Fixed point results in ordered bicomplex-valued metric spaces

Mohamed Abdalla (✉ moabdalla@kku.edu.sa)

King Khalid University <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0165-4992>

Fuli He

Central South University of Forestry and Technology Changsha Campus: Central South University of Forestry and Technology

Zahia Mostefaoui

ENS Kouba: Ecole Normale Supérieure de Kouba

Research

Keywords: Bicomplex, Partial order, Fixed point, Contraction mapping, Compatible mapping

Posted Date: February 2nd, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-194721/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Fixed point results in ordered bicomplex-valued metric spaces

Mohamed Abdalla^{1,*}, Fuli He^{2,†} and Zahia Mostefaoui^{3,‡}

¹ Mathematics Department, Faculty of Science, King Khalid University, Abha 61471, Saudi Arabia.

² School of Mathematics and Statistics, Central South University, Changsha 410083, China.

³ Department of Mathematics, E.N.S, B.P. 92 Vieux Kouba 16050 Algiers, Algeria.

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to state some fixed point theorems in ordered bicomplex valued metric spaces for generalized rational type contraction mappings. Examples are given to illustrate the results. Also, some special cases of the established results are deduced as corollaries.

MSC 2020: 47H10, 54D99, 54E99.

Keywords: Bicomplex, Partial order, Fixed point, Contraction mapping, Compatible mapping.

1 Introduction

Bicomplex numbers have been studied for quite a long time, probably beginning with the work of Segre [1], Spampinato [2, 3], and Scorza Dragoni [4]. Their interest arose from the fact that such numbers offer a commutative alternative to the skew field of quaternions (both sets are real four-dimensional spaces), and that in many ways they generalize complex numbers more closely and more accurately than quaternions do. Of course, commutativity is gained at a price, and in this case the price is the fact that the ring of bicomplex numbers is not a field, since zero divisors arise to prevent such a possibility. Anyway, one may expect that bicomplex numbers can serve as scalars both in the theory of functions and functional analysis, being at least a reasonable counterpart for the quaternions, see [5].

The most comprehensive study of analysis in the bicomplex setting is certainly the book of G. B. Price [6], and in recent years there has been a significant impulse to the study of the properties of those functions on the ring of bicomplex numbers, whose properties suggest a notion of bicomplex

*Correspondence: moabdalla@kku.edu.sa

† hefuli999@163.com

‡ z.mostefaoui26@yahoo.fr

holomorphy. Rather than giving an exhaustive list of references, we refer the reader to the article [7, 8] and the forthcoming monograph [9, 10].

The study of existence and uniqueness of coincidence points and common fixed points of mappings satisfying certain contractive conditions has been an interesting field of mathematics from 1922, when Banach stated and proved his famous contraction principle. The field of fixed point theory involving four single-valued maps, began with the assumption that all of the maps are commuted. In 1998, the concept of weakly compatible pairs of mappings had been introduced by Jungck [11], that is the class of mappings such that they commute at their coincidence points. Moreover, the notion of complex-valued metric spaces and some fixed point results for a pair of mappings for contraction condition satisfying a rational expression introduced by Azam et al. [12]. The generalization and extension of this work appeared recently in [13].

Recently, a lot of work is being done on bicomplex functional analysis and their applications, see, e.g., [14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19] and references therein. A systematic study of functional analysis in this setting began with the monograph [9]. After publication of this monograph, some interesting papers have been published in this direction. Also see [20] and [21] for recent work on bicomplex functional analysis. In [23], Choi et al. introduced the notion of bicomplex-valued metric space which is a generalization of complex-valued metric space and established sufficient conditions for the existence of common fixed points of a pair of mappings satisfying a contractive condition. Very recently, some new fixed point theorems for contractive maps that satisfied Mizoguchi-Takahashi's condition in the setting of bicomplex-valued metric spaces are investigated by authors in [22].

In this paper, we prove a unique common fixed point theorem for contractive mappings satisfying the notion of weak compatibility. To substantiate the authenticity of our results, some illustrative examples are also furnished. Moreover, some special cases and consequences of our main results are considered.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we recall some definitions and terminologies which will be used to prove the main results.

2.1 Bicomplex numbers

The set of bicomplex numbers denoted by $\mathbb{BC}$ is the first setting in an infinite sequence of multicomplex sets which are generalizations of the set of complex numbers $\mathbb{C}$. Here we recall the set of bicomplex numbers $\mathbb{BC}$ (see, for example, [6, 9, 10]):

$$\mathbb{BC} = \{w = x_0 + i_1x_1 + i_2x_2 + i_1i_2x_3; \ x_k \in \mathbb{R}, \ (k = 0, 1, 2, 3)\}.$$

Since each element w in $\mathbb{BC}$ can be written as $w = x_0 + i_1x_1 + i_2(x_2 + i_1x_3)$ or $w = z_1 + i_2z_2; \ (z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C})$ we can also express $\mathbb{BC}$ as

$$\mathbb{BC} := \{w = z_1 + i_2z_2, \ z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}\}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $z_1 = x_0 + i_1 x_1$, $z_2 = x_2 + i_1 x_3$ and i_1, i_2 are independent imaginary units such that $i_1^2 = -1 = i_2^2$. The product of i_1 and i_2 defines a hyperbolic unit j such that $j^2 = 1$. The product of units is commutative and is defined as

$$i_1 i_2 = j, \quad i_1 j = -i_2, \quad i_2 j = -i_1.$$

With the addition and multiplication of two bicomplex numbers defined in the obvious way, the set $\mathbb{BC}$ makes up a commutative ring. Three important subsets of $\mathbb{BC}$ can be specified as

$$\mathbb{C}(i_k) := \{x + y i_k; x, y \in \mathbb{R}\}, \quad \text{for } k = 1, 2. \quad (2.2)$$

$$\mathbb{D} := \{x + y j; x, y \in \mathbb{R}\}. \quad (2.3)$$

Each of the sets $\mathbb{C}(i_k)$ is isomorphic to the field of complex numbers, while $\mathbb{D}$ is the set of the so-called hyperbolic numbers.

2.2 Conjugation and moduli

Three kinds of conjugation can be defined on bicomplex numbers. With w specified as in (2.1) and the bar $\bar{\cdot}$ denoting complex conjugation in $\mathbb{C}$, we define

$$w^{\dagger_1} := \bar{z}_1 + \bar{z}_2 i_2, \quad w^{\dagger_2} := z_1 - z_2 i_2, \quad w^{\dagger_3} := \bar{z}_1 - \bar{z}_2 i_2. \quad (2.4)$$

It is easy to check that each conjugation has the following properties

$$(u + v)^{\dagger_k} = u^{\dagger_k} + v^{\dagger_k}, \quad (u^{\dagger_k})^{\dagger_k} = u, \quad (u.v)^{\dagger_k} = u^{\dagger_k}.v^{\dagger_k}. \quad (2.5)$$

here $u, v \in \mathbb{BC}$ and $k = 1, 2, 3$. With each kind of conjugation, one can define a specific bicomplex modulus as

$$\begin{aligned} |w|_{i_1}^2 &:= w.w^{\dagger_2} = z_1^2 + z_2^2 \in \mathbb{C}(i_1), \\ |w|_{i_2}^2 &:= w.w^{\dagger_1} = (|z_1|^2 - |z_2|^2) + 2\text{Re}(z_1 \bar{z}_2)i_2 \in \mathbb{C}(i_2), \\ |w|_j^2 &:= w.w^{\dagger_3} = (|z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2) - 2\text{Im}(z_1 \bar{z}_2)j \in \mathbb{D}. \end{aligned}$$

It can be shown that $|u.v|_s^2 = |u|_s^2 |v|_s^2$, where $s = i_1, i_2$ or j .

A norm of a bicomplex number $w = z_1 + i_2 z_2$ denoted by $\|w\|$ is defined by

$$\|w\| = \|z_1 + i_2 z_2\| = (|z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

which, upon choosing $w = x_0 + i_1 x_1 + i_2 x_2 + i_1 i_2 x_3$, ($x_k \in \mathbb{R}, k = 0, 1, 2, 3$), gives

$$\|w\| = (x_0^2 + x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

For any two bicomplex numbers $u, v \in \mathbb{BC}$, one can easily verify that $\|u + v\| \leq \|u\| + \|v\|$, $\|\alpha u\| = \alpha \|u\|$, where α is nonnegative real number. Further, for any two bicomplex numbers $u, v \in \mathbb{BC}$, $\|uv\| \leq \sqrt{2} \|u\| \|v\|$ holds.

Next, we recall some necessary definitions and lemmas.

First, define a partial order relation $\prec_{i_1}$ on $\mathbb{C}$ as $u_1 \in \mathbb{C}$, $u_1 \prec_{i_1} v_1$ if and only if $\operatorname{Re}(u_1) < \operatorname{Re}(v_1)$ and $\operatorname{Im}(u_1) < \operatorname{Im}(v_1)$. Let $u = u_1 + i_2 u_2 \in \mathbb{BC}$ and $v = v_1 + i_2 v_2 \in \mathbb{BC}$, then we define a partial order relation $\preceq_{i_2}$ on $\mathbb{BC}$ as follows

$$u \preceq_{i_2} v \iff u_1 \preceq_{i_1} v_1 \quad \text{and} \quad u_2 \preceq_{i_1} v_2,$$

where $\prec_{i_1}$ is a partial order relation on $\mathbb{C}$ and $\preceq_{i_1}$ is the reflexive closure of $\prec_{i_1}$.

It is easy to verify $0 \prec_{i_2} u \prec_{i_2} v \implies \|u\| \leq \|v\|$.

The definition of the complex metric space is introduced in [12], we extend this definition to Bicomplex analysis as follows.

Definition 2.1. Let X be a nonempty set. A function $d_{\mathbb{BC}} : X \times X \longrightarrow \mathbb{BC}$ is called a bicomplex-valued metric on X if for $x, y, z \in X$ the following conditions are satisfied:

- (m_1) $0 \preceq_{i_2} d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x, y)$,
- (m_2) $d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $x = y$,
- (m_3) $d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x, y) = d_{\mathbb{BC}}(y, x)$,
- (m_4) $d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x, y) \preceq_{i_2} d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x, z) + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(z, y)$.

Then $(X, d_{\mathbb{BC}})$ is called a bicomplex-valued metric space.

Some known examples of bicomplex-valued metric, which show that a bicomplex-valued metric, are the following.

Example 2.1. On set of real numbers together consider the functionals

$$d_{\mathbb{BC}}^1(x, y) = (1 + i_1 + i_2 + i_1 i_2)|x - y|$$

$$d_{\mathbb{BC}}^2(x, y) = i_1 i_2 |x - y|$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ where $|\cdot|$ is the usual real modulus. One can easily check that $(X, d_{\mathbb{BC}}^1)$, $(X, d_{\mathbb{BC}}^2)$ are a bicomplex-valued metric spaces.

A bicomplex-valued metric space $(X, d_{\mathbb{BC}})$ together with a partial order relation $\preceq_{i_2}$ on X is called partially ordered bicomplex-valued metric space.

Definition 2.2. [22] Let (x_n) be a sequence in a bicomplex-valued metric space $(X, d_{\mathbb{BC}})$. The sequence (x_n) is said to converge to $x \in X$ if and only if for any $0 \prec_{i_2} \varepsilon \in \mathbb{BC}$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ depending on ε such that $d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_n, x) \prec_{i_2} \varepsilon$ for all $n > N$. It is denoted by $x_n \rightarrow x$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ or $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} x_n = x$.

Definition 2.3. [22] A sequence (x_n) in a bicomplex-valued metric space $(X, d_{\mathbb{BC}})$ is said to be a Cauchy sequence if and only if for any $0 \prec_{i_2} \varepsilon \in \mathbb{BC}$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ depending on ε such that $d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_n, x_m) \prec_{i_2} \varepsilon$ for all $n, m > N$.

Definition 2.4. [22] A bicomplex-valued metric space $(X, d_{\mathbb{BC}})$ is said to be complete if and only if every Cauchy sequence in X converges in X .

Lemma 2.1. [23] Let $(X, d_{\mathbb{BC}})$ be a bicomplex-valued metric space and (x_n) be a sequence in X . Then (x_n) converges to $x \in X$ if and only if $\|d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_n, x)\| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$.

Lemma 2.2. [23] Let $(X, d_{\mathbb{BC}})$ be a bicomplex-valued metric space and (x_n) be a sequence in X such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} x_n = x$. Then for any $a \in X$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \|d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_n, a)\| = \|d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x, a)\|$.

Let (X, d) be a metric space and $T, S : X \rightarrow X$ be two mappings. A point $x \in X$ is said to be a coincidence point of T and S if and only if $Sx = Tx$ and a point $y \in X$ is said to be a common fixed point of T and S if and only if $Sx = Tx = x$.

Definition 2.5. [25, 26, 27] The mappings $T, S : X \rightarrow X$ are called commuting if $TSx = STx$ for all $x \in X$, compatible if $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} d(TSx_n, STx_n) = 0$ whenever (x_n) is a sequence such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} Tx_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} Sx_n = t$ for some t in X , weakly compatible if they commute at their coincidence points, that is, if $STx = TSx$ whenever $Sx = Tx$.

Remark 2.1. For the partially order set $(X, \preceq)$, we say that S is non-decreasing if for $x, y \in X$, $x \preceq y$, we have $Sx \preceq Sy$. Similarly, we say that S is non-increasing if for $x, y \in X$, $x \preceq y$, we have $Sx \succeq Sy$ and we say that T is S -non-decreasing if for $x, y \in X$, $Sx \preceq Sy$, we have $Tx \preceq Ty$. Note that if S is the identity mapping, then T is S -non-decreasing means T is monotone nondecreasing.

A subset Y of a partially ordered set X is said to be well-ordered if every two elements of Y are comparable.

3 Statement of Results

In this section, we will present some fixed point theorems in ordered bicomplex-valued metric spaces for generalized rational type contraction mappings. Furthermore, we will give examples and applications to our main results. The first result in this work is the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. Let $(X, \preceq, d_{\mathbb{BC}})$ be a partially ordered complete bicomplex-valued metric space. Suppose that T and S are continuous self mappings on X , $T(X) \subseteq S(X)$, T is a S -non-decreasing mapping and

$$d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Tx, Ty) \preceq_{i_2} \alpha \left(\frac{d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sx, Tx)d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sy, Ty)}{d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sx, Sy)} \right) + \beta d(Sx, Sy) \\ + \gamma [d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sx, Tx) + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sy, Ty)] \\ + \delta [d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sx, Ty) + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sy, Tx)],$$

for all $x, y \in X$ with $Sx \succeq Sy$, $Sx \neq Sy$ and for some $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in [0, 1)$ with $\alpha + 2\beta + 2\gamma + 2\delta < 1$. If there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $Sx_0 \preceq Tx_0$, T and S are compatible, then T and S have a coincidence point.

Proof. By the condition of the theorem there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $Sx_0 \preceq Tx_0$. Since $T(X) \subseteq S(X)$, we can find a point $x_1 \in X$ such that $Sx_1 = Tx_0$, then $Sx_0 \preceq Tx_0 = Sx_1$. Since T is S -non-decreasing, we have $Sx_1 = Tx_0 \preceq Tx_1$. In this way, we construct the sequence (x_n) recursively as

$$Tx_n = Sx_{n+1} \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1,$$

for which

$$Sx_0 \preceq Tx_0 = Sx_1 \preceq Tx_1 = Sx_2 \preceq Tx_2 \preceq \dots \preceq Tx_{n-1} = Sx_n \preceq Tx_n = Sx_{n+1} \preceq \dots$$

We suppose that $d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tx_n, Tx_{n+1}) \succ_{i_2} 0$ for all n . If not, then $Tx_{n+1} = Tx_n$ for some n , $Tx_{n+1} = Sx_{n+1}$, i.e., T and S have a coincidence point x_{n+1} , and thus, we have the result. Consider

$$\begin{aligned} & d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tx_{n+1}, Tx_n) \\ & \preceq_{i_2} \alpha \left(\frac{d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_{n+1}, Tx_{n+1}) d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_n, Tx_n)}{d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_{n+1}, Sx_n)} \right) + \beta d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_{n+1}, Sx_n) \\ & \quad + \gamma [d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_{n+1}, Tx_{n+1}) + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_n, Tx_n)] \\ & \quad + \delta [d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_{n+1}, Tx_n) + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_n, Tx_{n+1})] \\ & = \alpha \left(\frac{d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_{n+1}, Sx_{n+2}) d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_n, Sx_{n+1})}{d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_{n+1}, Sx_n)} \right) + \beta d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_{n+1}, Sx_n) \\ & \quad + \gamma [d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_{n+1}, Sx_{n+2}) + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_n, Sx_{n+1})] \\ & \quad + \delta [d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_{n+1}, Sx_{n+1}) + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_n, Sx_{n+2})] \\ & \preceq_{i_2} \alpha d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_{n+1}, Sx_{n+2}) + \beta d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_{n+1}, Sx_n) \\ & \quad + \gamma [d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_{n+1}, Sx_{n+2}) + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_n, Sx_{n+1})] \\ & \quad + \delta [d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_n, Sx_{n+1}) + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_{n+1}, Sx_{n+2})] \\ & = (\alpha + \gamma + \delta) d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_{n+1}, Sx_{n+2}) + (\beta + \gamma + \delta) d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_n, Sx_{n+1}) \\ & = (\alpha + \gamma + \delta) d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tx_n, Tx_{n+1}) + (\beta + \gamma + \delta) d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tx_{n-1}, Tx_n), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tx_{n+1}, Tx_n) \preceq_{i_2} \frac{(\beta + \gamma + \delta)}{1 - (\alpha + \gamma + \delta)} d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tx_n, Tx_{n-1}).$$

Using mathematical induction we have

$$d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tx_{n+1}, Tx_n) \preceq_{i_2} \left(\frac{\beta + \gamma + \delta}{1 - (\alpha + \gamma + \delta)} \right)^n d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tx_1, Tx_0).$$

Put $h = \frac{(\beta + \gamma + \delta)}{1 - (\alpha + \gamma + \delta)}$, since $\alpha + \beta + 2\gamma + 2\delta < 1$, then $0 \leq h < 1$ and consequently for all $n > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tx_{n+1}, Tx_{n+2}) & \preceq_{i_2} h d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tx_n, Tx_{n+1}) \preceq_{i_2} h^2 d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tx_{n-1}, Tx_n) \\ & \preceq_{i_2} \dots \preceq_{i_2} h^{n+1} d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tx_0, Tx_1). \end{aligned}$$

Now, for $m > n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tx_n, Tx_m) &\preceq_{i_2} d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tx_n, Tx_{n+1}) + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tx_{n+1}, Tx_{n+2}) + \dots + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tx_{m-1}, Tx_m) \\ &\preceq_{i_2} (h^n + h^{n+1} + h^{n+2} + \dots + h^{m-1}) d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tx_0, Tx_1) \\ &\preceq_{i_2} \frac{h^n}{1-h} d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tx_0, Tx_1). \end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$\| d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tx_n, Tx_m) \| \leq \frac{h^n}{1-h} \| d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tx_0, Tx_1) \|.$$

Taking limit as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, we obtain $\| d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tx_n, Tx_m) \| \rightarrow 0$, that is $d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tx_n, Tx_m) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. Therefore, (Tx_n) is a Cauchy sequence in the complete bicomplex-valued metric space. Then, there exists $u \in X$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tx_n, u) = 0.$$

By the continuity of T , we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(T(Tx_n), Tu) = 0.$$

Since $Sx_{n+1} = Tx_n \rightarrow u$ and the pair (T, S) is compatible, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(S(Tx_n), T(Sx_n)) = 0.$$

Then, since $Tx_n \rightarrow u$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ in $(X, d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}})$, and S is continuous, we get $STx_n \rightarrow Su$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ in $(X, d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}})$. Therefore, we get,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tu, Su) &\preceq_{i_2} d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tu, T(Sx_n)) + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(T(Sx_n), fu) \\ &\preceq_{i_2} d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tu, T(Sx_n)) + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(TSx_n, STx_n) + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(STx_n, Su), \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \| d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tu, Su) \| &\preceq_{i_2} \| d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tu, T(Sx_n)) \| + \| d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(T(Sx_n), Su) \| \\ &\preceq_{i_2} \| d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tu, T(Sx_n)) \| + \| d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(TSx_n, STx_n) \| + \| d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(STx_n, Su) \|. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $n \rightarrow +\infty$ in the above inequality, we get that $\| d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tu, Su) \| = 0$. i.e, $Tu = Su$ and u is a coincidence point of T and S . $\square$

Example 3.1. Let $X = \{1, 2, 3\}$ reendowed with the partial order $\preceq$ is defined as $\{(1, 1), (2, 2), (3, 3), (3, 1)\}$. Let a mapping $d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}} : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}$ be defined by $d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(x, y) = (1 + i_1 + i_2 + i_1 i_2) |x - y|$, $(\forall x, y \in X)$, where $|\cdot|$ is the usual real modulus. One can easily check that $(X, d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}})$ is a complete bicomplex-valued metric on $\mathbb{C}$.

Define $T(1) = 1$, $T(2) = 2$ and $T(3) = 1$ and $S(1) = 1$, $S(2) = 2$ and $S(3) = 3$. Then, for $x = 3$, $y = 1$, we have $d(Tx, Ty) = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(T(3), T(1)) = 0 &\preceq_{i_2} \alpha \left(\frac{d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(S3, T3) d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(S1, T1)}{d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(S3, S1)} \right) + \beta d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(S3, S1) \\ &\quad + \gamma [d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(S3, T3) + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(S1, T1)] \\ &\quad + \delta [d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(S3, T1) + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(S1, T3)] \\ &= 2(\beta + \gamma + \delta)(1 + i_1 + i_2 + i_1 i_2). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the inequality holds. On the other hand, it is obvious that T is S -non decreasing mapping and there exists $x_0 = 3$ such that $Sx_0 \preceq Tx_0$ and 1 is a unique common fixed point of S and T .

Example 3.2. Let $X = \{0, 1, 3\}$ reendowed with the partial order $\preceq$ is defined as $\{(0, 0), (1, 1), (3, 3), (0, 1), (0, 3), (3, 1)\}$. Let a mapping $d : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{BC}$ be defined by $d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x, y) = (i_1 i_2)|x - y|$, $(\forall x, y \in X)$, where $|\cdot|$ is the usual real modulus.

Define $Tx = 1$, for all $x \in X$ and $S(0) = 3$, $S(1) = 1$ and $S(3) = 1$. Then, for $x = 0$, $y = 1$, we have $d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Tx, Ty) = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbb{BC}}(T0, T1) = 0 &\preceq_{i_2} \alpha \left(\frac{d_{\mathbb{BC}}(S0, T0)d_{\mathbb{BC}}(S1, T1)}{d_{\mathbb{BC}}(S0, S1)} \right) \\ &+ \beta d_{\mathbb{BC}}(S0, S1) + \gamma [d_{\mathbb{BC}}(S0, T0) + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(S1, T1)] \\ &+ \delta [d_{\mathbb{BC}}(S0, T1) + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(S1, T0)] \\ &=_{i_2} (\beta + \gamma + \delta)d(3, 1) \\ &=_{i_2} 2(\beta + \gamma + \delta)(i_1 i_2). \end{aligned}$$

In the same way, for $x = 0$, $y = 3$, we have $d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Tx, Ty) = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbb{BC}}(T0, T3) = 0 &\preceq_{i_2} \alpha \left(\frac{d_{\mathbb{BC}}(S0, T0)d_{\mathbb{BC}}(S3, T3)}{d_{\mathbb{BC}}(S0, S3)} \right) \\ &+ \beta d_{\mathbb{BC}}(S0, S3) + \gamma [d_{\mathbb{BC}}(S0, T0) + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(S3, T3)] \\ &+ \delta [d_{\mathbb{BC}}(S0, T3) + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(S3, T0)] \\ &=_{i_2} (\beta + \gamma + \delta)d_{\mathbb{BC}}(3, 1) \\ &=_{i_2} 2(\beta + \gamma + \delta)(i_1 i_2). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the inequality holds. On the other hand, it is obvious that T is S -non-decreasing mapping with respect to $\preceq$ and there exists $x_0 = 3$ such that $Sx_0 \preceq Tx_0$, 1 is a common fixed point of S and T and 3 is a coincidence fixed point of S and T .

As a consequence of Theorem 3.1, we have the following corollaries.

If $S = I$ (the identity mapping) in Theorem 3.1, we have the following result:

Corollary 3.1. Let $(X, \preceq, d_{\mathbb{BC}})$ be a partially ordered complete bicomplex-valued metric space. Suppose that T is continuous self mapping on X , T is a monotone non-decreasing mapping and

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Tx, Ty) &\preceq_{i_2} \alpha \left(\frac{d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x, Tx)d(y, Ty)}{d(x, y)} \right) \\ &+ \beta d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x, y) + \gamma [d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x, Tx) + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(y, Ty)] \\ &+ \delta [d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x, Ty) + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(y, Tx)], \end{aligned}$$

for all $x, y \in X$ with $x \succeq y$, $x \neq y$ and for some $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in [0, 1)$ with $\alpha + \beta + 2\gamma + 2\delta < 1$. If there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $x_0 \preceq Tx_0$, then T has a fixed point.

If $\gamma = \delta = 0$ in Theorem 3.1, we have the following result:

Corollary 3.2. Let $(X, \preceq, d_{\mathbb{BC}})$ be a partially ordered complete bicomplex-valued metric space. T and S are continuous self mappings on X , $T(X) \subseteq S(X)$, T is a f non-decreasing mapping and

$$d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Tx, Ty) \preceq_{i_2} \alpha \left(\frac{d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sx, Tx)d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sy, Ty)}{d_{\mathbb{BC}}(fx, fy)} \right) + \beta d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sx, Sy),$$

for all $x, y \in X$ with $Sx \succeq Sy$, $Sx \neq Sy$ and for some $\alpha, \beta \in [0, 1)$ with $\alpha + \beta < 1$. If there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $Sx_0 \preceq Tx_0$, T and S are compatible, then T and S have a coincidence point.

Remark 3.1. Corollary 3.2 extends Theorem 2.1 of [24] from metric spaces to bicomplex-valued metric spaces.

If $\beta = 0$ in Corollary 3.2 we have the following result:

Corollary 3.3. *Let $(X, \preceq, d_{\mathbb{BC}})$ be a partially ordered complete bicomplex-valued metric. T and S are continuous self mappings on X , $T(X) \subseteq S(X)$, T is a S non-decreasing mapping and*

$$d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Tx, Ty) \preceq_{i_2} \alpha \left(\frac{d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sx, Tx)d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sy, Ty)}{d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sx, Sy)} \right),$$

for all $x, y \in X$ with $Sx \succeq Sy$, $Sx \neq Sy$ and for some $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ with $\alpha < 1$. If there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $Sx_0 \preceq Tx_0$, T and S are compatible, then T and S have a coincidence point.

Remark 3.2. Corollary 3.3 extends Corollary 2.2 of [24] from metric spaces to bicomplex-valued metric spaces.

In what follows, we prove that Theorem 3.1 is still valid for T not necessarily continuous, assuming the following hypothesis in X :

*if (x_n) is a nondecreasing sequence in X such that
 $x_n \rightarrow x$, then $x_n \preceq x$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

Theorem 3.2. *Let $(X, \preceq, d_{\mathbb{BC}})$ be a partially ordered complete bicomplex-valued. Suppose that T and S are self mappings on X , $T(X) \subseteq S(X)$, T is a S -monotone non-decreasing mapping and*

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Tx, Ty) \preceq_{i_2} & \alpha \left(\frac{d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sx, Tx)d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sy, Ty)}{d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sx, Sy)} \right) + \beta d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sx, Sy) \\ & + \gamma [d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sx, Tx) + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sy, Ty)] \\ & + \delta [d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sx, Ty) + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sy, Tx)], \end{aligned}$$

for all $x, y \in X$ with $Sx \succeq Sy$, $Sx \neq Sy$ and for some $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in [0, 1)$ with $\alpha + \beta + 2\gamma + 2\delta < 1$. Also assume that $S(X)$ is closed and for any non-decreasing sequence (x_n) in X which converges to x we have $x_n \preceq x$ for all n . If there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $Sx_0 \preceq Tx_0$, then T and f have a coincidence point.

Further, if T and S are weakly compatible, then T and S have a common fixed point. Moreover, the set of common fixed points of T and S is well ordered if and only if T and S have one and only one common fixed point.

Proof. Following the proof of Theorem 3.1, we have (Tx_n) is a Cauchy sequence and so is (Sx_n) . Since $S(X)$ is closed and X is complete,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} Tx_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} Sx_n = Su, \quad \text{for some } u \in X.$$

Notice that the sequences (Tx_n) and (Sx_n) are non-decreasing, then from our assumptions we have

$$Tx_n \preceq Su, \quad \text{and} \quad Sx_n \preceq Su, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Keeping in mind that T is S -monotone non-decreasing we get $Tx_n \preceq Tu$ for all n , let $n \rightarrow +\infty$, we obtain $Su \preceq Tu$. Suppose $Su \prec Tu$ (otherwise we are done), construct a sequence (u_n) as $u_0 = u$ and $Su_{n+1} = Tu_n$ for all n , a similar argument as in the proof of theorem (3.1) yields (Su_n) is a non-decreasing sequence and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} Tu_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} Su_n = Sv, \quad \text{for some } v \in X.$$

From our assumptions it follows that

$$\sup Su_n \preceq Sv \quad \text{and} \quad \sup Tu_n \preceq Sv.$$

Notice that

$$Sx_n \preceq Su \preceq Su_1 \preceq \cdots \preceq Su_n \preceq \cdots \preceq Sv,$$

we distinguish two cases:

Case 1: Suppose there is $n_0 \geq 1$ with $Sx_{n_0} = Su_{n_0}$, then $Sx_{n_0} = Su = Su_{n_0} = Su_1 = Tu$, we are done.

Case 2: Suppose $Sx_n \neq Su_n$ for all $n \geq 1$, then from the assumption we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_{n+1}, Su_{n+1}) &= d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tx_n, Tu_n) \\ &\preceq_{i_2} \alpha \left(\frac{d(Sx_n, Tx_n) d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Su_n, Tu_n)}{d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_n, Su_n)} \right) + \beta d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_n, Su_n) \\ &\quad + \gamma [d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_n, Tx_n) + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Su_n, Tu_n)] \\ &\quad + \delta [d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sx_n, Tu_n) + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Su_n, Tx_n)]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $n \rightarrow +\infty$, we get $d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Su, Sv) \preceq_{i_2} (\beta + 2\delta) d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Su, Sv)$, which implies that $Su = Sv$ since $\beta + 2\delta < 1$. Hence $Su = Sv = Su_1 = Tu$.

Now suppose that T and f are weakly compatible. Let $w = Tu = Su$. Then $Tw = TSu = STu = Sw$. Consider

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(T(u), T(w)) &\preceq_{i_2} \alpha \frac{d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Su, Tu) d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sw, Tw)}{d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Su, Sw)} + \beta d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Su, Sw) \\ &\quad + \gamma [d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Su, Tu) + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sw, Tw)] \\ &\quad + \delta [d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Su, Tw) + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Sw, Tu)] \\ &\preceq_{i_2} \beta d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tu, Tw) + \delta [d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tu, Tw) + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tw, Tu)] \\ &\preceq_{i_2} (\beta + 2\delta) d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tu, Tw). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tu, Tw) = 0$, as $\beta + 2\delta < 1$. Therefore, $Tw = Sw = w$. Now suppose that the set of common fixed points of T and S is well ordered. We claim that the common fixed point of T and S is unique. Assume on the contrary that $Tu = fSu = u$ and $Tv = Sv = v$ but $u \neq v$. Consider

$$\begin{aligned}
d_{\mathbb{BC}}(u, v) &= d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Tu, Tv) \\
&\preceq_{i_2} \alpha \frac{d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Su, Tu)d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sv, Tv)}{d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Su, Sv)} + \beta d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Su, Sv) \\
&\quad + \gamma[d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Su, Tu) + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sv, Tv)] + \delta[d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Su, Tv) + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sv, Tu)] \\
&\preceq_{i_2} \beta d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Tu, Tv) + \delta[d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Tu, Tv) + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Tv, Tu)] \\
&\preceq_{i_2} (\beta + 2\delta)d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Tu, Tv).
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that $d_{\mathbb{BC}}(u, v) = 0$, as $\beta + 2\delta < 1$. Hence $u = v$. Conversely, if T and S have only one common fixed point then the set of common fixed points of S and T being a singleton is well ordered, the proof is complete. $\square$

According to Theorem 3.2, we have the following corollaries.

If we take $\gamma = \delta = 0$ in Theorem (3.2) we get the following result:

Corollary 3.4. *Let $(X, \preceq, d_{\mathbb{BC}})$ be a partially ordered complete bicomplex-valued metric space. Suppose that T and S are self mappings on X , $T(X) \subseteq S(X)$, T is a S -monotone non-decreasing mapping and*

$$d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Tx, Ty) \preceq_{i_2} \alpha \left(\frac{d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sx, Tx)d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sy, Ty)}{d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sx, Sy)} \right) + \beta d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sx, Sy),$$

for all $x, y \in X$ with $Sx \succeq Sy$, $Sx \neq Sy$ and for some $\alpha, \beta \in [0, 1)$ with $\alpha + \beta < 1$.

Also assume that $S(X)$ is closed and for any non-decreasing sequence (x_n) in X which converges to x we have $x_n \preceq x$ for all n . If there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $Sx_0 \preceq Tx_0$, then T and f have a coincidence point.

Further, if T and S are weakly compatible, then T and S have a common fixed point. Moreover, the set of common fixed points of T and S is well ordered if and only if T and S have one and only one common fixed point.

Remark 3.3. Corollary 3.4 extends Theorem 2.3 [24] from metric spaces to bicomplex-valued metric spaces.

Corollary 3.5. *Let $(X, \preceq, d_{\mathbb{BC}})$ be a partially ordered complete bicomplex-valued metric space. Suppose that T and S are self mappings on X , $T(X) \subseteq S(X)$, T is a S -monotone non-decreasing mapping and*

$$d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Tx, Ty) \preceq_{i_2} \alpha \left(\frac{d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sx, Tx)d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sy, Ty)}{d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Sx, Sy)} \right),$$

for all $x, y \in X$ with $Sx \succeq Sy$, $Sx \neq Sy$ and for some $\alpha \in [0, 1)$. Also assume that $S(X)$ is closed and for any non-decreasing sequence (x_n) in X which converges to x we have $x_n \preceq x$ for all n . If there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $Sx_0 \preceq Tx_0$, then T and f have a coincidence point.

Further, if T and S are weakly compatible, then T and S have a common fixed point. Moreover, the set of common fixed points of T and S is well ordered if and only if T and S have one and only one common fixed point.

Remark 3.4. Corollary 3.5 extends Corollary 2.4 of [24] from metric spaces to bicomplex-valued metric spaces.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $(X, \preceq, d_{\mathbb{BC}})$ be a partially ordered complete bicomplex-valued metric space. Let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a continuous and nondecreasing mapping. Suppose there exist nonnegative real numbers α, β and γ with $\alpha + 2\beta + 2\gamma < 1$ such that for all $x, y \in X$ with $x \preceq y$,*

$$d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Tx, Ty) \preceq_{i_2} \alpha \left(\frac{d_{\mathbb{BC}}(y, Ty)[1 + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x, Tx)]}{1 + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x, y)} \right) + \beta [d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x, Tx) + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(y, Ty)] + \gamma [d_{\mathbb{BC}}(y, Tx) + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x, Ty)]. \quad (3.1)$$

If there exists $x_0 \in X$ with $x_0 \preceq Tx_0$, then T has a fixed point.

Proof. If $x_0 = Tx_0$, then we have the result. Suppose that $x_0 \prec Tx_0$. Then we construct a sequence (x_n) in X such that

$$x_{n+1} = Tx_n, \quad \text{for every } n \geq 0. \quad (3.2)$$

Since T is a nondecreasing mapping, we obtain by induction that

$$x_0 \prec Tx_0 = x_1 \preceq Tx_1 = x_2 \preceq \dots \preceq Tx_{n-1} = x_n \preceq Tx_n = x_{n+1} \preceq \dots \quad (3.3)$$

If there exists some $n_0 \geq 1$ such that $x_{n_0+1} = x_{n_0}$, then from (3.2), $x_{n_0+1} = Tx_{n_0} = x_{n_0}$, that is, x_{n_0} is a fixed point of T and the proof is finished. Then we can suppose that $x_{n+1} \neq x_n$, for all $n \geq 1$, since $x_n \prec x_{n+1}$, for all $n \geq 1$, applying (3.1) we have

$$d_{\mathbb{BC}}(Tx_n, Tx_{n+1}) \preceq_{i_2} \alpha \left(\frac{d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_{n+1}, Tx_{n+1})[1 + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_n, Tx_n)]}{1 + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_n, x_{n+1})} \right) + \beta [d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_n, Tx_n) + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_{n+1}, Tx_{n+1})] + \gamma [d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_{n+1}, Tx_n) + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_n, Tx_{n+1})],$$

that is,

$$d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) \preceq_{i_2} \alpha \left(\frac{d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2})[1 + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_n, x_{n+1})]}{1 + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_n, x_{n+1})} \right) + \beta [d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_n, x_{n+1}) + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2})] + \gamma [d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_n, x_{n+2})],$$

which implies that

$$d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) \preceq_{i_2} \alpha d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) + \beta [d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_n, x_{n+1}) + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2})] + \gamma [d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_n, x_{n+1}) + d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2})],$$

that is

$$d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) \preceq_{i_2} \frac{\beta + \gamma}{1 - \alpha - \beta - \gamma} d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_n, x_{n+1}). \quad (3.4)$$

Now, $\alpha + 2\beta + 2\gamma < 1$ implies that $\frac{\beta + \gamma}{1 - \alpha - \beta - \gamma} < 1$, put $\frac{\beta + \gamma}{1 - \alpha - \beta - \gamma} = h$, then by repeated application (3.4), we have

$$d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) \preceq_{i_2} h d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_n, x_{n+1}) \preceq h^2 d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_{n-1}, x_n) \preceq_{i_2} \dots \preceq h^{n+1} d_{\mathbb{BC}}(x_0, x_1). \quad (3.5)$$

For any $m > n$,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(x_m, x_n) &\preceq_{i_2} d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(x_n, x_{n+1}) + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) \preceq_{i_2} \dots + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(x_{m-1}, x_m) \\ &\preceq_{i_2} [h^n + h^{n+1} + h^{n+2} + \dots + h^{m-1}] d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(x_0, x_1) \\ &\preceq_{i_2} \frac{h^n}{1-h} d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(x_0, x_1) \end{aligned},$$

that is

$$\| d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(x_m, x_n) \| \leq \frac{h^n}{1-h} \| d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(x_0, x_1) \|.$$

Taking limit as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, we obtain $\| d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(x_n, x_m) \| \rightarrow 0$, that is $d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(x_n, x_m) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, which implies that, (x_n) is a Cauchy sequence, from the completeness of X , there exists $w \in X$ such that

$$x_n \rightarrow w \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

The continuity of T implies that $Tw = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} Tx_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} x_{n+1} = w$, that is, w is a fixed point of T . $\square$

In our next theorem we relax the continuity assumption of the mapping T in Theorem 3.3 by imposing the following order condition of the complex valued metric space X : if (x_n) is a non-decreasing sequence in X such that $x_n \rightarrow x$, then $x_n \preceq x$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $(X, \preceq, d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}})$ be a partially ordered complete Bicomplex valued metric space. Assume that if (x_n) is a nondecreasing sequence in X such that $x_n \rightarrow x$, then $x_n \preceq x$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a nondecreasing mapping such that for all $x, y \in X$ with $x \preceq y$, (3.1) is satisfied, where the condition on α, β and γ are same as in theorem 3.3. If there exists $x_0 \in X$ with $x_0 \preceq Tx_0$, then T has a fixed point.*

Proof. We take the same sequence (x_n) as in the proof of theorem 3.3. Arguing like in the proof of theorem 3.3, we prove that (x_n) is a nondecreasing sequence which satisfies $x_n \rightarrow w$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. Then, by the conditions of the theorem $x_n \preceq w$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Applying (3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(x_{n+1}, Tw) &= d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tx_n, Tw) \\ &\preceq_{i_2} \alpha \left(\frac{d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(w, Tw)[1 + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(x_n, x_{n+1})]}{1 + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(x_n, w)} \right) \\ &\quad + \beta [d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(x_n, x_{n+1}) + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(w, Tw)] \\ &\quad + \gamma [d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(w, x_{n+1}) + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(x_n, Tw)]. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ in the above inequality, we have

$$d(w, Tw) \preceq_{i_2} (\alpha + \beta + \gamma) d(w, Tw),$$

that is

$$\| d(w, Tw) \| \leq (\alpha + \beta + \gamma) \| d(w, Tw) \|.$$

Since $\alpha + \beta + \gamma < 1$, it is a contradiction unless $d(w, Tw) = 0$, that is, $Tw = w$, that is, w is a fixed point of T . $\square$

Now, we shall prove the uniqueness of the fixed point.

Theorem 3.5. *In addition to the hypotheses of theorem 3.3 (or theorem 3.4), suppose that for every $x, y \in X$, there exists $z \in X$ such that $z \preceq x$ and $z \preceq y$, then T has a unique fixed point.*

Proof. It follows from the theorem 3.3 (or theorem 3.4) that the set of fixed points of T is non-empty. We shall show that if v and w are two fixed points of T , that is, if $v = Tv$ and $w = Tw$, then $v = w$. By the assumption, there exists $z_0 \in X$ such that $z_0 \preceq v$ and $z_0 \preceq w$. Then, similarly as in the proof of theorem 3.3, we define the sequence (z_n) such that

$$z_{n+1} = Tz_n = T^{n+1}z_0, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots \quad (3.6)$$

monotonicity of T implies that $T^n z_0 = z_n \preceq v = T^n v$ and $TT^n z_0 = z_n \preceq w = T^n w$, if there exists a positive integer m such that $v = z_m$, then $v = Tv = Tz_m = z_{m+1}$, for all $n \geq m$. Then $z_n \rightarrow v$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. Now we suppose that $v \neq z_n$, for all $n \geq 0$, so $z_n \prec v$, for all $n \geq 0$, applying (3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(z_{n+1}, v) &= d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(Tz_n, Tv) \\ &\preceq_{i_2} \alpha \left(\frac{d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(v, Tv)[1 + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(z_n, z_{n+1})]}{1 + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(z_n, v)} \right) + \beta [d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(z_n, z_{n+1}) + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(v, Tv)] \\ &\quad + \gamma [d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(v, z_{n+1}) + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(z_n, Tv)] \\ &= \beta d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(z_n, z_{n+1}) + \gamma [d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(v, z_{n+1}) + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(z_n, v)] \\ &\preceq_{i_2} \beta [d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(z_n, v) + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(v, z_{n+1})] + \gamma [d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(v, z_{n+1}) + d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(z_n, v)], \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(z_{n+1}, v) \preceq_{i_2} \frac{\beta + \gamma}{1 - \beta - \gamma} d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(z_n, v).$$

Put $\frac{\beta + \gamma}{1 - \beta - \gamma} = k (< 1)$. Then it follows that

$$d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(z_{n+1}, v) \preceq_{i_2} k d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(z_n, v) \preceq_{i_2} k^2 d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(z_{n-1}, v) \preceq_{i_2} \dots \preceq_{i_2} k^{n+1} d(z_0, v),$$

then

$$\| d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(z_{n+1}, v) \| \preceq_{i_2} k^{n+1} \| d(z_0, v) \|.$$

Taking limit as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, we obtain $d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(z_n, v) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$; that is, $z_n \rightarrow v$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. Using a similar argument, we can prove that $z_n \rightarrow w$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. Finally, the uniqueness of the limit implies that $v = w$. Hence T has a unique fixed point. $\square$

Example 3.3. Let $X = \{0, \frac{1}{2}, 2\}$. Partial order $\preceq$ is defined as $x \preceq y$ iff $x \geq y$. Let the Bicomplex valued metric d be given as

$$d_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}}(x, y) = |x - y| i_1 i_2, \quad \forall x, y \in X$$

Let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be defined as follows

$$T(0) = 0, \quad T\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = 0, \quad T(2) = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Let $\alpha = \gamma = \frac{1}{8}$ and $\beta = \frac{1}{4}$.

Here all the conditions of Theorems 3.3 and 3.1 are satisfied. Additionally, the conditions of Theorem 3.5 are also satisfied and it is seen that 0 is the unique fixed point of T .

Acknowledgements

The authors are thankful to the area editor and referees for giving valuable comments and suggestions.

Funding

No funding.

Availability of data and materials

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analyzed in this study.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Authors' contributions

All authors contributed equally to the writing of this paper. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

References

- [1] C. Segre, *Le rappresentazioni reali delle forme complesse e gli enti iperalgebrici*, Math. Ann., **40**, (1892), 413-467.
- [2] N. Spampinato, *Estensione nel Campo Bicompleso di Due Teoremi, del Levi-Civita e del Severi, per le Funzione Olomorfe di Due Variabili Complesse. I, II*, Atti Reale Accad. Naz. Lincei, Rend., **22**, (1935), 96-102.
- [3] N. Spampinato, *Sulla Rappresentazione delle Funzioni di Variabile Bicomplessa Totalmente Derivabili*. Ann. Mat. Pura Appl., **14**, (1936), 305-325.
- [4] G. Scorza Dragoni, *Sulle funzioni olomorfe di una variabile bicomplessa*. Reale Accad. d'Italia, Mem. Classe Sci. Nat. Fis. Mat., **5**, (1934), 597-665.
- [5] C. Cerroni, *From the theory of congeneric surd equations to Segre's bicomplex numbers*, Historia Mathematica, **44**, (2017), 232-251.
- [6] G. B. Price, *An Introduction to Multicomplex Spaces and Functions*, Marcel Dekker, (1991).
- [7] M. E. Luna-Elizarraràs, M. Shapiro, *On modules over bicomplex and hyperbolic numbers*. Applied Complex and Quaternionic Approximation, editors: R.K. Kovacheva, J. Lawrynnowicz, and S. Marchiafava, Edizioni Nuova Cultura, Roma, (2009), 76-92.
- [8] M. E. Luna-Elizarraràs, M. Shapiro, D. C. Struppa, A. Vajiac, *Bicomplex numbers and their elementary functions*, Cubo, A. Mathe. J., **14**, (2012), 61-80.
- [9] D. Alpay, M. E. Luna-Elizarraràs, M. Shapiro and D. C. Struppa, *Basics of functional analysis with bicomplex scalars, and bicomplex Schur analysis*. Springer briefs in mathematics. Springer, (2014).

- [10] M. E. Luna-Elizarraràs, M. Shapiro, D. C. Struppa and A. Vajiac, Bicomplex holomorphic functions: the algebra, geometry and analysis of bicomplex numbers. *Frontiers in mathematics*. Birkhäuser, (2015).
- [11] G. Jungck, B.E. Rhoades, *Fixed point for set valued functions without continuity*, Indian J. Pure Appl. Math., **29**, (1998), 227-238.
- [12] A. Azam, F. Brain and M. Khan, *Common fixed point theorems in complex valued metric spaces*, Numer. Funct. Anal. Optim., **32**, (2011), 243-253.
- [13] N. Singh, D. Singh, A. Badal and V. Joshi, *Fixed point theorems in complex valued metric spaces*, J. Egypt. Math. Soci., **24**, (2016), 402-409.
- [14] D. Rochon and S. Tremblay, *Bicomplex Quantum Mechanics II: The Hilbert Space*, Advances in Applied Clifford Algebras, **16**, (2006), 135-157.
- [15] R. G. Lavoie, L. Marchildon and D. Rochon, *Infinite-dimensional bicomplex Hilbert spaces*, Ann. Funct. Anal., **11**, (2010), 75-91.
- [16] R. G. Lavoie, L. Marchildon and D. Rochon, *Finite-dimensional bicomplex Hilbert spaces*, Adv. Appl. Clifford Algebr., **21**, (2011), 561-581.
- [17] H. De Bie, D. C. Struppa, A. Vajiac and M. B. Vajiac, *The Cauchy-Kowalewski product for bicomplex holomorphic functions*, Math. Nachr., **285**, (2012), 1230-1242.
- [18] M. E. Luna-Elizarraràs, M. Shapiro, D. C. Struppa and A. Vajiac, *Complex Laplacian and derivatives of bicomplex functions*, Complex Anal. Oper. Theory., **7**, (2013), 1675-1711.
- [19] M. E. Luna-Elizarraràs, C. O. Perez-Regalado and M. Shapiro, *On the bicomplex Gleason-Kahane Zelazko theorem*, Complex Anal. Oper. Theory, **10**(2), (2016), 327-352.
- [20] R. Kumar and K. Singh, *Bicomplex linear operators on bicomplex Hilbert spaces and Littlewood's subordination theorem*, Adv. Appl. Clifford Alg., **25**(3), (2015), 591-610.
- [21] R. Kumar, K. Singh, H. Saini and S. Kumar, *Bicomplex weighted Hardy spaces and bicomplex C^* -algebras*, Adv. Appl. Clifford Alg., **26**(1), (2016), 217-235.
- [22] Fuli He, Z. Mostefaoui and M. Abdalla, *Fixed point theorems for Mizoguchi-Takahashi type contraction in bicomplex-valued metric spaces and applications*, J. Funct. Spaces., Vol. 2020 —Art. 4070324, 7 pages.
- [23] J. Choi, S. K. Datta, T. Biswas and M. N. Islam, *Some fixed point theorems in connection with two weakly compatible mappings in bicomplex valued metric spaces*, Hona. Math. J., **39**, (2017), 115-126.
- [24] S. Amritsar, *Some commn fixed pint result for rational type contraction mappings in partially ordered metric speces*, Math. Bohemia., **138**, (2013), 407-413.

- [25] G. Junck, *Commuting maps and fixed points*, Am. Math. Monthly, **83**, (1976), 261-263.
- [26] G. Junck, *Compatible mappings and common fixed points*, Int. J. Math. Sci., **9**, (1986), 771-779.
- [27] G. Junck, *Common fixed points of non continuous non-self mappings on a non-numeric spaces*, Far. East J. Math. Sci., **4(2)**, (1996), 199-212.