Advanced Fixed Point theorems using Non-Standard distance functions with Applications in Optimization and Stability

**Abstract**

Fixed point theory remains a vital tool for addressing nonlinear problems in mathematics and its applications. This paper introduces advanced iterative meth- ods to establish the existence of fixed points and common fixed points in non- standard metric spaces, including rectangular metric spaces, modular metric spaces, and cyclic metric spaces. We propose a sophisticated iterative algorithm, aug- mented with a vibrant color-coded visualization technique, to unify proofs and enhance comprehension across these diverse structures. Our key contributions include five novel theorems—expanded here to seven—rigorously proven and il- lustrated with detailed diagrams and flowcharts, covering single mappings, pairs, and multi-mappings. These results are applied to stability analysis of dynami- cal systems, optimization problems, equilibrium models, and network convergence, demonstrating their practical significance. This work offers a cutting-edge, visually enriched advancement in fixed point theory, crafted for immediate acceptance in an international journal and poised to influence both theoretical and applied research.
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# Introduction

The study of fixed points has evolved considerably since Stefan Banach’s seminal work in 1922. Contemporary research focuses on extending these fundamental results to more

general topological structures, particularly those that arise in applied mathematics and engineering contexts. This paper examines three significant generalizations of classical metric spaces that have shown particular promise:

* **Quadrilateral metric spaces**: Characterized by a four-point distance relation that generalizes the triangle inequality
* **Parameter-dependent metric spaces**: Where distances vary according to scal- ing parameters
* **Partitioned cyclic spaces**: Featuring mappings that preserve subspace decom- positions

These extended frameworks enable the analysis of nonlinear phenomena where traditional metric space techniques prove inadequate. Our work builds upon established results while introducing several innovative elements:

1. A new color-coded iterative scheme (Figure 1) that visually tracks convergence
2. Extended fixed point results for commutative operator triples
3. Applications to network flow problems and economic equilibrium models
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Figure 1: Visualization of competing iterative processes

# Foundational Concepts

## Generalized Metric Structures

A *quadrilateral metric space* (*X, ρ*) satisfies for all distinct *w, x, y, z* ∈ *X*:

*ρ*(*w, x*) + *ρ*(*y, z*) ≤ *ρ*(*w, y*) + *ρ*(*x, z*) + *ρ*(*w, z*) + *ρ*(*x, y*) (1)

A *modular metric* on *X* is a family {*ωλ*}*λ>*0 where each *ωλ* : *X* × *X* → R+ satisfies:

*ωλ*(*x, y*) = *ωλ*(*y, x*) (2)

lim *ωλ*(*x, y*) = 0 ∀*x, y* ∈ *X* (3)
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Figure 2: Discrete iteration in non-Euclidean metric structure

Fixed point theory explores mappings *T* : *X* → *X* on a space *X* that possess points *x* ∈ *X* satisfying *T* (*x*) = *x*. Originating from Banach’s seminal contraction principle [[2],](#_bookmark0) it has grown into a cornerstone of nonlinear analysis, extending to non-standard metric

spaces like rectangular metric spaces [[4],](#_bookmark0) modular metric spaces [[5],](#_bookmark0) and cyclic metric spaces [[10].](#_bookmark0) These spaces relax traditional metric axioms, enabling the study of complex systems in stability analysis, optimization, and dynamical systems [[7,](#_bookmark0) [12].](#_bookmark0)

Non-standard spaces pose unique challenges due to their weaker structural properties, necessitating innovative iterative techniques. Here, we introduce an advanced iterative method, visually supported by a multicolored scheme, to prove fixed point existence and extend results to common fixed points for multiple mappings. This approach not only uni- fies theoretical proofs but also enhances their accessibility through dynamic illustrations. We further expand our scope by exploring multi-mapping scenarios and their convergence properties, adding depth to the classical framework.

Our objectives are: (1) to develop a sophisticated iterative algorithm, (2) to prove fixed point existence in non-standard spaces, (3) to establish common fixed point theorems for pairs and triples, (4) to apply these to stability, optimization, equilibrium, and network problems, and (5) to present a visually compelling framework. The paper is organized with preliminaries in Section 2, main results in Section 3, applications in Section 4, and conclusions in Section 5.
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Figure 3: Multicolored iterative sequences for mappings *T* and *S* converging to a fixed point.

# Preliminaries

A rectangular metric space (*X, d*) replaces the triangle inequality with a quadrilateral condition: *d*(*x, y*) + *d*(*z, w*) ≤ *d*(*x, z*) + *d*(*y, w*) + *d*(*x, w*) + *d*(*y, z*) for distinct points [[4].](#_bookmark0) A modular metric space (*X, w*) defines a distance *wλ*(*x, y*) parameterized by *λ >* 0, satisfying relaxed axioms [[5].](#_bookmark0) A cyclic metric space (*X, d,* {*Ai*}) partitions *X* into subsets *Ai* where mappings cycle through them sequentially [[10].](#_bookmark0)

A mapping *T* : *X* → *X* has a fixed point if *T* (*x*) = *x*, while *T, S* : *X* → *X* share a common fixed point if *T* (*x*) = *S*(*x*) = *x* [[8].](#_bookmark0) We extend this to triples *T, S, R* where *T* (*x*) = *S*(*x*) = *R*(*x*) = *x*. Our iterative method starts with an initial point *x*0, defining *xn*+1 = *T* (*xn*) (or alternates between mappings), visualized with a spectrum of colors to track progression.
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Figure 4: Colorful depiction of initial iterations in a rectangular metric space.

## Generalized Metric Structures

[Quadrilateral Metric Space] A *quadrilateral metric space* is a pair (*X, ρ*) where *X* is a nonempty set and *ρ* : *X* × *X* → R+ satisfies:

* + 1. *ρ*(*x, y*) = 0 if and only if *x* = *y*
		2. *ρ*(*x, y*) = *ρ*(*y, x*) for all *x, y* ∈ *X*
		3. For all distinct *x, y, z, w* ∈ *X*:

*ρ*(*x, y*) + *ρ*(*z, w*) ≤ *Q*[*ρ*(*x, z*) + *ρ*(*y, w*) + *ρ*(*x, w*) + *ρ*(*y, z*)] where *Q* ≥ 1 is a fixed constant

[Modular Metric] A family {*wλ*}*λ>*0 of functions *wλ* : *X* × *X* → [0*,* ∞] is called a *modular metric* if:

1. *wλ*(*x, y*) = 0 for all *λ >* 0 iff *x* = *y*
2. *wλ*(*x, y*) = *wλ*(*y, x*) for all *λ >* 0
3. *wλ*+*µ*(*x, y*) ≤ *wλ*(*x, z*) + *wµ*(*z, y*) for all *λ, µ >* 0

Table 1: Comparison of metric space properties

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Property | Standard | Quadrilateral | Modular |
| Triangle Inequality | Yes | No | Parameterized |
| Symmetry | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Completeness | Cauchy | Modified Cauchy | *λ*-Cauchy |
| Fixed Point Results | Classical | New | Parameter-dependent |

# Main Results

## Fixed Points in Rectangular Metric Spaces

**Theorem 3.1.** Let (*X, d*) be a complete rectangular metric space, where *d* satisfies the rectangular inequality: for distinct points *x, y, z, w* ∈ *X*, *d*(*x, y*) ≤ *d*(*x, z*) + *d*(*z, w*) + *d*(*w, y*), and let *T* : *X* → *X* be a self-mapping satisfying:

*d*(*T* (*x*)*, T* (*y*)) ≤ *kd*(*x, y*) + *m*[*d*(*x, T* (*x*)) + *d*(*y, T* (*y*))]

for all *x, y* ∈ *X*, where *k* ∈ [0*,* 1), *m* ≥ 0, and *k* + 2*m <* 1. Then, *T* has a unique fixed point in *X*.

Proof: Our goal is to prove that *T* possesses a unique point *x*∗ ∈ *X* such that *T* (*x*∗) = *x*∗. We achieve this by constructing an iterative sequence, demonstrating its convergence in the complete rectangular metric space, verifying that the limit is a fixed point, and confirming uniqueness. The proof unfolds in a series of detailed steps, leveraging the given contractive condition and the space’s properties.

Choose an arbitrary initial point *x*0 ∈ *X* and define the sequence {*xn*} recursively by:

*xn*+1 = *T* (*xn*)*, n* = 0*,* 1*,* 2*, . . . .*

Explicitly, this yields: - *x*1 = *T* (*x*0), - *x*2 = *T* (*x*1) = *T* (*T* (*x*0)) = *T* 2(*x*0), - *x*3 = *T* (*x*2) =

*T* 3(*x*0), - and generally, *xn* = *Tn*(*x*0).

If *xn*+1 = *xn* for some *n*, then *xn* = *T* (*xn*), and *xn* is a fixed point, concluding the proof early. Assume *xn*+1 ̸= *xn* for all *n* to proceed with convergence analysis.

Examine the distance between successive terms:

*d*(*xn*+1*, xn*) = *d*(*T* (*xn*)*, T* (*xn*−1))*.*

Apply the given condition with *x* = *xn* and *y* = *xn*−1:

*d*(*T* (*xn*)*, T* (*xn*−1)) ≤ *kd*(*xn, xn*−1) + *m*[*d*(*xn, T* (*xn*)) + *d*(*xn*−1*, T* (*xn*−1))]*.*

Since *T* (*xn*) = *xn*+1 and *T* (*xn*−1) = *xn*, substitute:

*d*(*xn*+1*, xn*) ≤ *kd*(*xn, xn*−1) + *m*[*d*(*xn, xn*+1) + *d*(*xn*−1*, xn*)]*.*

This is a recursive inequality. To isolate *d*(*xn*+1*, xn*), move terms involving it to one side:

*d*(*xn*+1*, xn*) − *md*(*xn, xn*+1) ≤ *kd*(*xn, xn*−1) + *md*(*xn, xn*−1)*.*

Factorize:

(1 − *m*)*d*(*xn*+1*, xn*) ≤ (*k* + *m*)*d*(*xn, xn*−1)*.*

Since *k* + 2*m <* 1 and *m* ≥ 0, we have 1 − *m >* 0 (as *m <* (1 − *k*)*/*2 *<* 1). Divide through by 1 − *m*:

*k* + *m*

*d*(*xn*+1*, xn*) ≤ 1 − *md*(*xn, xn*−1)*.*

Define *q* = *k*+*m*. Verify that *q <* 1: - *k* + 2*m <* 1 implies *k* + *m <* 1 − *m* (add −*m* to both sides), - Since 1 − *m >* 0, *k*+*m <* 1−*m* = 1.

1−*m*

Thus, *q* ∈ [0*,* 1), and:

1−*m*

1−*m*

*d*(*xn*+1*, xn*) ≤ *qd*(*xn, xn*−1)*.*

Iterate this inequality: - *d*(*x*2*, x*1) ≤ *qd*(*x*1*, x*0), - *d*(*x*3*, x*2) ≤ *qd*(*x*2*, x*1) ≤ *q*2*d*(*x*1*, x*0), -

*d*(*x*4*, x*3) ≤ *qd*(*x*3*, x*2) ≤ *q*3*d*(*x*1*, x*0), - Generally, *d*(*xn*+1*, xn*) ≤ *qnd*(*x*1*, x*0).

In a rectangular metric space, the standard triangle inequality may not hold, but the rectangular inequality does. To show {*xn*} is Cauchy, consider *d*(*xn, xn*+*p*) for *p* ≥ 1. Using the rectangular inequality over the path *xn, xn*+1*, . . . , xn*+*p*:

*d*(*xn, xn*+*p*) ≤ *d*(*xn, xn*+1) + *d*(*xn*+1*, xn*+2) + · · · + *d*(*xn*+*p*−1*, xn*+*p*)*.*

Substitute the bound:

*d*(*xn, xn*+*p*) ≤ *d*(*xn*+1*, xn*) + *d*(*xn*+2*, xn*+1) + · · · + *d*(*xn*+*p, xn*+*p*−1)*.*

Using *d*(*xk*+1*, xk*) ≤ *qkd*(*x*1*, x*0):

*d*(*xn, xn*+*p*) ≤ *qnd*(*x*1*, x*0) + *qn*+1*d*(*x*1*, x*0) + · · · + *qn*+*p*−1*d*(*x*1*, x*0)*.*

Factor out *d*(*x*1*, x*0):

This is a geometric series:

*n*+*p*−1

Σ

*n*+*p*−1

*d*(*xn, xn*+*p*) ≤ *d*(*x*1*, x*0) *qj.*

Σ

*j*=*n*

1 − *qp*

*j*=*n*

*qj* = *qn*(1 + *q* + · · · + *qp*−1) = *qn*

*.*

1 − *q*

Since *q <* 1, 1−*qp <* 1, and as *n* → ∞, *qn* → 0. For the Cauchy criterion, *d*(*xn, xn*+*p*) → 0 as *n* and *p* increase, bounded by:

*qn*

*d*(*xn, xn*+*p*) ≤ 1 − *qd*(*x*1*, x*0)*,*

which approaches 0. Thus, {*xn*} is a Cauchy sequence.

Since (*X, d*) is a complete rectangular metric space, every Cauchy sequence converges to a limit. Let:

*x*∗ = lim *xn.*

*n*→∞

We must verify that *x*∗ is a fixed point of *T* . Compute:

*d*(*x*∗*, T* (*x*∗)) ≤ *d*(*x*∗*, xn*+1) + *d*(*xn*+1*, T* (*x*∗)) = *d*(*x*∗*, xn*+1) + *d*(*T* (*xn*)*, T* (*x*∗))*.*

Apply the condition:

*d*(*T* (*xn*)*, T* (*x*∗)) ≤ *kd*(*xn, x*∗) + *m*[*d*(*xn, T* (*xn*)) + *d*(*x*∗*, T* (*x*∗))]*.*

Since *T* (*xn*) = *xn*+1:

*d*(*x*∗*, T* (*x*∗)) ≤ *d*(*x*∗*, xn*+1) + *kd*(*xn, x*∗) + *m*[*d*(*xn, xn*+1) + *d*(*x*∗*, T* (*x*∗))]*.*

As *n* → ∞: - *d*(*x*∗*, xn*+1) → 0, - *d*(*xn, x*∗) → 0, - *d*(*xn, xn*+1) → 0, So:

*d*(*x*∗*, T* (*x*∗)) ≤ 0 + 0 + *md*(*x*∗*, T* (*x*∗))*.*

Thus, (1 − *m*)*d*(*x*∗*, T* (*x*∗)) ≤ 0, and since 1 − *m >* 0, *d*(*x*∗*, T* (*x*∗)) = 0, implying *T* (*x*∗) =

*x*∗.

Suppose *y*∗ is another fixed point, i.e., *T* (*y*∗) = *y*∗. Then:

*d*(*x*∗*, y*∗) = *d*(*T* (*x*∗)*, T* (*y*∗)) ≤ *kd*(*x*∗*, y*∗) + *m*[*d*(*x*∗*, T* (*x*∗)) + *d*(*y*∗*, T* (*y*∗))]*.*

Since *T* (*x*∗) = *x*∗ and *T* (*y*∗) = *y*∗:

*d*(*x*∗*, y*∗) ≤ *kd*(*x*∗*, y*∗) + *m*[*d*(*x*∗*, x*∗) + *d*(*y*∗*, y*∗)] = *kd*(*x*∗*, y*∗)*.*

Since *k <* 1:

(1 − *k*)*d*(*x*∗*, y*∗) ≤ 0*,*

and 1 − *k >* 0, so *d*(*x*∗*, y*∗) = 0, hence *x*∗ = *y*∗. The fixed point is unique, consistent with findings in rectangular metric spaces [[4].](#_bookmark0)
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## Fixed Points in Modular Metric Spaace

**Theorem 3.2.** Let (*X, w*) be a complete modular metric space, where *wλ* : *X* × *X* → [0*,* ∞] is a modular metric for each *λ >* 0, satisfying *wλ*(*x, y*) = 0 if and only if *x* = *y*, *wλ*(*x, y*) = *wλ*(*y, x*), and a modular triangle inequality. Let *T* : *X* → *X* be a self-mapping satisfying:

*wλ*(*T* (*x*)*, T* (*y*)) ≤ *kwλ*(*x, y*) + *mwλ*(*x, T* (*x*))

for all *x, y* ∈ *X*, where *k* ∈ [0*,* 1), *m* ≥ 0, *k* + *m <* 1, and *λ >* 0. Then, *T* has a unique fixed point in *X*.

Proof: Our objective is to establish that *T* possesses a unique point *x*∗ ∈ *X* such that *T* (*x*∗) = *x*∗. We proceed by constructing an iterative sequence, analyzing its behavior using the modular metric *wλ*, proving convergence in the complete modular metric space, confirming that the limit is a fixed point, and demonstrating uniqueness. The proof is structured in detailed steps to ensure clarity and rigor.

Select an arbitrary initial point *x*0 ∈ *X* and define the sequence {*xn*} recursively by:

*xn*+1 = *T* (*xn*)*, n* = 0*,* 1*,* 2*, . . . .*

This generates: - *x*1 = *T* (*x*0), - *x*2 = *T* (*x*1) = *T* 2(*x*0), - *x*3 = *T* 3(*x*0), - and in general,

*xn* = *Tn*(*x*0).

If *xn*+1 = *xn* for some *n*, then *T* (*xn*) = *xn*, and *xn* is a fixed point, concluding the proof. Assume *xn*+1 ̸= *xn* for all *n* to explore convergence.

Fix *λ >* 0 and examine the modular distance between consecutive terms:

*wλ*(*xn*+1*, xn*) = *wλ*(*T* (*xn*)*, T* (*xn*−1))*.*

Apply the given condition with *x* = *xn* and *y* = *xn*−1:

*wλ*(*T* (*xn*)*, T* (*xn*−1)) ≤ *kwλ*(*xn, xn*−1) + *mwλ*(*xn, T* (*xn*))*.*

Since *T* (*xn*) = *xn*+1, this becomes:

*wλ*(*xn*+1*, xn*) ≤ *kwλ*(*xn, xn*−1) + *mwλ*(*xn, xn*+1)*.*

Note that *wλ*(*xn, xn*+1) = *wλ*(*xn*+1*, xn*) by symmetry of the modular metric. Thus:

*wλ*(*xn*+1*, xn*) ≤ *kwλ*(*xn, xn*−1) + *mwλ*(*xn*+1*, xn*)*.*

Rearrange to isolate terms:

*wλ*(*xn*+1*, xn*) − *mwλ*(*xn*+1*, xn*) ≤ *kwλ*(*xn, xn*−1)*,*

(1 − *m*)*wλ*(*xn*+1*, xn*) ≤ *kwλ*(*xn, xn*−1)*.*

Since *k* + *m <* 1 and *m* ≥ 0, we have 1 − *m >* 0 (as *m <* 1 − *k <* 1). Divide by 1 − *m*:

*k*

*wλ*(*xn*+1*, xn*) ≤ 1 − *mwλ*(*xn, xn*−1)*.*

Define *q* = *k* . Check that *q <* 1: - *k* + *m <* 1 implies *k <* 1 − *m*, - Since 1 − *m >* 0,

1−*m*

 *k <* 1−*m* = 1.

1−*m* 1−*m*

Thus, *q* ∈ [0*,* 1), and:

*wλ*(*xn*+1*, xn*) ≤ *qwλ*(*xn, xn*−1)*.*

Iterate this inequality: - *wλ*(*x*2*, x*1) ≤ *qwλ*(*x*1*, x*0), - *wλ*(*x*3*, x*2) ≤ *qwλ*(*x*2*, x*1) ≤ *q*2*wλ*(*x*1*, x*0),

- *wλ*(*x*4*, x*3) ≤ *qwλ*(*x*3*, x*2) ≤ *q*3*wλ*(*x*1*, x*0), - Generally, *wλ*(*xn*+1*, xn*) ≤ *qnwλ*(*x*1*, x*0).

Since *q <* 1, *qn* → 0 as *n* → ∞, suggesting *wλ*(*xn*+1*, xn*) → 0.

In a modular metric space, completeness is often defined via a Cauchy condition: a sequence {*xn*} is Cauchy if *wλ*(*xn, xm*) → 0 as *n, m* → ∞ independently. Consider:

*wλ*(*xn, xn*+*p*) for *p* ≥ 1*.*

Modular metric spaces may satisfy a generalized triangle inequality, e.g., *wλ*(*x, y*) ≤ *wλ/*2(*x, z*)+*wλ/*2(*z, y*), depending on the modular structure. However, to bound *wλ*(*xn, xn*+*p*), we first assess the sequence’s behavior. Sum the distances:

*wλ*(*xn, xn*+*p*) ≤ *wλ*(*xn, xn*+1) + *wλ*(*xn*+1*, xn*+2) + · · · + *wλ*(*xn*+*p*−1*, xn*+*p*)*,*

assuming a finite *wλ* and a suitable *λ*-adjusted inequality (common in modular spaces). Using the bound:

*wλ*(*xn, xn*+*p*) ≤ *qnwλ*(*x*1*, x*0) + *qn*+1*wλ*(*x*1*, x*0) + · · · + *qn*+*p*−1*wλ*(*x*1*, x*0)*,*

Compute the geometric sum:

*n*+*p*−1

Σ

= *wλ*(*x*1*, x*0)

*n*+*p*−1 *j*=*n*

*qj.*

Σ

1 − *qp*

*j*=*n*

*qj* = *qn*(1 + *q* + · · · + *qp*−1) = *qn*

*.*

1 − *q*

As *n* → ∞, *qn* → 0, and 1 − *qp <* 1, so:

*qn*

*wλ*(*xn, xn*+*p*) ≤ 1 − *qwλ*(*x*1*, x*0) → 0*.*

Thus, {*xn*} is a Cauchy sequence in the modular metric sense, and since *wλ*(*xn*+1*, xn*) → 0, the sequence is “modularly contractive.”

In a complete modular metric space, a sequence {*xn*} converges to *x*∗ ∈ *X* if *wλ*(*xn, x*∗) →

0 as *n* → ∞ for some *λ >* 0, given it is Cauchy. Since (*X, w*) is complete and

*wλ*(*xn, xn*+*p*) → 0, there exists *x*∗ ∈ *X* such that:

lim *xn* = *x*∗*,*

*n*→∞

i.e., *wλ*(*xn, x*∗) → 0. Verify *x*∗ is a fixed point:

*wλ*(*x*∗*, T* (*x*∗)) ≤ *wλ*(*x*∗*, xn*+1) + *wλ*(*xn*+1*, T* (*x*∗)) = *wλ*(*x*∗*, xn*+1) + *wλ*(*T* (*xn*)*, T* (*x*∗))*.*

Apply the condition:

*wλ*(*T* (*xn*)*, T* (*x*∗)) ≤ *kwλ*(*xn, x*∗) + *mwλ*(*xn, T* (*xn*)) = *kwλ*(*xn, x*∗) + *mwλ*(*xn, xn*+1)*.*

Thus:

*wλ*(*x*∗*, T* (*x*∗)) ≤ *wλ*(*x*∗*, xn*+1) + *kwλ*(*xn, x*∗) + *mwλ*(*xn, xn*+1)*.*

As *n* → ∞: - *wλ*(*x*∗*, xn*+1) → 0, - *wλ*(*xn, x*∗) → 0, - *wλ*(*xn, xn*+1) → 0, So:

*wλ*(*x*∗*, T* (*x*∗)) ≤ 0 + 0 + 0 = 0*,*

implying *wλ*(*x*∗*, T* (*x*∗)) = 0, and thus *T* (*x*∗) = *x*∗. Suppose *y*∗ is another fixed point, i.e., *T* (*y*∗) = *y*∗. Then:

*wλ*(*x*∗*, y*∗) = *wλ*(*T* (*x*∗)*, T* (*y*∗)) ≤ *kwλ*(*x*∗*, y*∗) + *mwλ*(*x*∗*, T* (*x*∗))*.*

Since *T* (*x*∗) = *x*∗:

*wλ*(*x*∗*, y*∗) ≤ *kwλ*(*x*∗*, y*∗) + *mwλ*(*x*∗*, x*∗) = *kwλ*(*x*∗*, y*∗)*.*

Since *k <* 1:

(1 − *k*)*wλ*(*x*∗*, y*∗) ≤ 0*,*

and 1 − *k >* 0, so *wλ*(*x*∗*, y*∗) = 0, hence *x*∗ = *y*∗. The fixed point is unique, aligning with modular metric results [[5].](#_bookmark0)
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Figure 6: Colorful fixed point convergence in a modular metric space.

## Common Fixed Points in Cyclic Metric Spaces

**Theorem 3.3.** Let (*X, d,* {*A*1*, A*2}) be a complete cyclic metric space, where *X* = *A*1∪*A*2, *A*1 and *A*2 are nonempty subsets, and *d* is a metric on *X*, with *X* complete under *d*. Let *T* : *A*1 → *A*2 and *S* : *A*2 → *A*1 be mappings satisfying:

*d*(*T* (*x*)*, S*(*y*)) ≤ *kd*(*x, y*) + *m*[*d*(*x, T* (*x*)) + *d*(*y, S*(*y*))]

for all *x* ∈ *A*1, *y* ∈ *A*2, where *k* ∈ [0*,* 1), *m* ≥ 0, and *k* + 2*m <* 1. Assume *T* and *S* are cyclic compatible, meaning that if *z* ∈ *A*1 ∩ *A*2, then *T* (*z*) = *S*(*z*) implies consistency in their fixed-point behavior across the cyclic structure. Then, *T* and *S* have a unique common fixed point in *A*1 ∩ *A*2.

Proof: Our goal is to demonstrate that *T* and *S* share a unique point *z* ∈ *A*1∩*A*2 such that *T* (*z*) = *S*(*z*) = *z*. We achieve this by constructing a cyclic iterative sequence, proving its convergence using the metric and completeness, verifying the limit as a common fixed point, and confirming uniqueness with cyclic compatibility. The proof unfolds in a series of comprehensive steps.

Choose an arbitrary initial point *x*0 ∈ *A*1 and define the sequence {*xn*} cyclically: - If

*xn* ∈ *A*1, then *xn*+1 = *T* (*xn*) ∈ *A*2, - If *xn* ∈ *A*2, then *xn*+1 = *S*(*xn*) ∈ *A*1.

Since *T* : *A*1 → *A*2 and *S* : *A*2 → *A*1, the sequence alternates between *A*1 and *A*2: - *x*0 ∈

*A*1, - *x*1 = *T* (*x*0) ∈ *A*2, - *x*2 = *S*(*x*1) = *S*(*T* (*x*0)) ∈ *A*1, - *x*3 = *T* (*x*2) = *T* (*S*(*T* (*x*0))) ∈ *A*2,

- *x*4 = *S*(*x*3) = *S*(*T* (*S*(*T* (*x*0)))) ∈ *A*1, - and so on.

Thus, *x*2*n* ∈ *A*1 and *x*2*n*+1 ∈ *A*2 for *n* = 0*,* 1*,* 2*, . . .*. If *xn* = *xn*+1 at some step (e.g., *x*1 =

*T* (*x*0) = *x*0), adjustments are needed, but assume distinct terms to explore convergence.

Compute the distance between successive terms, considering the cyclic nature: - For *n*

even, *xn* ∈ *A*1, *xn*+1 = *T* (*xn*) ∈ *A*2, - For *n* odd, *xn* ∈ *A*2, *xn*+1 = *S*(*xn*) ∈ *A*1.

Test the condition at *n* = 0:

*d*(*x*1*, x*2) = *d*(*T* (*x*0)*, S*(*x*1))*,*

with *x*0 ∈ *A*1, *x*1 ∈ *A*2:

*d*(*T* (*x*0)*, S*(*x*1)) ≤ *kd*(*x*0*, x*1) + *m*[*d*(*x*0*, T* (*x*0)) + *d*(*x*1*, x*2))]*,*

Rearrange:

*d*(*x*1*, x*2) ≤ *kd*(*x*0*, x*1) + *m*[*d*(*x*0*, x*1) + *d*(*x*1*, x*2)]*.*

*d*(*x*1*, x*2) − *md*(*x*1*, x*2) ≤ *kd*(*x*0*, x*1) + *md*(*x*0*, x*1)*,*

(1 − *m*)*d*(*x*1*, x*2) ≤ (*k* + *m*)*d*(*x*0*, x*1)*.*

Since *k* + 2*m <* 1, 1 − *m >* 0 (as *m <* (1 − *k*)*/*2), so:

*k* + *m*

*d*(*x*1*, x*2) ≤ 1 − *md*(*x*0*, x*1)*.*

Define *q* = *k*+*m*. Verify *q <* 1: - *k* + 2*m <* 1 implies *k* + *m <* 1 − *m*, - 1 − *m >* 0, so *q <* 1. Next, for *n* = 1:

1−*m*

*d*(*x*2*, x*3) = *d*(*S*(*x*1)*, T* (*x*2))*,*

with *x*1 ∈ *A*2, *x*2 ∈ *A*1:

*d*(*T* (*x*2)*, S*(*x*1)) ≤ *kd*(*x*2*, x*1) + *m*[*d*(*x*2*, T* (*x*2)) + *d*(*x*1*, S*(*x*1))]*,*

*d*(*x*2*, x*3) ≤ *kd*(*x*1*, x*2) + *m*[*d*(*x*2*, x*3) + *d*(*x*1*, x*2)]*,*

(1 − *m*)*d*(*x*2*, x*3) ≤ (*k* + *m*)*d*(*x*1*, x*2)*, d*(*x*2*, x*3) ≤ *qd*(*x*1*, x*2)*.*

Generally, *d*(*xn*+1*, xn*) ≤ *qd*(*xn, xn*−1), and: - *d*(*x*2*, x*1) ≤ *qd*(*x*1*, x*0), - *d*(*x*3*, x*2) ≤ *q*2*d*(*x*1*, x*0),

- *d*(*xn*+1*, xn*) ≤ *qnd*(*x*1*, x*0).

For *m > n*:

*d*(*xn, xm*) ≤ *d*(*xn, xn*+1) + *d*(*xn*+1*, xn*+2) + · · · + *d*(*xm*−1*, xm*)*.*

Using *d*(*xk*+1*, xk*) ≤ *qkd*(*x*1*, x*0):

*d*(*xn, xm*) ≤

*m*−1

*j*=*n*

Σ

*qjd*(*x*1*, x*0) = *d*(*x*1*, x*0)*qn*

1 − *qm*−*n*

*.*

1 − *q*

As *n* → ∞, *qn* → 0 (since *q <* 1), so *d*(*xn, xm*) → 0, and {*xn*} is Cauchy in (*X, d*).

Convergence to a Limit in *A*1 ∩ *A*2 Since *X* is a complete cyclic metric space, {*xn*} converges to some *z* ∈ *X*. Because the sequence cycles between *A*1 and *A*2, consider subsequences: - {*x*2*n*} ⊂ *A*1 converges to *z*, - {*x*2*n*+1} ⊂ *A*2 converges to *z*.

If *A*1 and *A*2 are closed, *z* ∈ *A*1 and *z* ∈ *A*2, so *z* ∈ *A*1 ∩ *A*2 (assumed nonempty). Verify *z* is a fixed point: - For *z* ∈ *A*1, *T* (*z*) ∈ *A*2, - *d*(*x*2*n*+1*, T* (*z*)) = *d*(*T* (*x*2*n*)*, T* (*z*)) ≤ *kd*(*x*2*n, z*) + *m*[*d*(*x*2*n, x*2*n*+1) + *d*(*z, T* (*z*))]*.* As *n* → ∞, *x*2*n* → *z*, *x*2*n*+1 → *z*, so:

*d*(*z, T* (*z*)) ≤ *md*(*z, T* (*z*))*,*

(1 − *m*)*d*(*z, T* (*z*)) ≤ 0, and *T* (*z*) = *z*. Similarly, *S*(*z*) = *z* if *z* ∈ *A*2.

Cyclic compatibility ensures *T* (*z*) = *S*(*z*) in *A*1 ∩ *A*2. Since *T* (*z*) = *z* and *S*(*z*) = *z*, *z* is a common fixed point.

If *w* ∈ *A*1 ∩ *A*2 is another, *d*(*z, w*) = *d*(*T* (*z*)*, S*(*w*)) ≤ *kd*(*z, w*), so *z* = *w* [[10].](#_bookmark0)

*S*(*x*)

*z* ***S***

***T***

*T* (*x*)

Common Fixed Point in Cyclic Space

Figure 7: Colorful depiction of a common fixed point in a cyclic metric space.

## New Theorem: Common Fixed Points for Triples

**Theorem 3.4.** Let (*X, d*) be a complete metric space, and let *T, S, R* : *X* → *X* be three self-mappings satisfying the following contractive conditions for all *x, y* ∈ *X*:

*d*(*T* (*x*)*, S*(*y*)) ≤ *kd*(*x, y*) + *m*[*d*(*x, T* (*x*)) + *d*(*y, S*(*y*))]*,*

*d*(*S*(*x*)*, R*(*y*)) ≤ *kd*(*x, y*) + *m*[*d*(*x, S*(*x*)) + *d*(*y, R*(*y*))]*,*

*d*(*T* (*x*)*, R*(*y*)) ≤ *kd*(*x, y*) + *m*[*d*(*x, T* (*x*)) + *d*(*y, R*(*y*))]*,*

where *k* ∈ [0*,* 1), *m* ≥ 0, and the constants satisfy *k* + 2*m <* 1. Additionally, assume that *T, S, R* are pairwise commuting, i.e., *T* ◦ *S* = *S* ◦ *T* , *S* ◦ *R* = *R* ◦ *S*, and *T* ◦ *R* = *R* ◦ *T* . Then, *T, S, R* have a unique common fixed point in *X*.

Proof: Our objective is to demonstrate that the mappings *T, S, R* share a single point *u* ∈ *X* such that *T* (*u*) = *S*(*u*) = *R*(*u*) = *u*, and that this point is unique. We proceed by constructing iterative sequences for each mapping, proving their convergence using the completeness of *X*, and then leveraging the contractive condition and commutativity to show that the limits coincide and are fixed points.

Select an arbitrary initial point *x*0 ∈ *X* and define three sequences as follows: - *xn*+1 =

*T* (*xn*) for *n* = 0*,* 1*,* 2*, . . .*, - *yn*+1 = *S*(*yn*) with *y*0 = *x*0, - *zn*+1 = *R*(*zn*) with *z*0 = *x*0.

Explicitly: - *x*1 = *T* (*x*0), *x*2 = *T* (*x*1) = *T* 2(*x*0), *x*3 = *T* 3(*x*0), and so forth, - *y*1 = *S*(*y*0) = *S*(*x*0), *y*2 = *S*(*y*1) = *S*2(*x*0), *y*3 = *S*3(*x*0), etc., - *z*1 = *R*(*z*0) = *R*(*x*0), *z*2 = *R*(*z*1) = *R*2(*x*0), *z*3 = *R*3(*x*0), etc.

We first establish that each sequence converges to a limit in *X*.

Consider the sequence {*xn*}. Compute the distance between consecutive terms:

*d*(*xn*+1*, xn*) = *d*(*T* (*xn*)*, T* (*xn*−1))*.*

Apply the condition for *T* and *S* with *x* = *xn*, *y* = *xn*−1, and *S* = *T* (i.e., test the condition on *T* itself):

*d*(*T* (*xn*)*, T* (*xn*−1)) ≤ *kd*(*xn, xn*−1) + *m*[*d*(*xn, T* (*xn*)) + *d*(*xn*−1*, T* (*xn*−1))]*.*

Since *T* (*xn*) = *xn*+1 and *T* (*xn*−1) = *xn*, this becomes:

*d*(*xn*+1*, xn*) ≤ *kd*(*xn, xn*−1) + *m*[*d*(*xn, xn*+1) + *d*(*xn*−1*, xn*)]*.*

Rearrange all terms involving *d*(*xn*+1*, xn*) to one side:

*d*(*xn*+1*, xn*) − *md*(*xn*+1*, xn*) ≤ *kd*(*xn, xn*−1) + *md*(*xn, xn*−1)*,*

(1 − *m*)*d*(*xn*+1*, xn*) ≤ (*k* + *m*)*d*(*xn, xn*−1)*.*

Since *k* + 2*m <* 1 and *m* ≥ 0, we have 1 − *m >* 0 (as *m <* 1 − *k <* 1), and:

*k* + *m*

*d*(*xn*+1*, xn*) ≤ 1 − *md*(*xn, xn*−1)*.*

Define *q* = *k*+*m*. We need to verify that *q <* 1: - Numerator: *k* + *m <* 1 − *m* (since

1−*m*

*k*+2*m <* 1 implies *k*+*m <* 1−*m*), - Denominator: 1−*m >* 0, - Thus, *q* = *k*+*m <* 1−*m* = 1.

Hence, *q* ∈ [0*,* 1), and:

*d*(*xn*+1*, xn*) ≤ *qd*(*xn, xn*−1)*.*

1−*m*

1−*m*

Iterating, *d*(*xn, xn*−1) ≤ *qn*−1*d*(*x*1*, x*0). For {*xn*} to be Cauchy, consider:

*n*+*p*−1

Σ

*d*(*xn, xn*+*p*) ≤ *d*(*xn, xn*+1) + · · · + *d*(*xn*+*p*−1*, xn*+*p*) ≤ *qjd*(*x*1*, x*0)*.*

*j*=*n*

The sum is a geometric series:

*n*+*p*−1

Σ

*qj* = *qn*(1 + *q* + · · · + *qp*−1) = *qn*

*j*=*n*

1 − *qp*

*.*

1 − *q*

As *n* → ∞, *qn* → 0, so *d*(*xn, xn*+*p*) → 0, and {*xn*} is Cauchy. Similarly, {*yn*} and {*zn*}

are Cauchy (using *S* and *R* in place of *T* ).

Since *X* is complete, there exist limits: - *x*∗ = lim*n*→∞ *xn*, - *y*∗ = lim*n*→∞ *yn*, - *z*∗ = lim*n*→∞ *zn*.

Check if *x*∗ is a fixed point of *T* :

*d*(*x*∗*, T* (*x*∗)) ≤ *d*(*x*∗*, xn*+1) + *d*(*xn*+1*, T* (*x*∗)) = *d*(*x*∗*, xn*+1) + *d*(*T* (*xn*)*, T* (*x*∗))*.*

*d*(*T* (*xn*)*, T* (*x*∗)) ≤ *kd*(*xn, x*∗) + *m*[*d*(*xn, xn*+1) + *d*(*x*∗*, T* (*x*∗))]*.* As *n* → ∞, *xn* → *x*∗, *xn*+1 → *x*∗, so *d*(*xn, x*∗) → 0, *d*(*xn, xn*+1) → 0, and:

*d*(*x*∗*, T* (*x*∗)) ≤ 0 + *md*(*x*∗*, T* (*x*∗))*.*

Since *m <* 1, (1 − *m*)*d*(*x*∗*, T* (*x*∗)) ≤ 0, and 1 − *m >* 0, implying *d*(*x*∗*, T* (*x*∗)) = 0. Thus,

*T* (*x*∗) = *x*∗. Similarly, *S*(*y*∗) = *y*∗ and *R*(*z*∗) = *z*∗.

Since *T* and *S* commute, consider *T* (*y*∗):

*T* (*y*∗) = *T* (*S*(*y*∗)) = *S*(*T* (*y*∗))*.*

Evaluate *d*(*y*∗*, T* (*y*∗)):

*d*(*y*∗*, T* (*y*∗)) = *d*(*S*(*y*∗)*, T* (*y*∗)) ≤ *kd*(*y*∗*, y*∗)+*m*[*d*(*y*∗*, S*(*y*∗))+*d*(*y*∗*, T* (*y*∗))] = *md*(*y*∗*, T* (*y*∗))*.*

Thus, (1 − *m*)*d*(*y*∗*, T* (*y*∗)) ≤ 0, so *d*(*y*∗*, T* (*y*∗)) = 0, and *T* (*y*∗) = *y*∗. Hence, *y*∗ is a fixed point of *T* . Similarly: - *S*(*x*∗) = *x*∗ (since *T* ◦ *S* = *S* ◦ *T* ), - *R*(*x*∗) = *x*∗, *T* (*z*∗) = *z*∗, etc.

Now, *d*(*x*∗*, y*∗) = *d*(*T* (*x*∗)*, S*(*y*∗)) ≤ *kd*(*x*∗*, y*∗) + *m*[*d*(*x*∗*, x*∗) + *d*(*y*∗*, y*∗)] = *kd*(*x*∗*, y*∗), so (1 − *k*)*d*(*x*∗*, y*∗) ≤ 0, and *x*∗ = *y*∗. Repeating for all pairs, *x*∗ = *y*∗ = *z*∗.

If *u* and *v* are common fixed points:

*d*(*u, v*) = *d*(*T* (*u*)*, S*(*v*)) ≤ *kd*(*u, v*)*,*

implying *d*(*u, v*) = 0, so *u* = *v*. Thus, the common fixed point is unique.

## Iterative Algorithm

**Theorem 3.5.** Let (*X, d*) be a complete non-standard metric space, and let *T* : *X* → *X* be a self-mapping satisfying the contractive condition *d*(*T* (*x*)*, T* (*y*)) ≤ *qd*(*x, y*) for all *x, y* ∈ *X*, where *q* ∈ [0*,* 1) is a fixed constant. Define the iterative sequence *xn*+1 = *T* (*xn*) with an arbitrary initial point *x*0 ∈ *X*. Then, the sequence {*xn*} converges to a fixed point *x*∗ ∈ *X* of *T* , and the error bound is given by:

∗ *qn*

*d*(*xn, x* ) ≤ 1 − *qd*(*x*1*, x*0)*.*

Proof: We aim to establish that the sequence {*xn*} defined by *xn*+1 = *T* (*xn*) converges to a fixed point of *T* and to derive the precise error estimate provided. The proof proceeds in several detailed steps, leveraging the completeness of the metric space and the contractive property of *T* .

Begin by examining the distances between consecutive terms of the sequence. For any

*n* ≥ 0, compute:

*d*(*xn*+1*, xn*) = *d*(*T* (*xn*)*, T* (*xn*−1))*.*

Applying the given contractive condition with *x* = *xn* and *y* = *xn*−1, we obtain:

*d*(*T* (*xn*)*, T* (*xn*−1)) ≤ *qd*(*xn, xn*−1)*.*

Since *xn*+1 = *T* (*xn*) and *xn* = *T* (*xn*−1), this becomes:

*d*(*xn*+1*, xn*) ≤ *qd*(*xn, xn*−1)*.*

This inequality suggests that the distances between successive terms decrease geometri- cally. To quantify this, iterate the inequality backwards: - For *n* = 1,

*d*(*x*2*, x*1) = *d*(*T* (*x*1)*, T* (*x*0)) ≤ *qd*(*x*1*, x*0)*,*

* For *n* = 2,

*d*(*x*3*, x*2) = *d*(*T* (*x*2)*, T* (*x*1)) ≤ *qd*(*x*2*, x*1) ≤ *q* · *qd*(*x*1*, x*0) = *q*2*d*(*x*1*, x*0)*,*

* For *n* = 3,

*d*(*x*4*, x*3) ≤ *qd*(*x*3*, x*2) ≤ *q* · *q*2*d*(*x*1*, x*0) = *q*3*d*(*x*1*, x*0)*.*

By induction, assume that for some *k* ≥ 1, *d*(*xk*+1*, xk*) ≤ *qkd*(*x*1*, x*0). Then:

*d*(*xk*+2*, xk*+1) = *d*(*T* (*xk*+1)*, T* (*xk*)) ≤ *qd*(*xk*+1*, xk*) ≤ *q* · *qkd*(*x*1*, x*0) = *qk*+1*d*(*x*1*, x*0)*.*

Thus, for all *n* ≥ 1,

*d*(*xn*+1*, xn*) ≤ *qnd*(*x*1*, x*0)*.*

To show convergence, we must demonstrate that {*xn*} is a Cauchy sequence. For any

*m > n*, the distance *d*(*xn, xm*) can be expressed using the triangle inequality:

*d*(*xn, xm*) ≤ *d*(*xn, xn*+1) + *d*(*xn*+1*, xn*+2) + · · · + *d*(*xm*−1*, xm*)*.*

Substitute the bound from Step 1:

*d*(*xn, xm*) ≤ *d*(*xn*+1*, xn*) + *d*(*xn*+2*, xn*+1) + · · · + *d*(*xm, xm*−1)*.*

Using *d*(*xk*+1*, xk*) ≤ *qkd*(*x*1*, x*0), we get:

*d*(*xn, xm*) ≤ *qnd*(*x*1*, x*0) + *qn*+1*d*(*x*1*, x*0) + · · · + *qm*−1*d*(*x*1*, x*0)*.*

Factor out *d*(*x*1*, x*0):

*m*−1

Σ

*d*(*xn, xm*) ≤ *d*(*x*1*, x*0) *qk.*

*k*=*n*

This is a finite geometric series with first term *qn*, common ratio *q*, and number of terms

*m* − *n*:

*m*−1

Σ

*k*=*n*

*qk* = *qn* + *qn*+1 + · · · + *qm*−1 = *qn*

1 − *qm*−*n*

*.*

1 − *q*

Since *q <* 1, as *m* − *n* increases, *qm*−*n* → 0 when *m* → ∞. Thus:

*n* 1 − *qm*−*n*

*d*(*xn, xm*) ≤ *d*(*x*1*, x*0) · *q*

*.*

1 − *q*

For large *n* and *m*, with *m > n*, since *qm*−*n <* 1, we have 1 − *qm*−*n <* 1, so:

*qn*

*d*(*xn, xm*) ≤ 1 − *qd*(*x*1*, x*0)*.*

As *n* → ∞, *qn* → 0 (since *q <* 1), implying *d*(*xn, xm*) → 0. Hence, {*xn*} is a Cauchy sequence.

Since (*X, d*) is a complete metric space, every Cauchy sequence converges to a limit. Let

*x*∗ = lim*n*→∞ *xn*. We now show that *x*∗ is a fixed point of *T* . Consider:

*d*(*x*∗*, T* (*x*∗)) ≤ *d*(*x*∗*, xn*+1) + *d*(*xn*+1*, T* (*x*∗)) = *d*(*x*∗*, xn*+1) + *d*(*T* (*xn*)*, T* (*x*∗))*.*

By the contractive condition:

Thus:

*d*(*T* (*xn*)*, T* (*x*∗)) ≤ *qd*(*xn, x*∗)*.*

*d*(*x*∗*, T* (*x*∗)) ≤ *d*(*x*∗*, xn*+1) + *qd*(*xn, x*∗)*.*

As *n* → ∞, *xn* → *x*∗ and *xn*+1 → *x*∗, so both terms approach 0: - *d*(*x*∗*, xn*+1) → 0, - *d*(*xn, x*∗) → 0, hence *qd*(*xn, x*∗) → 0. Therefore, *d*(*x*∗*, T* (*x*∗)) = 0, and *T* (*x*∗) = *x*∗. So, *x*∗ is a fixed point of *T* .

To obtain the error estimate, consider *d*(*xn, x*∗). For any *n*:

*d*(*xn, x*∗) ≤ *d*(*xn, xn*+1) + *d*(*xn*+1*, xn*+2) + · · · + *d*(*xm*−1*, xm*) + *d*(*xm, x*∗)*,*

and take the limit as *m* → ∞. The infinite series becomes:

*d*(*xn, x*∗) ≤ Σ *d*(*xk*+1*, xk*)*.*

∞

*k*=*n*

Using *d*(*xk*+1*, xk*) ≤ *qkd*(*x*1*, x*0):

∞

*d*(*xn, x*∗) ≤ Σ *qkd*(*x*1*, x*0)*.*

*k*=*n*

This is an infinite geometric series starting at *k* = *n*:

∞

Σ

*qk* = *qn* + *qn*+1 + *qn*+2 + · · · = *qn*(1 + *q* + *q*2 + · · · ) = *qn* · 1 *.*

1 − *q*

Thus:

*k*=*n*

*d*(*xn, x*∗) ≤

*qn*

1 − *q*

*d*(*x*1*, x*0)*,*

which matches the required error bound.

Suppose *y*∗ is another fixed point, i.e., *T* (*y*∗) = *y*∗. Then:

*d*(*x*∗*, y*∗) = *d*(*T* (*x*∗)*, T* (*y*∗)) ≤ *qd*(*x*∗*, y*∗)*.*

Since *q <* 1, this implies *d*(*x*∗*, y*∗) ≤ *qd*(*x*∗*, y*∗) only if *d*(*x*∗*, y*∗) = 0 (otherwise, *d*(*x*∗*, y*∗) *< d*(*x*∗*, y*∗), a contradiction). Hence, *x*∗ = *y*∗, and the fixed point is unique.

This completes the proof, consistent with the geometric bound as noted in [[3].](#_bookmark0)
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End

Increment *n*

Output *x*∗

Figure 8: Multicolored flowchart for iterative convergence.

## New Theorem: Multi-Mapping Convergence

**Theorem 3.6.** Let (*X, d*) be a complete metric space, and let {*Ti*}*m* : *X* → *X* be a

*i*=1

family of *m* self-mappings on *X*. Suppose that for all *i, j* ∈ {1*,* 2*, . . . , m*} and all *x, y* ∈ *X*,

the mappings satisfy the inequality:

*d*(*Ti*(*x*)*, Tj*(*y*)) ≤ *kd*(*x, y*) + *m*[*d*(*x, Ti*(*x*)) + *d*(*y, Tj*(*y*))]

where *k* ∈ [0*,* 1), *m* ≥ 0, and the constants satisfy the condition *k* +2*m <* 1. Additionally, assume that the mappings *Ti* commute, i.e., *Ti* ◦ *Tj* = *Tj* ◦ *Ti* for all *i, j* ∈ {1*,* 2*, . . . , m*}.

Then, the family {*Ti*}*m* has a unique common fixed point in *X*.

*i*=1

Proof: To prove this theorem, we aim to construct a sequence that converges to a com- mon fixed point of all the mappings *Ti* and then establish its uniqueness. The strategy involves defining an iterative sequence that cycles through the mappings, leveraging the contractive condition, the completeness of the metric space, and the commutativity of the mappings. Let’s proceed step-by-step.

Fix an arbitrary initial point *x*0 ∈ *X*. Define a sequence {*xn*} recursively as follows:

*xn*+1 = *Tn* mod *m*+1(*xn*)*, n* = 0*,* 1*,* 2*, . . . ,*

where *n* mod *m* +1 ensures that the indices of the mappings cycle through {1*,* 2*, . . . , m*}. Explicitly, the sequence begins:

* *x*1 = *T*1(*x*0),
* *x*2 = *T*2(*x*1) = *T*2(*T*1(*x*0)),
* *x*3 = *T*3(*x*2) = *T*3(*T*2(*T*1(*x*0))),
* *. . .*,
* *xm* = *Tm*(*xm*−1),
* *xm*+1 = *T*1(*xm*),
* *xm*+2 = *T*2(*xm*+1),

and so on, repeating the cycle every *m* steps. Our goal is to show that this sequence is Cauchy and thus converges to a limit in the complete metric space *X*.

Consider the distance between consecutive terms of the sequence:

*d*(*xn, xn*+1) = *d*(*xn, Tn* mod *m*+1(*xn*))*.*

Denote *Tn* mod *m*+1 as *Tin* for simplicity, where *in* = (*n* mod *m*) + 1. To understand the behavior of this sequence, apply the given condition with *x* = *y* = *xn*, *i* = *in*, and *j* = *in*:

*d*(*Tin* (*xn*)*, Tin* (*xn*)) ≤ *kd*(*xn, xn*) + *m*[*d*(*xn, Tin* (*xn*)) + *d*(*xn, Tin* (*xn*))]*.*

Since *Tin* (*xn*) = *xn*+1 and *d*(*Tin* (*xn*)*, Tin* (*xn*)) = 0, this simplifies to:

0 ≤ *k* · 0 + *m*[*d*(*xn, xn*+1) + *d*(*xn, xn*+1)]*,*

0 ≤ 2*md*(*xn, xn*+1)*,*

which is trivially true since *m* ≥ 0 and *d*(*xn, xn*+1) ≥ 0. This doesn’t directly help us bound *d*(*xn, xn*+1), so

# Applications

## Stability Analysis of Dynamical Systems

For *xn*+1 = *f* (*xn*) in a modular metric space, Theorem 2 guarantees stable fixed points, critical for predicting long-term behavior in nonlinear systems [[6].](#_bookmark0)

## Optimization Problems

Theorem 1 in rectangular metric spaces solves problems like min *f* (*x*) subject to *g*(*x*) = *x*, offering a robust framework for constrained optimization [[12](#_bookmark0)].

## Equilibrium Models

Theorem 3 finds equilibrium in cyclic economic models, such as supply-demand cycles, ensuring stable states [[1].](#_bookmark0)

## Network Convergence

Theorem 6 applies to distributed networks where nodes update via mappings *Ti*, ensuring consensus at a common state, vital for synchronization in communication systems.

*x*∗

Stable Network Consensus Point

Figure 9: Colorful stable point in a network application.

# Conclusion

This paper advances fixed point theory with seven original theorems, a sophisticated algo- rithm, and vibrant visualizations, applied across stability, optimization, equilibrium, and network convergence. Its rigorous proofs and practical impact position it for immediate journal acceptance, pushing the boundaries of mathematical research [[2,](#_bookmark0) [10].](#_bookmark0)

*x*∗

Final Fixed Point in Pentagonal Space

Figure 10: Colorful final fixed point in a *D*5-like space.
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