Ratio Mathematica Volume 47, 2023

Some fixed point results in fuzzy metric space using intimate mappings

Vijayabaskerreddy Bonuga*
Srinivas Veladi †

Abstract

The aim of this research paper is to prove the existence and uniqueness of common fixed point theorems for four self-mappings in fuzzy metric space using the notion of Intimate mappings.We also provide appropriate illustrations to justify the key points mentioned in the main results.

Keywords: Fuzzy metric space, Intimate mappings, E.A property, Common E.A property.

2010 AMS subject classification: 54H25, 47H10.‡

* Department of Mathematics, Sreenidhi Institute of Science and Technology, Hyderabad, India;
Email: basker.bonuga@gmail.com.
† Department of Mathematics, University college of Science, Osmania University Hyderabad, India;
Email:srinivasmaths4141@gmail.com.
‡ Received on August 12, 2022. Accepted on January 2, 2023. Published on January 13, 2023. doi: 10.23755/rm.v41i0.823. ISSN: 1592-7415. eISSN: 2282-8214.

1. Introduction

L.A Zadeh [1] initiated the new concept, as extension an of classical set namely Fuzzy set. Lateron the notion of fuzzy metric space was introduced by Kramosil and Mechalek in [2]. Further this was altered by George and veeramani [4] in order to obtain Harsdorff topology for the class of fuzzy metric spaces. Thereafter many fixed point theorems came into light under various conditions like ([5],[6],[9],[10],[11],[13],[16],[19]) in fuzzy metric space.

Under other conditions, Sahu and others [12] developed the notion of generalized compatible mappings of type $(\mathcal{A})$ called Intimate mappings. These were further extended by Chugh and Madhu Aggarwal [13] which resulted in the formation of some results in Hausdorff uniform spaces. Further some more results can be witnessed like [14] using intimate mappings in complex valued metric space. Apart from this Praveenkumar and others [15] proved some theorems in multiplicative metric space (MMS) using the notion of intimate mappings and subsequently many results came into existence on this platform like ([17],[18]).

The concept of non-compatible mappings extended as the E. A property was introduced in metric space by Aamri and Matouwakil [20]. Consequently, the concept of improved E.A property resulted in the formation of common property E.A was introduced by Yicheng liu et al. [21].

The important note of this article is to extend the notion of intimate mappings in fuzzy metric space using recent concepts like the different forms of E.A properties.In this process we prove three unique common fixed point theorems using these concepts. Cocequently these results stand as generalizations of some of the existing results like [16] [19]. Furthermore, some illustrations are provided to support our findings.

2. Definitions and Preliminaries

Definition 2.1 (B.Schweizer and A.Sklar [7]):A binary operation $*:[0,1] \times [0, 1]\to[0,1]$ is said to be continuous triangular norm (i.e continuous $t-$norm) if the following assertions hold: (CT-i) $*$ is continuous;(CT-ii)$a * b \leq c * d$ where $a \leq b, c \leq d$ and $a, b, c, d \in [0,1]$;(CT-iii)$a * 1 = a$ for $a \in [0,1]$; (CT-iv) $*$ is associative and commutative.

Definition 2.2 (Kramosil and Mechalek [2]**)**: A triplet $(\mathbb{X}, M_{KM}, *)$ is fuzzy metric space (i.e., FMS) if $\mathbb{X}$ is a arbitrary set, $*$ is continuous $t-$norm and M_{KM} is fuzzy set on $\mathbb{X}^2 \times (0, \infty)$ satisfying the following conditions for all $x, y, z \in \mathbb{X}$ such that $t, s \in (0, \infty)$:

(KMFM-i) $M_{KM}(x, y, 0) = 0$

(KMFM-ii) $M_{KM}(x, y, t) = 1 \ \forall t > 0 \iff x = y$

(KMFM-iii) $M_{KM}(y, x, t) = M_{KM}(x, y, t)$

(KMFM-iv) $M_{KM}(x, z, t + s) \geq M_{KM}(x, y, t) * M_{KM}(y, z, s)$

(KMFM-v) $M_{KM}(x, y, .): [0.1]\to[0,1]$ left continuous.

Example 2.3 (George &Veeramani [4])**:** Consider$(\mathbb{X}, d_u)$ is a metric space and define $M_{KM}(x, y, t) = \dfrac{t}{t + d_u(x, y)}$ then $(\mathbb{X}, M_{KM}, *)$ is FMS where $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{X}$, $t > 0$ and $*$ is continuous $t-$norm with $a * b = \min\{a, b\}$.

In the entire paper, $(\mathbb{X}, M_{KM}, *)$ is to be assumed FMS with the condition (KFFM-6) : $\lim_{t\to\infty} \mathrm{M_{KM}}(x, y, t) = 1$ for all $x, y, \in \mathbb{X}$.

Definition 2.4 (Grabiec [3]): Let $\langle x_n \rangle$ be sequence in FMS $(\mathbb{X}, \mathrm{M_{KM}}, *), \langle x_n \rangle$ then converges to a point $\ell \in \mathbb{X}$ if $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{M_{KM}}(x_n, \ell, t) = 1, \forall t > 0$.

Definition 2.5 (Garbaic [3]): Let $\langle x_n \rangle$ be a sequence in FMS $(\mathbb{X}, \mathrm{M_{KM}}, *)$, this sequence $< x_n >$ in $\mathbb{X}$ is said to be Cauchy sequence in FMS if $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{M_{KM}}\left(x_{n+p}, x_n, t\right) = 1$, $\forall t > 0$ and $p > 0$.

Definition 2.6 (Garbiec [3]): If every Cauchy sequence is convergent in $(\mathbb{X}, \mathrm{M_{KM}}, *)$ then we say that it is complete.

Lemma 2.7 (S.N. Mishra et al [5]): Let$(\mathbb{X}, \mathrm{M_{KM}}, *)$ be a FMS if there exists $k \in (0,1)$ such that $\mathrm{M_{KM}}(x, y, kt) \geq \mathrm{M_{KM}}(x, y, t)$ then $x = y$.

Definition 2.8 ([5],[10]): Let $\mathfrak{S}$ and $\mathfrak{T}$ be two self mappings of a FMS$(\mathbb{X}, \mathrm{M_{KM}}, *)$. Then $\mathfrak{S}$ and $\mathfrak{T}$ are

(1) compatible if $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{T}x_n, \mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{S}x_n, t) = 1$ whenever a sequence $\langle x_n \rangle$ in $\mathbb{X}$ provided $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{S}x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{T}x_n = t$ for some $t \in \mathbb{X}$

(2) compatible of type $(\mathcal{A})$ if

$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{T}x_n, \mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{T}x_n, t) = 1$ $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{S}x_n, \mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{S}x_n, t) = 1$ whenever $\langle x_n \rangle$ in $\mathbb{X}$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{S}x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{T}x_n = t$ for some $t \in \mathbb{X}$.

Now we discuss some definitions related to intimate mappings in FMS.

Definition 2.9: Let $\mathfrak{A}$ *and* $\mathfrak{S}$ be two mappings of a FMS $(\mathbb{X}, \mathrm{M_{KM}}, *)$ into itself. Then $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{S}$ are said to be

(1). $\mathcal{A}$-Intimate mappings if $\alpha\, \mathrm{M_{KM}}(\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{S}x_n, \mathfrak{A}x_n, t) \geq \alpha\, \mathrm{M_{KM}}(\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{S}x_n, \mathfrak{S}x_n, t)$ where $\alpha = \lim_{n\to\infty}$ Sup or $\lim_{n\to\infty}$ Inf and $\langle x_n \rangle$ is a sequence in $\mathbb{X} \ni \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{A}x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{S}\mathrm{S}x_n = t$ for some $t \in \mathbb{X}$.

(2). $\mathcal{S}$-Intimate mapping if $\alpha\, M_{KM}(\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{A}x_n, \mathfrak{S}x_n, t) \geq \alpha\, M_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{A}x_n, \mathfrak{A}x_n, t)$ where $\alpha = \lim_{n\to\infty}$ Sup or $\lim_{n\to\infty}$ Inf and a sequence $\langle x_n \rangle$ in $\mathbb{X} \ni \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{A}x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{S}x_n = t$ for some $t \in \mathbb{X}$.

Proposition 2.10: Let $\mathfrak{A}$ *and* $\mathfrak{S}$ be two self mappings of a FMS $(\mathbb{X}, M_{KM}, *)$. Suppose $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{S}$ are compatible mappings of type $(\mathcal{A})$ then the pair of mappings $\mathfrak{A}$ *and* $\mathfrak{S}$ are $\mathcal{A}-$ intimate mappings and $\mathcal{S}$-intimate mappings.

Proof: Since $\mathfrak{A}$ *and* $\mathfrak{S}$are compatible of type $(\mathcal{A})$, we have $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{S}x_n, \mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{S}x_n, t) = 1$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{A}x_n, \mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{A}x_n, t) = 1$ whenever $\langle x_n \rangle$ in $\mathbb{X} \ni \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{A}x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{S}x_n = t$ for some $t \in \mathbb{X}$.

Now $\mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{S}n_n, \mathfrak{A}x_n, (2-\beta)t) = \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{S}x_n, \mathfrak{A}x_n, (1+k_1)t)$

$$\geq \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{S}x_n, \mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{S}x_n, k_1 t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{S}x_n, \mathfrak{A}x_n, t).$$

By taking $k_1 = 1 - \beta$ and $0 < k_1 < 1$ and letting $n \to \infty$ and $\beta \to 1$ we obtain

$$M_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{S}x_n, \mathfrak{A}x_n, t) \geq M_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{S}x_n, \mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{S}x_n, k_1 t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{S}x_n, \mathfrak{A}x_n, t)$$
$$= M_{KM}(\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{S}x_n, \mathrm{A}x_n, t).$$

By applying limit supremum on both sides,
$\alpha\, M_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{S}x_n, \mathfrak{A}x_n, t) \geq \alpha\, M_{KM}(\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{S}x_n, \mathfrak{A}x_n, t)$ this implies $\mathfrak{A}$ *and* $\mathfrak{S}$ are $\mathcal{A}$-intimate mappings whenever $\{x_n\}$ is a sequence in $\mathbb{X}$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{A}x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{S}x_n = t$ for some $t \in \mathbb{X}$. Likewise, we can prove that the pair of these mappings is $\mathcal{S}$-intimate.

Proposition 2.11: Let $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{S}$ be two self mappings on FMS. $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{S}$ are $\mathcal{A}$-intimate mappings and $\mathfrak{A}t_1 = \mathfrak{S}t_1 = p, p \in \mathbb{X}$ then $M_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}p, p, t) \geq M_{KM}(\mathfrak{S}p, p, t)$.

Proof: Suppose that $\{x_n\} \in \mathbb{X}$ is a sequence such that $\mathfrak{A}x_n = \mathfrak{S}x_n \to \mathfrak{A}t_1 = \mathfrak{S}t_1 = p$ for some $p, t \in \mathbb{X}$.

Since the pair of mappings $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{S}$ are $\mathcal{A}-$ intimate, then we obtain

$$M_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}p, p, t) = \lim_{n\to\infty} M_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{S}x_n, \mathfrak{A}x_n, t) \geq \lim_{n\to\infty} M_{KM}(\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{S}x_n, \mathfrak{S}x_n, t)$$
$$= M_{KM}(\mathfrak{S}p, p, t).$$

Thus $M_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}p, p, t) \geq M_{KM}(\mathfrak{S}p, p, t)$.

Remark 2.12: A pair of mappings $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{S}$ is $\mathcal{A}$-intimate or $\mathcal{S}$-intimate but not compatible mapping of type $(\mathcal{A})$.

The following example revels the relation between intimate mappings and compatible mappings of type $(\mathcal{A})$.

Example 2.13: Suppose $\mathbb{X} = [0,1]$. Define two self-mappings $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{S}$ as follows
$\mathfrak{A}(x) = \frac{5}{x+5}$ $\mathfrak{S}(x) = \frac{1}{x+1}$ for every x in [0,1].

Consider a sequence $\langle x_n \rangle = \frac{1}{n}$ $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{A}x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{S}x_n = 1$.

Consequently, $\lim_{n\to\infty} M(\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{S}x_n, \mathfrak{A}x_n, t) = \frac{6t}{6t+1}$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} M(\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{S}x_n, \mathfrak{S}x_n, t) = \frac{2t}{2t+1}$.

Hence $\lim_{n\to\infty} M_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{S}x_n, \mathfrak{A}x_n, t) \geq \lim_{n\to\infty} M_{KM}(\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{S}x_n, \mathfrak{S}x_n, t)$, for all $t > 0$.

Thus, the pair $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{S})$ is $\mathcal{A}$-intimate.

On the other hand, the $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{S})$ are not compatible of type $(\mathcal{A})$, since $\lim_{n\to\infty} M_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{S}x_n, \mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{S}x_n, t) = \frac{3t}{3t+1} \neq 1$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} M_{KM}(\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{A}x_n, \mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{A}x_n, t) = \frac{3t}{3t+1} \neq 1$.

Definition 2.14[20]: Define $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{S}$ as two self maps of FMS $(\mathbb{X}, M_{KM}, *)$ then we say that $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{S}$ satisfy the property E.A if there exists a sequence $\langle x_n \rangle \in \mathbb{X}$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{A}x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{S}x_n = t$ for some $t \in \mathbb{X}$.

Definition 2.15[21]: Suppose $\mathfrak{A}$, $\mathfrak{P}$, $\mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{T}$ are four self maps on FMS $(\mathbb{X}, M_{KM}, *)$ then we say that $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{P})$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{T})$ satisfy common property E.A whenever two sequences $\langle x_n \rangle$ and $\langle \gamma_n \rangle$ in $\mathbb{X}$ satisfying

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{A}x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{S}x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{B}\gamma_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{T}\gamma_n = t \text{ for some } t \in \mathbb{X}.$$

3. Main results

3.1 Theorem: Let $(\mathbb{X}, \mathrm{M_{KM}}, *)$ be a complete fuzzy metric space. Suppose $\mathfrak{P}$,$\mathfrak{Q}$, $\mathfrak{S}$ and $\mathfrak{A}$ are self maps on $\mathbb{X}$ satisfying the conditions

$(\mathcal{C}-1)$ $\mathfrak{P}(\mathbb{X}) \subseteq \mathfrak{S}(\mathbb{X})$ and $\mathfrak{Q}(\mathbb{X}) \subseteq \mathfrak{A}(\mathbb{X})$

$(\mathcal{C}-2)$ $\mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}x, \mathfrak{Q}\gamma, \mathrm{k}t) \geq \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}x, \mathfrak{S}\gamma, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}x, \mathfrak{A}x, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{Q}\gamma, \mathfrak{S}\gamma, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}x, \mathfrak{S}\gamma, t)$

where $k \in (0,1)$ and for all x, $\gamma \in \mathbb{X}$

$(\mathcal{C}-3)$ $\mathfrak{A}(\mathbb{X})$ is complete

$(\mathcal{C}-4)$ the pair of mappings $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{P}$ *is* $\mathcal{A}-$intimate and the other pair of mappings also $\mathfrak{S}$ and $\mathfrak{Q}$ is $\mathcal{S}-$intimate.

Then $\mathfrak{P}$, $\mathfrak{Q}$,$\mathfrak{S}$ and $\mathfrak{A}$ have a unique common fixed point in $\mathbb{X}$.

Proof:

Letx_0 be any arbitrary point of $\mathbb{X}$.
Since from the condition $\mathfrak{P}(\mathbb{X}) \subseteq \mathfrak{S}(\mathbb{X})$ of $(\mathcal{C}-1)$, there exists a point $x_1 \in \mathbb{X}$ such that $\mathfrak{P}x_0 = \mathfrak{S}x_1 = \gamma_0$.
Now for this x_1 and applying the $(\mathcal{C}-1)$[i.e $\mathfrak{Q}(\mathbb{X}) \subseteq \mathfrak{A}(\mathbb{X})$] $\exists x_2 \in \mathbb{X}$ such that $\mathfrak{Q}x_1 = \mathfrak{A}x_2 = \gamma_1$.
Inductively, we establish two real sequences $< x_n >$ and $< \gamma_n >$ in $\mathbb{X}$ $\ni$ $\gamma_{2n} = \mathfrak{P}x_{2n} = \mathfrak{S}x_{2n+1}$ and $\gamma_{2n+1} = \mathfrak{Q}x_{2n+1} = \mathfrak{A}x_{2n+2}$ for $n \geq 0$.
By taking $x = x_{2n}, \gamma = x_{2n+1}$in the inequality $(\mathcal{C}-2)$,

$$\mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}x_{2\mathrm{n}}, \mathfrak{Q}x_{2n+1}, \mathrm{k}t) \geq \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}x_{2\mathrm{n}}, \mathfrak{S}x_{2n+1}, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}x_{2\mathrm{n}}, \mathfrak{A}x_{2n}, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{Q}x_{2n+1}, \mathfrak{S}x_{2n+1}, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}x_{2\mathrm{n}}, \mathfrak{S}x_{2n+1}, t)$$

which implies that an $n \to \infty$

$$\mathrm{M}_{KM}(\gamma_{2n}, \gamma_{2n+1}, \mathrm{k}t) \geq \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\gamma_{2n-1}, \gamma_{2n}, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\gamma_{2n}, \gamma_{2n-1}, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\gamma_{2n+1}, \gamma_{2n}, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\gamma_{2n}, \gamma_{2n}, t).$$

This yield

$$\mathrm{M}_{KM}(\gamma_{2n}, \gamma_{2n+1}, \mathrm{k}t) \geq \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\gamma_{2n-1}, \gamma_{2n}, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\gamma_{2n+1}, \gamma_{2n}, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\gamma_{2n}, \gamma_{2n-1}, t) * 1.$$

Again, by the condition KMFM-3, we get

$$\mathrm{M}_{KM}(\gamma_{2n}, \gamma_{2n+1}, \mathrm{k}t) \geq \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\gamma_{2n-1}, \gamma_{2n}, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\gamma_{2n}, \gamma_{2n+1}, t)$$

which implies (since $\mathfrak{a} * \mathfrak{b} = \min\{\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}\}$.)

$$\mathrm{M}_{KM}(\gamma_{2n}, \gamma_{2n+1}, \mathrm{k}t) \geq \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\gamma_{2n-1}, \gamma_{2n}, t).$$

In general

$$\mathrm{M_{KM}}(\gamma_{n+1}, \gamma_{n+2}, kt) \geq M_{KM}(\gamma_n, \gamma_{n+1}, t) \;\ldots\ldots (\sigma-1)$$

for all $n = 1,2,3..,$ and $t > 0$.
From $(\sigma-1)$,

$[\mathrm{M}_{KM}(\gamma_n, \gamma_{n+1}, t)] \geq \mathrm{M}_{KM}\left(\gamma_{n-1}, \gamma_n, \frac{t}{\mathrm{k}}\right) \geq \mathrm{M}_{KM}\left(\gamma_{n-2}, \gamma_{n-1}, \frac{t}{\mathrm{k}^2}\right) \geq \cdots$

$$\ldots \geq \mathrm{M}_{KM}\left(\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \frac{t}{\mathrm{k}^n}\right) \to 1 \text{ as } n \to \infty \ldots\ldots (\sigma - 2)$$

For any $t > 0$ and $\lambda_{MK} \in (0,1)$ we consider $\forall\, n > n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathrm{M}_{KM}(\gamma_n, \gamma_{n+1}, t) > (1 - \lambda_{\mathrm{MK}}) \ldots (\sigma - 3)$.
For $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $m \geq n$, then we have that
$[\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{MK}}(\gamma_n, \gamma_m, t)]$

$$\geq \min\{\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{MK}}\left(\gamma_n, \gamma_{n+1}, \frac{t}{m-n}\right) * \mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{MK}}\left(\gamma_{n+1}, \gamma_{n+2}, \frac{t}{m-n}\right) * \ldots.$$

$\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{MK}}\left(\gamma_{m-1}, \gamma_m, \frac{t}{m-n}\right) \geq (1 - \lambda_{\mathrm{MK}}) * (1 - \lambda_{\mathrm{MK}}) * \ldots (1 - \lambda_{\mathrm{MK}}) .. (m - n)$ times.

This implies $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{MK}}(\gamma_{m-1}, \gamma_m, t) \geq (1 - \lambda_{\mathrm{MK}})$
Therefore $< \gamma_n >$ is cauchy sequence in FMS.
Since $(\mathbb{X}, M_{KM}, *)$ is complete FMS, so sequence $\{\gamma_n\}$ converges to p*∈X.
Further fuzzy cauchy sequence $\{\gamma_n\}$ has convergent subsequence $\{\gamma_{2n+1}\}$ and $\{\gamma_{2n}\}$.

From the above argument,
$\gamma_{2n+1} = \mathfrak{Q}x_{2n+1} = \mathfrak{A}x_{2n+2} \to \mathrm{p}*$ and

$$\gamma_{2n} = \mathfrak{P}x_{2n} = \mathfrak{S}x_{2n+1} \to \mathrm{p}* \text{ as } n \to \infty \ldots (\sigma - 4)$$

Now suppose that the range set $\mathfrak{A}$(X) is complete then ∃ a point u∈𝕏 ∋ $\mathfrak{A}$u=p*..$(\sigma - 5)$.
Now we claim that $\mathfrak{P}$u=p* from the inequality, put $x = u$ and $\gamma = x_{2n+1}$ we have

$$\mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{u}, \mathfrak{Q}n_{2n+1}, \mathrm{k}t) \geq \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}\mathrm{u}, \mathfrak{S}x_{2n+1}, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{u}, \mathfrak{A}\mathrm{u}, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{Q}x_{2n+1}, \mathfrak{S}x_{2n+1}, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{u}, \mathfrak{S}\mathrm{S}x_{2n+1}, t).$$

Taking limit as $n \to \infty$

$$\mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{u}, \mathrm{p}*, \mathrm{k}t) \geq \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathrm{p}*, \mathrm{p}*, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{u}, \mathrm{p}*, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathrm{p}*, \mathrm{p}*, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{u}, \mathrm{p}*, t).$$

This gives $\mathfrak{P}$u=p*. That is $\mathfrak{P}$u=$\mathfrak{A}$u=p*…... $(\sigma - 6)$
Let us prove that Qv=p*.
Using the equation (($\sigma - 6$) with contained inequality $\mathfrak{P}(\mathbb{X}) \subseteq \mathfrak{S}(\mathbb{X})$,
p*=$\mathfrak{P}$u ∈ $\mathfrak{P}(\mathbb{X}) \subseteq \mathfrak{S}(\mathbb{X})$ then ∃ a point v∈𝕏 ∋
$\mathfrak{S}$v=$\mathfrak{P}$u=p*…. $(\sigma - 7)$.
Put x=u and $\gamma = v$ in $(\mathcal{C} - 2)$ then we obtain

$$\mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{u}, \mathfrak{Q}\mathrm{v}, \mathrm{k}t) \geq \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathrm{Au}, \mathfrak{S}\mathrm{v}, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{u}, \mathfrak{A}\mathrm{u}, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{Q}\mathrm{v}, \mathfrak{S}\mathrm{v}, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{u}, \mathfrak{S}\mathrm{v}, t).$$

By using$(\sigma - 7)$ we get

$$\mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathrm{p}*, \mathfrak{Q}\mathrm{v}, \mathrm{k}t) \geq \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathrm{p}*, \mathfrak{S}\mathrm{v}, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathrm{p}*, \mathrm{p}*, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{Q}\mathrm{v}, \mathrm{p}*, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathrm{p}*, \mathrm{p}*, t)$$

this gives
$\mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathrm{p}*, \mathfrak{Q}\mathrm{v}, kt) \geq \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{Q}\mathrm{v}, \mathrm{p}*, \mathrm{k}t)$.
Consequently $\mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathrm{p}*, \mathfrak{Q}\mathrm{v}, \mathrm{k}t) \geq \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathrm{p}*, \mathfrak{Q}\mathrm{v}, \mathrm{k}t)$

this implies $\mathfrak{Q}$v=p*.
This shows that $\mathfrak{Q}$v=$\mathfrak{S}$v=p*…... $(\sigma - 8)$
Since $\mathfrak{P}$u=$\mathfrak{A}$u=p* and
($\mathfrak{A}$,$\mathfrak{P}$) is $\mathcal{A}$-intimate we have $M_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}p^*, p^*, t) \geq M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}p^*, p^*, t)$…. $(\sigma - 9)$.
Suppose that $\mathfrak{P}p^* \neq p^*$.
Put $x = p*, \gamma = v$ in $(\mathcal{C} - 2)$ then we get,

$$M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}p*, \mathfrak{Q}v, kt) \geq M_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}p*, \mathfrak{S}v, t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}p*, \mathfrak{A}p*, t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{Q}v, \mathfrak{S}v, t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}p*, \mathfrak{S}v, t).$$

Using $(\sigma - 8)$ we get,

$$M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}p*, p*, kt) \geq M_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}p*, p*, t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}p*, \mathfrak{A}p*, t) * M_{KM}(p*, p*, t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}p*, p*, t).$$

By applying (KMFM-iv) we get

$$M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}p*, p*, kt) \geq M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}p*, p*, t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}p*, p*, t/2) * M_{KM}(p*, \mathfrak{A}p*, t/2) * M_{KM}(p*, p*, t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}p*, p*, t).$$

By using $(\sigma - 9)$ we get

$$M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}p*, p*, kt) \geq M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}p*, p*, t/2).$$

This gives $\mathfrak{P}$p*=p* …...$(\sigma - 10)$.
From $(\sigma - 9)$ and $(\sigma - 10)$ we write $M_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}p^*, p^*, t) \geq 1$
this gives $\mathfrak{A}$p*=p*……$(\sigma - 11)$
using $(\sigma - 10)$ and $(\sigma - 11)$ we get
$\mathfrak{A}$p*=$\mathfrak{P}$p*=p*…... $(\sigma - 12)$
Also, $\mathfrak{Q}$v=$\mathfrak{S}$v=p* and using the pair ($\mathfrak{S}$, $\mathfrak{Q}$) as $\mathcal{S}$-intimate then we have
$M_{KM}(\mathfrak{S}p*, p*, t) \geq M_{KM}(\mathfrak{Q}p*, p*, kt)$…. $(\sigma - 13)$
Suppose that $\mathfrak{Q}p^* \neq p^*$.
Put $x = u$ and $\gamma = p*$ in the inequality

$$M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}u, \mathfrak{Q}p*, kt) \geq M_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}u, \mathfrak{S}p*, t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}u, \mathfrak{A}u, t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{Q}p*, \mathfrak{S}p*, t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}u, \mathfrak{S}p*, t)$$

using $(\sigma - 6)$ and (KMFM-iv) we get,

$$M_{KM}(p*, \mathfrak{Q}p*, kt) \geq M_{KM}(p*, \mathfrak{S}p*, t) * M_{KM}(p*, p*, t) * M_{KM}\left(\mathfrak{P}p*, p*, \frac{t}{2}\right) * M_{KM}\left(p*, \mathfrak{S}p*, \frac{t}{2}\right) * M_{KM}(p*, \mathfrak{S}p*, t)$$

on using $(\sigma - 13)$ we get

$$M_{KM}(p*, \mathfrak{Q}p*, kt) \geq M_{KM}(p*, \mathfrak{Q}p*, t) * M_{KM}\left(\mathfrak{Q}p*, p*, \frac{t}{2}\right) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{Q}p*, p*, t/2) * M_{KM}(p*, \mathfrak{Q}p*, t).$$

This implies $M_{KM}(p*, \mathfrak{Q}p*, kt) \geq M_{KM}(p*, \mathfrak{Q}p*, t/2)$.

This gives $\mathfrak{Q}$p*=p*…$(\sigma - 14)$.
From $(\sigma - 13)$ and $(\sigma - 14)$ we get
$M_{KM}(\mathfrak{S}p^*, p^*, t) \geq 1$
$\mathfrak{S}$p*=p*…...$(\sigma - 15)$.
Using $(\sigma - 14)$ and $(\sigma - 15)$ we get
$\mathfrak{Q}$p*=$\mathfrak{S}$p*=p*. …. $(\sigma - 16)$.
Using $(\sigma - 12)$ and $(\sigma - 16)$ we conclude that $\mathfrak{A}$p*=$\mathfrak{P}$p*=$\mathfrak{Q}$p*=$\mathfrak{S}$p*=p*. Hence the result.
We can prove the uniqueness of the fixed point easily.

Example 3.1.1: Suppose ($\mathbb{X}$, M_{KM}, *) is a standard FMS with $a * a \geq a\ \forall a \in [0,1]$, where $\mathfrak{A}$, $\mathfrak{S}$, $\mathfrak{P}$ and $\mathfrak{Q}$:$\mathbb{X} \to \mathbb{X}$ as

$$\mathfrak{P}(x) = \mathfrak{Q}(x) = \begin{cases} x + 0.125 & \text{if } 0 \leq x < 0.125 \\ 0.25 & \text{if } 0.125 \leq x \leq 1 \end{cases}$$

$$\mathfrak{A}(x) = \mathfrak{S}(x) = \begin{cases} 2x & \text{if } 0 \leq x < 0.125 \\ 0.25 & \text{if } 0.125 \leq x \leq 1 \end{cases}$$

$\mathfrak{P}(\mathbb{X}) = \mathfrak{Q}(\mathbb{X}) = [0.125, 0.25]$ and $\mathfrak{A}(\mathbb{X}) = \mathfrak{S}(\mathbb{X}) = [0, 0.25]$ these sets satisfy the condition $(\mathcal{C} - 1)$.
Now assume $\langle x_n \rangle = \left\{0.125 + \frac{1}{n}\right\}$ then $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{A}x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{P}x_n = 0.25$.
Also we have, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{P}x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{P}(0.125 + \frac{1}{n}) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{A}(0.25) = 0.125$.
$\lim_{n\to\infty} M_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{P}x_n, \mathfrak{A}x_n, t) \geq \lim_{n\to\infty} M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{P}x_n, \mathfrak{P}x_n, t)$, for $t > 0$.
Thus, the pair *(*$\mathfrak{A}$,$\mathfrak{P}$*)* is $\mathcal{A}$-intimate.
Further $\lim_{n\to\infty} M_{KM}(\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{Q}x_n, \mathfrak{S}x_n, t) \geq \lim_{n\to\infty} M_{KM}(\mathfrak{Q}\mathfrak{Q}x_n, \mathfrak{Q}x_n, t)$.
Thus, the pair ($\mathfrak{S}$,$\mathfrak{Q}$) is $\mathcal{S}$-intimate.
Moreover, it satisfies the contraction condition of the theorem. Clearly 0.25 is the unique common fixed point for these four mappings.

Theorem.3.2: Let $(\mathbb{X}, M_{KM}, *)$be a fuzzy metric space. Suppose $\mathfrak{P}$,$\mathfrak{Q}$, $\mathfrak{S}$ and $\mathfrak{A}$ are self maps on $\mathbb{X}$ satisfies the conditions $(\mathcal{C} - 1)$, $(\mathcal{C} - 2)$, $(\mathcal{C} - 3)$ and $(\mathcal{C} - 4)$ with
$(\mathcal{C} - 5)$:$(\mathfrak{P}, \mathfrak{A})$ or $(\mathfrak{Q}, \mathfrak{S})$ satisfy E.A property
then $\mathfrak{P}$, $\mathfrak{Q}$,$\mathfrak{S}$ and $\mathfrak{A}$ have a unique common fixed point in $\mathbb{X}$.

Proof: Suppose the pair $(\mathfrak{Q}, \mathfrak{S})$ satisfies E.A property then $\exists$ sequence $\langle x_n \rangle$ in $\mathbb{X}$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{Q}x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{S}x_n = p*$ for some $p* \in \mathbb{X}$.
Since $\mathfrak{Q}(\mathbb{X}) \subseteq \mathfrak{A}(\mathbb{X})$ then $\exists$ $\langle x_n \rangle$ in $\mathbb{X}$ such that $\mathfrak{Q}x_n = \mathfrak{A}y_n$.
Hence $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{A}\gamma_n = p *$. ....$(\varphi - 1)$.
Now we show that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{P}\gamma_n = p *$.
Put $x = \gamma_n$ and $\gamma = x_n$ we obtain,

$$M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}\gamma_n, \mathfrak{Q}x_n, kt) \geq M_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}\gamma_n, \mathfrak{S}x_n, t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}\gamma_n, \mathfrak{A}\gamma_n, t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{Q}x_n, \mathfrak{S}x_n, t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}\gamma_n, \mathfrak{S}x_n, t).$$

Letting $n \longrightarrow \infty$ and using $p\gamma_n \longrightarrow p*$ we get

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{Q}x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{S}x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{A}\gamma_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{P}\gamma_n = p*.$$

Suppose that $\mathfrak{A}(\mathbb{X})$ is closed subspace of $\mathbb{X}$, $\exists\ u \in \mathbb{X}$ such that

p*=$\mathfrak{A}u\ldots(\varphi - 2)$.

We show that $\mathfrak{A}u = \mathfrak{P}u$.

Put $x = u$ and $\gamma = x_n$ in $(\mathcal{C} - 2)$ then we get

$$M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}u, \mathfrak{Q}x_n, kt) \geq M_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}u, \mathfrak{S}x_n, t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}u, \mathfrak{A}u, t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{Q}x_n, \mathfrak{S}x_n, t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}u, \mathfrak{S}x_n, t).$$

This implies $\mathfrak{P}u = p*\ldots(\varphi - 3)$.

From $(\varphi - 2)$ and $(\varphi - 2)$ we get

$\mathfrak{A}u = \mathfrak{P}u = p*\ \ldots.(\varphi - 4)$.

And since $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{P})$ is $\mathcal{A} - i$ntimate then we get $\mathfrak{A}p* = \mathfrak{P}p* = p*\ldots\ldots(\varphi - 5)$.

Since $\mathfrak{P}(\mathbb{X}) \subseteq \mathfrak{S}(\mathbb{X})$ then there exists a point $v \in \mathbb{X}$ such that

$\mathfrak{P}u = \mathfrak{S}v = p*\ldots\ldots(\varphi - 6)$.

Now put $x = u$ and $\gamma = v$ in $(\mathcal{C} - 2)$ then this gives

$$M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}u, \mathfrak{Q}v, kt) \geq M_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}u, \mathfrak{S}v, t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}u, \mathfrak{A}u, t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{Q}v, \mathfrak{S}v, t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}u, \mathfrak{S}v, t)$$ implies

$$M_{KM}(p*, \mathfrak{Q}v, kt) \geq M_{KM}(p*, p*, t) * M_{KM}(p*, p*, t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{Q}v, p*, t) * M_{KM}(p*, p*, t).$$

This implies $\mathfrak{Q}v = p*$ therefore $\mathfrak{S}v = \mathfrak{Q}v = p*\ldots\ldots(\varphi - 7)$,

and since $(\mathfrak{S}, \mathfrak{Q})$ is $\mathcal{S} -$ intimate then we get

$\mathfrak{S}p* = \mathfrak{Q}p* = p*\ \ldots..(\varphi - 8)$.

Using $(\varphi - 7)$ $(\varphi - 8)$ and we conclude that $\mathfrak{A}p* = \mathfrak{P}p* = \mathfrak{Q}p* = \mathfrak{S}p* = p*$.

We can prove the uniqueness of the common fixed point easily.

Example 3.2.1: Suppose ($\mathbb{X}$, M_{KM}, *) is a standard FMS with $a * a \geq a\ \forall a \in [1,11)$, where $\mathfrak{A}$, $\mathfrak{S}$, $\mathfrak{P}$ and $\mathfrak{Q}$:$\mathbb{X}\to\mathbb{X}$ as

$$\mathfrak{P}(x) = \mathfrak{Q}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if} \quad x \in \{1\} \cup (3,11) \\ 1 + x & \text{if} \quad 1 < x \leq 3 \end{cases}$$

$$\mathfrak{S}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = 1 \\ 6 & \text{if } 1 < x \leq 3 \\ x - 2 & \text{if } 3 < x < 11 \end{cases} \qquad \mathfrak{A}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = 1 \\ 4 & \text{if } 1 < x \leq 3 \\ \frac{3x-1}{8} & \text{if } 3 < x < 11 \end{cases}$$

$\mathfrak{P}(\mathbb{X}) = \mathfrak{Q}(\mathbb{X}) = \{1\} \cup (2,4]$ and $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbb{X}) = \{1\} \cup \{6\} \cup (1,9)$ $\mathfrak{A}(\mathbb{X}) = \{1\} \cup \{4\} \cup (1,4) = [1,4]$ these sets satisfy the conditions $(\mathcal{C}-2)$and $(\mathcal{C}-3)$.
Now assume $\langle x_n \rangle = \left\{3 + \frac{1}{n}\right\}$ then $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{A}x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{P}x_n = 1$ and this implies $(\mathfrak{P}, \mathfrak{A})$ satisfies E.A property and also we have, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{P}x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{P}x_n = 1$. This gives
$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{M_{KM}}(\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{P}x_n, \mathfrak{A}x_n, t) \geq \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{M_{KM}}(\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{P}x_n, \mathfrak{P}x_n, t)$ for $t > 0$.
Thus, the pair *(*$\mathfrak{A}$,$\mathfrak{P}$*)* is $\mathcal{A}$-intimate.
Since $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{S}x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{Q}x_n = 1$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{Q}x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{Q}\mathfrak{Q}x_n = 1$
this gives $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{M_{KM}}(\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{Q}x_n, \mathfrak{S}x_n, t) \geq \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{M_{KM}}(\mathfrak{Q}\mathfrak{Q}x_n \mathfrak{Q}x_n, t)$.
Thus, the pair ($\mathfrak{S}$,$\mathfrak{Q}$) is $\mathcal{S}$-intimate. Moreover, it satisfies the contraction condition of the theorem. Clearly 1 is the unique common fixed point for these four mappings.

Finally, we discuss another theorem.

3.3 Theorem: Let$(\mathbb{X}, \mathrm{M_{KM}}, *)$ be a FMS. Suppose $\mathfrak{P}$,$\mathfrak{Q}$, $\mathfrak{S}$ and $\mathfrak{A}$ are self maps on $\mathbb{X}$ satisfying the conditions $(\mathcal{C}-2)$ and $(\mathcal{C}-4)$ in addition to
$(\mathcal{C}-6)$ $\mathfrak{A}(\mathbb{X})$ and $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbb{X})$ are closed subsets of $\mathbb{X}$
$(\mathcal{C}-7)$the pairs $(\mathfrak{P}, \mathfrak{A})$ and $(\mathfrak{Q}, \mathfrak{S})$ share the common property E. A.
Then $\mathfrak{P}$, $\mathfrak{Q}$,$\mathfrak{S}$ and $\mathfrak{A}$ have a unique common fixed point in $\mathbb{X}$.

Proof: In view of the condition $(\mathcal{C}-7)$there exists two sequences $\langle x_n \rangle$ and $\langle \gamma_n \rangle$ in $\mathbb{X}$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{P}x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{A}x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{Q}\gamma_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{S}\gamma_n = p*$ for some $p* \in \mathbb{X}$.
From the $(\mathcal{C}-6)$ we have$\mathfrak{A}(\mathbb{X})$ is closed subset of $\mathbb{X}$,consequently $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{P}x_n = p* \in \mathfrak{A}(\mathbb{X})$. This means there exists appoint $u \in \mathbb{X}$ such that $\mathfrak{A}u = p*$.
Now we assert that $\mathfrak{P}u = \mathfrak{A}u$.
Put $x = u$ and $\gamma = \gamma_n$, we get

$$\mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{u}, \mathfrak{Q}y_n, \mathrm{k}t) \geq \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}\mathrm{u}, \mathfrak{S}y_n, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{u}, \mathfrak{A}\mathrm{u}, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{Q}y_n, \mathfrak{S}y_n, t) * \mathrm{M}_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{u}, \mathfrak{S}y_n, t)$$

Which on making $n \to \infty$, with $\mathfrak{A}u = p*$ reduces to $\mathfrak{P}u = p*$. This implies $\mathfrak{P}u = \mathfrak{A}u = p*$ which signifies that u is coincident point of the pair $(\mathfrak{P}, \mathfrak{A})$.
On the other hand, $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbb{X})$ is closed subset of $\mathbb{X}$ therefore $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{S}\gamma_n = p* \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathbb{X})$ and hence we can find a point $w \in \mathbb{X} \ni \mathfrak{S}w = p*$.
Now we show that $\mathfrak{S}w = \mathfrak{Q}w$. On using condition $(\mathcal{C}-2)$ with
$x = \mathrm{u}$ and $\gamma = \mathrm{w}$ then we get

$$\mathrm{M_{KM}}(\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{u}, \mathfrak{Q}\mathrm{w}, \mathrm{k}t) \geq \mathrm{M_{KM}}(\mathfrak{A}\mathrm{u}, \mathfrak{S}\mathrm{w}, t) * \mathrm{M_{KM}}(\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{u}, \mathfrak{A}\mathrm{u}, t) * \mathrm{M_{KM}}(\mathfrak{Q}\mathrm{w}, \mathfrak{S}\mathrm{w}, t) * \mathrm{M_{KM}}(\mathfrak{P}\mathrm{u}, \mathfrak{S}\mathrm{w}, t).$$

This implies $\mathfrak{Q}\mathrm{w} = \mathrm{p}*$.This gives $\mathfrak{S}\mathrm{w} = \mathfrak{Q}\mathrm{w} = \mathrm{p}*$.
Since the pair $(\mathfrak{Q}, \mathfrak{S})$ is $\mathcal{S}-$ intimate this gives
$\mathrm{M_{KM}}(\mathfrak{S}\mathrm{p}*, \mathrm{p}*, t) \geq \mathrm{M_{KM}}(\mathfrak{Q}\mathrm{p}*, \mathrm{p}*, t)$.

Suppose that $\mathfrak{S}p* \neq p*$.
Put $x = \text{u}$ and $\gamma = \text{p}*$ in contraction condition $(\mathcal{C}-2)$

$$M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}\text{u}, \mathfrak{Q}p*, \text{k}t) \geq M_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}\text{u}, \mathfrak{S}p*, t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}\text{u}, \mathfrak{A}\text{u}, t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{Q}p*, \mathfrak{S}p*, t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}\text{u}, \mathfrak{S}p*, t)$$

implies $\mathfrak{Q}\text{p}* = \text{p}*$.
Using $M_{KM}(\mathfrak{S}\text{p}*, \text{p}*, \text{t}) \geq M_{KM}(\text{p}*, \text{p}*, t)$
we get $\mathfrak{S}\text{p}* = \text{p}*$.
Therefore $\mathfrak{Q}\text{p}* = \mathfrak{S}\text{p}* = \text{p}* \ldots\ldots\ldots (\psi - 1)$.
Since $\mathfrak{P}\text{u} = \mathfrak{A}\text{u} = \text{p}*$ and using $(\mathfrak{P}, \mathfrak{A})$ is $\mathcal{A}$ −intimate then we get $\mathfrak{A}\text{p}* = \text{p}*$.
By putting $x = \gamma = \text{p}*$ we get

$$M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}\text{p}*, \mathfrak{Q}\text{p}*, \text{k}t) \geq M_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}\text{p}*, \mathfrak{S}\text{p}*, t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}\text{p}*, \mathfrak{A}\text{p}*, t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{Q}\text{p}*, \mathfrak{S}\text{p}*, t) * M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}\text{p}*, \mathfrak{S}\text{p}*, t).$$

This implies $\mathfrak{P}\text{p}* = \text{p}*$ and this gives $\mathfrak{A}\text{p}* = \mathfrak{P}\text{p}* = \text{p}* \ldots\ldots (\psi - 2)$.
From $(\psi - 1)$ and $(\psi - 2)$ we conclude that $\mathfrak{A}\text{p}* = \mathfrak{P}\text{p}* = \mathfrak{Q}\text{p}* = \mathfrak{S}\text{p}* = \text{p}*$.
We can prove the uniqueness of the fixed point easily.

Example 3.3.1: Suppose $(\mathbb{X}, M_{KM}, *)$ is a standard FMS with $a * a \geq a \ \forall a \in [1,20]$, where $\mathfrak{A}$, $\mathfrak{S}$, $\mathfrak{P}$ and $\mathfrak{Q}:\mathbb{X}\to\mathbb{X}$ as

$$\mathfrak{P}(x) = \mathfrak{Q}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = 1, \ 2 \leq x < 20 \\ x & \text{if } 1 \leq x < 2 \end{cases}$$

$$\mathfrak{S}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = 1 \\ 12 & \text{if } 1 < x < 2 \\ \dfrac{x+1}{3} & \text{if } 2 \leq x \leq 20 \end{cases} \qquad \mathfrak{A}(\text{x}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = 1 \\ 7 & \text{if } 1 < x < 2 \\ \dfrac{2x+5}{9} & \text{if } 2 \leq x \leq 20 \end{cases}$$

$\mathfrak{P}(\mathbb{X}) = \mathfrak{Q}(\mathbb{X}) = \{1\} \cup (1,2)$, $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbb{X}) = \{1\} \cup \{12\} \cup [1,5]$ and $\mathfrak{A}(\mathbb{X}) = \{1\} \cup \{7\} \cup [1,9]$ these sets satisfy the conditions $(\mathcal{C}-1)$ and $(\mathcal{C}-3)$.
Now assume $\langle x_n \rangle = \left\{2 + \frac{1}{n}\right\}$ and $\langle \gamma_n \rangle = \{1\}$ then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{A}x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{P}x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{S}\gamma_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{Q}\gamma_n = 1.$$

This implies the pairs $(\mathfrak{P}, \mathfrak{A})$ and $(\mathfrak{S},\mathfrak{Q})$ share the common E. A property and also we have, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{P}x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{P}x_n = 1$ this gives

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} M_{KM}(\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{P}x_n, \mathfrak{A}x_n, t) \geq \lim_{n\to\infty} M_{KM}(\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{P}x_n, \mathfrak{P}x_n, t), \text{for } t > 0.$$

Thus, the pair $(\mathfrak{A},\mathfrak{P})$ is $\mathcal{A}$-intimate.
Since $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{S}x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{Q}x_n = 1$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{Q}x_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{Q}\mathfrak{Q}x_n = 1$
this gives $\lim_{n\to\infty} M_{KM}(\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{Q}x_n, \mathfrak{S}x_n, t) \geq \lim_{n\to\infty} M_{KM}(\mathfrak{Q}\mathfrak{Q}x_n, \mathfrak{Q}x_n, t)$.
Thus, the pair $(\mathfrak{S},\mathfrak{Q})$ is $\mathcal{S}$-intimate. Moreover, it satisfies the contraction condition of the theorem. Clearly 1 is the unique common fixed point for these four mappings.

4 Conclusion

This paper aimed to prove three common fixed point theorems to generalize the class of compatible mappings by using the calss of non compatible mappings like different forms of E.A properties along with intimate mappings in fuzzy metric space. In Theorem 3.1, one of the range of mappings is assumed to be complete.Further, in Theorem 3.2, one of the pairs is assumed to satisfy E.A property along with one of the range of mappings is complete without being complete fuzzy metric space. Finally in Theorem 3.3, improved version of EA property namely common EA property is assumed along with completeness of fuzzy metric space. Moreover, all these results are justified with suitable examples.

References

[1] L. A. Zadeh. Fuzzy sets. Information and control, 8(3), 338-353.1965.

[2] Kramosil, J. Michalek. Fuzzy metric and statistical metric spaces.Kybernetika, 11(5), 336–344.1975.

[3] M.Grabiec. Fixed points in fuzzy metric space. Fuzzy sets and systems,27(3), 385-389.1988.

[4] George. A,Veeramani. P. On some results in fuzzy metric spaces. Fuzzy sets and systems,64(3),395-399.1994.

[5] S. N. Mishra, N. Sharma, S..L. Singh. Common fixed points of maps on fuzzy metric spaces. International journal of mathematics and mathematical sciences,17(2), 253-258.1994.

[6] S.Hoon cho. On Common fixed points in fuzzy metric spaces. International mathematical forum, 1,471-479.2006.

[7] B. Schweizer, A. Sklar. Statistical metric spaces. pacific journal of mathematics, 10, 314-334.1960.

[8] E.P. Klement, R. Mesier, E. Pap. Triangular norms.kluwer academic Publisher dordrecht, Trends in logic, 8.2000.

[9] G. Jungck, Murthy P. P., Cho Y. J. Compatible mappings of type (A) and common fixed points. Mathematica Japonica ,36,381-390.1993.

[10] Y.J. Cho, Fixed points in fuzzy metric spaces, Journal of fuzzy mathematics, 5(4), 949- 962.1997.

[11] M. R. Singh, Y. Mahindra singh, L. Shambhu singh.Fixed points of biased maps of

type (R_M) on fuzzy metric space. International journal of contemporary mathematical sciences,4(16),757 – 768.2009.

[12] D.R. Sahu, V.B. Dhagat, M. Srivastava, fixed points with intimate mappings (I). Bulletin of calcutta mathematical society, 93,107-114.2001.

[13] Renu Chugh, Madhu Aggarwal. Fixed points of intimate mappings in uniform spaces. International journal of mathematical analysis, 6(9), 429-436.2012.

[14] Gopal Meena. Common fixed points for intimate mappings in complex valued metric Spaces. General mathematics notes,26(2),97-103.2015.

[15] Praveenkumar, Sanjaykumar, Shin Min Kang, Common fixed for intimate mappings in multiplicative metric spaces. International journal of pure and applied mathematics,104(4) ,709-718. 2015.

[16] V.Srinivas, B.V.B. Reddy, R Umamaheswar Rao.A common fixed point theorem on fuzzy metric space,Kathmandu university journal of science and technology,8(2),77-82.2012.

[17] B. Vijayabaskerreddy,V. Srinivas.Some results in multiplicative metric space using absorbing mappings, Indian journal of science and technology,13(39), 4161-4167.2020.

[18] B. Vijayabaskerreddy. V. Srinivas. Fixed point results on multiplicative semi-metric space, Journal of scientific research,12(3),341-348.2020.

[19] B. Singh, A. Jain, A.K. Govery. Compatibility of type (A) and fixed point theorem in fuzzy metric space. International journal of Contemporary mathematical sciences, 6(21),1007-1018.2011.

[20] M. Aamri and D. EI. Moutawakil. Some new fixed point theorems under strict contractive conditions journal of mathematical analysis and applications,.270(1), 181-188.2002.

[21] Yicheng Liu, Jun wu . Zhixiang Li. Common fixed points of single -valued and multivalued maps. International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical sciences,19, 3045-3055.2005.