

# A Characterization Of 0-Completeness In Dislocated $b$ -Metric Spaces And Its Application In Fixed Point Theory\*

Sushanta Kumar Mohanta<sup>†</sup>, Pinak Roy<sup>‡</sup>

Received 27 May 2024

## Abstract

The main aim of this paper is to introduce the concept of  $\sigma_b$ -point in a dislocated  $b$ -metric space and extend Weston's characterization of metric completeness to dislocated  $b$ -metric spaces in terms of  $\sigma_b$ -point. We use this new characterization to obtain some fixed point results including the celebrated Banach Contraction Principle in the framework of 0-complete dislocated metric spaces.

## 1 Introduction

In 1977, J. D. Weston [17] had characterized metric completeness in terms of the notion of  $d$ -point for lower semicontinuous functions. After that, several authors successfully characterized metric completeness in terms of fixed point theory (see [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16]). In recent investigations, there exist a lot of generalizations of the concept of metric spaces such as  $b$ -metric space, introduced by Bakhtin [2], partial metric space by Matthews [7], and dislocated metric space by Hitzler et al. [5]. Combining the notions of  $b$ -metric and dislocated metric, Alghamdi et al. [1] introduced another generalization which is called a dislocated  $b$ -metric. They established some fixed point results in dislocated  $b$ -metric spaces. In this study, our main purpose is to introduce the concept of  $\sigma_b$ -point in dislocated  $b$ -metric spaces and extend Weston's characterization [17] in such spaces in terms of  $\sigma_b$ -point. Finally, we apply this new characterization to obtain some important fixed point results in 0-complete dislocated metric spaces.

## 2 Some Basic Concepts

This section begins with some definitions, basic facts and properties which will be needed in the sequel.

**Definition 1** ([2, 4]) *Let  $X$  be a nonempty set and  $s \geq 1$  be a given real number. A function  $d : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is said to be a  $b$ -metric on  $X$  if the following conditions hold:*

- (i)  $d(x, y) = 0$  if and only if  $x = y$ ;
- (ii)  $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$  for all  $x, y \in X$ ;
- (iii)  $d(x, y) \leq s(d(x, z) + d(z, y))$  for all  $x, y, z \in X$ .

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

It is worth noting that the class of  $b$ -metric spaces is effectively larger than that of the ordinary metric spaces.

---

\*Mathematics Subject Classifications: 54H25, 47H10.

<sup>†</sup>Department of Mathematics, West Bengal State University, Barasat, 24 Parganas (North), Kolkata-700126, West Bengal, India

<sup>‡</sup>Department of Mathematics, West Bengal State University, Barasat, 24 Parganas (North), Kolkata-700126, West Bengal, India

**Definition 2** ([14]) *A partial  $b$ -metric on a nonempty set  $X$  is a function  $p_b : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  such that for some real number  $s \geq 1$  and all  $x, y, z \in X$ :*

$$(p_{b1}) \quad p_b(x, x) = p_b(y, y) = p_b(x, y) \iff x = y;$$

$$(p_{b2}) \quad p_b(x, x) \leq p_b(x, y);$$

$$(p_{b3}) \quad p_b(x, y) = p_b(y, x);$$

$$(p_{b4}) \quad p_b(x, y) \leq s[p_b(x, z) + p_b(z, y)] - p_b(z, z).$$

The pair  $(X, p_b)$  is called a *partial  $b$ -metric space*.

Taking  $s = 1$  in the above definition, we get the definition of a partial metric space [7]. It is obvious that if  $p_b(x, y) = 0$ , then from  $(p_{b1})$  and  $(p_{b2})$ , it follows that  $x = y$ . However,  $x = y$  does not imply  $p_b(x, y) = 0$ .

**Definition 3** ([5]) *Let  $X$  be a nonempty set. A function  $\sigma : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is said to be a dislocated metric (or a metric-like) on  $X$  if for any  $x, y, z \in X$ , the following conditions hold:*

$$(\sigma_1) \quad \sigma(x, y) = 0 \implies x = y;$$

$$(\sigma_2) \quad \sigma(x, y) = \sigma(y, x);$$

$$(\sigma_3) \quad \sigma(x, y) \leq \sigma(x, z) + \sigma(z, y).$$

The pair  $(X, \sigma)$  is then called a *dislocated metric (or metric-like) space*.

It is valuable to note that a partial metric is also a dislocated metric but the converse is not true, in general. The following example supports the above remark.

**Example 1** ([13]) *Let  $X = [0, 1]$ . Then the mapping  $\sigma : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  defined by  $\sigma(x, y) = x + y - xy$  is a dislocated metric on  $X$ . But  $\sigma$  is not a partial metric on  $X$  since  $p(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) = \frac{3}{4} \not\leq p(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4}) = \frac{5}{8}$ .*

**Definition 4** ([1]) *Let  $X$  be a nonempty set and  $s \geq 1$  be a given real number. A function  $\sigma_b : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is said to be a dislocated  $b$ -metric (or a  $b$ -metric-like) on  $X$  if the following conditions hold:*

$$(i) \quad \sigma_b(x, y) = 0 \implies x = y;$$

$$(ii) \quad \sigma_b(x, y) = \sigma_b(y, x) \text{ for all } x, y \in X;$$

$$(iii) \quad \sigma_b(x, y) \leq s(\sigma_b(x, z) + \sigma_b(z, y)) \text{ for all } x, y, z \in X.$$

The pair  $(X, \sigma_b)$  is then called a *dislocated  $b$ -metric (or a  $b$ -metric-like) space*.

It is clear that every partial  $b$ -metric space is a dislocated  $b$ -metric space with the same coefficient  $s$  and every  $b$ -metric space is also a dislocated  $b$ -metric space with the same coefficient  $s$ . However, the reverse implications need not hold true, in general.

**Example 2** ([6]) *Let  $X = [0, \infty)$ ,  $p > 1$  a constant, and  $\sigma_b : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be defined by*

$$\sigma_b(x, y) = (x + y)^p, \quad \forall x, y \in X.$$

Then  $(X, \sigma_b)$  is a dislocated  $b$ -metric space with coefficient  $s = 2^{p-1}$ , but it is neither a partial  $b$ -metric space nor a  $b$ -metric space. Indeed, for any  $0 < y < x$ , we have

$$0 \neq \sigma_b(x, x) = (x + x)^p > (x + y)^p = \sigma_b(x, y).$$

**Example 3 ([6])** Let  $(X, \sigma)$  be a dislocated metric space and  $\sigma_b(x, y) = (\sigma(x, y))^p$ , where  $p > 1$  is a real number. Then  $\sigma_b$  is a dislocated  $b$ -metric with coefficient  $s = 2^{p-1}$ .

**Definition 5 ([1])** Let  $(X, \sigma_b)$  be a dislocated  $b$ -metric space with coefficient  $s$ , and let  $(x_n)$  be a sequence in  $X$  and  $x \in X$ . Then

- (i)  $(x_n)$  converges to  $x$  if and only if  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_b(x_n, x) = \sigma_b(x, x)$ . We denote this by  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$  or  $x_n \rightarrow x (n \rightarrow \infty)$ .
- (ii)  $(x_n)$  is Cauchy if  $\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_b(x_n, x_m)$  exists and is finite.
- (iii)  $(X, \sigma_b)$  is said to be a complete dislocated  $b$ -metric space if for every Cauchy sequence  $(x_n)$  in  $X$ , there exists  $x \in X$  such that

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

**Definition 6** A sequence  $(x_n)$  in a dislocated  $b$ -metric space  $(X, \sigma_b)$  is called 0-Cauchy if

$$\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_b(x_n, x_m) = 0.$$

The space  $(X, \sigma_b)$  is said to be a 0-complete dislocated  $b$ -metric space if every 0-Cauchy sequence in  $X$  converges to a point  $x \in X$  such that  $\sigma_b(x, x) = 0$ , i.e.,

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

**Remark 1** The definition of a 0-complete dislocated metric space  $(X, \sigma)$  can be obtained from the above definition by taking  $s = 1$ .

**Remark 2** If  $(X, \sigma_b)$  is complete, then it is 0-complete.

The converse assertion of the above remark may not hold good, in general. The following example supports the above remark.

**Example 4** The space  $X = [0, \infty) \cap \mathbb{Q}$  with  $\sigma_b(x, y) = \max\{x, y\}$  is a 0-complete dislocated  $b$ -metric space with coefficient  $s = 1$ , but it is not complete. Moreover, the sequence  $(x_n)$  with  $x_n = 1$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $(X, \sigma_b)$ , but it is not a 0-Cauchy sequence.

### 3 A Characterization of 0-Completeness

**Definition 7** Let  $(X, \sigma_b)$  be a dislocated  $b$ -metric space. A function  $\varphi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called lower semicontinuous if, for each sequence  $(x_n) \subseteq X$  converges to a point  $x \in X$  with  $\sigma_b(x, x) = 0$ , we have

$$\varphi(x) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x_n).$$

**Definition 8** Let  $(X, \sigma_b)$  be a dislocated  $b$ -metric space with coefficient  $s \geq 1$  and  $h : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function. A point  $x_0 \in X$  is called a  $\sigma_b$ -point for  $h$  if for every point  $x \in X$  other than  $x_0$ ,

$$h(x_0) - h(x) < \frac{1}{s} \sigma_b(x_0, x).$$

Taking  $s = 1$  in the above definition, we get  $\sigma$ -point in dislocated metric space  $(X, \sigma)$ . In case of metric spaces  $(X, d)$ , the above  $\sigma_b$ -point reduces to  $d$ -point.

**Example 5** Let  $X = [0, \infty)$  and let  $\sigma_b(x, y) = (x + y)^2, \forall x, y \in X$ . Then  $(X, \sigma_b)$  is a dislocated b-metric space with coefficient  $s = 2$ . Let  $h : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be defined by  $h(x) = x^2$  for all  $x \in X$ . Then,  $h(0) - h(x) = -x^2 < \frac{1}{2}\sigma_b(0, x)$  for every  $x \in X$  with  $x \neq 0$ . Therefore, 0 is a  $\sigma_b$ -point for  $h$ . We now consider another mapping  $g : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by  $g(x) = \frac{x^2}{5}$  for all  $x \in X$ . Then it is easy to verify that every point of  $X$  is a  $\sigma_b$ -point for  $g$ .

**Theorem 1** If the dislocated b-metric space  $(X, \sigma_b)$  with coefficient  $s \geq 1$  is 0-complete then any lower semicontinuous function  $h : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which is bounded below has a  $\sigma_b$ -point.

**Proof.** For any point  $x_1 \in X$ , we can construct a sequence  $(x_n)$  in the following way:

For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let

$$c_n = \inf\{h(x) : h(x_n) - h(x) \geq \frac{1}{s^2}\sigma_b(x_n, x), x_n \neq x\}$$

and let  $x_{n+1}$  be a point such that

$$h(x_n) - h(x_{n+1}) \geq s^{n+1}\sigma_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) \quad (1)$$

and

$$h(x_{n+1}) < c_n + n^{-1}. \quad (2)$$

We now clarify that if the set  $\{h(x) : h(x_n) - h(x) \geq \frac{1}{s^2}\sigma_b(x_n, x), x_n \neq x\}$  is empty, then for every  $x \in X$  other than  $x_n$ ,

$$h(x_n) - h(x) < \frac{1}{s^2}\sigma_b(x_n, x) \leq \frac{1}{s}\sigma_b(x_n, x).$$

So, in this case  $x_n$  becomes a  $\sigma_b$ -point for  $h$  and the theorem is proved. Therefore, we assume that the set

$$\{h(x) : h(x_n) - h(x) \geq \frac{1}{s^2}\sigma_b(x_n, x), x_n \neq x\}$$

is nonempty.

In other words, in above construction, we have considered none of  $x_n$  as a  $\sigma_b$ -point for  $h$ . Because, if  $x_n$  is a  $\sigma_b$ -point for  $h$ , then we have nothing to prove. It follows from condition (1) that the sequence  $(h(x_n))$  is nonincreasing in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Also, it is bounded below by assumed hypothesis. So, the sequence  $(h(x_n))$  is convergent and hence it is Cauchy.

For  $m \geq n$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} h(x_n) - h(x_m) &= h(x_n) - h(x_{n+1}) + h(x_{n+1}) - h(x_{n+2}) \\ &\quad + \cdots + h(x_{m-2}) - h(x_{m-1}) + h(x_{m-1}) - h(x_m) \\ &\geq s^n[s\sigma_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) + s^2\sigma_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) \\ &\quad + \cdots + s^{m-n-1}\sigma_b(x_{m-2}, x_{m-1}) + s^{m-n}\sigma_b(x_{m-1}, x_m)] \\ &\geq s\sigma_b(x_n, x_{n+1}) + s^2\sigma_b(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) \\ &\quad + \cdots + s^{m-n-1}\sigma_b(x_{m-2}, x_{m-1}) + s^{m-n-1}\sigma_b(x_{m-1}, x_m) \\ &\geq \sigma_b(x_n, x_m). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Hence,

$$\sigma_b(x_n, x_m) \leq h(x_n) - h(x_m) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } m, n \rightarrow \infty.$$

This proves that the sequence  $(x_n)$  is 0-Cauchy in  $(X, \sigma_b)$ . By 0-completeness of  $(X, \sigma_b)$ , it follows that the sequence  $(x_n)$  converges to a point  $x_0 \in X$  such that  $\sigma_b(x_0, x_0) = 0$ . Thus,  $\sigma_b(x_n, x_0) \rightarrow \sigma_b(x_0, x_0) = 0$ . We now compute that for each  $y \in X$ ,

$$\sigma_b(x_0, y) \leq s[\sigma_b(x_0, x_n) + \sigma_b(x_n, y)].$$

This implies that

$$\sigma_b(x_0, y) \leq s \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} [\sigma_b(x_0, x_n) + \sigma_b(x_n, y)] = s \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_b(x_n, y).$$

Therefore, for each  $y \in X$ , we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_b(x_n, y) \geq \frac{1}{s} \sigma_b(x_0, y). \tag{4}$$

From condition (3), it follows that

$$h(x_m) \leq h(x_n) - \sigma_b(x_n, x_m) \tag{5}$$

for all  $m \geq n$ . By using conditions (4), (5) and lower semicontinuity of the function  $h$ , one can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} h(x_0) &\leq \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} h(x_m) \\ &\leq \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} [h(x_n) - \sigma_b(x_n, x_m)] \\ &= h(x_n) - \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_b(x_n, x_m) \\ &\leq h(x_n) - \frac{1}{s} \sigma_b(x_n, x_0) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $n \geq 1$ . Thus,

$$h(x_n) - h(x_0) \geq \frac{1}{s} \sigma_b(x_n, x_0) \text{ for all } n \geq 1. \tag{6}$$

If  $x_0$  is not a  $\sigma_b$ -point for  $h$ , then for some  $x (\neq x_0) \in X$ , we have

$$h(x_0) - h(x) \geq \frac{1}{s} \sigma_b(x_0, x) > 0. \tag{7}$$

Using conditions (6) and (2), we obtain

$$h(x) \leq h(x_{n+1}) + h(x) - h(x_0) < c_n + n^{-1} + h(x) - h(x_0). \tag{8}$$

In view of condition (7), we can choose  $n$  in such a way that condition (8) ensures that  $h(x) < c_n$ .

From conditions (6) and (7), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} h(x_n) - h(x) &= h(x_n) - h(x_0) + h(x_0) - h(x) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{s} [\sigma_b(x_n, x_0) + \sigma_b(x_0, x)] \\ &> 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $h(x_n) > h(x)$ . So,  $x_n \neq x$ . Moreover,

$$h(x_n) - h(x) \geq \frac{1}{s} [\sigma_b(x_n, x_0) + \sigma_b(x_0, x)] \geq \frac{1}{s^2} \sigma_b(x_n, x), \quad x_n \neq x.$$

It now follows from the definition of  $c_n$  that  $h(x) \geq c_n$ , which contradicts the fact that  $h(x) < c_n$ . Thus,  $x_0$  is a  $\sigma_b$ -point for  $h$ . ■

The following theorem is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.

**Theorem 2** *If the dislocated metric space  $(X, \sigma)$  is 0-complete then any lower semicontinuous function  $h : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which is bounded below has a  $\sigma$ -point.*

**Proof.** The proof can be obtained from Theorem 1 by taking  $s = 1$ . ■

The following is the result of Weston [17].

**Theorem 3** *If the metric space  $(X, d)$  is complete then any lower semicontinuous function  $X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which is bounded below has a  $d$ -point.*

**Proof.** The result follows from Theorem 1 by taking  $\sigma_b = d$ . ■

**Remark 3** *It is worthy to mention that the main result is obtained under the weaker assumption that the given dislocated b-metric space is 0-complete. Moreover, the result remains valid in complete b-metric spaces and 0-complete partial b-metric spaces.*

## 4 An Application in Fixed Point Theory

In this section, we give an application of our main Theorem 1 in fixed point theory. We assume that  $(X, \sigma)$  is a dislocated metric space and  $h : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a function.

**Remark 4** *When  $\sigma$  and  $h$  are given, a relation “ $\ll$ ” can be defined on  $X$  as follows:*

$$x \ll y \text{ if and only if } h(y) - h(x) \geq \sigma(x, y).$$

*This relation orders  $X$ . In fact, “ $\ll$ ” is transitive, antisymmetric, but it is not reflexive.*

**Definition 9** *A point  $x_0$  in  $(X, \sigma)$  is said to be a minimal point w.r.t.  $\ll$  if and only if  $x \ll x_0$  implies  $x = x_0$ .*

**Theorem 4** *A point of  $X$  is a  $\sigma$ -point for  $h$  if and only if it is a minimal point w.r.t.  $\ll$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $x_0 \in X$  be a  $\sigma$ -point for  $h$ . Then,

$$h(x_0) - h(x) < \sigma(x, x_0), \quad \forall x \in X \text{ and } x \neq x_0. \quad (9)$$

Now  $x \ll x_0$  implies that  $h(x_0) - h(x) \geq \sigma(x, x_0)$ . This gives that  $x = x_0$ . Because if  $x \neq x_0$ , then by condition (9) it follows that  $h(x_0) - h(x) < \sigma(x, x_0)$ , a contradiction. Therefore,  $x_0$  is a minimal point w.r.t.  $\ll$ .

Conversely, let  $x_0$  be a minimal point w.r.t.  $\ll$ . Then  $x \ll x_0$  implies that  $x = x_0$ . That is,  $x \ll x_0$  does not hold for all  $x \in X$  with  $x \neq x_0$ . Therefore,  $h(x_0) - h(x) < \sigma(x, x_0)$  for all  $x \in X$  with  $x \neq x_0$ . This gives that  $x_0$  is a  $\sigma$ -point for  $h$ . ■

**Theorem 5** *If a function  $f : X \rightarrow X$  is such that it may be possible to choose  $\sigma$  and  $h$  so that the relation  $\ll$  has the property that  $fx \neq x$  implies  $fx \ll x$ , then any  $\sigma$ -point for  $h$  is a fixed point for  $f$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $x_0 \in X$  be a  $\sigma$ -point for  $h$ . Then,

$$h(x_0) - h(x) < \sigma(x, x_0), \quad \forall x \in X \text{ and } x \neq x_0. \quad (10)$$

If  $fx_0 \neq x_0$ , then by hypothesis  $fx_0 \ll x_0$  which implies that

$$h(x_0) - h(fx_0) \geq \sigma(fx_0, x_0),$$

which contradicts the condition (10). So, it must be the case that  $fx_0 = x_0$ . This shows that  $x_0$  is a fixed point of  $f$ . ■

We now apply Theorems 2 and 5 to prove Banach Contraction Principle in 0-complete dislocated metric spaces.

**Theorem 6** *Let  $(X, \sigma)$  be a 0-complete dislocated metric space and let  $f : X \rightarrow X$  be a mapping satisfying the following condition:*

$$\sigma(fx, fy) \leq \alpha \sigma(x, y) \quad (11)$$

*for all  $x, y \in X$ , where  $0 \leq \alpha < 1$  is a constant. Then  $f$  has a unique fixed point  $u$  (say) in  $X$  with  $\sigma(u, u) = 0$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $h(x) = \beta \sigma(fx, x)$ , where  $\beta = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} > 0$  and  $x \in X$ . We first show that  $h : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a lower semicontinuous function. Let  $y_n \rightarrow y$  in  $(X, \sigma)$  with  $\sigma(y, y) = 0$ . Then,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(y, y_n) = \sigma(y, y) = 0$ . We have to show that

$$h(y) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(y_n).$$

By using condition (11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} h(y) &= \beta \sigma(fy, y) \leq \beta [\sigma(fy, y_n) + \sigma(y_n, y)] \\ &\leq \beta [\sigma(fy, fy_n) + \sigma(fy_n, y_n) + \sigma(y_n, y)] \\ &\leq \beta [\alpha \sigma(y, y_n) + \sigma(fy_n, y_n) + \sigma(y_n, y)] \\ &= \beta(\alpha + 1) \sigma(y, y_n) + h(y_n). \end{aligned}$$

This gives that,

$$h(y) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(y_n).$$

Thus,  $h$  is a lower semicontinuous function on a 0-complete dislocated metric space  $(X, \sigma)$  which is also bounded below. Therefore, Theorem 2 ensures the existence of a  $\sigma$ -point  $u$  (say) for  $h$ .

We now show that  $fx \neq x$  implies  $fx \ll x$ . Let  $fx \neq x$ . By using condition (11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} h(x) - h(fx) &= \beta [\sigma(fx, x) - \sigma(f^2x, fx)] \\ &\geq \beta [\sigma(fx, x) - \alpha \sigma(fx, x)] \\ &= \beta (1 - \alpha) \sigma(fx, x) \\ &= \sigma(fx, x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $f$  satisfies the condition that  $fx \neq x$  implies  $fx \ll x$ . By applying Remark 5, it follows that the  $\sigma$ -point  $u$  for  $h$  is a fixed point for  $f$  in  $X$ . For uniqueness, let  $v \in X$  be another fixed point of  $f$ . Then, by condition (11), we get

$$\sigma(u, v) = \sigma(fu, fv) \leq \alpha \sigma(u, v).$$

Since  $0 \leq \alpha < 1$ , it follows that  $\sigma(u, v) = 0$  and hence  $u = v$ .

Moreover,  $\sigma(u, u) = \sigma(fu, fu) \leq \alpha \sigma(u, u)$  gives that  $\sigma(u, u) = 0$ . ■

We now give an example in support of the above theorem.

**Example 6** Let  $X = [0, 1]$  and  $\sigma : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be defined by

$$\sigma(x, y) = x + y, \quad \forall x, y \in X.$$

Then  $(X, \sigma)$  is a 0-complete dislocated metric space. Let  $f : X \rightarrow X$  be defined by

$$fx = \frac{x^2}{1+x}, \quad \forall x \in X.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(fx, fy) &= fx + fy = \frac{x^2}{1+x} + \frac{y^2}{1+y} \\ &= \frac{x}{1+x}x + \frac{y}{1+y}y \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}(x+y) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\sigma(x, y) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $x, y \in X$ . Therefore, all the conditions of Theorem 6 hold good and 0 is the unique fixed point of  $f$  in  $X$  with  $\sigma(0, 0) = 0$ .

**Remark 5** *It is valuable to note that the last result of this section is obtained under the weaker assumption that the given dislocated metric space is 0-complete.*

**Acknowledgment.** The authors are grateful to the referees for their valuable comments and suggestions.

## References

- [1] M. A. Alghamdi, N. Hussain and P. Salimi, Fixed point and coupled fixed point theorems on  $b$ -metric-like spaces, *J. Inequal. Appl.*, 402(2013), 1–25.
- [2] I. A. Bakhtin, The contraction mapping principle in almost metric spaces, *Funct. Anal. Gos. Ped. Inst. Unianowsk*, 30(1989), 26–37.
- [3] M. Bukatin, R. Kopperman, S. Matthews and H. Pajoohesh, Partial metric spaces, *Am. Math. Mon.*, 116(2009), 708–718.
- [4] S. Czerwik, Contraction mappings in  $b$ -metric spaces, *Acta Math. Inform. Univ. Ostrav*, 1(1993), 5–11.
- [5] P. Hitzler and A. K. Seda, Dislocated topologies, *J. Electr. Eng.*, 51(2000), 3–7.
- [6] N. Hussain, J. R. Roshan, V. Parvaneh and Z. Kadelburg, Fixed points of contractive mappings in  $b$ -metric-like spaces, *The Scientific World Journal*, 2014(2014), 15 pages.
- [7] S. Matthews, Partial metric topology, *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.*, 728(1994), 183–197.
- [8] S. K. Mohanta, A fixed point theorem via generalized  $w$ -distance, *Bull. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 3(2011), 134–139.
- [9] S. K. Mohanta, Generalized  $w$ -distance and a fixed point theorem, *Int. J. Contemp. Math. Sciences*, 6(2011), 853–860.
- [10] S. K. Mohanta and R. Maitra, A characterization of completeness in cone metric spaces, *J. Nonlinear Anal. Appl.*, 6(2013), 227–233.
- [11] H. K. Nashine and Z. Kadelburg, Cyclic contractions and fixed point results via control functions on partial metric spaces, *International J. Anal.*, 2013(2013).
- [12] S. Park, Characterizations of metric completeness, *Colloq. Math.*, 49(1984), 21–26.
- [13] N. Shobkolaei, S. Sedghi, J. R. Roshan and N. Hussain, Suzuki type fixed point results in metric-like spaces, *J. Func. Spaces Appl.*, 2013(2013), 9 pages.
- [14] S. Shukla, Partial  $b$ -metric spaces and fixed point theorems, *Mediterr. J. Math.*, 11(2014), 703–711.
- [15] T. Suzuki and W. Takahashi, Fixed point theorems and characterizations of metric completeness, *Topolo. Method. Nonlinear Anal.*, 8(1996), 371–382.
- [16] T. Suzuki, A generalized Banach contraction principle that characterizes metric completeness, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 136(2008), 1861–1869.
- [17] J. D. Weston, A characterization of metric completeness, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 64(1977), 186–188.