IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Solution Model Of Functional Stochastic Integral Equation Associated To Fixed Point Theory

Dr. Gopi Sao, Dr. H. R. Suryavanshi , Prof. Snehlata Mishra

Eklavya University , Damoh, Vishvavidyalaya Engg. College Ambikapur (CG), D P Vipra College , Bilaspur

Abstract

The intersection of analysis, topology, and geometry in fixed point theory is stunning. The theory of fixed points has emerged during the past 60 years or so as a very useful and important instrument for the investigation of nonlinear events. Fixed point theory, in particular, has been used in a variety of disciplines, including biology, chemistry, economics, engineering, game theory, physics, and logic programming. The study of real-world nonlinear fractional differential equations that result from the modelling of nonlinear phenomena, the best control of complex systems, and other scientific investigations has greatly benefited from the use of fractional calculus. The creation of novel technologies, numerical computation techniques, control for nonlinear fractional differential equations, well-posedness of fractional mathematical models, and approximation theory and operator theory are among the primary research areas in this area.

In this essay, new fixed point theorems as well as findings from fractional calculus and their applications are reported.

Keywords: Approximation theory, fixed point, and fractional calculus.

Introduction and opening statements

The focus of active research has been the investigation of common fixed points of mappings satisfying specific contractive requirements. Regarding its potential for use, the phrase linked fixed point, which was first introduced and investigated by Opoitsev before being picked up by Guo and Lakhsmikantham, has drawn the attention of numerous authors. Studies on the coupled common fixed point theory and its applications have just recently been published.

Definition 1.1

An element $(u, v) \in X^2$ is said to be a coupled fixed point of a mapping $A: X^2 \to X$ if $u = A(u, v)$ and $v = A(v, u)$.

Definition 1.2

An element $(u, v) \in X^2$ is called a coupled common fixed point of mappings $A, B: X^2 \to X$ if $A(u, v) = B(u, v) = u$ and $A(u, v) = B(u, v) = v$. The set of all coupled common fixed points of A and B is indicated by $\mathcal{F}(A,B)$.

Definition 1.3

Let $(X,\preceq)$ be an ordered set. Two mappings $A, B: X^2 \to X$ are said to be weakly increasing with respect to $\preceq$ if $A(u,v) \preceq B(A(u,v),A(v,u))$ and $B(u,v) \preceq A(B(u,v),B(v,u))$ hold for all $(u,v) \in X^2$.

Following Su [22], we define the set $\Psi = \{\psi:[0, +\infty) \to [0, +\infty):\psi]$ that satisfies the conditions (i)–(iii)}, where

1. is non decreasing,

2. $\psi(t) = 0$ if and only if $t = 0$,

3. is sub additive, that is, $\psi(t + s) \leq \psi(t) + \psi(s)$ for all $t, s \in [0, +\infty)$.

The set $\Phi = \{\phi:[0, +\infty) \to [0, +\infty):\phi$ is a nondecreasing and right upper semi-continuous function with $\psi(t) > \phi(t)$ for all $t > 0$, where $\psi \in \Psi\}$.Throughout the article, $(X,d,\preceq)$ states an ordered metric space where d is a metric on X and $\preceq$ is a partial order on the set X. In addition, we say that $(x,y) \in X^2$ is comparable to $(u,v) \in X^2$ if $x \preceq u$ and $y \preceq v$, or $u \preceq x$ and $v \preceq y$. For brevity, we denote by $(x,y) \preceq (u,v)$ or $(x,y) \succeq (u,v)$.

If d is a metric on X, then $\delta: X^2 \times X^2 \to [0, +\infty)$, defined by $\delta((x,y),(u,v)) = d(x,u) + d(y,v)$ for all $(x,y),(u,v) \in X^2$, is also a metric on X^2.

Now, we define Su type contractive pairs, which will be utilized in our main results.

Definition 1.4

Let $(X,d,\preceq)$ be an ordered metric space and $A, B: X^2 \to X$ be given mappings. We say that (A, B) is a Su type contractive pair if, for all comparable pairs $(x, y),(u, v) \in X^2$,
(1)$\psi(d(A(x,y),B(u,v))) \leq 12\phi(Q(x,y,u,v))$

holds, where

$$Q(x,y,u,v)=\max\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \delta((x,y),(u,v)),\delta((x,y),(A(x,y),A(y,x))),\delta((u,v),(B(u,v),B(v,u))), \\ 1/2[\delta((x,y),(B(u,v),B(v,u)))+\delta((u,v),(A(x,y),A(y,x)))] \end{array} \right\}$$

By the definition of $Q(x, y, u, v)$, it is obvious that $Q(x,y,u,v)=Q(y,x,v,u)$.

2 Existence of a common solution to systems of integral equations

The following is one of the main results.

Theorem 2.1

Let $(X,d,\preceq)$ *be an ordered complete metric space,* $A, B: X^2 \to X$ *weakly increasing mappings with respect to* $\preceq$ *and* (A, B) *be a Su type contractive pair. If A (or B) is continuous, then* $\mathcal{F}(A,B) \neq \emptyset$.

Proof

Let $u_0, v_0, \in X$ Define sequences $\{u_n\}$ and $\{v_n\}$ in X by
$u2n+1=A(u2n,v2n),u2n+2=B(u2n+1,v2n+1)$

and
$v2n+1=A(v2n,u2n),v2n+2=B(v2n+1,v2n+1)$

for all $n \geq 0$. Since A and B are weakly increasing, we have
(2)$un\preceq un+1 \text{and} vn\preceq vn+1,n\geq 1.$

Suppose that $u_n \neq u_{n+1}$ and $v_n \neq v_{n+1}$ for all $n \geq 0$ Then, for $n = 2m + 1$ using (1) and (2), we have
(3)$\psi(d(un,un+1))=\psi(d(u2m+1,u2m+2))=\psi(d(A(u2m,v2m),B(u2m+1,v2m+1)))\leq 12\phi(Q(u2m,v2m,u2m+1,v2m+1)),$

where
$Q(u2m,v2m,u2m+1,v2m+1)=\max\{\delta((u2m,v2m),(u2m+1,v2m+1)),\delta((u2m,v2m),(A(u2m,v2m),A(v2m,u2m)))\delta((u2m+1,v2m+1),(B(u2m+1,v2m+1),B(v2m+1,u2m+1))),12[\delta((u2m,v2m),(B(u2m+1,v2m+1),B(v2m+1,u2m+1)))+\delta((u2m+1,v2m+1),(A(u2m,v2m),A(v2m,u2m)))]\}=\max\{\delta((u2m,v2m),(u2m+1,v2m+1)),\delta((u2m,v2m),(u2m+1,v2m+1)),\delta((u2m+1,v2m+1),(u2m+2,v2m+2)),12[\delta((u2m,v2m),(u2m+2,v2m+2))+\delta((u2m+1,v2m+1),(u2m+1,v2m+1))]\}.$

Since
$\delta((u2m+1,v2m+1),(u2m+1,v2m+1))=d(u2m+1,v2m+1)+d(v2m+1,u2m+1)=0$

and
$\delta((u2m,v2m),(u2m+2,v2m+2))=d(u2m,u2m+2)+d(v2m,v2m+2)\leq d(u2m,u2m+1)+d(u2m+1,u2m+2)+d(v2m,v2m+1)+d(v2m+1,v2m+2)=\delta((u2m,v2m),(u2m+1,v2m+1))+\delta((u2m+1,v2m+1),(u2m+2,v2m+2)),$

we obtain
$Q(u2m,v2m,u2m+1,v2m+1)=\max\{\delta((u2m,v2m),(u2m+1,v2m+1)),\delta((u2m+1,v2m+1),(u2m+2,v2m+2))\}.$

Similarly, by (1) and (2), we obtain
(4)$\psi(d(vn,vn+1))=\psi(d(v2m+1,v2m+2))=\psi(d(A(v2m,u2m),B(v2m+1,u2m+1)))\leq 12\phi(Q(v2m,u2m,v2m+1,u2m+1))=12\phi(Q(u2m,v2m,u2m+1,v2m+1)).$

Summing the inequalities (3) and (4) and using the subadditivity property of ψ, we obtain
(5)$\psi(d(u2m+1,u2m+2)+d(v2m+1,v2m+2))\leq\phi(Q(u2m,v2m,u2m+1,v2m+1)).$

If $Q(u_{2m}, v_{2m}, u_{2m+1}, v_{2m+1}) = \delta((u_{2m+1}, v_{2m+1}),(u_{2m+2}, v_{2m+2})$ for some m, then by (5), we obtain
$\psi(\delta((u2m+1,v2m+1),(u2m+2,v2m+2)))\leq\phi(\delta((u2m+1,v2m+1),(u2m+2,v2m+2)))<\psi(\delta((u2m+1,v2m+1),(u2m+2,v2m+2))).$

Since ψ is nondecreasing,
$\delta((u2m+1,v2m+1),(u2m+2,v2m+2))<\delta((u2m+1,v2m+1),(u2m+2,v2m+2)),$

which is a contradiction. Then,
$Q(u2m,v2m,u2m+1,v2m+1)=\delta((u2m,v2m),(u2m+1,v2m+1))$

and so, by (5),
(6)$\psi(\delta((un,vn),(un+1,vn+1)))\leq\phi(\delta((un-1,vn-1),(un,vn))).$

Set $\delta_n := \{\delta((u_n, v_n),(u_{n+1}, v_{n+1}))\}$. Then, the sequence $\{\delta_n\}$ is decreasing. Thus, there exists $r \geq 0$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \delta_n = r$. Suppose that $r > 0$. Letting $n \to \infty$ in (6), we deduce

$$\psi(r)\leq\lim_{n\to\infty}\psi(\delta((u_n,v_n),(u_{n+1},v_{n+1})))\leq\lim_{n\to\infty}\phi(\delta((u_{n-1},v_{n-1}),(u_n,v_n)))\leq\phi(r),$$

a contradiction, and hence, $r = 0$, that is,

(7) $$\lim_{n\to\infty}\delta((u_n,v_n),(u_{n+1},v_{n+1}))=\lim_{n\to\infty}[d(u_n,u_{n+1})+d(v_n,v_{n+1})]=0.$$

To prove that $\{u_n\}$ and $\{v_n\}$ are Cauchy sequences, it is sufficient to show that $\{u_{2n}\}$ and $\{v_{2n}\}$ are Cauchy sequences in (X, d). Suppose, to the contrary, that at least one of $\{u_{2n}\}$ or $\{v_{2n}\}$ is not Cauchy sequence. Then, there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ for which we can find subsequences $\{u_{2m_k}\},\{u_{2n_k}\}$ of $\{u_{2n}\}$ and $\{v_{2m_k}\},\{v_{2n_k}\}$ of $\{v_{2n}\}$, such that n_k is the smallest index for which $n_k > m_k > k$ and

(8) $$d(u_{2n_k},u_{2m_k})+d(v_{2n_k},v_{2m_k})\geq\varepsilon,\quad d(u_{2n_k-1},u_{2m_k})+d(v_{2n_k-1},v_{2m_k})<\varepsilon.$$

By using the triangle inequality and (8), we obtain

$$\varepsilon\leq d(u_{2n_k},u_{2m_k})+d(v_{2n_k},v_{2m_k})\leq d(u_{2m_k},u_{2n_k-1})+d(u_{2n_k-1},u_{2n_k})+d(v_{2m_k},v_{2n_k-1})+d(v_{2n_k-1},v_{2n_k})<\varepsilon+\delta_{2n_k-1}.$$

Taking $k \to \infty$ in the above inequality and using (7), we deduce

(9) $$\lim_{k\to\infty}[d(u_{2n_k},u_{2m_k})+d(v_{2n_k},v_{2m_k})]=\varepsilon.$$

Again, from the triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}d(u_{2n_k},u_{2m_k})+d(v_{2n_k},v_{2m_k})&\leq d(u_{2n_k},u_{2n_k+1})+d(u_{2n_k+1},u_{2n_k+2})+d(u_{2n_k+2},u_{2m_k+1})+d(u_{2m_k+1},u_{2m_k})+d(v_{2n_k},v_{2n_k+1})\\&\quad+d(v_{2n_k+1},v_{2n_k+2})+d(v_{2n_k+2},v_{2m_k+1})+d(v_{2m_k+1},v_{2m_k})\\&\leq\delta_{2n_k}+\delta_{2n_k+1}+\delta_{2m_k}+d(u_{2n_k+2},u_{2n_k+1})+d(u_{2n_k+1},u_{2m_k+1})+d(v_{2n_k+2},v_{2n_k+1})+d(v_{2n_k+1},v_{2m_k+1})\\&\leq\delta_{2n_k}+2\delta_{2n_k+1}+\delta_{2m_k}+d(u_{2n_k+1},u_{2m_k})+d(u_{2m_k},u_{2m_k+1})+d(v_{2n_k+1},v_{2m_k})+d(v_{2m_k},v_{2m_k+1})\\&\leq\delta_{2n_k}+2\delta_{2n_k+1}+2\delta_{2m_k}+d(u_{2n_k+1},u_{2n_k+2})+d(u_{2n_k+2},u_{2m_k})+d(v_{2n_k+1},v_{2n_k+2})+d(v_{2n_k+2},v_{2m_k})\\&\leq2\delta_{2n_k}+2\delta_{2m_k}+4\delta_{2n_k+1}+d(u_{2n_k},u_{2m_k})+d(v_{2n_k},v_{2m_k}).\end{aligned}$$

Letting $k \to \infty$ in the above inequality and using (7) and (9), we have

(10) $$\lim_{k\to\infty}[d(u_{2n_k+2},u_{2m_k+1})+d(v_{2n_k+2},v_{2m_k+1})]=\varepsilon,\ \lim_{k\to\infty}[d(u_{2n_k+1},u_{2m_k+1})+d(v_{2n_k+1},v_{2m_k+1})]=\varepsilon,\ \lim_{k\to\infty}[d(u_{2n_k+1},u_{2m_k})+d(v_{2n_k+1},v_{2m_k})]=\varepsilon,\ \lim_{k\to\infty}[d(u_{2n_k+2},u_{2m_k})+d(v_{2n_k+2},v_{2m_k})]=\varepsilon.$$

Since $(u_{2m_k},v_{2m_k})\preceq(u_{2n_k+1},v_{2n_k+1})$ for $n_k > m_k$, using (1), we obtain

(11) $$\psi(d(u_{2m_k+1},u_{2n_k+2}))=\psi(d(A(u_{2m_k},v_{2m_k}),B(u_{2n_k+1},v_{2n_k+1})))\leq12\phi(Q(u_{2m_k},v_{2m_k},u_{2n_k+1},v_{2n_k+1})),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}Q(u_{2m_k},v_{2m_k},u_{2n_k+1},v_{2n_k+1})&=\max\{\delta((u_{2m_k},v_{2m_k}),(u_{2n_k+1},v_{2n_k+1})),\delta((u_{2m_k},v_{2m_k}),(A(u_{2m_k},v_{2m_k}),A(v_{2m_k},u_{2m_k}))),\\&\quad\delta((u_{2n_k+1},v_{2n_k+1}),(B(u_{2n_k+1},v_{2n_k+1}),B(v_{2n_k+1},u_{2n_k+1}))),12[\delta((u_{2m_k},v_{2m_k}),(B(u_{2n_k+1},v_{2n_k+1}),B(v_{2n_k+1},u_{2n_k+1})))\\&\quad+\delta((u_{2n_k+1},v_{2n_k+1}),(A(u_{2m_k},v_{2m_k}),A(v_{2m_k},u_{2m_k})))]\}\\&=\max\{\delta((u_{2m_k},v_{2m_k}),(u_{2n_k+1},v_{2n_k+1})),\delta((u_{2m_k},v_{2m_k}),(u_{2m_k+1},v_{2m_k+1})),\delta((u_{2n_k+1},v_{2n_k+1}),(u_{2n_k+2},v_{2n_k+2})),\\&\quad12[\delta((u_{2m_k},v_{2m_k}),(u_{2n_k+2},v_{2n_k+2}))+\delta((u_{2n_k+1},v_{2n_k+1}),(u_{2m_k+1},v_{2m_k+1}))]\}.\end{aligned}$$

Again, since $(v_{2m_k},u_{2m_k})\preceq(v_{2n_k+1},u_{2n_k+1})$, by (1), we also have

(12) $$\psi(d(v_{2m_k+1},v_{2n_k+2}))=\psi(d(A(v_{2m_k},u_{2m_k}),B(v_{2n_k+1},u_{2n_k+1})))=12\phi(Q(u_{2m_k},v_{2m_k},u_{2n_k+1},v_{2n_k+1})).$$

Summing the inequalities (11) and (12) and using the subadditivity property of ψ, we obtain

$$\psi(d(u_{2m_k+1},u_{2n_k+2})+d(v_{2m_k+1},v_{2n_k+2}))\leq\phi(Q(u_{2m_k},v_{2m_k},u_{2n_k+1},v_{2n_k+1})).$$

Now, by using (7), (9) and (10) and letting $k \to \infty$ in the above inequality, we deduce

$$\psi(\varepsilon)\leq\lim_{k\to\infty}\psi(d(u_{2m_k+1},u_{2n_k+2})+d(v_{2m_k+1},v_{2n_k+2}))\leq\lim_{k\to\infty}\phi(Q(u_{2m_k},v_{2m_k},u_{2n_k+1},v_{2n_k+1}))\leq\phi(\max\{\varepsilon,0,0,\varepsilon)=\phi(\varepsilon),$$

which implies $\varepsilon = 0$ a contradiction with $\varepsilon > 0$. Therefore, $\{u_n\}$ and $\{v_n\}$ are Cauchy sequences in X.

Now, we prove the existence of coupled common fixed point of A and B.

Owing to the completeness of (X, d), there exist $u, v \in X$ such that

(13) $\lim_{n\to\infty} u_n = u \text{ and } \lim_{n\to\infty} v_n = v.$

Without loss of generality, we assume that A is continuous. Now we have

$$u=\lim_{n\to\infty} u_{2n+1}=\lim_{n\to\infty} A(u_{2n},v_{2n})=A(\lim_{n\to\infty} u_{2n},\lim_{n\to\infty} v_{2n})=A(u,v)$$

and

$$v=\lim_{n\to\infty} v_{2n+1}=\lim_{n\to\infty} A(v_{2n},u_{2n})=A(\lim_{n\to\infty} v_{2n},\lim_{n\to\infty} u_{2n})=A(v,u).$$

We now assert that $d(u, B(u, v)) = d(v, B(v, u)) = 0$. To establish the claim, assume that $d(u, B(u, v)) > 0$ and $d(v, B(v, u)) > 0$. Since $(u, v) \in X^2$ is comparable to its own, from (1), we obtain

(14) $\psi(d(u,B(u,v)))=\psi(d(A(u,v),B(u,v)))\le\frac{1}{2}\phi(Q(u,v,u,v)),$

where

$$Q(u,v,u,v)=\max\{\delta((u,v),(u,v)),\delta((u,v),(A(u,v),A(v,u))),\delta((u,v),(B(u,v),B(v,u))),\tfrac{1}{2}[\delta((u,v),(B(u,v),B(v,u)))+\delta((u,v),(A(u,v),A(v,u)))]\}=\delta((u,v),(B(u,v),B(v,u))).$$

Again, since $(v,u)\preceq(v,u)$, by (1), we have

(15) $\psi(d(v,B(v,u)))=\psi(d(A(v,u),B(v,u)))\le\frac{1}{2}\phi(Q(u,v,u,v)).$

Thus, it follows from (14) and (15) that

$$\psi(d(u,B(u,v))+d(v,G(v,u)))\le\phi(Q(u,v,u,v))=\phi(\delta((u,v),(B(u,v),B(v,u))))=\phi(d(u,B(u,v))+d(v,B(v,u))),$$

which implies $d(u, B(u, v)) = d(v, B(v, u)) = 0$

Therefore, $u = A(u, v) = B(u, v)$ and $v = A(v, u) = B(v, u)$□

Example 2.2

Let $X = [0,1]$ be equipped with the usual metric and the partial order defined by

$x\preceq y$ if and only if $y\le x$.

Define mappings $A, B: X^2 \to X$ by $A(u,v)=\frac{u+v}{4}$ and $B(u,v)=\frac{u+v}{3}$. Then, A and B are weakly increasing with respect to $\preceq$ and continuous.

Also, (A, B) is a Su type contractive pair. Indeed, for all comparable $(x, y), (u, v) \in X^2$,

$$\psi(d(A(x,y),B(u,v)))=\left|\frac{x+y}{4}-\frac{u+v}{3}\right|\le\frac{1}{4}(|x-u|+|y-v|)=\frac{1}{2}\phi(\delta((x,y),(u,v)))\le\frac{1}{2}\phi(\max\{\delta((x,y),(u,v)),\delta((x,y),(A(x,y),A(y,x))),\delta((u,v),(B(u,v),B(v,u))),\tfrac{1}{2}[\delta((x,y),(B(u,v),B(v,u)))+\delta((u,v),(A(x,y),A(y,x)))]\})=\frac{1}{2}\phi(Q(x,y,u,v)),$$

where $\psi(t)=t$ and $\phi(t)=\frac{t}{2}$. Thus, all the hypotheses of Theorem 2.1 are fulfilled. Therefore, A and B have a coupled common fixed point, which is (0,0).

Definition 2.3

Let $(X,d,\preceq)$ be an ordered metric space. We say that $(X,d,\preceq)$ is regular if each nondecreasing sequence $\{x_n\}$ with $d(x_n,x) \to 0$ implies that $x_n \preceq x$ for all n.

We replace the continuity of A (or B) with the regularity of $(X,d,\preceq)$ in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.4

Let $(X,d,\preceq)$ be an ordered complete metric space, $A, B: X^2 \to X$ weakly increasing mappings with respect to $\preceq$ and (A, B) be a Su type contractive pair. If $(X,d,\preceq)$ is regular, then A and B have a coupled common fixed point.

Proof

Let $u_0, v_0 \in X$. Define sequences $\{u_n\}$ and $\{v_n\}$ in X by
$u_{2n+1}=A(u_{2n},v_{2n}), u_{2n+2}=B(u_{2n+1},v_{2n+1})$

and
$v_{2n+1}=A(v_{2n},u_{2n}), v_{2n+2}=B(v_{2n+1},v_{2n+1})$

for all $n \geq 0$. Following the proof of Theorem 2.1, we can show that the sequences $\{u_n\}$ and $\{v_n\}$ are nondecreasing, $\lim_{n\to\infty} u_n = u$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} v_n = v$. Since $(X,d,\preceq)$ is regular, we deduce that (u_n, v_n) is comparable to (u, v) for all n. From (1), we obtain
(16) $\psi(d(u_{2n+1},B(u,v)))=\psi(d(A(u_{2n},v_{2n}),B(u,v)))\leq 12\phi(Q(u_{2n},v_{2n},u,v))$,

where
$Q(u_{2n},v_{2n},u,v)=\max\{\delta((u_{2n},v_{2n}),(u,v)),\delta((u_{2n},v_{2n}),((u_{2n+1},v_{2n+1}))),\delta((u,v),(B(u,v),B(v,u))),12[\delta((u_{2n},v_{2n}),(B(u,v),G(v,u)))+\delta((u,v),(u_{2n+1},v_{2n+1}))]\}$.

Again, by (1), we obtain
(17) $\psi(d(v_{2n+1},B(v,u)))=\psi(d(A(v_{2n},u_{2n}),B(v,u)))\leq 12\phi(Q(u_{2n},v_{2n},u,v))$.

Thus, it follows from (16), (17) and the subadditivity property of ψ that
$\psi(d(u_{2n+1},B(u,v))+d(v_{2n+1},B(v,u)))\leq\phi(Q(u_{2n},v_{2n},u,v))$.

Taking $n \to \infty$ in the above inequality, we obtain
$\psi(d(u,B(u,v))+d(v,B(v,u)))\leq\lim_{n\to\infty}\psi(d(u_{2n+1},B(u,v))+d(v_{2n+1},B(v,u)))\leq\lim_{n\to\infty}\phi(Q(u_{2n},v_{2n},u,v))\leq\phi(\delta((u,v),(B(u,v),B(v,u))))=\phi(d(u,B(u,v))+d(v,B(v,u)))$,

which implies that $d(u, B(u, v)) + d(v,B(v, u)) = 0$, that is, $u = B(u, v)$ and $v = B(v, u)$.

Since $(u,v)\preceq(u,v)$, by (1), we deduce
(18) $\psi(d(A(u,v),u))=\psi(d(A(u,v),B(u,v)))\leq 12\phi(Q(u,v,u,v))$,

where
$Q(u,v,u,v)=\delta((u,v),(A(u,v),A(v,u)))$.

Again, by (1),
(19) $\psi(d(A(v,u),v))=\phi(d(A(v,u),B(v,u)))\leq 12\phi(Q(u,v,u,v))$.

Hence, it follows from (18), (19) and the subadditivity of ψ that
$\psi(d(A(u,v),u)+d(A(v,u),v))\leq\phi(Q(u,v,u,v))=\phi(d(u,A(u,v))+d(v,A(v,u)))$,

which implies $d(u, A(u, v)) = d(v, A(v, u)) = 0$. This completes the proof.□

Example 2.5

Let $X = [0,+\infty)$ be equipped with the usual metric and the partial order defined by
$x \preceq y$ if and only if $y \leq x$.

Define mappings $A, B: X^2 \to X$ by
$A(u,v)=\{u+v6, \text{if } u\geq v, 0, \text{if } u<v$,

and
$B(u,v)=\{u+v5, \text{if } u\geq v, 0, \text{if } u<v$.

Then, A and B are weakly increasing with respect to $\preceq$ and discontinuous.

Now we demonstrate that (A, B) is a Su type contractive pair. For all comparable $(x, y), (u, v) \in X^2$,
$\psi(d(A(x,y),B(u,v)))=|x+y6-u+v5|\leq 16(|x-u|+|y-v|)=12\phi(\delta((x,y),(u,v)))\leq 12\phi(\max\{\delta((x,y),(u,v)),\delta((x,y),(A(x,y),A(y,x))),\delta((u,v),(B(u,v),B(v,u))),12[\delta((x,y),(B(u,v),B(v,u)))+\delta((u,v),(A(x,y),A(y,x)))]\})=12\phi(Q(x,y,u,v))$,

where $\psi(t)=t$ and $\phi(t)=t3$. Thus, all the hypotheses of Theorem 2.4 are fulfilled. Therefore, A and B have a coupled common fixed point.

If we replace $Q(x, y, u, v)$ with $d(x, y) + d(u, v)$ in Theorem 2.1 (or Theorem 2.4), then we obtain the following corollary, which is an extended version of the main result of Işık and Turkoglu [23].

Corollary 2.6

Let $(X,d,\preceq)$ be an ordered complete metric space and $A, B: X^2 \to X$ be weakly increasing mappings with respect to $\preceq$ such that

(20) $\psi(d(A(x,y),B(u,v)))\leq 12\phi(d(x,y)+d(u,v))$

for all comparable $(x, y), (u, v) \in X^2$, where $\psi \in \Psi$ and $\phi \in \Phi$. Assume that one of the following conditions is satisfied:

1. *A (or B) is continuous;*
2. *$(X,d,\preceq)$ is regular.*

Then, A and B have a coupled common fixed point.

If we choose $\psi(t) = t$ and $\phi(t) = kt$ in Corollary 2.6 for $k \in [0,1)$, then we obtain the following result, which is an extended version of the main result of Bhaskar and Laksmikantham [24].

Corollary 2.7

Let $(X,d,\preceq)$ be an ordered complete metric space and $A, B: X^2 \to X$ be weakly increasing mappings with respect to $\preceq$, such that

(21) $d(A(x,y),B(u,v)) \leq \frac{k}{2}[d(x,y)+d(u,v)]$

for all comparable $(x, y), (u, v) \in X^2$ *, where* $k \in [0,1)$. *Assume that one of the following conditions is satisfied:*

1. *A (or B) is continuous;*
2. $(X,d,\preceq)$ *is regular.*

Then, A and B have a coupled common fixed point.

3 Applications

Consider the following coupled systems of integral equations:

(22) $\begin{cases} u(s)=\int_a^b H_1(s,r,u(r),v(r))\,dr, \\ v(s)=\int_a^b H_1(s,r,v(r),u(r))\,dr, \end{cases}$

and

(23) $\begin{cases} u(s)=\int_a^b H_2(s,r,u(r),v(r))\,dr, \\ v(s)=\int_a^b H_2(s,r,v(r),u(r))\,dr, \end{cases}$

where $s \in I = [a, b]$ $H_1,H_2: I\times I\times \mathbb{R}\times \mathbb{R}\to \mathbb{R}$ and $b > a \geq 0$.

In this section, we present an existence theorem for a common solution to (22) and (23) that belongs to $X:=C(I,\mathbb{R})$ (the set of continuous functions defined on I) by using the obtained result in Corollary 2.6.

We consider the operators $A, B: X^2 \to X$ given by

$A(u,v)(s)=\int_a^b H_1(s,r,u(r),v(r))\,dr, \quad u,v\in X, s\in I,$

and

$B(u,v)(s)=\int_a^b H_2(s,r,u(r),v(r))\,dr, \quad u,v\in X, s\in I.$

Then, the existence of a common solution to the integral equations (22) and (23) is equivalent to the existence of a coupled common fixed point of A and B.

It is well known that X, endowed with the metric d defined by

$d(u,v)=\sup_{s\in I}|u(s)-v(s)|$

for all $u, v \in X$ is a complete metric space. X can also be equipped with the partial order $\preceq$ given by

(24) $u,v\in X, \quad u\preceq v \text{ if and only if } u(s)\geq v(s), \text{ for all } s\in I.$

Recall that it is proved that $(X,d,\preceq)$ is regular (see [25]).

Suppose that the following conditions hold:

1. $H_1,H_2: I\times I\times \mathbb{R}\times \mathbb{R}\to \mathbb{R}$ are continuous;

2. for all $s, r \in I$, we have

   $H_1(s,r,u(r),v(r))\geq H_2\left(s,r,\int_a^b H_1(r,\tau,u(\tau),v(\tau))\,d\tau,\int_a^b H_1(r,\tau,v(\tau),u(\tau))\,d\tau\right),$

   and

   $H_2(s,r,u(r),v(r))\geq H_1\left(s,r,\int_a^b H_2(r,\tau,u(\tau),v(\tau))\,d\tau,\int_a^b H_2(r,\tau,v(\tau),u(\tau))\,d\tau\right);$

3. for all comparable $(x, y), (u, v) \in X^2$ and for every $s, r \in I$, we have
|H1(s,r,x(r),y(r))−H2(s,r,u(r),v(r))|2≤14γ(s,r)(|x(r)−u(r)|+|y(r)−v(r)|)2,

where γ:I2→ℝ+ is a continuous function satisfying
sups∈I∫baγ(s,r)dr≤1b−a.

Theorem 3.1

Assume that the conditions (A)–(C) are satisfied. Then, the integral equations (22) *and* (23) *have a common solution in X.*

Proof

From the condition (B), the mappings A and B are weakly increasing with respect to ≼. Indeed, for all $s \in I$, we have
A(u,v)(s)=∫baH1(s,r,u(r),v(r))dr≥∫baH2(s,r,∫baH1(r,τ,u(τ),v(τ))dτ,∫baH1(r,τ,v(τ),u(τ))dτ)dr=∫baH2(s,r,A(u,v)(r),A(v,u)(r))dr=B(A(u,v),A(v,u))(s),

and so A(u,v)≼B(A(u,v),A(v,u)). Similarly, one can easily see that B(u,v)≼A(B(u,v),B(v,u)) .

Let (x, y) be comparable to (u, v). Then, by (C), for all $s \in I$, we deduce
|A(x,y)(s)−B(u,v)(s)|2≤(∫ba|H1(s,r,x(r),y(r))−H2(s,r,u(r),v(r))|dr)2≤∫ba12dr∫ba|H1(s,r,x(r),y(r))−H2(s,r,u(r),v(r))|2dr≤(b−a)∫ba14γ(s,r)(|x(r)−u(r)|+|y(r)−v(r)|)2dr≤14(b−a)∫baγ(s,r)(d(x,u)+d(y,v))2dr≤14(b−a)sups∈I(∫baγ(s,r)dr)(d(x,u)+d(y,v))2≤14(d(x,u)+d(y,v))2.

Therefore, by the above inequality, we obtain
(sups∈I|A(x,y)(s)−B(u,v)(s)|)2≤14(d(x,u)+d(y,v))2.

Putting $\psi(t) = t^2$ and ϕ(t)=t22, we obtain
(25)ψ(d(F(x,y),G(u,v)))≤12ϕ(d(x,u)+d(y,v))

for all comparable $(x, y), (u, v) \in X^2$. Hence, all the hypotheses of Corollary 2.6 are satisfied. So A and B have a coupled common fixed point, that is, the integral equations (22) and (23) have a common solution in X.□

Example 3.2

Consider the following systems of integral equations in X=C(I=[0,1],ℝ)
(26){u(s)=∫10(s2+r1+r+18|u(r)|1+3|u(r)|+18|v(r)|1+5|v(r)|)dr,v(s)=∫10(s2+r1+r+18|v(r)|1+3|v(r)|+18|u(r)|1+5|u(r)|)dr,

and
(27){u(s)=∫10(s2+r1+r+19|u(r)|1+7|u(r)|+19|v(r)|1+9|v(r)|)dr,v(s)=∫10(s2+r1+r+19|v(r)|1+7|v(r)|+19|u(r)|1+9|u(r)|)dr.

The systems (26) and (27) are particular cases of systems (22) and (23), respectively, where
H1(s,r,u(r),v(r))=s2+r1+r+18|u(r)|1+3|u(r)|+18|v(r)|1+5|v(r)|,

and
H2(s,r,u(r),v(r))=s2+r1+r+19|u(r)|1+7|u(r)|+19|v(r)|1+9|v(r)|.

Clearly, H_1 and H_2 are continuous, that is, the condition (A) is satisfied. Also, one can easily prove that the condition (B) holds with respect to the relation ≼ defined by (24).

For all $(x, y), (u, v) \in X^2$ with $x \geq u, y \geq v$ and for every $s, r \in I$, we obtain

|*H*1(*s*,*r*,*x*(*r*),*y*(*r*))−*H*2(*s*,*r*,*u*(*r*),*v*(*r*))|2=|18|*x*(*r*)|1+3|*x*(*r*)|+18|*y*(*r*)|1+5|*y*(*r*)|−19|*u*(*r*)|1+7|*u*(*r*)|−19|*v*(*r*)|1+9|*v*(*r*)||2≤18(|*x*(*r*)−*u*(*r*)|+|*y*(*r*)−*v*(*r*)|)2=14*γ*(*s*,*r*)(|*x*(*r*)−*u*(*r*)|+|*y*(*r*)−*v*(*r*)|)2,

where $\gamma(s, r) = 1/2$, so that
sup*s*∈*I*∫10*γ*(*s*,*r*)d*r*≤1.

Thus, all conditions of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied.

References

1. Banaś, J., Rzepka, B.: solutions of a quadratic integral equation of fractional order. J. Math. Anal. Appl. **332**(2), 1371–1379 (2007)
2. Barikbin, M., Vahidi, A., Damercheli, T., Babolian, E.: An iterative shifted chebyshev method for nonlinear stochastic itô-Volterra integral equations. J. Comput. Appl. Math. **378**, 112912 (2020)
3. Besalú, M., Márquez-Carreras, D., Nualart, E.: Existence and smoothness of the density of the solution to fractional stochastic integral Volterra equations. Stochastics **93**(4), 528–554 (2021)
4. Chen, P., Zhang, X.: Non-autonomous stochastic evolution equations of parabolic type with nonlocal initial conditions. Discrete Contin. Dynam. Syst. **26**(9), 4681–4695 (2021)
5. Chen, P., Zhang, X.: Upper semi-continuity of attractors for non-autonomous fractional stochastic parabolic equations with delay. Discrete Contin. Dynam. Syst. **26**(8), 4325–4357 (2021)
6. Chen, P., Li, Y., Zhang, X.: Cauchy problem for stochastic non-autonomous evolution equations governed by noncompact evolution families. Discrete Contin. Dynam. Syst. **26**(3), 1531–1547 (2021)
7. Chen, P., Zhang, X., Li, Y.: Cauchy problem for fractional non-autonomous evolution equations. Banach J. Math. Anal. **14**, 559–584 (2020)
8. Chen, P., Zhang, X., Li, Y.: Fractional non-autonomous evolution equation with nonlocal conditions. J. Pseudo-Differ. Oper. Appl. **10**, 955–973 (2019)
9. Cresson, J.: Fractional Calculus in Analysis, Dynamics, and Optimal Control. Nova Publishers (2014)
10. Darwish, M.A.: On quadratic integral equation of fractional orders. J. Math. Anal. Appl. **311**(1), 112–119 (2005)
11. W. Adel1, Z. Sabir Solving a new design of nonlinear second-order Lane-Emden pantograph delay differential modelvia Bernoulli collocation method Eur. Phys. J. Plus. (2020)
12. J. Banas, K. Goebel Measures of Noncompactness in Banach Spaces Marcel Dekker, New York (1980)
    J. Banas, M. Lecko Fixed points of the product of operators in Banach algebra Panamer. Math. J., 12 (2002), pp. 101-109
13. J. Banas, K. Sadarangani Solutions of some functional-integral equations in Banach algebra Math. Comput. Model., 38 (2003), pp. 245-250