

## SCIENTIFIC ARTICLE

© R. Chakar, S. Dehilis, W. Merchela, H. Guebbai, 2024

<https://doi.org/10.20310/2686-9667-2024-29-148-485-493> $\rho - F$ -contraction fixed point theoremRanda CHAKAR<sup>1</sup>, Sofiane DEHILIS<sup>1</sup>,  
Wassim MERCHELA<sup>2,3</sup>, Hamza GUEBBAI<sup>3</sup><sup>1</sup> Laboratory of Dynamical Systems and Control

Larbi Ben M'Hidi University

BP. 358 Constantine's Route, 04000 Oum El Bouaghi, Algeria

<sup>2</sup> Mustapha Stambouli University

BP. 305 Sheikh El Khaldi Av., 29000 Mascara, Algeria

<sup>3</sup> Laboratory of Applied Mathematics and Modeling

8 May 1945 University

BP. 401, 24000 Guelma, Algeria

**Abstract.** In this paper, we study the question of conditions for the existence and uniqueness of a fixed point of a mapping over a complete metric space. We first discuss the concepts of  $F$ -contraction and  $F^*$ -contraction in fixed point theory. These concepts, developed respectively by Wardowski and Piri with Kumam, have catalyzed significant research in various metric spaces. We then propose a generalization of these concepts,  $\rho - F$ -contraction and  $\rho - F^*$ -contraction, and demonstrate its effectiveness in ensuring the existence and uniqueness of fixed points. This new approach provides greater flexibility by including a function  $\rho$  that modulates the contraction, extending the applicability of  $F$ - and  $F^*$ -contractions. We conclude the paper with an example of a mapping that is a  $\rho - F$ -contraction and a  $\rho - F^*$ -contraction, respectively, and has a unique fixed point. However, this mapping does not satisfy the conditions of Wardowski and the conditions of Piri and Kumam.

**Keywords:** fixed-point, existence, uniqueness,  $F$ -contraction,  $\rho - F$ -contraction

**Mathematics Subject Classification:** 47H10, 54E35.

**For citation:** Chakar R., Dehilis S., Merchela W., Guebbai H.  $\rho - F$ -contraction fixed point theorem. *Vestnik rossiyskikh universitetov. Matematika = Russian Universities Reports. Mathematics*, **29**:148 (2024), 485–493. <https://doi.org/10.20310/2686-9667-2024-29-148-485-493>

## НАУЧНАЯ СТАТЬЯ

© Чакар Р., Дехилис С., Мерчела В., Геббай Х., 2024

<https://doi.org/10.20310/2686-9667-2024-29-148-485-493>

УДК 517.98

Теорема о неподвижной точке  $\rho - F$ -сжатияРанда ЧАКАР<sup>1</sup>, Софиан ДЕХИЛИС<sup>1</sup>,  
Вассим МЕРЧЕЛА<sup>2,3</sup>, Хамза ГЕББАЙ<sup>3</sup><sup>1</sup> Лаборатория динамических систем и управления,  
Университет Ларби Бен Мхиди

04000, Алжир, г. Ум Эль-Буаги, П.Я. 358 маршрут Константина

<sup>2</sup> Университет Мустафы Стамбули

29000, Алжир, г. Маскара, П.Я. 305 Проспект Шейха Эль Халди

<sup>3</sup> Лаборатория прикладной математики и моделирования,  
Университет 8 мая 1945 г.

24000, Алжир, г. Гельма, П.Я. 401

**Аннотация.** В работе исследуется вопрос об условиях существования и единственности неподвижной точки отображения полного метрического пространства. Вначале обсуждаются понятия  $F$ -сжатия и  $F^*$ -сжатия в теории неподвижных точек. Эти понятия, разработанные соответственно Вардовским и Пири совместно с Кумамом, послужили катализатором значительных исследований в различных метрических пространствах. Затем предлагаются обобщения этих понятий —  $\rho - F$ -сжатие и  $\rho - F^*$ -сжатие, демонстрируется их эффективность в обеспечении существования и единственности неподвижных точек. Этот новый подход обеспечивает большую гибкость за счет использования функции  $\rho$ , которая регулирует сжатие, расширяя возможности применения  $F$ - и  $F^*$ -сжатий. Завершает статью пример отображения, являющегося  $\rho - F$ -сжатием и  $\rho - F^*$ -сжатием и имеющего единственную неподвижную точку. При этом это отображение не удовлетворяет условиям Вардовского и условиям Пири и Кумама.

**Ключевые слова:** неподвижная точка, существование, единственность,  $F$ -сжатие,  $\rho - F$ -сжатие

**Для цитирования:** Чакар Р., Дехилис С., Мерчела В., Геббай Х. Теорема о неподвижной точке  $\rho - F$ -сжатия // Вестник российских университетов. Математика. 2024. Т. 29. № 148. С. 485–493. <https://doi.org/10.20310/2686-9667-2024-29-148-485-493> (In Engl., Abstr. in Russian)

## Introduction

The introduction of two distinct approaches to the concept of  $F$ -contraction and  $F^*$ -contraction, whereas  $F^*$  stands out as an adaptation of the  $F$ -contraction [1], developed respectively by Wardowski [2] and Piri with Kumam on [3] and authors on [4], has catalyzed significant research in the field of fixed point theories [5]. These approaches have found extensive applications in a multitude of metric spaces, such as b-metric, conic, partial, and fuzzy spaces, among others [6–10]. Essentially, this concept guarantees the existence of a fixed point  $S : X \rightarrow X$ , where  $(X, d)$  represents a complete metric space. The  $F$  and  $F^*$  have the possibility of assimilating these two contractions to well-established contractions such as Boyd–Wong [11] and Matkowski [12], for this, we must ensure certain conditions. Once  $S$  satisfies the following property, known as the  $F$ -contraction mapping:

$$\exists \tau > 0, \forall x, y \in X, Sx \neq Sy, F(d(Sx, Sy)) + \tau < F(d(x, y)),$$

where  $F : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is assumed to satisfy the following  $F[\mathbb{R}]$  conditions: [1]

- $(1_F)$ :  $F$  is strictly increasing, i.e,  $0 < t < s \Rightarrow F(t) < F(s)$ ,
- $(2_F)$ :  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} F(t) = -\infty$ ,
- $(3_F)$ : There exists  $k \in (0, 1)$ , such that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} t^k F(t) = 0$ ,

or we use the  $F^*[\mathbb{R}]$  conditions [12], which means that  $F$  verifies  $(1_F)$ ,  $(2_F)$  and

- $(3_{F^*})$ :  $F$  is a continuous function in  $(0, +\infty)$ .

However, while this theory represents great mathematical interest, it has seen numerous different applications and a strong attraction for scientific research. We find that Awais et al [13] establish fixed-point results for  $F$ -contractions of Reich type for single-valued and multivalued applications in complete metric spaces. Sahil et al [14] introduced the notion of generalized  $F$ -contraction and established fixed point theorems for this type of functions in complete metric spaces. They also explore  $F$ -expansions and their applications. We find also Inayat et al [15] establish fixed-point results for generalized  $F$ -contractions in complete metric spaces. They generalize and unify several known results in the literature. But, Meir Keeler [16] addresses fixed-point results for a class of contractions in metric spaces. He demonstrates that  $F$ -contractions (and  $F^*$ -contractions) fall under the category of Meir–Keeler contractions. Many results derived from  $F$ -contractions also apply to Meir–Keeler mappings.

Whereas, Zhukovskiy [17] extends the fixed point theory to  $f$ -quasimetric spaces, particularly generalizing the concept of  $F$ -contraction. Unlike the classic  $F$ -contraction proposed by Wardowski, where the parameter  $\tau$  is constant, the article introduces a generalized version where  $\tau$  is a variable function that depends on  $F(d(x, y))$ . As illustrated in [17, example 7], this new formulation allows  $\tau$  to vary based on the distance between two points  $x$  and  $y$ , providing greater flexibility in analyzing contractions within nonsymmetric metric spaces. This generalization maintains key results, such as the existence of a unique fixed point and convergence of iterations towards that point, while broadening the scope to  $f$ -quasimetric spaces.

Our objective is to introduce a new class of contraction,  $\rho - F$ -contraction condition defined, for  $\rho : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , as follows:

$$\forall x, y \in X \quad d(x, y) > 0 \Rightarrow F(d(Sx, Sy)) \leq \rho(F(d(x, y))).$$

This relation only indicates that it can be a generalization of  $F$ -contraction with  $\rho(t) = t - \tau$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . These assumptions are as follows:

- $(1_R)$ :  $\rho$  is increasing,
- $(2_R)$ :  $\rho$  is continuous,
- $(3_R)$ : For all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\rho(t) < t$ .

In this work, we will demonstrate that the hypotheses  $(1_R), (2_R), (3_R)$  are sufficient with the class  $F[\mathbb{R}]$  and  $F^*[\mathbb{R}]$  to ensure the existence of a fixed point for an operator  $S$ .

## 1. Preliminaries

Our goal is to demonstrate that if  $S$  is a  $\rho - F$ -contraction, where  $F$  is either of class  $F[\mathbb{R}]$  or of class  $F^*[\mathbb{R}]$  and  $\rho$  satisfies  $(1_R), (2_R)$  and  $(3_R)$ , then  $S$  has a unique fixed point. But before beginning all this, we need the result presented by the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.1.** *Suppose that  $\rho : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is verifying  $(1_R), (2_R)$  and  $(3_R)$ , then,*

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{R} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \rho^n(t) = -\infty.$$

**P r o o f.** Suppose that there exists  $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ , such that,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \rho^n(t_0) = M.$$

We define the sequence  $\{t_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  by  $t_0$  chosen in  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $t_{n+1} = \rho(t_n)$ , for all  $n \geq 0$ . This means that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} t_n = M$ . Using  $(2_R)$  we get,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} t_{n+1} = \rho\left(\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} t_n\right) \Rightarrow M = \rho(M).$$

And this is a contradiction with  $(3_R)$ . □

## 2. $\rho - F^*$ -contraction

In this section, we show that the class of function  $\rho[\mathbb{R}]$  is compatible with the  $F^*[\mathbb{R}_+]$  to ensure the existence and the unicity for a mapping  $S$  through the new condition  $\rho - F$ -contraction.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $(X, d)$  be a complete metric space. Let  $S : X \rightarrow X$  and for  $\rho$  verifying  $(1_R), (2_R)$  and  $(3_R)$ ,  $F \in F^*[\mathbb{R}]$ ,*

$$\forall x, y \in X \quad d(x, y) > 0 \Rightarrow F(d(Sx, Sy)) \leq \rho(F(d(x, y))).$$

*Then,  $S$  has a unique fixed point  $x^\infty \in X$  and*

$$\forall x_0 \in X \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} S^n x_0 = x^\infty.$$

P r o o f. For  $x_0 \in X$ , we define the sequence  $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  given by  $x_{n+1} = Sx_n$  for all  $n \geq 0$ . We remark that if exists  $n_0 \geq 0$ ,  $x_{n_0} = Sx_{n_0}$  then  $x_{n_0}$  will be the fixed point  $x^\infty$ . Now, suppose that for all  $n \geq 0$ ,  $d(x_n, Sx_n) > 0$ . We obtain,

$$F(d(x_n, Sx_n)) = F(d(Sx_{n-1}, Sx_n)) \leq \rho(F(d(x_{n-1}, x_n))).$$

Applying  $(1_\rho)$   $n$ -times we find

$$F(d(x_n, Sx_n)) \leq \rho(F(d(x_{n-1}, x_n))) \leq \rho^2(F(d(x_{n-2}, x_{n-1}))) \leq \dots \leq \rho^n(F(d(x_0, x_1))).$$

Then, using Lemma 1.1,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} F(d(x_n, Sx_n)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \rho^n(F(d(x_0, x_1))) = -\infty,$$

and by  $(2_F)$  we conclude that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} d(x_n, Sx_n) = 0.$$

Now to obtain the fixed point we have to show that  $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  is a Cauchy sequence.

We suppose the existence of some  $\varepsilon > 0$  and two sequences of natural numbers  $\{\varphi(n)\}_{n \geq 0}$  and  $\{\psi(n)\}_{n \geq 0}$  such that:

$$\forall n \geq 0 \quad \varphi(n) > \psi(n) > n, \quad d(x_{\varphi(n)}, x_{\psi(n)}) \geq \varepsilon, \quad d(x_{\varphi(n)-1}, x_{\psi(n)}) < \varepsilon.$$

We obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &\leq d(x_{\varphi(n)}, x_{\psi(n)}) \leq d(x_{\varphi(n)}, x_{\varphi(n)-1}) + d(x_{\varphi(n)-1}, x_{\psi(n)}) \\ &\leq d(x_{\varphi(n)}, x_{\varphi(n)-1}) + \varepsilon = d(x_{\varphi(n)-1}, Sx_{\varphi(n)-1}) + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

But,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} d(x_{\varphi(n)-1}, Sx_{\varphi(n)-1}) = 0 \Rightarrow \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} d(x_{\varphi(n)}, x_{\psi(n)}) = \varepsilon.$$

On the other hand and using  $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} d(x_n, Sx_n) = 0$ , we can conclude the existence of  $n_0 \geq 0$ ,

$$\forall n \geq n_0 \quad d(x_{\varphi(n)}, Sx_{\varphi(n)}) < \frac{\varepsilon}{4}, \quad d(x_{\psi(n)}, Sx_{\psi(n)}) < \frac{\varepsilon}{4}.$$

Now, we show that

$$\forall n \geq n_0 \quad d(x_{\varphi(n)+1}, x_{\psi(n)+1}) = d(Sx_{\varphi(n)}, Sx_{\psi(n)}) > 0. \quad (2.1)$$

In fact, suppose  $\exists m \geq n_0$ , such that

$$d(x_{\varphi(m)+1}, x_{\psi(m)+1}) = 0.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &\leq d(x_{\varphi(m)}, x_{\psi(m)}) \leq d(x_{\varphi(m)}, Sx_{\varphi(m)}) + d(x_{\varphi(m)+1}, x_{\psi(m)+1}) + d(Sx_{\psi(m)}, x_{\psi(m)}) \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4} + 0 + \frac{\varepsilon}{4} = \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Which is a contradiction. From (2.1) and using  $\rho - F$ -contraction hypothesis, we obtain

$$F(d(Sx_{\varphi(n)}, Sx_{\psi(n)})) \leq \rho(F(d(x_{\varphi(n)}, x_{\psi(n)}))).$$

Then

$$F(\varepsilon) \leq \rho(F(\varepsilon)) < F(\varepsilon).$$

The last contradiction allows us to confirm that  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a Cauchy sequence converging to  $x^\infty$ . Then

$$d(Sx^\infty, x^\infty) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} d(Sx_n, x_n) = 0 \Rightarrow x^\infty = Sx^\infty.$$

Suppose now that there exists another fixed point for  $S$  denoted  $y^\infty$ , i.e.  $y^\infty = Sy^\infty$ , and  $x^\infty \neq y^\infty \Rightarrow d(x^\infty, y^\infty) > 0$ . Now,

$$F(d(x^\infty, y^\infty)) = F(d(Sx^\infty, Sy^\infty)) \leq \rho F(d(x^\infty, y^\infty)) < F(d(x^\infty, y^\infty)),$$

which is a contradiction, then  $S$  has a unique fixed point  $x^\infty$ .  $\square$

### 3. $\rho - F$ -contraction

Our objective now is to show that the family of conditions  $(\rho_1)$ ,  $(\rho_2)$  and  $(\rho_3)$  ensure, for a  $\rho - F$ -contraction mapping  $S$ , a unique fixed point, when  $F$  is in the class  $F[\mathbb{R}_+]$ . To achieve our goal, we add a condition on  $\rho$ :

$$\forall \beta > 1 \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R} \quad \sum_{n \geq P(t)} |\rho^n(t)|^{-\beta} < \infty, \quad (3.1)$$

where  $P(t)$  is the smaller natural such that,  $\rho^{P(t)}(t) < 0$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $(X, d)$  be a complete metric space and  $S : X \rightarrow X$  be a  $\rho - F$ -contraction. Then  $S$  has a unique fixed point  $x^\infty$ , i. e.*

$$x^\infty = Sx^\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \forall x_0 \in X \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} S^n x_0 = x^\infty.$$

**P r o o f.** For  $x_0 \in X$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we introduce the positif real sequence  $\{a_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  by

$$a_n = d(x_n, Sx_n) = d(x_n, x_{n+1}),$$

where  $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 0} \subset X$  is given by  $x_0 \in X$  and  $x_{n+1} = Sx_n \quad \forall n \geq 0$ . If there exists  $n_0 \geq 0$  such  $a_{n_0} = 0$ , then  $x_{n_0} = Sx_{n_0}$  is the fixed point.

Now, suppose that  $a_n > 0$ , for all  $n \geq 0$ . Using the  $\rho - F$ -contraction hypothesis, we obtain

$$F(a_n) \leq \rho(F(a_{n-1})) \leq \rho^2(F(a_{n-2})) \leq \dots \leq \rho^n(F(a_0)).$$

Then,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} F(a_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \rho^n(F(a_0)) = -\infty,$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} a_n = 0.$$

Let

$$n \geq p(F(a_0)),$$

then

$$a_n^k F(a_n) \leq a_n^k \rho^n(F(a_0)) \leq 0 \Rightarrow \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} a_n^k \rho^n(F(a_0)) = 0.$$

We take  $n \geq N \geq P(F(a_0))$ ,  $N$  bigger enough such that,

$$|a_n^k \rho(F(a_0))| \leq 1 \Rightarrow a_n \leq |\rho^n(F(a_0))|^{-\frac{1}{k}},$$

then, for all  $m > n > N$ ,

$$d(x_m, x_n) \leq d(x_m, x_{m-1}) + d(x_{m-1}, x_{m-2}) + \dots + d(x_{n+1}, x_n) \leq \sum_{n \geq N} |\rho^n(F(a_0))|^{-\frac{1}{k}} \rightarrow 0.$$

Then,  $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  is a Cauchy sequence and it is converging to  $x^\infty$  in  $X$ . It is clear that  $x^\infty$  is a fixed point of  $S$ . Suppose now that  $y^\infty \in X$  is also a fixed point of  $S$ . Then,

$$F(d(x^\infty, y^\infty)) = F(d(Tx^\infty, Ty^\infty)) \leq \rho(F(d(x^\infty, y^\infty))) < F(d(x^\infty, y^\infty)),$$

which is a contraction. Then,  $S$  has a unique fixed point.  $\square$

#### 4. Illustration

Let  $X = \{x_n \mid n = 1, 2, \dots, \infty\}$  and define the metric  $d : X \rightarrow X$  as follows: for  $m > n$   $d(x_n, x_m) = d(x_m, x_n) = \frac{1}{n}$ , and  $d(x_n, x_n) = 0$ .

Let  $S : X \rightarrow X$  be defined by  $S(x_n) = x_{n+1}$ . Then we have:

$$d(S(x_n), S(x_m)) = \frac{1}{n+1},$$

and

$$\frac{d(S(x_n), S(x_m))}{d(x_n, x_m)} = \frac{n}{n+1} \rightarrow 1, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Therefore,  $S$  is not an ordinary contraction. Let's define the function  $F(d) = \ln d$ , which satisfies the conditions  $F[\mathbb{R}]$  and  $F^*[\mathbb{R}]$ .

Now, let's compute  $\tau$ :

$$\tau = -F(d(S(x_n), S(x_m))) + F(d(x_n, x_m)) = -\ln \frac{1}{n+1} + \ln \frac{1}{n} = \ln \frac{n+1}{n} \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

This implies that  $S$  does not satisfy the conditions of the Wardowski and Piri-Kumam theorems (where  $\tau > 0$ ). Let us show that  $S$  satisfies the conditions of the theorems proven in this article.

Now, let the function  $\rho(t) = \ln \left( \frac{e^t}{e^t + 1} \right) = t - \ln(e^t + 1)$ . This function is increasing as:

$$\rho'(t) = 1 - \frac{e^t}{e^t + 1} = \frac{1}{e^t + 1} > 0.$$

Furthermore,  $\rho(t) < t$  for  $t > 0$ , and  $\rho$  is continuous. Thus,  $\rho$  verified all conditions  $(\rho_1)$ ,  $(\rho_2)$  and  $(\rho_3)$ .

Finally, we have:

$$\rho(F(d(x_n, x_m))) = \rho\left(F\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right) = \rho\left(\ln \frac{1}{n}\right) = \ln \left( \frac{e^{\ln \frac{1}{n}}}{e^{\ln \frac{1}{n}} + 1} \right) = \ln \frac{1}{n+1} = F(d(Sx_n, Sx_m)).$$

We have introduced the concept of  $\rho - F$ -contraction, which extends the classic  $F$ -contraction. This new approach is crucial because it generalizes fixed-point results in metric spaces by incorporating a function  $\rho$  that adjusts the contracting behavior of the  $F$ -function. This

generalization is important as it not only covers traditional  $F$ -contractions but also broader versions like those of Wardowski and Piri–Kumam, offering greater flexibility in constructing unique fixed points and analyzing contractive behaviors in various contexts.

As a future direction, it would be interesting to apply this notion of  $\rho - F$ -contraction to  $f$ -quasimetric spaces [17], where distances are not necessarily symmetric. This would open up the exploration of new classes of contractive mappings and further validate the effectiveness of this generalized approach in more complex spaces, where distances may be asymmetric or only partially defined.

**Acknowledgment:** We would like to thank to the editor and reviewer for their great assistance and remarks proposed to improve our paper.

### References

- [1] N. Secolean, D. Wardowski, “New fixed point tools in non-metrizable spaces”, *Results in Mathematics*, **72**:3 (2017), 919–935.
- [2] D. Wardowski, “Fixed points of a new type of contractive mappings in complete metric spaces”, *Fixed Point Theory and Applications*, **94** (2012), Article number: 94(2012).
- [3] H. Piri, P. Kumam, “Some fixed point theorems concerning  $F$ -contraction in complete metric spaces”, *Fixed Point Theory and Applications*, **210** (2014), Article number: 210(2014).
- [4] E. Karapinar, M. A. Kutbi, H. Piri, D. O’Regan, “Fixed points of conditionally  $F$ -contractions in complete metric-like spaces”, *Fixed Point Theory and Applications*, **126** (2015), Article number: 126(2015).
- [5] J. Z. Vujakovi, S. N. Radenović, “On some  $F$ -contraction of Piri–Kumam–Dung-type mappings in metric spaces”, *Military Technical Courier*, **68**:4 (2020), 697–714.
- [6] S. Banach, “Sur les opérations dans les ensembles abstraits et leur application aux équations intégrales”, *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, **3**:1 (1922), 133–181.
- [7] M. A. Alghamdi, N. Hussain, P. Salimi, “Fixed point and coupled fixed point theorems on  $b$ -metric-like spaces”, *Journal of Inequalities and Applications*, **2013** (2013), Article number: 402.
- [8] S. Janković, Z. Kadelburg, S. Radenović, “On cone metric spaces: A survey”, *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, **74**:7 (2011), 2591–2601.
- [9] T. G. Bhaskar, V. Lakshmikantham, “Fixed point theorems in partially ordered metric spaces and applications”, *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, **65**:7 (2006), 1379–1393.
- [10] D. Turkoglu, C. Alaca, Y. J. Cho, C. Yildiz, “Common fixed point theorems in intuitionistic fuzzy metric spaces”, *Journal of Applied Mathematics and Computing*, **22**:1–1 (2006), 411–424.
- [11] I. Arandjelović, Z. Kadelburg, S. Radenović, “Boyd–Wong-type common fixed point results in cone metric spaces”, *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, **217**:17 (2011), 7167–7171.
- [12] C. Bylka, “Fixed point theorems of Matkowski on probabilistic metric spaces”, *Demonstratio Mathematica*, **29**:1 (1996), 159–164.
- [13] A. Awais, M. Nazam, M. Arshad, S. O. Kim, “ $F$ -metric,  $F$ -contraction and common fixed-point theorems with applications”, *Mathematics*, **7**:7 (2019), Article number: 586.
- [14] A. Sahil, M. Masta, M. Poonia, “Fixed point theorems for generalized orthogonal  $F$ -contraction and  $F$ -expansion of Wardowski kind via the notion of  $\psi$ -fixed point”, *International Journal of Nonlinear Analysis and Applications*, **14**:2 (2023), 221–231.
- [15] J. Ahmad, J. Al-Rawashdeh, A. Azam, “New fixed point theorems for generalized  $F$ -contractions in complete metric spaces”, *Fixed Point Theory and Algorithms for Sciences and Engineering*, **80** (2015), 1–18.
- [16] M. Cvetković, “The relation between  $F$ -contraction and Meir–Keeler contraction”, *Rev. Real Acad. Cienc. Exactas Fis. Nat. Ser. A-Mat.*, **117** (2023), Article number: 39.



- [17] E. S. Zhukovskiy, “The fixed points of contractions of  $F$ -quasimetric spaces”, *Siberian Mathematical Journal*, **59**:6 (2018), 1338–1350.

#### Information about the authors

**Randa Chakar**, Post-Graduate Student, Laboratory of Dynamical Systems and Control, Larbi Ben M’Hidi University, Oum El Bouaghi, Algeria. E-mail: chaker.doudi24@gmail.com randa.chakar@univ-oeb.dz  
**ORCID:** <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-4079-876X>

**Sofiane Dehilis**, PhD, Associate Professor of Mathematics and Computer Science Department, Laboratory of Dynamical Systems and Control. Larbi Ben M’Hidi University, Oum El Bouaghi, Algeria. E-mail: dehilissofiane@yahoo.fr  
**ORCID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8771-5046>

**Wassim Merchela**, Candidate of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, Associate Professor of Mathematics Department, Mustapha Stambouli University, Mascara; Researcher at the Laboratory of Applied Mathematics and Modeling, 08 May 1945 University, Guelma, Algeria. E-mail: merchela.wassim@gmail.com wassim.merchela@univ-mascara.dz  
**ORCID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3702-0932>

**Hamza Guebbai**, Professor, Professor of Mathematics Department, 08 May 1945 University, Guelma, Algeria. E-mail: guebaihamza@yahoo.fr  
**ORCID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8119-2881>

There is no conflict of interests.

#### Corresponding author:

Wassim Merchela  
E-mail: merchela.wassim@gmail.com

Received 27.07.2024

Reviewed 15.10.2024

Accepted for press 06.11.2024

#### Информация об авторах

**Чакар Ранда**, аспирант, лаборатория динамических систем и управления, Университет Ларби Бен Мхиди, г. Ум Эль-Буаги, Алжир. E-mail: chaker.doudi24@gmail.com randa.chakar@univ-oeb.dz  
**ORCID:** <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-4079-876X>

**Дехилис Софиан**, кандидат наук, доцент кафедры математики и информатики, лаборатория динамических систем и управления. Университет Ларби Бен Мхиди, г. Ум Эль-Буаги, Алжир. E-mail: dehilissofiane@yahoo.fr  
**ORCID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8771-5046>

**Мерчела Вассим**, кандидат физико-математических наук, доцент кафедры математики, Университет Мустафы Стамбули, г. Маскара; научный сотрудник лаборатории прикладной математики и моделирования, Университет 8 мая 1945 г., г. Гельма, Алжир. E-mail: merchela.wassim@gmail.com wassim.merchela@univ-mascara.dz  
**ORCID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3702-0932>

**Геббай Хамза**, профессор, профессор кафедры математики, Университет 8 мая 1945 г., г. Гельма, Алжир. E-mail: guebaihamza@yahoo.fr  
**ORCID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8119-2881>

Конфликт интересов отсутствует.

#### Для контактов:

Мерчела Вассим  
E-mail: merchela.wassim@gmail.com

Поступила в редакцию 27.07.2024 г.

Поступила после рецензирования 15.10.2024 г.

Принята к публикации 06.11.2024 г.