

Common fixed point theorems in 2-fuzzy metric spaces

Kamal Wadhwa*, Sanjay Choudhary**, Hargovind Dubey***

* Department of Mathematics, Govt. Narmada, PG College, Narmada Puram (M.P.)

AMS Subject Classification :47H10,54H25

Abstract: The present paper deals with application of 'E.A. Like' property in proving common fixed point results in a 2-fuzzy metric space.

Keywords: 2-Fuzzy metric space, E.A. property, E.A.Like property, weakly compatible maps.

1.Introduction:

Zadeh [29] introduced the concept of fuzzy sets in 1965. Following the concept of fuzzy sets, fuzzy metric spaces have been introduced by Kramosil and Michalek [13] and George and Veeramani [5] modified the notion of fuzzy metric spaces with the help of continuous t-norm, which shows a new way for further development of analysis in such spaces. Consequently in due course of time some metric fixed points results were generalized to fuzzy metric spaces by various authors. Sessa [25] improved commutativity condition in fixed point theorem by introducing the notion of weakly commuting maps in metric space. Vasuki [27] proved fixed point theorems for R-weakly commuting mapping Pant [19] introduced the new concept of reciprocally continuous mappings and established some common fixed point theorems. The concept of compatible maps by [13] in fuzzy metric space is generalized by [9] by introducing concept of weakly compatible maps. Aamri and Moutawakil [1] generalized the notion of non compatible mapping in metric space by E.A. property. It was pointed out in [11], that property E.A. buys containment of ranges without any continuity requirements besides minimizes the commutativity conditions of the maps to the commutativity at their points of coincidence. More-over, E. A. property allows replacing the completeness requirement of the space with a more natural condition of closeness of the range. Some common fixed point theorems in probabilistic or fuzzy metric spaces by E.A. property under weak compatibility have been recently obtained in ([3], [13],[20], [28]). In this article, we defined a E.A. like property and proved common fixed point theorems of Sanjay kumar [18] removing some conditions by using E.A. like property.

Definition 1.1 [23] - A binary operation $*$: $[0,1] \times [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]$ is a continuous t-norms if

* satisfying conditions:

- i. $*$ is commutative and associative;
- ii. $*$ is continuous;
- iii. $a * 1 = a$ for all $a \in [0,1]$;
- iv. $a * b \leq c * d$ whenever $a \leq c$ and $b \leq d$, and $a, b, c, d \in [0,1]$.

Examples: $a * b = \min\{a, b\}$, $a * b = a.b$

Definition 1.2[5] - A 3-tuple $(X, M, *)$ is said to be a fuzzy metric space if X is an arbitrary set, $*$ is a continuous t -norm and M is a fuzzy set on $X^2 \times (0, \infty)$ satisfying the following conditions, $\forall x, y, z \in X, s, t > 0$,

- (f1) $M(x, y, t) > 0$;
- (f2) $M(x, y, t) = 1$ if and only if $x = y$.
- (f3) $M(x, y, t) = M(y, x, t)$;
- (f4) $M(x, y, t) * M(y, z, s) \leq M(x, z, t + s)$
- (f5) $M(x, y, .) : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, 1]$ is continuous.

Then M is called a fuzzy metric on X . Then $M(x, y, t)$ denotes the degree of nearness between x and y with respect to t .

Example 1.3 (Induced fuzzy metric [5]) – Let (X, d) be a metric space. Denote $a * b = ab$ for all $a, b \in [0,1]$ and let M_d be fuzzy sets on $X^2 \times (0, \infty)$ defined as follows:

$$M_d(x, y, t) = \frac{t}{t + d(x, y)}$$

Then $(X, M_d, *)$ is a fuzzy metric space. We call this fuzzy metric induced by a metric d as the standard intuitionistic fuzzy metric.

Definition 1.4: Two self mappings f and g of a fuzzy metric space $(X, M, *)$ are called compatible if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M(fgx_n, gfx_n, t) = 1$ whenever $\{x_n\}$ is a sequence in X such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} fx_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} gx_n = x \text{ for some } x \in X.$$

Lemma 1.5 : Let $(X, M, *)$ be fuzzy metric space. If there exists $q \in (0,1)$ such that $M(x, y, qt) \geq M(x, y, t)$ for all $x, y \in X$ and $t > 0$, then $x = y$.

Definition 1.6 : Let X be a set, f and g selfmaps of X . A point $x \in X$ is called a coincidence point of f and g iff $fx = gx$. We shall call $w = fx = gx$ a point of coincidence of f and g .

Definition 1.7 [9] : A pair of maps S and T is called weakly compatible pair if they commute at coincidence points.

Definition1.8: Let f & g be two self-maps of a fuzzy metric space $(X, M, *)$. we say that f & g satisfy the property E.A. if there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}$ such that,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} fx_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} gx_n = z \text{ for some } z \in X$$

Definition1.9: Let f & g be two self-maps of a fuzzy metric space $(X, M, *)$. we say that f & g satisfy the property E.A.Like property if there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}$ such that,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} fx_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} gx_n = z \text{ for some } z \in f(X) \text{ or } z \in g(X) \text{ i.e. } z \in f(X) \cup g(X)$$

Definition1.10 (Common E.A. Property): Let $A, B, S, T : X \rightarrow X$ where X is a fuzzy metric space, then the pair $\{A, S\}$ & $\{B, T\}$ said to satisfy common E.A. property if there exist two sequences $\{x_n\}$ & $\{y_n\}$ in X s.t.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Ax_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Sx_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Ty_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} By_n = z \text{ For some } z \in X .$$

Definition1.11 (Common E.A. like Property) : Let A, B, S and T be self maps of a fuzzy metric space $(X, M, *)$, then the pairs (A, S) and (B, T) said to satisfy common E.A.Like property if there exists two sequences $\{x_n\}$ and $\{y_n\}$ in X such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Ax_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Sx_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Ty_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} By_n = z \text{ where } z \in S(X) \cap T(X) \text{ or } z \in A(X) \cap B(X) .$$

Example1.12: let $X = [0, 2)$ and $M(x, y, t) = \frac{t}{t + d(x, y)}$ for all $x, y \in X$ then $(X, M, *)$ is a fuzzy metric space. Where $a * b = \min\{a, b\}$.

$$A(x) = \begin{cases} .25, 0 \leq x \leq .52 \\ \frac{x}{2}, x > .52 \end{cases} \quad S(x) = \begin{cases} .25, 0 \leq x \leq .6 \\ x - .25, x > .6 \end{cases}$$

$$T(x) = \begin{cases} .25, 0 \leq x \leq .6 \\ \frac{x}{4}, x > .6 \end{cases} \quad B(x) = \begin{cases} .25, 0 \leq x \leq .95 \\ x - .75, x > .95 \end{cases}$$

We define $x_n = .5 + \frac{1}{n}$ and $y_n = 1 + \frac{1}{n}$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{We have } A(X) &= \{.25\} \cup (.26, 1] \\ S(X) &= \{.25\} \cup (.35, 1.75] \\ T(X) &= (.15, .5] \text{ and} \\ B(X) &= \{.25\} \cup (.20, 1.25] \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Also } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Ax_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \left[.5 + \frac{1}{n} \right] = .25 \in S(X)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Sx_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} .5 + \frac{1}{n} - .25 = .25 \in A(X)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Ty_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{4} \left[1 + \frac{1}{n} \right] = .25 \in B(X) \text{ and}$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} By_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} 1 + \frac{1}{n} - .75 = .25 \in T(X)$$

Role of E.A. property in proving common fixed point theorems can be concluded by following,

- (I) It buys containment of ranges without any continuity requirements.
- (II) It minimizes the commutativity conditions of the maps to the commutativity at their points of coincidence.
- (III) It allows replacing the completeness requirement of the space with a more natural condition of closeness of the range.

Of course, if two mappings satisfy E.A. like property then they satisfy E.A. property also, but, on the other hand, E.A. like property relaxes the condition of containment of ranges and closeness of the ranges to prove common fixed point theorems, which are necessary with E.A. property

Definition [1.12]: A binary operation $*$: $[0,1] \times [0,1] \times [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]$ is called a continuous t-norm if $([0,1],*)$ is an abelian topological monoid with unit 1 such that $a_1 * b_1 * c_1 \leq a_2 * b_2 * c_2$ whenever $a_1 \leq a_2, b_1 \leq b_2, c_1 \leq c_2$ for all a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 and c_1, c_2 are in $[0,1]$.

Definition [1.13]: The 3-tuple $(X, M, *)$ is called a 2-fuzzy metric space if X is an arbitrary set, $*$ is a continuous t-norm and M is a fuzzy set in $X^3 \times [0, \infty)$ satisfying the following conditions : for all $x, y, z, u \in X$ and $t_1, t_2, t_3 > 0$.

(FM' - 1) $M(x, y, z, 0) = 0$,

(FM' - 2) $M(x, y, z, t) = 1, t > 0$ and at least two of the three points are equal ,

(FM' - 3) $M(x, y, z, t) = M(x, z, y, t) = M(y, z, x, t)$,

(Symmetry about three variables)

(FM' - 4) $M(x, y, z, t_1 + t_2 + t_3) \geq M(x, y, u, t_1) * M(x, u, z, t_2) * M(u, y, z, t_3)$

(This corresponds to tetrahedron inequality in 2-fuzzy metric space).

The function value $M(x, y, z, t)$ may be interpreted as the probability that the area of triangle is less than t.

(FM' - 5) $M(x, y, z, .): [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]$ is left continuous.

Definition[1.14] : Let $(X, M, *)$ be a 2-fuzzy metric space :

- (1) A sequence $\{x_n\}$ in 2-fuzzy metric space X is said to be convergent to a point $x \in X$, if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M(x_n, x, \alpha, t) = 1$$

For all $\alpha \in X$ and $t > 0$.

(2) A sequence $\{x_n\}$ in 2-fuzzy metric space X is called a Cauchy sequence, if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M(x_{n+p}, x_n, \alpha, t) = 1$$

For all $\alpha \in X$ and $t > 0, p > 0$.

(3) A 2-fuzzy metric space in which every Cauchy sequence is convergent is said to be complete.

Definition [1.15]: A pair of mappings A and S is said to be weakly compatible in 2-fuzzy metric space if they commute at coincidence points.

2.Main Result:

In 2010, Sanjay Kumar [18] proved following results using E.A. property:

Theorem 2.1: Let f & g be self maps of a fuzzy metric space $(X, M, *)$, satisfying $M(x, y, t) > 0$ for all x, y in X and $t > 0$ such that following conditions holds:

- (I) $M(fx, fy, t) \geq r(M(gx, gy, t))$, for all x, y in X and $t > 0$, where $r : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a continuous function such that $r(t) > t$ for each $0 < t < 1, r(0) = 0$ & $r(1) = 1$
- (II) f & g satisfy the E.A. Property,
- (III) $g(X)$ is a closed subspace of X . If there exist sequences $\{x_n\}$ & $\{y_n\}$ in X such that $x_n \rightarrow x$ & $y_n \rightarrow y$, and $t > 0$, then $M(x_n, y_n, t) \rightarrow M(x, y, t)$.

Then f & g have a unique common fixed point in X provided f & g are weakly compatible maps.

Now we prove our main result for weakly compatible maps under E.A. like property as follows:

Theorem 2.2: Let f & g be self maps of a 2-fuzzy metric space $(X, M, *)$, satisfying $M(x, y, \alpha, t) > 0$

for all $x, y, \alpha \in X$ and $t > 0$ such that following conditions holds

- (I) $M(fx, fy, \alpha, qt) \geq \min\{M(fx, gy, \alpha, t), M(gx, fy, \alpha, t), M(gx, gy, \alpha, t)\}$
- (II) for $x, y, \alpha \in X$..
- (III) f & g satisfy the E.A. Like Property,

Then f & g have a unique common fixed point in X provided f & g are weakly compatible maps.

Proof: Since f & g satisfy E.A Like property therefore, there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in

X such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} fx_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} gx_n = z \in f(X)$ or $g(X)$.

Suppose that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} fx_n = z \in g(X)$ therefore $z = gu$ for some $u \in X$.

Now we show that $fu = gu$. from (I) we have;

$$M(fu, fx_n, a, qt) \geq \min\{M(fu, gx_n, a, t), M(gu, fx_n, a, t), M(gu, gx_n, a, t)\}$$

Taking $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}$ we get;

$$M(fu, z, a, qt) \geq \min\{M(fu, z, a, t), M(z, z, a, t), M(z, z, a, t)\}$$

$$M(fu, z, a, qt) \geq M(fu, z, a, t)$$

Which is a contradiction, Hence $fu = z = gu$ i.e. u is coincidence point of f & g .

Since f & g are weakly compatible, therefore $fz = fgu = gfu = gz$.

Now we show that $fz = z$, if not from (I) we have;

$$M(fz, fx_n, a, qt) \geq \min\{M(fz, gx_n, a, t), M(gz, fx_n, a, t), M(gz, gx_n, a, t)\}$$

Taking $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}$ we get;

$$M(fz, z, a, qt) \geq \min\{M(fz, z, a, t), M(gz, z, a, t), M(gz, z, a, t)\}$$

$$M(fz, z, a, qt) \geq \min\{M(fz, z, a, t), M(fz, z, a, t), M(fz, z, a, t)\}$$

$$M(fz, z, a, qt) \geq M(fz, z, a, t)$$

Which is a contradiction, hence.

$fz = z = gz$ hence z is a common fixed point of f & g .

Uniqueness: Let z_1 be another fixed point of f & g such that $z_1 \neq z$ then from (I) we have;

$$M(fz, fz_1, a, qt) \geq \min\{M(fz, gz_1, a, t), M(gz, fz_1, a, t), M(gz, gz_1, a, t)\}$$

$$M(z, z_1, a, qt) \geq \min\{M(z, z_1, a, t), M(z, z_1, a, t), M(z, z_1, a, t)\}$$

$$M(z, z_1, a, qt) \geq M(z, z_1, a, t)$$

which is a contradiction; hence $z = z_1$.

Theorem 2.3: Let A, B, S and T be self maps of a fuzzy metric space $(X, M, *)$ satisfying the following conditions:

(I) $A(X) \subset T(X)$ and $B(X) \subset S(X)$,

(II)

$$M(Ax, By, kt) \geq \min\{M(Sx, Ty, t), M(Ax, Sx, t), M(By, Ty, t), M(Sx, By, t), M(Ax, Ty, t)\}$$

for all x, y in X and $t > 0$, where $k \in (0, 1)$,

(IV) Pairs (A, S) or (B, T) satisfy E.A. property,

(V) Pairs (A, S) and (B, T) are weakly commpatible.

If the range of one of A, B, S and T is a closed subset of X , then A, B, S and T have a common fixed point in X

Theorem 2.4: Let A, B, S and T be self maps of a 2-fuzzy metric space $(X, M, *)$ satisfying the following conditions:

(I)

$$M(Ax, By, \alpha, qt) \geq \min\{M(Sx, Ty, \alpha, t), M(By, Sx, \alpha, t), M(Ax, Ty, \alpha, t), M(Sx, Ax, \alpha, t)\}$$

for all $x, y, \alpha \in X$ and $t > 0$, where $q \in (0, 1)$.

(II) Pairs (A, S) and (B, T) satisfy common E.A. Like property,

(III) Pairs (A, S) and (B, T) are weakly commpatible.

then A, B, S and T have a unique common fixed point in X .

Proof: since (A, S) and (B, T) satisfy common E.A. Like property therefore there exists two sequences $\{x_n\}$ and $\{y_n\}$ in X such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Ax_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Sx_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Ty_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} By_n = z \text{ where } z \in S(X) \cap T(X) \text{ or } z \in A(X) \cap B(X)$$

Suppose that $z \in S(X) \cap T(X)$, now we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Ax_n = z \in S(X) \text{ then } z = Su \text{ for some } u \in X.$$

Now, we claim that $Au = Su$, from (I) we have

$$M(Au, By_n, \alpha, qt) \geq \min\{M(Su, Ty_n, \alpha, t), M(By_n, Su, \alpha, t), M(Au, Ty_n, \alpha, t), M(Su, Au, \alpha, t)\}$$

Taking limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ we get,

$$M(Au, z, \alpha, qt) \geq \min\{M(z, z, \alpha, t), M(z, z, \alpha, t), M(Au, z, \alpha, t), M(z, Au, \alpha, t)\}$$

$$M(Au, z, \alpha, qt) \geq \min\{1, 1, M(Au, z, \alpha, t), M(z, Au, \alpha, t)\}$$

$$M(Au, z, \alpha, qt) \geq M(Au, z, \alpha, t)$$

which is a contradiction, hence $Au = z = Su$.

Again

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} By_n = z \in T(X) \text{ then } z = Tv \text{ for some } v \in X$$

Now, we claim that $Tv = Bv$, from (I) we have

$$M(Ax_n, Bv, \alpha, qt) \geq \min\{M(Sx_n, Tv, \alpha, t), M(Bv, Sx_n, \alpha, t), M(Ax_n, Tv, \alpha, t), M(Sx_n, Ax_n, \alpha, t)\}$$

$$M(z, Bv, \alpha, qt) \geq \min\{M(z, z, \alpha, t), M(Bv, z, \alpha, t), M(z, z, \alpha, t), M(z, z, \alpha, t)\}$$

$$M(z, Bv, \alpha, qt) \geq \min\{1, M(Bv, z, \alpha, t), 1, 1\}$$

$$M(z, Bv, \alpha, qt) \geq M(Bv, z, \alpha, t)$$

which is a contradiction hence $Bv = z = Tv$

Since the pair (A, S) is weak compatible, therefore $Az = ASu = SAu = Sz$

Now we show that $Az = z$

$$M(Az, By_n, \alpha, qt) \geq \min\{M(Sz, Ty_n, \alpha, t), M(By_n, Sz, \alpha, t), M(Az, Ty_n, \alpha, t), M(Sz, Az, \alpha, t)\}$$

Taking limit $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$M(Az, z, \alpha, qt) \geq \min\{M(Az, z, \alpha, t), M(z, Az, \alpha, t), M(Az, z, \alpha, t), M(Az, Az, \alpha, t)\}$$

$$M(Az, z, \alpha, qt) \geq \min\{M(Az, z, \alpha, t), M(z, Az, \alpha, t), M(Az, z, \alpha, t), 1\}$$

$$M(Az, z, \alpha, qt) \geq M(Az, z, \alpha, t)$$

which is a contradiction.hence $Az = z = Sz$.

The weak compatibility of B and T implies that $Tz = TBv = BTv = Bz$.

$$M(Ax_n, Bz, \alpha, qt) \geq \min\{M(Sx_n, Tz, \alpha, t), M(Bz, Sx_n, \alpha, t), M(Ax_n, Tz, \alpha, t), M(Sx_n, Ax_n, \alpha, t)\}$$

$$M(z, Bz, \alpha, qt) \geq \min\{M(z, Tz, \alpha, t), M(Bz, z, \alpha, t), M(z, Tz, \alpha, t), M(z, z, \alpha, t)\}$$

$$M(z, Bz, \alpha, qt) \geq \min\{M(z, Bz, \alpha, t), M(Bz, z, \alpha, t), M(z, Bz, \alpha, t), 1\}$$

$$M(z, Bz, \alpha, qt) \geq M(z, Bz, \alpha, t)$$

which is a contradiction.hence $Bz = z = Tz$.

Thus z is common fixed point of A, B, S & T .

Uniqueness:suppose that z_1 is another common fixed point of A, B, S & T such that $z_1 \neq z$

Then from (I) we have,

$$M(Az, Bz_1, \alpha, qt) \geq \min\{M(Sz, Tz_1, \alpha, t), M(Bz_1, Sz, \alpha, t), M(Az, Tz_1, \alpha, t), M(Sz, Az, \alpha, t)\}$$

$$M(z, z_1, \alpha, qt) \geq \min\{M(z, z_1, \alpha, t), M(z_1, z, \alpha, t), M(z, z_1, \alpha, t), M(z, z, \alpha, t)\}$$

$$M(z, z_1, \alpha, qt) \geq \min\{M(z, z_1, \alpha, t), M(z_1, z, \alpha, t), M(z, z_1, \alpha, t), 1\}$$

$$M(z, z_1, \alpha, qt) \geq M(z, z_1, \alpha, t)$$

which is a contradiction.therefore $z = z_1$.

Next we consider a function

$$\varphi: [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]$$

satisfying the conditions

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \varphi \text{ If continous and nondecreasing on } [0,1] \\ \varphi(t) > t \forall t \in (0,1) \end{array} \right.$$

We note that $\varphi(1) = 1$ for all t in $[0,1]$.

Theorem2.5: Let A, B, S and T be self maps of a 2-fuzzy metric space $(X, M, *)$ with continuous t -norm satisfying the following conditions:

(!)

$$M(Ax, By, \alpha, qt)$$

$$\geq \varphi [\min\{M(Sx, Ty, \alpha, t), M(By, Sx, \alpha, t), M(Ax, Ty, \alpha, t), M(Sx, Ax, \alpha, t)\}]$$

for all $x, y \in X, t > 0$.

(II) Pairs (A, S) and (B, T) satisfy common E.A.Like property,

(I) Pairs (A, S) and (B, T) are weakly commpatible.

then there is a unique common fixed point of A, B, S and T .

The Proof follows from theorem 3.1.

3.References:-----

1. M. Aamri and D. El Moutawakil, Some new common fixed point theorems under strict contractive conditions, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 27 (2002), 181-188.
2. Z. Deng, Fuzzy pseudo-metric space, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 86 (1982), 74-95.
3. J. X. Fang and Y. Gao, Common fixed point theorems under strict contractive conditions in Menger spaces, *Nonlinear Analysis (TMA)* 70(1) (2009), 184-193.
4. M.A. Erceg, Metric space in fuzzy set theory, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 69 (1979), 205-230.
5. A. George and P. Veeramani, On some results in fuzzy metric spaces, *Fuzzy Sets Systems* 64 (1994), 395-399.
6. M. Grabiec, Fixed points in fuzzy metric space, *Fuzzy Sets Systes* 2 (2007).
7. G. Jungck, Commuting mappings and fixed points, *Amer. Math. Monthly* 83, 261-263.
8. G. Jungck, Compatible mappings and common fixed points, *Internat J. Math. Math. Sci.* 9 (1996), 771-779.
9. G. Jungck and B.E. Rhoades, Fixed point for set valued functions without continuity, *Indian J. Pure and Appl. Math.* 29(3) (1998), 227-238.
10. M. Imdad and J. Ali, Jungck's common fixed point theorem and E.A. property, *Acta Mathematica Sinica* 24 (2008), 87-94.
11. M. Imdad and J. Ali, Some common fixed point theorems in fuzzy metric spaces, *Mathematical Communication* 11 (2006), 153-163.
12. O. Kaleva and S. Seikkala, On fuzzy metric spaces, *Fuzzy Sets Systems* 12 (1984), 215-229.
13. I. Kramosil and J. Michalek, Fuzzy metric and statistical metric spaces, *Kybernetika* 15(1975), 326-334.
14. I. Kubiacyk and S. Sharma, Some common fixed point theorems in menger space under strict contractive conditions, *Southeast Asian Bulletin of Mathematics* 32 (2008), 117-124.
15. S. Kumar and D. Mihet, G-completeness and M-completeness in fuzzy metric spaces : A note on Common fixed point theorem, *Acta Math. Hungar.* (accepted).
16. J.R Lopez and S. Romaguera, The Hausdorff metric on compact sets, fuzzy sets and systems, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 147 (2) (2004), 273-283.
17. D. Mihet, A note on fixed point theorem in Menger probabilistic quasi-metric spaces, *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals* 40 (5) (2009), 2349-2352
18. S. Kumar, *J. Appl. Math. & Informatics* Vol. 29 (2011), No. 1-2, pp.395-405
19. R.P Pant, Common fixed point for non commuting mappings, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 188 (1994), 436-440.
20. V. Pant, Some fixed point theorems in fuzzy metric spaces, *Tamkang Journal of Mathematics* 40 (2009) 59-66.
21. H.K. Pathak, Y.J. Cho and S.M. Kang, Remarks on R-weakly commuting mappings and common fixed point theorems, *Bull. Korean Math. Soc.* 34 (1997), 247-257.
22. H.K. Pathak, R. Rodryguez-Lopez and R.K. Verma, A common fixed point theorem using implicit relation and property (E. A.) in metric spaces, *Filomat* 21 (2) (2007), 211-234.
23. B. Schweizer and A. Sklar, *Probabilistic Metric Spaces*, North Holland (1983).
24. S. Sedghi, N. Shobe and M. Khademian, Generalizations of a contraction principle in M-fuzzy metric spaces, *Advances in Fuzzy Mathematics* 2 (2007).

25. S.Sessa , On a weak commutativity of mappings in fixed point considerations, Publ. Inst.Math.32 (46) (1982) , 149-153.
26. P.V Subramanyam , Common fixed point theorems in fuzzy metric spaes , Infor.Sci.83 (4) 1995 , 109-112.
- 27.R .Vasuki , Common fixed points for R –weakly commuting maps in fuzzy metric spaces ,Indian J.Pure Appl .Math.30 (1999) , 419-423.
28. P.Vijayaraju and Z.M.I Sajath , Some common fixed point theorems in fuzzy metric spaces , Int .Journal of Math.Analysis 3 (15) (2009) , 701-710.
29. L.A Zadeh, Fuzzy sets, Infor. Control 18 (1965).

