

## FIXED POINT ON CONVEX $b$ -METRIC SPACE VIA ADMISSIBLE MAPPINGS

ERDAL KARAPINAR<sup>1,2,3</sup>, ANDREEA FULGA<sup>4</sup>

**ABSTRACT.** In this manuscript, we define a convex admissible mapping. Using this notion, we consider specific contraction involving rational terms via convex admissible mapping. We investigate the necessary and sufficient requirement to guarantee a fixed point in the framework of convex  $b$ -metric spaces.

**Keywords:** convex structure, fixed point theorems,  $b$ -metric.

**AMS Subject Classification:** 47H09, 47H10, 54H25.

### 1. INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARIES

Fixed point notions appeared in the papers that provided certain solutions to the particular differential equations at the end. Banach [8] abstracted the first independent metric fixed point theory. Since then, the connection between the metric fixed point theory and applied mathematics has been advanced, see e.g. [1, 4]. The concept of  $b$ -metric can be considered the most valuable generalization of the metric put forward to date. The idea of  $b$ -metric appeared in [12], first, in 1974. This notion was also announced as a quasi-metric [9, 10, 11]. After the papers of Czerwik [15, 16] and Bakhtin [7],  $b$ -metric began to attract the attention of researchers [2, 5, 6, 3, 17, 19, 20, 14, 18, 21]. Roughly speaking, although  $b$ -metric axioms are very similar to the metric, the topology produced by  $b$ -metric has severe structural differences. For instance,  $b$ -metric is not need to be continuous.

On the other hand, metric spaces endowed with a convex structure is one of the interesting research topic, see, e.g. [23]. Very recently, in [13], the authors considered convex  $b$ -metric spaces and proved a certain fixed point theorem in this framework.

In this paper, we first consider to define admissible mapping for the set endowed with a convex structure. We get new type contractions by employing this notion to contractions involving rational terms. We prove the existence of a fixed point of such mappings in the context of convex  $b$ -metric spaces.

We start by recalling the following basic definition. Let  $U$  be a non empty set, a number  $s \geq 0$  and  $m : U \times U \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  with the following axioms:

- (m<sub>1</sub>)  $m(v, o) = 0 \Leftrightarrow v = o$ ;
- (m<sub>2</sub>)  $m(v, o) = m(o, v)$ ;
- (m<sub>3</sub>)  $m(v, o) \leq m(v, u) + m(u, o)$ ;

---

<sup>1</sup> Division of Applied Mathematics, Thu Dau Mot University, Binh Duong Province, Vietnam

<sup>2</sup> Department of Mathematics, Çankaya University, Ankara, Turkey

<sup>3</sup> Department of Medical Research, China Medical University Hospital, China Medical University, Taichung Taiwan

<sup>4</sup> Department of Mathematics and Computer Sciences, Transilvania University of Brasov, Brasov, Romania  
e-mail: erdalkarapinar@tdmu.edu.vn, erdalkarapinar@yahoo.com, afulga@unitbv.ro

*Manuscript received April 2021.*

$$(m_4) \quad m(v, o) \leq s[m(v, u) + m(u, o)];$$

where  $v, o, u \in U$ .

We say that the function  $m$  is a metric on  $U$  if satisfies the axioms  $(m_1)$ ,  $(m_2)$ ,  $(m_3)$  and it is a  $b$ -metric on  $U$  if satisfies  $(m_1)$ ,  $(m_2)$ ,  $(m_4)$ . Moreover, a non-empty set endowed with a metric ( $b$ -metric) is called a metric (respectively,  $b$ -metric) space.

Related to  $b$ -metric space we recall the following important result.

**Lemma 1.1.** [22] *If  $\{v_n\}$  is a sequence in a  $b$ -metric space  $(U, b)$  with the property that there exist  $\kappa \in [0, 1/s)$  and  $K > 0$  such that*

$$b(v_n, v_{n+1}) \leq \kappa^n K,$$

for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $\{v_n\}$  is a Cauchy sequence.

Let now  $(U, d)$  be a metric space and  $J = [0, 1]$ . A mapping  $w : U \times U \times J \rightarrow U$  is a convex structure on  $U$  if

$$d(u, w(v, o; \lambda)) \leq \lambda d(u, v) + (1 - \lambda)d(u, o), \tag{1}$$

for each  $(v, o, \lambda) \in U \times U \times J$  and  $u \in U$ . Moreover, the set  $U$  together with a convex structure  $w$  is said to be a convex metric space. (see [23]).

Recently, in [13], the notion of  $b$ -convex metric space was introduced.

**Definition 1.1.** [13] *Let  $(U, b)$  be a  $b$ -metric space (with  $s \geq 1$ ),  $w : U \times U \times J \rightarrow U$  be a convex structure on  $U$  and  $J = [0, 1]$ . The triplet  $(U, b, w)$  is called a convex  $b$ -metric space.*

**Example 1.1.** [13] *Letting  $U = \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $b : U \times U \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ , with  $b(v, o) = \sum_{j=1}^n (v_j - o_j)^2$ , with  $v = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n), o = (o_1, o_2, \dots, o_n) \in U$  we get that  $(U, b)$  is a  $b$ -metric space ( $s = 2$ ). Moreover, choosing the function  $w : U \times U \times [0, 1] \rightarrow U$  defined as*

$$w(v, o, \lambda) = \lambda v + (1 - \lambda)o,$$

for  $v, o \in U$ , then  $(U, b, w)$  becomes a convex  $b$ -metric space.

**Example 1.2.** [13] *If  $U = \mathbb{R}$ , let  $b : U \times U \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ , where  $b(v, o) = (v - o)^2$  be a  $b$ -metric on  $U$  (here  $s = 2$ ). Thus,  $(U, b, w)$  forms a convex  $b$ -metric space, where  $w : U \times U \times [0, 1] \rightarrow U$  is defined as*

$$w(v, o, \lambda) = \lambda v + (1 - \lambda)o,$$

for any  $v, o \in U$  and  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ .

**Theorem 1.1.** [13] *Let  $(U, b, w)$  with  $s > 1$  be a complete convex  $b$ -metric space and  $F : U \rightarrow U$  be a mapping. Supposing that there exists  $\kappa \in [0, 1)$  such that*

$$b(Fv, Fo) \leq \kappa b(v, o). \tag{2}$$

Let  $v_0 \in U$  be such that  $b(v_0, Fv_0) < \infty$  and the sequence  $\{v_n\}$  be defined by  $v_n = w(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}, \lambda_{n-1})$ , where  $0 \leq \lambda_{n-1} < 1$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then,  $F$  has a unique fixed point provided that  $\kappa < \frac{1}{s^4}$  and  $0 < \lambda_n < \frac{\frac{1}{s^4} - \lambda}{1 - \lambda}$ , for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Theorem 1.2.** [13] *Let  $(U, b, w)$  with  $s > 1$  be a complete convex  $b$ -metric space and  $F : U \rightarrow U$  be a mapping. Supposing that there exists  $\kappa \in [0, 1/2)$  such that*

$$b(Fv, Fo) \leq \kappa[b(v, Fv) + b(o, Fo)]. \tag{3}$$

Let  $v_0 \in U$  be such that  $b(v_0, Fv_0) < \infty$  and the sequence  $\{v_n\}$  be defined by  $v_n = w(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}, \lambda_{n-1})$ , where  $0 \leq \lambda_{n-1} < 1$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then,  $F$  has a unique fixed point provided that  $0 \leq \kappa \leq \frac{1}{4s^2}$  and  $0 < \lambda_n < \frac{1}{4s^2}$ , for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

## 2. MAIN RESULTS

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $U$  be a non-empty set,  $\alpha : U \times U \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  be a function and  $w : U \times U \times [0, 1] \rightarrow U$ . A mapping  $F : U \rightarrow U$  is called  $\alpha$ - $w$  admissible if for any  $v, o \in U$ ,

$$\alpha(v, o) \geq 1 \Rightarrow \alpha(w(v, Fv, \lambda_1), w(o, Fo, \lambda_2)) \geq 1, \quad (4)$$

where  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in [0, 1]$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** Let  $F : U \rightarrow U$  be an  $\alpha$ - $w$ -admissible mapping,  $v_0, v_1 \in U$  such that  $\alpha(v_0, v_1) \geq 1$  and the sequence  $\{v_n\}$  in  $U$ , where

$$v_n = w(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}, \lambda_{n-1}), \quad (5)$$

$\lambda_{n-1} \in [0, 1]$ . Then,  $\alpha(v_n, v_{n+1}) \geq 1$ , for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Proof.* By the hypotheses, we have that there exist  $v_0, v_1 \in U$  such that  $\alpha(v_0, v_1) \geq 1$ . Then, since the mapping  $F$  is  $\alpha$ - $w$ -admissible, by (4) together with (5) we have

$$\alpha(v_0, v_1) \geq 1 \Rightarrow \alpha(w(v_0, Fv_0, \lambda_0), w(v_1, Fv_1, \lambda_1)) = \alpha(v_1, v_2) \geq 1,$$

where  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in [0, 1]$ . Therefore, repeating this procedure we get that

$$\alpha(v_n, v_{n+1}) \geq 1, \text{ for any } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

□

**Theorem 2.1.** On a complete convex  $b$ -metric space  $(U, b, w)$  with  $s > 1$ , let  $F : U \rightarrow U$  be an  $\alpha$ - $w$ -admissible mapping such that there exist  $\kappa_1, \kappa_2 \in [0, 1)$  with the property that

$$\alpha(v, o)b(Fv, Fo) \leq \kappa_1 \frac{b(v, o)b(o, Fo)}{b(v, Fv)} + \kappa_2 b(v, o), \quad (6)$$

for all  $v, o \in U \setminus \text{Fix}_F U$ . Suppose that:

- (1) there exists  $v_0 \in U$  such that  $b(v_0, Fv_0) < \infty$  and  $\alpha(v_0, v_1) \geq 1$ , where the sequence  $\{v_n\}$  is defined by  $v_n = w(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}, \lambda_{n-1})$ , with  $0 \leq \lambda_{n-1} \leq 1$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ;
- (2)  $\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 \leq \frac{1}{4s^2}$  and  $\lambda_n \leq \frac{1}{4s^2}$ ;
- (3)  $\alpha(v_*, v_n) \geq 1$  for any sequence  $\{v_n\}$  in  $U$  such that  $\alpha(v_n, v_{n+1}) \geq 1$  and  $v_n \rightarrow v_*$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Then, the mapping  $F$  has a fixed point.

*Proof.* Let  $v_0, v_1$  be two points in  $U$  such that  $\alpha(v_0, v_1) \geq 1$  and  $b(v_0, Fv_0) = K < \infty$ . Thus, taking into account Lemma 2.1, letting  $v = v_{n-1}$  and  $o = v_n$  in (6), (where the sequence  $\{v_n\}$  in  $U$  is defined by (5)) we have

$$b(Fv_{n-1}, Fv_n) \leq \alpha(v_{n-1}, v_n)b(Fv_{n-1}, Fv_n) \leq \kappa_1 \frac{b(v_{n-1}, v_n)b(v_n, Fv_n)}{b(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1})} + \kappa_2 b(v_{n-1}, v_n). \quad (7)$$

But, since the space  $(U, b, w)$  is a convex  $b$ -metric space, and keeping in mind (5),

$$\begin{aligned} b(v_n, v_{n+1}) &= b(v_n, w(v_n, Fv_n, \lambda_n)) \\ &\leq \lambda_n b(v_n, v_n) + (1 - \lambda_n)b(v_n, Fv_n) \\ &= (1 - \lambda_n)b(v_n, Fv_n), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $\lambda_n \in [0, 1]$ . On the other hand, by  $(m_4)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{b}(v_n, Fv_n) &= \mathbf{b}(w(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}, \lambda_{n-1}), Fv_n) \\ &\leq \lambda_{n-1} \mathbf{b}(v_{n-1}, Fv_n) + (1 - \lambda_{n-1}) \mathbf{b}(Fv_{n-1}, Fv_n) \\ &\leq s\lambda_{n-1} \mathbf{b}(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) + s\lambda_{n-1} \mathbf{b}(Fv_{n-1}, Fv_n) + \mathbf{b}(Fv_{n-1}, Fv_n) \\ &= s\lambda_{n-1} \mathbf{b}(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) + (s\lambda_{n-1} + 1) \mathbf{b}(Fv_{n-1}, Fv_n) \end{aligned}$$

Thereupon, by (7) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{b}(v_n, Fv_n) &\leq s\lambda_{n-1} \mathbf{b}(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) + (s\lambda_{n-1} + 1) \left( \kappa_1 \frac{\mathbf{b}(v_{n-1}, v_n) \mathbf{b}(v_n, Fv_n)}{\mathbf{b}(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1})} + \kappa_2 \mathbf{b}(v_{n-1}, v_n) \right) \\ &\leq s\lambda_{n-1} \mathbf{b}(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) + \\ &\quad + (s\lambda_{n-1} + 1) \left( \kappa_1 \frac{(1 - \lambda_{n-1}) \mathbf{b}(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) \mathbf{b}(v_n, Fv_n)}{\mathbf{b}(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1})} + \kappa_2 (1 - \lambda_{n-1}) \mathbf{b}(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) \right) \\ &= s\lambda_{n-1} \mathbf{b}(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) + (s\lambda_{n-1} + 1) \kappa_1 (1 - \lambda_{n-1}) \mathbf{b}(v_n, Fv_n) + \\ &\quad + (s\lambda_{n-1} + 1) \kappa_2 (1 - \lambda_{n-1}) \mathbf{b}(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) \\ &\leq s\lambda_{n-1} \mathbf{b}(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) + (s\lambda_{n-1} + 1) \kappa_1 \mathbf{b}(v_n, Fv_n) + (s\lambda_{n-1} + 1) \kappa_2 \mathbf{b}(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbf{b}(v_n, Fv_n) \leq \frac{s\lambda_{n-1}(1 + \kappa_2) + \kappa_2}{1 - (s\lambda_{n-1} + 1)\kappa_1} \mathbf{b}(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}). \quad (9)$$

Denoting  $C_n = \frac{s\lambda_{n-1}(1 + \kappa_2) + \kappa_2}{1 - (s\lambda_{n-1} + 1)\kappa_1}$ , by (2) we get  $C_n < \frac{1}{s}$ , when  $s > 1$  and then

$$\mathbf{b}(v_n, Fv_n) \leq C_{n-1} \mathbf{b}(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) \leq \dots \leq \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} C_j \mathbf{b}(v_0, Fv_0) = K \cdot \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} C_j < K \frac{1}{s^{n-1}}.$$

From the above inequality, on one hand we conclude that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{b}(v_n, Fv_n) = 0 \quad (10)$$

and on the other hand, returning in (8) we have

$$\mathbf{b}(v_n, v_{n+1}) \leq (1 - \lambda_n) \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} C_j \cdot K \leq \frac{1}{2s^{n+1}} \cdot K.$$

Furthermore, by Lemma 1.1 we have that  $\{v_n\}$  is a Cauchy sequence on  $U$ . Thus, using the completeness of  $U$ , we get there exists  $v_* \in U$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{b}(v_n, v_*) = 0$ . Now, supposing that  $v_* \neq Fv_*$  and using  $(m_4)$ , (6) and the assumption (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \mathbf{b}(Fv_*, v_*) &\leq s[\mathbf{b}(Fv_*, Fv_n) + \mathbf{b}(Fv_n, v_*)] \\ &\leq s\mathbf{b}(Fv_*, Fv_n) + s^2 \mathbf{b}(Fv_n, v_n) + s^2 \mathbf{b}(v_n, v_*) \\ &\leq s\alpha(v_*, v_n) \mathbf{b}(Fv_*, Fv_n) + s^2 \mathbf{b}(Fv_n, v_n) + s^2 \mathbf{b}(v_n, v_*) \\ &\leq s[\kappa_1 \frac{\mathbf{b}(v_*, v_n) \mathbf{b}(v_n, Fv_n)}{\mathbf{b}(v_*, Fv_*)} + \kappa_2 \mathbf{b}(v_*, v_n)] + s^2 \mathbf{b}(Fv_n, v_n) + s^2 \mathbf{b}(v_n, v_*). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in the above inequality and keeping in mind (10) and (11) we get  $\mathbf{b}(Fv_*, v_*) = 0$ , which shows that  $v_*$  is a fixed point of the mapping  $F$ .  $\square$

**Example 2.1.** Let  $U = [0, 4]$  and the mapping  $F : U \rightarrow U$  defined as

$$Fv = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{for } v \in [0, 1) \cup (1, 2) \cup (2, 4) \\ 1, & \text{for } v \in \{1, 2\} \\ 2 & \text{for } v = 4 \end{cases}$$

Let  $b : U \times U \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ , where  $b(v, o) = (v - o)^2$  and  $w : U \times U \times \{\frac{1}{17}\} \rightarrow U$ ,  $w(v, o) = \frac{v+16o}{17}$ . Thus, by Example 1.2, we have that the triplet  $(U, b, w)$  forms a convex  $b$ -metric space.

Let the mapping  $\alpha : U \times U \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ , defined as:

$$\alpha(v, o) = \begin{cases} 2, & \text{for } (v, o) \in [0, 1] \\ 1, & \text{for } (v, o) = (2, 4) \\ 3, & \text{for } (v, o) = (\frac{18}{17}, \frac{36}{17}) \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} .$$

First of all, let's check that the mapping  $F$  is  $\alpha$ - $w$  admissible.

(1) For  $v, o \in [0, 1]$ , we have  $w(v, Fv, \frac{1}{17}) = \frac{v}{17} \in [0, 1]$ . So,

$$\alpha(v, o) = 2 \Rightarrow \alpha(w(v, Fv, \frac{1}{17}), w(o, Fo, \frac{1}{17})) = 2;$$

(2) For  $(v, o) = (2, 4)$ , since  $w(2, F2, \frac{1}{17}) = \frac{2+16}{17} = \frac{18}{17}$  and  $w(4, F4, \frac{1}{17}) = \frac{4+32}{17} = \frac{36}{17}$ , we have

$$\alpha(2, 4) = 1 \Rightarrow \alpha(w(2, F2, \frac{1}{17}), w(4, F4, \frac{1}{17})) = \alpha(\frac{18}{17}, \frac{36}{17}) = 3;$$

(3) For  $(v, o) = (\frac{18}{17}, \frac{36}{17})$ , since  $w(\frac{18}{17}, F\frac{18}{17}, \frac{1}{17}) = \frac{18}{17^2} < 1$  and  $w(\frac{36}{17}, F\frac{36}{17}, \frac{1}{17}) = \frac{36}{17^2} < 1$ , we have

$$\alpha(\frac{18}{17}, \frac{36}{17}) = 3 \Rightarrow \alpha(\frac{18}{17^2}, \frac{36}{17^2}) = 2.$$

Letting  $v_0 = 0$ , since  $\alpha(0, 0) = 2$  and  $b(0, F(0)) = 0$ , we have  $v_1 = \frac{v_0+16Fv_0}{17} = 0, \dots, v_n = 0$ . Consequently,  $v_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Letting  $v_0 = 1$ , since  $b(v_0, Fv_0) = 0$ , we have  $v_1 = \frac{1+16}{17} = 1, \dots, v_n = 1$ . Then,  $\alpha(v_0, v_1) = \alpha(1, 1) = 2$  and  $v_n \rightarrow 1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus, the assumptions (1) and (3) hold.

Choosing  $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 = \frac{1}{34}$ , and since  $\lambda_n = \lambda = \frac{1}{17}$ , and taking into account the definition of function  $\alpha$ , we have:

(1) For  $(v, o) \in (0, 1)$ , since  $Fv = 0$ , the inequality (6) is obviously satisfied.

(2) For  $(v, o) = (2, 4)$ , we have

$$b(2, 4) = 4, b(F2, F4) = b(1, 2) = 1, b(2, F2) = 1, b(4, F4) = b(4, 2) = 4.$$

Then,

$$1 = \alpha(2, 4)b(F2, F4) \leq \frac{1}{34} \frac{81}{1} + \frac{1}{34} = \kappa_1 \frac{b(2, 4)b(4, F4)}{b(2, F2)} + \kappa_2 b(2, 4)$$

so the inequality (6) holds.

(3) For  $(v, o) = (\frac{18}{17}, \frac{36}{17})$ , we have  $b(F\frac{18}{17}, F\frac{36}{17}) = 0$  and of course, (6) holds.

Therefore, by Theorem 2.1 the mapping  $F$  has fixed points, these are  $v = 0$  and  $o = 1$ .

We remark that, letting for example  $v = 2$  and  $o = 4$ , we have

$$b(F2, F4) = b(1, 2) = 1 \leq 4\kappa = \kappa b(2, 4)$$

gives us  $\kappa \geq \frac{1}{4}$ . So Theorem (1.1) can not be applied (there is the condition  $\kappa < 1s^4 = 1/16$  in our case.)

Also, since from

$$b(F2, F4) = b(1, 2) = 1 \leq 5\kappa = \kappa[b(2, F2) + b(4, F4)]$$

it follows  $\kappa \geq 1/5$ , neither Theorem 1.2 can not be applied (the condition  $\kappa < \frac{1}{4s^2} = \frac{1}{16}$  is not satisfied).

**Corollary 2.1.** *On a complete convex  $b$ -metric space  $(U, b, w)$  with  $s > 1$ , let  $F : U \rightarrow U$  be a mapping such that there exist  $\kappa_1, \kappa_2 \in [0, 1)$  such that*

$$b(Fv, Fo) \leq \kappa_1 \frac{b(v, o)b(o, Fo)}{b(v, Fv)} + \kappa_2 b(v, o), \tag{12}$$

for all  $v, o \in U \setminus \text{Fix}_F U$ . If there exists  $v_0 \in U$  such that  $b(v_0, Fv_0) < \infty$ , let  $\{v_n\}$  be the sequence defined by  $v_n = w(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}, \lambda_{n-1})$ ,  $0 \leq \lambda_{n-1} \leq 1$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then, the mapping  $F$  has a fixed point if  $\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 \leq \frac{1}{4s^2}$  and  $\lambda_n \leq \frac{1}{4s^2}$ .

*Proof.* Letting  $\alpha(u, v) = 1$  in Theorem 2.1 the proof follows immediately. □

**Theorem 2.2.** *On a complete convex  $b$ -metric space  $(U, b, w)$ , let  $F : U \rightarrow U$  be an  $\alpha$ - $w$ -admissible mapping such that there exist  $\kappa_1, \kappa_2 \in [0, 1)$  with the property that*

$$\alpha(v, o)b(Fv, Fo) \leq \kappa_1 \frac{[b(v, o) + 1]b(o, Fo)}{b(v, Fv) + 1} + \kappa_2 b(v, o), \tag{13}$$

for all  $v, o \in U$ . Suppose that:

- (1) there exists  $v_0 \in U$  such that  $b(v_0, Fv_0) < \infty$  and  $\alpha(v_0, v_1) \geq 1$ , where  $\{v_n\}$  is the sequence defined by  $v_n = w(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}, \lambda_{n-1})$ ,  $0 \leq \lambda_{n-1} \leq 1$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ;
- (2)  $\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 \leq \frac{1}{4s^2}$  and  $\lambda_n \leq \frac{1}{4s^2}$ ;
- (3)  $\alpha(v_*, v_n) \geq 1$  for any sequence  $\{v_n\}$  in  $U$  such that  $\alpha(v_n, v_{n+1}) \geq 1$  and  $v_n \rightarrow v_*$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Then, the mapping  $F$  has a fixed point. Moreover, if  $\alpha(o_*, v_*) \geq 1$  for every  $o_*, v_* \in \text{Fix}_F(U)$ , then the fixed point of  $F$  is unique.

*Proof.* Let  $v_0, v_1 \in U$  satisfying the conditions in (1). As in the previous proof, we construct the sequence  $\{v_n\}$  in  $U$  as

$$v_n = w(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}, \lambda_{n-1}),$$

where  $\lambda_{n-1} \in [0, 1]$ , for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus, since  $b(v_n, v_{n+1}) \leq (1 - \lambda_n)b(v_n, Fv_n)$ , for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} b(v_n, Fv_n) &= b(w(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}, \lambda_{n-1}), Fv_n) \\ &\leq \lambda_{n-1}b(v_{n-1}, Fv_n) + (1 - \lambda_{n-1})b(Fv_{n-1}, Fv_n) \\ &\leq s\lambda_{n-1}b(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) + s\lambda_{n-1}b(Fv_{n-1}, Fv_n) + b(Fv_{n-1}, Fv_n) \\ &= s\lambda_{n-1}b(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) + (s\lambda_{n-1} + 1)b(Fv_{n-1}, Fv_n) \\ &\leq s\lambda_{n-1}b(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) + (s\lambda_{n-1} + 1) \left( \kappa_1 \frac{[(1 - \lambda_{n-1})b(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) + 1]b(v_n, Fv_n)}{b(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) + 1} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \kappa_2(1 - \lambda_{n-1})b(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) \right) \\ &= s\lambda_{n-1}b(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) + (s\lambda_{n-1} + 1)\kappa_1(1 - \lambda_{n-1})b(v_n, Fv_n) + \\ &\quad + (s\lambda_{n-1} + 1)\kappa_2(1 - \lambda_{n-1})b(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) \\ &\leq s\lambda_{n-1}b(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) + (s\lambda_{n-1} + 1)\kappa_1b(v_n, Fv_n) + \\ &\quad + (s\lambda_{n-1} + 1)\kappa_2b(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$b(v_n, Fv_n) \leq \frac{s\lambda_{n-1}(1 + \kappa_2) + \kappa_2}{1 - (s\lambda_{n-1} + 1)\kappa_1} b(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}).$$

Consequently, by a verbatim repetition of the lines of the previous proof we obtain that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (b(v_n, Fv_n) = 0$  and also, the sequence  $\{v_n\}$  is Cauchy on a complete convex  $b$ -metric space, so, there exists  $v_* \in U$  such that  $v_n \rightarrow v_*$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

We claim that  $v_* \in \text{Fix}_F(U)$ . Supposing on the contrary,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < b(Fv_*, v_*) &\leq s[b(Fv_*, Fv_n) + b(Fv_n, v_*)] \\ &\leq sb(Fv_*, Fv_n) + s^2b(Fv_n, v_n) + s^2b(v_n, v_*) \\ &\leq s\alpha(v_*, v_n)b(Fv_*, Fv_n) + s^2b(Fv_n, v_n) + s^2b(v_n, v_*) \\ &\leq s[\kappa_1 \frac{b(v_*, v_n)+1}{b(v_*, Fv_*)+1} b(v_n, Fv_n) + \kappa_2 b(v_*, v_n)] + s^2b(Fv_n, v_n) + s^2b(v_n, v_*). \end{aligned}$$

Since the right part of this inequality tends to  $b(Fv_*, v_*)$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we get  $b(Fv_*, v_*) = 0$ . To prove the uniqueness of the fixed point, we assume by contradiction, that there exist  $o_*, v_* \in \text{Fix}_F(U)$ , with  $o_* \neq v_*$ . Using the supplementary condition,  $\alpha(o_*, v_*) \geq 1$  for any  $o_*, v_* \in \text{Fix}_F(U)$ , by (6) we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < b(o_*, v_*) &\leq \alpha(o_*, v_*)b(Fo_*, Fv_*) \leq \kappa_1 \frac{b(o_*, v_*)+1}{b(o_*, Fo_*)+1} + \kappa_2 b(o_*, v_*) \\ &= \kappa_2 b(o_*, v_*) < b(o_*, v_*), \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore,  $o_* = v_*$ . □

**Example 2.2.** Let  $U = [0, 8]$ , the  $b$ -metric  $b : U \times U \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ ,  $b(v - o) = (v - o)^2$ , the function  $w : U \times U \times \{\frac{1}{17}\}$  and a mapping  $F : U \rightarrow U$ , where

$$Fv = \begin{cases} 2, & \text{if } v \in [0, 5) \\ \frac{v^2+1}{13}, & \text{if } v \in [5, 6) \\ \frac{4v}{7}, & \text{if } v \in [6, 8] \end{cases}$$

Let also,  $\alpha : U \times U \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ ,

$$\alpha(v, o) = \begin{cases} 2, & \text{if } v, o \in [0, 5) \\ 1, & \text{if } (v, o) \in \{(2, 7), (2, 5)\} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We can easily check the  $\alpha$ - $w$ -admissibility of the mapping  $F$ . Indeed, for  $v, o \in [0, 5)$  we have

$$w(v, Fv, \frac{1}{17}) = \frac{v+32}{17} < 1,$$

so

$$\alpha(v, o) = 2 \geq 1 \Rightarrow \alpha(w(v, Fv, \frac{1}{17}), w(o, Fo, \frac{1}{17})) = 2 \geq 1.$$

For  $(v, u) = (2, 7)$ ,  $w(2, F2, \frac{1}{17}) = \frac{2+32}{17} = 2$  and  $w(7, F7, \frac{1}{17}) = \frac{7+32}{17} = \frac{71}{17}$ . Thus,

$$\alpha(2, 7) = 1 \Rightarrow \alpha(w(2, F2, \frac{1}{17}), w(7, F7, \frac{1}{17})) = \alpha(2, \frac{71}{17}) = 2 \geq 1.$$

For  $(v, u) = (2, 5)$ ,  $w(2, F2, \frac{1}{17}) = 2$  and  $w(5, F5, \frac{1}{17}) = \frac{5+32}{17} = \frac{37}{17}$ . Thus,

$$\alpha(2, 5) = 1 \Rightarrow \alpha(w(2, F2, \frac{1}{17}), w(5, F5, \frac{1}{17})) = \alpha(2, \frac{37}{17}) = 2 \geq 1.$$

Next, choosing  $v_0 = 2$ , we have  $\alpha(2, 2) = \alpha(2, F2) = 2$ ,  $b(2, F2) = 0$  and the sequence

$$\begin{aligned} v_1 &= \frac{v_0 + 16Fv_0}{17} = 2; \\ v_2 &= \frac{v_1 + 16Fv_1}{17} = 2; \\ &\dots \\ v_{n-1} &= \frac{v_n + 16Fv_n}{17} = 2. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,  $v_n \rightarrow 2$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\alpha(2, v_n) = 2 \geq 1$ . As a last step, we have to check (13). Taking into account the definitions of  $F$  and  $\alpha$  we will discuss just the following two cases.

- (1) For  $(v, o) = [0, 5) \cup \{(2, 5)\}$ , we have  $b(Fv, Fo) = b(2, 2) = 0$  and then (ref1T2) holds;
- (2) For  $(v, o) = (2, 7)$ , we have

$$b(2, 7) = 25, \quad b(F2, F7) = b(2, 4) = 4, \quad b(2, F2) = b(2, 2) = 0, \quad b(7, F7) = b(7, 4) = 9.$$

Then,

$$\alpha(2, 7)b(F2, F7) = 4 \leq \frac{259}{34} = \kappa_1 + 25\kappa_2 = \kappa_1 \frac{(b(2, 7) + 1)b(7, F7)}{b(2, F2) + 1} + \kappa_2 b(2, 7)$$

(we choose  $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 = \frac{1}{34}$ .) Consequently, all the assumption of Theorem 2.2 are satisfied and  $v = 2$  is the unique fixed point of  $F$ .

We can also mention that for example, when  $v = 2$  and  $o = 7$  the Theorem 1.1 respectively 1.2 can not be applied.

**Corollary 2.2.** On a complete convex  $b$ -metric space  $(U, b, w)$  with  $s > 1$ , let  $F : U \rightarrow U$  be a mapping such that there exist  $\kappa_1, \kappa_2 \in [0, 1)$  such that

$$b(Fv, Fo) \leq \kappa_1 \frac{[b(v, o) + 1]b(o, Fo)}{b(v, Fv) + 1} + \kappa_2 b(v, o), \tag{14}$$

for all  $v, o \in U$ . If there exists  $v_0 \in U$  such that  $b(v_0, Fv_0) < \infty$ , let  $\{v_n\}$  be the sequence defined by  $v_n = w(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}, \lambda_{n-1})$ ,  $0 \leq \lambda_{n-1} \leq 1$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then, the mapping  $F$  has a unique fixed point if  $\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 \leq \frac{1}{4s^2}$  and  $\lambda_n \leq \frac{1}{4s^2}$ .

$$b(Fv, Fo) \leq \kappa_1 \frac{[b(v, o) + 1]b(o, Fo)}{b(v, Fv) + 1} + \kappa_2 b(v, o), \tag{15}$$

for all  $v, o \in U$ , then the mapping  $F$  has a unique fixed point.

*Proof.* Let  $\alpha(v, o) = 1$  in Theorem 2.2. □

**Theorem 2.3.** On a complete convex  $b$ -metric space  $(U, b, w)$ , let  $F : U \rightarrow U$  be an  $\alpha$ - $w$ -admissible mapping such that there exists  $\kappa \in [0, 1)$  with the property that

$$\alpha(v, o)b(Fv, Fo) \leq \kappa \frac{b(v, Fo)b(v, Fv) + b(o, Fv)b(o, Fo)}{s \cdot \max \{b(v, Fv), b(o, Fo)\}}, \tag{16}$$

for all  $v, o \in U \setminus Fix_F(U)$ . Suppose that:

- (1) there exists  $v_0 \in U$  such that  $b(v_0, Fv_0) < \infty$  and  $\alpha(v_0, v_1) \geq 1$ , where  $\{v_n\}$  is the sequence defined by  $v_n = w(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}, \lambda_{n-1})$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ;
- (2)  $\kappa \leq \frac{1}{4s^2}$  and  $\lambda_n \leq \frac{1}{4s^2}$ ;
- (3)  $\alpha(v_*, v_n) \geq 1$  for any sequence  $\{v_n\}$  in  $U$  such that  $\alpha(v_n, v_{n+1}) \geq 1$  and  $v_n \rightarrow v_*$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Then, the mapping  $F$  has a fixed point.

*Proof.* As in the previous consideration, starting with two given points  $v_0, v_1 \in U$  such that  $b(v_0, Fv_0) < \infty$  and, also  $\alpha(v_0, v_1) \geq 1$ , we consider the sequence  $\{v_n\}$  in  $U$ , where  $v_n = w(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}, \lambda_{n-1})$ , for  $\lambda_{n-1} \in [0, 1]$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since by Lemma 2.1 we know that  $\alpha(v_n, v_{n+1}) \geq 1$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , taking  $v = v_{n-1}$  and  $o = v_n$  in (16) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 b(Fv_{n-1}, Fv_n) &\leq \alpha(v_{n-1}, v_n)b(Fv_{n-1}, Fv_n) \\
 &\leq \kappa \frac{b(v_{n-1}, Fv_n)b(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) + b(v_n, Fv_{n-1})b(v_n, Fv_n)}{s \max\{b(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}), b(v_n, Fv_n)\}} \leq \kappa \frac{b(v_{n-1}, Fv_n) + b(v_n, Fv_{n-1})}{s} \\
 &\leq \kappa \frac{sb(v_{n-1}, v_n) + sb(v_n, Fv_n) + b(w(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}, \lambda_{n-1}), Fv_{n-1})}{s} \\
 &\leq \kappa \frac{sb(v_{n-1}, v_n) + sb(v_n, Fv_n) + \lambda_{n-1}b(w(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}))}{s} \\
 &\leq \kappa[(1 - \lambda_{n-1})b(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) + b(v_n, Fv_n) + \lambda_{n-1}b(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1})] \\
 &\leq \kappa[b(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) + b(v_n, Fv_n)].
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{17}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
 b(v_n, Fv_n) &= b(w(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}, \lambda_{n-1}), Fv_n) \\
 &\leq \lambda_{n-1}b(v_{n-1}, Fv_n) + (1 - \lambda_{n-1})b(Fv_{n-1}, Fv_n) \\
 &\leq s\lambda_{n-1}b(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) + s\lambda_{n-1}b(Fv_{n-1}, Fv_n) + b(Fv_{n-1}, Fv_n) \\
 &= s\lambda_{n-1}b(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) + (s\lambda_{n-1} + 1)b(Fv_{n-1}, Fv_n) \\
 &\leq s\lambda_{n-1}b(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) + (s\lambda_{n-1} + 1)\kappa [b(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) + b(v_n, Fv_n)]
 \end{aligned}$$

and then

$$b(v_n, Fv_n) \leq \frac{s\lambda_{n-1}(1 + \kappa) + \kappa}{1 - (s\lambda_{n-1} + 1)\kappa} b(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}).$$

Letting  $C_n = \frac{s\lambda_{n-1}(1 + \kappa) + \kappa}{1 - (s\lambda_{n-1} + 1)\kappa}$ , for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , under the assumption (2), we can observe that  $C_n < \frac{1}{s}$ . Therefore,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b(v_n, Fv_n) = 0$  and moreover, since

$$b(v_n, v_{n-1}) \leq (1 - \lambda_{n-1})b(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}) \leq \beta_{n-1} \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} C_i \cdot b(v_0, Fv_0),$$

by Lemma 1.1 it follows that  $\{v_n\}$  is a Cauchy sequence on a complete convex  $b$ -metric space, so that it is convergent (here  $\beta_n = 1 - \lambda_n$ ). Let  $v_* \in U$  be the limit of the sequence  $\{v_n\}$ . We claim that this point is in fact a fixed point of  $F$ . Indeed, if it is not, then keeping in mind the assumption (3),

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 < b(Fv_*, v_*) &\leq sb(Fv_*, Fv_n) + s^2b(Fv_n, v_n) + s^2b(v_n, v_*) \\
 &\leq s\alpha(v_*, v_n)b(Fv_*, Fv_n) + s^2b(Fv_n, v_n) + s^2b(v_n, v_*) \\
 &\leq s\kappa \frac{b(v_*, Fv_n)b(v_*, Fv_*) + b(v_n, Fv_*)b(v_n, Fv_n)}{s \cdot \max\{b(v_n, Fv_n), b(v_*, Fv_*)\}} + s^2b(Fv_n, v_n) + s^2b(v_n, v_*) \\
 &\leq s\kappa \frac{b(v_*, Fv_n) + b(v_n, Fv_*)}{s} + s^2b(Fv_n, v_n) + s^2b(v_n, v_*) \\
 &\leq s\kappa[b(v_*, v_n) + b(v_n, Fv_n) + b(v_n, v_*) + b(v_*, Fv_*)] + \\
 &\quad + s^2b(Fv_n, v_n) + s^2b(v_n, v_*).
 \end{aligned}$$

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

$$0 < \mathbf{b}(Fv_*, v_*) \leq s\kappa \mathbf{b}(Fv_*, v_*) < \frac{1}{4s} \mathbf{b}(Fv_*, v_*),$$

which is a contradiction. Thereupon,  $v_* = Fv_*$ , that is  $v_* \in \text{Fix}_F(\mathbf{U})$ .

The uniqueness of the fixed point it follows as in the previous proof.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.3.** *On a complete convex  $b$ -metric space  $(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{w})$  with  $s > 1$ , let  $F : \mathbf{U} \rightarrow \mathbf{U}$  be a mapping such that there exists  $\kappa \in [0, 1)$  such that*

$$\mathbf{b}(Fv, Fo) \leq \kappa \frac{\mathbf{b}(v, Fo)\mathbf{b}(v, Fv) + \mathbf{b}(o, Fv)\mathbf{b}(o, Fo)}{s \cdot \max\{\mathbf{b}(v, Fv), \mathbf{b}(o, Fo)\}}, \quad (18)$$

for all  $v, o \in \mathbf{U} \setminus \text{Fix}_F \mathbf{U}$ . If there exists  $v_0 \in \mathbf{U}$  such that  $\mathbf{b}(v_0, Fv_0) < \infty$ , let  $\{v_n\}$  be the sequence defined by  $v_n = \mathbf{w}(v_{n-1}, Fv_{n-1}, \lambda_{n-1})$ ,  $0 \leq \lambda_{n-1} \leq 1$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then, the mapping  $F$  has a fixed point provided that  $\kappa \leq \frac{1}{4s^2}$  and  $\lambda_n \leq \frac{1}{4s^2}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\alpha(v, o) = 1$  in Theorem 2.3.  $\square$

### 3. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we discuss the existence and uniqueness of a fixed point of certain operators that providing inequalities with rational expressions in the setting of  $b$ -convex metric spaces. Although the notion of convexity has been considered in the metric structure, it is rarely used in the  $b$ -metric structure. Another interesting contribution of the paper is the usage of admissible mappings. This consideration is a candidate to initiate the new trends in the metric fixed point theory.

### REFERENCES

- [1] Adiguzel, R.S., Aksoy, U., Karapinar, E., and Erhan, I. M., (2021), On the solutions of fractional differential equations via Geraghty type hybrid contractions, *Appl. Comput. Math.*, 20(2), pp.313-333.
- [2] Afshari, H., Aydi, H., Karapinar, E., (2020) On generalized  $\alpha$ - $\psi$ -Geraghty contractions on  $b$ -metric spaces, *Georgian Math. J.*, 27(1), pp.9-21.
- [3] Alghamdi, M.A., Gulyaz-Ozyurt, S., Karapinar, E., (2020), A note on extended Z-contraction mathematics, 8(2), Article Number:195.
- [4] Aksoy, U., Karapinar, E., and Erhan, I. M., (2016), Fixed points of generalized alpha-admissible contractions on  $b$ -metric spaces with an application to boundary value problems, *J. Nonlinear Convex Anal.*, 17(6), pp.1095-1108.
- [5] Aydi, H., Karapinar, E., Bota, M.F., Mitrovic, S., (2012), A fixed point theorem for set-valued quasi-contractions in  $b$ -metric spaces, *Fixed Point Theory Appl.*, 88p.
- [6] Aydi, H., Bota, M.F., Karapinar, E., Moradi, S., (2012), A common fixed point for weak  $\varphi$ -contractions on  $b$ -metric spaces, *Fixed Point Theory*, 13(2), pp.337-346.
- [7] Bakhtin, I.A., (1989), The contraction mapping principle in quasimetric spaces, *Funct. Anal. Unianowsk Gos. Ped. Inst.*, 30, pp.26-37.
- [8] Banach, S., (1922), Sur les opérations dans les ensembles abstraits et leur application aux équations intégrales. *Fund. Math.*, 3, pp.133-181.
- [9] Berinde, V., (1997), *Contractiții Generalizate și Aplicații*, Editura Club Press 22, Baia Mare.
- [10] Berinde, V., (1993), Generalized contractions in quasimetric spaces, *Seminar on Fixed Point Theory*, Preprint, 3, pp.3-9.
- [11] Berinde, V., (1996), Sequences of operators and fixed points in quasimetric spaces, *Stud. Univ. "Babeș-Bolyai", Math.*, 16(4), pp.23-27.
- [12] Bourbaki, N., (1974), *Topologie Générale*, Herman, Paris.
- [13] Chen, L., Li, C., Kaczmarek, R., Zhao, Y., (2020), Several fixed point theorems in convex  $b$ -metric spaces and applications, *Mathematics*, 8, Article No.242.

- [14] Chifu, C., Karapinar, E., Petrusel, G., (2020), Fixed point results in varepsilon-chainable complete b-metric spaces, *Fixed Point Theory*, 21(2), pp.453-464.
  - [15] Czerwik, S., (1993), Contraction mappings in *b*-metric spaces. *Acta. Math. Inform. Univ. Ostraviensis*, 1, pp.5-11.
  - [16] Czerwik, S., (1998), Nonlinear set-valued contraction mappings in *b*-metric spaces, *Atti Sem. Mat. Univ. Modena*, 46, pp.263-276.
  - [17] Gulyaz-Ozyurt, S., (2017), On some alpha-admissible contraction mappings on Branciari b-metric spaces, *Advances in the Theory of Nonlinear Analysis and its Applications*, 1(1), pp.1-13. Article Id: 2017:1:1.
  - [18] Imdad, M., Perveen, A., Gubran, R., (2020), Some common fixed point results via b-simulation function, *TWMS J. App. Eng. Math.*, 10(3), pp.606-615.
  - [19] Karapinar, E., Aydi, H., Mitrovic, Z.D., (2020), On interpolative Boyd-Wong and Matkowski type contractions, *TWMS J. Pure Appl. Math.*, 11(2), pp.204-212.
  - [20] Karapinar, E., (2019), Ciric type nonunique fixed points results: a review, *Appl. Comput. Math.*, 18(1), pp.3-21.
  - [21] Karapinar, E., Fulga, A., Petrusel, A., (2020), On Istratescu type contractions in b-metric spaces, *Mathematics*, 8, Article No. 388.
  - [22] Mitrović, Z.D., (2019), A note on the results of Suzuki, Miculescu and Mihail, *J. Fixed Point Theory Appl.*, 21, Article No.24.
  - [23] Takahashi, W., (1970), A convexity in metric space and nonexpansive mappings, *Kodai Math.Sem. Rep.*, 22, pp.142-149.
- 
- 



**Erdal Karapinar** - received his Ph.D. degree in 2004 from Graduate School of Natural Applied Sciences, Middle East Technical University (METU), Ankara, Turkey. He is currently a full professor at Çankaya University, Ankara, Turkey. He is a Highly Cited Researcher (HCR) of Clarivate Analysis between 2015-2019. His current research interest is focused on fixed point theory and its applications.



**Andreea Fulga** - has received her Ph.D. degree in 2007 from the Transilvania University of Brasov, Romania. She is an Associate Professor in the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Transilvania University of Brasov, Romania. Her current research is focused on fixed point theory and its applications.