_1, d_1 \) into (13), (14), we obtain (13) and (13). The proof is completed. \( \square \)
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3 Main results

Let \( C = C([0, T], \mathbb{R}) \) denotes the Banach space of all continuous functions from \([0, T]\) to \(\mathbb{R}\). Let us introduce the space \( X = \{ x(t) | x(t) \in C([0, T]) \} \) endowed with the norm \(\| x \| = \sup \{|x(t)|, t \in [0, T]\}\). Obviously \((X, \| \cdot \|)\) is a Banach space. Also let \( Y = \{ y(t) | y(t) \in C([0, T]) \} \) be endowed with the norm \(\| y \| = \sup \{|y(t)|, t \in [0, T]\}\). Obviously the product space \((X \times Y, \| (x, y) \|)\) is a Banach space with norm \(\| (x, y) \| = \| x \| + \| y \|\).

Throughout this paper, for convenience, we use the following expressions

\[
J^\alpha h(x(s), y(s))(\tau) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^\tau (\tau - s)^{\alpha - 1} f(s, x(s), y(s))ds,
\]

and

\[
\rho J^\alpha h(x(s), y(s))(\tau) = \frac{\rho^{1-\alpha}}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^\tau s^{\alpha - 1} f(s, x(s), y(s))ds,
\]

where \(\rho, \alpha > 0\) and \(\tau \in [0, T]\).

In view of Lemma 2.6, we define an operator \(\mathcal{F} : X \times Y \to X \times Y\) by

\[
\mathcal{F}(x, y)(t) = \begin{pmatrix}
P(x, y)(t) \\
Q(x, y)(t)
\end{pmatrix},
\]

where

\[
P(x, y)(t) = \frac{\Gamma(p_1)}{\Gamma(p_1 + p_2)} \frac{t^{p_1 + p_2 - 1}}{\Omega} \left[ J^{p_1 + p_2} f(s, x(s), y(s))(\eta) - \lambda_1 J^{p_2} x(s)(\eta) \right.
\]

\[
- \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \frac{\mu_i}{\eta} J^{\mu_i} \left( J^{p_1 + p_2} f(s, x(s), y(s))(\tau) - \lambda_1 J^{p_2} x(s)(\tau) \right)(\xi_i)
\]

\[
+ J^{p_1 + p_2} f(s, x(s), y(s))(t) - \lambda_1 J^{p_2} x(s)(t),
\]

and

\[
Q(x, y)(t) = \frac{\Gamma(q_1)}{\Gamma(q_1 + q_2)} \frac{t^{q_1 + q_2 - 1}}{\Psi} \left[ J^{q_1 + q_2} g(s, x(s), y(s))(\kappa) - \lambda_2 J^{q_2} y(s)(\kappa) \right.
\]

\[
- \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j \delta_j J^{\delta_j} \left( J^{q_1 + q_2} g(s, x(s), y(s))(s) - \lambda_2 J^{q_2} x(s)(s) \right)(\zeta_j)
\]

\[
+ J^{q_1 + q_2} g(t) - \lambda_2 J^{q_2} y(t).
\]

To simplify the notations, we use in the following constants

\[
\Phi(a) = \frac{T^{a+p_2}}{\Gamma(1 + a + p_2)} + \frac{\Gamma(p_1)}{\Gamma(p_1 + p_2)} \frac{T^{p_1 + p_2 - 1}}{\Omega} \left( \frac{\eta^{a+p_2}}{\Gamma(1 + a + p_2)} \right)
\]

\[
+ \frac{\Gamma(q_1)}{\Gamma(q_1 + q_2)} \frac{T^{q_1 + q_2 - 1}}{\Psi} \left( \frac{\nu^{a+p_2}}{\Gamma(1 + a + p_2)} \right)
\]

\[
+ \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \frac{1}{\Gamma(1 + a + p_2)} \frac{\xi_i^{\alpha+\beta_i + \mu_i \gamma_i}}{\mu_i^{\mu_i \gamma_i}} \Gamma(\frac{\nu^{a+p_2}}{\mu_i^{\mu_i \gamma_i}}) \right],
\]

and

\[
\Lambda(b) = \frac{T^{b+q_2}}{\Gamma(1 + b + q_2)} + \frac{\Gamma(q_1)}{\Gamma(q_1 + q_2)} \frac{T^{q_1 + q_2 - 1}}{\Psi} \left( \frac{\nu^{b+q_2}}{\Gamma(1 + b + q_2)} \right)
\]

\[
+ \sum_{j=1}^m \left[ \frac{1}{\Gamma(1 + b + q_2)} \frac{\xi_j^{b+\beta_j + \delta_j \phi_j}}{\delta_j^{\delta_j \phi_j}} \Gamma(\frac{\nu^{b+q_2}}{\delta_j^{\delta_j \phi_j}}) \right],
\]

where \(a \in \{p_1, 0\}\) and \(b \in \{q_1, 0\}\).
3.1 Existence result via Krasnoselskii’s fixed point theorem

The next result is based on the following fixed point theorem.

Lemma 3.1 (Krasnoselskii’s fixed point theorem) [29]. Let $M$ be a closed, bounded, convex and nonempty subset of a Banach space $X$. Let $A, B$ be the operators such that (a) $Ax + By \in M$ whenever $x, y \in M$; (b) $A$ is compact and continuous; (c) $B$ is a contraction mapping. Then there exists $z \in M$ such that $z = Az + Bz$.

Theorem 3.2 Suppose that the following conditions hold:

(H1) $|f(t, u, v)| \leq \psi(t)$, $\forall (t, u, v) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^2$, $\psi \in C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^+)$;

(H2) $|g(t, u, v)| \leq \omega(t)$, $\forall (t, u, v) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^2$, $\omega \in C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^+)$;

If

$$\Upsilon = \max\{|\lambda_1|\Phi(0), |\lambda_2|\Lambda(0)| < 1,$$  \hspace{1cm} (22)

where $\Phi(0)$ and $\Lambda(0)$ are defined by (20) and (21) with $a = b = 0$, respectively. Then the problem (1) has at least one solution on $[0, T]$.

Proof. To prove our result, we set $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\psi(t)| = \|\psi\|$, $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\omega(t)| = \|\omega\|$ and choose

$$R \geq \frac{\|\psi\|\Phi(p_1) + \|\omega\|\Lambda(q_1)}{1 - \Upsilon},$$  \hspace{1cm} (23)

where $\Phi(p_1)$ and $\Lambda(q_1)$ are defined by (20) and (21) with $a = p_1$ and $b = q_1$, respectively. Let $B_R = \{(x, y) \in X \times Y : \| (x, y) \| \leq R \}$. We define four operators by

$$P_1(x, y)(t) = J^{p_1 + p_2} f(s, x(s), y(s))(t) + \frac{\Gamma(p_1)}{\Gamma(p_1 + p_2)} \frac{t^{p_1 + p_2 - 1}}{\Omega} \left[ J^{p_1 + p_2} f(s, x(s), y(s))(\eta) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \mu_i \Gamma(\nu) \left( J^{p_1 + p_2} f(s, x(s), y(s))(\tau) \right)(\xi_i) \right],$$

$$P_2(x)(t) = -\lambda_1 J^{p_2} x(s)(t) - \lambda_1 \frac{\Gamma(p_1)}{\Gamma(p_1 + p_2)} \frac{t^{p_1 + p_2 - 1}}{\Omega} \left[ J^{p_2} x(s)(\eta) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \mu_i \Gamma(\nu) \left( J^{p_2} x(s)(\tau) \right)(\xi_i) \right],$$

and

$$Q_1(x, y)(t) = J^{q_1 + q_2} g(s, x(s), y(s))(t) + \frac{\Gamma(q_1)}{\Gamma(q_1 + q_2)} \frac{t^{q_1 + q_2 - 1}}{\Psi} \left[ J^{q_1 + q_2} g(s, x(s), y(s))(\kappa) - \sum_{j=1}^{m} \beta_j \delta_j \Gamma(\phi) \left( J^{q_1 + q_2} g(s, x(s), y(s))(s) \right)(\zeta_j) \right],$$

and

$$Q_2(y)(t) = -\lambda_2 J^{q_2} y(s)(t) - \lambda_2 \frac{\Gamma(q_1)}{\Gamma(q_1 + q_2)} \frac{t^{q_1 + q_2 - 1}}{\Psi} \left[ J^{q_2} y(s)(\kappa) - \sum_{j=1}^{m} \beta_j \delta_j \Gamma(\phi) \left( J^{q_2} y(s)(\tau) \right)(\zeta_j) \right].$$
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and

\[ F_1(x, y)(t) = \left( \frac{P_2(x, y)(t)}{Q_2(x, y)(t)} \right), \quad F_2(x, y)(t) = \left( \frac{P_2(x)(t)}{Q_2(y)(t)} \right). \]

(24)

Observe that \( P = P_1 + P_2, \ Q = Q_1 + Q_2 \) and \( F = F_1 + F_2. \) For any \((x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in B_R\) we have

\[ |P_1(x_1, y_1)(t) + P_2(x_2(t))| = |J^{p_1+p_2}f(s, x_1(s), y_1(s))(\eta) + \frac{\Gamma(p_1)}{\Gamma(p_1 + p_2)} t^{p_1+p_2-1} \frac{\Gamma(p_1 + p_2)}{\Omega} \left[ J^{p_1+p_2}f(s, x_1(s), y_1(s))(\eta) \right] - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \mu_i \Gamma(\tau_i) \left[ J^{p_1+p_2}f(x_1(s), y_1(s))(\tau_i) \right] - \lambda_1 J^{p_2}x_2(s)(t) \]

\[ \leq \|P\| \left( |J^{p_1+p_2}(T) + \frac{\Gamma(p_1)}{\Gamma(p_1 + p_2)} t^{p_1+p_2-1} \frac{\Gamma(p_1 + p_2)}{\Omega} \left[ J^{p_1+p_2}(T) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \mu_i \Gamma(\tau_i) \left[ J^{p_1+p_2}(\tau_i) \right] \right] \right) \]

\[ + |\lambda_1||x_2||J^{p_2}(T) + \frac{\Gamma(p_1)}{\Gamma(p_1 + p_2)} t^{p_1+p_2-1} \frac{\Gamma(p_1 + p_2)}{\Omega} \left[ J^{p_2}(T) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \mu_i \Gamma(\tau_i) \left[ J^{p_2}(\tau_i) \right] \right] \]

\[ \leq \|P\|\Phi(p_1) + |\lambda_1||x_2||\Phi(0). \]

In a similar way, we get

\[ |Q_1(x_1, y_1)(t) + Q_2(y_2)(t)| = |J^{q_1+q_2}g(s, x_1(s), y_1(s))(\kappa) + \frac{\Gamma(q_1)}{\Gamma(q_1 + q_2)} t^{q_1+q_2-1} \frac{\Gamma(q_1 + q_2)}{\Psi} \left[ J^{q_1+q_2}g(s, x_1(s), y_1(s))(\kappa) \right] - \sum_{j=1}^{m} \beta_j \delta_j I^{q_j} (J^{q_1+q_2}(s, x_1(s), y_1(s))(\kappa)) \]

\[ \leq \|Q\| \left( |J^{q_1+q_2}(T) + \frac{\Gamma(q_1)}{\Gamma(q_1 + q_2)} t^{q_1+q_2-1} \frac{\Gamma(q_1 + q_2)}{\Psi} \left[ J^{q_1+q_2}(T) + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \beta_j \delta_j I^{q_j} (J^{q_1+q_2}(\kappa)) \right] \right) \]

\[ + |\lambda_2||y_2||J^{q_2}(T) + \frac{\Gamma(q_1)}{\Gamma(q_1 + q_2)} t^{q_1+q_2-1} \frac{\Gamma(q_1 + q_2)}{\Psi} \left[ J^{q_2}(T) + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \beta_j \delta_j I^{q_j} (J^{q_2}(\kappa)) \right] \]

\[ \leq \|Q\|\Lambda(q_1) + |\lambda_2||y_2||\Lambda(0), \]

which imply that \( \|F_1(x, y) + F_2(x, y)\| \leq R. \) This shows that \( F_1(x, y) + F_2(x, y) \in B_R. \)

For \((x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in X \times Y \) and for each \( t \in [0, T] \) we have

\[ \|P_1(x_1) - P_2(x_2)\| \leq |\lambda_1|\Phi(0)|x_1 - x_2|, \]

and

\[ \|Q_2(y_1) - Q_2(y_2)\| \leq |\lambda_2|\Lambda(0)|y_1 - y_2|. \]

Thus

\[ \|F_2(x_1, y_1) - F_2(x_2, y_2)\| \leq \|x_1 - x_2\| + \|y_1 - y_2\| = T\|x_1 - x_2, y_1 - y_2\|, \]

which implies that \( F_2 \) is a contraction mapping by (22). The continuity of \( f \) implies that the operator \( F_1 \) is continuous. Also, \( F_1 \) is uniformly bounded on \( B_R \) as

\[ \|P_1(x, y)\| \leq \|P\|\Phi(p_1), \quad \|Q_1(x, y)\| \leq \|Q\|\Lambda(q_1). \]
Thus

\[ \|\mathcal{F}_1(x, y)\| \leq \|\psi\|\Phi(p_1) + \|\omega\|\Lambda(q_1). \]

Next we will prove the compactness of the operator \(\mathcal{F}_1\). Let \(t_1, t_2 \in [0, T]\) with \(t_1 < t_2\). Then we have

\[
\begin{align*}
|\mathcal{F}_1(x, y)(t_2) - \mathcal{F}_1(x, y)(t_1)| & \leq |J^{p_1+p_2}f(s, x(s), y(s))(t_2) - J^{p_1+p_2}f(s, x(s), y(s))(t_1)| \\
& + \frac{\Gamma(p_1)(t_2^{p_1+p_2-1} - t_1^{p_1+p_2-1})}{\Omega(p_1 + p_2)} \left[ J^{p_1+p_2}f(s, x(s), y(s))(\eta) \right] \\
& - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \mu_i \Gamma(\mu_i) \left( J^{p_1+p_2}f(s, x(s), y(s))(\xi_i) \right) \\
& \leq \|\psi\| \left( t_2^{p_1+p_2} - t_1^{p_1+p_2} \right) + \frac{\Gamma(p_1)(t_2^{p_1+p_2} - t_1^{p_1+p_2})}{\Omega(p_1 + p_2)} \left[ J^{p_1+p_2}(\eta) \right] \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\alpha_i| \mu_i \Gamma(\mu_i) \left( J^{p_1+p_2}(\xi_i) \right)
\end{align*}
\]

and

\[
\begin{align*}
|\mathcal{Q}_1(x, y)(t_2) - \mathcal{Q}_1(x, y)(t_1)| & \leq |J^{q_1+q_2}g(s, x(s), y(s))(t_2) - J^{q_1+q_2}g(s, x(s), y(s))(t_1)| \\
& + \frac{\Gamma(q_1)(t_2^{q_1+q_2-1} - t_1^{q_1+q_2-1})}{\Psi(q_1 + q_2)} \left[ J^{q_1+q_2}g(s, x(s), y(s))(\kappa) \right] \\
& - \sum_{j=1}^{m} \beta_j \delta_j \Gamma(\delta_j) \left( J^{q_1+q_2}g(s, x(s), y(s))(\zeta_j) \right) \\
& \leq \|\omega\| \left( t_2^{q_1+q_2} - t_1^{q_1+q_2} \right) + \frac{\Gamma(q_1)(t_2^{q_1+q_2} - t_1^{q_1+q_2})}{\Psi(q_1 + q_2)} \left[ J^{q_1+q_2}(\kappa) \right] \\
& + \sum_{j=1}^{m} |\beta_j| \delta_j \Gamma(\delta_j) \left( J^{q_1+q_2}(\zeta_j) \right),
\end{align*}
\]

which is independent of \((x, y)\) and tends to zero as \(t_2 - t_1 \to 0\). Thus, \(\mathcal{F}_1\) is equicontinuous. So \(\mathcal{F}_1\) is relatively compact on \(B_R\). Hence, by the Arzelá-Ascoli theorem, \(\mathcal{F}_1\) is compact on \(B_R\). Thus all the assumptions of Lemma 3.1 are satisfied. So the conclusion of Lemma 3.1 implies that the problem (1) has at least one solution on \([0, T]\). This completes the proof.

### 3.2 Existence result via O’Regan’s fixed point theorem

Our next existence result relies on a fixed point theorem due to O’Regan in [30].

**Lemma 3.3** Denote by \(\bar{U}\) an open set in a closed, convex set \(C\) of a Banach space \(E\). Assume \(0 \in U\). Also assume that \(F(\bar{U})\) is bounded and that \(F : \bar{U} \to C\) is given by \(F = F_1 + F_2\), in which \(F_1 : \bar{U} \to E\) is continuous and completely continuous and \(F_2 : \bar{U} \to E\) is a nonlinear contraction (i.e., there exists a nonnegative nondecreasing function \(\phi : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)\) satisfying \(\phi(z) < z\) for \(z > 0\), such that \(\|F_2(x) - F_2(y)\| \leq \phi(\|x - y\|)\) for all \(x, y \in \bar{U}\). Then, either

1. (C1) \(F\) has a fixed point \(u \in \bar{U}\); or
2. (C2) there exist a point \(u \in \partial U\) and \(\lambda \in (0, 1)\) with \(u = \lambda F(u)\), where \(\bar{U}\) and \(\partial U\), respectively, represent the closure and boundary of \(U\).
ON SYSTEMS OF FRACTIONAL LANGEVIN EQUATIONS . . .

In the sequel, we will use Lemma 3.3 by taking $C$ to be $E$. For more details of such fixed point theorems, we refer a paper [31] by Petryshyn. Let

$$K_r = \{(x, y) \in X \times Y : \| (x, y) \| \leq R\}.$$ 

**Theorem 3.4** Let $f, g : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous functions. Suppose that (22) holds. In addition we assume that:

1. \((H_3)\) there exist a nonnegative function $z_1 \in C([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ and nondecreasing functions $\psi_1, \psi_2 : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that

$$|f(t, u, v)| \leq z_1(t)\psi_1(\|u\|) + \psi_2(\|v\|) \quad \text{for all} \quad (t, u, v) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^2;$$

2. \((H_4)\) there exist a nonnegative function $z_2 \in C([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ and nondecreasing functions $\omega_1, \omega_2 : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that

$$|g(t, u, v)| \leq z_2(t)\omega_1(\|u\|) + \omega_2(\|v\|) \quad \text{for all} \quad (t, u, v) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^2;$$

3. \((H_5)\) there exist a nonnegative function $z_3 \in C([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ and nondecreasing functions $\psi_1, \psi_2 : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ and nondecreasing functions $\omega_1, \omega_2 : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that

$$\sup_{r \in (0, \infty)} \frac{z_1(\|\psi_1(r) + \psi_2(r)\|\Phi(p_1) + z_2(\|\omega_1(r) + \omega_2(r)\|\Lambda(q_1))}{1 - \Upsilon} \quad \text{where} \Phi(p_1), \Lambda(q_1) \text{ and } \Upsilon \text{ are defined in (20), (21) and (22) respectively.}$$

Then the problem (1) has at least one solution on $[0, T]$.

**Proof.** Consider the operator $F : X \times Y \rightarrow X \times Y$ as that defined in (18). We decompose $F$ into a sum of two operators

$$F(x, y)(t) = F_1(x, y)(t) + F_2(x, y)(t)$$

where $F_1(x, y), F_2(x, y)$ defined in (24). From (H5) there exists a number $r_0 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{r_0}{\|z_1\|\|\psi_1(r_0) + \psi_2(r_0)\|\Phi(p_1) + \|z_2\|\|\omega_1(r_0) + \omega_2(r_0)\|\Lambda(q_1)} \geq \frac{1}{1 - \Upsilon}. \quad (25)$$

We shall prove that the operators $F_1$ and $F_2$ satisfy all the conditions of Lemma 3.3.

**Step 1.** The set $F_1(K_{r_0})$ is bounded. We first show that $F_1(K_{r_0})$ is bounded. For any $(x, y) \in K_{r_0}$ we have

$$\| P_1(x, y) \| \leq \| z_1 \| \| \psi_1(r_0) + \psi_2(r_0) \| \Phi(p_1),$$

and

$$\| Q_1(x, y) \| \leq \| z_2 \| \| \omega_1(r_0) + \omega_2(r_0) \| \Lambda(q_1).$$

Thus

$$F_1(x, y) \| \leq \| z_1 \| \| \psi_1(r_0) + \psi_2(r_0) \| \Phi(p_1) + \| z_2 \| \| \omega_1(r_0) + \omega_2(r_0) \| \Lambda(q_1).$$

This proves that $F_1(K_{r_0})$ is uniformly bounded. In a similar way we have

$$\| P_2(x) \| \leq | \lambda_1 | \| \Phi(0) \| x \|, \text{ and } \| Q_2(y) \| \leq | \lambda_2 | \| \Lambda(0) \| y \|,$$

and thus

$$\| F_2(x, y) \| \leq \Upsilon r_0.$$ 

**Step 2.** The operator $F_1$ is continuous and completely continuous.

By Step 1, $F_1(K_{r_0})$ is uniformly bounded. In addition for any $t_1, t_2 \in [0, T]$, we have:

$$\| P_1(x, y)(t_2) - P_1(x, y)(t_1) \| \leq \| z_1 \| \| \psi_1(r_0) + \psi_2(r_0) \| \frac{1}{1 + p_1 + p_2} \left| \frac{t_2}{(t_2 - t_1)^{p_1 + p_2}} - \frac{t_1}{t_1^{p_1 + p_2}} \right| + \frac{\Gamma(p_1)(t_2^{p_1 + p_2 - 1} - t_1^{p_1 + p_2 - 1})}{\Gamma(p_1 + p_2)} J^{p_1 + p_2}(\eta) \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} |a_i| \Gamma^\gamma(j^{p_1 + p_2} \eta)(\xi_i) \right),$$

where $J^{p_1 + p_2}(\eta)$ is the Riemann-Liouville fractional integral of order $p_1 + p_2$ and $\gamma = \frac{p_1 + p_2}{p_1 + p_2 - 1}$. This implies that $F_1$ is continuous and completely continuous.
and
\[
|Q_1(x, y)(t_2) - Q_1(x, y)(t_1)| \\
\leq \|z_2\||\omega_1(r_0) + \omega_2(r_0)| \left[ \frac{1}{\Gamma(q_1 + q_2 + 1)} (t_2^{q_1+q_2} - t_1^{q_1+q_2} + 2(t_2 - t_1)^{q_1+q_2}) \right] \\
+ \frac{\Gamma(q_1)(t_2^{2q_2-1} - t_1^{2q_2-1}) j_{q_2}^{2q_2}(\kappa)}{\Psi \Gamma(q_1 + q_2)} \sum_{j=1}^{m} |\beta_j| \delta_j \Phi \left( j^{q_1+q_2}(\tau) (\zeta_j) \right),
\]

which are independent of \((x, y)\) and tends to zero as \(t_2 - t_1 \to 0\). Thus, \(F_1\) is equicontinuous. Hence, by the Arzelá-Ascoli Theorem, \(F_1(K_{r_0})\) is a relatively compact set. Now, let \((x_n, y_n) \subset K_{r_0}\) with \(\|(x_n, y_n) - (x, y)\| \to 0\). Then the limit \(\|(x_n, y_n)(t) - (x, y)(t)\| \to 0\) is uniformly valid on \([0, T]\). From the uniform continuity of \(f(t, x, y)\) and \(g(t, x, y)\) on the compact set \([0, T] \times [-r_0, r_0] \times [-r_0, r_0]\), it follows that \(\|f(t, x_n(t), y_n(t)) - f(t, x(t), y(t))\| \to 0\) and \(\|g(t, x_n(t), y_n(t)) - g(t, x(t), y(t))\| \to 0\) are uniformly valid on \([0, T]\). Hence \(\|F_1(x_n, y_n) - F_1(x, y)\| \to 0\) as \(n \to \infty\) which proves the continuity of \(F_1\). Therefore the operator \(F_2\) is continuous and completely continuous.

**Step 3.** The operator \(F_2\) is contractive. This was proved in Theorem 3.2.

**Step 4.** Finally, it will be shown that the case (C2) in Lemma 3.3 does not hold. On the contrary, we suppose that (C2) holds. Then, we have that there exist \(\theta \in (0, 1)\) and \((x, y) \in \partial K_{r_0}\) such that \((x, y) = \theta F(x, y)\). So, we have \(\|(x, y)\| = r_0\) and
\[
\|x\| \leq z_1|\psi_1(r_0) + \psi_2(r_0)| \Phi(p_1) + |\lambda_1| \Phi(0) \|x\|,
\]
and
\[
\|y\| \leq z_2|\omega_1(r_0) + \omega_2(r_0)| \Lambda(q_1) + |\lambda_2| \Lambda(0) \|y\|,
\]
from which we get
\[
\|x\| + \|y\| \leq z_1|\psi_1(r_0) + \psi_2(r_0)| \Phi(p_1) + z_2|\omega_1(r_0) + \omega_2(r_0)| \Lambda(q_1) + \Upsilon r_0,
\]
or
\[
\|x\| + \|y\| \leq \frac{z_1|\psi_1(r_0) + \psi_2(r_0)| \Phi(p_1) + z_2|\omega_1(r_0) + \omega_2(r_0)| \Lambda(q_1)}{1 - \Upsilon} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \Upsilon},
\]
which contradicts to (25). Consequently, we have proved that the operators \(F_1\) and \(F_2\) satisfy all the conditions in Lemma 3.3. Hence, the operator \(F\) has at least one fixed point \((x, y) \in K_{r_0}\), which is the solution of the he problem (1). The proof is completed.

**Theorem 3.5** Let \(f, g : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}\) be continuous functions. Suppose that (22) holds. In addition we assume that:

\begin{itemize}
\item[(H_6)] there exist a nonnegative function \(z_1 \in C([0, T], \mathbb{R})\) and a nondecreasing function \(\psi : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)\) such that
\[
|f(t, u, v)| \leq z_1(t) \psi(\|u\| + \|v\|) \quad \text{for all } (t, u, v) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^2;
\]
\item[(H_7)] there exist a nonnegative function \(z_2 \in C([0, T], \mathbb{R})\) and a nondecreasing function \(\omega : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)\) such that
\[
|g(t, u, v)| \leq z_2(t) \omega(\|u\| + \|v\|) \quad \text{for all } (t, u, v) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^2;
\]
\item[(H_8)] \[
\sup_{r \in (0, \infty)} \frac{r}{z_1(\psi(r) \Phi(p_1) + z_2(\omega(r) \Lambda(q_1)) > \frac{1}{1 - \Upsilon}, \quad \text{where } \Phi(p_1), \Lambda(q_1) \text{ and } \Upsilon \text{ are defined in (20), (21) and (22) respectively.}
\]
\end{itemize}

Then the he problem (1) has at least one solution on \([0, T]\).
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**Proof.** The proof is similar to that of Theorem 3.4 and it is omitted. □

To establish some special cases, we set constants

$$ R_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\alpha_i \Gamma(p_1)}{\Gamma(p_1 + p_2)} \frac{\Gamma(p_1 + p_2)}{\Gamma(p_1 + p_2 + \gamma_i)} \xi_i^{p_1 + p_2 + \gamma_i - 1}, \quad R_1 = R_1 - \Omega_1 \neq 0, $$

and

$$ L_1 = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{\beta_j \Gamma(q_1)}{\Gamma(q_1 + q_2)} \frac{\Gamma(q_1 + q_2)}{\Gamma(q_1 + q_2 + \phi_j)} \phi_j^{q_1 + q_2 + \phi_j - 1}, \quad L_1 = L_1 - \Psi_1 \neq 0, $$

$$ \chi(a) = \frac{T^{a+p_2}}{\Gamma(1 + a + p_2)} \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{[\alpha_i]} \left[ \frac{\xi_i^{a+p_2+\gamma_i}}{\Gamma(a + p_2 + 1)} \right] \right\} \left( \frac{\Gamma(a + p_2 + 1)}{\Gamma(1 + a + p_2)} \right) $$

and

$$ \Theta(b) = \frac{T^{b+q_2}}{\Gamma(1 + b + q_2)} \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{[\beta_i]} \left[ \frac{\phi_i^{b+q_2+\phi_i}}{\Gamma(b + q_2 + 1)} \right] \right\} \left( \frac{\Gamma(b + q_2 + 1)}{\Gamma(1 + b + q_2)} \right) $$

where $$ a = \{p_1, 0\} $$ and $$ b = \{q_1, 0\} $$

By setting $$ \mu_i = 1 $$ and $$ \delta_j = 1, $$ we have a boundary value problem with nonlocal Riemann-Liouville fractional integral conditions

$$ \begin{cases} 
D^{p_1}(D^{p_2} + \lambda_1)x(t) = f(t, x(t), y(t)), & 0 < t < T, \\
D^{q_1}(D^{q_2} + \lambda_2)y(t) = g(t, x(t), y(t)), & 0 < t < T, \\
x(0) = 0, & x(\eta) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i J^{p_1} x(\xi_i), \\
y(0) = 0, & y(\kappa) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \beta_j J^{q_1} y(\zeta_j).
\end{cases} \tag{28} $$

Using the above constants, we have the following corollaries.

**Corollary 3.6** Suppose that (H1) and (H2) holds. If

$$ M = \max \{|\lambda_1|x(0), |\lambda_2|\Theta(0)| < 1, $$

then the problem (28) has at least one solution on $$ [0, T] $$.

**Corollary 3.7** Let $$ f, g : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} $$ be continuous functions. Suppose that (29), (H3) and (H4) holds. In addition we assume that:

$$ \sup_{r \in (0, \infty)} \||z_1]||\psi_1(r) + |z_2]||\omega_1(r) + |z_2]||\omega_2(r)\Theta(q_1)| > \frac{1}{1 - M} $$

Then the problem (28) has at least one solution on $$ [0, T] $$.

**Corollary 3.8** Let $$ f, g : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} $$ be continuous functions. Suppose that (29), (H6) and (H7) holds. In addition we assume that:

$$ \sup_{r \in (0, \infty)} \||z_1]||\psi_1(r)\Theta(q_1) + |z_2]||\omega(r)\Theta(q_1)| > \frac{1}{1 - M} $$

Then the problem (28) has at least one solution on $$ [0, T] $$.
4 Examples

In this section we present examples to illustrate our results.

Example 4.1 Consider the following system of fractional Langevin equation subject to the nonlocal Katugampola fractional integral conditions

\[
\begin{align*}
D^{1/2} \left( D^{3/5} + 0.2 \right) x(t) &= \frac{t \sin 3t \arctan x(t)}{t + 1} \frac{3|x(t)| + 4}{3x(t)} + 2 \cos t \frac{\sin y(t)}{3t^2 + 2|y(t)| + 3}, \quad 0 < t < 1, \\
D^{2/5} \left( D^{4/5} + 0.25 \right) y(t) &= \frac{4t \sin 5|x(t)| + 1}{3|y(t)| + 4} + 2 y(t) + 3, \quad 0 < t < 1, \\
x(0) &= 0, \quad x(0.6) = 0.2 \frac{1/2 \Gamma^{10/9} x(0.3)}{3/t^3} + 0.3 \frac{2/3 \Gamma^{10/9} x(0.6)}, \\
y(0) &= 0, \quad y(0.2) = 0.2 \frac{2 \Gamma^{10/9} y(0.3)}{3/t^5} + 0.3 \frac{2 \Gamma^{10/9} y(0.7)}{y(0.9)}.
\end{align*}
\]

Here \( p_1 = 1/2, p_2 = 3/5, q_1 = 2/5, q_2 = 4/5, \lambda_1 = 0.2, \eta = 0.6, \kappa = 0.2, \alpha_1 = 0.2, \alpha_2 = 0.3, \beta_1 = 0.2, \beta_2 = 0.3, \mu_1 = 1/2, \mu_2 = 1/3, \gamma_1 = 7/10, \gamma_2 = 3/5, \delta_1 = 3/10, \delta_2 = 3/5, \delta_3 = 3/5, \phi_1 = 4/5, \phi_2 = 2/5, \phi_3 = 9/10, \xi_1 = 0.3, \xi_2 = 0.6, \zeta_1 = 0.3, \zeta_2 = 0.7, \zeta_3 = 0.9, \)
\( T = 1, f(t, x, y) = (t \sin 3t \arctan x(t)) / ((t + 1)(5|x(t)| + 2)) + (2 \cos t \sin y(t)) / ((3t^2 + 2|y(t)| + 3)) \) and \( g(t, x, y) = (9t^2 x(t)) / ((4t + 3)(5|x(t)| + 1)) + (2y(t) + 3) / (3|y(t)| + 4) \). Since \( f(t, x, y) \leq (t \sin 3t) / (3t + 3) + (2 \cos t) / (6t^2 + 4), g(t, x, y) \leq (9t^2 / 20t + 15) + (2 / 3) \) and by using the Maple program, we can find

\[
\Phi(0) = \frac{TP^2}{\Gamma(1 + p_2)} + \frac{\Gamma(p_1)}{\Gamma(p_1 + p_2)} \frac{T^{p_1 + p_2 - 1}}{\Gamma} \left( \frac{\eta^p_2}{\Gamma(1 + p_2)} + \sum_{i=1}^{2} \left( \frac{1}{\Gamma(1 + p_2)} \frac{\xi_{p_2 + \mu_1, i} \Gamma(\mu)}{\mu_i} \right) \right) \\
\approx 4.318646369,
\]

and

\[
\Lambda(0) = \frac{T^{q_2}}{\Gamma(1 + q_2)} + \frac{\Gamma(q_1)}{\Gamma(q_1 + q_2)} \frac{T^{q_1 + q_2 - 1}}{\Gamma} \left( \frac{\kappa^{q_2}}{\Gamma(1 + q_2)} + \sum_{j=1}^{3} \left( \frac{1}{\Gamma(1 + q_2)} \frac{\xi_{q_2 + \phi_j, j} \Gamma(\phi_j)}{\phi_j} \right) \right) \\
\approx 3.234126953.
\]

Thus \( \Upsilon \approx 0.8637292738 < 1 \). Hence, by Theorem 3.2, the system (30) has at least one solution on \([0, 1] \).

Example 4.2 Consider the following system of fractional Langevin equation subject to the nonlocal Katugampola fractional integral conditions

\[
\begin{align*}
D^{3/10} \left( D^{4/5} + 0.25 \right) x(t) &= \frac{t}{15} \left( \frac{|x| + 5}{|x| + 4} + \frac{|y| + 4}{|y| + 5} \right), \quad 0 < t < 1, \\
D^{2/5} \left( D^{9/10} + 0.2 \right) y(t) &= \frac{t}{15} \left( \frac{|x|^2 + 2|x|}{|x| + 1} + \frac{|y|^2}{|y| + 5} \right), \quad 0 < t < 1, \\
x(0) &= 0, \quad x(0.1) = 1.5 \frac{1/2 \Gamma^{10/9} x(0.6)}{3/t^3} + 2 \frac{3/5 \Gamma^{10/9} x(0.9)}, \\
y(0) &= 0, \quad y(0.8) = 3 \frac{1/2 \Gamma^{10/9} y(0.7)}{3/t^3} + 2.5 \frac{3/5 \Gamma^{10/9} y(0.8)}{y(0.8)}.
\end{align*}
\]

Here \( p_1 = 3/10, p_2 = 4/5, q_1 = 2/5, q_2 = 4/5, \lambda_1 = 0.25, \lambda_2 = 0.2, \eta = 0.1, \kappa = 0.8, \alpha_1 = 1.5, \alpha_2 = 2, \alpha_3 = 2.5, \beta_1 = 3, \beta_2 = 2.5, \mu_1 = 7/10, \mu_2 = 3/10, \mu_3 = 3/10, \gamma_1 = 1/2, \gamma_2 = 1/5, \gamma_3 = 3/10, \delta_1 = 7/10, \delta_2 = 3/10, \phi_1 = 4/5, \phi_2 = 9/10, \xi_1 = 0.6, \xi_2 = 0.6, \xi_3 = 0.9, \zeta_1 = 0.7, \zeta_2 = 0.8, 
\]
\( T = 1, f(t, x, y) = (t/15) \left[ (|x| + 2)|x| / (|x| + 4) + (5|y|^2 + 2|y| + 2) / (3|y| + 4) \right] \) and \( g(t, x, y) = (t/5) \left[ (|x|^2 + |x| + 1) / (|x| + 5) + 5|y|^2 + 1) / (3|y| + 4) \right] \). By using the Maple program, we can find

\[
\Phi(0) = \frac{TP^2}{\Gamma(1 + p_2)}
\]
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\[ T^{p_2} + p_2 \left( \eta_{p_2} \Gamma(p_1 + p_2) \Gamma(1 + p_2) \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \alpha_i \left[ \frac{1}{\Gamma(1 + p_2)} \xi^2_{2 + \mu_1} \Gamma(5 + \mu_1) \right] + \frac{\beta_j}{\Gamma(1 + q_2)} \left( \xi^2_{2 + \delta_j} \Omega \left( \frac{5 + \delta_j}{\delta_j} \right) \right) \]

\[ \approx 1.892763483, \]

and

\[ \Lambda(0) = \frac{T^{q_2}}{\Gamma(1 + q_2)} \]

Thus \( Y \approx 0.4731908708 < 1 \). Since \( |f(t, x, y)| \leq (t/15)[(x^2 + 2|x|)/4 + (y^2 + 2y + 2)/4], \)

\( |g(t, x, y)| \leq (t/5)[(x^2 + |x| + 1)/5 + (y^2 + 1)/5], \)

we choose \( z_1(t) = t/15, \)

\( z_2(t) = t/5, \)

\( \omega_1(x) = (x^2 + 2|x|)/4, \)

\( \omega_2(y) = (y^2 + 2y + 2)/4. \)

We can show that

\[ \sup_{r \in (0, \infty)} \|z_1\|_r + \|z_2\|_r \|\Phi(p_1) + \omega_2(r)\|_r \Lambda(q_1) \]

\[ \approx 2.080080186 > 1.898220711 \]

Hence, by Theorem 3.4, the system (31) has at least one solution on \([0, 1] . \)

**Example 4.3** Consider the following system of fractional Langevin equation subject to the nonlocal Katugumwala fractional integral conditions

\[ \begin{cases}
D^{4/5} \left( D^{9/10} + 0.3 \right) x(t) = \frac{t}{5} \left( \frac{2(|x + y|)^3 + 2|x| + |y|}{3|x| + 4} \right), & 0 < t < \frac{2}{3}, \\
D^{3/10} \left( D^{9/10} + 0.35 \right) y(t) = \frac{t}{3} \left( \frac{(|x + y|)^2 + 1}{|x| + 2|y| + 3} \right), & 0 < t < \frac{2}{3}, \\
x(0) = 0, & x(0.6) = 0.4, \\
y(0) = 0, & y(0) = 0.8.
\end{cases} \]

Here \( p_1 = 4/5, p_2 = 9/10, q_1 = 3/10, q_2 = 9/10, \)

\( \lambda_1 = 0.3, \lambda_2 = 0.35, \eta = 0.6, \kappa = 0.3, \)

\( \alpha_1 = 0.4, \alpha_2 = 0.4, \beta_1 = 0.8, \beta_2 = 0.7, \beta_3 = 0.8, \mu_1 = 2/5, \mu_2 = 4/5, \gamma_1 = 7/10, \gamma_2 = 2/5, \)

\( \delta_1 = 4/5, \delta_2 = 1/5, \delta_3 = 7/10, \phi_1 = 4/5, \phi_2 = 9/10, \phi_3 = 7/10, \xi_1 = 0.2, \xi_2 = 0.6, \xi_3 = 0.2, \)

\( \zeta_2 = 0.5, \zeta_3 = 0.6, T = \frac{2}{3}, \)

\( f(t, x, y) = (t/5) \left( (2(|x + y|)^3 + 2|x| + |y|)/(3|x| + 4) \right) \)

\( g(t, x, y) = (t/3) \left( (|x + y|)^2 + 1)/(|x| + 2|y| + 3) \right). \)

By using the Maple program, we can find

\[ \Phi(0) = \frac{T^{p_2}}{\Gamma(1 + p_2)} + \frac{\Gamma(p_1)}{\Gamma(p_1 + p_2)} \frac{T^{p_1 + p_2 - 1}}{\Gamma(1 + p_2)} \left( \frac{\eta_{p_2}}{\Gamma(1 + p_2)} \right) \]

\[ + \sum_{i=1}^{2} |\alpha_i| \left[ \frac{1}{\Gamma(1 + p_2)} \xi^2_{2 + \mu_1} \Gamma(5 + \mu_1) \right] \approx 2.401980728, \]

and

\[ \Lambda(0) = \frac{T^{q_2}}{\Gamma(1 + q_2)} + \frac{\Gamma(q_1)}{\Gamma(q_1 + q_2)} \frac{T^{q_1 + q_2 - 1}}{\Gamma(1 + q_2)} \left( \frac{\eta_{q_2}}{\Gamma(1 + q_2)} \right) \]

\[ + \sum_{j=1}^{3} |\beta_j| \left[ \frac{1}{\Gamma(1 + q_2)} \xi^2_{2 + \delta_j} \Gamma(5 + \delta_j) \right] \approx 1.824427804. \]
Thus \( Y \approx 0.7205942184 < 1 \).

Since \(|f(t,x,y)| \leq (t/5) \left(\left(\left|x + y\right|^2 + |x| + |y|\right)/2\right)\), \(|g(t,x,y)| \leq (t/3) \left(\left(\left|x + y\right|^2 + 1\right)/3\right)\), we choose \( z_1(t) = t/10, \psi(x+y) = |x + y|^3 + |x| + |y|, z_2(t) = t/9, \omega(x+y) = (|x + y|^2 + 1) \). We can show that

\[
\sup_{r \in (0,\infty)} r \left[ z_1 \left( \psi_1(r) + \psi_2(r) \Phi(p_1) \right) + z_2 \left( \omega_1(r) + \omega_2(r) \Lambda(q_1) \right) \right] \approx 3.980031158 > 3.579024007 \approx \frac{1}{1-Y}.
\]

Hence, by Theorem 3.5, the system (32) has at least one solution on \([0, \frac{2}{3}]\).
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SUBORDINATION RESULTS FOR CERTAIN CLASS OF ANALYTIC FUNCTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH MITTAG-LEFFLER FUNCTION

MANSOUR F. YASSEN

Abstract. In this paper, we introduce a new class of analytic functions associated with Mittag-Leffler function in the open unit disk. Several properties of functions belonging to this class are derived.

1. Introduction

Let $U$ be the open unit disk $U = \{ z : |z| < 1 \}$. Also, Let $A(p)$ the class of functions $f(z)$ of the form
\[
f(z) = z^p + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} a_n z^n z^{p-1},
\]
which are analytic in $U$, where $p \in \mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\}$. Also $f_i(z) \in A(p)$ $(i = 1, 2)$ defined by
\[
f_i(z) = z^p + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} a_{n,i} z^n z^{p-1}, \quad (i = 1, 2)
\]
the convolution (or Hadamard product) of $f_1(z)$ and $f_2(z)$ given by:
\[
(f_1 * f_2)(z) := (f_2 * f_1)(z) := z^p + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} a_{n,1} a_{n,2} z^n z^{p-1}.
\]
The Mittag-Leffler function ([11],[12]) is defined by:
\[
E_{\alpha}(z) = 1 + \frac{z}{\alpha!} + \frac{z^2}{(2\alpha)!} + \frac{z^3}{(3\alpha)!} + \cdots + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{z^n}{\Gamma(\alpha n + 1)}, \quad (\alpha \in \mathbb{C}; \text{Re}(\alpha) > 0).
\]

Some interesting properties and general of Mittag-Leffler function can be found e.g. in [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [9], [13], [14], [15], [16], [18], [21], [22] and [23]. The function $E_{\alpha,\beta}^{\eta,k}(z) (z \in \mathbb{C})$ introduced by Srivastava and Tomovski [20] in the form:
\[
E_{\alpha,\beta}^{\eta,k}(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\eta)_{nk} z^n}{\Gamma(\alpha n + \beta) n!}, \quad (\alpha, \beta, \eta \in \mathbb{C}; \text{Re}(\alpha) > \max\{0, \text{Re}(k)-1\}; \text{Re}(k) > 0),
\]
where
\[
(\eta)_n = \frac{\Gamma(\eta + n)}{\Gamma(\eta)} = \begin{cases} 1, & n = 0, \\ \eta(\eta + 1)(\eta + 2) \cdots (\eta + n - 1), & n \in \mathbb{N}. \end{cases}
\]
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The function $E_{n,k}^α(z)$ proved by Srivastava and Tomovski [20] is an entire function in the complex $z$-plane. Attiya [1] defined the function $Q_{n,k}^α(z)$ by

$$Q_{n,k}^α(z) = \frac{(\eta + \beta)(\alpha + \beta)}{(\eta + k)(n\alpha + \beta)} a_0 z^n, \quad (z \in U), \quad (1.7)$$

very recently, Attiya [1] introduce the operator

$$H_{n,k}^α(f(z)) : A(1) \to A(1),$$

defined, in terms of convolution by

$$H_{n,k}^α(f(z)) = Q_{n,k}^α(z) \ast f(z)$$

and

$$Q_{n,k}^α(z) = \frac{1}{(\eta + k)n} \left( E_{n,k}^α(z) - \frac{1}{\Gamma(\beta)} \right), \quad (z \in U). \quad (1.8)$$

Analogous to $H_{n,k}^α(f(z))$, we introduce the operator $H_{n,k,p}^α(f(z))$ as follows

$$H_{n,k,p}^α(f(z)) : A(p) \to A(p), \quad (1.9)$$

where

$$H_{n,k,p}^α(f(z)) = Q_{n,k,p}^α(z) \ast f(z), \quad (z \in U). \quad (1.10)$$

and

$$Q_{n,k,p}^α(z) = z^{p-1} \frac{1}{(\eta + k)n} \left( E_{n,k}^α(z) - \frac{1}{\Gamma(\beta)} \right), \quad (z \in U). \quad (1.11)$$

from equations (1.9), (1.10) and (1.11) we not that

$$H_{n,k,p}^α(f(z)) = Q_{n,k,p}^α(z) \ast f(z)$$

$$= z^p + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{\Gamma(\eta + nk)\Gamma(\alpha + \beta)}{\Gamma(\eta + k)\Gamma(n\alpha + \beta)} a_n z^{n+p-1}, \quad (z \in U), \quad (1.12)$$

when $p = 1$, the operator $H_{n,k,1}^α(f(z))$ is the Attiya operator $H_{n,k}^α(f(z))$ [1].

A function $f(z) \in A(1)$ is said to be in the class $S^*(\sigma)$ [7] and [19] or (star-like of order $\alpha$ in $U$) if:

$$S^*(\sigma) := \left\{ f(z) : Re \left( \frac{zf(z)}{f(z)} \right) > \sigma, 0 \leq \sigma < 1, z \in U \right\}. \quad (1.13)$$

A function $f(z) \in A(1)$ is said to be in the class $R(\sigma)$ [7] and [17] or (pre-starlike of order $\alpha$ in $U$) if:

$$R(\sigma) := \left\{ f(z) : \frac{z}{(1-z)^{2(1-\sigma)}} \ast f(z) \in S^*(\sigma), \sigma < 1, z \in U \right\}. \quad (1.14)$$

The function $g(z)$ is called subordinate to $G(z)$, if there exist a Schwarz function $h(z)$, analytic in $U$, with $h(0) = 0$ and $|h(z)| \leq 1$, such that $g(z) = G(h(z))$ for all $z \in U$.

This subordination is denoted by $g(z) \prec G(z)$. If the function $G(z)$ is univalent in $U$, then $g(z) \prec G(z)$ if and only if $g(0) = G(0)$ and $g(U) \subset G(U)$.

Let $T$ be the class of function $w(z)$ with $w(0) = 1$, which are analytic and univalent in $U$. 
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Definition 1. Let $f(z) \in A(p)$, then $f(z)$ is said to be in the class $\mathcal{C}^{n,k}_{\alpha,\beta,p}(\delta;w)$ if it satisfies the following condition
\[
\frac{(1-\delta)}{p} z^{-p+1} \left( \mathcal{H}_{n,k}^{\alpha,\beta,p}(f(z)) \right)' + \frac{\delta}{p(p-1)} z^{-p+2} \left( \mathcal{H}_{n,k}^{\alpha,\beta,p}(f(z)) \right)'' < w(z), \tag{1.15}
\]
where $\delta \in \mathbb{C}$, $p \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$ and $w(z) \in \mathcal{S}$.

The main object of our paper is to investigate and introduce some subordination results of the class $\mathcal{C}^{n,k}_{\alpha,\beta,p}(\delta;w)$.

2. SOME LEMMAS

In our paper, we use the following lemmas:

Lemma 1.1 [10]. Let $G(z)$ be analytic function in $U$ and $w(z)$ be analytic and convex univalent in $U$ with $G(0) = w(0)$, if
\[
G(z) + \frac{1}{\vartheta} z G'(z) < w(z), \tag{2.1}
\]
where $\text{Re}(\vartheta) \geq 0$ and $\vartheta \neq 0$, then $G(z) < w(z)$.

Lemma 1.2 [17]. Let $\sigma < 1$, $f(z) \in S^*(\sigma)$, and $G(z) \in \mathcal{R}(\sigma)$, then, for analytic function $F(z)$ in $U$,
\[
\frac{G \ast (fF)}{G \ast f}(U) \subset \overline{co}(F(U)), \tag{2.2}
\]
where $\overline{co}(F(U))$ denote the closed convex hull of $F(U)$.

Lemma 1.3 [8]. Let $G(z) = 1 + \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} d_n z^n (k \in \mathbb{N})$ be analytic function and convex univalent function in $U$. If $\text{Re} \{G(z)\} > 0, (z \in U)$, then
\[
\text{Re} \{G(z)\} \geq 1 - \frac{|z|^k}{1 + |z|^k} \quad (k \in \mathbb{N}; z \in U). \tag{2.3}
\]

3. PROPERTIES OF THE CLASS $\mathcal{C}^{n,k}_{\alpha,\beta,p}(\delta;w)$

In this section, we let $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p > 1$.

Theorem 3.1. Let $0 \leq \delta_1 < \delta_2$. Then $\mathcal{C}^{n,k}_{\alpha,\beta,p}(\delta_2;w) \subset \mathcal{C}^{n,k}_{\alpha,\beta,p}(\delta_1;w)$.

Proof. Let $f(z) \in \mathcal{C}^{n,k}_{\alpha,\beta,p}(\delta_2;w)$ and $0 \leq \delta_1 < \delta_2$. Suppose that
\[
\phi(z) = \frac{z^{-p+1}}{p} \left( \mathcal{H}_{n,k}^{\alpha,\beta,p}(f(z)) \right)'. \tag{3.1}
\]
Therefore, the function $\phi(z)$ in the above equation is analytic in $U$ with $\phi(0) = 1$. Differentiating the both sides of the above equation w.r.t. $z$, we have
\[
\phi'(z) = \frac{(1-p)z^{-p}}{p} \left( \mathcal{H}_{n,k}^{\alpha,\beta,p}(f(z)) \right)' + \frac{z^{-p+1}}{p} \left( \mathcal{H}_{n,k}^{\alpha,\beta,p}(f(z)) \right)'' \tag{3.2}
\]
By using Equation (1.15), we have
\[
\frac{(1-\delta)z^{-p+1}}{p} \left( \mathcal{H}_{n,k}^{\alpha,\beta,p}(f(z)) \right)' + \frac{\delta_2 z^{-p+2}}{p(p-1)} \left( \mathcal{H}_{n,k}^{\alpha,\beta,p}(f(z)) \right)'' = \phi(z) + \frac{\delta_2 \phi'(z)}{(p-1)} < w(z). \tag{3.3}
\]
Let  

\[
\phi(z) \prec w(z).  \tag{3.4}
\]

Since \(0 \leq \delta_1/\delta_2 < 1\) and \(w(z)\) is univalent in \(U\), using equations (3.1) and (3.4), we get that

\[
\frac{(1 - \delta_1)z^{-p+1}}{p} \left( \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^n(f(z)) \right)' + \frac{\delta_1z^{-p+2}}{p(p-1)} \left( \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^n(f(z)) \right)'' = \left(1 - \frac{\delta_1}{\delta_2}\right)\phi(z)
\]

\[
+ \frac{\delta_1}{\delta_2} \left(1 - \delta_2\right)z^{-p+1} \left( \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^n(f(z)) \right)' + \frac{\delta_2z^{-p+2}}{p(p-1)} \left( \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^n(f(z)) \right)'' < w(z).  \tag{3.5}
\]

Therefore \(f(z) \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{\eta,k}(\delta_1; w)\), and the proof of Theorem 1.1 is completed. \(\blacksquare\)

**Theorem 3.2.** Let \(\delta > 0, \rho > 0\), and \(f(z) \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{\eta,k}(\delta; \rho w + 1 - \rho)\). If \(\rho \leq \rho_0\), where

\[
\rho_0 = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{(p-1)}{\delta} \int_0^1 \frac{t((p-1)/\delta)-1}{1+t} \, dt \right)^{-1}. \tag{3.6}
\]

Then \(f(z) \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{\eta,k}(0; w)\). The bound \(\rho_0\) is sharp in the case \(w(z) = 1/(1 - z)\).

**Proof.** Let \(f(z) \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{\eta,k}(\delta; \rho w + 1 - \rho)\) with \(\delta > 0, \rho > 0\). Suppose that

\[
\phi(z) = \frac{z^{-p+1}}{p} \left( \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^n(f(z)) \right)'. \tag{3.7}
\]

Then we have

\[
\phi(z) + \frac{\delta z \phi'(z)}{(p-1)} = \frac{(1 - \delta)z^{-p+1}}{p} \left( \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^n(f(z)) \right)' + \frac{\delta z^{-p+2}}{p(p-1)} \left( \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^n(f(z)) \right)'' \prec \rho w(z) + 1 - \rho. \tag{3.8}
\]

Using Lemma 1.1, we have

\[
\phi(z) < \frac{\rho(p-1)}{\delta}z^{(-p-1)/\delta} \int_0^z u^{((p-1)/\delta)-1} w(u) \, du + 1 - \rho = (w \ast \varphi)(z),  \tag{3.9}
\]

where

\[
\varphi(z) = \rho(p-1)z^{(-p-1)/\delta} \int_0^z \frac{u^{((p-1)/\delta)-1}}{1-u} \, du + 1 - \rho.  \tag{3.10}
\]

If \(0 < \rho \leq \rho_0\) where \(\rho_0(>1)\) is given by (3.6), then it follows from (3.10) that

\[
\text{Re} \{\varphi(z)\} = \frac{\rho(p-1)}{\delta} \int_0^1 \frac{t((p-1)/\delta)-1}{1+t} \text{Re} \left\{ \frac{1}{1-tz} \right\} \, dt + 1 - \rho
\]

\[
> \frac{\rho(p-1)}{\delta} \int_0^1 \frac{t((p-1)/\delta)-1}{1+t} \, dt + 1 - \rho
\]

\[
\geq \frac{1}{2} (z \in U). \tag{3.11}
\]

Using the Herglotz representation for \(\varphi(z)\). Also, from Equations (3.7) and (3.9) we obtain

\[
\frac{z^{-p+1}}{p} \left( \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^n(f(z)) \right)' < (w \ast \varphi)(z) \prec w(z), \tag{3.12}
\]
Theorem 3.3. Let $w(z)$ is convex univalent in $U$. Therefore $f(z) \in T_{\alpha,\beta,p}(0;w)$. If $w(z) = 1/(1-z)$ and $f(z) \in A(p)$ defined by:

$$
\frac{z^{-p+1}}{p} \left( H_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{\eta,k}(f(z)) \right)' = \frac{\rho(p-1)z^{-(p-1)/\delta}}{u^{(p-1)/\delta}-1} \int_0^z \frac{u^{(p-1)/\delta}-1}{1-u} du + 1 - \rho,
$$

(3.13)

we can see that

$$
\frac{(1-\delta)z^{-p+1}}{p} \left( H_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{\eta,k}(f(z)) \right)' + \frac{\delta z^{-p+2}}{p(p-1)} \left( H_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{\eta,k}(f(z)) \right)'' = \rho w(z) + 1 - \rho.
$$

(3.14)

Thus $f(z) \in T_{\alpha,\beta,p}(\delta;\rho h + 1 - \rho)$. Also, for $\rho > \rho_0$, we have (at $z \to -1$)

$$
Re \left\{ \frac{z^{-p+1}}{p} \left( H_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{\eta,k}(f(z)) \right)' \right\} \to \frac{\rho(p-1)}{\delta} \int_0^1 \frac{t^{(p-1)/\delta}-1}{1+t} dt + 1 - \rho < \frac{1}{2},
$$

(3.15)

which obtains $f(z) \not\in T_{\alpha,\beta,p}(0;w)$. Therefore, the value $\rho_0$ cannot be increased when $w(z) = 1/(1-z)$.

Theorem 3.3. Let $f(z) \in T_{\alpha,\beta,p}(\delta;w), \phi(z) \in A(p)$, and

$$
Re \left\{ z^{-p}\phi(z) \right\} > \frac{1}{2} \quad (z \in U).
$$

(3.16)

Then $(f * \phi)(z) \in T_{\alpha,\beta,p}(\delta;w)$.

Proof. For $f(z) \in T_{\alpha,\beta,p}(\delta;w)$ and $\phi(z) \in A(p)$, we have

$$
\frac{(1-\delta)z^{-p+1}}{p} \left( H_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{\eta,k}(f(z)) \right)' + \frac{\delta z^{-p+2}}{p(p-1)} \left( H_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{\eta,k}(f(z)) \right)'' = \frac{(1-\delta)z^{-p+1}}{p} \left( H_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{\eta,k}(f(z)) \right)' + \frac{\delta z^{-p+2}}{p(p-1)} \left( H_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{\eta,k}(f(z)) \right)''
$$

(3.17)

where

$$
\varphi(z) = \frac{(1-\delta)z^{-p+1}}{p} \left( H_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{\eta,k}(f(z)) \right)' + \frac{\delta z^{-p+2}}{p(p-1)} \left( H_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{\eta,k}(f(z)) \right)''.
$$

(3.18)

Using (3.16), the function $z^{-p}\phi(z)$ has the Herglotz Representation

$$
z^{-p}\phi(z) = \int_{|y|=1} \frac{d\mu(y)}{(1-yz)^{1/2}} \quad (z \in U),
$$

(3.19)

where $\mu(y)$ is a probability measure defined on the circle $|y| = 1$ and

$$
\int_{|y|=1} d\mu(y) = 1.
$$

Since $w(z)$ is convex univalent in $U$, it follows from (3.17) to (3.19) that

$$
\frac{(1-\delta)z^{-p+1}}{p} \left( H_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{\eta,k}(f(z)) \right)' + \frac{\delta z^{-p+2}}{p(p-1)} \left( H_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{\eta,k}(f(z)) \right)'' = \int_{|y|=1} \varphi(yz)d\mu(y) < w(z).
$$

(3.20)
This shows that \((f * \phi)(z) \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{n,k}(\delta; w)\) and the theorem is proved.

**Theorem 3.4.** Let \(f(z) \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{n,k}(\delta; w)\), \(\phi(z) \in A(p)\), and
\[
z^{-p+1}f(z) \in R(\sigma) \quad (\sigma < 1, z \in U).
\] (3.21)

Then \((f * \phi)(z) \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{n,k}(\delta; w)\).

**Proof.** For \(f(z) \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{n,k}(\delta; w)\) and \(\phi(z) \in A(p)\) from (3.17), we have
\[
\frac{(1 - \delta)z^{-p+1}}{p} \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{n,k}((f * \phi)(z))'}{\delta z^{-p+2}} + \frac{\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{n,k}((f * \phi)(z))''}{p(p-1)}\right) = \left(\frac{z^{-p+1}\phi(z)}{(z^{-p+1}\phi(z))^*} + (z \varphi(z))\right) \quad (z \in U),
\] (3.22)

where \(\varphi(z)\) is defined as in (3.18). Since \(w(z)\) is convex univalent in \(U\), \(\varphi(z) < w(z)\), \(z^{-p+1}\phi(z) \in R(\sigma)\) and \(z \in S^*(\sigma)\), \((\sigma < 1)\).

It follows from (3.22) and Lemma 1.2 the desired result.

**Theorem 3.5.** Let \(\delta \geq 0\) and
\[
f_i(z) = z^p + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} a_{n,i}z^{n+p-1} \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{n,k}(\delta; w), \quad (i = 1, 2)
\] (3.23)

where
\[
w_i(z) = \gamma_i + (1 - \gamma_i) \frac{1 + z}{1 - z} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_i < 1, (i = 1, 2).
\] (3.24)

If \(f(z) \in A(p)\) is defined by
\[
\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{n,k}(f(z)) = \int_0^z \left(\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{n,k}(f_1(u))\right)' * \left(\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{n,k}(f_2(u))\right)' \, du.
\] (3.25)

Then \(f(z) \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{n,k}(\delta; w)\), where
\[
w(z) = \gamma + (1 - \gamma) \frac{1 + z}{1 - z},
\] (3.26)

where \(\gamma\) is given by
\[
\gamma = \begin{cases} 
p - 4p(1 - \gamma_1)(1 - \gamma_2) \left(1 - \frac{p-1}{\delta} \int_0^{(p-1)/\delta} \frac{t}{1+t} \, dt \right) & (\delta > 0) \\
p - 2p(1 - \gamma_1)(1 - \gamma_2) & (\delta = 0),
\end{cases}
\] (3.27)

the value of \(\gamma\) is the best possible.

**Proof.** For the case when \(\delta > 0\), by putting
\[
G_i(z) = \frac{(1 - \delta)z^{-p+1}}{p} \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{n,k}(f_i(z))'}{\delta z^{-p+2}} + \frac{\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{n,k}(f_i(z))''}{p(p-1)}\right) = \left(\frac{z^{-p+1}\phi(z)}{(z^{-p+1}\phi(z))^*} + (z \varphi(z))\right) \quad (i = 1, 2),
\] (3.28)

for \(f_i(z), (i = 1, 2)\) given by (3.23), we find that
\[
G_i(z) = 1 + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} b_{n,i}z^{n-1} < \gamma_i + (1 - \gamma_i) \frac{1 + z}{1 - z} \quad (i = 1, 2),
\]
and
\[
\left(\mathcal{H}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{n,k}(f_i(z))\right)' = \frac{p(p-1)z^{-(p-1)(1-\delta)/\delta}}{\delta} \int_0^z \frac{u^{(p-1)/\delta} - 1}{G_i(u)} \, du \quad (i = 1, 2).
\]
Now, if \( f(z) \in \mathcal{A}(p) \) is defined by (3.25), we find from (3.30) that
\[
\left( \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{\eta,k}(f(z)) \right)' = \left( \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{\eta,k}(f_1(z)) \right)' \ast \left( \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{\eta,k}(f_2(z)) \right)'
\]
\[
= \left( \frac{p(p-1)z^{p-1}}{\delta} \int_0^1 t^{((p-1)\delta)-1}G_1(tz)dt \right) \ast \left( \frac{p(p-1)z^{p-1}}{\delta} \int_1^z t^{((p-1)\delta)-1}G_2(tz)dt \right)
\]
\[
= \left( \frac{p(p-1)z^{p-1}}{\delta} \int_1^z t^{((p-1)\delta)-1}G(tz)dt \right)
\]
(3.29)
where
\[
G(z) = \frac{p(p-1)}{\delta} \int_0^1 u^{((p-1)\delta)-1}(G_1 \ast G_2)(tz)dt.
\]
(3.30)
Also, by using (3.29) and the Herglotz theorem, we see that
\[
\text{Re} \left\{ \left( \frac{G_1(z) - \gamma_1}{1 - \gamma_1} \right) \ast \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{G_2(z) - \gamma_2}{2(1 - \gamma_2)} \right) \right\} > 0 \quad (z \in U),
\]
(3.31)
which gives
\[
\text{Re} \{ (G_1 \ast G_2)(z) \} \geq \gamma_0 = 1 - 2(1 - \gamma_1)(1 - \gamma_2) \quad (z \in U).
\]
(3.32)
According to Lemma 1.3, we have
\[
\text{Re} \{ (G_1 \ast G_2)(z) \} \geq \gamma_0 + (1 - \gamma_0) \left( \frac{1 - |z|}{1 + |z|} \right) \quad (z \in U).
\]
(3.33)
Now it follows from (3.31) to (3.35) that
\[
\text{Re} \left\{ \left( \frac{(1 - \delta)z^{-p+1}}{p} \right) \left( \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{\eta,k}(f(z)) \right)' + \frac{\delta z^{-p+2}}{p(p-1)} \left( \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{\eta,k}(f(z)) \right)'' \right\} = \text{Re}\{G(z)\}
\]
\[
= \frac{p(p-1)}{\delta} \int_0^1 t^{((p-1)\delta)-1} \text{Re}\{(G_1 \ast G_2)(tz)\} dt
\]
\[
\geq \frac{p(p-1)}{\delta} \int_0^1 t^{((p-1)\delta)-1} \left( \beta_0 + (1 - \beta_0) \frac{1 - tz}{1 + tz} \right) dt
\]
\[
> p\gamma_0 + \frac{p(p-1)(1 - \gamma_0)}{\delta} \int_0^1 t^{((p-1)\delta)-1} \frac{1 - t}{1 + t} dt
\]
\[
= p - 4p(1 - \gamma_1)(1 - \gamma_2) \left( 1 - \frac{p-1}{\delta} \int_0^1 t^{((p-1)\delta)-1} \frac{1}{1 + t} dt \right)
\]
\[
= \gamma \quad (z \in U).
\]
(3.34)
which proves that \( f(z) \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{\eta,k}(\delta; w) \) for the function \( w(z) \) given by (3.26). In order to show that the bound \( \gamma \) is sharp, we take the functions \( f_i(z) \in \mathcal{A}(p) \) \( (i = 1, 2) \) defined by
\[
\left( \mathcal{H}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{\eta,k}(f_i(z)) \right)' = \frac{p(p-1)z^{-(p-1)(1-\delta)/\delta}}{\delta}
\]
\[
\times \int_0^z u^{((p-1)\delta)-1} \left( \gamma_i + (1 - \gamma_i) \frac{1 + u}{1 - u} \right) du,
\]
(3.35)
for $i = 1, 2$ and, we have
\[
G_i(z) = \frac{(1 - \delta)z^{-p+1}}{p} \left( H_{\eta,k}^{\alpha,\beta,p}(f_i(z)) \right)' + \frac{\delta z^{-p+2}}{p(p-1)} \left( H_{\eta,k}^{\alpha,\beta,p}(f_i(z)) \right)''
\]
\[
= \gamma_i + (1 - \gamma_i) \frac{1 + z}{1 - z} \quad (i = 1, 2),
\]
and
\[
(G_1 * G_2)(z) = 1 + 4(1 - \gamma_1)(1 - \gamma_2) \frac{z}{1 - z}.
\]
Hence, for $f(z) \in A(p)$ given by (3.25), we obtain
\[
\frac{(1 - \delta)z^{-p+1}}{p} \left( H_{\eta,k}^{\alpha,\beta,p}(f(z)) \right)' + \frac{\delta z^{-p+2}}{p(p-1)} \left( H_{\eta,k}^{\alpha,\beta,p}(f(z)) \right)'' = \frac{p(p-1)}{\delta} \int_0^1 t^{(p-1)/\delta - 1} \left( 1 + 4(1 - \gamma_1)(1 - \gamma_2) \frac{t z}{1 - t z} \right) dt \rightarrow \gamma \quad \text{as} \quad z \rightarrow -1.
\]

The proof is simple in the case of $\delta = 0$, therefore, we omit the details involved.

Conclusions

we introduced the class $T_{\eta,k}^{\alpha,\beta,p}(\delta; w)$ of analytic functions associated with Mittag-Leffler function. Conclusion property of the class $T_{\eta,k}^{\alpha,\beta,p}(\delta; w)$ is obtained, sufficient condition of the class $T_{\eta,k}^{\alpha,\beta,p}(\delta; w)$ is also derived. Furthermore, several properties of functions belonging to this class are derived.
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