# International Journal Of Mathematical Sciences And Engineering Applications 

## (IJMSEA)



International J. of Math. Sci. \& Engg. Appls. (IJMSEA)
ISSN 0973-9424, Vol. 10 No. III (December, 2016), pp. 213-224

# FIXED POINT THEOREMS IN NORMAL CONE METRIC SPACE 

R. KRISHNAKUMAR ${ }^{1}$ AND D. DHAMODHARAN ${ }^{2}$<br>${ }^{1}$ Department of Mathematics, Urumu Dhanalakshmi College, Tiruchirappalli-620019, India<br>${ }^{2}$ Department of Mathematics, Jamal Mohamed College (Autonomous), Tiruchirappalli-620020, India


#### Abstract

In this paper, we proved some fixed point theorems in complete normal cone metric spaces, which are the generalization of some existing results in the literature.


## 1. Introduction

There exist a number of generalizations of metric spaces, and one of them is the cone metric spaces. The notion of cone metric space is initiated by Huang and Zhang [2] and also they discussed some properties of the convergence of sequences and proved the fixed point theorems of a contraction mappings cone metric spaces.

Many authors have studied the existence and uniqueness of strict fixed points for single valued mappings and multivalued mappings in metric spaces $[1,5,6,10]$. In this paper discuss existence and unique fixed point in complete normal cone metric spaces, which are the generalization of some existing Contraction principle.
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Definition 1.1 : A subset $P$ of $E$ is called a cone if and only if:

1. $P$ is closed, nonempty and $P \neq 0$
2. $a x+b y \in P$ for all $x, y \in P$ and nonnegative real numbers $a, b$
3. $P \cap P^{-}=\{0\}$.

Given a cone $P \subset E$, we define a partial ordering $\leq$ with respect to P by $x \leq y$ if and only if $y-x \in P$. We will write $x<y$ to indicate that $x \leq y$ but $x \neq y$, while $x, y$ will stand for $y-x \in \operatorname{int} P$, where intP denotes the interior of $P$. The cone $P$ is called normal if there is a number $K>0$ such that $0 \leq x \leq y$ implies $\|x\| \leq K\|y\|$ for all $x, y \in E$. The least positive number satisfying the above is called the normal constant. The cone $P$ is called regular if every increasing sequence which is bounded from above is convergent. That is, if $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ is sequence such that $x_{1} \leq x_{2} \leq \cdots \leq x_{n} \cdots \leq y$ for some $y \in E$, then there is $x \in E$ such that $\left\|x_{n}-x\right\| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow 0$. Equivalently the cone $P$ is regular if and only if every decreasing sequence which is bounded from below is convergent. It is well known that a regular cone is a normal cone. Suppose $E$ is a Banach space, $P$ is a cone in $E$ with $\operatorname{int} P \neq 0$ and $\leq$ is partial ordering with respect to $P$.
Example 1: Let $K>1$ be given. Consider the real vector space with

$$
E=\left\{a x+b: a, b \in \mathbb{R} ; x \in\left[1-\frac{1}{k}, 1\right]\right\}
$$

with supremum norm and the cone

$$
P=\{a x+b: a \geq 0, b \leq 0\}
$$

in $E$. The cone $P$ is regular and so normal.
Definition 1.2: Suppose that $E$ is a real Banach space, then $P$ is a cone in $E$ with $\operatorname{int} P \neq \emptyset$, and $\leq$ is partial ordering with respect to $P$. Let $X$ be a nonempty set, a function $d: X \times X \rightarrow E$ is called a cone metric on $X$ if it satisfies the following conditions with

1. $d(x, y) \geq 0$, and $d(x, y)=0$ if and only if $x=y \forall x, y \in X$,
2. $d(x, y)=d(y, x), \forall x, y \in X$,
3. $d(x, y) \leq d(x, z)+d(z, y), \forall x, y, z \in X$,

Then $(X, d)$ is called a cone metric space ( $C M S$ ).
Example 2: Let $E=\mathbb{R}^{2}$

$$
P=\{(x, y): x, y \geq 0\}
$$

$X=\mathbb{R}$ and $d: X \times X \rightarrow E$ such that

$$
d(x, y)=(|x-y|, \alpha|x-y|)
$$

where $\alpha \geq 0$ is a constant. Then $(X, d)$ is a cone metric space.
Definition 1.3: Let $(X, d)$ be a CMS and $\left\{x_{n}\right\}_{n \geq 0}$ be a sequence in $X$. Then $\left\{x_{n}\right\}_{n \geq 0}$ converges to $x$ in $X$ whenever for every $c \in E$ with $0 \ll c$, there is a natural number $N \in N$ such that $d\left(x_{n}, x\right) \ll c$ for all $n \geq N$. It is denoted by $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} x_{n}=x$ or $x_{n} \rightarrow x$.

Definition 1.4: Let $(X, d)$ be a CMS and $\left\{x_{n}\right\}_{n \geq 0}$ be a sequence in $X .\left\{x_{n}\right\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a Cauchy sequence whenever for every $c \in E$ with $0 \ll c$, there is a natural number $N \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $d\left(x_{n}, x_{m}\right) \ll c$ for all $n, m \geq N$.
Lemma 1.5 : Let $(X, d)$ be a cone metric space, $P$ be a normal cone with normal constant $K$. Let $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ be a sequence in $X$. If $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ converges to $x$ and $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ converges to $y$, then $x=y$. That is the limit of $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ is unique.
Definition 1.6 : Let $(X, d)$ be a cone metric space, if every Cauchy sequence is convergent in $X$, then $X$ is called a complete cone metric space.

Lemma 1.7: Let $(X, d)$ be a cone metric space, $P$ be a normal cone with normal constant $K$. Let $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ be a sequence in $X$. Then $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ is a Cauchy sequence if and only if $d\left(x_{n}, x_{m}\right) \rightarrow 0(n, m \rightarrow \infty)$.

## 2. Main Result

Theorem 2.1 : Let $(X, d)$ be a complete cone metric space and $P$ be a normal cone with normal constant $K$. Suppose the mapping $T: X \rightarrow X$ satisfies the following conditions:

$$
\begin{equation*}
d(T x, T y) \leq\left(\frac{d(x, T x)+d(y, T y)}{d(x, T x)+d(y, T y)+l}\right) d(x, y) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $x, y \in X$, where $l \geq 1$. Then
(i) $T$ has unique fixed point in $X$.
(ii) $T^{n} x^{\prime}$ converges to a fixed point, for all $x^{\prime} \in X$.

Proof : (i) Let $x_{0} \in X$ be arbitrary and choose a sequence $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ such that $x_{n+1}=T x_{n}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
d\left(x_{n+1}, x_{n}\right) & =d\left(T x_{n}, T x_{n-1}\right) \\
& \leq\left(\frac{d\left(x_{n}, T x_{n}\right)+d\left(x_{n-1}, T x_{n-1}\right)}{d\left(x_{n}, T x_{n}\right)+d\left(x_{n-1}, T x_{n-1}\right)+l}\right) d\left(x_{n}, x_{n-1}\right) \\
& \leq\left(\frac{d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+1}\right)+d\left(x_{n-1}, x_{n}\right)}{d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+1}\right)+d\left(x_{n-1}, x_{n}\right)+l}\right) d\left(x_{n}, x_{n-1}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Take

$$
\lambda_{n}=\frac{d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+1}\right)+d\left(x_{n-1}, x_{n}\right)}{d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+1}\right)+d\left(x_{n-1}, x_{n}\right)+l}
$$

we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
d\left(x_{n+1}, x_{n}\right) & \leq \lambda_{n} d\left(x_{n}, x_{n-1}\right) \\
& \leq\left(\lambda_{n} \lambda_{n-1}\right) d\left(x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}\right) \\
& \vdots \\
& \leq\left(\lambda_{n} \lambda_{n-1} \cdots \lambda_{1}\right) d\left(x_{1}, x_{0}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Observe that $\left(\lambda_{n}\right)$ is non increasing, with positive terms. So, $\lambda_{1} \ldots \lambda_{n} \leq \lambda_{1}^{n}$ and $\lambda_{1}^{n} \rightarrow 0$. It follows that

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left(\lambda_{1} \lambda_{2} \cdots \lambda_{n}\right)=0
$$

Thus, it is verified that

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} d\left(x_{n+1}, x_{n}\right)=0
$$

Now for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m>n$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
d\left(x_{m}, x_{n}\right) & \leq d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+1}\right)+d\left(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}\right)+\cdots+d\left(x_{m-1}, x_{m}\right) \\
& \leq\left[\left(\lambda_{n} \lambda_{n-1} \cdots \lambda_{1}\right)+\left(\lambda_{n+1} \lambda_{n} \cdots \lambda_{1}\right)+\cdots+\left(\lambda_{m-1} \lambda_{m-2} \cdots \lambda_{1}\right)\right] d\left(x_{1}, x_{0}\right) \\
& =\sum_{k=n}^{m-1}\left(\lambda_{k} \lambda_{k-1} \cdots \lambda_{1}\right) d\left(x_{1}, x_{0}\right) \\
\left\|d\left(x_{m}, x_{n}\right)\right\| & \leq K\left\|\sum_{k=n}^{m-1}\left(\lambda_{k} \lambda_{k-1} \cdots \lambda_{1}\right) d\left(x_{1}, x_{0}\right)\right\| \\
\left\|d\left(x_{m}, x_{n}\right)\right\| & \leq K \sum_{k=n}^{m-1}\left(\lambda_{k} \lambda_{k-1} \cdots \lambda_{1}\right)\left\|d\left(x_{1}, x_{0}\right)\right\| \\
\left\|d\left(x_{m}, x_{n}\right)\right\| & \leq K \sum_{k=n}^{m-1} a_{k}\left\|d\left(x_{1}, x_{0}\right)\right\|
\end{aligned}
$$

where $a_{k}=\left(\lambda_{k} \lambda_{k-1} \cdots \lambda_{1}\right)$ and $K$ is normal constant of $P$.
Now $\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_{k+1}}{a_{k}}<1$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_{k}$ is finite, and $\sum_{k=n}^{m-1}\left(\lambda_{k} \lambda_{k-1} \cdots \lambda_{1}\right) \rightarrow 0$, as $m, n \rightarrow \infty$.
Hence $\left\{a_{k}\right\}$ is convergent by D'Alembert's ratio test, Therefore $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. There is $x^{\prime} \in X$ such that $x_{n} \rightarrow x^{\prime}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
d\left(T x^{\prime}, x^{\prime}\right) & \leq d\left(T x^{\prime}, T x_{n}\right)+d\left(T x_{n}, x^{\prime}\right) \\
& \leq\left(\frac{d\left(x^{\prime}, T x^{\prime}\right)+d\left(x_{n}, T x_{n}\right)}{d\left(x^{\prime}, T x^{\prime}\right)+d\left(x_{n}, T x_{n}\right)+l}\right) d\left(x_{n}, x^{\prime}\right)+d\left(T x_{n}, x^{\prime}\right) \\
& \leq\left(\frac{d\left(x^{\prime}, T x^{\prime}\right)+d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+1}\right)}{d\left(x^{\prime}, T x^{\prime}\right)+d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+1}\right)+l}\right) d\left(x_{n}, x^{\prime}\right)+d\left(x_{n+1}, x^{\prime}\right) \\
d\left(T x^{\prime}, x^{\prime}\right) & \leq 0 \quad \text { as } \quad n \rightarrow \infty
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore $\left\|d\left(x^{\prime}, T x^{\prime}\right)\right\|=0$. Thus, $T x^{\prime}=x^{\prime}$.

## Uniqueness

Suppose $x^{\prime}$ and $y^{\prime}$ are two fixed points of $T$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
d\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) & =d\left(T x^{\prime}, T y^{\prime}\right) \\
& \leq\left(\frac{d\left(x^{\prime}, T x^{\prime}\right)+d\left(y^{\prime}, T y^{\prime}\right)}{d\left(x^{\prime}, T x^{\prime}\right)+d\left(y^{\prime}, T y^{\prime}\right)+l}\right) d\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) \\
& \leq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore $\left\|d\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right)\right\|=0$. Thus $x^{\prime}=y^{\prime}$.
Hence $x^{\prime}$ is an unique fixed point of $T$.
(ii) Now

$$
d\left(T^{n} x^{\prime}, x^{\prime}\right)=d\left(T^{n-1}\left(T x^{\prime}\right), x^{\prime}\right)=d\left(T^{n-1} x^{\prime}, x^{\prime}\right)=d\left(T^{n-2}\left(T x^{\prime}\right), x^{\prime}\right) \cdots=d\left(T x^{\prime}, x^{\prime}\right)=0
$$

Hence $T^{n} x^{\prime}$ converges to a fixed point, for all $x^{\prime} \in X$.
Corollary 2.2 : Let $(X, d)$ be a complete cone metric space and $P$ be a normal cone with normal constant $K$. Suppose the mapping $T: X \rightarrow X$ satisfies the following conditions:

$$
\begin{equation*}
d(T x, T y) \leq\left(\frac{d(x, T x)+d(y, T y)}{d(x, T x)+d(y, T y)+1}\right) d(x, y) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Then
(i) $T$ has unique fixed point in $X$.
(ii) $T^{n} x^{\prime}$ converges to a fixed point, for all $x^{\prime} \in X$.

Proof: The proof of the corollary immediate by taking $l=1$ in the above theorem.
Theorem 2.3: Let $(X, d)$ be a complete metric space and let $T$ be a mapping from $X$ into itself. Suppose that $T$ satisfies the following condition:

$$
\begin{equation*}
d(T x, T y) \leq\left(\frac{d(y, T y)}{d(x, T x)+d(y, T y)+l}\right) d(x, y) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $x, y \in X$, where $l \geq 1$. Then
(i) $T$ has unique fixed point in $X$.
(ii) $T^{n} x^{\prime}$ converges to a fixed point, for all $x^{\prime} \in X$.

Proof: (i) Let $x_{0} \in X$ be arbitrary and choose a sequence $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ such that $x_{n+1}=T x_{n}$. We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
d\left(x_{n+1}, x_{n}\right) & =d\left(T x_{n}, T x_{n-1}\right) \\
& \leq\left(\frac{d\left(x_{n-1}, T x_{n-1}\right)}{d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+1}\right)+d\left(x_{n-1}, x_{n}\right)+l}\right) d\left(x_{n}, x_{n-1}\right) \\
& \leq\left(\frac{d\left(x_{n-1}, x_{n}\right)}{d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+1}\right)+d\left(x_{n-1}, x_{n}\right)+l}\right) d\left(x_{n}, x_{n-1}\right) \\
& \leq\left(\frac{d\left(x_{n-1}, x_{n}\right)}{d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+1}\right)+d\left(x_{n-1}, x_{n}\right)+l}\right) d\left(x_{n}, x_{n-1}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Take

$$
\lambda_{n}=\frac{d\left(x_{n-1}, x_{n}\right)}{d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+1}\right)+d\left(x_{n-1}, x_{n}\right)+l}
$$

we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
d\left(x_{n+1}, x_{n}\right) & \leq \lambda_{n} d\left(x_{n}, x_{n-1}\right) \\
& \leq\left(\lambda_{n} \lambda_{n-1}\right) d\left(x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}\right) \\
& \vdots \\
& \leq\left(\lambda_{n} \lambda_{n-1} \cdots \lambda_{1}\right) d\left(x_{1}, x_{0}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Observe that $\left\{\lambda_{n}\right\}$ is non increasing, with positive terms.
So, $\lambda_{1} \ldots \lambda_{n} \leq \lambda_{1}^{n}$ and $\lambda_{1}^{n} \rightarrow 0$. It follows that

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left(\lambda_{1} \lambda_{2} \cdots \lambda_{n}\right)=0
$$

Thus, it is verified that

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} d\left(x_{n+1}, x_{n}\right)=0 .
$$

Now for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
d\left(x_{m}, x_{n}\right) & \leq d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+1}\right)+d\left(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}\right)+\cdots+d\left(x_{m-1}, x_{m}\right) \\
& \leq\left[\left(\lambda_{n} \lambda_{n-1} \cdots \lambda_{1}\right)+\left(\lambda_{n+1} \lambda_{n} \cdots \lambda_{1}\right)+\cdots+\left(\lambda_{m-1} \lambda_{m-2} \cdots \lambda_{1}\right)\right] d\left(x_{1}, x_{0}\right) \\
& =\sum_{k=n}^{m-1}\left(\lambda_{k} \lambda_{k-1} \cdots \lambda_{1}\right) d\left(x_{1}, x_{0}\right) \\
\left\|d\left(x_{m}, x_{n}\right)\right\| & \leq K\left\|\sum_{k=n}^{m-1}\left(\lambda_{k} \lambda_{k-1} \cdots \lambda_{1}\right) d\left(x_{1}, x_{0}\right)\right\| \\
\left\|d\left(x_{m}, x_{n}\right)\right\| & \leq K \sum_{k=n}^{m-1} a_{k}\left\|d\left(x_{1}, x_{0}\right)\right\|
\end{aligned}
$$

where $a_{k}=\lambda_{k} \lambda_{k-1} \cdots \lambda_{1}$ and $K$ is normal constant of $P$.
Now $\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_{k+1}}{a_{k}}<1$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_{k}$ is finite, and $\sum_{k=n}^{m-1}\left(\lambda_{k} \lambda_{k-1} \cdots \lambda_{1}\right) \rightarrow 0$, as $m, \rightarrow \infty$.
Hence $\left\{a_{k}\right\}$ is convergent by D'Alembert's ratio test, Therefore $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ is a Cauchy se-
quence. There is $x^{\prime} \in X$ such that $x_{n} \rightarrow x^{\prime}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
d\left(T x^{\prime}, x^{\prime}\right) & \leq d\left(T x^{\prime}, T x_{n}\right)+d\left(T x_{n}, x^{\prime}\right) \\
& \leq\left(\frac{d\left(x_{n}, T x_{n}\right)}{d\left(x^{\prime}, T x^{\prime}\right)+d\left(x_{n}, T x_{n}\right)+l}\right) d\left(x_{n}, x^{\prime}\right)+d\left(T x_{n}, x^{\prime}\right) \\
& \leq\left(\frac{d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+1}\right)}{d\left(x^{\prime}, T x^{\prime}\right)+d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+1}\right)+l}\right) d\left(x_{n}, x^{\prime}\right)+d\left(x_{n+1}, x^{\prime}\right) \\
d\left(T x^{\prime}, x^{\prime}\right) & \leq 0 \quad \text { as } \quad n \rightarrow \infty
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore $\left\|d\left(x^{\prime}, T x^{\prime}\right)\right\|=0$. Thus, $T x^{\prime}=x^{\prime}$.

## Uniqueness

Suppose $x^{\prime}$ and $y^{\prime}$ are two fixed points of $T$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
d\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) & =d\left(T x^{\prime}, T y^{\prime}\right) \\
& \leq\left(\frac{d\left(y^{\prime}, T y^{\prime}\right)}{d\left(x^{\prime}, T x^{\prime}\right)+d\left(y^{\prime}, T y^{\prime}\right)+l}\right) d\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) \\
& \leq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore $\left\|d\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right)\right\|=0$. Thus $x^{\prime}=y^{\prime}$.
Hence $x^{\prime}$ is an unique fixed point of $T$.
(ii) Now

$$
d\left(T^{n} x^{\prime}, x^{\prime}\right)=d\left(T^{n-1}\left(T x^{\prime}\right), x^{\prime}\right)=d\left(T^{n-1} x^{\prime}, x^{\prime}\right)=d\left(T^{n-2}\left(T x^{\prime}\right), x^{\prime}\right) \cdots=d\left(T x^{\prime}, x^{\prime}\right)=0
$$

Hence $T^{n} x^{\prime}$ converges to a fixed point, for all $x^{\prime} \in X$.
Corolary 2.4: Let $(X, d)$ be a complete metric space and let $T$ be a mapping from $X$ into itself. Suppose that $T$ satisfies the following condition:

$$
\begin{equation*}
d(T x, T y) \leq\left(\frac{d(y, T y)}{d(x, T x)+d(y, T y)+1}\right) d(x, y) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Then
(i) $T$ has unique fixed point in $X$.
(ii) $T^{n} x^{\prime}$ converges to a fixed point, for all $x^{\prime} \in X$.

Proof: The proof of the corollary immediate by taking $l=1$ in the above theorem.
Theorem 2.5 : Let $(X, d)$ be a complete cone metric space and $P$ be a normal cone with normal constant $K$. Suppose the mapping $T: X \rightarrow X$ satisfies the following
conditions:

$$
\begin{equation*}
d(T x, T y) \leq\left(\frac{d(x, T y)+d(y, T x)}{d(x, T x)+d(y, T y)+l}\right)(d(x, T x)+d(y, T y)) \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $x, y \in X$, where $l \geq 1$. Then
(i) $T$ has unique fixed point in $X$.
(ii) $T^{n} x^{\prime}$ converges to a fixed point, for all $x^{\prime} \in X$.

Proof:(i) Let $x_{0} \in X$ be arbitrary and choose a sequence $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ such that $x_{n+1}=T x_{n}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+1}\right) & =d\left(T x_{n}, T x_{n-1}\right) \\
& \leq\left(\frac{d\left(x_{n}, T x_{n-1}\right)+d\left(x_{n-1}, T x_{n}\right)}{d\left(x_{n}, T x_{n}\right)+d\left(x_{n-1}, T x_{n-1}\right)+l}\right)\left(d\left(x_{n}, T x_{n}\right)+d\left(x_{n-1}, T x_{n-1}\right)\right) \\
& \leq\left(\frac{d\left(x_{n}, x_{n}\right)+d\left(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1}\right)}{d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+1}\right)+d\left(x_{n-1}, x_{n}\right)+l}\right)\left(d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+1}\right)+d\left(x_{n}, x_{n-1}\right)\right) \\
& \leq\left(\frac{d\left(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1}\right)}{d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+1}\right)+d\left(x_{n-1}, x_{n}\right)+l}\right)\left(d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+1}\right)+d\left(x_{n}, x_{n-1}\right)\right) \\
& \leq\left(\frac{d\left(x_{n-1}, x_{n}\right)+d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+1}\right)}{d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+1}\right)+d\left(x_{n-1}, x_{n}\right)+l}\right)\left(d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+1}\right)+d\left(x_{n}, x_{n-1}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Take

$$
\lambda_{n}=\frac{d\left(x_{n-1}, x_{n}\right)+d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+1}\right)}{d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+1}\right)+d\left(x_{n-1}, x_{n}\right)+l},
$$

we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
d\left(x_{n+1}, x_{n}\right) & \leq \lambda_{n}\left(d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+1}\right)+d\left(x_{n}, x_{n-1}\right)\right) \\
\left(1-\lambda_{n}\right) d\left(x_{n+1}, x_{n}\right) & \leq \lambda_{n} d\left(x_{n}, x_{n-1}\right) \\
d\left(x_{n+1}, x_{n}\right) & \leq \frac{\lambda_{n}}{\left(1-\lambda_{n}\right)} d\left(x_{n}, x_{n-1}\right) \\
& \leq \frac{\lambda_{n} \lambda_{n-1}}{\left(1-\lambda_{n}\right)\left(1-\lambda_{n-1}\right)} d\left(x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}\right) \\
& \vdots \\
& \leq \frac{\lambda_{n} \lambda_{n-1} \cdots \lambda_{1}}{\left(1-\lambda_{n}\right)\left(1-\lambda_{n-1}\right) \cdots\left(1-\lambda_{1}\right)} d\left(x_{1}, x_{0}\right) . \\
& \leq \gamma_{n} d\left(x_{1}, x_{0}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\gamma_{n}=\frac{\lambda_{n} \lambda_{n-1} \cdots \lambda_{1}}{\left(1-\lambda_{n}\right)\left(1-\lambda_{n-1}\right) \cdots\left(1-\lambda_{1}\right)}
$$

Observe that $\left\{\lambda_{n}\right\}$ is non increasing, with positive terms. So, $\lambda_{1} \ldots \lambda_{n} \leq \lambda_{1}^{n}$ and $\lambda_{1}^{n} \rightarrow 0$. It follows that

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left(\lambda_{1} \lambda_{2} \cdots \lambda_{n}\right)=0
$$

Therefore

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{n}=0
$$

Thus, it is verified that

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} d\left(x_{n+1}, x_{n}\right)=0
$$

Now for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
d\left(x_{m}, x_{n}\right) & \leq d\left(x_{n}, x_{n+1}\right)+d\left(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}\right)+\cdots+d\left(x_{m-1}, x_{m}\right) \\
& \leq\left[\gamma_{n}+\gamma_{n+1}+\cdots+\gamma_{m-1}\right] d\left(x_{1}, x_{0}\right) \\
& \leq \sum_{k=n}^{m-1} \gamma_{k} d\left(x_{1}, x_{0}\right) \\
\left\|d\left(x_{m}, x_{n}\right)\right\| & \leq K\left\|\sum_{k=n}^{m-1} \gamma_{k} d\left(x_{1}, x_{0}\right)\right\| \\
\left\|d\left(x_{m}, x_{n}\right)\right\| & \leq K \sum_{k=n}^{m-1} \gamma_{k}\left\|d\left(x_{1}, x_{0}\right)\right\|,
\end{aligned}
$$

where $a_{k}=\gamma_{k}$ and $K$ is normal constant of $P$.
Now $\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_{k+1}}{a_{k}}<0$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_{k}$ is finite. Since $\sum_{k=n}^{m-1} \gamma_{k}$ is convergent by D'Alembert's ratio test, as $m \rightarrow \infty$.
Therefore $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. There is $x^{\prime} \in X$ such that $x_{n} \rightarrow x^{\prime}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
d\left(T x^{\prime}, x^{\prime}\right) & \leq d\left(T x^{\prime}, T x_{n}\right)+d\left(T x_{n}, x^{\prime}\right) \\
& \leq\left(\frac{d\left(x^{\prime}, T x_{n}\right)+d\left(x_{n}, T x^{\prime}\right)}{d\left(x^{\prime}, T x_{n}\right)+d\left(x_{n}, T x^{\prime}\right)+l}\right)\left(d\left(x_{n}, x^{\prime}\right)+d\left(T x_{n}, x^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
& \leq\left(\frac{d\left(x^{\prime}, x_{n+1}\right)+d\left(x_{n}, T x^{\prime}\right)}{d\left(x^{\prime}, x_{n+1}\right)+d\left(x_{n}, T x^{\prime}\right)+l}\right)\left(d\left(x_{n}, x^{\prime}\right)+d\left(x_{n+1}, x^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
d\left(T x^{\prime}, x^{\prime}\right) & \leq 0 \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore $\left\|d\left(x^{\prime}, T x^{\prime}\right)\right\|=0$. Thus, $T x^{\prime}=x^{\prime}$.

## Uniqueness

Suppose $x^{\prime}$ and $y^{\prime}$ are two fixed points of $T$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
d\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) & =d\left(T x^{\prime}, T y^{\prime}\right) \\
& \leq\left(\frac{d\left(x^{\prime}, T y^{\prime}\right)+d\left(y^{\prime}, T x^{\prime}\right)}{d\left(x^{\prime}, T x^{\prime}\right)+d\left(y^{\prime}, T y^{\prime}\right)+l}\right)\left(d\left(x^{\prime}, T x^{\prime}\right)+d\left(y^{\prime}, T y^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
& \leq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore $\left\|d\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right)\right\|=0$. Thus $x^{\prime}=y^{\prime}$.
Hence $x^{\prime}$ is an unique fixed point of $T$.
(ii) Now

$$
d\left(T^{n} x^{\prime}, x^{\prime}\right)=d\left(T^{n-1}\left(T x^{\prime}\right), x^{\prime}\right)=d\left(T^{n-1} x^{\prime}, x^{\prime}\right)=d\left(T^{n-2}\left(T x^{\prime}\right), x^{\prime}\right) \cdots=d\left(T x^{\prime}, x^{\prime}\right)=0
$$

Hence $T^{n} x^{\prime}$ converges to a fixed point, for all $x^{\prime} \in X$.
Corollary 2.6 : Let $(X, d)$ be a complete cone metric space and $P$ be a normal cone with normal constant $K$. Suppose the mapping $T: X \rightarrow X$ satisfies the following conditions:

$$
\begin{equation*}
d(T x, T y) \leq\left(\frac{d(x, T y)+d(y, T x)}{d(x, T x)+d(y, T y)+1}\right)(d(x, T x)+d(y, T y)) \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $x, y \in X$. Then
(i) $T$ has unique fixed point in $X$.
(ii) $T^{n} x^{\prime}$ converges to a fixed point, for all $x^{\prime} \in X$.

Proof: The proof of the corollary immediate by taking $l=1$ in the above theorem.
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