

Research Article

Discussion on “Multidimensional Coincidence Points” via Recent Publications

Saleh A. Al-Mezel,¹ Hamed H. Alsulami,¹ Erdal Karapınar,^{1,2}
and Antonio-Francisco Roldán López-de-Hierro³

¹Nonlinear Analysis and Applied Mathematics Research Group (NAAM), King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia

²Department of Mathematics, Atilim University, Incek, 06836 Ankara, Turkey

³University of Jaén, Campus las Lagunillas s/n, 23071 Jaén, Spain

Correspondence should be addressed to Erdal Karapınar; erdalkarapinar@yahoo.com

Received 17 March 2014; Accepted 23 March 2014; Published 8 May 2014

Academic Editor: Jen-Chih Yao

Copyright © 2014 Saleh A. Al-Mezel et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

We show that some definitions of multidimensional coincidence points are not compatible with the mixed monotone property. Thus, some theorems reported in the recent publications (Dalal et al., 2014 and Imdad et al., 2013) have gaps. We clarify these gaps and we present a new theorem to correct the mentioned results. Furthermore, we show how multidimensional results can be seen as simple consequences of our unidimensional coincidence point theorem.

1. Introduction and Preliminaries

In the sequel, X will be a nonempty set and \leq will represent a partial order on X . Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq 2$, let denote by X^n the product space $X \times X \times \dots \times X$ of n identical copies of X .

In [1], Guo and Lakshmikantham introduced the notion of *coupled fixed point* and, thus, they initiated the investigation of multidimensional fixed point theory.

Definition 1 (Guo and Lakshmikantham [1]). Let $F : X \times X \rightarrow X$ be a given mapping. We say that $(x, y) \in X \times X$ is a *coupled fixed point* of F if

$$F(x, y) = x, \quad F(y, x) = y. \quad (1)$$

Following this initial paper [1], in 2006, Bhaskar and Lakshmikantham [2] obtained some coupled fixed point theorems for mapping $F : X \times X \rightarrow X$ (where X is a partially ordered metric space) by defining the notion of *mixed monotone mapping*.

Definition 2 (see [2]). Let (X, \leq) be a partially ordered set. A mapping $F : X \times X \rightarrow X$. F is said to have the *mixed*

monotone property if $F(x, y)$ is monotone nondecreasing in x and is monotone nonincreasing in y ; that is, for any $x, y \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} x_1, x_2 \in X, \quad x_1 \leq x_2 &\implies F(x_1, y) \leq F(x_2, y), \\ y_1, y_2 \in X, \quad y_1 \leq y_2 &\implies F(x, y_2) \leq F(x, y_1). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

After that, Lakshmikantham and Ćirić [3] proved coupled fixed/coincidence point theorems for mappings $F : X \times X \rightarrow X$ and $g : X \rightarrow X$ by introducing the concept of the *mixed g -monotone property*. Inspired by these papers [2, 3], Berinde and Borcut defined tripled fixed points and established some tripled fixed point theorems.

Definition 3 (Berinde and Borcut [4]). Let $F : X^3 \rightarrow X$ be a given mapping. We say that $(x, y, z) \in X^3$ is a *triple fixed point* of F if

$$F(x, y, z) = x, \quad F(y, x, y) = y, \quad F(z, y, x) = z. \quad (3)$$

Definition 4 (see [4]). Let (X, \leq) be a partially ordered set and $F : X^3 \rightarrow X$. We say that F has the *mixed monotone property*

if $F(x, y, z)$ is monotone nondecreasing in x and z and it is monotone nonincreasing in y ; that is, for any $x, y, z \in X$

$$\begin{aligned} x_1, x_2 \in X, \quad x_1 \leq x_2 &\implies F(x_1, y, z) \leq F(x_2, y, z), \\ y_1, y_2 \in X, \quad y_1 \leq y_2 &\implies F(x, y_1, z) \geq F(x, y_2, z), \\ z_1, z_2 \in X, \quad z_1 \leq z_2 &\implies F(x, y, z_1) \leq F(x, y, z_2). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

As a natural extension, Karapınar [5] studied the quadruple case (see also [6, 7]).

Definition 5 (see [5]). An element $(x, y, z, w) \in X^4$ is called a *quadruple fixed point* of $F : X^4 \rightarrow X$ if

$$\begin{aligned} F(x, y, z, w) = x, \quad F(y, z, w, x) = y, \\ F(z, w, x, y) = z, \quad F(w, x, y, z) = w. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Definition 6 (see [5]). Let (X, \leq) be a partially ordered set and $F : X^4 \rightarrow X$. We say that F has the *mixed monotone property* if $F(x, y, z, w)$ is monotone nondecreasing in x and z and it is monotone nonincreasing in y and w ; that is, for any $x, y, z, w \in X$

$$\begin{aligned} x_1, x_2 \in X, \quad x_1 \leq x_2 &\implies F(x_1, y, z, w) \leq F(x_2, y, z, w), \\ y_1, y_2 \in X, \quad y_1 \leq y_2 &\implies F(x, y_1, z, w) \geq F(x, y_2, z, w), \\ z_1, z_2 \in X, \quad z_1 \leq z_2 &\implies F(x, y, z_1, w) \leq F(x, y, z_2, w), \\ w_1, w_2 \in X, \quad w_1 \leq w_2 &\implies F(x, y, z, w_1) \geq F(x, y, z, w_2). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

When a mapping $g : X \rightarrow X$ is involved, we have the notion of *coincidence point*. We will only recall the corresponding definitions in the quadruple case since they are similar in other dimensions.

Definition 7 (see [6]). An element $(x, y, z, w) \in X^4$ is called a *quadrupled coincident point of the mappings* $F : X^4 \rightarrow X$ and $g : X \rightarrow X$ if

$$\begin{aligned} gx = F(x, y, z, w), \quad gy = F(y, z, w, x), \\ gz = F(z, w, x, y), \quad gw = F(w, x, y, z). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Definition 8 (see [6]). Let (X, \leq) be a partially ordered set and let $F : X^4 \rightarrow X$ and $g : X \rightarrow X$ be two mappings. We say F has the *mixed g -monotone property* if $F(x, y, z, w)$ is g -nondecreasing in x and z and is g -nonincreasing in y and w ; that is, for any $x, y, z, w \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} x_1, x_2 \in X, \quad gx_1 \leq gx_2 \\ \implies F(x_1, y, z, w) \leq F(x_2, y, z, w), \\ y_1, y_2 \in X, \quad gy_1 \leq gy_2 \\ \implies F(x, y_1, z, w) \geq F(x, y_2, z, w), \\ z_1, z_2 \in X, \quad gz_1 \leq gz_2 \\ \implies F(x, y, z_1, w) \leq F(x, y, z_2, w), \\ w_1, w_2 \in X, \quad gw_1 \leq gw_2 \\ \implies F(x, y, z, w_1) \geq F(x, y, z, w_2). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

It is very natural to extend the definition of 2-dimensional fixed point (coupled fixed point), 3-dimensional fixed point (tripled fixed point), and so on to multidimensional fixed point (n -tuple fixed point) (see, e.g., [8–19]). In this paper, we give some remarks on the notion of n -tuple fixed point given in several papers, such as Imdad et al. [9], Dalal et al. [8], and Ertürk and Karakaya [20, 21]. Notice that this paper can be considered as a continuation of Karapınar and Roldán [10, 22]. We note also that authors preferred to say “ n -tuple fixed point” [20, 21] or “ n -tuple fixed point” [8, 9] instead of “ n -tuple fixed point”.

Definition 9 (see [8, 9, 20]). An element $(x^1, x^2, x^3, \dots, x^n) \in X^n$ is called an *n -tuple fixed point* of the mapping $F : X^n \rightarrow X$ if

$$\begin{aligned} x^1 &= F(x^1, x^2, x^3, \dots, x^n), \\ x^2 &= F(x^2, x^3, \dots, x^n, x^1), \\ x^3 &= F(x^3, \dots, x^n, x^1, x^2), \\ &\vdots \\ x^n &= F(x^n, x^1, x^2, \dots, x^{n-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Definition 10 (see [8, 9, 20]). Let (X, \leq) be a partially ordered set and let $F : X^n \rightarrow X$ be a mapping. We say F has the *mixed monotone property* if $F(x^1, x^2, x^3, \dots, x^n)$ is nondecreasing in odd arguments and is nonincreasing in its even arguments; that is, for any $x^1, x^2, x^3, \dots, x^n \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} y_1, z_1 \in X, \quad y_1 \leq z_1 \\ \implies F(y_1, x^2, x^3, \dots, x^n) \\ \leq F(z_1, x^2, x^3, \dots, x^n), \\ y_2, z_2 \in X, \quad y_2 \leq z_2 \\ \implies F(x^1, y_2, x^3, \dots, x^n) \geq F(x^1, z_2, x^3, \dots, x^n), \\ \vdots \\ y_n, z_n \in X, \quad y_n \leq z_n \\ \implies F(x^1, x^2, x^3, \dots, y_n) \\ \leq F(x^1, x^2, x^3, \dots, z_n), \text{ if } n \text{ is odd,} \\ y_n, z_n \in X, \quad y_n \leq z_n \\ \implies F(x^1, x^2, x^3, \dots, y_n) \\ \geq F(x^1, x^2, x^3, \dots, z_n), \text{ if } n \text{ is even.} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Definition 11 (see [8, 9, 20]). An element $(x^1, x^2, x^3, \dots, x^n) \in X^n$ is called an *n -tuple coincidence point of the mappings* $F : X^n \rightarrow X$ and $g : X \rightarrow X$ if

$$\begin{aligned} gx^1 &= F(x^1, x^2, x^3, \dots, x^n), \\ gx^2 &= F(x^2, x^3, \dots, x^n, x^1), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 gx^3 &= F(x^3, \dots, x^n, x^1, x^2), \\
 &\vdots \\
 gx^n &= F(x^n, x^1, x^2, \dots, x^{n-1}).
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{11}$$

Definition 12 (see [8, 9, 20]). Let (X, \leq) be a partially ordered set and let $F : X^n \rightarrow X$ and $g : X \rightarrow X$ be two mappings. We say F has the *mixed g -monotone property* if $F(x^1, x^2, x^3, \dots, x^n)$ is g -nondecreasing in odd arguments and is g -nonincreasing in its even arguments; that is, for any $x^1, x^2, x^3, \dots, x^n \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 y_1, z_1 \in X, \quad gy_1 &\leq gz_1 \\
 &\implies F(y_1, x^2, x^3, \dots, x^n) \leq F(z_1, x^2, x^3, \dots, x^n), \\
 y_2, z_2 \in X, \quad gy_2 &\leq gz_2 \\
 &\implies F(x^1, y_2, x^3, \dots, x^n) \geq F(x^1, z_2, x^3, \dots, x^n), \\
 &\vdots \\
 y_n, z_n \in X, \quad gy_n &\leq gz_n \\
 &\implies F(x^1, x^2, x^3, \dots, x^{n-1}, y_n) \\
 &\leq F(x^1, x^2, x^3, \dots, x^{n-1}, z_n), \quad \text{if } n \text{ is odd,} \\
 y_n, z_n \in X, \quad gy_n &\leq gz_n \\
 &\implies F(x^1, x^2, x^3, \dots, x^{n-1}, y_n) \\
 &\geq F(x^1, x^2, x^3, \dots, x^{n-1}, z_n), \\
 &\quad \text{if } n \text{ is even.}
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{12}$$

Using these preliminaries, the following result was announced in [9]. Notice that in that paper, the authors used the notation $\prod_{i=1}^r X^i$ to refer to the product space X^r .

Theorem 13 (Imdad et al. [9], Theorem 13). *Let (X, \leq) be a partially ordered set equipped with a metric d such that (X, d) is a complete metric space. Assume that there is a function $\phi : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ with $\phi(t) < t$ and $\lim_{r \rightarrow t^+} \phi(t) < t$ for all $t > 0$. Further, suppose that $F : X^r \rightarrow X$ and $g : X \rightarrow X$ are two maps such that F has the mixed g -monotone property satisfying the following conditions:*

- (i) $F(X^r) \subseteq g(X)$,
- (ii) g is continuous and monotonically increasing,
- (iii) (g, F) is a commuting pair,
- (iv)

$$\begin{aligned}
 d(F(x^1, x^2, \dots, x^r), F(y^1, y^2, \dots, y^r)) \\
 \leq \phi\left(\frac{1}{r} \sum_{i=1}^r d(gx_i, gy_i)\right)
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{13}$$

for all $x^1, x^2, \dots, x^r, y^1, y^2, \dots, y^r \in X$ with $gx^1 \leq gy^1, gx^2 \geq gy^2, gx^3 \leq gy^3, \dots, gx^r \geq gy^r$.

Also, suppose that either

- (a) F is continuous or
- (b) X has the following properties:

- (b.1) if a nondecreasing sequence $\{x_n\} \rightarrow x$, then $x_n \leq x$ for all $n \geq 0$;
- (b.2) if a nonincreasing sequence $\{x_n\} \rightarrow x$, then $x_n \geq x$ for all $n \geq 0$.

If there exist $x_0^1, x_0^2, x_0^3, \dots, x_0^r \in X$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
 gx_0^1 &\leq F(x_0^1, x_0^2, x_0^3, \dots, x_0^r), \\
 gx_0^2 &\geq F(x_0^2, x_0^3, \dots, x_0^r, x_0^1), \\
 gx_0^3 &\leq F(x_0^3, \dots, x_0^r, x_0^1, x_0^2), \\
 &\vdots \\
 gx_0^r &\geq F(x_0^r, x_0^1, x_0^2, \dots, x_0^{r-1}),
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{14}$$

then F and g have a r -tupled coincidence point; that is, there exists $x^1, x^2, x^3, \dots, x^r \in X$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
 gx^1 &= F(x^1, x^2, x^3, \dots, x^r), \\
 gx^2 &= F(x^2, x^3, \dots, x^r, x^1), \\
 gx^3 &= F(x^3, \dots, x^r, x^1, x^2), \\
 &\vdots \\
 gx^r &= F(x^r, x^1, x^2, \dots, x^{r-1}).
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{15}$$

Based on this theorem, Dalal et al. [8] extended the previous result to compatible mappings in the following sense.

Definition 14 (Dalal et al. [8]). Let (X, d) be a metric space provided with a partial order \leq and let $F : X^n \rightarrow X$ and $g : X \rightarrow X$ be two mappings. We will say that (F, g) is a *compatible pair* if

$$\begin{aligned}
 \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(gF(x_n^1, x_n^2, x_n^3, \dots, x_n^r), \\
 F(gx_n^1, gx_n^2, gx_n^3, \dots, gx_n^r)) &= 0, \\
 \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(gF(x_n^2, x_n^3, \dots, x_n^r, x_n^1), \\
 F(gx_n^2, gx_n^3, \dots, gx_n^r, gx_n^1)) &= 0,
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(gF(x_n^3, \dots, x_n^r, x_n^1, x_n^2), \\ & \quad F(gx_n^3, \dots, gx_n^r, gx_n^1, gx_n^2)) = 0, \\ & \quad \vdots \\ & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(gF(x_n^r, x_n^1, x_n^2, \dots, x_n^{r-1}), \\ & \quad F(gx_n^r, gx_n^1, gx_n^2, \dots, gx_n^{r-1})) = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

whenever $\{x_n^1\}, \{x_n^2\}, \{x_n^3\}, \dots, \{x_n^r\}$ are sequences in X such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(x_n^1, x_n^2, x_n^3, \dots, x_n^r) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} gx_n^1 = x^1, \\ & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(x_n^2, x_n^3, \dots, x_n^r, x_n^1) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} gx_n^2 = x^2, \\ & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(x_n^3, \dots, x_n^r, x_n^1, x_n^2) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} gx_n^3 = x^3, \\ & \quad \vdots \\ & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(x_n^r, x_n^1, x_n^2, \dots, x_n^{r-1}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} gx_n^r = x^r, \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

for some $x^1, x^2, x^3, \dots, x^r \in X$.

Theorem 15 (Dalal et al. [8], Theorem 3.2). *Let (X, \leq) be a partially ordered set equipped with a metric d such that (X, d) is a complete metric space. Assume that there is a function $\varphi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ with $\varphi(t) < t$ and $\lim_{r \rightarrow t^+} \varphi(t) < t$ for all $t > 0$. Further, let $F : X^r \rightarrow X$ and $g : X \rightarrow X$ be two maps such that F has the mixed g -monotone property satisfying the following conditions:*

- (i) $F(X^r) \subseteq g(X)$,
- (ii) g is continuous and monotonically increasing,
- (iii) the pair (g, F) is compatible,
- (iv)

$$\begin{aligned} & d(F(x^1, x^2, \dots, x^r), F(y^1, y^2, \dots, y^r)) \\ & \leq \varphi\left(\frac{1}{r} \sum_{i=1}^r d(gx_i, gy_i)\right) \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

for all $x^1, x^2, \dots, x^r, y^1, y^2, \dots, y^r \in X$ with $gx^1 \leq gy^1, gx^2 \geq gy^2, gx^3 \leq gy^3, \dots, gx^r \geq gy^r$.

Also, suppose that either

- (a) F is continuous or
- (b) X has the following properties:
 - (b.1) if a nondecreasing sequence $\{x_n\} \rightarrow x$, then $x_n \leq x$ for all $n \geq 0$;
 - (b.2) if a nonincreasing sequence $\{x_n\} \rightarrow x$, then $x_n \geq x$ for all $n \geq 0$.

If there exists $x_0^1, x_0^2, x_0^3, \dots, x_0^r \in X$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & gx_0^1 \leq F(x_0^1, x_0^2, x_0^3, \dots, x_0^r), \\ & gx_0^2 \geq F(x_0^2, x_0^3, \dots, x_0^r, x_0^1), \\ & gx_0^3 \leq F(x_0^3, \dots, x_0^r, x_0^1, x_0^2), \\ & \quad \vdots \\ & gx_0^r \geq F(x_0^r, x_0^1, x_0^2, \dots, x_0^{r-1}), \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

then F and g have a r -tupled coincidence point; that is, there exists $x^1, x^2, x^3, \dots, x^r \in X$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & gx^1 = F(x^1, x^2, x^3, \dots, x^r), \\ & gx^2 = F(x^2, x^3, \dots, x^r, x^1), \\ & gx^3 = F(x^3, \dots, x^r, x^1, x^2), \\ & \quad \vdots \\ & gx^r = F(x^r, x^1, x^2, \dots, x^{r-1}). \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

2. Some Remarks

Firstly we notice that, in the case $n = 3$, Definitions 9 and 11,

$$\begin{aligned} & gx^1 = F(x^1, x^2, x^3), \\ & gx^2 = F(x^2, x^3, x^1), \\ & gx^3 = F(x^3, x^1, x^2) \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

do not extend the notion of tripled coincidence point in the sense of Berinde and Borcut [4]. Therefore, their results are not extensions of well-known results in the tripled case. This fact shows that the odd case is not well-posed by Definitions 9 and 11 or, more precisely, the mixed monotone property is not useful to ensure the existence of coincidence points. In this sense, we have the following result.

Theorem 16. *Theorem 13 in [9] is not valid if n is odd.*

Proof. It is sufficient to examine the case $n = 3$ to indicate the mentioned invalidity. It is evident that the illustrative proof for the case $n = 3$ can be analogously extended to the case in which n is odd. We follow the lines of the proof of Theorem 3.1 in [8]. Let $x_0^1, x_0^2, x_0^3 \in X$ be the initial points. We construct three recursive sequences $\{x_k^1\}, \{x_k^2\}$, and $\{x_k^3\}$ in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} & gx_k^1 = F(x_{k-1}^1, x_{k-1}^2, x_{k-1}^3), \\ & gx_k^2 = F(x_{k-1}^2, x_{k-1}^3, x_{k-1}^1), \\ & gx_k^3 = F(x_{k-1}^3, x_{k-1}^1, x_{k-1}^2) \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, k \geq 1. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Due to the assumption, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} gx_0^1 &\leq F(x_0^1, x_0^2, x_0^3) = gx_1^1, \\ gx_0^2 &\geq F(x_0^2, x_0^3, x_0^1) = gx_1^2, \\ gx_0^3 &\leq F(x_0^3, x_0^1, x_0^2) = gx_1^3. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Then, the authors concluded that these sequences verify, for all $k \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} gx_{k-1}^1 &\leq gx_k^1, \\ gx_{k-1}^2 &\geq gx_k^2, \\ gx_{k-1}^3 &\leq gx_k^3. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Now, we will show that it is impossible to prove that $gx_1^2 \geq gx_2^2$ because the mixed g -monotone property leads to contrary inequalities. Indeed, we derive the following inequalities:

$$gx_1^2 \leq gx_0^2 \implies F(x_1^2, x_0^3, x_0^1) \leq F(x_0^2, x_0^3, x_0^1) = gx_1^2. \tag{25}$$

Furthermore,

$$gx_0^3 \leq gx_1^3 \implies F(x_1^2, x_0^3, x_0^1) \geq F(x_1^2, x_1^3, x_0^1). \tag{26}$$

By combining the inequalities above, we conclude that

$$F(x_1^2, x_1^3, x_0^1) \leq F(x_1^2, x_0^3, x_0^1) \leq F(x_0^2, x_0^3, x_0^1) = gx_1^2. \tag{27}$$

Notice that in the third component the inequality is on the contrary

$$gx_0^1 \leq gx_1^1 \implies F(x_1^2, x_1^3, x_0^1) \leq F(x_1^2, x_1^3, x_1^1) = gx_2^2. \tag{28}$$

Then, we find that

$$F(x_1^2, x_1^3, x_0^1) \leq gx_1^2, \quad F(x_1^2, x_1^3, x_0^1) \leq gx_2^2. \tag{29}$$

Consequently, we cannot get the inequality $gx_1^2 \geq gx_2^2$, since other possibilities yield to another cases in which points are not comparable. \square

By using the same argument above, we also conclude that Corollaries 14 and 15 in [9] are not valid. Similarly, we may prove the following result.

Corollary 17. *Theorem 3.1 in [8] is not valid if n is odd.*

In Theorem 16, we investigate the case in which n is odd. But we must emphasize that, when n is even, the main results of Dalal et al. [8] are also very weak. To prove it, we show the following example inspired by [23].

Example 18. Let $X = \mathbb{R}$ be the set of all real numbers provided with its usual order \leq and the Euclidean metric

$d(x, y) = |x - y|$ for all $x, y \in X$. Let $F : X^4 \rightarrow X$ and $g : X \rightarrow X$ be the mappings given by

$$\begin{aligned} F(x, y, z, w) &= \frac{x - 6y + z - w}{11} \quad \forall x, y, z, w \in X; \\ gx &= \frac{10x}{11} \quad \forall x \in X. \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

It is easy to check that the contractivity condition of Theorem 16 is not satisfied. Indeed, consider $x = a, y \leq b, z = c$, and $w = t$. Then, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &d(F(x, y, z, w), F(a, b, c, t)) \\ &= \left| \frac{x - 6y + z - w}{11} - \frac{a - 6b + c - t}{11} \right| = \frac{6|y - b|}{11}, \\ &\frac{d(ga, gx) + d(gy, gb) + d(gz, gc) + d(gw, gt)}{4} \\ &= \frac{10|y - b|}{44}. \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

Thus, it is impossible to find φ (as it was defined in [8]) such that

$$\begin{aligned} &d(F(x, y, z, w), F(a, b, c, d)) \\ &\leq \varphi \left(\frac{d(ga, gx) + d(gy, gb) + d(gz, gc) + d(gw, gd)}{4} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

However, it is clear that $(0, 0, 0, 0)$ is the only common n -tuple fixed point of F and g .

3. Corrected Versions of the Mentioned Theorems

For the sake of completeness and to conclude this paper, in this section, we state a corrected version of Theorem 3.1 in [8], which immediately leads to a corrected version of Theorem 13 in [9]. For this purpose, we recollect here some notations, definitions, and results from the literature (that can also be found in [10, 14–16]).

First at all, instead of Definitions 9 and 11, we recall here the concept of *multidimensional fixed/coincidence point* introduced by Roldán et al. in [13] (see also [14–16]), which is an extension of Berzig and Samet’s notion given in [12].

Throughout this section, fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n \geq 2$ and let $F : X^n \rightarrow X$ and $g : X \rightarrow X$ be two mappings. Fix a nontrivial partition $\{A, B\}$ of $\Lambda_n = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$; that is, A and B are nonempty subsets of Λ_n such that $A \cup B = \Lambda_n$ and $A \cap B = \emptyset$. We will denote

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{A,B} &= \{ \sigma : \Lambda_n \rightarrow \Lambda_n : \sigma(A) \subseteq A, \sigma(B) \subseteq B \}, \\ \Omega'_{A,B} &= \{ \sigma : \Lambda_n \rightarrow \Lambda_n : \sigma(A) \subseteq B, \sigma(B) \subseteq A \}. \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Henceforth, let $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_n : \Lambda_n \rightarrow \Lambda_n$ be n mappings from Λ_n into itself and let Y be the n -tuple $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_n)$.

Definition 19 (Roldán et al. [13, 16]). A point $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in X^n$ is called a *Y-coincidence point of the mappings* $F : X^n \rightarrow X$ and $g : X \rightarrow X$ if

$$F(x_{\sigma_i(1)}, x_{\sigma_i(2)}, \dots, x_{\sigma_i(n)}) = gx_i \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}. \quad (34)$$

If g is the identity mapping on X , then $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in X^n$ is called a *Y-fixed point of the mapping* F .

It is clear that the previous definition extends the notions of coupled, tripled, and quadruple fixed/coincidence points. In fact, if we represent a mapping $\sigma : \Lambda_n \rightarrow \Lambda_n$ throughout its ordered image, that is, $\sigma = (\sigma(1), \sigma(2), \dots, \sigma(n))$, then

- (i) Gnana-Bhaskar and Lakshmikantham’s coupled fixed points occur when $n = 2$, $\sigma_1 = (1, 2)$, and $\sigma_2 = (2, 1)$;
- (ii) Berinde and Borcut’s tripled fixed points are associated with $n = 3$, $\sigma_1 = (1, 2, 3)$, $\sigma_2 = (2, 1, 2)$, and $\sigma_3 = (3, 2, 1)$;
- (iii) Karapınar’s quadruple fixed points are considered when $n = 4$, $\sigma_1 = (1, 2, 3, 4)$, $\sigma_2 = (2, 3, 4, 1)$, $\sigma_3 = (3, 4, 1, 2)$, and $\sigma_4 = (4, 1, 2, 3)$;
- (iv) Berzig and Samet’s multidimensional fixed points are given when $A = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and $B = \{m + 1, m + 2, \dots, n\}$.

For more details see [13].

A partial order \leq on X can be extended to a partial order \sqsubseteq on X^n in the following way. If (X, \leq) is a partially ordered space, $x, y \in X$ and $i \in \Lambda_n$, we will use the following notation:

$$x \leq_i y \iff \begin{cases} x \leq y, & \text{if } i \in A, \\ x \geq y, & \text{if } i \in B. \end{cases} \quad (35)$$

Consider on the product space X^n the following partial order: for $X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n), Y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) \in X^n$,

$$X \sqsubseteq Y \iff x_i \leq_i y_i, \quad \forall i. \quad (36)$$

We say that two points X and Y are *comparable* if $X \sqsubseteq Y$ or $X \supseteq Y$.

Using this partial order, the mixed g -monotone property is as follows.

Definition 20 (see [13]). Let (X, \leq) be a partially ordered space. We say that F has the *mixed (g, \leq) -monotone property (with respect to $\{A, B\}$)* if F is g -monotone nondecreasing in arguments of A and g -monotone nonincreasing in arguments of B ; that is, for all $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, y, z \in X$ and all i ,

$$gy \leq gz \implies \begin{cases} F(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, y, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n) \\ \leq F(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, z, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n), & \text{if } i \in A, \\ F(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, y, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n) \\ \geq F(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, z, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n), & \text{if } i \in B. \end{cases} \quad (37)$$

Remark 21 (see [10]). In order to ensure the existence of Y -coincidence/fixed points, it is very important to assume

that the mixed g -monotone property is compatible with the permutation of the variables; that is, the mappings of $Y = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_n)$ should verify

$$\sigma_i \in \Omega_{A,B} \quad \text{if } i \in A, \quad \sigma_i \in \Omega'_{A,B} \quad \text{if } i \in B. \quad (38)$$

Remark 22 (see [10]). Notice that, in fact, when n is even, Definitions 11 and 12 can be seen as particular cases of the previous definitions when A is the set of all odd numbers and B is the family of all even numbers in $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and the mappings $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_n$ are appropriate permutations of the variables.

The following definitions are usual in the field of fixed point theory.

Definition 23. An *ordered metric space* (X, d, \leq) is a metric space (X, d) provided with a partial order \leq .

Definition 24 (see [2]). An ordered metric space (X, d, \leq) is said to be *nondecreasing-regular* (resp., *nonincreasing-regular*) if we have that $x_m \leq x$ (resp., $x_m \geq x$) for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ when $\{x_m\} \subseteq X$ is any sequence verifying $\{x_m\} \rightarrow x$ and $x_m \leq x_{m+1}$ (resp., $x_m \geq x_{m+1}$) for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. And (X, d, \leq) is said to be *regular* if it is both nondecreasing-regular and nonincreasing-regular.

Definition 25. Let (X, \leq) be a partially ordered set and let $T, g : X \rightarrow X$ be two mappings. We will say that T is *monotone (g, \leq) -nondecreasing* if $Tx \leq Ty$ for all $x, y \in X$ such that $gx \leq gy$.

Remark 26. If T is (g, \leq) -nondecreasing and $gx = gy$, then $Tx = Ty$. It follows from

$$\begin{aligned} gx = gy &\implies \begin{cases} gx \leq gy \\ gy \leq gx \end{cases} \\ &\implies \begin{cases} Tx \leq Ty \\ Ty \leq Tx \end{cases} \implies Tx = Ty. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Lemma 27 (see [16]). Let (X, d) be a metric space and define $\Delta_n : X^n \times X^n \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, for all $A = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n), B = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n) \in X^n$, by

$$\Delta_n(A, B) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d(a_i, b_i). \quad (40)$$

Then Δ_n is metric on X^n . And d is complete if, and only if, Δ_n is complete.

Lemma 28 (see [16]). Let (X, d, \leq) be an ordered metric space and let $F : X^n \rightarrow X$ and $g : X \rightarrow X$ be two mappings. Let $Y = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_n)$ be an n -tuple of mappings from $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ into itself verifying $\sigma_i \in \Omega_{A,B}$ if $i \in A$ and

$\sigma_i \in \Omega'_{A,B}$ if $i \in B$. Define $F_Y, G : X^n \rightarrow X^n$, for all $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \in X$, by

$$F_Y(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \left(F(x_{\sigma_1(1)}, x_{\sigma_1(2)}, \dots, x_{\sigma_1(n)}), \right. \\ \left. F(x_{\sigma_2(1)}, x_{\sigma_2(2)}, \dots, x_{\sigma_2(n)}), \dots, \right. \\ \left. F(x_{\sigma_n(1)}, x_{\sigma_n(2)}, \dots, x_{\sigma_n(n)}) \right); \quad (41)$$

$$G(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = (gx_1, gx_2, \dots, gx_n).$$

- (1) If F has the mixed (g, \leq) -monotone property, then F_Y is monotone (G, \sqsubseteq) -nondecreasing.
- (2) If F is Δ_n -continuous, then F_Y is also Δ_n -continuous.
- (3) If g is d -continuous, then G is Δ_n -continuous.
- (4) A point $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in X^n$ is a Y -fixed point of F if, and only if, (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) is a fixed point of F_Y .
- (5) A point $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in X^n$ is a Y -coincidence point of F and g if, and only if, (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) is a coincidence point of F_Y and G .
- (6) If (X, d, \leq) is regular, then $(X^n, \Delta^n, \sqsubseteq)$ is also regular.

The commutativity and compatibility of the mappings are defined as follows.

Definition 29. We will say that two mappings $T, g : X \rightarrow X$ are commuting if $gTx = Tgx$ for all $x \in X$. We will say that $F : X^n \rightarrow X^n$ and $g : X \rightarrow X$ are commuting if $gF(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = F(gx_1, gx_2, \dots, gx_n)$ for all $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$.

The following notion was introduced in order to avoid the necessity of commutativity.

Definition 30 (see [24–26]). Let (X, d, \leq) be an ordered metric space. Two mappings $T, g : X \rightarrow X$ are said to be O -compatible if

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} d(gTx_m, Tgx_m) = 0 \quad (42)$$

provided that $\{x_m\}$ is a sequence in X such that $\{gx_m\}$ is \leq -monotone and

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} Tx_m = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} gx_m \in X. \quad (43)$$

The natural extension to an arbitrary number of variables is the following one.

Definition 31. Let (X, d, \leq) be an ordered metric space and let $F : X^n \rightarrow X^n$ and $g : X \rightarrow X$ be two mappings. Let $Y = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_n)$ be an n -tuple of mappings from $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ into itself verifying $\sigma_i \in \Omega_{A,B}$ if $i \in A$ and $\sigma_i \in \Omega'_{A,B}$ if $i \in B$. We will say that (F, g) is a (O, Y) -compatible pair if

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} d(gF(x_m^{\sigma_1(1)}, x_m^{\sigma_1(2)}, x_m^{\sigma_1(3)}, \dots, x_m^{\sigma_1(n)}), \\ F(gx_m^{\sigma_1(1)}, gx_m^{\sigma_1(2)}, gx_m^{\sigma_1(3)}, \dots, gx_m^{\sigma_1(n)})) = 0 \quad (44)$$

$\forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$

whenever $\{x_m^1\}, \{x_m^2\}, \dots, \{x_m^n\}$ are sequences in X such that $\{gx_m^1\}, \{gx_m^2\}, \dots, \{gx_m^n\}$ are \leq -monotone and

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} F(x_m^{\sigma_1(1)}, x_m^{\sigma_1(2)}, x_m^{\sigma_1(3)}, \dots, x_m^{\sigma_1(n)}) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} gx_m^i \in X \\ \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}. \quad (45)$$

Notice that the previous definition is different from Definition 14 because we impose that the sequences $\{gx_m^1\}, \{gx_m^2\}, \dots, \{gx_m^n\}$ are \leq -monotone.

Lemma 32. If F and g are (O, Y) -compatible, then F_Y and G are O -compatible.

Inspired by Boyd and Wong's theorem [27], Mukherjea [28] introduced the following kind of control functions:

$$\Psi = \left\{ \varphi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty) : \varphi(t) < t, \right. \\ \left. \lim_{r \rightarrow t^+} \varphi(r) < t \text{ for each } t > 0 \right\}. \quad (46)$$

The following property is well-known.

Lemma 33. Let $\varphi \in \Psi$ and let $\{a_m\} \subset [0, \infty)$ be a sequence. If $a_{m+1} \leq \varphi(a_m)$ and $a_m \neq 0$ for all m , then $\{a_m\} \rightarrow 0$.

Using this kind of control functions, we present the following theorem.

Theorem 34. Let (X, d, \leq) be an ordered metric space and let $T, g : X \rightarrow X$ be two mappings such that the following properties are fulfilled;

- (i) $T(X) \subseteq g(X)$;
- (ii) T is monotone (g, \leq) -nondecreasing;
- (iii) there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $gx_0 \leq Tx_0$;
- (iv) there exists $\varphi \in \Psi$ verifying

$$d(Tx, Ty) \leq \varphi(d(gx, gy)) \quad \forall x, y \in X \\ \text{such that } gx \leq gy. \quad (47)$$

Also assume that, at least, one of the following conditions holds:

- (a) (X, d) is complete, T and g are continuous, and the pair (T, g) is O -compatible;
- (b) (X, d) is complete and T and g are continuous and commuting;
- (c) $(g(X), d)$ is complete and (X, d, \leq) is nondecreasing-regular;
- (d) (X, d) is complete, $g(X)$ is closed, and (X, d, \leq) is nondecreasing-regular;
- (e) (X, d) is complete, g is continuous and monotone \leq -nondecreasing, the pair (T, g) is O -compatible, and (X, d, \leq) is nondecreasing-regular.

Then T and g have, at least, a coincidence point.

Proof. We divide the proof into four steps.

Step 1. We claim that there exists a sequence $\{x_m\} \subseteq X$ such that $\{gx_m\}$ is \leq -nondecreasing and $gx_{m+1} = Tx_m$ for all $m \geq 0$. Starting from $x_0 \in X$ given in (iii) and taking into account that $Tx_0 \in T(X) \subseteq g(X)$, there exists $x_1 \in X$ such that $Tx_0 = gx_1$. Then $gx_0 \leq Tx_0 = gx_1$. Since T is (g, \leq) -nondecreasing, $Tx_0 \leq Tx_1$. Now $Tx_1 \in T(X) \subseteq g(X)$, so there exists $x_2 \in X$ such that $Tx_1 = gx_2$. Then $gx_1 = Tx_1 \leq Tx_2 = gx_2$. Since T is (g, \leq) -nondecreasing, $Tx_1 \leq Tx_2$. Repeating this argument, there exists a sequence $\{x_m\}_{m \geq 0}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \{gx_m\} \text{ is } \leq\text{-nondecreasing,} \\ gx_{m+1} = Tx_m \leq Tx_{m+1} = gx_{m+2} \quad \forall m \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Now, let us define $a_m = d(gx_{m+1}, gx_{m+2})$ for all $m \geq 0$.

Step 2. We claim that $a_{m+1} \leq \phi(a_m)$ for all $m \geq 0$. Since $gx_{m+1} \leq gx_{m+2}$ for all $m \geq 0$, it follows from (iv) that

$$\begin{aligned} a_{m+1} &= d(gx_{m+2}, gx_{m+3}) = d(Tx_{m+1}, Tx_{m+2}) \\ &\leq \phi(d(gx_{m+1}, gx_{m+2})) = \phi(a_m). \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Step 3. We claim that $\{d(gx_m, gx_{m+1})\} \rightarrow 0$. We consider two possibilities.

- (i) Suppose that there is $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a_{m_0} = 0$. Then $d(gx_{m_0+1}, gx_{m_0+2}) = a_{m_0} = 0$. Remark 26 guarantees that $a_{m_0+1} = d(gx_{m_0+2}, gx_{m_0+3}) = d(Tx_{m_0+1}, Tx_{m_0+2}) = 0$. By induction, the same reasoning proves that if there is $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a_{m_0} = 0$, then $a_m = 0$ for all $m \geq m_0$ and, in this case, it is clear that $\{a_m\} \rightarrow 0$.
- (ii) Suppose that $a_m \neq 0$ for all m . In this case, $\{a_m\} \rightarrow 0$ by Lemma 33.

Step 4. We claim that $\{gx_m\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Let us show that $\{gx_m\}$ is Cauchy reasoning by contradiction. Suppose that $\{gx_m\}$ is not Cauchy. Then there exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and partial subsequences $\{gx_{n(k)}\}$ and $\{gx_{m(k)}\}$ verifying $k < n(k) < m(k) < n(k+1)$, $d(gx_{n(k)}, gx_{m(k)}) > \varepsilon_0$, and $d(gx_{n(k)}, gx_{m(k)-1}) \leq \varepsilon_0$ for all $k \geq 1$ ($m(k)$ is the least integer number, greater than $n(k)$, such that $d(gx_{n(k)}, gx_{m(k)}) > \varepsilon_0$). Since $n(k) \leq m(k) - 1 < m(k)$, we have $gx_{n(k)} \leq gx_{m(k)-1} \leq gx_{m(k)}$. By (e),

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_0 &< d(gx_{n(k)}, gx_{m(k)}) \\ &\leq d(gx_{n(k)}, gx_{m(k)-1}) + d(gx_{m(k)-1}, gx_{m(k)}) \\ &\leq \varepsilon_0 + d(gx_{m(k)-1}, gx_{m(k)}), \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

and using Step 3,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d(gx_{n(k)}, gx_{m(k)}) &= \varepsilon_0, \\ \varepsilon_0 &< d(gx_{n(k)}, gx_{m(k)}) \quad \forall k. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Using the contractivity condition (iv),

$$\begin{aligned} d(gx_{n(k)+1}, gx_{m(k)+1}) \\ = d(Tx_{n(k)}, Tx_{m(k)}) &\leq \phi(d(gx_{n(k)}, gx_{m(k)})) \quad \forall k. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} d(gx_{n(k)}, gx_{m(k)}) \\ \leq d(gx_{n(k)}, gx_{n(k)+1}) + d(gx_{n(k)+1}, gx_{m(k)}) \\ \leq d(gx_{n(k)}, gx_{n(k)+1}) + d(gx_{n(k)+1}, gx_{m(k)+1}) \\ + d(gx_{m(k)}, gx_{m(k)+1}) \\ \leq d(gx_{n(k)}, gx_{n(k)+1}) + \phi(d(gx_{n(k)}, gx_{m(k)})) \\ + d(gx_{m(k)}, gx_{m(k)+1}). \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Taking limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$ in (53) and using $\phi \in \Psi$, Step 3, and (51), we get the contradiction

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_0 &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d(gx_{n(k)}, gx_{m(k)}) \\ &\leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (d(gx_{n(k)}, gx_{n(k)+1}) + \phi(d(gx_{n(k)}, gx_{m(k)})) \\ &\quad + d(gx_{m(k)}, gx_{m(k)+1})) \\ &= 0 + \lim_{t \rightarrow \varepsilon_0^+} \phi(t) + 0 < \varepsilon_0. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

This contradiction proves that, in any case, $\{gx_m\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Now, we prove that T and g have a coincidence point distinguishing between cases (a)–(e).

Case (a). (X, d) is complete, T and g are continuous, and the pair (T, g) is O -compatible. As (X, d) is complete, there exists $z \in X$ such that $\{gx_m\} \rightarrow z$. Since $Tx_m = gx_{m+1}$ for all m , we also have that $\{Tx_m\} \rightarrow z$. As T and g are continuous, then $\{Tgx_m\} \rightarrow Tz$ and $\{ggx_m\} \rightarrow gz$. Taking into account that the pair (T, g) is O -compatible, we deduce that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} d(gTx_m, Tgx_m) = 0$. In such a case, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} d(gz, Tz) &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} d(ggx_{m+1}, Tgx_m) = 0 \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} d(gTx_m, Tgx_m) = 0; \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

that is, z is a coincidence point of T and g .

Case (b). (X, d) is complete and T and g are continuous and commuting. It is obvious because (b) implies (a).

Case (c). $(g(X), d)$ is complete and (X, d, \leq) is nondecreasing-regular. As $\{gx_m\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in the complete space $(g(X), d)$, there is $y \in g(X)$ such that $\{gx_m\} \rightarrow y$. Let $z \in X$ be any point such that $y = gz$. In this case, $\{gx_m\} \rightarrow gz$. We are also going to show that $\{gx_m\} \rightarrow Tz$, so we will conclude that $gz = Tz$ (and z is a coincidence point of T and g).

Indeed, as (X, d, \leq) is regular and $\{gx_m\}$ is \leq -nondecreasing and converging to gz , we deduce that $gx_m \leq gz$ for all $m \geq 0$. Applying the contractivity condition (iv),

$$d(gx_{m+1}, Tz) = d(Tx_m, Tz) \leq \phi(d(gx_m, gz)) \quad (56)$$

$$\forall m \geq 0.$$

We are going to show that

$$d(gx_{m+1}, Tz) \leq d(gx_m, gz) \quad \forall m \geq 1. \quad (57)$$

- (i) If $d(gx_m, gz) \neq 0$, then $d(gx_{m+1}, Tz) \leq \phi(d(gx_m, gz)) < d(gx_m, gz)$ because $\phi \in \Psi$.
- (ii) Suppose that there is some $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(gx_{m_0}, gz) = 0$. Remark 26 guarantees that $d(Tx_{m_0}, Tz) = 0$. This proves that if there is some $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(gx_{m_0}, gz) = 0$, then $d(Tx_{m_0}, Tz) = 0$, so (57) also holds.

In any case, (57) holds and this implies that $\{gx_m\}$ converges to Tz . This completes this case.

Case (d). (X, d) is complete, $g(X)$ is closed, and (X, d, \leq) is nondecreasing-regular. It follows from the fact that a closed subset of a complete metric space is also complete. Then, $(g(X), d)$ is complete and *Case (c)* is applicable.

Case (e). (X, d) is complete, g is continuous and monotone \leq -nondecreasing, the pair (T, g) is O -compatible, and (X, d, \leq) is nondecreasing-regular. As (X, d) is complete, there exists $z \in X$ such that $\{gx_m\} \rightarrow z$. As $Tx_m = gx_{m+1}$ for all m , we also have that $\{Tx_m\} \rightarrow z$. As g is continuous, $\{ggx_m\} \rightarrow gz$. Furthermore, as the pair (T, g) is O -compatible, then

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} d(ggx_{m+1}, Tgx_m) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} d(gTx_m, Tgx_m) = 0. \quad (58)$$

As $\{ggx_m\} \rightarrow gz$, the previous property means that $\{Tgx_m\} \rightarrow gz$. We are going to show that $\{Tgx_m\} \rightarrow Tz$ and this finishes the proof.

Indeed, since $\{gx_m\}$ is \leq -nondecreasing, converges to z , and (X, d, \leq) is nondecreasing-regular, we have that $gx_m \leq z$ for all $m \geq 0$. Moreover, as g is monotone \leq -nondecreasing, we deduce that $ggx_m \leq gz$ for all $m \geq 0$. Applying the contractivity condition (iv),

$$d(Tgx_m, Tz) \leq \phi(d(ggx_m, gz)) \quad \forall m \geq 0. \quad (59)$$

We claim that

$$d(Tgx_m, Tz) \leq d(ggx_m, gz) \quad \forall m \geq 1. \quad (60)$$

- (i) If $d(ggx_m, gz) \neq 0$, then $d(Tgx_m, Tz) \leq \phi(d(ggx_m, gz)) < d(ggx_m, gz)$ because $\phi \in \Psi$.
- (ii) Suppose that there is some $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(ggx_{m_0}, gz) = 0$. Remark 26 guarantees that $d(Tgx_{m_0}, Tz) = 0$. This proves that if there is some $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(ggx_{m_0}, gz) = 0$, then $d(Tgx_{m_0}, Tz) = 0$, so (60) also holds.

In any case, (60) holds and this implies that $\{Tgx_m\}$ converges to Tz . This completes the proof. \square

Inspired by Berinde's approach [23], we deduce the following result which removes the weakness of Theorem 3.1 in [8].

Corollary 35. *Let (X, d, \leq) be an ordered metric space, let $F : X^n \rightarrow X$ and $g : X \rightarrow X$ be two mappings, and let $Y = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_n)$ be an n -tuple of mappings from $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ into itself verifying $\sigma_i \in \Omega_{A,B}$ if $i \in A$ and $\sigma_i \in \Omega'_{A,B}$ if $i \in B$. Suppose that the following properties are fulfilled:*

- (i) $F(X^n) \subseteq g(X)$;
- (ii) F has the mixed g -monotone property;
- (iii) there exists $x_0^1, x_0^2, \dots, x_0^n \in X$ such that $gx_0 \leq_i F(x_0^{\sigma_i(1)}, x_0^{\sigma_i(2)}, \dots, x_0^{\sigma_i(n)})$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$;
- (iv) there exists $\phi \in \Psi$ verifying

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d(F(x_{\sigma_i(1)}, x_{\sigma_i(2)}, \dots, x_{\sigma_i(n)}), F(y_{\sigma_i(1)}, y_{\sigma_i(2)}, \dots, y_{\sigma_i(n)})) \leq \phi\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d(gx_i, gy_i)\right) \quad (61)$$

for all $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n \in X$ such that $gx_i \leq_i gy_i$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

Also assume that at least one of the following conditions holds;

- (a) (X, d) is complete, F and g are continuous, and the pair (F, g) is (O, Y) -compatible;
- (b) (X, d) is complete and F and g are continuous and commuting;
- (c) $(g(X), d)$ is complete and (X, d, \leq) is regular;
- (d) (X, d) is complete, $g(X)$ is closed, and (X, d, \leq) is regular;
- (e) (X, d) is complete, g is continuous and monotone \leq -nondecreasing, the pair (F, g) is (O, Y) -compatible, and (X, d, \leq) is regular.

Then F and g have, at least, a Y -coincidence point.

Proof. Notice that the contractivity condition (61) means that

$$\Delta_n(F_Y X, F_Y Y) \leq \phi(\Delta_n(X, Y)) \quad (62)$$

for all $X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n), Y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) \in X^n$ such that $G_X \sqsubseteq G_Y$. Therefore, it is only necessary to apply Theorem 34 to the mappings $F_Y, G : X^n \rightarrow X^n$ defined in Lemma 28. \square

We now reconsider Example 18.

Example 36. Let $X = \mathbb{R}$ be the set of all real numbers provided with its usual order \leq and the Euclidean metric $d(x, y) = |x - y|$ for all $x, y \in X$. Let $F : X^4 \rightarrow X$ and $g : X \rightarrow X$ be given by

$$F(x, y, z, w) = \frac{x - 6y + z - w}{11} \quad \forall x, y, z, w \in X; \tag{63}$$

$$gx = \frac{10x}{11} \quad \forall x \in X.$$

It is easy to check that the contractivity condition of Corollary 35 is satisfied successfully. Indeed, we have that

$$= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^4 d(F(x_{\sigma_i(1)}, x_{\sigma_i(2)}, x_{\sigma_i(3)}, x_{\sigma_i(4)}), F(y_{\sigma_i(1)}, y_{\sigma_i(2)}, y_{\sigma_i(3)}, y_{\sigma_i(4)}))$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{4} \left[\frac{9}{11} |x - a| + \frac{9}{11} |y - b| + \frac{9}{11} |z - c| + \frac{9}{11} |w - d| \right] \tag{64}$$

$$= \frac{9}{44} (|x - a| + |y - b| + |z - c| + |w - d|),$$

$$\frac{d(ga, gx) + d(gy, gb) + d(gz, gc) + d(gw, gt)}{4}$$

$$= \frac{10}{44} (|x - a| + |y - b| + |z - c| + |w - d|).$$

Thus, it is sufficient to take $\varphi(t) = 19/20$ (as it was defined in [8]) such that the contractive condition in Corollary 35 is satisfied.

Notice that $(0, 0, 0, 0)$ is the only common n -tuple fixed point of F and g and

$$\frac{d(a, x) + d(y, b) + d(z, c) + d(w, t)}{4} = \frac{|y - b|}{4}. \tag{65}$$

Thus, it is impossible to find φ (as it was defined in [8]) such that

$$d(F(x, y, z, w), F(a, b, c, d)) \leq \varphi \left(\frac{d(a, x) + d(y, b) + d(z, c) + d(w, d)}{4} \right). \tag{66}$$

However, it is clear that $(0, 0, 0, 0)$ is the only common n -tuple fixed point of F and g .

4. Consequences

In this section, we can list some of the consequences of our main result (Theorem 34).

Corollary 37 (Ran and Reurings [29]). *Let (X, \leq) be an ordered set endowed with a metric d and $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a given mapping. Suppose that the following conditions hold:*

- (a) (X, d) is complete,
- (b) T is nondecreasing (with respect to \leq),
- (c) T is continuous,
- (d) there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $x_0 \leq Tx_0$,
- (e) there exists a constant $k \in (0, 1)$ such that $d(Tx, Ty) \leq kd(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in X$ with $x \geq y$.

Then T has a fixed point. Moreover, if for all $(x, y) \in X^2$ there exists $z \in X$ such that $x \leq z$ and $y \leq z$, one obtains uniqueness of the fixed point.

Nieto and Rodríguez-López [30] slightly modified the hypothesis of the previous result obtaining the following theorem.

Corollary 38 (Nieto and Rodríguez-López [30]). *Let (X, \leq) be an ordered set endowed with a metric d and $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a given mapping. Suppose that the following conditions hold:*

- (a) (X, d) is complete,
- (b) T is nondecreasing (with respect to \leq),
- (c) if a nondecreasing sequence $\{x_m\}$ in X converges to some point $x \in X$, then $x_m \leq x$ for all m ,
- (d) there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $x_0 \leq Tx_0$,
- (e) there exists a constant $k \in (0, 1)$ such that $d(Tx, Ty) \leq kd(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in X$ with $x \geq y$.

Then T has a fixed point. Moreover, if for all $(x, y) \in X^2$ there exists $z \in X$ such that $x \leq z$ and $y \leq z$, one obtains uniqueness of the fixed point.

Corollary 39 (Bhaskar and Lakshmikantham [2]). *Let (X, \leq) be a partially ordered set endowed with a metric d . Let $F : X \times X \rightarrow X$ be a given mapping. Suppose that the following conditions hold:*

- (i) (X, d) is complete;
- (ii) F has the mixed monotone property;
- (iii) F is continuous or X has the following properties:

- (X_1) if a nondecreasing sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X converges to some point $x \in X$, then $x_n \leq x$ for all n ,
- (X_2) if a decreasing sequence $\{y_n\}$ in X converges to some point $y \in X$, then $y_n \geq y$ for all n ;

- (iv) there exists $x_0, y_0 \in X$ such that $x_0 \leq F(x_0, y_0)$ and $y_0 \geq F(y_0, x_0)$;
- (v) there exists a constant $k \in (0, 1)$ such that for all $(x, y), (u, v) \in X \times X$ with $x \geq u$ and $y \leq v$,

$$d(F(x, y), F(u, v)) \leq \frac{k}{2} [d(x, u) + d(y, v)]. \tag{67}$$

Then F has a coupled fixed point $(x^*, y^*) \in X \times X$. Moreover, if for all $(x, y), (u, v) \in X \times X$ there exists $(z_1, z_2) \in X \times X$ such that $(x, y) \leq_2 (z_1, z_2)$ and $(u, v) \leq_2 (z_1, z_2)$, one has uniqueness of the coupled fixed point and $x^* = y^*$.

In [31] a version of the following result using a mapping g can be found.

Corollary 40 (Berinde and Borcut [32]). *Let (X, \preceq) be a partially ordered set and suppose there is a metric d on X such that (X, d) is a complete metric space. Let $F : X \times X \times X \rightarrow X$ be a mapping having the mixed g -monotone property. Assume that there exist constants $j, k, \ell \in [0, 1)$ with $j + k + \ell < 1$ such that*

$$d(F(x, y, z), F(u, v, w)) \leq jd(x, u) + kd(y, v) + \ell d(z, w) \tag{68}$$

for all $x, y, z, u, v, w \in X$ with $x \preceq u, y \succeq v, z \preceq w$. Suppose either F is continuous or (X, d, \preceq) has the following properties:

- (a) if a nondecreasing sequence $\{x_m\} \rightarrow x$, then $x_m \preceq x$ for all m ;
- (b) if a nondecreasing sequence $\{y_m\} \rightarrow y$, then $y_m \preceq y$ for all m .

If there exists $x_0, y_0, z_0 \in X$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} x_0 &\preceq F(x_0, y_0, z_0), & y_0 &\succeq F(y_0, x_0, y_0), \\ z_0 &\preceq F(z_0, y_0, x_0), \end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

then there exists $x, y, z \in X$ such that

$$x = F(x, y, z), \quad y = F(y, x, y), \quad z = F(z, y, x). \tag{70}$$

A quadruple version was obtained by Karapınar and Luong in [33].

Corollary 41 (Karapınar and Luong [33]). *Let (X, \preceq) be a partially ordered set and (X, d) be a complete metric space. Let $F : X \times X \times X \times X \rightarrow X$ be a mapping having the mixed monotone property. Assume that there exist constants $k \in [0, 1)$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} d(F(x, y, z, w), F(u, v, r, t)) \\ \leq \frac{k}{4} [d(x, u) + d(y, v) + d(z, r) + d(w, t)] \end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

for all $x, y, z, u, v, w \in X$ with $x \succeq u, y \preceq v, z \succeq r$ and $w \preceq t$. Suppose that there exists $x_0, y_0, z_0, w_0 \in X$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} x_0 &\preceq F(x_0, y_0, z_0, w_0), & y_0 &\succeq F(y_0, z_0, w_0, x_0), \\ z_0 &\preceq F(z_0, w_0, x_0, y_0), & w_0 &\succeq F(w_0, x_0, y_0, z_0). \end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

Suppose that either F is continuous or (X, d, \preceq) has the following properties:

- (a) if a nondecreasing sequence $\{x_m\} \rightarrow x$, then $x_m \preceq x$ for all m ;
- (b) if a nondecreasing sequence $\{y_m\} \rightarrow y$, then $y_m \preceq y$ for all m .

Then there exists $x, y, z, w \in X$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} F(x, y, z, w) &= x, & F(y, z, w, x) &= y, \\ F(z, w, x, y) &= z, & F(w, x, y, z) &= w. \end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

Later, Berzig and Samet extended the previous result to the multidimensional case in the following way.

Corollary 42 (Berzig and Samet [34]). *Let (X, \preceq) be a partially ordered set and suppose there is a metric d on X such that (X, d) is a complete metric space. For N, m positive integers, $N \geq 2, 1 \leq m < N$, let $F : X^N \rightarrow X$ be a continuous mapping having the m -mixed monotone property. Assume that there exist the constants $\delta_i \in [0, 1)$ with $\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_i < 1$ for which*

$$d(F(U), F(V)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_i d(x_i, y_i) \tag{74}$$

for all $U = (x_1, \dots, x_N), V = (y_1, \dots, y_N) \in X^N$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &\preceq y_1, \dots, x_m &\preceq y_m, \\ x_{m+1} &\succeq y_{m+1}, \dots, x_N &\succeq y_N. \end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

If there exists $U^{(0)} = (x_1^{(0)}, \dots, x_N^{(0)}) \in X^N$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} x_1^{(0)} &\preceq F(x^{(0)}[\varphi_1(1:m)], x^{(0)}[\psi_1(m+1:N)]), \\ &\vdots \\ x_m^{(0)} &\preceq F(x^{(0)}[\varphi_m(1:m)], x^{(0)}[\psi_m(m+1:N)]), \\ x_{m+1}^{(0)} &\succeq F(x^{(0)}[\varphi_{m+1}(1:m)], x^{(0)}[\psi_{m+1}(m+1:N)]), \\ &\vdots \\ x_N^{(0)} &\succeq F(x^{(0)}[\varphi_N(1:m)], x^{(0)}[\psi_N(m+1:N)]), \end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

where $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m : \{1, \dots, m\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, m\}, \psi_1, \dots, \psi_m : \{m+1, \dots, N\} \rightarrow \{m+1, \dots, N\}, \varphi_{m+1}, \dots, \varphi_N : \{1, \dots, m\} \rightarrow \{m+1, \dots, N\}$, and $\psi_{m+1}, \dots, \psi_N : \{m+1, \dots, N\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, m\}$, then there exists $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) \in X^N$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= F(x[\varphi_1(1:m)], x[\psi_1(m+1:N)]), \\ &\vdots \\ x_m &= F(x[\varphi_m(1:m)], x[\psi_m(m+1:N)]), \\ x_{m+1} &= F(x[\varphi_{m+1}(1:m)], x[\psi_{m+1}(m+1:N)]), \\ &\vdots \\ x_N &= F(x[\varphi_N(1:m)], x[\psi_N(m+1:N)]). \end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

Corollary 43 (Choudhury and Kundu [24], Theorem 3.1). *Let (X, \preceq) be a partially ordered set and let there be a metric*

d on X such that (X, d) is a complete metric space. Let $\varphi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be such that $\varphi(t) < t$ and $\lim_{r \rightarrow t^+} \varphi(r) < t$ for each $t > 0$. Let $F : X^n \rightarrow X$ and $g : X \rightarrow X$ be two mappings such that F has the mixed g -monotone property and satisfies

$$d(F(x, y), F(u, v)) \leq \varphi \left(\frac{d(gx, gu) + d(gy, gv)}{2} \right) \quad (78)$$

for all $x, y, u, v \in X$, with $gx \leq gu$ and $gy \geq gv$. Let $F(X \times X) \subseteq g(X)$, g be continuous and monotone increasing and F and g be compatible mappings. Also suppose

- (a) F is continuous, or
- (b) X has the following properties:
 - (b.1) if a nondecreasing sequence $\{x_n\} \rightarrow x$, then $x_n \leq x$ for all $n \geq 0$;
 - (b.2) if a nonincreasing sequence $\{y_n\} \rightarrow y$, then $y_n \geq y$ for all $n \geq 0$.

If there exists $x_0, y_0 \in X$ such that

$$gx_0 \leq F(x_0, y_0), \quad gy_0 \geq F(y_0, x_0), \quad (79)$$

then there exists $x, y \in X$ such that

$$gx = F(x, y), \quad gy = F(y, x); \quad (80)$$

that is, F and g have a coincidence point.

In the multidimensional case, we have the following result.

Corollary 44 (Wang [35], Theorem 3.4). *Let (X, \leq) be a partially ordered set and suppose there is a metric d on X such that (X, d) is a complete metric space. Let $G : X^n \rightarrow X^n$ and $T : X^n \rightarrow X^n$ be a G -isotone mapping for which there exists $\phi \in \Psi$ such that for all $Y \in X^n$, $V \in X^n$ with $G(Y) \sqsupseteq G(V)$,*

$$\rho_n(T(Y), T(V)) \leq \phi(\rho_n(G(Y), G(V))), \quad (81)$$

where ρ_n is defined for all $Y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)$, $V = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n) \in X^n$ by

$$\rho_n(Y, V) = \frac{1}{n} [d(y_1, v_1) + d(y_2, v_2) + \dots + d(y_n, v_n)]. \quad (82)$$

Suppose $T(X^n) \subseteq G(X^n)$ and also suppose either

- (a) T is continuous, G is continuous and commutes with T , or
- (b) (X, d, \leq) is regular and $G(X^n)$ is closed.

If there exists $Y_0 \in X^n$ such that $G(Y_0)$ and $T(Y_0)$ are \sqsubseteq -comparable, then T and G have a coincidence point.

We, finally, note that most of multidimensional fixed point theorems can be reduced to one-dimensional fixed point results. This observation and hence the initial results

in this direction were given in [16, 36]. In particular, in [36], the authors proved that the first coupled fixed point result (Theorem 2.1 in [2]) is a consequence of Theorem 2.1 in [37]. On the other hand, in [16], the authors proved that the initial multidimensional fixed point result (Theorem 9 in [13]) can be derived from Theorem 2.1 in [37] either.

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interests regarding the publication of this paper.

Authors' Contribution

All authors contributed equally and significantly in writing this paper. All authors read and approved the final paper.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by Deanship of Scientific Research (DSR), King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. Antonio-Francisco Roldán López-de-Hierro has been partially supported by Junta de Andalucía by Project FQM-268 of the Andalusian CICYE. The authors thank the anonymous referees for their remarkable comments, suggestions, and ideas that helped improve this paper.

References

- [1] D. Guo and V. Lakshmikantham, "Coupled fixed points of nonlinear operators with applications," *Nonlinear Analysis*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 623–632, 1987.
- [2] T. G. Bhaskar and V. Lakshmikantham, "Fixed point theorems in partially ordered metric spaces and applications," *Nonlinear Analysis, Theory, Methods and Applications*, vol. 65, no. 7, pp. 1379–1393, 2006.
- [3] V. Lakshmikantham and L. Ćirić, "Coupled fixed point theorems for nonlinear contractions in partially ordered metric spaces," *Nonlinear Analysis, Theory, Methods and Applications*, vol. 70, no. 12, pp. 4341–4349, 2009.
- [4] V. Berinde and M. Borcut, "Tripled fixed point theorems for contractive type mappings in partially ordered metric spaces," *Nonlinear Analysis, Theory, Methods and Applications*, vol. 74, no. 15, pp. 4889–4897, 2011.
- [5] E. Karapınar, "Quartet fixed point for nonlinear contraction," <http://arxiv.org/abs/1106.5472>.
- [6] E. Karapınar and N. V. Luong, "Quadruple fixed point theorems for nonlinear contractions," *Computers and Mathematics with Applications*, vol. 64, no. 6, pp. 1839–1848, 2012.
- [7] E. Karapınar, "Quadruple fixed point theorems for weak ϕ -contractions," *ISRN Mathematical Analysis*, vol. 2011, Article ID 989423, 15 pages, 2011.
- [8] S. Dalal, M. A. Khan, and S. Chauhan, " n -tupled coincidence point theorems in partially ordered metric spaces for compatible mappings," *Abstract and Applied Analysis*, vol. 2014, Article ID 614019, 8 pages, 2014.
- [9] M. Imdad, A. H. Soliman, B. S. Choudhury, and P. Das, "On n -tupled coincidence point results in metric spaces," *Journal of Operators*, vol. 2013, Article ID 532867, 8 pages, 2013.

- [10] E. Karapınar and A. Roldán, "A note on ' N -fixed point theorems for nonlinear contractions in partially ordered metric spaces," *Fixed Point Theory and Applications*, vol. 2013, p. 310, 2013.
- [11] M. E. Gordji, Y. J. Cho, S. Ghods, M. Ghods, and M. H. Dehkordi, "Coupled fixed-point theorems for contractions in partially ordered metric spaces and applications," *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*, vol. 2012, Article ID 150363, 20 pages, 2012.
- [12] M. Berzig and B. Samet, "An extension of coupled fixed point's concept in higher dimension and applications," *Computers and Mathematics with Applications*, vol. 63, no. 8, pp. 1319–1334, 2012.
- [13] A. Roldán, J. Martínez-Moreno, and C. Roldán, "Multidimensional fixed point theorems in partially ordered complete metric spaces," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 396, no. 2, pp. 536–545, 2012.
- [14] A. Roldán, J. Martínez-Moreno, C. Roldán, and E. Karapınar, "Multidimensional fixed-point theorems in partially ordered complete partial metric spaces under (ψ, ϕ) -contractivity conditions," *Abstract and Applied Analysis*, vol. 2013, Article ID 634371, 12 pages, 2013.
- [15] E. Karapınar, A. Roldán, J. Martínez-Moreno, and C. Roldán, "Meir-Keeler type multidimensional fixed point theorems in partially ordered metric spaces," *Abstract and Applied Analysis*, vol. 2013, Article ID 406026, 9 pages, 2013.
- [16] A. Roldán, J. Martínez-Moreno, C. Roldán, and E. Karapınar, "Some remarks on multidimensional fixed point theorems," *Fixed Point Theory*. In press.
- [17] H. Aydi, E. Karapınar, and M. Zead, "Some tripled coincidence point theorems for almost generalized contractions in ordered metric spaces," *Tamkang J. Math.*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 233–251, 2013.
- [18] E. Karapınar and V. Berinde, "Quadruple fixed point theorems for nonlinear contractions in partially ordered metric spaces," *Banach Journal of Mathematical Analysis*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 74–89, 2012.
- [19] Z. Mustafa, H. Aydi, and E. Karapınar, "On common fixed points in G -metric spaces using (E.A) property," *Computers and Mathematics with Applications*, 2012.
- [20] M. Ertürk and V. Karakaya, " n -tuple fixed point theorems for contractive type mappings in partially ordered metric spaces," *Journal of Inequalities and Applications*, vol. 2013, p. 196, 2013.
- [21] M. Ertürk and V. Karakaya, "Correction: ' n -tuple fixed point theorems for contractive type mappings in partially ordered metric spaces," *Journal of Inequalities and Applications*, vol. 2013, p. 368, 2013.
- [22] E. Karapınar and A. Roldán, "A note on ' n -tuple fixed point theorems for contractive type mappings in partially ordered metric spaces," *Journal of Inequalities and Applications*, vol. 2013, p. 567, 2013.
- [23] V. Berinde, "Coupled fixed point theorems for φ -contractive mixed monotone mappings in partially ordered metric spaces," *Nonlinear Analysis, Theory, Methods and Applications*, vol. 75, no. 6, pp. 3218–3228, 2012.
- [24] B. S. Choudhury and A. Kundu, "A coupled coincidence point result in partially ordered metric spaces for compatible mappings," *Nonlinear Analysis, Theory, Methods and Applications*, vol. 73, no. 8, pp. 2524–2531, 2010.
- [25] N. V. Luong and N. X. Thuan, "Coupled fixed point theorems for mixed monotone mappings and an application to integral equations," *Computers and Mathematics with Applications*, vol. 62, no. 11, pp. 4238–4248, 2011.
- [26] N. M. Hung, E. Karapınar, and N. V. Luong, "Coupled coincidence point theorem for O -compatible mappings via implicit relation," *Abstract and Applied Analysis*, vol. 2012, Article ID 796964, 14 pages, 2012.
- [27] D. W. Boyd and J. S. W. Wong, "On nonlinear contractions," *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 20, pp. 458–464, 1969.
- [28] A. Mukherjea, "Contractions and completely continuous mappings," *Nonlinear Analysis*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 235–247, 1977.
- [29] A. C. M. Ran and M. C. B. Reurings, "A fixed point theorem in partially ordered sets and some applications to matrix equations," *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 132, no. 5, pp. 1435–1443, 2004.
- [30] J. J. Nieto and R. Rodríguez-López, "Contractive mapping theorems in partially ordered sets and applications to ordinary differential equations," *Order*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 223–239, 2005.
- [31] M. Borcut and V. Berinde, "Tripled coincidence theorems for contractive type mappings in partially ordered metric spaces," *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, vol. 218, no. 10, pp. 5929–5936, 2012.
- [32] V. Berinde and M. Borcut, "Tripled fixed point theorems for contractive type mappings in partially ordered metric spaces," *Nonlinear Analysis, Theory, Methods and Applications*, vol. 74, no. 15, pp. 4889–4897, 2011.
- [33] E. Karapınar and N. V. Luong, "Quadruple fixed point theorems for nonlinear contractions," *Computers and Mathematics with Applications*, vol. 64, no. 6, pp. 1839–1848, 2012.
- [34] M. Berzig and B. Samet, "An extension of coupled fixed point's concept in higher dimension and applications," *Computers and Mathematics with Applications*, vol. 63, no. 8, pp. 1319–1334, 2012.
- [35] S. Wang, "Coincidence point theorems for G -isotone mappings in partially ordered metric spaces," *Fixed Point Theory and Applications*, vol. 2013, p. 96, 2013.
- [36] B. Samet, E. Karapınar, H. Aydi, and V. C. Rajic, "Discussion on some coupled fixed point theorems," *Fixed Point Theory and Applications*, vol. 2013, p. 50, 2013.
- [37] A. C. M. Ran and M. C. B. Reurings, "A fixed point theorem in partially ordered sets and some applications to matrix equations," *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 132, no. 5, pp. 1435–1443, 2004.