

RESEARCH

Open Access



Orthogonal neutrosophic 2-metric spaces

Gopinath Janardhanan¹, Gunaseelan Mani¹, Ozgur Ege², Vidhya Varadharajan³ and Reny George^{4*}

*Correspondence:

renygeorge02@yahoo.com

⁴Department of Mathematics,
College of Science and Humanities
in Al-Kharj, Prince Sattam Bin
Abdulaziz University, Al-Kharj 11942,
Saudi Arabia

Full list of author information is
available at the end of the article

Abstract

In this study, we introduce the notion of an orthogonal neutrosophic 2-metric space and prove the common fixed-point theorem on an orthogonal neutrosophic 2-metric space. From the obtained results, we give an example to support our results.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 47H10; 54H25

Keywords: Fuzzy 2-metric spaces; Neutrosophic 2-metric space; Orthogonal neutrosophic 2-metric space; Common fixed point

1 Introduction

Nowadays, a fuzzy concept has become the subject of several research works. Finding the fuzzy equivalents of the classical set theory is one of the advancements made to the basic theory of fuzzy sets provided by Zadeh [1]. Following that, the use of a fuzzy metric space in applied sciences including fixed-point theory, image and signal processing, medical imaging, and decision making occurred. The concept of intuitionistic fuzzy metric spaces was first proposed by Park [2]. The domains of population dynamics [3] computer programming [4], chaos control [5], nonlinear dynamical system [6], and medicine [7] are only a few examples of the scientific and technological fields that have utilized it. Gahler [8] presented a study on a 2-metric space. Schweizer and Sklar [9] explored the statistical metric spaces. The concept of intuitionistic fuzzy sets was presented by Atanassov [10] and Çoker [11] and the concept of intuitionistic fuzzy topological was discussed in [12]. In [13] the authors introduced the concepts of intuitionistic fuzzy 2-normed spaces and in [14] intuitionistic fuzzy 2-metric spaces.

Bera and Mahapatra [15] established the neutrosophic soft linear space. The neutrosophic normed linear space was established by Bera and Mahapatra [16]. The concept of an orthogonal neutrosophic metric space was introduced by Ishtiaq et al. [17] who proved several fixed-point results in the context of an orthogonal neutrosophic metric space. The contraction mapping was used to prove common fixed-point results in the context of a neutrosophic metric space established by Jeyaraman and Sowndharajan [18]. Several fixed-point results in weak and rational $(\alpha - \psi)$ -contractions in an ordered 2-metric space were established by Fathollahi et al. [19]. Many authors like Salama and Alblowi [20] worked on neutrosophic topological spaces and Al-omeri et al. [21] worked on a neutrosophic cone metric space, etc. Mursaleen and Lohani [22] introduced the idea of an intuitionistic 2-normed space and an intuitionistic 2-metric space. Ali Asghar and Aftab Hussain [23]

© The Author(s) 2023. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

established the basic properties of N2MSs and demonstrated some fixed-point findings. Umar Ishtiaq [24] introduced the notion of ONMSs and investigated some fixed-point results. The idea of orthogonality has several applications in mathematics. The notion of orthogonality in a metric space was established by Eshagi Gordji, Ramezani, De la Sen and Cho [25] and also expanded the findings in the setting of a metric space with new orthogonality and proved fixed-point theorems.

The main objectives of this study are as follows:

- (i) To introduce the concept of an orthogonal neutrosophic 2-metric space (ON2MS).
- (ii) To prove common fixed-point results on the orthogonal neutrosophic 2-metric space.
- (iii) To enhance the literature of an intuitionistic fuzzy 2-metric space and a neutrosophic metric space.
- (iv) To prove the uniqueness of the solution of integral equations.

Now, we provide some basic definitions to help to understand the main section.

2 Preliminaries

Here, “con-t-nm” means continuous triangular-norm, “con-t-conm” means continuous-triangular-conorm, “NMS” means neutrosophic metric space, “N2MS” means neutrosophic 2-metric space, “ON2MS” means orthogonal neutrosophic 2-metric space. Some basic definitions are given below:

Definition 2.1 [26] Let $*$: $[0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a con-t-nm on a binary operation, then:

- (I) $*$ is associative and commutative;
- (II) $*$ is continuous;
- (III) $\mu * 1 = \mu$ for all $\mu \in [0, 1]$;
- (IV) $\mu * \alpha \leq \eta * \gamma$, when $\mu \leq \eta$ and $\alpha \leq \gamma$ for all $\mu, \alpha, \eta, \gamma \in [0, 1]$.

Definition 2.2 Let $+$: $[0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a con-t-conm on a binary operation, then it satisfies (I), (II), (IV), and

- (III) $\mu + 0 = \mu$ for all $\mu \in [0, 1]$.

Definition 2.3 Let Φ be the universe. A neutrosophic set (NS) \mathcal{A} in Φ is characterized by a truth membership function $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{A}}$, an indeterminacy membership function $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$, and a falsity membership function $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$, where $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{A}}$, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$, and $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ are real standard elements of $[0, 1]$. This can be written as:

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{ \left\langle v, \left(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{A}}(v), \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}(v), \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}(v) \right) \right\rangle : v \in \Phi, \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{A}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}} \in]^{-}0, 1^{+}[\right\}.$$

There is no restriction on the sum of $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{A}}(v)$, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}(v)$, and $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}(v)$ and so $0^{-} \leq \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{A}}(v) + \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}(v) + \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}(v) \leq 3^{+}$.

Definition 2.4 [27] Let $\Phi \neq \emptyset$. A 6-tuple $(\Phi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, *, +)$, where $*$ is a con-t-nm, $+$ is a con-t-conm, \mathcal{Q} , \mathcal{F} , and \mathcal{G} are neutrosophic sets on $\Phi \times \Phi \times (0, \infty)$. If $(\Phi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, *, +)$, satisfies the conditions below for all $v, \varrho, \wp \in \Phi$, and $\wp, s > 0$:

- (N1) $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \wp) + \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \wp) + \mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \wp) \leq 3$;
- (N2) $0 \leq \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \wp) \leq 1$;

- (N3) $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \wp) = 1$ if and only if $v = \varrho$;
- (N4) $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \wp) = \mathcal{Q}(\varrho, v, \wp)$;
- (N5) $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varsigma, \wp + \mathfrak{s}) \geq \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \wp) * \mathcal{Q}(\varrho, \varsigma, \mathfrak{s})$;
- (N6) $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \cdot): [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is continuous;
- (N7) $\lim_{\wp \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \wp) = 1$;
- (N8) $0 \leq \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \wp) \leq 1$;
- (N9) $\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \wp) = 0$ if and only if $v = \varrho$;
- (N10) $\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \wp) = \mathcal{F}(\varrho, v, \wp)$;
- (N11) $\mathcal{F}(v, \varsigma, \wp + \mathfrak{s}) \leq \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \wp) + \mathcal{F}(\varrho, \varsigma, \mathfrak{s})$;
- (N12) $\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \cdot): [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is continuous;
- (N13) $\lim_{\wp \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \wp) = 0$;
- (N14) $0 \leq \mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \wp) \leq 1$;
- (N15) $\mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \wp) = 0$ if and only if $v = \varrho$;
- (N16) $\mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \wp) = \mathcal{G}(\varrho, v, \wp)$;
- (N17) $\mathcal{G}(v, \varsigma, \wp + \mathfrak{s}) \leq \mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \wp) + \mathcal{G}(\varrho, \varsigma, \mathfrak{s})$;
- (N18) $\mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \cdot): [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is continuous;
- (N19) $\lim_{\wp \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \wp) = 0$;
- (N20) if $\wp \leq 0$, then $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \wp) = 0$, $\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \wp) = 1$, $\mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \wp) = 1$.

Then, $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is a neutrosophic metric and $(\Phi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, *, +)$ is a NMS.

Definition 2.5 [28] The 5-tuple $(\Phi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, *, +)$ is called an intuitionistic fuzzy 2-metric space if Φ is any nonvoid set, $*$ is a con-t-nm, $+$ is a con-t-conm, and \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F} are fuzzy sets on $\Phi \times \Phi \times \Phi \times (0, \infty)$, then it satisfies for all $v, \varrho, \varsigma, \mathfrak{w} \in \Phi$, and $\mathfrak{s}, \wp > 0$:

- (a) $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) + \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) \leq 1$;
- (b) Let v, ϱ of Φ , there exists an element ς of Φ such that $0 \leq \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) \leq 1$;
- (c) $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) = 1$ if at least two of v, ϱ, ς are equal;
- (d) $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) = \mathcal{Q}(v, \varsigma, \varrho, \wp) = \mathcal{Q}(\varrho, \varsigma, v, \wp)$ for all v, ϱ, ς in Φ ;
- (e) $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \mathfrak{w}, \wp) * \mathcal{Q}(v, \mathfrak{w}, \varsigma, \mathfrak{s}) * \mathcal{Q}(\mathfrak{w}, \varrho, \varsigma, \mathfrak{h}) \leq \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp + \mathfrak{s} + \mathfrak{h})$ for all $v, \varrho, \varsigma, \mathfrak{w} \in \Phi$;
- (f) $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \cdot): (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, 1]$ is continuous;
- (g) $\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) < 1$;
- (h) $\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) = 0$ if at least two of v, ϱ, ς are equal;
- (i) $\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) = \mathcal{F}(v, \varsigma, \varrho, \wp) = \mathcal{F}(\varrho, \varsigma, v, \wp)$ for all v, ϱ, ς in Φ ;
- (j) $\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \mathfrak{w}, \wp) + \mathcal{F}(v, \mathfrak{w}, \varsigma, \mathfrak{s}) + \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{w}, \varrho, \varsigma, \mathfrak{h}) \geq \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp + \mathfrak{s} + \mathfrak{h})$;
- (k) $\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \cdot): (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, 1]$ is continuous.

Definition 2.6 The 6-tuple $(\Phi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, *, +)$ is said to be a N2MS if Φ is any nonempty set, $*$ is a con-t-nm, $+$ is a con-t-conm, and $\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}$ are neutrosophic sets on $\Phi \times \Phi \times \Phi \times (0, \infty)$, then it satisfies for all $v, \varrho, \varsigma, \mathfrak{w} \in \Phi$, and $\mathfrak{s}, \wp > 0$:

- (N2MS1) $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) + \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) + \mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) \leq 3$;
- (N2MS2) Let v, ϱ of Φ , there exists an element ς of Φ such that $0 \leq \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) \leq 1$;
- (N2MS3) $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) = 1$ if at least two of v, ϱ, ς are equal;
- (N2MS4) $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) = \mathcal{Q}(v, \varsigma, \varrho, \wp) = \mathcal{Q}(\varrho, \varsigma, v, \wp)$;
- (N2MS5) $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \mathfrak{w}, \wp) * \mathcal{Q}(v, \mathfrak{w}, \varsigma, \mathfrak{s}) * \mathcal{Q}(\mathfrak{w}, \varrho, \varsigma, \mathfrak{h}) \leq \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp + \mathfrak{s} + \mathfrak{h})$;
- (N2MS6) $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \cdot): (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, 1]$ is continuous for all $v, \varrho, \varsigma \in \Phi$ such that $v \perp \varrho \perp \varsigma$;

- (N2MS7) $\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) \leq 1$;
 (N2MS8) $\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) = 0$ if at least two of v, ϱ, ς are equal;
 (N2MS9) $\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) = \mathcal{F}(v, \varsigma, \varrho, \wp) = \mathcal{F}(\varrho, \varsigma, v, \wp)$;
 (N2MS10) $\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \mathfrak{w}, \wp) + \mathcal{F}(v, \mathfrak{w}, \varsigma, \mathfrak{s}) + \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{w}, \varrho, \varsigma, \mathfrak{h}) \geq \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp + \mathfrak{s} + \mathfrak{h})$;
 (N2MS11) $\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \cdot): (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, 1]$ is continuous;
 (N2MS12) $\mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) \leq 1$;
 (N2MS13) $\mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) = 0$ if at least two of v, ϱ, ς are equal;
 (N2MS14) $\mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) = \mathcal{G}(v, \varsigma, \varrho, \wp) = \mathcal{G}(\varrho, \varsigma, v, \wp)$;
 (N2MS15) $\mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \mathfrak{w}, \wp) + \mathcal{G}(v, \mathfrak{w}, \varsigma, \mathfrak{s}) + \mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{w}, \varrho, \varsigma, \mathfrak{h}) \geq \mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp + \mathfrak{s} + \mathfrak{h})$;
 (N2MS16) $\mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \cdot): (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, 1]$ is continuous.

Here, the functions $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp)$, $\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp)$, and $\mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp)$ denotes the degree of nearness, the degree of nonnearness, and the degree of naturalness between v, ϱ , and ς with respect to \wp , respectively.

Now, we define the notion of ON2MS

Definition 2.7 The 6-tuple $(\Phi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, *, +, \perp)$ is said to be a ON2MS if Φ is any nonempty set, $*$ is a con-t-nm, $+$ is a con-t-conm, and $\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}$ are neutrosophic sets on $\Phi \times \Phi \times \Phi \times (0, \infty)$, then it satisfies for all $v, \varrho, \varsigma, \mathfrak{w} \in \Phi$ and $\mathfrak{s}, \wp > 0$;

- (ON2MS1) $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) + \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) + \mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) \leq 3$ for all $v, \varrho, \varsigma \in \Phi$, $\wp > 0$ such that $v \perp \varrho \perp \varsigma$;
 (ON2MS2) Let v, ϱ of Φ , there exists an element ς of Φ such that $0 \leq \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) \leq 1$ such that $v \perp \varrho \perp \varsigma$;
 (ON2MS3) $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) = 1$ if at least two of v, ϱ, ς are equal such that $v \perp \varrho \perp \varsigma$;
 (ON2MS4) $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) = \mathcal{Q}(v, \varsigma, \varrho, \wp) = \mathcal{Q}(\varrho, \varsigma, v, \wp)$ for all v, ϱ, ς in Φ such that $v \perp \varrho \perp \varsigma$;
 (ON2MS5) $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \mathfrak{w}, \wp) * \mathcal{Q}(v, \mathfrak{w}, \varsigma, \mathfrak{s}) * \mathcal{Q}(\mathfrak{w}, \varrho, \varsigma, \mathfrak{h}) \leq \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp + \mathfrak{s} + \mathfrak{h})$ for all $v, \varrho, \varsigma, \mathfrak{w} \in \Phi$ such that $v \perp \varrho \perp \varsigma$;
 (ON2MS6) $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \cdot): (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, 1]$ is continuous for all $v, \varrho, \varsigma \in \Phi$ such that $v \perp \varrho \perp \varsigma$;
 (ON2MS7) $\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) \leq 1$, for all $v, \varrho, \varsigma \in \Phi$ such that $v \perp \varrho \perp \varsigma$;
 (ON2MS8) $\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) = 0$ if at least two of v, ϱ, ς are equal for all $v, \varrho, \varsigma \in \Phi$ such that $v \perp \varrho \perp \varsigma$;
 (ON2MS9) $\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) = \mathcal{F}(v, \varsigma, \varrho, \wp) = \mathcal{F}(\varrho, \varsigma, v, \wp)$ for all $v, \varrho, \varsigma \in \Phi$ such that $v \perp \varrho \perp \varsigma$;
 (ON2MS10) $\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \mathfrak{w}, \wp) + \mathcal{F}(v, \mathfrak{w}, \varsigma, \mathfrak{s}) + \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{w}, \varrho, \varsigma, \mathfrak{h}) \geq \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp + \mathfrak{s} + \mathfrak{h})$, for all $v, \varrho, \varsigma \in \Phi$ such that $v \perp \varrho \perp \varsigma$;
 (ON2MS11) $\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \cdot): (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, 1]$ is continuous for all $v, \varrho, \varsigma \in \Phi$ such that $v \perp \varrho \perp \varsigma$;
 (ON2MS12) $\mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) \leq 1$, for all $v, \varrho, \varsigma \in \Phi$ such that $v \perp \varrho \perp \varsigma$;
 (ON2MS13) $\mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) = 0$ if at least two of v, ϱ, ς are equal for all $v, \varrho, \varsigma \in \Phi$ such that $v \perp \varrho \perp \varsigma$;
 (ON2MS14) $\mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) = \mathcal{G}(v, \varsigma, \varrho, \wp) = \mathcal{G}(\varrho, \varsigma, v, \wp)$ for all $v, \varrho, \varsigma \in \Phi$ such that $v \perp \varrho \perp \varsigma$;
 (ON2MS15) $\mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \mathfrak{w}, \wp) + \mathcal{G}(v, \mathfrak{w}, \varsigma, \mathfrak{s}) + \mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{w}, \varrho, \varsigma, \mathfrak{h}) \geq \mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp + \mathfrak{s} + \mathfrak{h})$, for all $v, \varrho, \varsigma \in \Phi$ such that $v \perp \varrho \perp \varsigma$;

(ON2MS16) $\mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \cdot): (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, 1]$ is continuous for all $v, \varrho, \varsigma \in \Phi$ such that $v \perp \varrho \perp \varsigma$.

Definition 2.8 Suppose $(\Phi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, *, +, \perp)$ is a ON2MS. Suppose $h \in (0, 1)$, $\wp > 0$ and $v \in \Phi$. The set $\mathbb{B}(v, h, \wp) = \{\varrho \in \Phi: \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) > 1 - h, \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) < h \text{ and } \mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) < h \text{ for all } \varsigma \in \Phi\}$ is called the open ball with center v and radius h with respect to \wp .

Definition 2.9 Suppose $(\Phi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, *, +, \perp)$ is a ON2MS. Then, an open set of $\mathcal{U} \subset \Phi$ of its points is the center of a open ball contained in \mathcal{U} . The open set in a N2MS $(\Phi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, *, +, \perp)$ is represented by \mathbb{U} .

Definition 2.10 Assume $(\Phi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, *, +, \perp)$ is a ON2MS. A sequence (v_n) in Φ is a Cauchy one if for each $\epsilon > 0$ and each $\wp > 0$, there exist $n^* \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{Q}(v_n, v_m, h, \wp) > 1 - h$, $\mathcal{F}(v_n, v_m, h, \wp) < h$ and $\mathcal{G}(v_n, v_m, h, \wp) < h$ for all $n, m \geq n^*$ for all $h \in \Phi$.

Definition 2.11 Suppose $(\Phi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, *, +, \perp)$ is a ON2MS. A sequence $v = (v_i)$ is convergent to $l \in \Phi$, with respect to the ON2MS if, for every $\epsilon > 0$ and $\wp > 0$, there exist $t_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{Q}(v_i, l, h, \wp) > 1 - \epsilon$, $\mathcal{F}(v_i, l, h, \wp) < \epsilon$, and $\mathcal{G}(v_i, l, h, \wp) < \epsilon$ for all $i \geq t_0$ and for all $h \in \Phi$. In this case, we write $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})_2 - \lim v = l$ (or) $v_i \xrightarrow{(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})_2} l$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$.

Definition 2.12 Let $(\Phi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, *, +, \perp)$ be a ON2MS. Define $\tau_{(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})_2} = \mathcal{T} \subset \Phi$: for each $v \in \Phi$, there exist $\wp > 0$ and $h \in (0, 1)$ such that $\mathbb{B}(v, h, \wp) \subset \mathcal{T}$. Then, $\tau_{(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})_2}$ is a topology on $(\Phi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, *, +, \perp)$.

Definition 2.13 Let $(\Phi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, *, +, \perp)$ be a ON2MS. If each Cauchy sequence converges with respect to $\varsigma(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})_2$ then it is called complete.

Theorem 2.1 Every open ball $\mathbb{B}(v, h, \wp)$ in ON2MS is an open set.

Proof Consider $\mathbb{B}(v, h, \wp)$ to be an open ball with center v and radius h . Assume $\varrho \in \mathbb{B}(v, h, \wp)$. Therefore, $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) > 1 - h$, $\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) < h$, and $\mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) < h$ for each $\varsigma \in \Xi$. There exists $\frac{\wp}{3} \in (0, \wp)$ such that $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, p, \frac{\wp}{3}) > 1 - h$, $\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, p, \frac{\wp}{3}) < h$, and $\mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, p, \frac{\wp}{3}) < h$, due to $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) > 1 - h$. If we take $h_0 = \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, p, \frac{\wp}{3})$, then for $h_0 > 1 - h$, $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ will exist such that $h_0 > 1 - \epsilon > 1 - h$. Given h_0 and ϵ such that $h_0 > 1 - \epsilon$, then $\{h_i\}_{i=1}^6 \in (0, 1)$ such that $h_0 * h_1 * h_2 > 1 - \epsilon$, $(1 - h_0) + (1 - h_3) + (1 - h_4) \leq \epsilon$, and $(1 - h_0) + (1 - h_5) + (1 - h_6) \leq \epsilon$. Choose $h_7 = \max\{h_i\}_{i=1}^6$. Consider $\mathbb{B}(\varrho, 1 - h_7, \frac{\wp}{3})$. To show that $\mathbb{B}(\varrho, 1 - h_7, \frac{\wp}{3}) \subset \mathbb{B}(v, h, \wp)$, consider $v \in \mathbb{B}(\varrho, 1 - h_7, \frac{\wp}{3})$, then $\mathcal{Q}(v, p, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3}) > h_7$, $\mathcal{F}(v, p, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3}) < h_7$, and $\mathcal{Q}(v, p, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3}) < h_7$ and $\mathcal{F}(p, \varrho, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3}) > h_7$, $\mathcal{F}(p, \varrho, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3}) < h_7$, and $\mathcal{G}(p, \varrho, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3}) < h_7$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) &\geq \mathcal{Q}\left(v, \varrho, p, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) * \mathcal{Q}\left(v, p, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) * \mathcal{Q}\left(p, \varrho, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) \\ &\geq h_0 * h_7 * h_7 \geq h_0 * h_1 * h_2 \geq 1 - \epsilon > 1 - h, \\ \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) &\leq \mathcal{F}\left(v, \varrho, p, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) * \mathcal{F}\left(v, p, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) * \mathcal{F}\left(p, \varrho, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) \\ &\leq (1 - h_0) + (1 - h_7) + (1 - h_7) \\ &\leq (1 - h_0) + (1 - h_1) + (1 - h_2) \leq \epsilon < h, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) &\geq \mathcal{Q}\left(v, \varrho, \mathfrak{p}, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) * \mathcal{Q}\left(v, \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) * \mathcal{Q}\left(\mathfrak{p}, \varrho, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) \\
&\leq (1 - \mathfrak{h}_0) + (1 - \mathfrak{h}_7) + (1 - \mathfrak{h}_7) \\
&\leq (1 - \mathfrak{h}_0) + (1 - \mathfrak{h}_1) + (1 - \mathfrak{h}_2) \leq \epsilon < \mathfrak{h}.
\end{aligned}$$

We obtain $v \in \mathbb{B}(v, \mathfrak{h}, \wp)$ and $\mathbb{B}(\varrho, 1 - \mathfrak{h}_7, \frac{\wp}{3}) \subset \mathbb{B}(v, \mathfrak{h}, \wp)$. \square

Theorem 2.2 *Every ON2MS is Hausdorff.*

Proof Let $(\Phi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, *, +)$ be a N2MS. Let v and ϱ be points in Φ . Then, $0 < \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) < 1$, $0 < \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) < 1$, and $0 < \mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) < 1$ for every $\varsigma \in \Phi$. Put $\mathfrak{h}_1 = \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma_1, \wp)$, $1 - \mathfrak{h}_2 = \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma_1, \wp)$, and $1 - \mathfrak{h}_3 = \mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma_1, \wp)$, $\mathfrak{h}_4 = \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \mathfrak{p}, \frac{\wp}{3})$, $1 - \mathfrak{h}_5 = \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \mathfrak{p}, \frac{\wp}{3})$, $1 - \mathfrak{h}_6 = \mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \mathfrak{p}, \frac{\wp}{3})$ and $\mathfrak{h} = \max\{\mathfrak{h}_1, 1 - \mathfrak{h}_2, 1 - \mathfrak{h}_3, \mathfrak{h}_4, 1 - \mathfrak{h}_5, 1 - \mathfrak{h}_6\}$. For each $\mathfrak{h}_0 \in (\mathfrak{h}, 1)$ there exist \mathfrak{h}_7 and \mathfrak{h}_8 such that $\mathfrak{h}_4 * \mathfrak{h}_7 * \mathfrak{h}_7 \geq \mathfrak{h}_0$ and $(1 - \mathfrak{h}_5) * (1 - \mathfrak{h}_8) * (1 - \mathfrak{h}_8) \leq 1 - \mathfrak{h}_0$. Put $\mathfrak{h}_9 = \max\{\mathfrak{h}_7, \mathfrak{h}_8\}$ and consider the open balls $\mathbb{B}(v, 1 - \mathfrak{h}_9, \frac{\wp}{3})$ and $\mathbb{B}(\varrho, 1 - \mathfrak{h}_9, \frac{\wp}{3})$. Then, clearly

$$\varrho \mathbb{B}\left(v, 1 - \mathfrak{h}_9, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) \cap \mathbb{B}\left(\varrho, 1 - \mathfrak{h}_9, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) = \emptyset.$$

If there is $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{B}(v, 1 - \mathfrak{h}_9, \frac{\wp}{3}) \cap \mathbb{B}(\varrho, 1 - \mathfrak{h}_9, \frac{\wp}{3}) = \emptyset$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{h}_1 = \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma_1, \wp) &\geq \mathcal{Q}\left(v, \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma_1, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) * \mathcal{Q}\left(\mathfrak{p}, \varrho, \varsigma_1, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) * \mathcal{Q}\left(v, \varrho, \mathfrak{p}, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) \\
&\geq \mathfrak{h}_4 * \mathfrak{h}_9 * \mathfrak{h}_9 \geq \mathfrak{h}_4 * \mathfrak{h}_7 * \mathfrak{h}_7 \geq \mathfrak{h}_0 > \mathfrak{h}_1
\end{aligned}$$

and similarly, $1 - \mathfrak{h}_2 < 1 - \mathfrak{h}_2$, is its contrary. Hence, $(\Phi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, *, +)$ is Hausdorff. \square

3 Main results

Lemma 1 *If $(\Phi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, *, +, \perp)$ is a N2MS. Then, $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp)$ is nondecreasing, $\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp)$ is nonincreasing, and $\mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp)$ is nonincreasing for all $v, \varrho, \varsigma \in \Phi$.*

Proof Let $\mathfrak{s}, \wp > 0$ be any points such that $\wp > \mathfrak{s} \cdot \wp = \mathfrak{s} + \frac{\wp - \mathfrak{s}}{2} + \frac{\wp - \mathfrak{s}}{2}$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Y}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) &= \mathcal{Y}\left(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \mathfrak{s} + \frac{\wp - \mathfrak{s}}{2} + \frac{\wp - \mathfrak{s}}{2}\right), \\
&\leq \mathcal{Y}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \mathfrak{s}) + \mathcal{Y}\left(v, \varsigma, \varsigma, \frac{\wp - \mathfrak{s}}{2}\right) + \mathcal{Y}\left(\varsigma, \varrho, \varsigma, \frac{\wp - \mathfrak{s}}{2}\right) = \mathcal{Y}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \mathfrak{s})
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) &= \psi\left(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \mathfrak{s} + \frac{\wp - \mathfrak{s}}{2} + \frac{\wp - \mathfrak{s}}{2}\right), \\
&\leq \mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \mathfrak{s}) + \psi\left(v, \varsigma, \varsigma, \frac{\wp - \mathfrak{s}}{2}\right) + \mathcal{G}\left(\varsigma, \varrho, \varsigma, \frac{\wp - \mathfrak{s}}{2}\right) = \mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \mathfrak{s}).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) > \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \mathfrak{s})$. \square

From Lemma 1, let $(\Phi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, *, +, \perp)$ be a ON2MS with the following conditions:

$$\lim_{\wp \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) = 1, \quad \lim_{\wp \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\wp \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) = 0.$$

Lemma 2 *Let $(\Phi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, *, +, \perp)$ be a ON2MS. If there exists $\ell \in (0, 1)$ such that $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \ell\wp + 0) \geq \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp)$, $\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \ell\wp + 0) \leq \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp)$, and $\mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \ell\wp + 0) \leq \mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp)$ for all $v, \varrho, \varsigma \in \Phi$ with $\varsigma \neq v$, $\varsigma \neq \varrho$, and $\wp > 0$, then $v = \varrho$.*

Proof Since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) &\geq \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \ell\wp + 0) \geq \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp), \\ \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) &\leq \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \ell\wp + 0) \leq \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) \leq \mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \ell\wp + 0) \leq \mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp),$$

for all $\wp > 0$, $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \cdot)$, $\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \cdot)$, and $\mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \cdot)$ are constant. Since $\lim_{\wp \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) = 1$, $\lim_{\wp \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) = 0$ and $\lim_{\wp \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) = 0$, then $\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) = 1$, $\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) = 0$ and $\mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \varsigma, \wp) = 0$. Consequently, for all $\wp > 0$. Hence, $v = 0$ because $\varsigma \neq v$, $\varsigma \neq \varrho$. \square

Lemma 3 *Let $(\Phi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, *, +, \perp)$ be a ON2MS and let $\lim_{\wp \rightarrow \infty} v_n = v$, $\lim_{\wp \rightarrow \infty} \varrho_n = \varrho$. Then, it satisfies for all $\tau \in \Phi$ and $\wp \geq 0$:*

(1)

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{Q}(v_n, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp) &\geq \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \tau, \wp), \\ \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{F}(v_n, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp) &\leq \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \tau, \wp) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{G}(v_n, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp) \leq \mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \tau, \wp).$$

(2)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \tau, \wp) &\geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{Q}(v_n, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp), \\ \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \tau, \wp + 0) &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{F}(v_n, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \tau, \wp + 0) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{G}(v_n, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp).$$

Proof For all $\tau \in \Phi$ and $\wp \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(v_n, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp) &\geq \mathcal{Q}(v_n, \varrho_n, v, \wp_1) * \mathcal{Q}(v_n, v, \tau, \wp_2) * \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp), \quad \wp_1 + \wp_2 = 0 \\ &\geq \mathcal{Q}(v_n, \varrho_n, v, \wp_1) * \mathcal{Q}(v_n, v, \tau, \wp_2) * \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho_n, \varrho, \wp_3) \\ &\quad * \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \tau, \wp_4) * \mathcal{Q}(\varrho, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp), \quad \wp_3 + \wp_4 = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{Q}(v_n, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp) \geq 1 * 1 * 1 * \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \tau, \wp) * 1 = \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \tau, \wp)$, also

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(v_n, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp) &\leq \mathcal{F}(v_n, \varrho_n, v, \wp_1) + \mathcal{F}(v_n, v, \tau, \wp_2) + \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp), \quad \wp_1 + \wp_2 = 0 \\ &\leq \mathcal{F}(v_n, \varrho_n, v, \wp_1) + \mathcal{F}(v_n, v, \tau, \wp_2) + \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho_n, \varrho, \wp_3) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \tau, \wp_4) + \mathcal{F}(\varrho, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp), \quad \wp_3 + \wp_4 = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \mathcal{F}(v_n, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp) \leq 0 + 0 + 0 + \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \tau, \wp) + 0 = \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \tau, \wp)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(v_n, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp) &\leq \mathcal{G}(v_n, \varrho_n, v, \wp_1) + \mathcal{G}(v_n, v, \tau, \wp_2) + \mathcal{G}(v, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp), \quad \wp_1 + \wp_2 = 0 \\ &\leq \mathcal{G}(v_n, \varrho_n, v, \wp_1) + \mathcal{G}(v_n, v, \tau, \wp_2) + \mathcal{G}(v, \varrho_n, \varrho, \wp_3) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \tau, \wp_4) + \mathcal{G}(\varrho, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp_4), \quad \wp_3 + \wp_4 = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \mathcal{G}(v_n, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp) \leq 0 + 0 + 0 + \mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \tau, \wp) + 0 = \mathcal{G}(v, \varrho, \tau, \wp)$.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. For all $\tau \in v$ and $\wp > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \tau, \wp + 2\epsilon) &\geq \mathcal{Q}\left(v, \varrho, v_n, \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) * \mathcal{Q}\left(v, v_n, \tau, \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) * \mathcal{Q}(v_n, \varrho, \tau, \wp + \epsilon) \\ &\geq \mathcal{Q}\left(v, \varrho, v_n, \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) * \mathcal{Q}\left(v, v_n, \tau, \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) * \mathcal{Q}\left(v_n, \varrho, \varrho_n, \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \\ &\quad * \mathcal{Q}(v_n, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp) * \mathcal{Q}\left(\varrho_n, \varrho, \tau, \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \tau, \wp + 2\epsilon) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \mathcal{Q}(v_n, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp).$$

Letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\mathcal{Q}(v, \varrho, \tau, \wp + 0) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \mathcal{Q}(v_n, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp).$$

Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \tau, \wp + 2\epsilon) &\leq \mathcal{F}\left(v, \varrho, v_n, \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \diamond \mathcal{F}\left(v, v_n, \tau, \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \diamond \mathcal{F}(v_n, \varrho, \tau, \wp + \epsilon) \\ &\geq \mathcal{F}\left(v, \varrho, v_n, \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \diamond \mathcal{F}\left(v, v_n, \tau, \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \diamond \mathcal{F}(v_n, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp) \\ &\quad \diamond \mathcal{F}\left(\varrho_n, \varrho, \tau, \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \diamond \mathcal{F}(v_n, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp) \diamond \mathcal{F}\left(\varrho_n, \varrho, \tau, \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\mathcal{F}(v, \varrho, \tau, \wp + 2\epsilon) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf \mathcal{F}(v_n, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp).$$

Letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\mathcal{F}(\nu, \varrho, \tau, \wp + 0) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{F}(\nu_n, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(\nu, \varrho, \tau, \wp + 2\epsilon) &\leq \mathcal{G}\left(\nu, \varrho, \nu_n, \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \diamond \mathcal{G}\left(\nu, \nu_n, \tau, \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \diamond \mathcal{G}(\nu_n, \varrho, \tau, \wp + \epsilon) \\ &\geq \mathcal{G}\left(\nu, \varrho, \nu_n, \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \diamond \mathcal{G}\left(\nu, \nu_n, \tau, \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \diamond \mathcal{G}\left(\nu_n, \varrho, \varrho_n, \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \diamond \mathcal{G}(\nu_n, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp) \\ &\quad \diamond \mathcal{G}\left(\varrho_n, \varrho, \tau, \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \diamond \mathcal{G}(\nu_n, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp) \diamond \mathcal{G}\left(\varrho_n, \varrho, \tau, \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\mathcal{G}(\nu, \varrho, \tau, \wp + 2\epsilon) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{G}(\nu_n, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp).$$

Letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\mathcal{G}(\nu, \varrho, \tau, \wp + 0) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{G}(\nu_n, \varrho_n, \tau, \wp). \quad \square$$

Lemma 4 Let $(\Phi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, *, +, \perp)$ be a N2MS. Let Υ and Λ be a continuous self-map on Φ and $[\Upsilon, \Lambda]$ are compatible. Let ν_n be a sequence in Φ such that $\Upsilon \nu_n \rightarrow \omega$ and $\Lambda \nu_n \rightarrow \omega$. Then, $\Upsilon \Lambda \nu_n \rightarrow \Lambda \omega$.

Proof Since Υ, Λ are compatible maps, $\Upsilon \Lambda \nu_n \rightarrow \Upsilon \omega$, $\Lambda \Upsilon \nu_n \rightarrow \Lambda \omega$ and so, $\mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon \Lambda \nu_n, \Upsilon \omega, \tau, \frac{\wp}{3}) \rightarrow 1$, $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda \Upsilon \nu_n, \Lambda \omega, \tau, \frac{\wp}{3}) \rightarrow 0$ and $\mathcal{G}(\Lambda \Upsilon \nu_n, \Lambda \omega, \tau, \frac{\wp}{3}) \rightarrow 0$ for all $\tau \in \Phi$ and $\wp > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon \Lambda \nu_n, \Lambda \omega, \tau, \wp) &\geq \mathcal{Q}\left(\Upsilon \Lambda \nu_n, \Lambda \omega, \Lambda \Upsilon \nu_n, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) * \mathcal{Q}\left(\Upsilon \Lambda \nu_n, \Lambda \Upsilon \nu_n, \tau, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) \\ &\quad * \mathcal{Q}\left(\Lambda \Upsilon \nu_n, \Lambda \omega, \tau, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) \\ &\geq \mathcal{Q}\left(\Lambda \Upsilon \nu_n, \Lambda \omega, \Upsilon \Lambda \nu_n, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) * \mathcal{Q}\left(\Lambda \Upsilon \nu_n, \omega \Lambda \nu_n, \tau, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) \\ &\quad * \mathcal{Q}\left(\Lambda \Upsilon \nu_n, \Lambda \omega, \tau, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) \rightarrow 1. \end{aligned}$$

Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon \Lambda \nu_n, \Lambda \omega, \tau, \wp) &\leq \mathcal{F}\left(\Upsilon \Lambda \nu_n, \Lambda \omega, \Lambda \Upsilon \nu_n, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) + d\mathcal{F}\left(\Upsilon \Lambda \nu_n, \Lambda \Upsilon \nu_n, \tau, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{F}\left(\Lambda \Upsilon \nu_n, \Lambda \omega, \tau, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) \\ &\leq \mathcal{F}\left(\Lambda \Upsilon \nu_n, \Lambda \omega, \Upsilon \Lambda \nu_n, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) + \mathcal{F}\left(\Lambda \Upsilon \nu_n, \omega \Lambda \nu_n, \tau, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{F}\left(\Lambda \Omega \nu_n, \Lambda \omega, \tau, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

For all $\tau \in \Xi$ and $\wp > 0$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon \Lambda v_n, \Lambda \omega, \tau, \wp) &\leq \mathcal{G}\left(\Upsilon \Lambda v_n, \Lambda \omega, \Lambda \Upsilon v_n, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) + \mathcal{G}\left(\Upsilon \Lambda v_n, \Lambda \Upsilon v_n, \tau, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{G}\left(\Lambda \Upsilon v_n, \Lambda \omega, \tau, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) \\ &\leq \mathcal{G}\left(\Lambda \Upsilon v_n, \Lambda \omega, \Upsilon \Lambda v_n, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) + \mathcal{G}\left(\Lambda \Upsilon v_n, \omega \Lambda v_n, \tau, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{G}\left(\Lambda \Upsilon v_n, \Lambda \omega, \tau, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

For all $\tau \in \Phi$ and $\wp > 0$. Hence, $\Upsilon \Lambda v_n \rightarrow \Lambda \omega$. \square

Theorem 3.1 *Let $(\Phi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, *, +, \perp)$ be an orthogonal complete neutrosophic 2-metric space with “*” as con-t-nm and “+” as con-t-comm. Let Θ and Γ be continuous self-mappings on Φ . Then, Θ and Γ have a unique common fixed point in Φ if and only if there exist two self-mappings Υ, Λ of Φ satisfying:*

- (1) $\Upsilon \Phi \subset \Gamma \Phi, \Lambda \Phi \subset \Theta \Phi$;
- (2) The pair $\{\Upsilon, \Theta\}$ and $\{\Lambda, \Gamma\}$ are compatible;
- (3) $\Upsilon, \Lambda, \Theta, \Gamma$ be \perp -preserving;
- (4) There exists $\ell \in (0, 1)$ such that for every $v, \varrho, \varsigma \in \Phi$ and $\wp > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon v, \Lambda \varrho, \varsigma, \ell \wp) &\geq \min\{\mathcal{Q}(\Theta v, \Gamma v, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon v, \Theta v, \varsigma, \wp), \\ &\quad \mathcal{Q}(\Lambda \varrho, \Gamma \varrho, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon v, \Lambda \varrho, \varsigma, \ell \wp)\}, \\ \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon v, \Lambda \varrho, \varsigma, \ell \wp) &\leq \max\{\mathcal{F}(\Theta v, \Gamma v, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon v, \Theta v, \varsigma, \wp), \\ &\quad \mathcal{F}(\Lambda \varrho, \Gamma \varrho, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon v, \Lambda \varrho, \varsigma, \ell \wp)\}, \\ \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon v, \Lambda \varrho, \varsigma, \ell \wp) &\leq \max\{\mathcal{G}(\Theta v, \Gamma v, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon v, \Theta v, \varsigma, \wp), \\ &\quad \mathcal{G}(\Lambda \varrho, \Gamma \varrho, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon v, \Lambda \varrho, \varsigma, \ell \wp)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\Upsilon, \Lambda, \Theta$, and Γ have a unique common fixed point in Φ .

Proof Suppose Θ and Γ have a unique common fixed point, say $\tau \in \Phi$. Define $\Upsilon: \Phi \rightarrow \Phi$ by $\Upsilon v = \tau$ for all $v \in \Phi$ and $\Lambda: \Phi \rightarrow \Phi$ by $\Lambda v = \tau$ for all $v \in \Phi$. Then, it satisfies (1)–(4)

Conversely, if there exist two self-mappings Υ, Λ of Φ this satisfies (1)–(4). From (1) if two sequences are v_n and ϱ_n of Φ such that $\varrho_{2n-1} = \Gamma v_{2n-1}$ and $v_{2n-1} = \Theta v_{2n} = \Lambda v_{2n-1}$ for $n = 1, 2, 3$. Putting $v = v_{2n}$ and $v = v_{2n+1}$ in condition (4), for all $\varsigma \in \Phi$ and $\wp > 0$.

Since $(\Phi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, *, +, \perp)$ is an orthogonal complete neutrosophic 2-metric space there exists $v_0 \in \Phi$, such that

$$v_0 \perp \varrho, \quad \text{for all } \varrho \in \Phi,$$

$$\text{i.e., } v_0 \perp \Upsilon v_0 \quad \text{take}$$

$$v_n = \Upsilon^n v_0 = \Upsilon v_{n-1}, \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathcal{F}.$$

Since \mathcal{Y} is \perp -preserving, $\{v_n\}$ is an O-sequence. Now, since \mathcal{Y} is an \perp -contraction, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(\varrho v_{2n+1}, \varrho v_{2n+2}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) &= \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{Y} v_{2n}, \Lambda v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) \\ &\geq \min\{\mathcal{Q}(\Theta v_{2n}, \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{Y} v_{2n}, \Theta v_{2n}, \varsigma, \wp), \\ &\quad \mathcal{Q}(\Lambda \varrho_{2n+1}, \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{Y} v_{2n}, \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp)\} \\ &\geq \min\{\mathcal{Q}(\varrho v_{2n}, \varrho v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp), \mathcal{Q}(\varrho v_{2n+1}, \varrho v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp)\}, \\ \mathcal{F}(\varrho v_{2n+1}, \varrho v_{2n+2}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) &= \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y} v_{2n}, \Lambda v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) \\ &\leq \max\{\mathcal{F}(\Theta v_{2n}, \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y} v_{2n}, \Theta v_{2n}, \varsigma, \wp), \\ &\quad \mathcal{F}(\Lambda \varrho_{2n+1}, \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y} v_{2n}, \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp)\} \\ &\leq \max\{\mathcal{F}(\varrho v_{2n}, \varrho v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp), \mathcal{F}(\varrho v_{2n+1}, \varrho v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp)\} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(\varrho v_{2n+1}, \varrho v_{2n+2}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) &= \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y} v_{2n}, \Lambda v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) \\ &\leq \max\{\mathcal{G}(\Theta v_{2n}, \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y} v_{2n}, \Theta v_{2n}, \varsigma, \wp), \\ &\quad \mathcal{G}(\Lambda \varrho_{2n+1}, \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y} v_{2n}, \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp)\} \\ &\leq \max\{\mathcal{G}(\varrho v_{2n}, \varrho v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp), \mathcal{G}(\varrho v_{2n+1}, \varrho v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp)\}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(\varrho v_{2n+1}, \varrho v_{2n+2}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) &\geq \mathcal{Q}(\varrho v_{2n+1}, \varrho v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp), \\ \mathcal{F}(\varrho v_{2n+1}, \varrho v_{2n+2}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) &\leq \mathcal{F}(\varrho v_{2n+1}, \varrho v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}(\varrho v_{2n+1}, \varrho v_{2n+2}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) \leq \mathcal{G}(\varrho v_{2n+1}, \varrho v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp).$$

By using Lemma 1 and letting $v = v_{2n+1}$ and $\varrho = v_{2n+1}$ in condition (4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(\varrho_{2n+2}, \varrho_{2n+3}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) &\geq \mathcal{Q}(\varrho_{2n+1}, \varrho_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp), \\ \mathcal{F}(\varrho_{2n+2}, \varrho_{2n+3}, \varsigma, \wp) &\leq \mathcal{F}(\varrho_{2n+1}, \varrho_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}(\varrho_{2n+2}, \varrho_{2n+3}, \varsigma, \wp) \leq \mathcal{G}(\varrho_{2n+1}, \varrho_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp),$$

for all $\varsigma \in \Phi$ and $\wp > 0$.

In general, we obtain that for all $\varsigma \in \Phi$ and $\wp > 0$ and $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(\varrho_n, \varrho_{n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) &\geq \mathcal{Q}(\varrho_{n-1}, \varrho_n, \varsigma, \wp), \\ \mathcal{F}(\varrho_n, \varrho_{n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) &\leq \mathcal{F}(\varrho_{n-1}, \varrho_n, \varsigma, \wp) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}(\varrho_n, \varrho_{n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) \leq \mathcal{G}(\varrho_{n-1}, \varrho_n, \varsigma, \wp).$$

Thus, for all $\varsigma \in \Phi$ and $\wp > 0$, and $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$

$$\mathcal{Q}(\varrho_n, \varrho_{n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) \geq \mathcal{Q}\left(\varrho_0, \varrho_1, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{\ell^n}\right), \quad (1)$$

$$\mathcal{F}(\varrho_n, \varrho_{n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) \leq \mathcal{F}\left(\varrho_0, \varrho_1, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{\ell^n}\right), \quad (2)$$

$$\mathcal{G}(\varrho_n, \varrho_{n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) \leq \mathcal{G}\left(\varrho_0, \varrho_1, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{\ell^n}\right). \quad (3)$$

To show that $\{\varrho_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in Φ , let $m > n$. Then, for all $\varsigma \in \Phi$ and $\wp > \nu$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(\varrho_m, \varrho_n, \varsigma, \wp) &\geq \mathcal{Q}\left(\varrho_m, \varrho_n, \varrho_{n+1}, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) * \mathcal{Q}\left(\varrho_{n+1}, \varrho_n, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) * \mathcal{Q}\left(\varrho_m, \varrho_{n+1}, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) \\ &\geq \mathcal{Q}\left(\varrho_m, \varrho_n, \varrho_{n+1}, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) * \mathcal{Q}\left(\varrho_{n+1}, \varrho_n, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) * \mathcal{Q}\left(\varrho_m, \varrho_{n+1}, \varrho_{n+1}, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) \\ &\quad * \mathcal{Q}\left(\varrho_{n+2}, \varrho_{n+1}, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3^2}\right) * \mathcal{Q}\left(\varrho_m, \varrho_{n+2}, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3^2}\right) * \dots \\ &\quad * \mathcal{Q}\left(\varrho_m, \varrho_{m-1}, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3^{m-n}}\right), \\ \mathcal{F}(\varrho_m, \varrho_n, \varsigma, \wp) &\leq \mathcal{F}\left(\varrho_m, \varrho_n, \varrho_{n+1}, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) * \mathcal{F}\left(\varrho_{n+1}, \varrho_n, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) * \mathcal{F}\left(\varrho_m, \varrho_{n+1}, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) \\ &\leq \mathcal{F}\left(\varrho_m, \varrho_n, \varrho_{n+1}, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) * \mathcal{F}\left(\varrho_{n+1}, \varrho_n, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) * \mathcal{F}\left(\varrho_m, \varrho_{n+1}, \varrho_{n+1}, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) \\ &\quad * \mathcal{F}\left(\varrho_{n+2}, \varrho_{n+1}, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3^2}\right) * \mathcal{F}\left(\varrho_m, \varrho_{n+2}, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3^2}\right) * \dots \\ &\quad * \mathcal{F}\left(\varrho_m, \varrho_{m-1}, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3^{m-n}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(\varrho_m, \varrho_n, \varsigma, \wp) &\leq \mathcal{G}\left(\varrho_m, \varrho_n, \varrho_{n+1}, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) * \mathcal{G}\left(\varrho_{n+1}, \varrho_n, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) * \mathcal{G}\left(\varrho_m, \varrho_{n+1}, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) \\ &\leq \mathcal{G}\left(\varrho_m, \varrho_n, \varrho_{n+1}, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) * \mathcal{G}\left(\varrho_{n+1}, \varrho_n, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) * \mathcal{G}\left(\varrho_m, \varrho_{n+1}, \varrho_{n+1}, \frac{\wp}{3}\right) \\ &\quad * \mathcal{G}\left(\varrho_{n+2}, \varrho_{n+1}, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3^2}\right) * \mathcal{G}\left(\varrho_m, \varrho_{n+2}, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3^2}\right) * \dots \\ &\quad * \mathcal{G}\left(\varrho_m, \varrho_{m-1}, \varsigma, \frac{\wp}{3^{m-n}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $m, n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q(\varrho_m, \varrho_n, \varsigma, \wp) = 1, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{F}(\varrho_m, \varrho_n, \varsigma, \wp) = 0 \quad \text{and} \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{G}(\varrho_m, \varrho_n, \varsigma, \wp) = 0.$$

Thus, $\{\varrho_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in Φ . By completeness of Φ there exist $\tau \in \Phi$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varrho_n = \tau, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varrho_{2n-1} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_{2n-1} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Upsilon v_{2n-2} = \tau$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varrho_{2n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Theta v_{2n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda v_{2n-1} = \tau.$$

From Lemma 4, we have

$$\Upsilon \Theta v_{2n+1} = \Theta \tau \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda \Gamma v_{2n+1} = \Gamma \tau. \quad (4)$$

Meanwhile, for all $\varsigma \in \Phi$ with $\varsigma \neq \Theta \tau$ and $\varsigma \neq \Gamma \tau$ and $\wp > 0$, we have

$$Q(\Upsilon \Theta v_{2n+1}, \Lambda \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) \\ \geq \min \{ Q(\Theta \Theta v_{2n+1}, \Gamma \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp), Q(\Upsilon \Theta v_{2n+1}, \Theta \Theta v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp), \\ Q(\Lambda \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \Gamma \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \ell \varsigma, \wp), Q(\Upsilon \Theta v_{2n+1}, \Gamma \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp) \}, \\ \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon \Theta v_{2n+1}, \Lambda \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) \\ \leq \max \{ \mathcal{F}(\Theta \Theta v_{2n+1}, \Gamma \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon \Theta v_{2n+1}, \Theta \Theta v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp), \\ \mathcal{F}(\Lambda \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \Gamma \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \ell \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon \Theta v_{2n+1}, \Gamma \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp) \}$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}(\Upsilon \Theta v_{2n+1}, \Lambda \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) \\ \leq \max \{ \mathcal{G}(\Theta \Theta v_{2n+1}, \Gamma \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon \Theta v_{2n+1}, \Theta \Theta v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp), \\ \mathcal{G}(\Lambda \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \Gamma \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \ell \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon \Theta v_{2n+1}, \Gamma \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp) \}.$$

Taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and using (4), we have for all $\varsigma \in \Phi$ with $\varsigma \neq \Theta \tau$ and $\varsigma \neq \Gamma \tau$ and $\wp > 0$,

$$Q(\Theta \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \ell \wp + 0) \\ \geq \min \{ Q(\Theta \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), Q(\Theta \tau, \Theta \tau, \varsigma, \wp), Q(\Gamma \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), Q(\Theta \tau, \Theta \tau, \varsigma, \wp) \} \\ = Q(\Theta \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \\ \mathcal{F}(\Theta \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \ell \wp + 0) \\ \leq \max \{ \mathcal{F}(\Theta \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\Theta \tau, \Theta \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\Gamma \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\Theta \tau, \Theta \tau, \varsigma, \wp) \} \\ = \mathcal{F}(\Theta \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{G}(\Theta \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \ell \wp + 0) \\ & \leq \max \{ \mathcal{G}(\Theta \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\Theta \mathfrak{r}, \Theta \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\Theta \mathfrak{r}, \Theta \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp) \} \\ & = \mathcal{G}(\Theta \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2, we have

$$\Theta \mathfrak{r} = \Gamma \mathfrak{r}. \quad (5)$$

From condition (4), we obtain for all $\varsigma \in \Phi$ with $\varsigma \neq \Upsilon \mathfrak{r}$, $\varsigma \neq \Gamma \mathfrak{r}$ and $\wp > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Lambda \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) & \geq \min \{ \mathcal{Q}(\Theta \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Theta \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp) \\ & \quad \mathcal{Q}(\Lambda \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \Gamma \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp) \}, \\ \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Lambda \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) & \leq \max \{ \mathcal{F}(\Theta \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Theta \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp) \\ & \quad \mathcal{F}(\Lambda \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \Gamma \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp) \} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Lambda \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) & \leq \max \{ \mathcal{G}(\Theta \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Theta \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp) \\ & \quad \mathcal{G}(\Lambda \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \Gamma \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \Gamma v_{2n+1}, \varsigma, \wp) \}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $n \rightarrow \infty$, by condition (4), and Lemma 3, for all $\varsigma \in \Phi$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \ell \wp + 0) & \geq \min \{ \mathcal{Q}(\Theta \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Theta \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp), \\ & \quad \mathcal{Q}(\Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp) \} \\ & = \mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp), \\ \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \ell \wp + 0) & \leq \max \{ \mathcal{F}(\Theta \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Theta \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp), \\ & \quad \mathcal{F}(\Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp) \} \\ & = \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \ell \wp + 0) & \leq \max \{ \mathcal{G}(\Theta \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Theta \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp), \\ & \quad \mathcal{G}(\Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp) \} \\ & = \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2, we have

$$\Upsilon \mathfrak{r} = \Gamma \mathfrak{r}. \quad (6)$$

For all $\varsigma \in \Phi$ with $\varsigma \neq \Upsilon \tau$ and $\varsigma \neq \Lambda \tau$ and $\wp > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon \tau, \Lambda \tau, \varsigma, \ell \wp) \\ & \geq \min \{ \mathcal{Q}(\Theta \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{Q}(\Lambda \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp) \} \\ & \geq \min \{ \mathcal{Q}(\Gamma \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{Q}(\Lambda \tau, \Upsilon \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{Q}(\Gamma \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp) \} \\ & = \mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon \tau, \Lambda \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \\ & \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon \tau, \Lambda \tau, \varsigma, \ell \wp) \\ & \leq \max \{ \mathcal{F}(\Theta \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\Lambda \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp) \} \\ & \leq \max \{ \mathcal{F}(\Gamma \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\Lambda \tau, \Upsilon \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\Gamma \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp) \} \\ & = \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon \tau, \Lambda \tau, \varsigma, \wp) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon \tau, \Lambda \tau, \varsigma, \ell \wp) \\ & \leq \max \{ \mathcal{G}(\Theta \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\Lambda \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp) \}, \\ & \leq \max \{ \mathcal{G}(\Gamma \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\Lambda \tau, \Upsilon \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\Gamma \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp) \} \\ & = \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon \tau, \Lambda \tau, \varsigma, \wp). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2,

$$\Upsilon \tau = \Lambda \tau. \quad (7)$$

It follows that $\Upsilon \tau = \Lambda \tau = \Theta \tau = \Gamma \tau$. For all $\varsigma \in \Phi$ with $\varsigma \neq \Lambda \tau$ and $\varsigma \neq \tau$, and $\wp > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon v_{2n}, \Lambda \tau, \varsigma, \ell \wp) & \geq \min \{ \mathcal{Q}(\Theta v_{2n}, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon v_{2n}, \Theta v_{2n}, \varsigma, \wp) \\ & \quad \mathcal{Q}(\Lambda \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon v_{2n}, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp) \}, \\ \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon v_{2n}, \Lambda \tau, \varsigma, \ell \wp) & \leq \max \{ \mathcal{F}(\Theta v_{2n}, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon v_{2n}, \Theta v_{2n}, \varsigma, \wp) \\ & \quad \mathcal{F}(\Lambda \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon v_{2n}, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp) \} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon v_{2n}, \Lambda \tau, \varsigma, \ell \wp) & \leq \max \{ \mathcal{G}(\Theta v_{2n}, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon v_{2n}, \Theta v_{2n}, \varsigma, \wp) \\ & \quad \mathcal{G}(\Lambda \tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon v_{2n}, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp) \}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and using (4) and Lemma 3, we have for all $\varsigma \in \Phi$ we $\varsigma \neq \Lambda \tau$, $\varsigma \neq \tau$ and $\wp > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(\tau, \Lambda \tau, \varsigma, \ell \wp + 0) & \geq \min \{ \mathcal{Q}(\tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{Q}(\tau, \tau, \tau, \wp), \mathcal{Q}(\Lambda \tau, \Lambda \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{Q}(\tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp) \} \\ & \geq \mathcal{Q}(\tau, \Gamma \tau, \varsigma, \wp) \geq \mathcal{Q}(\tau, \Lambda \tau, \varsigma, \wp), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{r}, \Lambda \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \ell \wp + 0) &\leq \max \{ \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{r}, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\Lambda \mathfrak{r}, \Lambda \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp) \} \\ &\leq \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp) \leq \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{r}, \Lambda \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{r}, \Lambda \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \ell \wp + 0) &\leq \max \{ \mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{r}, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\Lambda \mathfrak{r}, \Lambda \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp) \} \\ &\leq \mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp) \leq \mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{r}, \Lambda \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\mathcal{Q}(\mathfrak{r}, \Lambda \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) \geq \mathcal{Q}(\mathfrak{r}, \Lambda \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp), \quad \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{r}, \Lambda \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) \leq \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{r}, \Lambda \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp)$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{r}, \Lambda \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) \leq \mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{r}, \Lambda \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp).$$

Therefore, $\Lambda \mathfrak{r} = \mathfrak{r}$. Thus, $\mathfrak{r} = \Upsilon \mathfrak{r} = \Lambda \mathfrak{r} = \Theta \mathfrak{r} = \Gamma \mathfrak{r}$. Hence, \mathfrak{r} is a common fixed point of Υ , Λ , Θ , and Γ .

Let \mathfrak{p} be another common fixed point of Υ , Λ , Θ , and Γ for all $\varsigma \in \Phi$ with $\varsigma \neq \mathfrak{r}$, $\varsigma \neq \mathfrak{p}$, and $\wp > 0$, we have

$$\nu_0 \perp \nu^*,$$

$$\nu_0 \perp \varrho^*.$$

Since, Γ is \perp -preserving, one writes

$$\Upsilon^n \nu_0 \perp \Upsilon^n \nu^*,$$

$$\Upsilon^n \nu_0 \perp \Upsilon^n \varrho^*.$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Q}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) &= \mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Lambda \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) \\ &\geq \min \{ \mathcal{Q}(\Theta \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Theta \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{Q}(\Lambda \mathfrak{p}, \Gamma \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \wp), \\ &\quad \mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \wp) \} \\ &\geq \min \{ \mathcal{Q}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{Q}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{Q}(\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{Q}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \wp) \} \\ &\geq \mathcal{Q}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \wp), \\ \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) &= \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Lambda \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) \\ &\leq \max \{ \mathcal{F}(\Theta \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Theta \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\Lambda \mathfrak{p}, \Gamma \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \wp), \\ &\quad \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \wp) \} \\ &\leq \max \{ \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \wp) \} \\ &\leq \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \wp)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) &= \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Lambda \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) \\
 &\leq \max \{ \mathcal{G}(\Theta \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Theta \mathfrak{r}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\Lambda \mathfrak{p}, \Gamma \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \wp), \\
 &\quad \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon \mathfrak{r}, \Gamma \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \wp) \} \\
 &\leq \max \{ \mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \wp), \mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \wp) \} \\
 &\leq \mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \wp),
 \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{Q}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) &\geq \mathcal{Q}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \ell \wp), \\
 \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) &\leq \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \ell \wp)
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) \leq \mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{p}, \varsigma, \ell \wp).$$

Hence, $\mathfrak{r} = \mathfrak{p}$. □

Example 3.2 Let $\Phi = [-1, 2]$ and define a binary relation \perp by $v \perp \varrho \perp \varsigma \iff v + \varrho + \varsigma \geq 0$. Define $\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}$ by,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon v, \Lambda \varrho, \varsigma, \ell \wp) &= \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } v = \varrho = \varsigma, \\ \frac{\ell \wp}{\ell \wp + \min\{\Upsilon v, \Lambda \varrho, \varsigma, \ell \wp\}}, & \text{if otherwise,} \end{cases} \\
 \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon v, \Lambda \varrho, \varsigma, \ell \wp) &= \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } v = \varrho = \varsigma, \\ 1 - \frac{\ell \wp}{\ell \wp + \max\{\Upsilon v, \Lambda \varrho, \varsigma, \ell \wp\}}, & \text{if otherwise,} \end{cases} \\
 \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon v, \Lambda \varrho, \varsigma, \ell \wp) &= \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } v = \varrho = \varsigma, \\ \frac{\ell \wp + \max\{\Upsilon v, \Lambda \varrho, \varsigma, \ell \wp\}}{\ell \wp}, & \text{if otherwise.} \end{cases}
 \end{aligned}$$

With CTN $\mu * \alpha = \mu \cdot \alpha$ and CTCN $\mu + \alpha = \max\{\mu + \alpha\}$, $(\Phi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, *, +, \perp)$ is an O-complete N2MS. Also, observe that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon v, \Lambda \varrho, \varsigma, \ell \wp) = 1$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon v, \Lambda \varrho, \varsigma, \ell \wp) = 0$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon v, \Lambda \varrho, \varsigma, \ell \wp) = 0 \forall v, \varrho, \varsigma \in \Phi$.

Define $\Upsilon, \Lambda, \Theta, \Gamma: \Phi \rightarrow \Phi$

$$\Upsilon v = v^2, \quad \Lambda v = v, \quad \Theta v = 4v^4 - 3, \quad \Gamma v = 4v^2 - 3.$$

From this, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{Q}(\varrho_n, \varrho_{n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) &\geq \mathcal{Q}(\varrho_{n-1}, \varrho_n, \varsigma, \wp), \\
 \mathcal{F}(\varrho_n, \varrho_{n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) &\leq \mathcal{Q}(\varrho_{n-1}, \varrho_n, \varsigma, \wp), \\
 \mathcal{G}(\varrho_n, \varrho_{n+1}, \varsigma, \ell \wp) &\geq \mathcal{Q}(\varrho_{n-1}, \varrho_n, \varsigma, \wp).
 \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{Q}(\varrho_m, \varrho_n, \varsigma, \wp) = 1, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{F}(\varrho_m, \varrho_n, \varsigma, \wp) = 0 \quad \text{and}$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{G}(\varrho_m, \varrho_n, \varsigma, \wp) = 0 \quad \text{for all } v, \varrho, \varsigma \in \Phi.$$

All the conditions of the above theorem are satisfied and 1 is a common fixed point of Υ , Λ , Θ , and Γ .

4 Application

In this section, we given an application to the Fredholm integral equation as below:

Suppose $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{C}([\rho, \pi], \mathbb{R})$ is the set of real-valued continuous functions defined on $[\rho, \pi]$.

Consider the integral equation,

$$d(\varpi) = f(\varpi) + \delta \int_{\rho}^{\pi} \mathcal{U}_1(\varpi, \theta) \mathfrak{k}(\varpi) d\theta \quad \text{for all } \theta, \varpi \in [\rho, \pi], \quad (8)$$

$$d(\varpi) = f(\varpi) + \delta \int_{\rho}^{\pi} \mathcal{U}_1(\varpi, \theta) \mathfrak{k}(\varpi) d\theta \quad \text{for all } \theta, \varpi \in [\rho, \pi], \quad (9)$$

where $\delta > 0$, $f(\varpi)$ is a neutrosophic function of $\varpi : \varpi \in [\rho, \pi]$ and $\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2 : \mathcal{C}([\rho, \pi] \times \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$. Define the binary relation \perp on \mathcal{X} by $\mathfrak{x} \perp \mathfrak{y} \perp \mathfrak{z}$ iff $\mathfrak{x} + \mathfrak{y} + \mathfrak{z} \geq 0$ and define \mathcal{Q} , \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} by

$$\mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon v, \Lambda \varrho, \varsigma, \ell \wp) = \min \left\{ \frac{\ell \wp}{\ell \wp + \min\{\Upsilon v, \Lambda \varrho, \varsigma, \ell \wp\}} \right\} \quad \forall v, \varrho, \varsigma \in \Phi \text{ and } \wp > 0,$$

$$\mathcal{F}(\Upsilon v, \Lambda \varrho, \varsigma, \ell \wp) = \max \left\{ 1 - \frac{\ell \wp}{\ell \wp + \max\{\Upsilon v, \Lambda \varrho, \varsigma, \ell \wp\}} \right\} \quad \forall v, \varrho, \varsigma \in \Phi \text{ and } \wp > 0,$$

$$\mathcal{G}(\Upsilon v, \Lambda \varrho, \varsigma, \ell \wp) = \max \left\{ \frac{\max\{\Upsilon v, \Lambda \varrho, \varsigma, \ell \wp\}}{\ell \wp} \right\} \quad \forall v, \varrho, \varsigma \in \Phi \text{ and } \wp > 0.$$

With con-t-nm and con-t-conm defined by $\rho * \pi = \rho \cdot \pi$ and $\rho + \pi = \max\{\rho, \pi\}$, then $(\Phi, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, *, +)$ is a O-complete N2MS. Consider $\int_{\rho}^{\pi} d\theta \leq \ell \wp < 1$. Then, the neutrosophic integral equations (8) and (9) have a unique common solution.

Proof Define $\Upsilon, \Lambda : \Phi \rightarrow \Phi$ by

$$d(\varpi) = f(\varpi) + \delta \int_{\rho}^{\pi} \mathcal{U}_1(\varpi, \theta) \mathfrak{k}(\varpi) d\theta \quad \text{for all } \theta, \varpi \in [\rho, \pi], \quad (10)$$

$$d(\varpi) = f(\varpi) + \delta \int_{\rho}^{\pi} \mathcal{U}_1(\varpi, \theta) \mathfrak{k}(\varpi) d\theta \quad \text{for all } \theta, \varpi \in [\rho, \pi]. \quad (11)$$

The survival of a fixed of the operator \mathcal{U} has come to the survival of solution of a neutrosophic integral equation,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon v(\varpi), \Lambda \varrho(\varpi), \varsigma \varpi, \ell \wp) \\ &= \sup_{\varpi \in [\rho, \pi]} \frac{\ell \wp}{\ell \wp + \min(\Upsilon v(\varpi), \Lambda \varrho(\varpi), \varsigma \varpi, \ell \wp)} \\ &= \sup_{\varpi \in [\rho, \pi]} \ell \wp / \left(\ell \wp + \left| f(\varpi) + \delta \int_{\rho}^{\pi} \mathcal{U}_1(\varpi, \theta) \Upsilon v(\varpi) - \varsigma \varpi - \wp - f(\varpi) \right| \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\delta \int_{\rho}^{\pi} \mathcal{U}_2(\varpi, \theta) \Lambda \varrho(\varpi) - \varsigma \varpi - \wp \Big| \Big) \\
& \geq \sup_{\varpi \in [\rho, \pi]} \frac{\ell \wp}{\ell \wp + |\Upsilon v(\varpi) - \Lambda \varrho(\varpi) - \varsigma \varpi - \wp|} \\
& \geq \mathcal{Q}(\Upsilon v, \Lambda \varrho, \varsigma, \wp), \\
& \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon v(\varpi), \Lambda \varrho(\varpi), \varsigma \varpi, \ell \wp) \\
& = 1 - \sup_{\varpi \in [\rho, \pi]} \frac{\ell \wp}{\ell \wp + \max(\Upsilon v(\varpi), \Lambda \varrho(\varpi), \varsigma \varpi, \ell \wp)} \\
& = 1 - \sup_{\varpi \in [\rho, \pi]} \ell \wp / \left(\ell \wp + \left| \mathfrak{f}(\varpi) + \delta \int_{\rho}^{\pi} \mathcal{U}_1(\varpi, \theta) \Upsilon v(\varpi) - \varsigma \varpi - \wp - \mathfrak{f}(\varpi) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - \delta \int_{\rho}^{\pi} \mathcal{U}_2(\varpi, \theta) \Lambda \varrho(\varpi) - \varsigma \varpi - \wp \right| \right) \\
& \leq 1 - \sup_{\varpi \in [\rho, \pi]} \frac{\ell \wp}{\ell \wp + |\Upsilon v(\varpi) - \Lambda \varrho(\varpi) - \varsigma \varpi - \wp|} \\
& \leq \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon v, \Lambda \varrho, \varsigma, \wp)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{G}(\Upsilon v(\varpi), \Lambda \varrho(\varpi), \varsigma \varpi, \ell \wp) \\
& = \sup_{\varpi \in [\rho, \pi]} \frac{\ell \wp}{\ell \wp + \max(\Upsilon v(\varpi), \Lambda \varrho(\varpi), \varsigma \varpi, \ell \wp)} \\
& = \sup_{\varpi \in [\rho, \pi]} \ell \wp / \left(\ell \wp + \left| \mathfrak{f}(\varpi) + \delta \int_{\rho}^{\pi} \mathcal{U}_1(\varpi, \theta) \Upsilon v(\varpi) - \varsigma \varpi - \wp - \mathfrak{f}(\varpi) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - \delta \int_{\rho}^{\pi} \mathcal{U}_2(\varpi, \theta) \Lambda \varrho(\varpi) - \varsigma \varpi - \wp \right| \right) \\
& \leq \sup_{\varpi \in [\rho, \pi]} \frac{\ell \wp}{\ell \wp + |\Upsilon v(\varpi) - \Lambda \varrho(\varpi) - \varsigma \varpi - \wp|} \\
& \leq \mathcal{F}(\Upsilon v, \Lambda \varrho, \varsigma, \wp).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, all the conditions of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied. Hence, Υ and Λ have a unique common solution. \square

5 Conclusion

We introduced the notion of a neutrosophic metric space to an orthogonal neutrosophic 2-metric space that deals with greater ambiguity and uncertainty in engineering and research studies. Finally, we obtained the common fixed-point theorem in an orthogonal neutrosophic 2-metric space.

Funding

The authors extend their appreciation to Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University, Alkharij, Saudi Arabia for funding this research work through the project number (PSAU/2023/01/33030).

Availability of data and materials

Not applicable.

Declarations

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Author contributions

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

Author details

¹Department of Mathematics, Saveetha School of Engineering, Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences, Chennai 602105, Tamil Nadu, India. ²Department of Mathematics, Ege University, Izmir, 35100, Bornova, Turkey. ³Department of Mathematics, School of Advanced Sciences, VIT-Chennai, Chennai, 600127, India. ⁴Department of Mathematics, College of Science and Humanities in Al-Kharj, Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, Al-Kharj 11942, Saudi Arabia.

Received: 19 March 2023 Accepted: 22 August 2023 Published online: 11 September 2023

References

1. Zadeh, L.A.: Fuzzy sets. *Inf. Control* **8**(3), 338–353 (1965)
2. Park, J.H.: Intuitionistic fuzzy metric spaces. *Chaos Solitons Fractals* **22**(5), 1039–1064 (2004)
3. Barros, L.C., Bassanezi, R.C., Tonelli, P.A.: Fuzzy modelling in population dynamics. *Ecol. Model.* **128**, 27–33 (2000). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3800\(99\)00223-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3800(99)00223-9)
4. Fradkov, A.L., Evans, R.J.: Control of chaos: methods and applications in engineering. *Chaos Solitons Fractals* **29**, 33–56 (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arcontrol.2005.01.001>
5. Giles, R.: A computer program for fuzzy reasoning. *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* **4**, 221–234 (1980). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-0114\(80\)90012-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-0114(80)90012-3)
6. Hong, L., Sun, J.Q.: Bifurcations of fuzzy nonlinear dynamical systems. *Commun. Nonlinear Sci. Numer. Simul.* **1**, 1–12 (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cnsns.2004.11.001>
7. Barro, S., Marin, R.: Fuzzy Logic in Medicine. Physica-Verlag, Heidelberg (2002). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-7908-1804-8>
8. Gähler, S.: 2-metrische Räume und ihre topologische Struktur. *Math. Nachr.* **26**, 115–148 (1963). <https://doi.org/10.1002/mana.19630260109>
9. Schweizer, B., Sklar, A.: Statistical metric spaces. *Pac. J. Math.* **10**, 313–334 (1960). <https://doi.org/10.2140/pjm.1960.10.313>
10. Atanassov, K.: Intuitionistic fuzzy sets. *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* **20**, 87–96 (1986). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-0114\(86\)80034-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-0114(86)80034-3)
11. Çoker, D.: An introduction to intuitionistic fuzzy topological spaces. *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* **88**, 81–99 (1997). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-0114\(96\)00076-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-0114(96)00076-0)
12. Abbas, S.E.: On intuitionistic fuzzy compactness. *Inf. Sci.* **173**, 75–91 (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2004.07.004>
13. Mursaleen, M., Lohani, Q.M.D.: Intuitionistic fuzzy 2-normed space and some related concepts. *Chaos Solitons Fractals* **42**, 224–234 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chaos.2008.11.006>
14. Mursaleen, M., Lohani, Q.M.D., Mohiuddine, S.A.: Intuitionistic fuzzy 2-metric space and its completion. *Chaos Solitons Fractals* **42**, 1258–1265 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chaos.2009.03.025>
15. Bera, T., Mahapatra, N.K.: On neutrosophic soft linear spaces. *Fuzzy Inf. Eng.* **9**(3), 299–324 (2017)
16. Bera, T., Mahapatra, N.K.: Neutrosophic soft normed linear spaces. *Neutrosophic Sets Syst.* **23**, 52–71 (2018)
17. Ishfaq, U., Javed, K., Uddin, F., de la Sen, M., Ahmed, K., Ali, M.U.: Fixed point results in orthogonal neutrosophic metric spaces. *Complexity* **2021**, Article ID 2809657 (2021)
18. Jeyaraman, M., Sowndarajan, S.: Common fixed point results in neutrosophic metric spaces. *Neutrosophic Sets Syst.* **42**, 208–220 (2021)
19. Fathollahi, S., Hussain, N., Khan, L.A.: Fixed point results for modified weak and rational $(\alpha - \psi)$ -contractions in ordered 2-metric spaces. *Fixed Point Theory Appl.* **2014**, Article ID 6 (2014)
20. Salama, A.A., Alblowi, S.A.: Neutrosophic set and neutrosophic topological spaces. *IOSR J. Math.* **3**(4), 31–35 (2012)
21. Al-Omeri, W.F., Jafari, S., Smarandache, F.: (Φ, Ψ) -Weak contractions in neutrosophic cone metric spaces via fixed point theorems. *Math. Probl. Eng.* **2020**, Article ID 9216805 (2020)
22. Riaz, M., Ishfaq, U., Park, C., Ahmad, K., Uddin, F.: Some fixed point results for ξ -chainable neutrosophic and generalized neutrosophic cone metric spaces with application. *AIMS Math.* **7**(8), 14756–14784 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.3934/math.2022811>
23. Asghar, A., Hussain, A., Ahmad, K., Ishfaq, U., Al Sulami, H., Hussain, N.: On neutrosophic 2-metric spaces with application. *J. Funct. Spaces* **2023**, Article ID 9057107 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/9057107>
24. Ishfaq, U., Javed, K., Uddin, F., de la Sen, M., Ahmed, K., Usman Ali, M.: Fixed point results in orthogonal neutrosophic metric spaces. *Complexity* **2021**, Article ID 2809657 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/2809657>
25. Eshaghi Gordji, M., Ramezani, M., De la Sen, M., Cho, Y.: On orthogonal sets and Banach fixed point theorem. *Fixed Point Theory* **18**, 569–578 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.24193/fpt-ro.2017.2.45>
26. Schweizer, B., Sklar, A.: Statistical metric spaces. *Pac. J. Math.* **10**, 313–334 (1960). <https://doi.org/10.2140/pjm.1960.10.313>
27. Kirişçi, M., Simsek, N.: Neutrosophic metric spaces. *Math. Sci.* **14**, 241–248 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40096-020-00335-8>
28. Mursaleen, M., Lohani, Q.M.D.: Baire's and Cantor's theorems in intuitionistic fuzzy 2-metric spaces. *Chaos Solitons Fractals* **42**, 2254–2259 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chaos.2009.03.134>

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Terms and Conditions

Springer Nature journal content, brought to you courtesy of Springer Nature Customer Service Center GmbH (“Springer Nature”).

Springer Nature supports a reasonable amount of sharing of research papers by authors, subscribers and authorised users (“Users”), for small-scale personal, non-commercial use provided that all copyright, trade and service marks and other proprietary notices are maintained. By accessing, sharing, receiving or otherwise using the Springer Nature journal content you agree to these terms of use (“Terms”). For these purposes, Springer Nature considers academic use (by researchers and students) to be non-commercial.

These Terms are supplementary and will apply in addition to any applicable website terms and conditions, a relevant site licence or a personal subscription. These Terms will prevail over any conflict or ambiguity with regards to the relevant terms, a site licence or a personal subscription (to the extent of the conflict or ambiguity only). For Creative Commons-licensed articles, the terms of the Creative Commons license used will apply.

We collect and use personal data to provide access to the Springer Nature journal content. We may also use these personal data internally within ResearchGate and Springer Nature and as agreed share it, in an anonymised way, for purposes of tracking, analysis and reporting. We will not otherwise disclose your personal data outside the ResearchGate or the Springer Nature group of companies unless we have your permission as detailed in the Privacy Policy.

While Users may use the Springer Nature journal content for small scale, personal non-commercial use, it is important to note that Users may not:

1. use such content for the purpose of providing other users with access on a regular or large scale basis or as a means to circumvent access control;
2. use such content where to do so would be considered a criminal or statutory offence in any jurisdiction, or gives rise to civil liability, or is otherwise unlawful;
3. falsely or misleadingly imply or suggest endorsement, approval, sponsorship, or association unless explicitly agreed to by Springer Nature in writing;
4. use bots or other automated methods to access the content or redirect messages
5. override any security feature or exclusionary protocol; or
6. share the content in order to create substitute for Springer Nature products or services or a systematic database of Springer Nature journal content.

In line with the restriction against commercial use, Springer Nature does not permit the creation of a product or service that creates revenue, royalties, rent or income from our content or its inclusion as part of a paid for service or for other commercial gain. Springer Nature journal content cannot be used for inter-library loans and librarians may not upload Springer Nature journal content on a large scale into their, or any other, institutional repository.

These terms of use are reviewed regularly and may be amended at any time. Springer Nature is not obligated to publish any information or content on this website and may remove it or features or functionality at our sole discretion, at any time with or without notice. Springer Nature may revoke this licence to you at any time and remove access to any copies of the Springer Nature journal content which have been saved.

To the fullest extent permitted by law, Springer Nature makes no warranties, representations or guarantees to Users, either express or implied with respect to the Springer nature journal content and all parties disclaim and waive any implied warranties or warranties imposed by law, including merchantability or fitness for any particular purpose.

Please note that these rights do not automatically extend to content, data or other material published by Springer Nature that may be licensed from third parties.

If you would like to use or distribute our Springer Nature journal content to a wider audience or on a regular basis or in any other manner not expressly permitted by these Terms, please contact Springer Nature at

onlineservice@springernature.com