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1. Introduction

The fixed point theory is a very interesting research area in due to its wide range of applicability, to resolve diverse problems emanating from the theory of nonlinear differential equations and integral equations.

Wardowski [1], generalized the famous Banach theorem [2] for \( F \)-contraction on metric spaces, several mathematicians extended this new notion for contraction on metric spaces [3–6].

The concept of a rectangular metric space was introduced by Branciari in [7]. After that, several interesting results about the existence of fixed points in rectangular metric spaces have been obtained [8–11]. Recently, Kari et al., [12], obtained some results for generalized \( \theta - \phi \)-expansive mapping in rectangular metric spaces.

In 1984, Wang et al., [13], presented some interesting work on expansion mappings in metric spaces. Recently, Kumar et al., [14], introduced a new concept of \( (a, \varphi) \)-expansive mappings and established some fixed point theorems for such mapping in complete rectangular metric spaces.

In this paper, inspired by the idea of \( F \)-contraction introduced by Wardowski [1] in metric spaces, we presented generalized \( F \)-expansive mapping and establish various fixed point theorems in complete rectangular metric spaces. Our theorems extend, generalize and improve many existing results.

2. Preliminaries

By an expansion mappings [13] on a metric space \((X, d)\), we understand a mapping \( T : X \to X \) satisfying for all \( x, y \in X \):

\[ d(Tx, Ty) \geq kd(x, y), \]

where \( k \) is a real in \([1, +\infty[\).


Definition 1. [7] Let \( X \) be a non-empty set and \( d : X \times X \to \mathbb{R}^+\) be a mapping such that for all \( x, y \in X \) and for all distinct points \( u, v \in X \), each of them different from \( x \) and \( y \), on has

(i) \( d(x, y) = 0 \) if and only if \( x = y \);
(ii) \( d(x, y) = d(y, x) \) for all distinct points \( x, y \in X \);
(iii) \( d(x, y) \leq d(x, u) + d(u, v) + d(v, y) \) (the rectangular inequality).

Then \((X, d)\) is called an rectangular metric space.

**Definition 2.** [15] Let \( T : X \to X \) and \( a, \eta : X \times X \to [0, +\infty[ \). We say that \( T \) is a triangular \((a, \eta)\)-admissible mapping if

\[
\begin{align*}
(T_1) & \quad a(x, y) \geq 1 \Rightarrow a(Tx, Ty) \geq 1, x, y \in X; \\
(T_2) & \quad \eta(x, y) \leq 1 \Rightarrow \eta(Tx, Ty) \leq 1, x, y \in X; \\
(T_3) & \quad \begin{cases} 
\alpha(x, y) \geq 1 \\
\alpha(y, z) \geq 1
\end{cases} \Rightarrow \alpha(x, z) \geq 1 \text{ for all } x, y, z \in X; \\
(T_4) & \quad \begin{cases} 
\eta(x, y) \leq 1 \\
\eta(y, z) \leq 1
\end{cases} \Rightarrow \eta(x, z) \leq 1 \text{ for all } x, y, z \in X.
\end{align*}
\]

**Definition 3.** [15] Let \((X, d)\) be a rectangular metric space and let \( a, \eta : X \times X \to [0, +\infty[ \) be two mappings. Then

(a) \( T \) is \( \alpha \)-continuous mapping on \((X, d)\), if for given point \( x \in X \) and sequence \( \{x_n\} \) in \( X \), \( x_n \to x \) and \( a(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 1 \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), imply that \( Tx_n \to Tx \).
(b) \( T \) is \( \eta \)-sub-continuous mapping on \((X, d)\), if for given point \( x \in X \) and sequence \( \{x_n\} \) in \( X \), \( x_n \to x \) and \( \eta(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq 1 \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), imply that \( Tx_n \to Tx \).
(c) \( T \) is \((a, \eta)\)-continuous mapping on \((X, d)\), if for given point \( x \in X \) and sequence \( \{x_n\} \) in \( X \), \( x_n \to x \) and \( a(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 1 \) or \( \eta(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq 1 \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), imply that \( Tx_n \to Tx \).

Recently Hussain et al., gives the following definition [16]:

**Definition 4.** [16] Let \( d(X, d) \) be a rectangular metric space and let \( a, \eta : X \times X \to [0, +\infty[ \) be two mappings. The space \( X \) is said to be

(a) \( \alpha \)-complete, if every Cauchy sequence \( \{x_n\} \) in \( X \) with \( a(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 1 \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), converges in \( X \).
(b) \( \eta \)-sup-continuous mapping on \((X, d)\), if for given point \( x \in X \) and sequence \( \{x_n\} \) in \( X \) with \( \eta(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq 1 \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), converges in \( X \).
(c) \((a, \eta)\)-complete, if every Cauchy sequence \( \{x_n\} \) in \( X \) with \( a(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 1 \) or \( \eta(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq 1 \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), converges in \( X \).

**Definition 5.** [16] Let \((X, d)\) be a rectangular metric space and let \( a, \eta : X \times X \to [0, +\infty[ \) be two mappings. The space \((X, d)\) is said to be

(a) \((X, d)\) is \( \alpha \)-regular, if \( x_n \to x \), where \( a(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 1 \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), implies \( a(x_n, x) \geq 1 \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \).
(b) \((X, d)\) is \( \eta \)-sub-regular, if \( x_n \to x \), where \( \eta(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq 1 \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), implies \( \eta(x_n, x) \leq 1 \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \).
(c) \((X, d)\) is \((a, \eta)\)-regular, if \( x_n \to x \), where \( a(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 1 \) or \( \eta(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq 1 \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), imply that \( a(x_n, x) \geq 1 \) or \( \eta(x_n, x) \leq 1 \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \).

The following definition introduced by Wardowski [1] :

**Definition 6.** [1] Let \( \mathcal{F} \) be the family of all functions \( F : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R} \) such that

(i) \( F \) is strictly increasing;
(ii) for each sequence \( \{x_n\} \) of positive numbers \( \lim_{n \to \infty} x_n = 0 \), if and only if \( \lim_{n \to \infty} F(x_n) = -\infty \);
(iii) there exists \( k \in [0, 1] \) such that \( \lim_{x \to 0} x^k F(x) = 0 \).

Recently, Piri and Kuman [4] extended the result of Wardowski [1] by changing the condition (iii) in the Definition 6 as follow:

**Definition 7.** [4] Let \( \Gamma \) be the family of all functions \( F : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R} \) such that
where
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Proof. Let \( (X, d) \) be a rectangular metric space and \( T : X \rightarrow X \) be a given mapping. \( T \) is said to be generalized \( F \)-expansive mapping if there exists \( F \in \mathcal{F} \) and \( \tau > 0 \) such that

\[ M(x, y) > 0 \Rightarrow F(d(Tx, Ty)) - \tau \geq F(M(x, y)), \text{ for all } x, y \in X, \]  

(1)

where \( M(x, y) = \min \{d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty), d(x, Ty)\} \).

Theorem 1. Let \( (X, d) \) be a \((\alpha - \eta)\)-complete generalized metric space, and \( T : X \rightarrow X \) be a bijective, generalized \( F \)-expansive mapping satisfying following conditions

(i) \( T^{-1} \) is a triangular \((\alpha, \eta)\)-admissible mapping;
(ii) there exists \( x_0 \in X \) such that \( \alpha(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \geq 1 \) or \( \eta(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \leq 1 \);
(iii) \( T \) is a \((\alpha, \eta)\) -continuously.

Then \( T \) has a fixed point. Moreover, \( T \) has a unique fixed point when \( \alpha(z, u) \geq 1 \) or \( \eta(z, u) \leq 1 \) for all \( z, u \in \text{Fix}(T) \).

Proof. Let \( x_0 \in X \) such that \( \alpha(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \geq 1 \) or \( \eta(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \leq 1 \). We define the sequence \( \{x_n\} \) in \( X \) by

\[ x_n = Tx_{n+1}, \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \]

Since \( T^{-1} \) is an triangular \((\alpha, \eta)\) -admissible mapping, then

\[ \alpha(x_0, x_1) = \alpha(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \geq 1 \Rightarrow \alpha(T^{-1}x_0, T^{-1}x_1) = \alpha(x_1, x_2) \geq 1, \]

or

\[ \eta(x_0, x_1) = \eta(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \leq 1 \Rightarrow \eta(T^{-1}x_0, T^{-1}x_1) = \eta(x_1, x_2) \leq 1. \]

Continuing this process we have

\[ \alpha(x_{n-1}, x_n) \geq 1, \]

or

\[ \eta(x_{n-1}, x_n) \leq 1, \]

for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). By \((T_3)\) and \((T_4)\), one has.

\[ \alpha(x_m, x_n) \geq 1 \text{ or } \eta(x_m, x_n) \leq 1, \quad \forall m, n \in \mathbb{N}, \; m \neq n. \]  

(2)

Suppose that there exists \( n_0 \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( x_{n_0} = Tx_{n_0} \). Then \( x_{n_0} \) is a fixed point of \( T \) and the proof is finished. Hence, we assume that \( x_n \neq Tx_n \), i.e., \( d(x_n, x_{n+1}) > 0 \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \).

Step 1: We shall prove

\[ \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} d(x_n, x_{n+1}) = 0. \]

Applying inequality (1) with \( x = x_n \) and \( y = x_{n+1} \), we obtain

\[ F(d(x_{n-1}, x_n)) = F(d(Tx_n, Tx_{n+1})) > F(d(Tx_n, Tx_{n+1})) - \tau \geq F(M(x_n, x_{n+1})), \]  

(3)

where

\[ M(x_n, x_{n+1}) = \min \{d(x_n, x_{n+1}), d(x_n, Tx_n), d(x_{n+1}, Tx_{n+1}), d(x_n, Tx_{n+1})\} \]

\[ = \min \{d(x_n, x_{n+1}), d(x_n, x_{n-1}), d(x_{n+1}, x_n), d(x_n, x_n)\} \]

\[ = \min \{d(x_n, x_{n+1}), d(x_n, x_{n-1})\}. \]
If for some \( n, M(x_n, x_{n+1}) = d(x_n, x_{n-1}) \), then the inequality (3), we get
\[
F(d(x_{n-1}, x_n)) > F(d(Tx_n, Tx_{n+1})) - \tau \geq F(d(x_{n-1}, x_n)).
\]  
(4)

It is a contradiction. Hence \( M(x_n, x_{n+1}) = d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \). Therefore
\[
F(d(Tx_n, Tx_{n+1})) - \tau \geq F(d(x_n, x_{n+1})).
\]  
(5)

Thus,
\[
F(d(x_n, x_{n+1})) \leq F(d(x_{n-1}, x_n)) - \tau \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.
\]  
(6)

Continuing this process, we get
\[
F(d(x_n, x_{n+1})) \leq F(d(x_{n-1}, x_n)) - \tau \leq ... \leq F(d(x_0, x_1)) - n\tau.
\]  
(7)

Now, by (6) and the condition \( F_3 \) of Definition 2, we deduce that
\[
d(x_n, x_{n+1}) < d(x_{n-1}, x_n).
\]  
(8)

Taking the limit as \( n \to \infty \) in (7) and using the condition \( F_2 \), we get
\[
\lim_{n \to +\infty} d(x_n, x_{n+1}) = 0.
\]  
(9)

**Step 2:** Now, we shall prove
\[
x_n \neq x_m, \text{ for all } m, n \in \mathbb{N}, m \neq n.
\]  
(10)

On the contrary, assume that \( x_n = x_m \) for some \( n = m + k > m \). Indeed, suppose that \( x_n = x_m \), so we have
\[
x_n = Tx_{n+1} = Tx_{m+1} = x_m.
\]

Denote \( d_n = d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \). By the inequality (8), we have
\[
d_n < d_{n-1}.
\]

Continuing this process, we get
\[
d_m = d_n < d_{n-1} < ... < d_m.
\]  
(11)

Which is a contradiction. Thus (10) hold.

**Step 3:** We prove shall
\[
\lim_{n \to +\infty} d(x_n, x_{n+2}) = 0.
\]  
(12)

Applying inequality (1) with \( x = x_n, y = x_{n+2} \), we obtain
\[
F(d(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1})) = F(d(Tx_n, Tx_{n+2})) > F(d(Tx_n, Tx_{n+2})) - \tau \geq F(M(x_n, x_{n+2})),
\]  
(13)

where
\[
M(x_n, x_{n+2}) = \min \{d(x_n, x_{n+2}), d(x_n, Tx_n), d(x_{n+2}, Tx_{n+2}), d(x_n, Tx_{n+2})\}
\]
\[
= \min \{d(x_n, x_{n+2}), d(x_n, x_{n-1}), d(x_{n+2}, x_{n+1}), d(x_n, x_{n+1})\}
\]
\[
= \min \{d(x_n, x_{n+2}), d(x_{n+1}, x_n)\}.
\]

Take \( a_n = d(x_n, x_{n+2}) \) and \( b_n = d(x_{n+1}, x_n) \). Thus, by (13), one can write
\[
F(a_{n-1}) = F(d(x_{n-1}, x_{n+1})) = F(d(Tx_n, Tx_{n+2})) > F(d(Tx_n, Tx_{n+2})) - \tau \geq F(M(x_n, x_{n+2})) = F(\min\{a_n, b_n\}).
\]

Therefore,
\[
a_{n-1} \geq \min \{a_n, b_n\}.
\]
Again, by (8)\[ b_{n-1} \geq b_n \geq \min \{a_n, b_n\}.]\ Which implies that\[ \min \{a_n, b_n\} \leq \min \{a_{n-1}, b_{n-1}\}, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.\]Then the sequence $\min \{a_n, b_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is monotone non-increasing. Thus, there exists $\lambda \geq 0$ such that\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} \min \{a_n, b_n\} = \lambda.\]

Assume that $\lambda > 0$. By (9), we have\[ \limsup_{n \to \infty} a_n = \limsup_{n \to \infty} \min \{a_n, b_n\} = \liminf_{n \to \infty} \{a_n, b_n\} = \lambda.\]

Taking the $\limsup_{n \to \infty}$ in (13), and using $(F_3)$, we obtain\[ F(\lambda) = F(\limsup_{n \to \infty} a_{n-1}) \geq F(\limsup_{n \to \infty} a_n) > F(\limsup_{n \to \infty} a_n) - \tau \geq F(\liminf_{n \to \infty} \{a_n, b_n\}),\]which implies that\[ F(\lambda) > F(\lambda) - \tau \geq F(\lambda).\]

Therefore,\[ F(\lambda) < F(\lambda).\]

By $(F_1)$, we get\[ \lambda < \lambda.\]

It is a contradiction, then\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} d(x_n, x_{n+2}) = 0.\]

**Step 4:** We shall prove that $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $(X, d)$, that is\[ \lim_{n, m \to \infty} d(x_n, x_m) = 0 \text{ for all } n \neq m.\]

If otherwise there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ for which we can find sequence of positive integers $\{x_{n(k)}\}$ and $\{x_{m(k)}\}$ of $\{x_n\}$ such that, for all positive integers $k, m(k) > m(k) > k,$\[ d(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)}) \geq \varepsilon \text{ and } d(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)-1}) < \varepsilon.\]

Now, using (9), (14), (16) and the rectangular inequality, we find\[ \varepsilon \leq d(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)}) \leq d(x_{m(k)}, x_{m(k)+1}) + d(x_{m(k)+1}, x_{n(k)}) \leq d(x_{m(k)}, x_{m(k)+1}) + d(x_{m(k)+1}, x_{n(k)}) + \varepsilon.\]

Then\[ \lim_{k \to \infty} d(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)}) = \varepsilon.\]

Now, by rectangular inequality, we have\[ d(x_{m(k)+1}, x_{n(k)}) \leq d(x_{m(k)+1}, x_{m(k)}) + d(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)}) + d(x_{n(k)}, x_{n(k)+1}).\]

**Step 4.1:** We shall prove that $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $(X, d)$, that is\[ \lim_{n, m \to \infty} d(x_n, x_m) = 0 \text{ for all } n \neq m.\]

If otherwise there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ for which we can find sequence of positive integers $\{x_{n(k)}\}$ and $\{x_{m(k)}\}$ of $\{x_n\}$ such that, for all positive integers $k, m(k) > m(k) > k,$\[ d(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)}) \geq \varepsilon \text{ and } d(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)-1}) < \varepsilon.\]

Now, using (9), (14), (16) and the rectangular inequality, we find\[ \varepsilon \leq d(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)}) \leq d(x_{m(k)}, x_{m(k)+1}) + d(x_{m(k)+1}, x_{n(k)}) \leq d(x_{m(k)}, x_{m(k)+1}) + d(x_{m(k)+1}, x_{n(k)}) + \varepsilon.\]

Then\[ \lim_{k \to \infty} d(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)}) = \varepsilon.\]

Now, by rectangular inequality, we have\[ d(x_{m(k)+1}, x_{n(k)}) \leq d(x_{m(k)+1}, x_{m(k)}) + d(x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)}) + d(x_{n(k)}, x_{n(k)+1}).\]
\[ \varepsilon \leq d \left( x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)} \right) \leq d \left( x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)-1} \right) + d \left( x_{n(k)-1}, x_{n(k)+1} \right) + d \left( x_{n(k)+1}, x_{n(k)} \right). \]  
(20)

Letting \( k \to \infty \) in the above inequalities, using (9), (16) and (17), we obtain

\[ \lim_{k \to \infty} d \left( x_{m(k)+1}, x_{n(k)+1} \right) = \varepsilon, \]  
(21)

and

\[ \lim_{k \to \infty} d \left( x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)-1} \right) = \varepsilon. \]  
(22)

On the other hand

\[ M \left( x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)} \right) = \min \left\{ d \left( x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)} \right), d \left( x_{m(k)}, T x_{m(k)} \right), d \left( x_{n(k)}, T x_{n(k)} \right), d \left( x_{m(k)}, T x_{n(k)} \right) \right\} \]
\[ = \min \left\{ d \left( x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)} \right), d \left( x_{m(k)}, x_{m(k)-1} \right), d \left( x_{n(k)}, x_{n(k)-1} \right), d \left( x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)-1} \right) \right\}. \]

Letting \( k \to \infty \) in the above inequalities and using (9), (17) and (22), we get that

\[ \lim_{k \to \infty} M \left( x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)} \right) = \varepsilon. \]  
(23)

By (21), let \( A = \frac{\varepsilon}{2} > 0 \), from the definition of the limit, there exists \( n_0 \in \mathbb{N} \) such that

\[ |d \left( x_{m(k)+1}, x_{n(k)+1} \right) - \varepsilon| \leq A \forall n \geq n_0. \]

This implies that

\[ d \left( x_{m(k)+1}, x_{n(k)+1} \right) \geq A > 0 \forall n \geq n_0, \]

and by (23), let \( B = \frac{\varepsilon}{2} > 0 \), from the definition of the limit, there exists \( n_1 \in \mathbb{N} \) such that

\[ M \left( x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)} \right) \geq B > 0 \forall n \geq n_1. \]

Applying (1) with \( x = x_{m(k)} \) and \( y = x_{n(k)} \), we obtain

\[ F \left( d \left( x_{m(k)+1}, x_{n(k)+1} \right) \right) > F \left( d \left( x_{m(k)+1}, x_{n(k)+1} \right) \right) - \tau \geq F \left( M \left( x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)} \right) \right) \]

Letting \( k \to \infty \) the above inequality and using \((F_3)\), we obtain

\[ F \left( \lim_{k \to \infty} d \left( x_{m(k)+1}, x_{n(k)+1} \right) \right) > F \left( \lim_{k \to \infty} d \left( x_{m(k)+1}, x_{n(k)+1} \right) \right) - \tau \geq F \left( \lim_{k \to \infty} M \left( x_{m(k)}, x_{n(k)} \right) \right), \]

Therefore,

\[ F(\varepsilon) < F(\varepsilon). \]

It is a contradiction. Then

\[ \lim_{n,m \to \infty} d \left( x_m, x_n \right) = 0. \]

It follows that \( \{x_n\} \) is a Cauchy sequence in \( X \). Since \( (X, d) \) is \((\alpha, \eta)\)-complete and

\[ \alpha(x_{n-1}, x_n) \geq 1 \text{ or } \eta(x_{n-1}, x_n) \leq 1, \]

for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), the there exists \( z \in X \) such that

\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} d \left( x_n, z \right) = 0. \]

**Step 5:** We show that \( d \left( Tz, z \right) = 0 \) arguing by contradiction, we assume that

\[ d \left( Tz, z \right) > 0. \]
By rectangular inequality we get,
\[ d(Tx_n, Tz) \leq d(Tx_n, x_n) + d(x_n, z) + d(z, Tz), \tag{24} \]
\[ d(z, Tz) \leq d(z, x_u) + d(x_u, Tx_u) + d(Tx_u, Tz). \tag{25} \]

By letting \( n \to \infty \) in inequality (24) and (25) we obtain
\[ d(z, Tz) \leq \lim_{n \to \infty} d(Tx_n, Tz) \leq d(z, Tz). \]

Therefore,
\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} d(Tx_n, Tz) = d(z, Tz). \tag{26} \]

Since \( T \) is \((\alpha, \eta)\)-continuous, then \( Tx_n \to Tz \) i.e \( \lim_{n \to \infty} d(Tx_n, Tz) = 0 \). Hence \( d(Tz, z) = 0 \), so \( Tz = z \).

**Step 6: (Uniqueness)** Now, suppose that \( z, u \in X \) are two fixed points of \( T \) such that \( u \neq z \) and \( \alpha(z, u) \geq 1 \) or \( \eta(z, u) \leq 1 \). Therefore, we have
\[ d(Tz, Tu) = d(z, u) > 0. \]

Applying (1) with \( x = z \) and \( y = u \), we have
\[ F(d(Tu, Tz)) - \tau \geq F(M(z, u)), \]
where
\[ M(z, u) = \min\{d(z, u), d(z, Tz), d(u, Tu), d(z, Tu)\} = d(z, u). \]

Therefore, we have
\[ F(d(z, u)) > F(d(u, z)) - \tau \geq F(d(z, u)). \]

It is a contradiction. Therefore \( u = z \). \( \square \)

**Theorem 2.** Let \( \alpha, \eta : X \times X \to \mathbb{R}^+ \) be two function and let \( (X, d) \) be a \((\alpha, \eta)\)-complete rectangular metric space. Let \( T : X \to X \) be a bijective mapping satisfying the following conditions:

(i) \( T^{-1} \) is a triangular \((\alpha, \eta)\)-admissible mapping;
(ii) \( T \) is a generalized \((\alpha, \eta)\)-F-expansive mapping;
(iii) \( \alpha(z, T^{-1}z) \geq 1 \) or \( \eta(z, T^{-1}z) \leq 1 \), for all \( z \in \text{Fix}(T) \).

Then \( T \) has a fixed point.

**Proof.** Let \( z \in \text{Fix}(T^n) \) for some fixed \( n > 1 \). As \( \alpha(z, T^{-1}z) \geq 1 \) or \( \eta(z, T^{-1}z) \leq 1 \) and \( T^{-1} \) is a triangular \((\alpha, \eta)\)-admissible mapping, then
\[ \alpha(T^{-1}z, T^{-2}z) \geq 1 \text{ or } \eta(T^{-2}z, T^{-1}z) \leq 1. \]

Continuing this process, we have
\[ \alpha(T^{-nz}, T^{-n-1}z) \geq 1 \text{ or } \eta(T^{-n-1}z, T^{-n}z) \leq 1, \]
for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). By (T3) and (T4), we get
\[ \alpha(T^{-m}z, T^{-m-1}z) \geq 1 \text{ or } \eta(T^{-m-1}z, T^{-m}z) \leq 1, \quad \forall m, n \in \mathbb{N}, n \neq m. \]

Since \( T \) is a bijective mapping, then \( T^{-n}z = z = T^nz \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( z \in \text{Fix}(T) \). Therefore,
\[ \alpha(T^nz, T^nz) \geq 1 \text{ or } \eta(T^nz, T^nz) \leq 1, \quad \forall m, n \in \mathbb{N}, n \neq m. \]

Assume that \( z \notin \text{Fix}(T) \), i.e. \( d(z, Tz) > 0 \). Then, we have
\[ d(z, Tz) = d(T^nz, Tz) = d(TT^{n-1}z, Tz). \]
Applying (1) with \( x = z \) and \( y = T^{-1}z \), we obtain
\[
F(d(z, Tz)) - \tau = F(d(T^{-1}z, Tz) - \tau) \geq F(M(T^{-1}z, z)),
\]
where
\[
M(T^{-1}z, z) = \min \{ d(z, T^{-1}z), d(z, Tz), d(T^{-1}z, Tz), d(T^{-1}z, Tz) \}.
\]
Letting \( n \to \infty \) in (27), we obtain
\[
\lim_{n \to +\infty} M(T^{-1}z, z) = d(z, Tz)
\]
Now, using \( (F_3) \), we get
\[
F(d(z, Tz)) - \tau \geq F(d(z, Tz)).
\]
It is a contradiction. Then \( z \in \text{Fix}(T) \). \( \square \)

**Example 1.** Let \( X = [1, +\infty) \) and \( d : X \times X \to [0, +\infty) \) define by
\[
d(x, y) = |x - y|.
\]
Then \( (X, d) \) is a metric space and rectangular metric space. Define mapping \( T : X \to X \) and \( a, \eta : X \times X \to [0, +\infty) \) by
\[
T(x) = x^2
\]
and
\[
a(x, y) = \frac{x + y}{\max \{x, y\} + 1},
\]
\[
\eta(x, y) = \frac{|x - y|}{\max \{x, y\} + 1}.
\]
Then, \( T \) is an \( (a, \eta) \) – continuous triangular \( (a, \eta) \) – admissible mapping and \( T \) is a bijective mapping.

Let \( F(t) = \ln(t) \), \( \tau = \ln(2) \). Evidently, \( (a(x, y) \geq 1 \text{ or } (x, y) \leq 1) \) and \( \min \{d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty), d(y, TX)\} > 0 \) are when \( x \neq y \neq 1 \).

Now, consider the following two cases:

**Case 1: \( x > y > 1 \)**

As
\[
d(Tx, Ty) = x^2 - y^2, F(d(Tx, Ty)) = \ln(x^2 - y^2) = \ln(x - y) + \ln(x + y).
\]
Thus,
\[
F(d(Tx, Ty)) - \tau = \ln(x^2 - y^2) - \ln(2) = \ln(x - y) + \ln(x + y) - \ln(2).
\]
We have
\[
F(d(x, y)) = \ln(x - y).
\]
On the other hand
\[
F(d(x, y)) - F(d(Tx, Ty)) + \tau = \ln(x^2 - y^2) = \ln(x - y) - \ln(x - y) - \ln(x + y) + \ln(2) = \ln(x - y) + \ln(2).
\]
Since \( x, y \in [1, +\infty) \), then
\[
-\ln(x + y) + \ln(2) \leq 0.
\]
Which implies that
\[
F(d(Tx, Ty)) - \tau \geq F(d(x, y)) \geq F[\min \{d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty), d(y, Ty)\}].
\]

**Case 2: \( y > x > 1 \)**

As
\[
d(Ty, Tx) = y^2 - x^2, F(d(Ty, Tx)) = \ln(y^2 - x^2) = \ln(y - x) + \ln(y + x),
\]
Thus,
\[ F(d(Ty, Tx)) - \tau = \ln(y^2 - x^2) - \ln(2) = \ln(y - x) + \ln(y + x) - \ln(2). \]
We have
\[ F(d(x, y)) = \ln(y - x). \]

On the other hand
\[ F(d(y, x)) - F(d(Ty, Tx)) + \tau = \ln(y - x) - \ln(y - x) - \ln(y + x) + \ln(2) = -\ln(x - y) + \ln(2). \]

Since \( y, x \in [1, +\infty] \), then
\[ \ln(y - x) + \ln(2) \leq 0. \]
Which implies that
\[ F(d(Ty, Tx)) - \tau \geq F(d(y, x)) \geq F[\min\{d(y, x), d(y, Ty), d(x, Tx), d(x, Ty)\}]. \]

Hence, the condition (1) is satisfied. Therefore, \( T \) has a unique fixed point \( z = 1 \).

**Theorem 3.** Let \( \alpha, \eta : X \times X \to \mathbb{R}^+ \) be two functions and let \( d(X, d) \) be a \((\alpha, \eta)\)-complete rectangular metric space. Let \( T : X \to X \) be a bijective mapping satisfying the following assertions:
(i) \( T^{-1} \) is triangular \((\alpha, \eta)\)-admissible;
(ii) \( T \) is a generalized \((\alpha, \eta)\)-\( F \)-expansive mapping;
(iii) there exists \( x_0 \in X \) such that \( \alpha(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \geq 1 \) or \( \eta(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \leq 1 \);
(iv) \((X, d)\) is a \((\alpha, \eta)\)-regular rectangular metric space.

Then \( T \) has a fixed point. Moreover, \( T \) has a unique fixed point whenever \( \alpha(z, u) \geq 1 \) or \( \eta(z, u) \leq 1 \) for all \( z, u \in \text{Fix}(T) \).

**Proof.** Let \( x_0 \in X \) such that \( \alpha(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \geq 1 \) or \( \eta(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \leq 1 \). Similar to the proof of Theorem 1, we can conclude that
\[ \alpha(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 1 \text{ or } \eta(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq 1 \], and \( x_n \to z \) as \( n \to \infty \),
and from inequality (26), we have
\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} d(Tx_n, Tz) = d(z, Tz). \]

From (iv) \( \alpha(x_n, z) \geq 1 \) or \( \eta(x_n, z) \leq 1 \), hold for \( n \in \mathbb{N} \).

Suppose that \( Tz = x_{n_0} = Tx_{n_0} \) for some \( n_0 \in \mathbb{N}^+ \). From Theorem 1 we know that the members of the sequence \( \{x_n\} \) are distinct. Hence, we have \( Tz \neq Tx_n \), i.e. \( d(Tz, Tx_n) > 0 \) for all \( n > n_0 \). Thus, we can apply (1) to \( x_n \) and \( z \) for all \( n > n_0 \) to get
\[ F(d(Tz, Tx_n)) - \tau \geq F(M(z, x_n)), \forall n \geq n_0, \]
where
\[
M(z, x_n) = \min \{d(z, x_n), d(z, Tz), d(x_n, Tx_n), d(z, Tx_n)\} = \min \{d(z, x_n), d(z, Tz), d(x_n, x_{n-1}), d(z, x_{n-1})\}.
\]

Therefore,
\[ F(d(Tz, Tx_n)) - \tau \geq F(\min\{d(z, x_n), d(z, Tz), d(x_n, x_{n-1}), d(z, x_{n-1})\}). \quad (28) \]

By letting \( n \to \infty \) in inequality (28), we obtain
\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} F(d(Tz, Tx_n)) > \lim_{n \to \infty} F(d(Tz, Tx_n)) - \tau \geq \lim_{n \to \infty} F(\min\{d(z, x_n), d(z, Tz), d(x_n, x_{n-1}), d(z, x_{n-1})\}). \]
Since \( F \) is continuous function and \( \lim_{n \to +\infty} M(z, x_n) = d(z, Tz) \), we conclude that

\[
F (d(z, Tz)) > F (d(z, Tz)),
\]

which implies that

\[
d(z, Tz) < d(z, Tz).
\]

It is a contradiction. Hence \( Tz = z \). The proof of the uniqueness is similarly to that of Theorem 1. \( \Box \)

**Corollary 1.** Let \( a, \eta : X \times X \to [0, +\infty] \) be two functions, \((X, d)\) be a \((a, \eta)\)-complete rectangular metric space and \( T : X \to X \) be a bijective mapping. Suppose that for all \( x, y \in X \) with \( a(x, y) \geq 1 \) or \( \eta(x, y) \leq 1 \) and \( M(x, y) > 0 \) we have

\[
F (d (Tx, Ty)) - \tau \geq F (d (x, y)).
\]

Then \( T \) has a fixed point, if

(i) \( T^{-1} \) is a triangular \((a, \eta)\)-admissible mapping;
(ii) there exists \( x_0 \in X \) such that \( a(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \geq 1 \) or \( \eta(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \leq 1 \);
(iii) \( T \) is \((a, \eta)\)-continuous; or
(iv) \((X, d)\) is an \((a, \eta)\)-regular rectangular metric space.

Moreover, \( T \) has a unique fixed point when \( a(z, u) \geq 1 \) or \( \eta(z, u) \leq 1 \) for all \( z, u \in \text{Fix}(T) \).

### 4. Fixed point theorem on rectangular metric spaces endowed with a partial order

**Definition 9.** [16] Let \((X, d, \preceq)\) be an ordered rectangular metric space and \( T : X \to X \) be a mapping. Then

1) \((X, d)\) is said to be \(O\)-complete, if every Cauchy \( \{n_n\} \) in \( X \) with \( x_n \preceq x_{n+1} \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) or \( x_n \succeq x_{n+1} \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), converges in \( X \).
2) \((X, d)\) is said to be \(O\)-regular, if for each sequence \( \{n_n\} \) in \( X \) \( \{x_n\} \to x \) and \( x_n \preceq x_{n+1} \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) or \( x_n \succeq x_{n+1} \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) imply that \( \{n_n\} \preceq x \) or \( \{n_n\} \succeq x \) respectively.
3) \( T \) is said to be \(O\)-continuous, if for given \( x \in X \) and sequence \( \{n_n\} \) with \( x_n \preceq x_{n+1} \) or \( x_n \succeq x_{n+1} \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), \( \{n_n\} \to x \Rightarrow Tx_n \to Tx \).

**Definition 10.** Let \((X, d, \preceq)\) be an ordered rectangular metric spaces and \( T : X \to X \) be a mapping. We say that \( T \) be an ordered \(F\)-expansive mapping, if for all \( x, y \in X \) with \( x \preceq y \) or \( x \succeq y \) such that

\[
M(x, y) > 0 \Rightarrow F (d (Tx, Ty)) - \tau \geq F (M(x, y)),
\]

where \( M(x, y) = \min \{d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty), d(x, Ty)\} \).

**Theorem 4.** Let \((X, d, \preceq)\) be an \(O\)-complete partially ordered rectangular metric space. Let \( T : X \to X \) be a bijective self mapping on \( X \) satisfying the following assertions:

(i) \( T^{-1} \) is monotone;
(ii) \( T \) is an ordered \(F\)-expansive mapping;
(iii) there exists \( x_0 \in X \) such that \( x_0 \preceq T^{-1}x_0 \) or \( x_0 \succeq T^{-1}x_0 \)
(iv) either \( T \) is \(O\)-continuous; or
(v) \((X, d)\) is \(O\)-regular.

Then \( T \) has a fixed point. Moreover, \( T \) has a unique fixed point whenever \( z \preceq u \) or \( z \succeq u \) for all \( z, u \in \text{Fix}(T) \).

**Proof.** Define the mapping \( \alpha : X \times X \to [0, +\infty] \) by

\[
\alpha(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \preceq y \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\]
and the mapping \( \eta : X \times X \to [0, +\infty) \) by
\[
\eta(x, y) = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } x \geq y \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

Using condition (iii) we have
\[
x_0 \preceq T^{-1}x_0 \Rightarrow a(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \geq 1,
\]
or
\[
x_0 \succeq T^{-1}x_0 \Rightarrow \eta(x_0, T^{-1}x_0) \leq 1.
\]

Owing to the monotonicity of \( T^{-1} \), we get
\[
a(x, y) \geq 1 \Rightarrow x \preceq y \Rightarrow T^{-1}x \preceq T^{-1}y \Rightarrow a(T^{-1}x, T^{-1}y) \geq 1,
\]
or
\[
\eta(x, y) \leq 1 \Rightarrow x \preceq y \Rightarrow T^{-1}x \preceq T^{-1}y \Rightarrow \eta(T^{-1}x, T^{-1}y) \leq 1.
\]

Therefore, \( (T_1) \) and \( (T_2) \) hold.

On the other hand, if
\[
\begin{cases} 
a(x, y) \geq 1 \\
a(x, y) \geq 1
\end{cases} \Rightarrow \begin{cases} 
x \preceq y \\
y \preceq z
\end{cases}
\]
or
\[
\begin{cases} 
\eta(x, y) \leq 1 \\
\eta(x, y) \leq 1
\end{cases} \Rightarrow \begin{cases} 
x \succeq y \\
y \succeq z
\end{cases}
\]

Since \( (X, d) \) be an O-complete partially ordered rectangular metric space, we conclude that
\[
x \preceq z \text{ or } x \succeq z \Rightarrow a(x, z) \geq 1 \text{ or } \eta(x, z) \leq 1.
\]

Thus, \( (T_3) \) and \( (T_4) \) hold. This shows that \( T^{-1} \) is a triangular \( (a, \eta) \) – admissible mapping then
\[
(a(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 1 \text{ or } \eta(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq 1).
\]

Now, if \( T \) is O-continuous, then \( x_n \preceq x_{n+1} \text{ or } x_n \succeq x_{n+1} \Rightarrow a(x_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 1 \text{ or } \eta(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq 1 \) and \( x_n \to z \) as \( n \to \infty \) with \( z \in X \Rightarrow Tx_n \to Tx \). The existence and uniqueness of a fixed point follows from Theorem 1.

Now, suppose that follow \( (X, d, \preceq) \) is O-regular. Let \( \{x_n\} \) be a sequence such that
\[
\{x_n\} \preceq x \text{ or } \{x_n\} \succeq x,
\]
which implies that
\[
(a(x_n, x) \geq 1 \text{ or } \eta(x_n, x) \leq 1),
\]
for all \( n \) and \( x_n \to x \) as \( n \to \infty \). This shows that \( (X, d) \) is \( (a, \eta) \) – regular. Thus, the existence and uniqueness of fixed point from Theorem 3.

**Corollary 2.** Let \( (X, d, \preceq) \) be an O-complete partially ordered rectangular metric spaces. Further, let \( T : X \to X \) be a bijective self mapping on \( X \) be such that \( T^{-1} \) is a monotone mapping and there exist \( k \in [0, 1] \) such that \( kd(Tx, Ty) \geq d(x, y), \) for all \( x, y \in X \) with \( x \preceq y \text{ or } x \succeq y \). Also, suppose that the following conditions hold:

(i) there exists \( x_0 \in X \) such that \( x_0 \preceq T^{-1}x_0 \text{ or } x_0 \succeq T^{-1}x_0); \\
(ii) either \( T \) is O-continuous; or \\
(iii) \( X \) is O-regular.

Then \( T \) has a fixed point. Moreover, \( T \) has a unique fixed point whenever \( z \preceq u \text{ or } z \succeq u \) for all \( z, u \in \text{Fix}(T) \).
Proof. Let \( F(t) = \ln(t) \) for all \( t \in [0, +\infty[ \) and \( \tau = \frac{1}{\ln(k)} \). Clearly \( F \in \mathcal{F} \) and \( \tau > 0 \). We prove that \( T \) is a generalized \( F \)-expansive mapping. Indeed, since

\[
kd(Tx, Ty) \geq d(x, y).
\]

We have

\[
\ln [k.d(Tx, Ty)] = \ln [d(Tx, Ty)] + \ln(k) = \ln (d(Tx, Ty)) - \frac{1}{\ln(k)} \geq \ln [d(x, y)] \geq \ln [\min\{d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty), d(Tx, Ty)\}].
\]

As in the proof of Theorems 1 and 4, \( T \) has a unique fixed point \( x \in X \). \( \square \)

**Corollary 3.** Let \( (X, d, \leq) \) be an O-complete partially ordered rectangular metric spaces. Further, let \( T : X \to X \) be a bijective self mapping on \( X \) such that \( T^{-1} \) is a monotone mapping and there exist \( a \in ]0, \frac{1}{2}[ \) such that

\[
ad(Tx, Ty) \geq \frac{d(x, Tx) + d(y, Ty)}{2}
\]

for all \( x, y \in X \) with \( x \leq y \) or \( x \geq y \). Also suppose that the following conditions hold:

(i) there exists \( x_0 \in X \) such that \( x_0 \leq T^{-1}x_0 \) or \( x_0 \geq T^{-1}x_0 \);
(ii) either \( T \) is O-continuous; or
(iii) \( X \) is O-regular.

Then \( T \) has a fixed point. Moreover, \( T \) has a unique fixed point whenever \( z \leq u \) or \( z \geq u \) for all \( z, u \in \text{Fix}(T) \).

**Proof.** Let \( F(t) = \ln(t) \) for all \( t \in [0, +\infty[ \) and \( \tau = \frac{1}{\ln(2\lambda)} \). Clearly \( F \in \mathcal{F} \) and \( \tau > 0 \). We prove that \( T \) is a generalized \( F \)-expansive mapping. Indeed, since

\[
ad(Tx, Ty) \geq \frac{d(x, Tx) + d(y, Ty)}{2}
\]

We have

\[
\ln [2\lambda.d(Tx, Ty)] = \ln [d(Tx, Ty)] + \ln(2\lambda) = \ln (d(Tx, Ty)) - \frac{1}{\ln(2\lambda)} \geq \ln [\min\{d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty), d(Tx, Ty)\}].
\]

As in the proof of Theorems 1 and 4, \( T \) has a unique fixed point \( x \in X \). \( \square \)

**Corollary 4.** Let \( (X, d, \leq) \) be an O-complete partially ordered rectangular metric spaces. Further, let \( T : X \to X \) be a bijective self mapping on \( X \), such that \( T^{-1} \) is a monotone mapping and there exist \( \lambda \in ]0, \frac{1}{2}[ \) such that

\[
ad(Tx, Ty) \geq \frac{d(x, y) + d(x, Tx) + d(y, Ty)}{3}
\]

for all \( x, y \in X \) with \( x \leq y \) or \( x \geq y \). Also suppose that the following conditions hold:

(i) there exists \( x_0 \in X \) such that \( x_0 \leq T^{-1}x_0 \) or \( x_0 \geq T^{-1}x_0 \);
(ii) either \( T \) is O-continuous; or
(iii) \( X \) is O-regular.
Then $T$ has a fixed point. Moreover, $T$ has a unique fixed point whenever $z \leq u$ or $z \geq u$ for all $z, u \in \text{Fix}(T)$.

**Proof.** Let $F(t) = \ln(t)$ for all $t \in ]0, +\infty[$, and $\tau = \frac{1}{\ln(3\lambda)}$. Clearly $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\tau > 0$. We prove that $T$ is a $F$-expansive mapping. Indeed, since
\[
\lambda d(Tx, Ty) \geq \frac{d(x, y) + d(x, Tx) + d(y, Ty)}{3}.
\]
We have
\[
\ln[3\lambda d(Tx, Ty)] = \ln[d(Tx, Ty)] + \ln(3\lambda) = \ln(d(Tx, Ty)) - \frac{1}{\ln(3\lambda)} \geq \ln[d(x, y) + d(x, Tx) + d(y, Ty)] \geq \ln[\min\{d(x, y), d(x, Tx), d(y, Ty), d(Tx, y)\}].
\]
As in the proof of Theorems 1 and 4, $T$ has a unique fixed point $x \in X$. □
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