

ISSN: 1017-060X (Print)



ISSN: 1735-8515 (Online)

**Bulletin of the**  
**Iranian Mathematical Society**

Vol. 42 (2016), No. 1, pp. 49–52

**Title:**

**Erratum: Coupled fixed point results for weakly related mappings in partially ordered metric spaces**

**Author(s):**

**M. Jain, N. Gupta, and S. Kumar**

Published by Iranian Mathematical Society  
<http://bims.ims.ir>

## ERRATUM: COUPLED FIXED POINT RESULTS FOR WEAKLY RELATED MAPPINGS IN PARTIALLY ORDERED METRIC SPACES

M. JAIN\*, N. GUPTA, AND S. KUMAR

(Communicated by Hamid Reza Ebrahimi Vishki)

**ABSTRACT.** In this note we point out and rectify some errors in a recently published paper “N. Singh, R. Jain: Coupled Fixed Point Results For Weakly Related Mappings in Partially Ordered Metric Spaces, *Bull. Iranian Math. Soc.* 40 (2014), no. 1, 29–40”.

**Keywords:** Coupled fixed point, common coupled fixed point, partially ordered space, weakly related mappings.

**MSC(2010):** Primary: 47H10; Secondary: 54H25.

In [1], the authors showed the existence of coupled fixed points for the non-decreasing mappings in partially ordered complete metric space using a partial order induced by an appropriate function  $\phi$ . The reader should consult [1] for terms not specifically defined in this note.

**Remark 1.** The authors in [1] claimed that Example 2.4 supports Theorem 2.3. In Theorem 2.3, the function  $\phi$  is considered to be bounded from above but in Example 2.4, the function  $\phi : X (= [0, +\infty)) \rightarrow R$  defined by  $\phi(x) = 2x$  for  $x \in X$  is not bounded from above. Further, the order relation “ $\preceq$ ” must be induced by  $\phi$  but in Example 2.4 it is considered to be the usual ordering.

We now rectify Example 2.4 as follows:

**Example 2.** Let  $X = [0, 1]$  and  $d(x, y) = |x - y|$ , then  $(X, d)$  is a complete metric space. Let  $\phi : X \rightarrow R$  be the mapping defined by  $\phi(x) = -2x$  for all  $x \in X$ . Define the relation “ $\preceq$ ” on  $X$  as follows:

$$x \preceq y \text{ iff } d(x, y) \leq \phi(y) - \phi(x).$$

Then “ $\preceq$ ” is partial order induced by  $\phi$ .

Clearly,  $\phi$  is bounded from above on  $X$ .

---

Article electronically published on February 22, 2016.

Received: 9 July 2014, Accepted: 15 October 2015.

\*Corresponding author.

Define  $F : X \times X \rightarrow X$  by  $F(x, y) = \frac{x(1+y)}{2}$  for all  $x, y \in X$ .

Then  $F$  is non-decreasing function on  $X$ .

Let  $x_0 = 0, y_0 = 1$ , then  $F(x_0, y_0) = \frac{x_0(1+y_0)}{2} = 0$  and

$$F(y_0, x_0) = \frac{y_0(1+x_0)}{2} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Finally, we check that  $x_0 \preceq F(x_0, y_0)$  and  $y_0 \preceq F(y_0, x_0)$ .

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} x_0 \preceq F(x_0, y_0) & \text{ iff } d(x_0, F(x_0, y_0)) \leq \phi(F(x_0, y_0)) - \phi(x_0) \\ & \text{ iff } d(0, 0) = 0 \leq \phi(0) - \phi(0) = 0, \text{ which is true.} \end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned} y_0 \preceq F(y_0, x_0) & \text{ iff } d(y_0, F(y_0, x_0)) \leq \phi(F(y_0, x_0)) - \phi(y_0) \\ & \text{ iff } d\left(1, \frac{1}{2}\right) \leq \phi\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) - \phi(1) \\ & \text{ iff } \frac{1}{2} \leq (-2)\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) - (-2)(1) = 1, \text{ which is again true.} \end{aligned}$$

Hence all the conditions of Theorem 2.3 are satisfied. Applying Theorem 2.3,  $(0, 0)$  is the coupled fixed point of  $F$ .

**Remark 3.** (i) In Example 2, the partial order “ $\preceq$ ” induced by  $\phi$  is not the usual ordering “ $\leq$ ”. Clearly,  $1 \preceq \frac{1}{2}$  but  $1 \not\leq \frac{1}{2}$ .

(ii) Again, the authors in [1] claimed that Example 3.3 supports Theorem 3.2. In Theorem 3.2, the function  $\phi$  is considered to be bounded from above but in Example 3.3, the function  $\phi : X (= [0, \infty)) \rightarrow R$  defined by  $\phi(x) = 2x$  for  $x \in X$  is not bounded from above. Further, the order relation “ $\preceq$ ” must be induced by  $\phi$  but in Example 3.3 it is considered to be the usual ordering.

We now rectify Example 3.3 as follows:

**Example 4.** Let  $X = [0, 1]$  and  $d(x, y) = |x - y|$ , then  $(X, d)$  is a complete metric space. Let  $\phi : X \rightarrow R$  be the mapping defined by  $\phi(x) = -2x$  for all  $x \in X$ . Define the relation “ $\preceq$ ” on  $X$  as follows:

$$x \preceq y \text{ iff } d(x, y) \leq \phi(y) - \phi(x).$$

Then “ $\preceq$ ” is partial order induced by  $\phi$ .

Since  $1 \preceq \frac{1}{2}$ , so “ $\preceq$ ” is not the usual order “ $\leq$ ”.

Clearly,  $\phi$  is bounded from above on  $X$ .

Define  $F : X \times X \rightarrow X$  by  $F(x, y) = \frac{x(1+y)}{4}$  for all  $x, y \in X$  and  $G : X \rightarrow X$  by  $G(x) = \frac{x}{2}$  for  $x \in X$ .

$$\text{Now, } GF(x, y) = \frac{x(1+y)}{8}, F(Gx, Gy) = F\left(\frac{x}{2}, \frac{y}{2}\right) = \frac{x(2+y)}{16},$$

$$GF(y, x) = \frac{y(1+x)}{8}, F(Gy, Gx) = F\left(\frac{y}{2}, \frac{x}{2}\right) = \frac{y(2+x)}{16} \text{ for } x, y \in X.$$

We first show that the pair  $\{F, G\}$  is weakly related.

We consider the following:

$$(i) F(x, y) \preceq GF(x, y)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{iff } d(F(x, y), GF(x, y)) \leq \phi(GF(x, y)) - \phi(F(x, y)) \\ &\text{iff } \left| \frac{x(1+y)}{4} - \frac{x(1+y)}{8} \right| \leq \phi\left(\frac{x(1+y)}{8}\right) - \phi\left(\frac{x(1+y)}{4}\right) \\ &\text{iff } \frac{x(1+y)}{8} \leq \frac{-x(1+y)}{4} + \frac{x(1+y)}{2} \\ &\text{iff } \frac{x(1+y)}{8} \leq \frac{x(1+y)}{4}, \text{ which is true for } x, y \in X. \end{aligned}$$

$$(ii) Gx \preceq F(Gx, Gy)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{iff } d(Gx, F(Gx, Gy)) \leq \phi(F(Gx, Gy)) - \phi(Gx) \\ &\text{iff } \left| \frac{x}{2} - \frac{x(2+y)}{16} \right| \leq \phi\left(\frac{x(2+y)}{16}\right) - \phi\left(\frac{x}{2}\right) \\ &\text{iff } \left| \frac{6x - xy}{16} \right| \leq \frac{-x(2+y)}{8} + x \\ &\text{iff } \left| \frac{6x - xy}{16} \right| \leq \frac{6x - xy}{8}, \text{ which is true for } x, y \in X. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we show that  $F(y, x) \preceq GF(y, x)$  and  $Gy \preceq F(Gy, Gx)$  for all  $x, y \in X$ . Hence the pair  $\{F, G\}$  is weakly related.

Let  $x_0 = 0, y_0 = 1$ , then  $F(x_0, y_0) = 0$  and  $F(y_0, x_0) = \frac{1}{4}$ .

Finally, we check that  $x_0 \preceq F(x_0, y_0)$  and  $y_0 \preceq F(y_0, x_0)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} x_0 \preceq F(x_0, y_0) &\text{ iff } d(x_0, F(x_0, y_0)) \leq \phi(F(x_0, y_0)) - \phi(x_0) \\ &\text{ iff } d(0, 0) \leq \phi(0) - \phi(0), \text{ which is true.} \\ y_0 \preceq F(y_0, x_0) &\text{ iff } d(y_0, F(y_0, x_0)) \leq \phi(F(y_0, x_0)) - \phi(y_0) \\ &\text{ iff } d\left(1, \frac{1}{4}\right) \leq \phi\left(\frac{1}{4}\right) - \phi(1) \\ &\text{ iff } \frac{3}{4} \leq (-2) \left(\frac{1}{4}\right) - (-2)(1) \\ &\text{ iff } \frac{3}{4} \leq -\frac{1}{2} + 2 = \frac{3}{2}, \text{ which is true.} \end{aligned}$$

Hence all the conditions of Theorem 3.2 are satisfied. Applying Theorem 3.2,  $(0, 0)$  is the common coupled fixed point of the pair  $\{F, G\}$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] N. Singh and R. Jain, Coupled fixed point results for weakly related mappings in partially ordered metric spaces, *Bull. Iranian Math. Soc.* **40** (2014), no. 1, 29–40.

(Manish Jain) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, AHIR COLLEGE, REWARI 123401, INDIA.  
*E-mail address:* [manish.261283@rediffmail.com](mailto:manish.261283@rediffmail.com)

(Neetu Gupta) HAS DEPARTMENT, YMCAUST, FARIDABAD, INDIA.  
*E-mail address:* [neetumca@yahoo.co.in](mailto:neetumca@yahoo.co.in)

(Sanjay Kumar) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, DCRUST, MURTHAL, SONEPAT, INDIA.  
*E-mail address:* [sanjuciet@rediffmail.com](mailto:sanjuciet@rediffmail.com)