

RESEARCH

Open Access



# A Suzuki-type multivalued contraction on weak partial metric spaces and applications

Hassen Aydi<sup>1,2</sup>, M. A. Barakat<sup>3</sup>, Zoran D. Mitrović<sup>4,5\*</sup> and Vesna Šešum-Čavić<sup>6</sup>

\*Correspondence:

zoran.mitrovic@tdtu.edu.vn

<sup>4</sup>Nonlinear Analysis Research Group, Ton Duc Thang University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

<sup>5</sup>Faculty of Mathematics and Statistics, Ton Duc Thang University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

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

## Abstract

Based on a recent paper of Beg and Pathak (Vietnam J. Math. 46(3):693–706, 2018), we introduce the concept of  $\mathcal{H}_q^+$ -type Suzuki multivalued contraction mappings. We establish a fixed point theorem for this type of mappings in the setting of complete weak partial metric spaces. We also present an illustrated example. Moreover, we provide applications to a homotopy result and to an integral inclusion of Fredholm type. Finally, we suggest open problems for the class of 0-complete weak partial metric spaces, which is more general than complete weak partial metric spaces.

**MSC:** Primary 47H10; secondary 54H25; 05C40

**Keywords:** Weak partial metric;  $\mathcal{H}^+$ -type Pompeiu–Hausdorff metric; Suzuki-type fixed point result

## 1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, we use following notation:  $\mathbb{N}$  is the set of all natural numbers,  $\mathbb{R}$  is the set of all real numbers, and  $\mathbb{R}^+$  is the set of all nonnegative real numbers.

**Definition 1.1** ([2]) A partial metric on a nonempty set  $X$  is a function  $p : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  such that, for all  $x, y, z \in X$ :

$$(P_1) \quad x = y \text{ if and only if } p(x, x) = p(x, y) = p(y, y);$$

$$(P_2) \quad p(x, x) \leq p(x, y);$$

$$(P_3) \quad p(x, y) = p(y, x);$$

$$(P_4) \quad p(x, y) \leq p(x, z) + p(z, y) - p(z, z).$$

The pair  $(X, p)$  is called a partial metric space. Many fixed point results in partial metric spaces have been proved; see [3–17]. Recently, Beg and Pathak [1] introduced a weaker form of partial metrics called a weak partial metric.

**Definition 1.2** ([1]) Let  $X$  be a nonempty set. A function  $q : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  is called a weak partial metric on  $X$  if for all  $x, y, z \in X$ , the following conditions hold:

$$(WP1) \quad q(x, x) = q(x, y) \text{ if and only if } x = y;$$

$$(WP2) \quad q(x, x) \leq q(x, y);$$

$$(WP3) \quad q(x, y) = q(y, x);$$

$$(WP4) \quad q(x, y) \leq q(x, z) + q(z, y).$$

The pair  $(X, q)$  is called a weak partial metric space.

Examples of weak partial metric spaces [1] are:

- (1)  $(\mathbb{R}^+, q)$ , where  $q : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  is defined as  $q(x, y) = |x - y| + 1$  for  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^+$ .
- (2)  $(\mathbb{R}^+, q)$ , where  $q : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  is defined as  $q(x, y) = \frac{1}{4}|x - y| + \max\{x, y\}$  for  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^+$ .
- (3)  $(\mathbb{R}^+, q)$ , where  $q : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  is defined as  $q(x, y) = \max\{x, y\} + e^{|x-y|} + 1$  for  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^+$ .

Notice that

- If  $q(x, y) = 0$ , then (WP1) and (WP2) imply that  $x = y$ , but the converse need not be true.
- (P1) implies (WP1), but the converse need not be true.
- (P4) implies (WP4), but the converse need not be true.

*Example 1.1* ([1]) If  $X = \{[a, b] : a, b \in \mathbb{R}, a \leq b\}$ , then  $q([a, b], [c, d]) = \max\{b, d\} - \min\{a, c\}$  is a weak partial metric.

Each weak partial metric  $q$  on  $X$  generates a  $T_0$  topology  $\tau_q$  on  $X$ . Topology  $\tau_q$  has as a base the family of open  $q$ -balls  $\{B_q(x, \epsilon) : x \in X, \epsilon > 0\}$ , where  $B_q(x, \epsilon) = \{y \in X : q(x, y) < q(x, x) + \epsilon\}$  for all  $x \in X$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ .

If  $q$  is a weak partial metric on  $X$ , then the function  $q^s : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  given by  $q^s(x, y) = q(x, y) - \frac{1}{2}[q(x, x) + q(y, y)]$  defines a metric on  $X$ .

**Definition 1.3** Let  $(X, q)$  be a weak partial metric space.

- (i) A sequence  $\{x_n\}$  in  $(X, q)$  converges to a point  $x \in X$ , with respect to  $\tau_q$  if  $q(x, x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q(x, x_n)$ ;
- (ii) A sequence  $\{x_n\}$  in  $X$  is said to be a Cauchy sequence if  $\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} q(x_n, x_m)$  exists and is finite;
- (iii)  $(X, q)$  is called complete if every Cauchy sequence  $\{x_n\}$  in  $X$  converges to  $x \in X$  with respect to topology  $\tau_q$ .

Clearly, we also have the following:

**Lemma 1.1** Let  $(X, q)$  be a weak partial metric space. Then

- (a) A sequence  $\{x_n\}$  in  $X$  is Cauchy sequence in  $(X, q)$  if and only if it is a Cauchy sequence in the metric space  $(X, q^s)$ ;
- (b)  $(X, q)$  is complete if and only if the metric space  $(X, q^s)$  is complete. Furthermore, a sequence  $\{x_n\}$  converges in  $(X, q^s)$  to a point  $x \in X$  if and only if

$$\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} q(x_n, x_m) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q(x_n, x) = q(x, x). \tag{1.1}$$

Let  $(X, q)$  be a weak partial metric space. Let  $CB^q(X)$  be the family of all nonempty closed bounded subsets of  $(X, q)$ . Here, the boundedness is given as follows:  $E$  is a bounded subset in  $(X, q)$  if there exist  $x_0 \in X$  and  $M \geq 0$  such that, for all  $a \in E$ , we have  $a \in B_q(x_0, M)$ , that is,  $q(x_0, a) < q(a, a) + M$ .

For  $E, F \in CB^q(X)$  and  $x \in X$ , define

$$q(x, E) = \inf\{q(x, a), a \in E\}, \quad \delta_q(E, F) = \sup\{q(a, F) : a \in E\}$$

and

$$\delta_q(F, E) = \sup\{q(b, E) : b \in F\}.$$

Now,  $q(x, E) = 0$  implies  $q^s(x, E) = 0$ , where  $q^s(x, E) = \inf\{q^s(x, a), a \in E\}$ .

**Remark 1.1** ([1]) Let  $(X, q)$  be a weak partial metric space, and let  $E$  be a nonempty set in  $(X, q)$ . Then

$$a \in \bar{E} \quad \text{if and only if} \quad q(a, E) = q(a, a), \tag{1.2}$$

where  $\bar{E}$  denotes the closure of  $E$  with respect to the weak partial metric  $q$ .

Note that  $E$  is closed in  $(X, q)$  if and only if  $E = \bar{E}$ .

First, we study properties of the mapping  $\delta_q : CB^q(X) \times CB^q(X) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ .

**Proposition 1.1** ([1]) *Let  $(X, q)$  be a weak partial metric space, We have the following:*

- (i)  $\delta_q(E, E) = \sup\{q(a, a) : a \in E\}$ ;
- (ii)  $\delta_q(E, E) \leq \delta_q(E, F)$ ;
- (iii)  $\delta_q(E, F) = 0$  implies  $E \subseteq F$ ;
- (iv)  $\delta_q(E, F) \leq \delta_q(E, H) + \delta_q(H, F)$  for all  $E, F, H \in CB^q(X)$ .

**Definition 1.4** ([1]) Let  $(X, q)$  be a weak partial metric space. For  $E, F \in CB^q(X)$ , define

$$\mathcal{H}_q^+(E, F) = \frac{1}{2} \{ \delta_q(E, F) + \delta_q(F, E) \}. \tag{1.3}$$

The following proposition is a consequence of Proposition 1.1.

**Proposition 1.2** ([1]) *Let  $(X, q)$  be a weak partial metric space. Then, for all  $E, F, H \in CB^q(X)$ , we have*

- (wh1)  $\mathcal{H}_q^+(E, E) \leq \mathcal{H}_q^+(E, F)$ ;
- (wh2)  $\mathcal{H}_q^+(E, F) = \mathcal{H}_q^+(F, E)$ ;
- (wh3)  $\mathcal{H}_q^+(E, F) \leq \mathcal{H}_q^+(E, H) + \mathcal{H}_q^+(H, F)$ .

The mapping  $\mathcal{H}_q^+ : CB^q(X) \times CB^q(X) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ , is called the  $\mathcal{H}^+$ -type Pompeiu–Hausdorff metric induced by  $q$ .

**Definition 1.5** ([1]) Let  $(X, q)$  be a complete weak partial metric space. A multivalued map  $T : X \rightarrow CB^q(X)$  is called an  $\mathcal{H}_q^+$ -contraction if

- (1°) there exists  $k$  in  $(0, 1)$  such that

$$\mathcal{H}_q^+(Tx \setminus \{x\}, Ty \setminus \{y\}) \leq kq(x, y) \quad \text{for every } x, y \in X, \tag{1.4}$$

- (2°) for all  $x$  in  $X, y$  in  $Tx$ , and  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $z$  in  $Ty$  such that

$$q(y, z) \leq \mathcal{H}_q^+(Ty, Tx) + \epsilon. \tag{1.5}$$

Beg and Pathak [1] proved the following fixed point theorem.

**Theorem 1.1** ([1]) *Let  $(X, q)$  be a complete weak partial metric space. Every  $\mathcal{H}_q^+$ -type multivalued contraction mapping  $T : X \rightarrow CB^q(X)$  with Lipschitz constant  $k < 1$  has a fixed point.*

In this paper, we generalize the concept of  $\mathcal{H}_q^+$ -type multivalued contractions by introducing  $\mathcal{H}_q^+$ -type Suzuki mult-valued contraction mappings.

**2 Fixed point results**

First, let  $\psi : [0, 1) \rightarrow (0, 1]$  be the nonincreasing function

$$\psi(r) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } 0 \leq r < \frac{1}{2}, \\ 1 - r & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} \leq r < 1. \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

Now, we state a fixed point result for  $\mathcal{H}_q^+$ -type Suzuki multivalued contraction mappings.

**Theorem 2.1** *Let  $(X, q)$  be a complete weak partial metric space, and let  $F : X \rightarrow CB^q(X)$  be a multivalued mapping. Let  $\psi : [0, 1) \rightarrow (0, 1]$  be the nonincreasing function defined by (2.1). Suppose that there exists  $0 \leq s < 1$  such that  $T$  satisfies the condition*

$$\psi(s)q(x, Fx) \leq q(x, y) \quad \text{implies} \quad \mathcal{H}_q^+(Fx \setminus \{x\}, Fy \setminus \{y\}) \leq sq(x, y) \tag{2.2}$$

for all  $x, y \in X$ . Suppose also that, for all  $x$  in  $X, y$  in  $Fx$ , and  $t > 1$ , there exists  $z$  in  $Fy$  such that

$$q(y, z) \leq t\mathcal{H}_q^+(Fy, Fx). \tag{2.3}$$

Then  $F$  has a fixed point.

*Proof* Let  $s_1 \in (0, 1)$  be such that  $0 \leq s \leq s_1 < 1$  and  $w_0 \in X$ . Since  $Fw_0$  is nonempty, it follows that if  $w_0 \in Fw_0$ , then the proof is completed. Let  $w_0 \notin Fw_0$ . Then there exists  $w_1 \in Fw_0$  such that  $w_1 \neq w_0$ .

Similarly, there exists  $w_2 \in Fw_1$  such that  $w_1 \neq w_2$ , and from (2.3) we have

$$q(w_1, w_2) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{s_1}}\mathcal{H}_q^+(Fw_0, Fw_1). \tag{2.4}$$

Since

$$\psi(s)q(w_1, Fw_1) \leq q(w_1, Fw_1) \leq q(w_1, w_2),$$

from (2.2) and (2.4) we get

$$\begin{aligned} q(w_1, w_2) &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{s_1}}\mathcal{H}_q^+(Fw_0, Fw_1) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{s_1}}\mathcal{H}_q^+(Fw_0 \setminus \{w_0\}, Fw_1 \setminus \{w_1\}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{s_1}}.s.q(w_0, w_1) < \sqrt{s_1}.q(w_0, w_1). \end{aligned}$$

By repeating this process  $n$  times we obtain

$$q(w_n, w_{n+1}) \leq (\sqrt{s_1})^n \cdot q(w_0, w_1). \tag{2.5}$$

Hence

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q(w_n, w_{n+1}) = 0. \tag{2.6}$$

Now we prove that  $\{w_n\}$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $(X, q^s)$ . For all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} q^s(w_n, w_{n+m}) &= q(w_n, w_{n+m}) - \frac{1}{2} [q(w_n, w_n) + q(w_{n+m}, w_{n+m})] \\ &\leq q(w_n, w_{n+m}) \\ &\leq q(w_n, w_{n+1}) + q(w_{n+1}, w_{n+2}) + \dots + q(w_{n+m-1}, w_{n+m}) \\ &\leq [(\sqrt{s_1})^n + (\sqrt{s_1})^{n+1} + \dots + (\sqrt{s_1})^{n+m-1}] q(w_0, w_1) \\ &\leq (\sqrt{s_1})^n \frac{1}{1 - \sqrt{s_1}} q(w_0, w_1). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q^s(w_n, w_{n+m}) = 0. \tag{2.7}$$

This implies that  $\{w_n\}$  is a Cauchy sequence in the complete metric space  $(X, q^s)$ . It follows that there exists  $u \in X$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q(w_n, u) = \lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} q(w_n, w_m) = q(u, u). \tag{2.8}$$

From (WP2) we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} [q(w_n, w_n) + q(w_{n+1}, w_{n+1})] \leq q(w_n, w_{n+1}). \tag{2.9}$$

By taking the limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  from (2.6) we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q(w_n, w_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q(w_{n+1}, w_{n+1}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q(w_n, w_{n+1}) = 0. \tag{2.10}$$

Also, from (2.7) and (2.10) we find

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q^s(w_n, w_{n+m}) = 0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q(w_n, w_{n+m}) - \frac{1}{2} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [q(w_n, w_n) + q(w_{n+m}, w_{n+m})]. \tag{2.11}$$

Therefore

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q(w_n, w_{n+m}) = 0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q(w_n, u) = q(u, u). \tag{2.12}$$

Now, we prove that

$$q(u, Fx) \leq 2sq(u, x) \quad \text{for all } x \in X \setminus \{u\}. \tag{2.13}$$

Since  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q(w_n, u) = 0$ , there exists  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$q(w_n, u) \leq \frac{1}{3}q(x, u) \quad \text{for all } n \geq n_0.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(s)q(w_n, Fw_n) &\leq q(w_n, Fw_n) \\ &\leq q(w_n, w_{n+1}) \\ &\leq q(w_n, u) + q(u, w_{n+1}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{3}q(u, x) + \frac{1}{3}q(u, x) \\ &\leq q(u, x) - \frac{1}{3}q(u, x) \\ &\leq q(u, x) - q(u, w_n) \leq q(x, w_n). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$H_q^+(Fw_n, Fx) \leq sq(w_n, x).$$

Since  $w_{n+1} \in Fw_n$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} q(w_{n+1}, Fx) &\leq \delta_q(Fw_n, Fx) \\ &\leq 2H_q^+(Fw_n, Fx) \\ &\leq 2sq(w_n, x) \\ &\leq 2s[q(w_n, u) + q(u, x)]. \end{aligned}$$

By taking the limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q(w_{n+1}, Fx) \leq 2sq(u, x). \quad (2.14)$$

Also, since

$$q(u, Fx) \leq q(u, w_{n+1}) + q(w_{n+1}, Fx)$$

and

$$q(w_{n+1}, Fx) \leq q(w_{n+1}, w_n) + q(w_n, u) + q(u, Fx),$$

we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q(w_{n+1}, Fx) = q(u, Fx). \quad (2.15)$$

From (2.14) and (2.15) we find that

$$q(u, Fx) \leq 2sq(u, x) \quad \text{for all } x \in X \setminus \{u\}. \quad (2.16)$$

We claim that

$$H_q^+(Fx, Fu) \leq sq(u, u) \quad \text{for all } x \in X.$$

If  $x = u$ , then at that point, this clearly holds. So, let  $x \neq u$ . Then for every positive integer  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $y_n \in Fx$  such that

$$q(u, y_n) \leq q(u, Fx) + \frac{1}{n}q(u, x).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} q(x, Fx) &\leq q(x, y_n) \\ &\leq q(x, u) + q(u, y_n) \\ &\leq q(x, u) + q(u, Fx) + \frac{1}{n}q(x, u). \end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

From (2.16) and (2.17) we get

$$q(x, Fx) \leq q(u, x) + 2sq(u, x) + \frac{1}{n}q(x, u) \tag{2.18}$$

$$= \left[ 1 + 2s + \frac{1}{n} \right] q(x, u). \tag{2.19}$$

Hence

$$\frac{1}{1 + 2s + \frac{1}{n}} q(x, Fx) \leq q(u, x).$$

This implies that

$$H_q^+(Fu, Fx) \leq sq(u, x).$$

Finally, we show that  $u \in Fu$ . For this,

$$\begin{aligned} q(u, Fu) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q(w_{n+1}, Fu) \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_q(Fw_n, Fu) \\ &\leq 2 \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_q^+(Fw_n, Fu) \\ &\leq 2s \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q(w_n, u) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

We deduce that  $q(u, u) = q(u, Fu) = 0$ . Since  $Fu$  is closed,  $u \in \overline{Fu} = Fu$ . □

We provide the following example.

*Example 2.1* Let  $X = \{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$  and define a weak partial metric  $q : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  as follows:  $q(0, 0) = 0$ ,  $q(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) = \frac{1}{3}$ ,  $q(1, 1) = \frac{1}{4}$ ,  $q(0, \frac{1}{2}) = q(\frac{1}{2}, 0) = \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $q(\frac{1}{2}, 1) = q(1, \frac{1}{2}) = \frac{3}{4}$ , and

$q(1, 0) = q(0, 1) = 1$ . It is clear that  $(X, q)$  is a weak partial metric space. Note that

$$q(1, 0) = 1 \not\leq q\left(1, \frac{1}{2}\right) + q\left(\frac{1}{2}, 0\right) - q\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right) = \frac{3}{4} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{3}.$$

Then  $(X, q)$  is not a partial metric space. Define the mapping  $F : X \rightarrow CB^q(X)$  by  $F(0) = F(\frac{1}{2}) = \{0\}$  and  $F(1) = \{0, \frac{1}{3}\}$ . Choose  $s = 0.5$ . From the definition of  $\psi$  we have  $\psi(s) = 1$ .

To prove the contraction condition (2.2), we need the following cases:

Case 1. At  $x = 0$ , we have

$$\psi(s)q(0, F(0)) = q(0, 0) = 0 \leq q(0, y) \quad \text{for all } x \in X.$$

For  $y = 0$ , we have

$$H_q^+(F(0) \setminus \{0\}, F(0) \setminus \{0\}) = H_q^+(\phi, \phi) = 0 \leq sq(0, 0).$$

For  $y = \frac{1}{2}$ , we get

$$H_q^+\left(F(0) \setminus \{0\}, F\left(\frac{1}{2} \setminus \left\{\frac{1}{2}\right\}\right)\right) = H_q^+(\phi, \{0\}) = 0 \leq sq\left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right).$$

If  $y = 1$ , then

$$H_q^+(F(0) \setminus \{0\}, F(1) \setminus \{1\}) = H_q^+\left(\phi, \left\{0, \frac{1}{2}\right\}\right) = 0 \leq sq(0, 1).$$

Case 2. At  $x = \frac{1}{2}$ , we have

$$\psi(s)q\left(\frac{1}{2}, F\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)\right) = q\left(\frac{1}{2}, 0\right) = \frac{1}{2} \leq q\left(\frac{1}{2}, y\right) \quad \text{for all } y \in X \setminus \left\{\frac{1}{2}\right\}.$$

Similarly, if  $y = 0$ , then

$$H_q^+\left(F\left(\frac{1}{2} \setminus \left\{\frac{1}{2}\right\}\right), F(0) \setminus \{0\}\right) = H_q^+(\{0\}, \phi) = 0 \leq sq\left(\frac{1}{2}, 0\right),$$

If  $y = 1$ , then

$$H_q^+\left(F\left(\frac{1}{2} \setminus \left\{\frac{1}{2}\right\}\right), F(1) \setminus \{1\}\right) = H_q^+\left(\{0\}, \left\{0, \frac{1}{2}\right\}\right) = \frac{1}{4} < sq\left(\frac{1}{2}, 1\right) = \frac{3}{8}.$$

Case 3. At  $x = 1$ , we have

$$\psi(s)q(1, F(1)) = q\left(1, \frac{1}{2}\right) = \frac{3}{4} \leq q(1, y) \quad \text{for all } y \in X \setminus \{1\}.$$

Again, if  $y = 0$ , then

$$H_q^+(F(1) \setminus \{1\}, F(0) \setminus \{0\}) = H_q^+\left(\left\{0, \frac{1}{2}\right\}, \phi\right) = 0 \leq sq(1, 0).$$



If  $y = \frac{1}{2}$ , then

$$H_q^+ \left( F(1) \setminus \{1\}, F\left(\frac{1}{2} \setminus \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \right\} \right) \right) = H_q^+ \left( \left\{ 0, \frac{1}{2} \right\}, \{0\} \right) = \frac{1}{4} < sq \left( 1, \frac{1}{2} \right) = \frac{3}{8}.$$

Finally, we will enquire the condition (2.3) with  $t = 2$ . For this, we discuss the following situations:

- (i) If  $x = 0$  or  $x = \frac{1}{2}$ , then  $y \in F(0) = F(\frac{1}{2}) = \{0\}$ . This yields that  $y = 0$ , so there exists  $z \in F(y)$  such that

$$0 = q(y, z) \leq 2H_q^+(F(x), F(y)).$$

- (ii) If  $x = 1$ , then  $y \in F(1) = \{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ . If  $y = 0$ , then  $z = 0$ , and condition (2.3) is satisfied. Also, If  $y = \frac{1}{2}$ , then  $z = 0$ , so that

$$\frac{1}{2} = q(y, z) = 2H_q^+ \left( F(1), F\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \right) = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Therefore all conditions of Theorem 2.1 are satisfied, and the function  $F$  has a fixed point  $u = 0$ .

On the other hand, the result of Beg and Pathak [1] is not applicable. Indeed,

$$H_q^+(F(1) \setminus \{1\}, F(1) \setminus \{1\}) = \frac{1}{3} > \frac{1}{2}q(1, 1) = \frac{1}{8}.$$

### 3 Applications

First, we present an application concerning a homotopy result for complete weak partial metric spaces.

**Theorem 3.1** *Let  $(X, q)$  be a complete weak partial metric space, let  $D$  be an open subset of  $X$ , and let  $W$  be a closed subset of  $X$  with  $D \subset W$ . Let  $F : W \times [0, 1] \rightarrow CB^q(X)$  be an operator satisfying:*

- (i)  $x \notin F(x, t)$  for each  $x \in W \setminus D$  and each  $t \in [0, 1]$ ;
- (ii) there exists  $s \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  such that, for each  $t \in [0, 1]$  and each  $x, y \in W$ , we have

$$\psi(s)q(x, F(x, t)) \leq q(x, y) \Rightarrow H_q^+(F(x, t) \setminus \{x\}, F(y, t) \setminus \{y\}) \leq sq(x, y);$$

- (iii) for all  $x \in W$ ,  $y \in F(x, t)$ , and  $h > 1$ , there exists  $z \in F(y, t)$  such that

$$q(y, z) \leq hH_q^+(F(y, t), F(x, t));$$

- (iv) there exists a continuous function  $\eta : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$H_q^+(F(x, t_1) \setminus \{x\}, F(x, t_2) \setminus \{x\}) \leq s|\eta(t_1) - \eta(t_2)|$$

for all  $t_1, t_2 \in [0, 1]$  and  $x \in W$ ;

- (v) if  $x \in F(x, t)$ , then  $F(x, t) = \{x\}$ . Then  $F(\cdot, 0)$  has a fixed point if and only if  $F(\cdot, 1)$  has a fixed point.

*Proof* Define the set

$$\Delta := \{t \in [0, 1]; x \in F(x, t) \text{ for some } x \in D\}.$$

Since  $F(\cdot, 0)$  has a fixed point, from condition (i), we get  $0 \in \Delta$ , so  $\Delta \neq \emptyset$ . First, we want to show that  $\Delta$  is an open set. Let  $t_1 \in \Delta$  and  $x_1 \in D$  be such that  $x_1 \in F(x_1, t_1)$ . Since  $D$  is open in  $(X, q)$ , there exists  $r > 0$  such that  $B(x_1, r) \subset D$ . Consider  $\epsilon = (\frac{1-2s}{2})(q(x_1, x_1) + r) > 0$ . Since  $\eta$  is continuous at  $t_1$ , there exists  $\delta(\epsilon) > 0$  such that  $|\eta(t) - \eta(t_1)| < \epsilon$  for all  $t \in (t_1 - \delta(\epsilon), t_1 + \delta(\epsilon))$ .

Let  $t \in (t_1 - \delta(\epsilon), t_1 + \delta(\epsilon))$  and  $x \in B(x_1, r) = \{x \in X; q(x_1, x) \leq q(x_1, x_1) + r\}$ . Since  $x_1 \in F(x_1, t_1)$ , from (WP2) we have

$$\psi(s)q(x_1, F(x_1, t_1)) \leq q(x_1, x_1) \leq q(x_1, x) \quad \text{for all } x \in X.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} q(x_1, F(x, t)) &\leq 2H_q^+(F(x, t), F(x_1, t_1)) \\ &\leq 2[H_q^+(F(x, t), F(x, t_1)) + H_q^+(F(x, t_1), F(x_1, t_1))] \\ &= 2[H_q^+(F(x, t) \setminus \{x\}, F(x, t_1) \setminus \{x\}) + H_q^+(F(x, t_1) \setminus \{x\}, F(x_1, t_1) \setminus \{x_1\})] \\ &\leq 2[|\eta(t) - \eta(t_1)| + sq(x, x_1)] \\ &\leq 2[\epsilon + s(q(x_1, x_1) + r)] \\ &\leq 2\left[\left(\frac{1-2s}{2}\right)(q(x_1, x_1) + r) + s(q(x_1, x_1) + r)\right] \\ &\leq q(x_1, x_1) + r. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $F(x, t) \subset B(x_1, r)$ . Since  $F(\cdot, t) : B(x_1, r) \rightarrow CB^q(X)$  for each fixed  $t \in (t_1 - \delta(\epsilon), t_1 + \delta(\epsilon))$  and (ii) holds, all the hypotheses of Theorem 2.1 are satisfied. We conclude that  $F(\cdot, t)$  has a fixed point in  $B(x_1, r) \subset W$ . This fixed point must be in  $D$  due to (i). Hence  $(t_1 - \delta(\epsilon), t_1 + \delta(\epsilon)) \subset \Delta$ , and therefore  $\Delta$  is open in  $[0, 1]$ .

Second, we prove that  $\Delta$  is closed in  $[0, 1]$ . To show this, choose a sequence  $\{t_n\}$  in  $\Delta$  such that  $t_n \rightarrow t^* \in [0, 1]$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . We must show that  $t^* \in \Delta$ . By the definition of  $\Delta$  there exists  $x_n \in D$  with  $x_n \in F(x_n, t_n)$ . Then

$$\psi(s)q(x_n, F(x_n, t_n)) \leq q(x_n, x_n) \leq q(x_n, x) \quad \text{for all } x \in X.$$

This implies that, for all positive integers  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ , using (v) and (Wh3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} q(x_n, x_m) &\leq 2H_q^+(F(x_n, t_n), F(x_m, t_m)) \\ &\leq 2H_q^+(F(x_n, t_n), F(x_n, t_m)) + 2H_q^+(F(x_n, t_m), F(x_m, t_m)) \\ &= 2H_q^+(F(x_n, t_n) \setminus \{x_n\}, F(x_n, t_m) \setminus \{x_n\}) \\ &\quad + 2H_q^+(F(x_n, t_m) \setminus \{x_n\}, F(x_m, t_m) \setminus \{x_m\}) \\ &\leq 2s|\eta(t_n) - \eta(t_m)| + 2sq(x_n, x_m). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$q(x_n, x_m) \leq \frac{2s}{1 - 2s} (|\eta(t_n) - \eta(t_m)|).$$

Hence  $\lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} q(x_n, x_m) = 0$ . Therefore  $\{x_n\}$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $(X, q)$ . Since  $(X, q)$  is complete, there exists  $x^* \in W$  such that

$$q(x^*, x^*) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q(x^*, x_n) = \lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} q(x_n, x_m) = 0.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} q(x_n, F(x^*, t^*)) &\leq 2H_q^+(F(x_n, t_n), F(x^*, t^*)) \\ &\leq 2H_q^+(F(x_n, t_n), F(x_n, t^*)) + 2H_q^+(F(x_n, t^*), F(x^*, t^*)) \\ &= 2H_q^+(F(x_n, t_n) \setminus \{x_n\}, F(x_n, t^*) \setminus \{x_n\}) \\ &\quad + 2H_q^+(F(x_n, t^*) \setminus \{x_n\}, F(x^*, t^*) \setminus \{x^*\}) \\ &\leq 2s|\eta(t_n) - \eta(t^*)| + 2sq(x_n, x^*). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in the above inequality, we get

$$q(x^*, F(x^*, t^*)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q(x_n, F(x^*, t^*)) = 0.$$

It follows that  $x^* \in F(x^*, t^*)$ . Thus  $t^* \in \Delta$ , and hence  $\Delta$  is closed in  $[0, 1]$ . By the connectedness of  $[0, 1]$  we have  $\Delta = [0, 1]$ .

The reverse implication easily follows by applying the same strategy. This completes the proof. □

Now, we give another application to the solvability of integral inclusions of Fredholm type. Let  $I = [0, 1]$ , and let  $C(I, \mathbb{R})$  be the space of all continuous functions  $f : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Consider the weak partial metric on  $X$  given by

$$q(x, y) = \sup_{t \in I} |x(t) - y(t)| + \alpha$$

for all  $x, y \in C(I, \mathbb{R})$  and  $\alpha > 0$ . We have  $q^s(x, y) = \sup_{t \in I} |x(t) - y(t)|$ , so by Lemma 1.1  $(C(I, \mathbb{R}), q)$  is a complete weak partial metric space. Denote by  $P_{cv}(\mathbb{R})$  the family of all nonempty compact and convex subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$  and by  $P_{cl}(\mathbb{R})$  the family of all nonempty closed subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$ .

**Theorem 3.2** *Consider the integral inclusion of Fredholm type*

$$h(t) \in f(t) + \int_0^1 K(t, u, h(u)) du, \quad t \in [0, 1]. \tag{3.1}$$

Suppose that:

- (i)  $K : I \times I \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow P_{cv}(\mathbb{R})$  is such that  $K_h(t, u) := K(t, u, h(u))$  is a lower semicontinuous for all  $(t, u) \in I \times I$  and  $h \in C(I, \mathbb{R})$ ,

- (ii)  $f \in C(I, \mathbb{R})$ ;
- (iii) for each  $t \in I$ , there exists  $l(t, \cdot) \in L^1(I)$  such that  $\sup_{t \in I} \int_0^1 l(t, u) \, du = \frac{s}{2}$  with  $s \in [0, 1)$  and

$$H_q^+(K(t, u, h(u)), K(t, u, r(u))) \leq l(t, u) \left( \sup_{u \in I} |h(u) - r(u)| + \alpha \right)$$

for all  $t, u \in I$  and all  $h, r \in C(I, \mathbb{R})$ .

Then the integral inclusion (3.1) has at least one solution in  $C(I, \mathbb{R})$ .

*Proof* Consider the multivalued operator  $T : C(I, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow P_{CL}(C(I, \mathbb{R}))$  defined by

$$Tx(t) = \left\{ h \in C(I, \mathbb{R}) \text{ such that } h(t) \in f(t) + \int_0^1 K(t, u, x(u)) \, du, t \in I \right\}$$

for  $x \in C(I, \mathbb{R})$ . For each  $K_x(t, u) : I \times I \rightarrow P_{cv}(\mathbb{R})$ , by the Michael selection theorem there exists a continuous operator  $k_x : I \times I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $k_x(t, u) \in K_x(t, u)$  for all  $t, u \in I$ . This implies that  $f(t) + \int_0^1 k_x(t, u) \, du \in Tx$ , and so  $Tx \neq \emptyset$ . It is easy to prove that  $Tx$  is closed, and so we omit the details (see also [18]). This implies that  $Tx$  is closed in  $(C(I, \mathbb{R}), q)$ .

Now, we will show that  $T$  is  $H_q^+$ -type Suzuki multivalued contraction mapping. Let  $x_1, x_2 \in C(I, \mathbb{R})$  and  $h \in Tx$ . Then there exists  $k_{x_1}(t, u) \in K_{x_1}(t, u)$  with  $t, u \in I$  such that  $h(t) = f(t) + \int_0^1 k_x(t, u) \, du, t \in I$ . Also, by hypothesis (iii),

$$H_q^+(K(t, u, x_1(u)), K(t, u, x_2(u))) \leq l(t, u) \left( \sup_{u \in I} |x_1(u) - x_2(u)| + \alpha \right) \quad \forall t, u \in I.$$

Then there exists  $z(t, u) \in K_{x_2}(t, u)$  such that

$$|k_{x_1}(t, u) - z(t, u)| + n \leq l(t, u) [|x_1(u) - x_2(u)| + \alpha]$$

for all  $t, u \in I$ . Now, we define the multivalued operator  $M(t, u)$  by

$$M(t, u) = K_{x_2}(t, u) \cap \{ m \in \mathbb{R}, |k_{x_1}(t, u) - m| + \alpha \leq l(t, u) (|x_1(u) - x_2(u)| + \alpha) \}$$

for  $t, u \in I$ . Since  $M$  is a lower semicontinuous operator, there exists a continuous operator  $k_{x_2} : I \times I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $k_{x_2}(t, u) \in M(t, u)$  for all  $t, u \in I$  and

$$w(t) = f(t) + \int_0^1 k_{x_2}(t, u) \, du \in f(t) + \int_0^1 K(t, u, x_2(u)) \, du.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} q(h(t), Tx_2(t)) &\leq q(h(t), w(t)) \\ &= \sup_{t \in I} |h(t) - w(t)| + \alpha \\ &= \sup_{t \in I} \left| \int_0^1 [k_{x_1}(t, u) - k_{x_2}(t, u)] \, du \right| + \alpha \\ &\leq \sup_{t \in I} \int_0^1 (|k_{x_1}(t, u) - k_{x_2}(t, u)| + \alpha - \alpha) \, du + \alpha \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \sup_{t \in I} \int_0^1 l(t, u)[|x_1(u) - x_2(u)| + \alpha] du - \int_0^1 \alpha du + \alpha \\ &= \left( \sup_{t \in I} |x_1(u) - x_2(u)| + \alpha \right) \int_0^1 l(t, u) du \\ &\leq sq(x_1(t), x_2(t)). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $h(t) \in Tx_1$  is arbitrary, we have

$$\delta_q(Tx_1, Tx_2) \leq sq(x_1, x_2). \tag{3.2}$$

Similarly, we can get

$$\delta_q(Tx_2, Tx_1) \leq sq(x_1, x_2). \tag{3.3}$$

From (3.2) and (3.3) we have

$$H_q^+(Tx_1, Tx_2) = \frac{\delta_q(Tx_1, Tx_2) + \delta_q(Tx_2, Tx_1)}{2} \leq sq(x_1, x_2).$$

In particular, the previous inequality holds for any  $t \in I$ , so that

$$\psi(s)q(x_1, Tx_1) \leq q(x_1, x_2).$$

Thus all conditions of Theorem 2.1 are satisfied, and hence a solution of (3.1) exists.  $\square$

### 4 Perspectives

In 2010, Romaguera [19] introduced the notions of 0-Cauchy sequences and 0-complete partial metric spaces and proved some characterizations of partial metric spaces in terms of completeness and 0-completeness. Adapting the same concepts, we introduce the concepts of 0-Cauchy sequences and 0-complete weak partial metric spaces.

**Definition 4.1** Let  $(X, q)$  be a weak partial metric space.

- (i) A sequence  $\{x_n\}$  in  $X$  is said to be 0-Cauchy if  $\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} q(x_n, x_m) = 0$ ;
- (iii)  $(X, q)$  is called 0-complete if every 0-Cauchy sequence  $\{x_n\}$  in  $X$  converges to  $x \in X$  such that  $q(x, x) = 0$ .

Open problems: Since 0-completeness is more general than completeness, we would like to prove

- (i) Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 2.1, and
- (ii) a Hardy–Rogers-type result

in the class of 0-complete weak partial metric spaces.

**Funding**

The first author is funded by China Medical University.

**Availability of data and materials**

No data were used to support this study.

**Competing interests**

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

**Authors' contributions**

All authors read and approved the manuscript.

**Author details**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Mathematics, College of Education in Jubail, Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University, Jubail, Saudi Arabia. <sup>2</sup>Department of Medical Research, China Medical University Hospital, China Medical University, Taichung, Taiwan. <sup>3</sup>Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Sciences, Al-Azhar University, Assiut, Egypt. <sup>4</sup>Nonlinear Analysis Research Group, Ton Duc Thang University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. <sup>5</sup>Faculty of Mathematics and Statistics, Ton Duc Thang University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. <sup>6</sup>Vienna University of Technology, Institute of Computer Languages, Vienna, Austria.

**Publisher's Note**

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

Received: 5 September 2018 Accepted: 28 September 2018 Published online: 05 October 2018

**References**

- Beg, I., Pathak, H.K.: A variant of Nadler's theorem on weak partial metric spaces with application to a homotopy result. *Vietnam J. Math.* **46**(3), 693–706 (2018)
- Matthews, S.G.: Partial metric topology. *Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci.* **728**(1), 183–197 (1994). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1994.tb44144.x>
- Abdeljawad, T., Aydi, H., Karapinar, E.: Coupled fixed points for Meir–Keeler contractions in ordered partial metric spaces. *Math. Probl. Eng.* **2012**, Article ID 327273 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1155/2012/327273>
- Altun, I., Sola, F., Simsek, H.: Generalized contractions on partial metric spaces. *Topol. Appl.* **157**(18), 2778–2785 (2010)
- Aydi, H., Barakat, A.F.H.I.M.: On  $\phi$ -contraction type couplings in partial metric spaces. *J. Math. Anal.* **8**(4), 78–89 (2017)
- Aydi, H., Amor, S.H., Karapinar, E.: Berinde-type generalized contractions on partial metric spaces. *Abstr. Appl. Anal.* **2013**, Article ID 312479 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1155/2013/312479>
- Ćirić, L., Samet, B., Aydi, H., Vetro, C.: Common fixed points of generalized contractions on partial metric spaces and an application. *Appl. Math. Comput.* **218**(6), 2398–2406 (2011)
- Ćojbašić, R.V., Radenović, S., Chauhan, S.: Common fixed point of generalized weakly contractive maps in partial metric spaces. *Acta Math. Sci. Ser. B Engl. Ed.* **34**(4), 1345–1356 (2014)
- Di Bari, C., Milojević, M., Radenović, S., Vetro, P.: Common fixed points for self-mappings on partial metric spaces. *Fixed Point Theory Appl.* **2012**, Article ID 140 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1687-1812-2012-140>
- Haghi, R.H., Rezapour, S., Shahzad, N.: Be careful on partial metric fixed point results. *Topol. Appl.* **160**(3), 450–454 (2013)
- Kadelburg, Z., Radenović, S.: Fixed points under  $\psi$ - $\alpha$ - $\beta$  conditions in ordered partial metric spaces. *Int. J. Anal. Appl.* **5**(1), 91–101 (2014)
- Kadelburg, Z., Nashine, H.K., Radenović, S.: Coupled fixed points in 0-complete ordered partial metric spaces. *J. Adv. Math. Stud.* **6**(1), 159–172 (2013)
- Lakzian, H., Aydi, H., Rhoades, B.E.: Fixed points for  $(\varphi, \psi, p)$ -weakly contractive mappings in metric spaces with image-distance. *Appl. Math. Comput.* **219**(12), 6777–6782 (2013)
- Radenović, S.: Remarks on some coupled fixed point results in partial metric spaces. *Nonlinear Funct. Anal. Appl.* **18**(1), 39–50 (2013)
- Shukla, S., Radenović, S.: Some common fixed point theorems for  $F$ -contraction type mappings in 0-complete partial metric spaces. *J. Math.* **2013**, Article ID 878730 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1155/2013/878730>
- Shukla, S., Radenović, S., Vetro, C.: Set-valued Hardy–Rogers type contraction in 0-complete partial metric spaces. *Int. J. Math. Math. Sci.* **2014**, Article ID 652925 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/652925>
- Vetro, F., Radenović, S.: Nonlinear  $\psi$ -quasi-contractions of Ćirić-type in partial metric spaces. *Appl. Math. Comput.* **219**(4), 1594–1600 (2012)
- Sîntămărian, A.: Integral inclusions of Fredholm type relative to multivalued  $\varphi$ -contractions. *Semin. Fixed Point Theory Cluj-Napoca* **3**, 361–368 (2002)
- Romaguera, S.: A Kirk type characterization of completeness for partial metric spaces. *Fixed Point Theory Appl.* **2010**, Article ID 493298 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1155/2010/493298>
- Aydi, H., Abbas, M., Vetro, C.: Partial Hausdorff metric and Nadler's fixed point theorem on partial metric spaces. *Topol. Appl.* **159**, 3234–3242 (2012)
- Aydi, H., Abbas, M., Vetro, C.: Common fixed points for multivalued generalized contractions on partial metric spaces. *Rev. R. Acad. Cienc. Exactas Fis. Nat., Ser. A Mat.* **108**(2), 483–501 (2014)