

Research Article

A Generalized Meir-Keeler-Type Contraction on Partial Metric Spaces

Hassen Aydi,¹ Erdal Karapınar,² and Shahram Rezapour³

¹ Institut Supérieur d'Informatique et des Technologies de Communication de Hammam Sousse, Université de Sousse, Route GP1-4011, Hammam Sousse, Tunisia

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

³ Department of Mathematics, Azarbaijan University of Tarbiat Moallem, Azarshahr, Tabriz, Iran

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

Received 12 November 2011; Revised 16 February 2012; Accepted 17 February 2012

Academic Editor: Irena Rachůnková

Copyright © 2012 Hassen Aydi et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

We introduce a generalization of the Meir-Keeler-type contractions, referred to as generalized Meir-Keeler-type contractions, over partial metric spaces. Moreover, we show that every orbitally continuous generalized Meir-Keeler-type contraction has a fixed point on a 0-complete partial metric space.

1. Introduction

In 1992, Matthews introduced the notion of a partial metric space which is a generalization of usual metric space [1]. The main motivation behind the idea of a partial metric space is to transfer mathematical techniques into computer science. This is mostly apparent in the research areas of computer domains and semantics, which have many applications (see, e.g., [2–10]). Following this initial work, Matthews generalized the Banach contraction principle in the context of complete partial metric spaces. He proved that a self-mapping T on a complete partial metric space (X, p) has a unique fixed point if there exists $0 \leq k < 1$ such that $p(Tx, Ty) \leq kp(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in X$. After Matthews' innovative approach, many authors conducted further studies on partial metric spaces and their topological properties (see, e.g., [2–4, 6, 11–41]).

A partial metric is a function $p : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfying the following conditions:

(P1) $p(x, y) = p(y, x)$,

(P2) if $p(x, x) = p(x, y) = p(y, y)$, then $x = y$,

(P3) $p(x, x) \leq p(x, y)$,

(P4) $p(x, z) + p(y, y) \leq p(x, y) + p(y, z)$,

for all $x, y, z \in X$. Then (X, p) is called a partial metric space.

Example 1.1 (see [42]). Let (X, d) and (X, p) be a metric space and partial metric space, respectively. Mappings $\rho_i : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ ($i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$) defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_1(x, y) &= d(x, y) + p(x, y), \\ \rho_2(x, y) &= d(x, y) + \max\{\omega(x), \omega(y)\}, \\ \rho_3(x, y) &= d(x, y) + a\end{aligned}\tag{1.1}$$

induce partial metrics on X , where $\omega : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is an arbitrary function and $a \geq 0$.

Each partial metric p on X generates a T_0 topology τ_p on X with the family of open p -balls $\{B_p(x, \varepsilon) : x \in X, \varepsilon > 0\}$ as a base, where $B_p(x, \varepsilon) = \{y \in X : p(x, y) < p(x, x) + \varepsilon\}$ for all $x \in X$. Similarly, a closed p -ball is defined as $B_p[x, \varepsilon] = \{y \in X : p(x, y) \leq p(x, x) + \varepsilon\}$.

In [1, page 187], Matthews gave the characterization of convergence in partial metric space as follows: a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in a partial metric space (X, p) converges to $x \in X$ with respect to τ_p if and only if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p(x, x_n) = p(x, x)$.

Now we recall some basic concepts and useful facts on completeness of partial metric spaces. A sequence $\{x_n\}$ in a partial metric space (X, p) is called Cauchy whenever $\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} p(x_n, x_m)$ exists (and is finite) [1, Definition 5.2].

A partial metric space (X, p) is said to be complete if every Cauchy sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X converges, with respect to τ_p , to a point $x \in X$ such that $\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} p(x_n, x_m) = p(x, x)$ [1, Definition 5.3].

In [35], Romaguera introduced the concepts 0-Cauchy sequence in a partial metric space and 0-complete partial metric space as follows.

Definition 1.2. A sequence $\{x_n\}$ in a partial metric space (X, p) is called 0-Cauchy if $\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} p(x_n, x_m) = 0$. A partial metric space (X, p) is said to be 0-complete if every 0-Cauchy sequence in X converges, with respect to τ_p , to a point $x \in X$ such that $p(x, x) = 0$. In this case, p is said to be a 0-complete partial metric on X .

Notice that each 0-Cauchy sequence is also a Cauchy sequence in a partial metric space. In particular, each complete partial metric is a 0-complete partial metric on X . But the converse is not true. The following example shows that there exists a 0-complete partial metric which is not complete.

Example 1.3 (see [35, 39]). Let $(\mathbb{Q} \cap [0, \infty), p)$ be the partial metric space, where \mathbb{Q} and $p(x, y)$ represent the set of rational numbers and the partial metric $\max\{x, y\}$, respectively.

A self-mapping F on a partial metric space (X, p) is continuous at $x \in X$ if and only if for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $F(B_p(x, \delta)) \subseteq B_p(Fx, \varepsilon)$ (see, e.g., [15]).

It is quite natural to consider characterizations of continuity of mappings in partial metric spaces. For example, Samet et al. [43] proved the following.

Lemma 1.4. *Let (X, p) be a partial metric space. $F : X \rightarrow X$ is continuous if given a sequence $\{x_n\} \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in X$ such that $p(x, x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} p(x, x_n)$; then, $p(Fx, Fx) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} p(Fx, Fx_n)$.*

Very recently, Samet et al. [43] also observed the relationship between the continuity of a mapping in a partial metric space and in a metric space.

Lemma 1.5. Consider $X = [0, \infty)$ endowed with the partial metric $p : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ defined by $p(x, y) = \max\{x, y\}$ for all $x, y \geq 0$. Let $F : X \rightarrow X$ be a nondecreasing function. If F is continuous with respect to the standard metric $d(x, y) = |x - y|$ for all $x, y \geq 0$, then F is continuous with respect to the partial metric p .

In 1971, Ćirić [44] introduced orbitally continuous maps on metric spaces as follows.

Definition 1.6. Let (X, d) be a metric space. A mapping T on X is orbitally continuous if $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} T^i x = u$ implies $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} T T^i x = Tu$ for each $x \in X$.

Recently, Karapınar and Erhan [28] renovated the definition above in the context of partial metric spaces in the following way.

Definition 1.7. Let (X, p) be a partial metric space, and let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a self-map. One says that T is orbitally continuous whenever $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} p(T^i x, z) = p(z, z)$ implies that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} p(T T^i x, Tz) = p(Tz, Tz)$ for each $x \in X$.

It is clear that continuous mappings are orbitally continuous.

We would like to point out the close relationship between metrics and partial metrics. In fact, if p is a partial metric on X , then the function $d_p : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ given by

$$d_p(x, y) = 2p(x, y) - p(x, x) - p(y, y) \quad (1.2)$$

is a metric on X . Moreover,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_p(x, x_n) = 0 \iff \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p(x, x_n) = \lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} p(x_n, x_m) = p(x, x). \quad (1.3)$$

Lemma 1.8 (see, e.g., [1, 15]). Let (X, p) be a partial metric space.

- (a) A sequence $\{x_n\}$ is Cauchy if and only if $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in the metric space (X, d_p) ;
- (b) (X, p) is complete if and only if the metric space (X, d_p) is complete.

In 1969, Meir and Keeler [45] published their celebrated paper in which an interesting and general contraction condition for self-maps in metric spaces was considered.

Definition 1.9. Let (X, d) be a metric space, and let T be a self-map on X . Then T is called a Meir-Keeler-type contraction whenever for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$d(x, y) < \varepsilon + \delta \implies d(Tx, Ty) < \varepsilon. \quad (1.4)$$

Many authors have discussed several variations, generalizations, and modifications of that condition both in metric spaces and other related structures (see, e.g., [46–49]). Following this trend, we introduce a generalized Meir-Keeler-type contraction on partial metric spaces. In this paper, we show an orbitally continuous self-mapping T on a 0-complete partial metric spaces satisfying that generalized Meir-Keeler-type contraction has a unique fixed point.

2. Main Results

We start this section by recalling the following two lemmas ([13]), which will be frequently used in the proofs of the main results.

Lemma 2.1. *Let (X, p) be a partial metric space. Then*

- (a) *if $p(x, y) = 0$, then $x = y$,*
- (b) *if $x \neq y$, then $p(x, y) > 0$,*
- (c) *if $x_n \rightarrow z$ with $p(z, z) = 0$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p(x_n, y) = p(z, y)$ for all $y \in X$.*

We introduce the definition of a generalized Meir-Keeler-type contraction.

Definition 2.2. Let (X, p) be a partial metric space and T a self-map on X . Then T is called a generalized Meir-Keeler-type contraction whenever for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\varepsilon \leq M(x, y) < \varepsilon + \delta \implies p(Tx, Ty) < \varepsilon, \quad (2.1)$$

where $M(x, y) = \max\{p(x, y), p(Tx, x), p(Ty, y), (1/2)[p(Tx, y) + p(x, Ty)]\}$.

Remark 2.3. Note that if T is a generalized Meir-Keeler-type contraction, we have

$$p(Tx, Ty) \leq M(x, y) \quad \forall x, y \in X. \quad (2.2)$$

If $M(x, y) = 0$, it follows from (2.2) that $p(Tx, Ty) = 0$. On the other hand, if $M(x, y) > 0$, we get the strict inequality $p(Tx, Ty) < M(x, y)$ by (2.1).

Now, we are ready to state and prove our main results.

Proposition 2.4. *Let (X, p) be a partial metric space and $T : X \rightarrow X$ a generalized Meir-Keeler-type contraction. Then, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p(T^{n+1}x, T^n x) = 0$ for all $x \in X$.*

Proof. Take $x \in X$, and set $x_0 = x$. Define $x_{n+1} = Tx_n = T^{n+1}x_0$ for all $n \geq 0$. If $p(x_{n_0+1}, x_{n_0}) = 0$ for some $n_0 \geq 0$, then $Tx_{n_0} = x_{n_0+1} = x_{n_0}$ by Lemma 2.1. Then, $p(x_{k+1}, x_k) = 0$ for all $k \geq n_0$. In this case, the proposition follows. In the rest of the proof, we assume that $p(x_{n+1}, x_n) \neq 0$ for every $n \geq 0$. As a consequence, we have $M(x_{n+1}, x_n) > 0$ for every $n \geq 0$. By Remark 2.3,

$$\begin{aligned} p(x_{n+2}, x_{n+1}) &= p(Tx_{n+1}, Tx_n) \leq M(x_{n+1}, x_n) \\ &= \max \left\{ p(x_{n+1}, x_n), p(Tx_{n+1}, x_{n+1}), p(Tx_n, x_n), \frac{1}{2} [p(Tx_{n+1}, x_n) + p(x_{n+1}, Tx_n)] \right\} \\ &\leq \max \{ p(x_{n+1}, x_n), p(x_{n+2}, x_{n+1}) \}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

Since $M(x_{n+1}, x_n)$ is strictly positive for each n , we find that

$$p(x_{n+2}, x_{n+1}) < M(x_{n+1}, x_n) \leq \max \{ p(x_{n+1}, x_n), p(x_{n+2}, x_{n+1}) \} \quad (2.4)$$

by the use of Remark 2.3 again. Notice that the case where

$$\max\{p(x_{n+1}, x_n), p(x_{n+2}, x_{n+1})\} = p(x_{n+2}, x_{n+1}) \quad (2.5)$$

is not possible. Hence we derive that

$$p(x_{n+2}, x_{n+1}) < M(x_{n+1}, x_n) \leq p(x_{n+1}, x_n) \quad (2.6)$$

for every n . Thus, $\{p(x_{n+1}, x_n)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a decreasing sequence which is bounded below by 0. Hence, it converges to some $\varepsilon \in [0, \infty)$, that is,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p(x_{n+1}, x_n) = \varepsilon. \quad (2.7)$$

In particular, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M(x_{n+1}, x_n) = \varepsilon. \quad (2.8)$$

Notice that $\varepsilon = \inf\{p(x_n, x_{n+1}) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

We claim that $\varepsilon = 0$. Suppose, to the contrary, that $\varepsilon > 0$. Regarding (2.8) together with the assumption that T is generalized Meir-Keeler-type contraction, for this ε , there exists $\delta > 0$ and a natural number m such that

$$\varepsilon \leq M(x_{m+1}, x_m) < \varepsilon + \delta \quad \text{implies that } p(Tx_{m+1}, Tx_m) = p(x_{m+2}, x_{m+1}) < \varepsilon. \quad (2.9)$$

This is a contradiction since $\varepsilon = \inf\{p(x_n, x_{n+1}) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. □

Theorem 2.5. *Let (X, p) be a 0-complete partial metric space, and let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be an orbitally continuous generalized Meir-Keeler-type contraction. Then, T has a unique fixed point, say $z \in X$. Moreover, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p(T^n x, z) = p(z, z)$ for all $x \in X$ and $p(z, z) = 0$.*

Proof. Take $x \in X$, and set $x_0 = x$. Define $x_{n+1} = Tx_n = T^{n+1}x_0$ for all $n \geq 0$. We claim that $\lim_{m, n \rightarrow \infty} p(x_n, x_m) = 0$. If this is not the case, then there exist a $\varepsilon > 0$ and a subsequence $\{x_{n(i)}\}$ of $\{x_n\}$ such that

$$p(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i+1)}) > 2\varepsilon. \quad (2.10)$$

For the same $\varepsilon > 0$ above, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\varepsilon \leq M(x, y) < \varepsilon + \delta$ which implies that $p(Tx, Ty) < \varepsilon$. Set $r = \min\{\varepsilon, \delta\}$ and $d_n = p(x_n, x_{n+1})$ for all $n \geq 1$. By Proposition 2.4, one can choose a natural number n_0 such that

$$d_n = p(x_n, x_{n+1}) < \frac{r}{4} \quad (2.11)$$

for all $n \geq n_0$. Let $n(i) > n_0$. We have $n(i) \leq n(i+1) - 1$. If $p(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i+1)-1}) \leq \varepsilon + (r/2)$, then by using (P4) we derive

$$\begin{aligned} p(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i+1)}) &\leq p(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i+1)-1}) + p(x_{n(i+1)-1}, x_{n(i+1)}) - p(x_{n(i+1)-1}, x_{n(i+1)-1}) \\ &\leq p(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i+1)-1}) + p(x_{n(i+1)-1}, x_{n(i+1)}) \\ &< \varepsilon + \frac{r}{2} + d_{n(i+1)-1} < \varepsilon + \frac{3r}{4} < 2\varepsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

which contradicts with assumption (2.10). Therefore, there are values of k such that $n(i) \leq k \leq n(i+1)$ and $p(x_{n(i)}, x_k) > \varepsilon + (r/2)$. Now if $p(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i+1)}) \geq \varepsilon + (r/2)$, then

$$d_{n(i)} = p(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i+1)}) \geq \varepsilon + \frac{r}{2} > r + \frac{r}{2} > \frac{r}{4}. \quad (2.13)$$

This is a contradiction because of (2.11). Hence, there are values of k with $n(i) \leq k \leq n(i+1)$ such that $p(x_{n(i)}, x_k) < \varepsilon + (r/2)$. Choose the smallest integer k with $k \geq n(i)$ such that $p(x_{n(i)}, x_k) \geq \varepsilon + (r/2)$. Thus, we find $p(x_{n(i)}, x_{k-1}) < \varepsilon + (r/2)$. So we see that

$$\begin{aligned} p(x_{n(i)}, x_k) &\leq p(x_{n(i)}, x_{k-1}) + p(x_{k-1}, x_k) - p(x_{k-1}, x_{k-1}) \\ &\leq p(x_{n(i)}, x_{k-1}) + p(x_{k-1}, x_k) < \varepsilon + \frac{r}{2} + \frac{r}{4} = \varepsilon + \frac{3r}{4}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

Now, we can choose a natural number k satisfying $n(i) \leq k \leq n(i+1)$ such that

$$\varepsilon + \frac{r}{2} \leq p(x_{n(i)}, x_k) < \varepsilon + \frac{3r}{4}. \quad (2.15)$$

Therefore, we obtain the inequalities

$$p(x_{n(i)}, x_k) < \varepsilon + \frac{3r}{4} < \varepsilon + r, \quad (2.16)$$

$$\begin{aligned} p(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i+1)}) &= d_{n(i)} < \frac{r}{4} < \varepsilon + r, \\ p(x_k, x_{k+1}) &= d_k < \frac{r}{4} < \varepsilon + r. \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} [p(x_{n(i)}, x_{k+1}) + p(x_{n(i+1)}, x_k)] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} [p(x_{n(i)}, x_k) + p(x_k, x_{k+1}) - p(x_k, x_k) + p(x_{n(i+1)}, x_{n(i)}) + p(x_{n(i)}, x_k) - p(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i)})] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} [p(x_{n(i)}, x_k) + p(x_k, x_{k+1}) + p(x_{n(i+1)}, x_{n(i)}) + p(x_{n(i)}, x_k)] \\ &= p(x_{n(i)}, x_k) + \frac{1}{2} [d_k + d_{n(i)}] < \varepsilon + \frac{3r}{4} + \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{r}{4} + \frac{r}{4} \right] = \varepsilon + r. \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

Now, inequalities (2.16)–(2.18) imply that $M(x_{n(i)}, x_k) < \varepsilon + r \leq \varepsilon + \delta$. Hence, the fact that T is a generalized Meir-Keeler-type contraction yields $p(x_{n(i)+1}, x_{k+1}) < \varepsilon$. By using (P4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} p(T^{n(i)}x_0, T^kx_0) &\leq p(T^{n(i)}x_0, T^{n(i)+1}x_0) + p(T^{n(i)+1}x_0, T^kx_0) \\ &\quad - p(T^{n(i)+1}x_0, T^{n(i)+1}x_0) \\ &\leq p(T^{n(i)}x_0, T^{n(i)+1}x_0) + p(T^{n(i)+1}x_0, T^kx_0) \\ &\leq p(T^{n(i)}x_0, T^{n(i)+1}x_0) + p(T^{n(i)+1}x_0, T^{k+1}x_0) \\ &\quad + p(T^{k+1}x_0, T^kx_0). \end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

We combine the inequality above with (2.15) and (2.17) to conclude

$$\begin{aligned} p(x_{n(i)+1}, x_{k+1}) &\geq p(x_{n(i)}, x_k) - p(x_{n(i)}, x_{n(i)+1}) - p(x_k, x_{k+1}) \\ &> \varepsilon + \frac{r}{2} - \frac{r}{4} - \frac{r}{4} = \varepsilon, \end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, our claim is proved. So $\{x_n\} = \{T^n x_0\}$ is a 0-Cauchy sequence. Since (X, p) is 0-complete, then by Definition 1.2, the sequence $\{x_n\}$ converges with respect to τ_p to some $z \in X$ such that $p(z, z) = 0$. Thus

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p(T^n x_0, z) = p(z, z) = 0. \tag{2.21}$$

Now, we will show that z is a fixed point of T .

Since T is orbitally continuous and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p(T^n x_0, z) = p(z, z)$, we get that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p(TT^n x_0, Tz) = p(Tz, Tz). \tag{2.22}$$

On the other hand, from Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p(TT^n x_0, Tz) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p(x_{n+1}, Tz) = p(z, Tz) \tag{2.23}$$

which follows from the fact that $\{x_{n+1}\}$ converges to z in (X, p) with $p(z, z) = 0$, where $x_{n+1} = TT^n x_0 = T^{n+1}x_0$. Combining this with (2.22), we get that $p(z, Tz) = p(Tz, Tz)$.

We aim to show that $p(z, Tz) = 0$. Assume that $p(z, Tz) > 0$. Then, we obtain $M(z, z) \geq p(z, Tz) > 0$. By (2.2), we have

$$p(Tz, Tz) < M(z, z) = \max\{p(z, z) = 0, p(z, Tz)\} = p(z, Tz) = p(Tz, Tz), \tag{2.24}$$

a contradiction. This implies $Tz = z$ by Lemma 2.1.

Finally, we show that T has a unique fixed point. If there exists $w \in X$ such that $Tw = w$ and $p(z, w) \neq 0$, then we get $M(z, w) \geq p(z, w) > 0$. Since T is a generalized Meir-Keeler-type contraction, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < p(z, w) &= p(Tz, Tw) < M(z, w) \\ &= \max \left\{ p(z, w), p(Tz, z), p(Tw, w), \frac{1}{2} [p(Tz, w) + p(z, Tw)] \right\} \\ &= \max \{ p(z, w), p(w, w) \} = p(w, z), \end{aligned} \quad (2.25)$$

which is a contradiction. Thus, we find that $p(z, w) = 0$. So by Lemma 2.1 we conclude that $z = w$. In particular, T has a unique fixed point. \square

We state two examples to illustrate our results.

Example 2.6. Let (X, p) be the set $[0, \infty)$ equipped with the partial metric $p(x, y) = \max\{x, y\}$. Clearly, (X, p) is a 0-complete partial metric space. Consider $T : X \rightarrow X$ defined by $Tx = x/3(1+x)$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, we will show that there exists $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon) \geq 0$ such that (2.1) holds for all $x, y \in X$. Without loss of generality, take $x \leq y$. Then, it is easy to show that

$$\begin{aligned} p(Tx, Ty) &= \frac{y}{3(1+y)} \\ M(x, y) &= \max \left\{ p(x, y), p(Tx, x), p(Ty, y), \frac{1}{2} [p(Tx, y) + p(x, Ty)] \right\} = y. \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

Thus, taking $\delta(\varepsilon) = 2\varepsilon$, we get that (2.1) holds. Also, by Lemma 1.5, the mapping T is continuous, and hence it is orbitally continuous. All hypotheses of Theorem 2.5 are satisfied and $z = 0$ is the unique fixed point of T .

Example 2.7. Let (X, p) be the interval $[0, 2]$ equipped with the partial metric $p(x, y) = \max\{x, y\}$. Consider $T : X \rightarrow X$ defined by

$$Tx = \begin{cases} \frac{x}{2} & \text{if } 0 \leq x < 1, \\ \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } 1 \leq x \leq 2. \end{cases} \quad (2.27)$$

Take $x \leq y$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, we have the two following cases.

Case 1 ($0 \leq x \leq y < 1$). We have

$$p(Tx, Ty) = \frac{y}{2}, \quad M(x, y) = y. \quad (2.28)$$

Case 2 ($(0 \leq x < 1$ and $1 \leq y < 2)$ or $(1 \leq x \leq y \leq 2)$). We have

$$p(Tx, Ty) = \frac{1}{2}, \quad M(x, y) = y. \quad (2.29)$$

In each case, it suffices to take $\delta = \varepsilon$ in order that (2.1) holds. Again, by Lemma 1.5, the mapping T is continuous, and hence it is orbitally continuous. All hypotheses of Theorem 2.5 are satisfied and $z = 0$ is the unique fixed point of T .

References

- [1] S. G. Matthews, "Partial metric topology," *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, vol. 728, pp. 183–197, 1994.
- [2] R. D. Kopperman, S. G. Matthews, and H. Pajoohesh, "What do partial metrics represent?" in *Proceedings of the 19th Summer Conference on Topology and Its Applications*, University of CapeTown, 2004.
- [3] H.-P. A. Künzi, H. Pajoohesh, and M. P. Schellekens, "Partial quasi-metrics," *Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 365, no. 3, pp. 237–246, 2006.
- [4] S. J. O'Neill, "Two topologies are better than one," Tech. Rep., University of Warwick, 1995.
- [5] R. Heckmann, "Approximation of metric spaces by partial metric spaces," *Applied Categorical Structures*, vol. 7, no. 1-2, pp. 71–83, 1999.
- [6] S. Romaguera and M. Schellekens, "Duality and quasi-normability for complexity spaces," *Applied General Topology*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 91–112, 2002.
- [7] M. P. Schellekens, "A characterization of partial metrizable domains: domains are quantifiable," *Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 305, no. 1–3, pp. 409–432, 2003.
- [8] M. P. Schellekens, "The correspondence between partial metrics and semivaluations," *Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 315, no. 1, pp. 135–149, 2004.
- [9] P. Waszkiewicz, "Partial metrisability of continuous posets," *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 359–372, 2006.
- [10] P. Waszkiewicz, "Quantitative continuous domains," *Applied Categorical Structures*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 41–67, 2003.
- [11] M. Abbas, T. Nazir, and S. Romaguera, "Fixed point results for generalized cyclic contraction mappings in partial metric spaces," *Revista de la Real Academia de Ciencias Exactas*. In press.
- [12] T. Abdeljawad, "Fixed points for generalized weakly contractive mappings in partial metric spaces," *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*, vol. 54, no. 11-12, pp. 2923–2927, 2011.
- [13] T. Abdeljawad, E. Karapinar, and K. Taş, "Existence and uniqueness of a common fixed point on partial metric spaces," *Applied Mathematics Letters*, vol. 24, no. 11, pp. 1900–1904, 2011.
- [14] T. Abdeljawad, E. Karapinar, and K. Taş, "A generalized contraction principle with control functions on partial metric spaces," *Computers and Mathematics with Applications*, vol. 63, no. 3, pp. 716–719, 2012.
- [15] I. Altun and A. Erduran, "Fixed point theorems for monotone mappings on partial metric spaces," *Fixed Point Theory and Applications*, vol. 2011, Article ID 508730, 10 pages, 2011.
- [16] I. Altun, F. Sola, and H. Simsek, "Generalized contractions on partial metric spaces," *Topology and its Applications*, vol. 157, no. 18, pp. 2778–2785, 2010.
- [17] H. Aydi, "Some coupled fixed point results on partial metric spaces," *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, vol. 2011, Article ID 647091, 11 pages, 2011.
- [18] H. Aydi, "Fixed point results for weakly contractive mappings in ordered partial metric spaces," *Journal of Advanced Mathematical Studies*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 1–12, 2011.
- [19] H. Aydi, "Fixed point theorems for generalized weakly contractive condition in ordered partial metric spaces," *Journal of Nonlinear Analysis and Optimization: Theory and Applications*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 33–48, 2011.
- [20] H. Aydi, "Common fixed point results for mappings satisfying (ψ, ϕ) -weak contractions in ordered partial metric spaces," *International Journal of Applied Mathematics and Statistics*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 53–64, 2012.
- [21] H. Aydi, E. Karapinar, and W. Shatanawi, "Coupled fixed point results for (ψ, ϕ) -weakly contractive condition in ordered partial metric spaces," *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, vol. 62, no. 12, pp. 4449–4460, 2011.
- [22] H. Aydi, "A common fixed point result by altering distances involving a contractive condition of integral type in partial metric spaces," *Demonstratio Mathematica*. In press.
- [23] K. P. Chi, E. Karapinar, and T. D. Thanh, "A generalized contraction principle in partial metric spaces," *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*, vol. 55, no. 5-6, pp. 1673–1681, 2012.

- [24] L. Ćirić, B. Samet, H. Aydi, and C. Vetro, "Common fixed points of generalized contractions on partial metric spaces and an application," *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, vol. 218, no. 6, pp. 2398–2406, 2011.
- [25] D. Ilić, V. Pavlović, and V. Rakočević, "Some new extensions of Banach's contraction principle to partial metric space," *Applied Mathematics Letters*, vol. 24, no. 8, pp. 1326–1330, 2011.
- [26] D. Ilić, V. Pavlović, and V. Rakočević, "Extensions of the Zamfirescu theorem to partial metric spaces," *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*, vol. 55, no. 34, pp. 801–809, 2012.
- [27] E. Karapinar, "Weak ϕ -contraction on partial metric spaces," *Journal of Computational Analysis and Applications*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 206–210, 2012.
- [28] E. Karapinar and I. M. Erhan, "Fixed point theorems for operators on partial metric spaces," *Applied Mathematics Letters*, vol. 24, pp. 1900–1904, 2011.
- [29] E. Karapinar, "Generalizations of Caristi Kirk's theorem on partial metric spaces," *Fixed Point Theory and Applications*, vol. 2011, article 4, 2011.
- [30] E. Karapinar and U. Yüksel, "Some common fixed point theorems in partial metric spaces," *Journal of Applied Mathematics*, vol. 2011, Article ID 263621, 17 pages, 2011.
- [31] E. Karapinar and U. Yüksel, "Some common fixed point theorems in partial metric spaces," *Journal of Applied Mathematics*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 185–191, 2011.
- [32] H. K. Nashine, Z. Kadelburg, and S. Radenović, "Common fixed point theorems for weakly isotone increasing mappings in ordered partial metric spaces," *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*. In press.
- [33] S. Oltra and O. Valero, "Banach's fixed point theorem for partial metric spaces," *Rendiconti dell'Istituto di Matematica dell'Università di Trieste*, vol. 36, no. 1-2, pp. 17–26, 2004.
- [34] D. Paesano and P. Vetro, "Suzuki's type characterizations of completeness for partial metric spaces and fixed points for partially ordered metric spaces," *Topology and its Applications*, vol. 159, no. 3, pp. 911–920, 2012.
- [35] S. Romaguera, "A Kirk type characterization of completeness for partial metric spaces," *Fixed Point Theory and Applications*, vol. 2010, Article ID 493298, 6 pages, 2010.
- [36] S. Romaguera and M. Schellekens, "Partial metric monoids and semivaluation spaces," *Topology and its Applications*, vol. 153, no. 5-6, pp. 948–962, 2005.
- [37] S. Romaguera and O. Valero, "A quantitative computational model for complete partial metric spaces via formal balls," *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 541–563, 2009.
- [38] S. Romaguera, "Fixed point theorems for generalized contractions on partial metric spaces," *Topology and its Applications*, vol. 159, no. 1, pp. 194–199, 2012.
- [39] S. Romaguera, "Matkowskis type theorems for generalized contractions on (ordered) partial metric spaces," *Applications of General Topology*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 213–220, 2011.
- [40] W. Shatanawi, B. Samet, and M. Abbas, "Coupled fixed point theorems for mixed monotone mappings in ordered partial metric spaces," *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*, vol. 55, no. 3-4, pp. 680–687, 2012.
- [41] O. Valero, "On Banach fixed point theorems for partial metric spaces," *Applied General Topology*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 229–240, 2005.
- [42] N. Shobkolaei, S.M. Vaezpour, and S. Sedghi, "A common fixed point theorem on ordered partial metric spaces," *Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, vol. 1, no. 12, pp. 3433–3439, 2011.
- [43] B. Samet, M. Rajović, R. Lazović, and R. Stojiljković, "Common fixed point results for nonlinear contractions in ordered partial metric spaces," *Fixed Point Theory and Applications*, vol. 2011, article 71, 2011.
- [44] L. Ćirić, "On contraction type mappings," *Mathematica Balkanica*, vol. 1, pp. 52–57, 1971.
- [45] A. Meir and E. Keeler, "A theorem on contraction mappings," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 28, pp. 326–329, 1969.
- [46] J. Jachymski, "Equivalent conditions and the Meir-Keeler type theorems," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 194, no. 1, pp. 293–303, 1995.
- [47] Z. Kadelburg and S. Radenović, "Meir-Keeler-type conditions in abstract metric spaces," *Applied Mathematics Letters*, vol. 24, no. 8, pp. 1411–1414, 2011.
- [48] B. Samet, "Coupled fixed point theorems for a generalized Meir-Keeler contraction in partially ordered metric spaces," *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, vol. 72, no. 12, pp. 4508–4517, 2010.
- [49] T. Suzuki, "Fixed-point theorem for asymptotic contractions of Meir-Keeler type in complete metric spaces," *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, vol. 64, no. 5, pp. 971–978, 2006.



Hindawi

Submit your manuscripts at
<http://www.hindawi.com>

