

A COUPLED COINCIDENCE POINT THEOREM ON ORDERED PARTIAL B-METRIC-LIKE SPACES

K.P.R.RAO,K.V.SIVA PARVATHI,M.IMDAD

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we prove a coupled coincidence point theorem in ordered partial b -metric-like spaces besides furnishing an illustrative example to demonstrate our main result.

1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of b -metric space was introduced by Czerwik [3] which runs as follows:

Definition 1.1([3]): A b -metric on a non empty set X is a function $d : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that for all $x, y, z \in X$ and $k \geq 1$, the following three conditions are satisfied:

- (i) $d(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $x = y$,
- (ii) $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$,
- (iii) $d(x, y) \leq k[d(x, z) + d(z, y)]$.

As usual, the pair (X, d) is called a b -metric space.

Example 1.2: Let $X = \mathcal{R}$ and $d(x, y) = (x - y)^2$ for all $x, y \in X$. Then d is a b -metric with $k = 2$ but not a metric as $d(1, -1) > d(1, 0) + d(0, -1)$.

Ali Alghamdi et al.[1] introduced the concept of b -metric-like spaces and proved some fixed point theorems involving a single map.

Definition 1.3([1]): A b -metric-like on a non empty set X is a function $d : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that for all $x, y, z \in X$ and a constant $k \geq 1$, the following three conditions are satisfied:

- (i) $d(x, y) = 0$ implies $x = y$,
- (ii) $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$,
- (iii) $d(x, y) \leq k[d(x, z) + d(z, y)]$.

The pair (X, d) is called a b -metric-like space.

Example 1.4: Let $X = [0, \infty)$ and $d(x, y) = (x + y)^2$ for all $x, y \in X$. Then d is a b -metric-like space with $k = 2$ but not a b -metric.

Matthews [6] introduced the concept of a partial metric space which runs as follows:

Definition 1.5([6]): A mapping $p : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ (where X is a nonempty set)

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 54H25, 47H10 .

Key words and phrases. Partial b -metric-like space, coupled fixed point, mixed monotone property.

Submitted Jun 29, 2014. Revised July 29, 2014 .

is said to be a partial metric on X if (for any $x, y, z \in X$) the following conditions are satisfied:

- (i) $x = y \Leftrightarrow p(x, x) = p(x, y) = p(y, y)$,
- (ii) $p(x, x) \leq p(x, y), p(y, y) \leq p(x, y)$,
- (iii) $p(x, y) = p(y, x)$,
- (iv) $p(x, y) \leq p(x, z) + p(z, y) - p(z, z)$.

The pair (X, p) is called a partial metric space.

In [2], Bhaskar and Lakshmikantham introduced the concept of coupled fixed points and obtained some coupled fixed point theorems. Later Lakshmikantham and Ćirić [5] introduced the following definitions.

Definition 1.6([5]): An element $(x, y) \in X \times X$ is called

- (i) a coupled coincidence point of the mappings $F : X \times X \rightarrow X$ and $g : X \rightarrow X$ if $gx = F(x, y)$ and $gy = F(y, x)$.
- (ii) a common coupled fixed point of the mappings $F : X \times X \rightarrow X$ and $g : X \rightarrow X$ if $x = gx = F(x, y)$ and $y = gy = F(y, x)$.

Definition 1.7([5]): Let (X, \preceq) be a partially ordered set with $F : X \times X \rightarrow X$ and $g : X \rightarrow X$. Then F is said to have mixed g -monotone property if for any $x, y \in X$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (i) & x_1, x_2 \in X, gx_1 \preceq gx_2 \Rightarrow F(x_1, y) \preceq F(x_2, y) \\ (ii) & y_1, y_2 \in X, gy_1 \preceq gy_2 \Rightarrow F(x, y_1) \succeq F(x, y_2). \end{aligned}$$

In the sequel, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 1.8([4]): Let X be a non-empty set and $g : X \rightarrow X$ be a mapping. Then there exists a subset E of X such that $g(E) = g(X)$ and the mapping $g : E \rightarrow X$ is one-one.

Note that for $x, y \in [0, \infty)$ with $x \leq y$, we have $\frac{x}{1+x} \leq \frac{y}{1+y}$.

2. MAIN RESULT

Now, we give the following definition (by combining Definitions 1.3 and 1.5)

Definition 2.1: A partial b-metric-like on a non empty set X is a function $p : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, wherein for all $x, y, z \in X$ and a constant $k \geq 1$, the following conditions are satisfied:

- (p₁) $p(x, y) = 0$ implies $x = y$,
- (p₂) $p(x, x) \leq p(x, y), p(y, y) \leq p(x, y)$,
- (p₃) $p(x, y) = p(y, x)$,
- (p₄) $p(x, y) \leq k[p(x, z) + p(z, y) - p(z, z)]$.

The pair (X, p, k) is called a partial b-metric-like space.

Definition 2.2: Let (X, p, k) be a partial b-metric-like space and $\{x_n\}$ a sequence in X with $x \in X$. Then the sequence $\{x_n\}$ is said to be convergent to x if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p(x_n, x) = p(x, x)$.

Definition 2.3: Let (X, p, k) be a partial b-metric-like space.

- (i) A sequence $\{x_n\}$ in (X, p, k) is said to be Cauchy sequence if

$$\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} p(x_n, x_m) \text{ exists and is finite .}$$

- (ii) A partial b-metric-like space (X, p, k) is said to be complete if every Cauchy sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X converges, to a point $x \in X$ so that

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

One can easily verify the following remark.

Remark 2.4: Let (X, p, k) be a partial b-metric-like space and $\{x_n\}$ a sequence in X such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p(x_n, x) = 0$. Then

(i) x is unique,

(ii) $\frac{1}{k}p(x, y) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p(x_n, y) \leq kp(x, y)$ for all $y \in X$

(iii) $p(x_n, x_0) \leq kp(x_0, x_1) + k^2p(x_1, x_2) + \dots + k^{n-1}p(x_{n-2}, x_{n-1}) + k^{n-1}p(x_{n-1}, x_n)$ whenever $\{x_k\}_{k=0}^n \in X$.

Ali Alghamdi et al.[1] introduced the following class of functions.

Let $\Psi_{\mathcal{L}}^k$ be the class of those functions $\mathcal{L} : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \frac{1}{k^2})$ which satisfy the condition $\mathcal{L}(t_n) \rightarrow (\frac{1}{k^2})^+ \Rightarrow t_n \rightarrow 0$, where $k > 0$.

Using these functions, we now prove a coupled coincidence point theorem in ordered partial b-metric-like spaces.

Let (X, p, k) be a partial b-metric-like space and $F : X \times X \rightarrow X$ and $g : X \rightarrow X$. For $x, y, u, v \in X$, we denote

$$M(x, y, u, v) = \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p(gx, gu), p(gy, gv), p(gx, F(x, y)), p(gy, F(y, x)), \\ p(gu, F(u, v)), p(gv, F(v, u)), \\ \frac{1}{2k}[p(gx, F(u, v)) + p(gu, F(x, y))], \\ \frac{1}{2k}[p(gy, F(v, u)) + p(gv, F(y, x))] \end{array} \right\}.$$

Notice that $M(x, y, u, v) = M(y, x, v, u)$ for all $x, y, u, v \in X$.

Now, we are equipped to prove our main result as follows.

Theorem 2.5: Let (X, p, k, \preceq) be an ordered partial b-metric-like space and $F : X \times X \rightarrow X$, $g : X \rightarrow X$ be the mappings which satisfy the following conditions:

(2.5.1) $F(X \times X) \subseteq g(X)$, $g(X)$ is complete,

(2.5.2) F has the mixed g -monotone property,

(2.5.3) $p(F(x, y), F(u, v)) \leq \mathcal{L}(M(x, y, u, v))M(x, y, u, v)$

for all $x, y, u, v \in X$ with $gx \preceq gu$, $gy \succeq gv$, where $\mathcal{L} \in \Psi_{\mathcal{L}}^k$

(2.5.4) there exist two elements $x_0, y_0 \in X$ such that $gx_0 \preceq F(x_0, y_0)$ and $gy_0 \succeq F(y_0, x_0)$,

(2.5.5) (a) Suppose F and g are continuous

or

(b) $g(X)$ has the following properties:

(i) If a non-decreasing sequence $\{a_n\} \rightarrow a$, then $a_n \preceq a$, $\forall n$,

(ii) If a non-increasing sequence $\{a_n\} \rightarrow a$, then $a \preceq a_n$, $\forall n$.

Then F and g have a coupled coincidence point in $X \times X$.

Proof . By (2.5.4), there exist two elements $x_0, y_0 \in X$ such that $gx_0 \preceq F(x_0, y_0)$ and $gy_0 \succeq F(y_0, x_0)$. Since $F(X \times X) \subseteq g(X)$, we can choose $x_1, y_1 \in X$ such that $gx_1 = F(x_0, y_0)$ and $gy_1 = F(y_0, x_0)$. Again we can choose $x_2, y_2 \in X$ such that $gx_2 = F(x_1, y_1)$ and $gy_2 = F(y_1, x_1)$. Continuing this process indefinitely, we construct sequences $\{x_n\}$ and $\{y_n\}$ in X such that $gx_{n+1} = F(x_n, y_n)$ and $gy_{n+1} = F(y_n, x_n)$ for all $n \geq 0$.

Now for $n \geq 0$, we shall prove that

$$gx_n \preceq gx_{n+1} \text{ and } gy_n \succeq gy_{n+1}. \quad (1)$$

From (2.5.4), (1) holds for $n = 0$. Suppose (1) holds for $n = m > 0$. Now, by (2.5.2), we have

$$gx_{m+1} = F(x_m, y_m) \preceq F(x_{m+1}, y_m) \preceq F(x_{m+1}, y_{m+1}) = gx_{m+2} \text{ and}$$

$$gy_{m+1} = F(y_m, x_m) \succeq F(y_{m+1}, x_m) \succeq F(y_{m+1}, x_{m+1}) = gy_{m+2}.$$

Thus (1) holds for $n = m + 1$. Hence by mathematical induction, (1) holds for all

$n \geq 0$.

In case, $gx_{n+1} = gx_n$ and $gy_{n+1} = gy_n$ for some n , then (x_n, y_n) is a coupled coincidence point of F and g . Otherwise, assume that $gx_n \neq gx_{n+1}$ or $gy_n \neq gy_{n+1}$ for all n . Consider

$$\begin{aligned} p(gx_n, gx_{n+1}) &= p(F(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}), F(x_n, y_n)) \\ &\leq \mathcal{L}(M(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}, x_n, y_n))M(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}, x_n, y_n) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} M(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}, x_n, y_n) &= \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p(gx_{n-1}, gx_n), p(gy_{n-1}, gy_n), p(gx_{n-1}, gx_n), \\ p(gy_{n-1}, gy_n), p(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), p(gy_n, gy_{n+1}), \\ \frac{1}{2k}[p(gx_{n-1}, gx_{n+1}) + p(gx_n, gx_n)], \\ \frac{1}{2k}[p(gy_{n-1}, gy_{n+1}) + p(gy_n, gy_n)] \end{array} \right\}, \\ \frac{1}{2k}[p(gx_{n-1}, gx_{n+1}) + p(gx_n, gx_n)] &\leq \frac{1}{2k} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} k[p(gx_{n-1}, gx_n) + p(gx_n, gx_{n+1}) - p(gx_n, gx_n)] \\ +kp(gx_n, gx_n) \end{array} \right\} \\ &\leq \max \{p(gx_{n-1}, gx_n), p(gx_n, gx_{n+1})\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} M(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}, x_n, y_n) &\leq \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p(gx_{n-1}, gx_n), p(gy_{n-1}, gy_n), \\ p(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), p(gy_n, gy_{n+1}) \end{array} \right\} \\ &\leq M(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}, x_n, y_n). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$M(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}, x_n, y_n) = \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p(gx_{n-1}, gx_n), p(gy_{n-1}, gy_n), \\ p(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), p(gy_n, gy_{n+1}) \end{array} \right\}. \quad (2)$$

So,

$$p(gx_n, gx_{n+1}) \leq \mathcal{L}(M(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}, x_n, y_n)) \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p(gx_{n-1}, gx_n), p(gy_{n-1}, gy_n), \\ p(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), p(gy_n, gy_{n+1}) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Similarly by using $M(y_{n-1}, x_{n-1}, y_n, x_n) = M(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}, x_n, y_n)$, we can show that

$$p(gy_n, gy_{n+1}) \leq \mathcal{L}(M(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}, x_n, y_n)) \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p(gx_{n-1}, gx_n), p(gy_{n-1}, gy_n), \\ p(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), p(gy_n, gy_{n+1}) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Thus

$$\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), \\ p(gy_n, gy_{n+1}) \end{array} \right\} \leq \mathcal{L}(M(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}, x_n, y_n)) \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p(gx_{n-1}, gx_n), p(gy_{n-1}, gy_n), \\ p(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), p(gy_n, gy_{n+1}) \end{array} \right\}. \quad (3)$$

$$\text{If } \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p(gx_{n-1}, gx_n), p(gy_{n-1}, gy_n), \\ p(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), p(gy_n, gy_{n+1}) \end{array} \right\} = \max \{ p(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), p(gy_n, gy_{n+1}) \}$$

then using $\mathcal{L}(M(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}, x_n, y_n)) < \frac{1}{k^x}$, we get a contradiction from (3).

Hence

$$\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), \\ p(gy_n, gy_{n+1}) \end{array} \right\} \leq \mathcal{L}(M(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}, x_n, y_n)) \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p(gx_{n-1}, gx_n), \\ p(gy_{n-1}, gy_n), \end{array} \right\}.$$

Put $p_n = \max \{ p(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), p(gy_n, gy_{n+1}) \}$. Then

$$p_n \leq \mathcal{L}(M(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}, x_n, y_n))p_{n-1} < p_{n-1} \quad (4)$$

Thus $\{p_n\}$ is a non-increasing sequence of non-negative real numbers and hence also converges to some real number $s \geq 0$. Suppose $s > 0$.

From (4), we have $s \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}(M(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}, x_n, y_n))s$ so that

$$1 \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}(M(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}, x_n, y_n)).$$

Now we have

$$\frac{1}{k^2} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}(M(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}, x_n, y_n)) \leq \frac{1}{k^2} \text{ which in turn yields that}$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}(M(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}, x_n, y_n)) = \frac{1}{k^2}. \text{ Hence } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}, x_n, y_n) = 0.$$

Thus from(2), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max \{p(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), p(gy_n, gy_{n+1})\} = 0. \tag{5}$$

Also, from (p_2) we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max \{p(gx_n, gx_n), p(gy_n, gy_n)\} = 0. \tag{6}$$

Now, we prove that

$$\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \max \{p(gx_n, gx_m), p(gy_n, gy_m)\} = 0. \tag{7}$$

Suppose (7) is not true. Then

$$\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \max \{p(gx_n, gx_m), p(gy_n, gy_m)\} > 0. \tag{8}$$

Let $m > n$. Then from (1), we have $gx_n \preceq gx_m$ and $gy_n \succeq gy_m$.

From (2.5.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} p(gx_{n+1}, gx_{m+1}) &= p(F(x_n, y_n, F(x_m, y_m))) \\ &\leq \mathcal{L}(M(x_n, y_n, x_m, y_m))M(x_n, y_n, x_m, y_m) \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where

$$\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} M(x_n, y_n, x_m, y_m) = \lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p(gx_n, gx_m), p(gy_n, gy_m), p(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), \\ p(gy_n, gy_{n+1}), p(gx_m, gx_{m+1}), p(gy_m, gy_{m+1}), \\ \frac{1}{2k} [p(gx_n, gx_{m+1}) + p(gx_m, gx_{n+1})], \\ \frac{1}{2k} [p(gy_n, gy_{m+1}) + p(gy_m, gy_{n+1})] \end{array} \right\}.$$

But

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2k} [p(gx_n, gx_{m+1}) + p(gx_m, gx_{n+1})] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2k} k \left[\begin{array}{l} p(gx_n, gx_m) + p(gx_m, gx_{m+1}) - p(gx_m, gx_m) + \\ p(gx_m, gx_n) + p(gx_n, gx_{n+1}) - p(gx_n, gx_n) \end{array} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} M(x_n, y_n, x_m, y_m) &\leq \lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \max \{p(gx_n, gx_m), p(gy_n, gy_m)\} \text{ from (5), (6)} \\ &\leq \lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} M(x_n, y_n, x_m, y_m). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} M(x_n, y_n, x_m, y_m) = \lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \max \{p(gx_n, gx_m), p(gy_n, gy_m)\} \tag{10}$$

From (9), we have

$$\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} p(gx_{n+1}, gx_{m+1}) \leq \lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}(M(x_n, y_n, x_m, y_m)) \lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p(gx_n, gx_m), \\ p(gy_n, gy_m) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Similarly, we can show that

$$\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} p(gy_{n+1}, gy_{m+1}) \leq \lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}(M(x_n, y_n, x_m, y_m)) \lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p(gx_n, gx_m), \\ p(gy_n, gy_m) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Thus

$$\lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} \max \left\{ \begin{matrix} p(gx_{n+1}, gx_{m+1}), \\ p(gy_{n+1}, gy_{m+1}) \end{matrix} \right\} \leq \lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}(M(x_n, y_n, x_m, y_m)) \lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} \max \left\{ \begin{matrix} p(gx_n, gx_m), \\ p(gy_n, gy_m) \end{matrix} \right\} \tag{11}$$

We have

$$p(gx_n, gx_m) \leq kp(gx_n, gx_{n+1}) + k^2p(gx_{n+1}, gx_{m+1}) + k^2p(gx_{m+1}, gx_m)$$

which implies that $\frac{1}{k^2} \lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} p(gx_n, gx_m) \leq \lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} p(gx_{n+1}, gx_{m+1})$ from(5).

Similarly, $\frac{1}{k^2} \lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} p(gy_n, gy_m) \leq \lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} p(gy_{n+1}, gy_{m+1})$.

Thus by using (11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{k^2} \lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} \max \left\{ \begin{matrix} p(gx_n, gx_m), \\ p(gy_n, gy_m) \end{matrix} \right\} &\leq \lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} \max \left\{ \begin{matrix} p(gx_{n+1}, gx_{m+1}), \\ p(gy_{n+1}, gy_{m+1}) \end{matrix} \right\} \\ &\leq \lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}(M(x_n, y_n, x_m, y_m)) \lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} \max \left\{ \begin{matrix} p(gx_n, gx_m), \\ p(gy_n, gy_m) \end{matrix} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

which in turn implies from (8) that

$$\frac{1}{k^2} \leq \lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}(M(x_n, y_n, x_m, y_m)) \leq \frac{1}{k^2} \text{ so that } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M(x_n, y_n, x_m, y_m) = 0.$$

It is a contradiction to (8) in view of (10).

Hence (7) holds. Thus $\{gx_n\}$ and $\{gy_n\}$ are Cauchy sequences in $g(X)$. Since $g(X)$ is complete, there exist $r_1, r_2, z_1, z_2 \in X$ such that $gx_n \rightarrow r_1 = gz_1$ and $gy_n \rightarrow r_2 = gz_2$.

Suppose (2.5.5)(a) holds.

From Lemma 1.8, there exists a subset $E \subseteq X$ such that $g(E) = g(X)$ and the mapping $g : E \rightarrow X$ is one-one. Without loss of generality, we are able to choose $E \subseteq X$ such that $z_1, z_2 \in E$. Now define $G : g(E) \times g(E) \rightarrow X$ by

$$G(ga, gb) = F(a, b) \text{ for all } ga, gb \in g(E) \text{ where } a, b \in E.$$

Since F and g are continuous, it follows that G is continuous. As $g : E \rightarrow X$ is one-one and $F(X \times X) \subseteq g(X)$, G is well defined. Again since F and g are continuous, it follows that G is continuous. Since $\{x_n\}, \{y_n\} \subset X$ and $g(E) = g(X)$, there exists $\{a_n\}, \{b_n\} \subset E$ such that $g(x_n) = g(a_n)$ and $g(y_n) = g(b_n)$ for all n . So we have

$$F(z_1, z_2) = G(gz_1, gz_2) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G(ga_n, gb_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(a_n, b_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} ga_{n+1} = gz_1,$$

$$F(z_2, z_1) = G(gz_2, gz_1) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G(gb_n, ga_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(b_n, a_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} gb_{n+1} = gz_2.$$

Thus (z_1, z_2) is a coupled coincidence point of F and g .

Suppose (2.5.5) (b) holds.

From (1)and (i) and (ii) of (2.5.5)(b), we have $gx_n \preceq gz_1$ and $gy_n \succeq gz_2$ for all n .

From definition of completeness of $g(X)$ and from (7), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p(gx_n, gz_1) = p(gz_1, gz_1) = \lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} p(gx_n, gx_m) = 0 \tag{12}$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p(gy_n, gz_2) = p(gz_2, gz_2) = \lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} p(gy_n, gy_m) = 0 \tag{13}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} p(gx_{n+1}, F(z_1, z_2)) &= p(F(x_n, y_n), F(z_1, z_2)) \\ &\leq \mathcal{L}(M(x_n, y_n, z_1, z_2))M(x_n, y_n, z_1, z_2) \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M(x_n, y_n, z_1, z_2) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p(gx_n, gz_1), p(gy_n, gz_2), p(gx_n, gx_{n+1}), \\ p(gy_n, gy_{n+1}), p(gz_1, F(z_1, z_2)), p(gz_2, F(z_2, z_1)), \\ \frac{1}{2k} [p(gx_n, F(z_1, z_2)) + p(gz_1, gx_{n+1})], \\ \frac{1}{2k} [p(gy_n, F(z_2, z_1)) + p(gz_2, gy_{n+1})] \end{array} \right\} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 0, 0, 0, 0, p(gz_1, F(z_1, z_2)), p(gz_2, F(z_2, z_1)), \\ \frac{1}{2k} [kp(gz_1, F(z_1, z_2)) + 0], \\ \frac{1}{2k} [kp(gz_2, F(z_2, z_1)) + 0] \end{array} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

from (12), (13), (5) and Remark 2.4

$$\begin{aligned} &= \max \{p(gz_1, F(z_1, z_2)), p(gz_2, F(z_2, z_1))\} \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M(x_n, y_n, z_1, z_2). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M(x_n, y_n, z_1, z_2) = \max \{p(gz_1, F(z_1, z_2)), p(gz_2, F(z_2, z_1))\} \tag{15}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{k^2} p(gz_1, F(z_1, z_2)) &\leq \frac{1}{k} p(gz_1, F(z_1, z_2)) \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p(gx_{n+1}, F(z_1, z_2)) \text{ from Remark 2.4} \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}(M(x_n, y_n, z_1, z_2)) \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p(gz_1, F(z_1, z_2)), \\ p(gz_2, F(z_2, z_1)) \end{array} \right\} \text{ from (14), (15)} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we can show that

$$\frac{1}{k^2} p(gz_2, F(z_2, z_1)) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}(M(x_n, y_n, z_1, z_2)) \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p(gz_1, F(z_1, z_2)), \\ p(gz_2, F(z_2, z_1)) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Thus

$$\frac{1}{k^2} \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p(gz_1, F(z_1, z_2)), \\ p(gz_2, F(z_2, z_1)) \end{array} \right\} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}(M(x_n, y_n, z_1, z_2)) \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p(gz_1, F(z_1, z_2)), \\ p(gz_2, F(z_2, z_1)) \end{array} \right\}.$$

If $\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p(gz_1, F(z_1, z_2)), \\ p(gz_2, F(z_2, z_1)) \end{array} \right\} > 0$, then from property of \mathcal{L} , we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M(x_n, y_n, z_1, z_2) = 0 \text{ which is a contradiction in view of (15).}$$

Hence $gz_1 = F(z_1, z_2)$ and $gz_2 = F(z_2, z_1)$.

Thus (z_1, z_2) is a coupled coincidence point of F and g . This completes the proof.

Now, we furnish an example to illustrate Theorem 2.5.

Example 2.6: Let $X = [0, 1]$ and $p(x, y) = \max\{x^2, y^2\}$. Then p is a partial b -metric-like with $k = 2$. Define $x \preceq y$ as $x \leq y$. Consider the functions $F : X \times X \rightarrow X$ and $g : X \rightarrow X$ which are defined as $gx = x$ and

$$F(x, y) = \begin{cases} \frac{x}{2\sqrt{1+y^2}}, & \text{if } x \leq y \\ 0, & \text{if } x > y \end{cases}$$

Let $\mathcal{L} : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \frac{1}{4})$ be defined by $\mathcal{L}(t) = \frac{1}{4(1+t)}$.

Let $gx \preceq gu$ and $gy \succeq gv$. That is let $x \leq u$ and $y \geq v$.

Case(i): Assume $x \leq y$ and $u \leq v$.

Then $p(x, u) = \max\{x^2, u^2\} = u^2 \leq M(x, y, u, v)$.

$$p(F(x, y), F(u, v)) = \max \left\{ \frac{x^2}{4(1+y^2)}, \frac{u^2}{4(1+v^2)} \right\}$$

$$= \frac{u^2}{4(1+v^2)} \leq \frac{u^2}{4(1+u^2)} \leq \frac{M(x, y, u, v)}{4(1+M(x, y, u, v))} = L(M(x, y, u, v))M(x, y, u, v)$$

Case(ii): Assume $x \leq y$ and $u > v$.

$$\text{Then } p(gx, F(x, y)) = \max \left\{ x^2, \frac{x^2}{4(1+y^2)} \right\} = x^2 \leq M(x, y, u, v).$$

$$p(F(x, y), F(u, v)) = \frac{x^2}{4(1+y^2)}$$

$$\leq \frac{x^2}{4(1+x^2)} \leq \frac{M(x, y, u, v)}{4(1+M(x, y, u, v))} = L(M(x, y, u, v))M(x, y, u, v)$$

Case(iii): Assume $x > y$ and $u > v$.

$$\text{Then } p(F(x, y), F(u, v)) = 0 \leq L(M(x, y, u, v))M(x, y, u, v).$$

The case $x > y$ and $u \leq v$ does not arise as $x \leq u$ and $y \geq v$. Thus the condition (2.5.3) is satisfied. One can easily verify the remaining conditions. Clearly $(0, 0)$ is a coupled coincidence point of F and g .

Corollary 2.7: Let (X, p, k, \preceq) be an ordered complete partial b-metric-like space and $F : X \times X \rightarrow X$ be a mapping satisfying

(2.7.1) F has the mixed monotone property,

$$(2.7.2) \quad p(F(x, y), F(u, v)) \leq \mathcal{L}(M(x, y, u, v))M(x, y, u, v)$$

for all $x, y, u, v \in X$ with $x \preceq u, y \succeq v$, where $\mathcal{L} \in \Psi_{\mathcal{L}}^k$ and

$$M(x, y, u, v) = \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p(x, u), p(y, v), p(x, F(x, y)), p(y, F(y, x)), \\ p(u, F(u, v)), p(v, F(v, u)), \\ \frac{1}{2k} [p(x, F(u, v)) + p(u, F(x, y))], \\ \frac{1}{2k} [p(y, F(v, u)) + p(v, F(y, x))] \end{array} \right\}$$

(2.7.3) there exist two elements $x_0, y_0 \in X$ such that $x_0 \preceq F(x_0, y_0)$ and $y_0 \succeq F(y_0, x_0)$,

(2.7.4) (a) Suppose F is continuous

or

(b) X has the following properties:

(i) If a non-decreasing sequence $\{x_n\} \rightarrow x$, then $x_n \preceq x, \forall n$,

(ii) If a non-increasing sequence $\{y_n\} \rightarrow y$, then $y \preceq y_n, \forall n$.

Then F has a coupled fixed point in $X \times X$.

Acknowledgment All the authors are grateful to an anonymous learned referee for his fruitful suggestions.

REFERENCES

- [1] M.Ali Alghamdi, N.Hussain and P.Salimi, Fixed point and coupled fixed point theorems on b-metric-like spaces, Journal of Inequalities and Applications, (2013), 2013:402, 25 pages.
- [2] T.G. Bhaskar and V. Lakshmikantham, Fixed point theorems in partially ordered metric spaces and applications, Nonlinear Analysis, 65, (7) (2006), 1379 - 1393.
- [3] S. Czerwik, Contraction mappings in b-metric spaces, Acta Math. Inf. Univ. Ostraviensis, 1(1993), 5 - 11.
- [4] R. H. Haghi, Sh. Rezapour and N. Shahzad, Some fixed point generalizations are not real generalizations, Nonlinear Anal., 74 (2011), 1799 - 1803.
- [5] V. Lakshmikantham and Lj. Ćirić, Coupled fixed point theorems for nonlinear contractions in partially ordered metric spaces, Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods and Applications, vol. 70, no. 12(2009), 4341-4349.
- [6] S.G. Matthews, Partial metric topology, Proc. 8th Summer conference on General Topology and Applications, Ann. New York Acad. Sci., vol. 728, 1994, 183 - 197.

K.P.R.RAO

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS,ACHARYA NAGARJUNA UNIVERSITY, NAGARJUNA NAGAR -522 510,
A.P., INDIA

E-mail address: kprrao2004@yahoo.com

K.V.SIVA PARVATHI

DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS,KRISHNA UNIVERSITY-M.R.APPA ROW P.G.CENTER,,
NUZVID-521 201, A.P, INDIA.

E-mail address: kvsp1979@yahoo.com

M.IMDAD

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS,ALIGARH MUSLIM UNIVERSITY ,ALIGARH-202 002, U.P,INDIA.

E-mail address: mhimdad@yahoo.co.in