Nr 56

2016 DOI:10.1515/fascmath-2016-0009

# VALERIU POPA

# A GENERAL FIXED POINT THEOREM FOR A PAIR OF MULTI-VALUED MAPPINGS IN PARTIAL METRIC SPACES

ABSTRACT. The purpose of this paper is to prove a general fixed point theorem for a pair of multi-valued mappings satisfying a new type of implicit relation in partial metric spaces, which generalizes Theorem 2.2 [4], Theorem 3.1 [3], Theorem 3.2 [7], Corollary 2.3 [4], Theorem 2.8 [16] and obtain other particular results.

KEY WORDS: fixed point, pair of multi-valued mappings, partial metric space, implicit relation.

AMS Mathematics Subject Classification: 54H25, 47H10.

# 1. Introduction

In 1994, Matthews [9] introduced the concept of partial metric space as a part of the study of denotational semantics of dataflow networks and proved the Banach contraction principle in such spaces.

Many authors studied the fixed points for mappings satisfying some contractive condition in complete partial metric spaces. In 2012, Aydi et al. [3] introduced the definition of partial Hausdorff metric and also proved the existence of the Banach contraction principle for multi-valued mappings in complete partial metric spaces.

Quite recently, in [4] is proved a common fixed point theorem for a pair of multi-valued mappings satisfying a contractive condition in partial metric spaces.

Other results for fixed points of multi-valued mappings in complete partial metric spaces are recently obtained in [1], [5], [6], [7], [8], [16] and in other paper.

A Nadler type theorem for multi-valued mappings in partial metric spaces is proved in [3]. Quite recently, a new generalized Nadler type theorem in complete partial metric spaces is proved in [7].

#### VALERIU POPA

Several classical fixed point theorems and common fixed point theorems have been unified considering a general condition by an implicit relation in [11], [12] and in other papers. Recently, the method is used in the study of fixed points in metric spaces, symmetric spaces, quasi-metric spaces, ultra-metric spaces, convex metric spaces, reflexive spaces, compact metric spaces, paracompact metric spaces, in two or three metric spaces, for single valued mappings, hybrid pairs of mappings and set-valued mappings. Quite recently, the method is used in the study of fixed points for mappings satisfying a contractive/extensive condition of integral type, in fuzzy metric spaces, probabilistic metric spaces, intuitionistic metric spaces and G-metric spaces. With this method the proofs of some fixed points theorems are more simple. Also, the method allows the study of local and global properties of fixed point structures. The study of fixed points for self mappings in complete partial metric spaces satisfying an implicit relation is initiated in [17].

The study of coincidence and fixed points for multi-valued mappings in metric spaces satisfying implicit relations is initiated in [13], [14], [15] and in other papers.

The purpose of this paper is to prove a general fixed point theorem for a pair of multi-valued mappings satisfying a new type of implicit relation in partial metric spaces, which generalizes Theorems 2.2 [4], Theorem 3.1 [3], Theorem 3.2 [7], Corollary 2.3 [4], Theorem 2.8 [16] and obtain other particular results.

## 2. Preliminaries

**Definition 1** ([9]). Let X be a nonempty set. A function  $p: X \times X \to \mathbb{R}_+$  is said to be a partial metric on X if for any  $x, y, z \in X$ , the following conditions hold:

 $(P_1): p(x,x) = p(y,y) = p(x,y)$  if and only if x = y,  $(P_2): p(x,x) \le p(x,y)$ ,  $(P_3): p(x,y) = p(y,x)$ ,  $(P_4): p(x,z) \le p(x,y) + p(y,z) - p(y,y)$ . The pair (X,p) is called a partial metric space.

If p(x, y) = 0, then x = y, but the converse does not hold always.

Each partial metric p on X generates a  $T_0$ -topology  $\tau_p$  which has as base the family of open p-balls  $\{B_p(x,\varepsilon) : x \in X, \varepsilon > 0\}$ , where  $B_p(x,y) = \{y \in X : p(x,y) \le p(x,x) + \varepsilon\}$  for all  $x \in X$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

A sequence  $\{x_n\}$  in a partial metric space (X, p) converges to a point  $x \in X$  with respect to  $\tau_p$  if and only if  $p(x, x) = \lim_{n \to \infty} p(x, x_n)$ .

If p is a partial metric on X, then the function  $p^s(x,y) = 2p(x,y) - p(x,x) - p(y,y)$  defines a metric on X.

Furthermore, a sequence  $\{x_n\}$  converges in  $(X, p^s)$  to a point  $x \in X$  if and only if

(1) 
$$\lim_{n,m\to\infty} p(x_n, x_m) = \lim_{n\to\infty} p(x_n, x) = p(x, x).$$

**Definition 2** ([9]). Let (X, p) be a partial metric space.

a) A sequence  $\{x_n\}$  in X is said to be a Cauchy sequence if  $\lim_{n,m\to\infty} p(x_n, x_m)$  exists and is finite.

b) (X, p) is said to be complete if every Cauchy sequence in X converges with respect to  $\tau_p$  to a point  $x \in X$  such that  $\lim_{n \to \infty} p(x_n, x) = p(x, x)$ .

**Lemma 1** ([9]). Let (X, p) be a partial metric space. Then:

a) A sequence in X is a Cauchy sequence in (X, p) if and only if is a Cauchy sequence in  $(X, p^s)$ ;

b) A partial metric space (X,p) is complete if and only if the metric space  $(X,p^s)$  is complete.

Let (X, p) be a partial metric space. We denote by  $CB^p(X)$  the family of all nonempty closed and bounded subsets of the partial metric space (X, p), induced by the partial metric p, where the closedness in take from  $(X, \tau_p)$ and boundness if given as follows: A is a bounded subset in (X, p) if there exists  $x_0 \in X$  and  $M \ge 0$  such that for all  $a \in A$ , we have  $a \in B_p(x_0, M)$ , that is  $p(x_0, a) < p(a, a) + M$ .

For  $A, B \in CB^p(X)$  and  $x \in X$ , we define

$$p(x, A) = \inf \{ p(x, a) : a \in A \},\$$
  
$$\delta_p(A, B) = \sup \{ p(a, B) : a \in A \}$$

and

$$\delta_p(B, A) = \sup\{p(b, A) : b \in B\}.$$

Then p(x, A) = 0 implies  $p^s(x, A) = 0$ , where  $p^s(x, A) = \inf\{p^s(x, A) : a \in A\}$ .

**Lemma 2** ([2]). Let (X, p) be a partial metric space and A a nonempty subset in (X, p). Then  $x \in \overline{A}$  if and only if p(a, A) = p(a, a), where  $\overline{A}$  denotes the closure of A with respect to the partial metric p.

The following properties of  $\delta_p : CB^p(X) \times CB^p(X) \to [0, \infty)$  are established in [3].

**Lemma 3** ([3]). For  $A, B, C \in CB^p(X)$ , we have the following:

- (i)  $\delta_p(A, A) = \sup\{p(a, a) : a \in A\},\$
- (*ii*)  $\delta_p(A, A) \le \delta_p(A, B)$ ,
- (*iii*)  $\delta_p(A, B) = 0$  implies  $A \subset B$ ,
- $(iv) \quad \delta(A,B) \le \delta(A,C) + \delta(C,B) \inf\{p(c,c) : c \in C\}.$

Let (X, p) be a partial metric space. For  $A, B \in CB^p(X)$  we define [3]

$$H_p(A, B) = \max\{\delta_p(A, B), \delta_p(B, A)\}.$$

**Lemma 4** ([3]). For all  $A, B, C \in CB^p(X)$ , we have:

- (i)  $H_p(A, A) \le H_p(A, B),$
- (*ii*)  $H_p(A, B) = H_p(B, A),$
- (*iii*)  $H_p(A, B) \le H_p(A, C) + H(C, B) \inf\{p(c, c) : c \in C\}.$

**Corollary 1** ([3]). Let (X, p) be a partial metric space. For  $A, B \in CB^p(X)$ ,  $H_p(A, B) = 0$  implies A = B.

**Remark 1.** The converse of Corollary 1 is not true in general.

The mapping  $H_p$  is called a partial Hausdorff metric induced by p [3].

**Lemma 5** ([3]). Let (X, p) be a partial metric space,  $A, B \in CB^p(X)$ and k > 1. For any  $a \in A$  there exists  $b = b(a) \in B$  such that  $p(a, b) \leq kH(A, B)$ .

**Lemma 6** ([16]). Let  $x_n \to x$  as n tends to infinite in a partial metric space with p(x,x) = 0. Then  $\lim_{n\to\infty} p(x_n,B) = p(x,B)$  for any  $B \in CB^p(X)$ .

The following result generalizes Nadler theorem [10] for partial metric space.

**Theorem 1** ([3] Theorem 3.1). Let (X, p) be a complete partial metric space. If  $T : (X, p) \to CB^p(X)$  is a multi-valued mapping such that for all  $x, y \in X$  we have

$$H_p(Tx, Ty) \le hp(x, y),$$

where  $h \in (0, 1)$ , then T has a fixed point.

Quite recently, a generalization of Theorem 1 is obtained.

**Theorem 2** ([7] Theorem 3.2). Theorem 2. Let (X, p) be a complete partial metric space and let  $T : (X, p) \to CB^p(X)$  be a multi-valued mapping such that for all  $x, y \in X$ 

$$H(Tx,Ty) \le \alpha p(x,y) + \beta [p(x,Tx) + p(y,Ty)] + \gamma [p(x,Ty) + p(y,Tx)],$$

where  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \geq 0, 0 < \alpha + 2\beta + 2\gamma < 1$ . Then T has a fixed point.

In a recent paper [4] the following results are obtained.

**Theorem 3** ([4] Theorem 2.2). Let (X, p) be a complete partial metric space and  $T, S : (X, p) \to CB^p(X)$  be two multi-valued mappings satisfying, for all  $x, y \in X$ , the following condition:

(2) 
$$H_p(Tx, Sy) \le \alpha \max\{p(x, y), p(x, Tx), p(y, Sy), \frac{p(x, Sy) + p(y, Tx)}{2}\},\$$

 $\alpha \in [0,1)$ . Then, T and S have a common fixed point. Moreover, if T or S is a single valued mapping, then the common fixed point is unique.

**Corollary 2** ([4] Corollary 2.3). Let (X, p) be a complete partial metric space and  $T, S : (X, p) \to CB^p(X)$  be two multi-valued mappings satisfying, for all  $x, y \in X$ , the following condition:

$$H_p(Tx, Sy) \leq a_1 p(x, y) + a_2 p(x, Tx) + a_3 p(y, Sy) + a_4 [p(x, Sy) + p(y, Tx)],$$

where  $a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 \ge 0$  and  $0 < a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + 2a_4 < 1$ . Then, T and S have a common fixed point. Moreover, if T or S is a single valued mapping, then the common fixed point is unique.

**Theorem 4** ([16] Theorem 2.8). Let (X, p) be a complete partial metric space and  $S, T : (X, p) \to CB^p(X)$  be mappings satisfying (2). Then T and S have a common fixed point. Further, if we assume that  $p(x, y) \leq p(x, Sx)$ or  $p(x, y) \leq p(y, Tx)$  for all  $x, y \in X$ , then T and S have a unique common fixed point.

### 3. Implicit relations

**Definition 3.** Let  $\mathfrak{F}_p$  be the set of all continuous functions  $F(t_1, \ldots, t_5)$ :  $\mathbb{R}^5_+ \to \mathbb{R}$  satisfying the following conditions:

 $(F_1): F$  is increasing in variable  $t_1$  and nonincreasing in variables  $t_3, t_4, t_5;$  $(F_2): There exist <math>h_1, h_2 \in (0, 1)$  and k > 1 such that for all  $u, v \ge 0$ ,

t > 0 and  $u \le kt$  then:

 $(F_{2a}): F(t, v, v, u, u + v) \leq 0 \text{ implies } u \leq h_1 v,$  $(F_{2b}): F(t, v, u, v, u + v) \leq 0 \text{ implies } u \leq h_2 v.$ 

**Example 1.**  $F(t_1, \ldots, t_5) = t_1 - a \max\{t_2, t_3, t_4, \frac{t_5}{2}\}$ , where  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ .  $(F_1)$ : Obviously.

 $(F_2)$ : Let  $1 < k < \frac{1}{\alpha}$  be such that if  $u, v \ge 0, t > 0$  and  $u \le kt$ ,  $F(t, v, v, u, u + v) = t - \alpha \max\{u, v, \frac{u+v}{2}\} \le 0$ . Then  $u \le \alpha k \max\{u, v, \frac{u+v}{2}\}$ . If u > v, then  $u(1 - \alpha k) \le 0$ , a contradiction. Hence,  $u \le v$ , which implies  $u \le h_1 v$ , where  $0 < h_1 = \alpha k < 1$ .

Similarly,  $u \leq kt$  and  $F(t, v, u, v, u + v) \leq 0$  implies  $u \leq h_2 v$ .

**Example 2.**  $F(t_1, \ldots, t_5) = t_1 - at_2 - bt_3 - ct_4 - dt_5$ , where  $a, b, c, d \ge 0$ and 0 < a + b + c + 2d < 1.

 $(F_1)$ : Obviously.

 $(F_2)$ : Let  $1 < k < \frac{1}{a+b+c+2d}$  be such that if  $u, v \ge 0, t > 0$  and  $u \le kt$ ,  $F(t, v, v, u, u + v) = t - [av + bv + cu + d(u + v)] \le 0$ . Then  $u \le kt$  implies  $u \le h_1 v$ , where  $0 < h_1 = \frac{k(a+b+d)}{1-k(c+d)} < 1$ .

Similarly,  $u \leq kt$  and  $F(t, v, u, v, u + v) \leq 0$  implies  $u \leq h_2 v$ , where  $0 < h_2 = \frac{k(a+c+d)}{1-k(c+d)} < 1$ .

If  $h = \max\{h_1, h_2\}$  and  $u \le kt$  then  $u \le hv$ .

**Example 3.**  $F(t_1, \ldots, t_5) = t_1 - a \max\{t_2, t_3, t_4, t_5\}$ , where  $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$ .  $(F_1)$ : Obviously.

 $(F_2)$ : Let  $1 < k < \frac{1}{2\alpha}$  be such that if  $u, v \ge 0, t > 0$  and  $u \le kt$ ,  $F(t, v, v, u, u + v) = t - \alpha \max\{v, u, u + v\} \le 0$ . Then  $u \le kt$  implies  $u \le k\alpha(u+v)$ , hence  $u \le hv$ , where  $0 < h = \frac{\alpha k}{1-\alpha k} < 1$ . Similarly,  $u \le kt$  and  $F(t, v, u, v, u + v) \le 0$  implies  $u \le hv$ .

**Example 4.**  $F(t_1, \ldots, t_5) = t_1 - \max\{ct_2, ct_3, ct_4, at_5\}$ , where 0 < a,  $c < \frac{1}{2}$ .

 $(F_1)$ : Obviously.

 $(F_2): \text{Let } 1 < k < \frac{1}{2\max\{a,c\}} \text{ be such that if } u, v \ge 0, t > 0 \text{ and } u \le kt,$   $F(t, v, v, u, u + v) = t - \max\{cu, cv, a(u + v)\} \le 0. \text{ Since } u \le kt, \text{ then } u \le kt \text{ max}\{a, c\}(u + v) \text{ which implies } u \le hv, \text{ where } 0 < h = \frac{k\max\{a,c\}}{1 - k\max\{a,c\}} < 1.$ Similarly,  $u \le kt$  and  $F(t, v, u, v, u + v) \le 0$  implies  $u \le hv.$ 

**Example 5.**  $F(t_1, \ldots, t_5) = t_1^2 - at_2t_3 - bt_4^2 - ct_5^2$ , where  $a, b, c \ge 0$  and 0 < a + b + 4c < 1.

 $(F_1)$ : Obviously.

 $(F_2)$ : Let  $1 < k < \frac{1}{\sqrt{a+b+4c}}$  be such that if  $u, v \ge 0, t > 0$  and  $u \le kt$ ,  $F(t, v, v, u, u + v) = t^2 - av^2 - bu^2 - c(u+v)^2 \le 0$ . If u > v, since  $u \le kv$ , then  $u^2[1 - k^2(a+b+4c)] \le 0$ , a contradiction. Hence  $u \le v$  which implies  $u \le hv$ , where  $0 < h = k\sqrt{a+b+4c} < 1$ .

Similarly,  $u \leq kt$  and  $F(t, v, u, v, u + v) \leq 0$  implies  $u \leq hv$ .

**Example 6.**  $F(t_1, \ldots, t_5) = t_1 - at_2 - bt_3 - c \max\{2t_4, t_5\}$ , where  $a, b, c \ge 0$  and 0 < a + b + 2c < 1.

 $(F_1)$ : Obviously.

 $(F_2)$ : Let  $1 < k < \frac{1}{a+b+2c}$  be such that if  $u, v \ge 0, t > 0$  and  $u \le kt$ ,  $F(t, v, v, u, u + v) = t - av - bv - c \max\{2u, u + v\} \le 0$ . Since  $u \le kt$ , if u > v, then  $u[1 - k(a + b + 2c)] \le 0$ , a contradiction. Hence  $u \le v$  which implies  $u \le hv$ , where 0 < h = k(a + b + 2c) < 1.

Similarly,  $u \leq kt$  and  $F(t, v, u, v, u + v) \leq 0$  implies  $u \leq hv$ .

#### 4. Main results

**Theorem 5.** Let (X, p) be a complete partial metric space and  $T, S : (X, p) \to CB^p(X)$  be two multi-valued mappings satisfying, for all  $x, y \in X$ , the following condition

(3) 
$$\begin{cases} F(H_p(Tx, Sy), p(x, y), p(x, Tx), \\ p(y, Sy), p(x, Sy) + p(y, Tx)) \le 0, \end{cases}$$

where  $F \in \mathfrak{F}_p$ . Then, T and S have a common fixed point. Moreover, if T or S is single-valued, then the common fixed point is unique.

**Proof.** Let  $x_0 \in X$  be and  $x_1 \in Sx_0$ . By Lemma 5, there exists  $x_2 \in Tx_1$  such that

$$p(x_2, x_1) \le kH_p(Tx_1, Sx_0).$$

Continuing in this manner, we can construct a sequence  $\{x_n\}$  in X such that

(4) 
$$x_{2n+1} \in Sx_{2n}$$
 and  $x_{2n+2} \in Tx_{2n+1}$ 

(5) 
$$p(x_{2n+1}, x_{2n}) \le kH_p(Sx_{2n}, Tx_{2n-1}),$$

(6) 
$$p(x_{2n+2}, x_{2n+1}) \le kH_p(Tx_{2n+1}, Sx_{2n}).$$

By (3) we get

$$\begin{cases} F(H_p(Tx_{2n-1}, Sx_{2n}), p(x_{2n-1}, x_{2n}), p(x_{2n-1}, Tx_{2n-1}), \\ p(x_{2n}, Sx_{2n}), p(x_{2n-1}, Sx_{2n}) + p(x_{2n}, Tx_{2n-1})) \le 0. \end{cases}$$

By (4) and  $(F_1)$  we have

$$\begin{cases} F(H_p(Tx_{2n-1}, Sx_{2n}), p(x_{2n-1}, x_{2n}), p(x_{2n-1}, x_{2n}), p(x_{2n-1}, x_{2n}) \\ p(x_{2n}, x_{2n+1}), p(x_{2n-1}, x_{2n+1}) + p(x_{2n}, x_{2n})) \le 0. \end{cases}$$

Since by  $(P_4)$ ,

$$p(x_{2n-1}, x_{2n+1}) \le p(x_{2n-1}, x_{2n}) + p(x_{2n}, x_{2n+1}) - p(x_{2n}, x_{2n}),$$

by  $(F_1)$  we obtain

(7) 
$$\begin{cases} F(H_p(Tx_{2n-1}, Sx_{2n}), p(x_{2n-1}, x_{2n}), p(x_{2n-1}, x_{2n}), p(x_{2n-1}, x_{2n}), \\ p(x_{2n}, x_{2n+1}), p(x_{2n-1}, x_{2n}) + p(x_{2n}, x_{2n+1})) \le 0. \end{cases}$$

By (5), (7) and  $(F_{2a})$  it follows that

$$p(x_{2n}, x_{2n+1}) \le h_1 p(x_{2n-1}, x_{2n}).$$

Similarly, by (3) we have

$$\begin{cases} F(H_p(Tx_{2n+1}, Sx_{2n}), p(x_{2n+1}, x_{2n}), p(x_{2n+1}, Tx_{2n+1}), \\ p(x_{2n}, Sx_{2n}), p(x_{2n+1}, Sx_{2n}) + p(x_{2n}, Tx_{2n+1})) \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

By  $(F_1)$  we get

$$\begin{cases} F(H_p(Tx_{2n+1}, Sx_{2n}), p(x_{2n+1}, x_{2n}), p(x_{2n+1}, x_{2n+2}), \\ p(x_{2n}, x_{2n+1}), p(x_{2n+1}, x_{2n+1}) + p(x_{2n}, x_{2n+2})) \le 0. \end{cases}$$

Since by  $(P_4)$ ,

$$p(x_{2n}, x_{2n+2}) \le p(x_{2n}, x_{2n+1}) + p(x_{2n+1}, x_{2n+2}) - p(x_{2n+1}, x_{2n+1}),$$

by  $(F_1)$  we obtain

(8) 
$$\begin{cases} F(H_p(Tx_{2n+1}, Sx_{2n}), p(x_{2n+1}, x_{2n}), p(x_{2n+1}, x_{2n+2}), \\ p(x_{2n}, x_{2n+1}), p(x_{2n}, x_{2n+1}) + p(x_{2n+1}, x_{2n+2})) \le 0. \end{cases}$$

Then by (6), (8) and  $(F_{2b})$  we have

$$p(x_{2n+1}, x_{2n+2}) \le h_2 p(x_{2n}, x_{2n+1}).$$

Let  $h = \max\{h_1, h_2\}$ . Then

$$p(x_n, x_{n+1}) \le hp(x_{n-1}, x_n) \le \ldots \le h^p p(x_0, x_1).$$

For every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  we have

$$p(x_n, x_{n+k}) \leq p(x_n, x_{n+1}) + p(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) + \dots + p(x_{n+k-1}, x_{n+k})$$
  
$$\leq (h^n + h^{n+1} + \dots + h^{n+k-1})p(x_0, x_1)$$
  
$$= \frac{h^n}{1 - h}p(x_0, x_1) \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

By the definition of  $p^s$  we get

$$p^s(x_n, x_{n+k}) \le 2p(x_n, x_{n+k}) \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

This implies that  $\{x_n\}$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $(X, p^s)$ . Since (X, p) is complete then by Lemma 1  $(X, p^s)$  is a complete metric space. Therefore,

the sequence  $\{x_n\}$  converges to some  $v \in X$  with respect to the metric  $p^s$ , that is

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} p^s(x_n, v) = 0$$

Moreover, by (2) we have

(9) 
$$p(v,v) = \lim_{n \to \infty} p(x_n,v) = \lim_{n,m \to \infty} p(x_n,x_m) = 0.$$

Also, we get

$$\begin{cases} F(H_p(Tx_{2n+1}, Sv), p(x_{2n+1}, v), p(x_{2n+1}, Tx_{2n+1}), \\ p(v, Sv), p(x_{2n+1}, Sv) + p(v, Tx_{2n+1})) \le 0. \end{cases}$$

By  $(F_1)$  we get

$$\begin{cases} F(p(x_{2n+2}, Sv), p(x_{2n+1}, v), p(x_{2n+1}, x_{2n+2}), \\ p(v, Sv), p(x_{2n+1}, Sv) + p(v, x_{2n+2})) \le 0. \end{cases}$$

By (9) and Lemma 6 letting n tends to infinity we obtain

$$F(p(v, Sv), 0, 0, p(v, Sv), p(v, Sv)) \le 0.$$

Since p(v, Sv) < kp(v, Sv), by  $(F_{2a})$  we have p(v, Sv) = 0. Since Sv is closed then  $v \in Sv$ .

Similarly, by  $(F_{2b})$  we obtain  $v \in Tv$ .

Now, we show that the common point v is unique if T is a single-valued mappings. Assume that  $u \in X$  is another common fixed point of T and S.

By (3) we have

$$\begin{cases} F(H_p(Tu, Sv), p(u, v), p(u, Tu), \\ p(v, Sv), p(u, Sv) + p(v, Tu)) \le 0. \end{cases}$$

Since  $u = \{Tu\}$  and  $v \in Sv$  we have

$$p(u, v) \le H_p(Tu, Sv),$$
  
$$p(v, Sv) = p(v, v),$$

which implies by  $(F_1)$  that

$$F(p(u, v), p(u, v), p(u, u), p(v, v), p(u, v) + p(u, v)) \le 0.$$

By  $p(u, u) \le p(u, v), p(v, v) \le p(u, v)$  and by (F1), we obtain

$$F(p(u, v), p(u, v), p(u, v), p(u, v), p(u, v) + p(u, v)) \le 0$$

Since  $p(u, v) \leq kp(u, v)$  if p(u, v) > 0, by  $(F_{2a})$  or  $(F_{2b})$  we have

$$p(u, v) \le hp(u, v) < p(u, v),$$

a contradiction. Hence, p(u, v) = 0 which implies u = v and v is the unique common fixed point of T and S. If S is single-valued mapping instead T, the proof is similar.

Corollary 3. Theorem 3.

**Proof.** The proof it follows by Theorem 5 and Example 1.

**Example 7.** Let  $X = \{0, 1, 2\}$  be endowed with the partial metric  $p: X \times X \to \mathbb{R}_+$  defined by p(0,0) = p(1,1) = 0,  $p(0,1) = p(1,0) = \frac{1}{4}$ ,  $p(2,2) = \frac{1}{3}$ ,  $p(0,2) = p(2,0) = \frac{2}{5}$ ,  $p(1,2) = p(2,1) = \frac{13}{20}$ .

We define  $T: X \to X$  and  $S: X \to CB^p(X)$  by

$$Tx = \begin{cases} 0, & x \in \{0, 1\} \\ 1, & x = 2 \end{cases}$$

and

$$Sx = \begin{cases} \{0\}, & x \neq 2\\ \{0,1\}, & x = 2 \end{cases}$$

as in Example 2.11 [4], and

$$M(x,y) = \max\left\{p(x,y), p(x,Tx), p(y,Sy), \frac{p(x,Sy) + p(y,Tx)}{2}\right\}.$$

Note that Sx is closed and bounded for all  $x \in X$  under the given partial metric p.

We distinguish the following cases:

(i) If  $x \in \{0, 1\}$  then  $H_p(\{T0\}, S1) = 0$  and  $H_p(\{Tx\}, Sy) \le \alpha M(\{Tx\}, Sy)$  for  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ .

(*ii*) If 
$$x = 0$$
 and  $y = 2$ , then  $H_p({T0}, S2) = H_p({0}, {0, 1}) = \frac{1}{4}$  and

$$\begin{cases} M(0,2) = \max\left\{p(0,2), p(0,T0), p(2,S2), \frac{p(0,S2)+p(2,T0)}{2}\right\} \\ = \max\left\{\frac{2}{5}, 0, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{0+\frac{2}{5}}{2}\right\} = \frac{2}{5}. \end{cases}$$

Hence  $Hp(\{T0\}, S2) = \frac{1}{4} \le \alpha M(0, 2)$  for  $\alpha \in [\frac{5}{8}, 1]$ .

(*iii*) Similarly, if x = 2 and y = 0, then  $H_p(\{T2\}, S0) = H_p(\{1\}, 0) = \frac{1}{4} \leq \alpha M(2, 0) = \frac{13}{20}\alpha$ . Hence,  $H_p(\{T2\}, S0) = \frac{1}{4} \leq \alpha M(2, 0) = \frac{13}{20}\alpha$  for  $\alpha \in [\frac{5}{13}, 1)$ .

(iv) If x = 2, y = 1, then  $H_p(\{T2\}, S1) = H_p(\{1\}, \{0\}) = \frac{1}{4}$  and  $M(2,1) = \frac{13}{20}$ . Hence  $H_p(\{T2\}, S1) = \frac{1}{4} \leq \alpha M(2,1) = \frac{13}{20}\alpha$ . Hence  $Hp(\{T2\}, S1) = \frac{1}{4} \leq \alpha M(2,1) = \frac{13}{20}$  for  $\alpha \in [\frac{5}{13}, 1]$ .

(v) Similarly, if x = 1, y = 2, we have  $H_p(\{T1\}, S2) = \frac{1}{4} \leq \alpha M(1, 2) = \frac{13}{20}\alpha$  for  $\alpha \in [\frac{5}{13}, 1)$ .

(vi) If x = 2, y = 2, similarly we obtain  $H_p({T2}, S2) = \frac{1}{4} \leq \alpha M(2, 2) = \frac{13}{20}\alpha$  for  $\alpha \in [\frac{5}{13}, 1)$ .

Hence,  $Hp(\{Tx\}, Sy) \leq \alpha M(x, y)$  for  $\alpha \in \left[\frac{5}{8}, 1\right)$ . Thus all the conditions of Corollary 3 are satisfied and x = 0 is the unique common fixed point.

Corollary 4. Corollary 2.

**Proof.** The proof it follows by Theorem 5 and Example 2 with  $a_2 = a_3$ .

If T = S, by Theorem 5 we obtain

**Theorem 6.** (X, p) be a complete partial metric space and  $T : (X, p) \rightarrow CB^{p}(X)$  be a multi-valued mapping satisfying, for all  $x, y \in X$ , the following condition

$$F(H_p(Tx, Ty), p(x, y), p(x, Tx), p(y, Ty), p(x, Ty) + p(y, Tx)) \le 0,$$

where  $F \in \mathfrak{F}_p$ . Then, T has a fixed point. Moreover, if T is single-valued mapping, then the common fixed point is unique.

**Remark 2.** (a) The proof of Theorem 1 it follows by Theorem 6 and Example 2 with b = c = d = 0.

(b) The proof of Theorem 2 it follows by Theorem 6 and Example 2 with  $b = c = \beta$ .

**Definition 4.** A function  $F(t_1, \ldots, t_5) : \mathbb{R}^5_+ \to \mathbb{R}$  satisfies the condition  $(F'_1)$ : F is increasing in variable  $t_1$  and nonincreasing in variables  $t_2$ ,  $t_3$ ,  $t_4$ ,  $t_5$ .

**Theorem 7.** Let (X, p) be a complete partial metric space and  $T, S : X \to CB^p(X)$  be two multivalued mappings satisfying (2) for all  $x, y \in X$ , where F satisfy  $(F'_1)$  and  $F_2$ . Then, T and S have a common fixed point. Further if  $p(x, y) \leq p(y, Sx)$  or  $p(x, y) \leq p(y, Tx)$ , then T and S have a unique common fixed point in X.

**Proof.** As in Theorem 5, T and S have a common fixed point z. Suppose that z' is another fixed point of T and S. By hypothesis

(10) 
$$p(z,z') \le p(z',Sz) \le H_p(Sz,Tz')$$

Then by (2) we have

$$\begin{cases} F(H_p(Tz, Sz'), p(z', z), p(z', Tz'), \\ p(z, Sz), p(z, Tz') + p(z', Sz)) \le 0. \end{cases}$$

From  $(F'_1)$  and (10) we obtain:

$$\begin{cases} F(H_p(Tz', Sz), H_p(Tz', Sz), H(Tz', Tz'), \\ Hp(Sz, Sz), H_p(Sz, Tz') + H_p(z', Sz)) \le 0. \end{cases}$$

By  $(F'_1)$  and Lemma 4 (i) we obtain

$$\begin{cases} F(H_p(Tz', Sz), H_p(Tz', Sz), H_p(Tz', Sz), \\ H_p(Tz', Sz), H_p(Tz', Sz) + H_p(Tz', Sz)) \le 0. \end{cases}$$

Since  $H_p(Tz', Sz) \leq kH_p(Tz', Sz)$  then by  $(F_2)$  we obtain  $H_p(Tz', Sz) \leq h_1H_p(Tz', Sz)$  which implies  $H_p(Tz, Sz') = 0$  and by (10), z = z'.

Corollary 5. Theorem 4.

**Proof.** The proof it follows by Theorem 7 and Example 1.

## References

- AHMED J., DI BARI C., CHO Y.J., ARSHAD M., Some fixed point results for multi-valued mappings in partial metric spaces, *Fixed Point Theory Appl.*, 2013(175)(2013).
- [2] ALTUN I., SIMSEK H., Some fixed point theorems on dualistic partial metric spaces, J. Adv. Math. Stud., 1(2008), 1-8.
- [3] AYDI H., ABBAS M., VETRO C., Partial Hausdorff metric and Nadler's fixed point theorem on partial metric spaces, *Topology Appl.*, 159(2012), 3234-3242.
- [4] AYDI H., ABBAS M., VETRO C., Common fixed points for multi-valued generalized contractions on partial metric spaces, *RACSAM*, (2013), 1-19.
- [5] KAEWCHAROEN A., YUYING T., Coincidence points and fixed point theorems for multi-valued mappings, *Intern. J. Pure Appl. Math.*, 89(4)(2013), 531-546.
- [6] KHAN A.R., ABBAS M., NAZIR T., IONESCU C., Fixed point for multi-valued contractive mappings in partial metric spaces, *Abstr. Appl. Anal.*, Volume 2014, Article ID 230708.
- [7] MACANSANTOS P.S., A generalized Nadler-type theorem in partial metric spaces, Intern. J. Math. Anal., 7(7)(2013), 343-348.
- [8] MACANSANTOS P.S., A fixed point theorem for multi-functions in partial metric spaces, J. Nonlinear Anal. Appl., 2013(2013), 1-7.
- [9] MATTHEWS S.G., Partial metric topology, Proc. 8-th Summer Conference on General Topology and Applications, Ann. New York Acad. Sci., 728(1994), 183-197.

- [10] NADLER S.B., Multi-valued contractive mappings, Pacific J. Math., 30(1969), 475-488.
- [11] POPA V., Fixed point theorems for implicit contractive mappings, Stud. Cercet. Ştiinţ., Ser. Mat., Univ. Bacău, 7(1997), 129-133.
- [12] POPA V., Some fixed point theorems for compatible mappings satisfying an implicit relation, *Demonstr. Math.*, 32(1999), 1157-163.
- [13] POPA V., A general fixed point theorem for weakly commuting multi-valued mappings, Anal. Univ. "Dunărea de Jos" Galați, Ser. Mat. Fiz. Mec. Teor. Fasc. II, 16(22)(1999), 19-22.
- [14] POPA V., A general coincidence theorem for multi-valued mappings satisfying an implicit relation, *Demonstr. Math.*, 33(1)(2000), 159-164.
- [15] POPA V., Coincidence and fixed point theorems for noncontinuous hybrid contractions, Nonlinear Anal. Forum, 7(2002), 153-158.
- [16] RAO K.P.R., RAO K.R.K., Unique common fixed point theorems for pairs of hybrid maps under new conditions in partial metric spaces, *Demonstr. Math.*, 47(3)(2014), 715-725.
- [17] VETRO C., VETRO F., Common fixed points of mappings satisfying implicit relations in partial metric spaces, J. Nonlinear Sci. Appl., 6(2013), 152-161.

VALERIU POPA "VASILE ALECSANDRI" UNIVERSITY OF BACĂU 157 CALEA MĂRĂȘEȘTI BACĂU, 600115, ROMANIA *e-mail:* vpopa@ub.ro

Received on 25.03.2015 and, in revised form, on 06.04.2016.