# ON (α – β) - CONTRACTIVE MAPPING OF PARTIAL b-METRIC SPACES AND FIXED POINT THEOREM

### Moayad Mhmoud Khlil

Dept. of mathematics - College of education for pure Sciences University of Tikrit

#### **Abstract**

we prove in this article a unique common fixed point theorem for  $\alpha-\beta$  contractive condition for rational contraction and also we give example that explain the main result.

**Keywords:** Partial, b-metric space, weakly, compatible mapping, rational contraction. metric space.

#### \.Preliminaries

In the year  $^{1997}$ ,a partial metric space is a generalization of the notion of the metric space defined in  $^{1997}$ ,by (Maurice.frechet) such that the distance of a point from itself isn't necessarily ·.well known banach fixed point theorem also known as banach contaction principle,was.a foundation for a development of metric fixed point theory and found applications in different areas. There was much popularization of that result in tha last seventy years. At  $^{1949}$  [1] submitted the notion of Quasi-Metric Space as a special general concept of Metric Spaces. At  $^{1997}$ ,[7][7] put many theorems due to the b-metric spaces. In  $(^{1992})$ [6] assumptive the notion of partial metric space in which the Self-distance of every point of space not equal ·.At( $^{1997}$ )o'neill generalized the concept of (P.M.SP) by introduced negative distances. At( $^{1997}$ )o'neill generalized both the notion of (b-M.SP) and (P.M.SP) by presenting the partial b-metric spaces (P.b-M.SP)as example alot of researchers at present day have studying this presupposition and its generalization in different types of (M.SP).

some authors close to our interest were studying some fixed point theorems in the so called b-metric space. After then, some authors started to prove  $((\alpha - \psi))$  versions of certain fixed point theorems in different type metric spaces [7,7, $\Lambda$ ]. Mustafa in [ $^{4}$ ], gave a generalization of Banach's contraction principles in a complete ordered partial b-metric space by introducing a generalized  $(\alpha-\psi)$ weakly contractive mapping.

**Definition**\[\dagger\] Let Q be a set and  $q \ge \$ \ be a real no. A mapping  $d: Q \times Q \to [\cdot, \infty)$  then(Q, d) is said to be a(b-M.SP) and q is called the coefficient of (Q, d) if  $\forall e, f, g \in Q$ then following properties satisfied:

$$(d)$$
)  $e = f iff d(e, f) = \cdot$ 

$$(d^{\Upsilon\Upsilon}) d(e, f) = d(f, e)$$

$$(d^{rr}) d(e,f) \le q[d(e,g) + d(g,f)]$$

**Definition**<sup> $\gamma$ </sup>[ $\xi$ ] Let  $Q \neq \emptyset$  A map  $p: Q \times Q \rightarrow [\cdot, \infty)$  is a(P.M.SP) then (Q, p) is called (P.M.SP) if  $\forall e, f, g \in Q$  if the following terms are satisfying:

$$(p)) p(e,e) = p(e,f) = p(f,f) iff e = f$$

$$(p^{\Upsilon\Upsilon}) p(e,e) \le p(e,f)$$

$$(p^{\Upsilon\Upsilon}) p(e,f) = p(f,e)$$

$$(p \, \xi \, \xi) \, p(e,f) \le p(e,g) + p(g,f) - p(g,g)$$

**Remark**<sup> $\varphi$ </sup> it's obvious that (P.M.SP) mayn't be a (M.SP), since in a (b-M.SP) if e = f then d(e, e) = d(e, f) = d(f, f) = zero. but in (P.M.SP) if e = f then p(e, e) = p(e, f) = p(f, f) doesn't need equalize zero therefore (P.M.SP) doesn't need to be (b-M.SP).

At other hand,[°] admit the concept of (P.b-M.SP) as:

**Definition**<sup> $\xi$ </sup>[°] Let  $Q \neq \emptyset$  and  $q \geq {}^{\backprime}.P_b: Q \times Q \rightarrow [{}^{\backprime}, \infty)$  is called a (P.b-M.SP) if  $\forall e, f, g \in Q$  then

$$(P_b \land \land) P_b(e, e) = P_b(e, f) = P_b(f, f) \text{ if } f e = f$$

$$(P_b \land \land) P_b(e, e) \le P_b(e, f)$$

$$(P_b \land \land) P_b(e, f) = P_b(f, e)$$

$$(P_b \land \land) P_b(e, f) = P_b(f, e)$$

$$(P_b^{\xi\xi}) P_b(e,f) \le q[P_b(e,g) + P_b(g,f)] - P_b(g,g)$$

then  $(Q, P_b)$  is a (P.b-M.SP). $q \ge 1$  the coefficient of  $(Q, P_b)$ .

**Remark**  $\circ$  the order of (P.b-M.SP)(Q,  $P_b$ ) is certainly greater than the class of (P.M.SP), Since a (P.M.SP) is a particular kind of a (P.b-M.SP)(Q,  $P_b$ ) when q = 1 also the class of (P.b-M.SP)(Q,  $P_b$ ) is greater than the order of (b-M.SP) since (b-M.SP) is a particular kind of a (P.b-M.SP)(Q,  $P_b$ ) while the self-distance p(e,e) = zero.

The following example explain that a (P.b-M.SP) on Q need not be a (P.M.SP), nor a (b-M.SP) on Q.

**Example**  $\P[\circ]$  Let  $Q = [\cdot, \cdot]$  define amap  $P_b: Q \times Q \to [\cdot, \infty)$  where

$$P_b(e, f) = [max\{e, f\}]^{\mathsf{T}} + |e - f|^{\mathsf{T}}, \forall e, f \in Q$$

then  $(Q, P_b)$  is a(P.b-MS) on Q with coefficient q = 7 > 1 but  $P_b$  isn't a(b-MS) nor a(P.M.S) on Q.

**Definition** $^{\vee}[^{\mathfrak{q}}]$  every partial b-metric  $P_{b}$  defines a b - metric  $d_{P_{b}}$ , where  $d_{P_{b}}(e,f) = {}^{\mathsf{q}}P_{b}(e,f) - P_{b}(e,e) - P_{b}(f,f), \forall e,f \in Q.$ 

**Definition**  $^{\Lambda}[^{\mathfrak{q}}]$  A sequence  $\{e_n\}$  in a(P.b-M.SP)  $(Q, P_b)$  is called:

- a)  $P_b$  -convergent to a point  $e \in Q$  if  $\lim_{n \to \infty} P_b$   $(e, e_n) = P_b$  (e, e)
- b) A P<sub>b</sub>-Cauchy seq.(C.Seq.) if  $\lim_{n,m\to\infty} P_b$  (  $e_n,e_m$ ) defined and limited;
- c) A (P.b-M.SP) (M,  $P_b$ ) is called  $P_b$ -complete if any  $P_b$  (C.Seq.)  $\{e_n\}$  in Q is  $P_b$  Approaches to A Point  $e \in Q$  where  $\lim_{n,m\to\infty} P_b$  ( $e_n,e_m$ ) =  $\lim_{n\to\infty} P_b$  ( $e_n,e$ ) =  $P_b$  (e,e)

**Lemma**  ${}^{q}[{}^{q}]$  a seq.  $\{e_n\}$  is a  $P_b$  - (C. Seq.) in a (P.b-M.SP)  $(Q, P_b)$  iff b\_(C. Seq.) in the (b-M.SP)  $(Q, d_{P_b})$ .

**Lemma**  $``[^{q}]$  a (P.b-M.SP)  $(Q,P_{b})$  is  $P_{b}$  - Complete iff (b - M.SP)  $(Q,d_{P_{b}})$  is b - complete. moreover,  $\lim_{n,m\to\infty} d_{P_{b}}(e_{n},e_{m}) = ` \inf_{n,m\to\infty} \lim_{n\to\infty} P_{b}(e_{m},e) = \lim_{n\to\infty} P_{b}(e_{n},e) = P_{b}(e,e).$ 

**Definition** [11] The twin of a self-maps A and S of a(M.SP.) (Q,d) are said to be weakened compatible if they subrogate at fortuity points that is if  $Ae = Se \Rightarrow ASe = SAe$  for  $e \in Q$ .

#### **Y. Main Results**

**Theorem** \( \text{suppose} \( (Q, P\_b) \) be a a  $(P_b ext{-M.SP})$  with coefficient  $q \ge 1$ . Let  $T, A : Q \to Q$  be a mapping satisfies the following

$$\alpha \left(q^2 \cdot P_b\left(Ae, Af\right)\right) \le \alpha \left(Q_{P_b}\left(e, f\right)\right) - \beta \left(Q_{P_b}\left(e, f\right)\right) \quad (\Upsilon, \Upsilon)$$

 $\forall e, f \in Q, \alpha: [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$  be continuous and monotonically increasing function with  $\alpha(t) = 0$  iff  $t = \cdot, l$   $\beta: [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$  be lower semi-continuous with  $\beta(t) = 0$  iff  $t = \cdot$  also where

$$Q_{P_b}\left(e,f\right) = \max\left\{\frac{P_b\left(Te,Ae\right) \cdot P_b\left(Te,Af\right)}{1 + P_b\left(Te,Tf\right)}, P_b\left(Te,Tf\right)\right\}$$

 $A(Q) \le T(Q)$  and T(Q) is complete subspace of Q ( $^{\Upsilon},^{\Upsilon}$ )

(T,A) weakly compatible pair.  $(\Upsilon, \Upsilon)$ 

Then A and T have unique common fixed point in Q.

**Proof:** Choose  $e_0 \in Q$ . From  $(\red{1}.\red{1})$ , there is seq.  $\langle e_n \rangle$  in Q. Where  $Ae_n = Te_{n+1}$ ,  $\forall n = \red{1}$ , ...

Case ((a)) Let  $Te_{n+1} \neq Te_n$ ,  $\forall n$ , From (7, 1) we obtain

$$\alpha \left(q^2 P_b \left(A e_1, A e_2\right)\right) \leq \alpha \left(Q_{P_b} \left(e_1, e_2\right)\right) - \beta \left(Q_{P_b} \left(e_1, e_2\right)\right)$$

Where

$$Q_{P_{b}}\left(e_{1},e_{2}\right) = \max \left\{ \frac{P_{b}\left(Te_{1},Ae_{1}\right) \cdot P_{b}\left(Te_{2},Ae_{2}\right)}{1 + P_{b}\left(Te_{1},Te_{2}\right)}, P_{b}\left(Te_{1},Te_{2}\right) \right\}$$

$$= \max \left\{ \frac{P_b \left( Te_1, Te_1 \right) \cdot P_b \left( Te_2, Ae_3 \right)}{1 + P_b \left( Te_1, Te_2 \right)}, P_b \left( Te_1, Te_2 \right) \right\}$$

If  $\frac{P_b(Te_1,Te_2)\cdot P_b(Te_2,Te_3)}{1+P_b(Te_2,Tf_2)}$  is maximum, then

$$\begin{split} \alpha\left(q^{2}\cdot P_{b}\left(Te_{2},Te_{3}\right)\right) \leq \alpha\left(\frac{P_{b}\left(Te_{1},Te_{2}\right)\cdot P_{b}\left(Te_{2},Te_{3}\right)}{1+P_{b}\left(Te_{1},Te_{2}\right)}\right) - \beta\left(\frac{P_{b}\left(Te_{1},Te_{2}\right)\cdot P_{b}\left(Te_{2},Te_{3}\right)}{1+P_{b}\left(Te_{1},Te_{2}\right)}\right) \\ < \alpha\left(\frac{P_{b}\left(Te_{1},Te_{2}\right)\cdot P_{b}\left(Te_{2},Te_{3}\right)}{1+P_{b}\left(Te_{1},Te_{2}\right)}\right) \end{split}$$

Since  $\alpha$  is monotonically increasing, we have that

$$q^{2} \cdot P_{b} (Te_{2}, Te_{3}) \leq \frac{P_{b} (Te_{1}, Te_{2}) \cdot P_{b} (Te_{2}, Te_{3})}{1 + P_{b} (Te_{1}, Te_{2})}$$

It follows that

$$q^{2} \lceil 1 + P_b \left( Te_1, Te_2 \right) \rceil \leq P_b \left( Te_1, Te_2 \right),$$

which is contradiction.

Hence  $P_{\mathbf{h}}(Te_1, Te_2)$  is maximum.

$$\alpha \left[q^{2} \cdot P_{b}\left(Te_{2}, Te_{3}\right)\right] \leq \left[P_{b}\left(Te_{1}, Te_{2}\right)\right] - \beta \left[P_{b}\left(Te_{1}, Te_{2}\right)\right]$$

$$\leq \alpha \left(P_{b}\left(Te_{1}, Te_{2}\right)\right)$$

Since  $\alpha$  is monotonically increasing, we have that

$$q^{2} \cdot P_{b} (Te_{2}, Te_{3}) \leq P_{b} (Te_{1}, Te_{3}) \leq \frac{1}{q^{2}} P_{b} (Te_{0}, Te_{1})$$

Similarly we can also prove that

$$\begin{split} q^2 \cdot P_b \left( Te_3, Te_4 \right) &\leq P_b \left( Te_2, Te_3 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{q^4} P_b \left( Te_0, Te_1 \right) \end{split}$$

Continuing this way we can conclude that

$$\alpha \left(q^{2} \cdot P_{b} \left(Te_{n}, Te_{n+1}\right)\right) \leq \alpha \left(P_{b} \left(Te_{n-1}, Te_{n}\right)\right) - \beta \left(P_{b} \left(Te_{n-1}, Te_{n}\right)\right) \dots (1)$$

Also it is clear that  $\{P_b(Te_n, Te_{n+1})\}$  is decreasing sequence of positive real nos. which approaches to  $t \ge 0$ .

let t > 0

assuming n approaches to infinity in (1), we have that

$$\alpha(t) \leq \alpha(q^2 \cdot t) \leq \alpha(t) - \beta(t) < \alpha(t),$$

which is contradiction.

therefore  $t = \cdot$ .

Thus 
$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P_{\mathbf{b}}(Te_n, Te_{n+1}) = 0$$
 .....( $^{\gamma}$ )

From 
$$(Pb2)$$
,  $\lim_{n\to\infty} P_b(Te_n, Te_n) = 0 \dots (\Upsilon)$ 

From ( $^{\gamma}$ ) and ( $^{\gamma}$ ) and by the definition of  $d_{P_b}$ , we have that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} d_{P_b} \left( Te_n, Te_{n+1} \right) = 0 \dots \left( \xi \right)$$

We will prove now that  $\{Te_n\}$  is (C. seq.) in  $(Q, P_b)$ . Alternatively, we can prove that

 $\{Te_n\}$  is (C. seq.) in  $(Q, d_{P_h})$ . On contrary suppose that  $\{Te_n\}$  is not (C. seq.) in  $(Q, P_b)$ . This implies that  $d_{P_b}(Te_n, Te_m) \not\to 0$  as  $n, m \to \infty$ .

Then there exist  $\in > 0$  and monotonically increasing sequence of natural numbers  $\{m_k\}$  and

 $\{n_k\}$  such that  $n_k > m_k > k$ 

$$d_{P_b}\left(Te_{n_k}, Te_{m_k}\right) \ge \in \dots (\circ)$$

and

$$d_{P_b}\left(Te_{n_k-1}, Te_{m_k}\right) < \in \dots(\mathsf{I})$$

From ( $\circ$ ) and ( $^{7}$ ), we have that

$$\begin{split} & \in \leq d_{P_b} \left( Te_{n_k}, Te_{m_k} \right) \\ & \leq q \left[ d_{P_b} \left( Te_{m_k}, Te_{n_k-1} \right) + d_{P_b} \left( Te_{n_k-1}, Te_{n_k} \right) \right] \\ & < q \cdot \in +q \cdot d_{P_b} \left( Te_{n_k-1}, Te_{n_k} \right) \end{split}$$

Taking the upper limit as  $k \to \infty$  and using ( $\xi$ ), we have that

$$\in \leq \lim_{k \to \infty} \sup d_{P_b} \left( Te_{n_k}, Te_{m_k} \right) \leq q \in \dots (\forall)$$

Also

$$\leq \leq d_{P_{b}} \left( Te_{m_{k}}, Te_{n_{k}} \right)$$

$$\leq q \cdot d_{P_{b}} \left( Te_{m_{k}}, Te_{n_{k}+1} \right) + q \cdot d_{P_{b}} \left( Te_{n_{k}+1}, Te_{n_{k}} \right)$$

Taking upper unit as  $k \to \infty$  and using  $(\xi)$ , we have that

$$\stackrel{\epsilon}{=} \le \lim_{k \to \infty} \sup d_{P_b} \left( Te_{m_k}, Te_{n_k+1} \right) \dots (\Lambda)$$

On other hand

$$d_{P_b}\left(\!Te_{m_k},\!Te_{n_k+1}\right)\!\leq\! q\cdot d_{P_b}\left(\!Te_{m_k},\!Te_{n_k}\right)\!+\!q\,d_{P_b}\left(\!Te_{n_k},\!Te_{n_k+1}\right)$$

Taking upper limit as  $k \to \infty$ , using ( $\xi$ ) we have that

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \sup d_{P_b} \left( Te_{m_k}, Te_{n_k+1} \right) < \in q^2 \dots (9)$$

Also from (°), we have that

$$\leq \leq d_{P_b} \left( Te_{m_k}, Te_{n_k} \right)$$

$$\leq q \left[ d_{P_b} \left( Te_{m_k}, Te_{m_k+1} \right) + d_{P_b} \left( Te_{m_k+1}, Te_{n_k} \right) \right]$$

$$\leq q \cdot d_{P_b} \left( Te_{m_k}, Te_{m_k+1} \right) + q^2 \cdot d_{P_b} \left( Te_{m_k+1}, Te_{n_k+2} \right) + q^2 \cdot d_{P_b} \left( Te_{n_k+2}, Te_{n_k} \right) \\ \leq q \cdot d_{P_b} \left( Te_{m_k}, Te_{m_k+1} \right) + q^2 \cdot d_{P_b} \left( Te_{m_k+1}, Te_{n_k+2} \right) + q^3 \cdot d_{P_b} \left( Te_{n_k+2}, Te_{n_k} \right) + q^2 \cdot d_{P_b} \left( Te_{n_k+2}, Te_{n_k} \right) \\$$

Taking upper limit as  $k \to \infty$  and using ( $\xi$ ), we have that

$$\frac{\epsilon}{q^2} \le \lim_{k \to \infty} \sup d_{P_b} \left( Te_{m_k+1}, Te_{n_k+2} \right) \dots \left( \uparrow \bullet \right)$$

On other hand

$$\begin{split} d_{P_b} \left( & Te_{m_k+1}, Te_{n_k+2} \right) \leq q \left[ d_{P_b} \left( Te_{m_k+1}, Te_{m_k} \right) + d_{P_b} \left( Te_{m_k}, Te_{n_k+2} \right) \right] \\ & \leq q \ d_{P_b} \left( Te_{m_k+1}, Te_{m_k} \right) + q^2 \left[ d_{P_b} \left( Te_{m_k}, Te_{n_k+1} \right) \right] \\ & + q \ d_{P_b} \left( Te_{n_k+1}, Te_{n_k+2} \right) \end{split}$$

Taking upper limit as  $k \to \infty$  and using ( $\xi$ ), we have

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \sup d_{P_b} \left( Te_{m_k+1}, Te_{n_k+2} \right) \le q^4 \in \dots (11)$$

Now

$$\alpha \left( q^{2} \cdot P_{b} \left( Te_{m_{k}+1}, Te_{n_{k}+2} \right) \right) = \alpha \left( q^{2} \cdot P_{b} \left( Ae_{m_{k}}, Ae_{n_{k}+1} \right) \right)$$

$$\leq \alpha \left( Q_{P_{b}} \left( e_{m_{k}}, e_{n_{k}+1} \right) \right) - \beta \left( Q_{P_{b}} \left( e_{m_{k}}, e_{n_{k}+1} \right) \right) \dots (17)$$

where

$$\begin{split} Q_{P_{b}}\left(e_{m_{k}},e_{n_{k}+1}\right) &= \max\left\{\frac{P_{b}\left(Te_{m_{k}},Ae_{m_{k}}\right)\cdot P_{b}\left(Te_{n_{k}+1},Ae_{n_{k}+1}\right)}{1+P_{b}\left(Te_{m_{k}},Te_{n_{k}+1}\right)},P_{b}\left(Te_{m_{k}},Ae_{n_{k}+1}\right)\right\} \\ &= \max\left\{\frac{P_{b}\left(Te_{m_{k}},Te_{m_{k}+1}\right)\cdot P_{b}\left(Te_{n_{k}+1},Te_{n_{k}+2}\right)}{1+P_{b}\left(Te_{m_{k}},Te_{n_{k}+1}\right)},P_{b}\left(Te_{m_{k}},Te_{n_{k}+1}\right)\right\} \end{split}$$

Taking  $k \to \infty$  (9) and (7), we have that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\sup Q_{P_b}\left(e_{m_k}\,,e_{n_k+1}\right)\leq \max\left\{0,q^2\cdot\in\right\}=q^2\cdot\in$$

$$\alpha \left(q^{6} \cdot \epsilon\right) \leq \alpha \left(q^{2} \cdot \epsilon\right) - \beta \left(\lim_{k \to \infty} \sup Q_{P_{b}}\left(e_{m_{k}}, e_{n_{k}+1}\right)\right) \dots (\Upsilon)$$

**Subcase** (i) if q = 1, from (17), we obtain

$$\alpha(\in) \leq \alpha(\in) - \beta \left( \lim_{k \to \infty} \sup Q_{P_b} \left( e_{m_k}, e_{n_k + 1} \right) \right)$$

$$< \alpha(\in)$$

which is a contradiction

**Subcase** (ii) if q > 1, from (17), we see

$$\alpha \left(q^{6} \in\right) \leq \alpha \left(q^{2} \in\right) - \beta \left(\lim_{k \to \infty} \sup Q_{P_{b}}\left(e_{m_{k}}, e_{n_{k}+1}\right)\right)$$

$$< \alpha \left(q^{6} \in\right)$$

Since  $\alpha$  is monotonically increasing, we have that

$$q^6 \in \leq q^2 \in$$

It follows that  $a^4 \le 1$ 

which is a contradiction.

Hence we conclude that  $\{Te_n\}$  is (C. seq.) in  $(Q, d_{P_k})$ .

let T(Q) is complete subspace of Q then  $\{Te_n\}$  converges to e in  $(T(e), d_{P})$ 

Thus  $d_{P_n}(Te_n, u) = 0$  for some u = TV. From Lemma \(\cdot\) we obtain

$$\lim_{n,m\to\infty} P_b\left(Te_n, Te_m\right) = P_b\left(Te_n, u\right) = P_b\left(Te_m, u\right) = P_b\left(u, u\right) = 0 \quad ... \quad (15)$$

Now we claim that AV =u

From (7,1), we have that

$$\alpha (q^2 \cdot P_b(Av, Ae_n)) \leq \alpha (Q_{P_b}(v, e_n)) \dots (10)$$

Where

$$Q_{P_{b}}(v,e_{n}) = \max \left\{ \frac{P_{b}(Tv,Av) \cdot P_{b}(Te_{n},Ae_{n})}{1 + P_{b}(Tv,Te_{n})}, P_{b}(Tv,Te_{n}) \right\}$$

$$= \max \left\{ \frac{P_{b}(u,Av) \cdot P_{b}(Te_{n},Te_{n+1})}{1 + P_{b}(u,Te_{n})}, P_{b}(u,Te_{n}) \right\}$$

$$\rightarrow * \text{ as } n \to \infty$$

Letting  $n \to \infty$  and

From  $(\ \ )^{\circ}$ ), we have that

$$\alpha (q^2 \cdot P_b(Av,u)) \leq 0$$

It follows that Av = u = Tv

Since (A, T) is weakly compatible pair, we have that Au = TuSuppose  $Au \neq u$ 

Now

$$\alpha \left(q^{2} \cdot P_{b}\left(Au, Ae_{n}\right)\right) \leq \left(Q_{P_{b}}\left(u, e_{n}\right)\right) - \beta \left(Q_{P_{b}}\left(u, e_{n}\right)\right) \dots (17)$$

Where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q}_{P_b}\left(u,e_n\right) &= \max \left\{ \frac{P_b\left(Tu,Au\right) \cdot P_b\left(Te_n,Ae_n\right)}{1 + P_b\left(Tu,Te_n\right)}, P_b\left(Tu,Te_n\right) \right\} \\ &= \max \left\{ \frac{P_b\left(Au,Au\right) \cdot P_b\left(Te_n,Te_{n+1}\right)}{1 + P_b\left(Au,Te_n\right)}, P_b\left(Au,Te_n\right) \right\} \\ &\to P_b\left(Au,u\right) \text{ as } n \to \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Hence letting  $n \to \infty$  in (17), we have that

$$\alpha \left(q^{2} \cdot P_{b}\left(Au,u\right)\right) \leq \alpha \left(P_{b}\left(Au,u\right)\right) - \beta \left(P_{b}\left(Au,u\right)\right) \dots (\Upsilon \Upsilon)$$

$$\alpha (P_b(Au,u)) \leq \alpha (P_b(Au,u)) - \beta (P_b(Au,u))$$

$$< \alpha (P_b(Au,u))$$

Which is a contradiction

**Subcase(iv)** if q > 1, from (\forall \forall ), we have

$$\alpha \left(q^{2} \cdot P_{b}\left(Au,u\right)\right) \leq \alpha \left(P_{b}\left(Au,u\right)\right) - \beta \left(P_{b}\left(Au,u\right)\right)$$

$$< \alpha \left(P_{b}\left(Au,u\right)\right)$$

Since  $\alpha$  is monotonically increasing function, we have that  $q^2 \cdot P_b(Au,u) \leq P_b(Au,u)$ 

It follows that  $q^2 \le 1$ 

Which is a contradiction.

Hence Au = u = Tu

hence u is com. fixed pt. of A and T.

For uniqueness let g is another com. fixed pt. of A and T provided  $u \neq g$  then

$$\alpha \left( q^{2} P_{b} \left( u, g \right) \right) = \alpha \left( q^{2} P_{b} \left( A u, A g \right) \right)$$

$$\leq \alpha \left( Q_{P_{b}} \left( u, g \right) \right) - \beta \left( Q_{P_{b}} \left( u, g \right) \right) \dots ( ) \wedge )$$

Where

$$Q_{P_b}(u,g) = \max \left\{ \frac{P_b(Tu,Au) \cdot P_b(Tg,Ag)}{1 + P_b(Tu,Tg)}, P_b(Tu,Tg) \right\}$$

$$= \max \left\{ \frac{P_b(u,u) \cdot P_b(g,g)}{1 + P_b(u,g)}, P_b(u,g) \right\}$$

$$= \max \left\{ 0, P_b(u,g) \right\}$$

$$= P_b(u,g)$$

Therefore, from  $(\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ )$ , we have that

$$\alpha \left(q^{2} \cdot P_{b}\left(u,g\right)\right) \leq \alpha \left(P_{b}\left(u,g\right)\right) - \beta \left(P_{b}\left(u,g\right)\right)$$

$$< \alpha \left(P_{b}\left(u,g\right)\right)$$

Which is contradiction

since u = g

hence, u a unique fixed pt. of A and T.

**Example** 
$$\[ \]^1 \quad Q = [\cdot, \cdot] \]$$
 and  $P_b : QQQ \to [0, \infty] \]$  defined as  $P_b(e, f) = \left(\max\{e, f\}\right)^2 \] \forall e, f \in Q.$  Then it's obviously that  $(Q, P_b)$  is a complete (P.b-MS) with  $q = \[ \]^1 \]$ .

define 
$$A,T:Q \to Q$$
 by  $T(Q) = \frac{e}{2}$ ,  $A(Q) = \frac{e^2}{e+1}$  and  $\alpha,\beta:[0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$  by  $\alpha(t) = t$  and

 $\beta(t) = \frac{t}{2}$ . Then all terms of theorem ( $^{\gamma}$ ,  $^{\gamma}$ ) are holding and zero is unique fixed pt. of A and T.

**Result**  $^{\vee}$  in theorem  $(^{\vee}, ^{\vee})$ , if we take  $\alpha(t) = \beta(t) = t$  and (P.M.SP)  $(Q, P_b)$  is exchanged by (M.SP) (Q, d). Then we will see main result of  $[^{\circ}]$ .

**Result**  $\stackrel{\checkmark}{}$  if we put  $p(e, f) = \cdot \text{ in } (^{\checkmark}, ^{\backprime})$  and let  $p: Q \times Q \to [\cdot, \infty)$  be a mapping, provided  $p(e, f) = \cdot \text{ iff } e = f = \cdot \text{ then theorem } (^{\checkmark}, ^{\backprime}) \text{ reduces to theorem } (^{\checkmark}, ^{\backprime}) \text{ in } [^{\backprime}].$ 

#### **References:**

- [1] I. A. Bakhtin, The contraction principle in quasi metric spaces, It. Funct. Anal., T. (1949), 77-77.
- S. Czerwik, Nonlinear set-valued contraction mappings in b-metric spaces, Atti Sem. Mat. Fis. Univ. Modena. ٤٦ (١٩٩٨), ٢٦٣ ٢٧٦.
- [\*] S. Czerwik, Contraction mappings in b-metric spaces, Acta Math. Inform. Univ. Osrav., \(\((199\)\), \(\circ\_{-1}\)\).
- [5] S. G. Matthews, Partal metric topology Proc. Ath Summer Conference on General Topology and Applications, Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci., YYA (1995), 1AT-19V.

- [ $^{\vee}$ ] E. Karapinar, R. P. Agarwal, A note on Coupled fixed point theorems for  $\alpha$   $\psi$  contractive-type mappings in partially ordered metric spaces, Fixed Point Theory and Applications,  $^{\vee}$  .  $^{\vee}$ ,  $^{\vee$
- [A] J. Asl, S. Rezapour, N. Shahzad, On fixed points of  $\alpha$   $\psi$  contractive multi functions, Fixed Point Theory and Applications, Y.IY, Y.IY:YIY, 7 pp.
- [9] Z. Mustafa, J. R. Roshan, V. Parvaneh, Z. Kadelburg, Some common fixed point result in ordered partial b-metric spaces, Journal of Inequalities and Applications, (۲۰۱۳), ۲۰۱۳:0٦٢.

- [1.] H. Aydi, M. Bota, E. Karapinar, S. Mitrovic, A fixed point theorem for set valued quasi-contractions in b-metric spaces, Fixed Point Theory and its Applications, Y. 17, Y. 17: AA, App.
- [11] Jha, K., R.P. Pant and S.L. Singh, On the existence of common fixed points for compatible mappings, Punjab Univ. J. Math.,  $\Upsilon V$  ( $\Upsilon \cdot \cdot \circ$ ),  $\Upsilon Q = \xi A$ .
- [17] C. Chen and C. Zhu, Fixed point theorems for weakly C-contractive mappings in partial metric spaces, Fixed Point Theory and Applications, vol. 7.17, article 1.7, 7.17.

# حول التطبيق الانكماشي $(\alpha-eta)$ للفضاءات المترية الجزئية من النوع ومبرهنة النقطة الثابتة

م. مؤید محمود خلیل

قسم الرياضيات / كلية التربية للعلوم الصرفة / جامعة تكريت

مستخلص البحث

 $(\alpha - \beta)$  تم في هذا البحث برهان مبرهنة النقطة الثابتة الوحيدة للتطبيق الانكماشي وإعطينا مثالاً يدعم ويوضح النتيجة الرئيسية للبحث كما استنتجنا بعض النتائج المفيدة.