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#### Abstract

In this paper, we prove a common fixed point theorem for two self-mappings satisfying certain conditions over the class of partial metric spaces. In particular, the main theorem of this manuscript extends some well-known fixed point theorems in the literature on this topic.


## 1. Introduction

Recently, studies on the existence and uniqueness of fixed points of self-mappings on partial metric spaces have gained momentum (see e.g., [1] - [4],[7], [14]-[? ],[26, 33]). The idea of partial metric space, a generalization of metric space, was introduced by Mathews [25] in 1992. When compared to metric spaces, the innovation of partial metric spaces is that the self distance of a point is not necessarily zero [24]. This feature of partial metrics makes them suitable for many purposes of semantics and domain theory in computer sciences. In particular, partial metric spaces have applications on the Scott-Strachey order-theoretic topological models [32] used in the logics of computer programs.

Mathews [25] proved the analog of Banach contraction mapping principle in the class of partial metric spaces. This remarkable paper of Mathews [25] constructed another important bridge between the domain theory in computer science and fixed point theory in mathematics. Thus, it becomes feasible to transform the tools from Mathematics to Computer Science.

A self-mapping $T$ on a metric space $X$ is called contraction if there exists a constant $k \in[0,1)$ such that $d(T x, T y) \leq k d(x, y)$ for each $x, y \in X$. Banach contraction mapping principle, which states that a contraction has a fixed point, is one of the most important result in nonlinear analysis. This crucial result has been studied continuously since it was first published (See e.g. [1]-[23],[26]-[30]). As a generalization of this fundamental principle, Kirk-Srinivasan-Veeramani [23] developed the cyclic contraction. A contraction $T: A \cup B \rightarrow A \cup B$ on non-empty set $A, B$ is called cyclic if $T(A) \subset B$ and $T(B) \subset A$ hold for closed subsets $A, B$ of a complete metric space $X$. In the last decade, many authors (see e.g.[21, 22, 27-29, 34]) reported some fixed point theorems for cyclic operators.

Rus [29] introduced the following definition which is a further generalization of a cyclic mapping.

[^0]Definition 1.1. Let $X$ be a nonempty set, $m$ be a positive integer and $T: X \rightarrow X$ be a mapping. $X=\cup_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}$ is said to be a cyclic representation of $X$ with respect to $T$ if
(i) $A_{i}, i=1,2, \cdots, m$ are nonempty sets.
(ii) $T\left(A_{1}\right) \subset A_{2}, \cdots, T\left(A_{m-1}\right) \subset A_{m}, T\left(A_{m}\right) \subset A_{1}$.

Remark 1.2. For convenience, we denote by $\mathcal{F}$ the class of functions $\phi:[0, \infty) \rightarrow[0, \infty)$ nondecreasing and continuous satisfying $\phi(t)>0$ for $t \in(0, \infty)$ and $\phi(0)=0$.

We recall the following definition.
Definition 1.3. (See e.g.[? ]) Let $(X, d)$ be a metric space, $m$ be a positive integer, $A_{1}, A_{2}, \cdots, A_{m}$ be nonempty subsets of $X$ and $X=\cup_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}$. An operator $T: X \rightarrow X$ is a cyclic weak $(\phi-\psi)$-contraction if
(i) $X=\cup_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}$ is a cyclic representation of X with respect to T ,
(ii) $\phi(d(T x, T y)) \leq \phi(d(x, y))-\psi(d(x, y))$, for any $x \in A_{i}, y \in A_{i+1}, i=1,2, \cdots, m$, where $A_{m+1}=A_{1}$ and $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{F}$.

The main result of [22] is the following.
Theorem 1.4. (Theorem 6 of [22]) Let $(X, d)$ be a complete metric space, $m$ be a positive integer, $A_{1}, A_{2}, \cdots, A_{m}$ be nonempty subsets of $X$ and $X=\cup_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}$. Let $T: X \rightarrow X$ be a cyclic $(\phi-\psi)$-contraction with $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{F}$. Then $T$ has a unique fixed point $z \in \cap_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}$.

In this paper, we proved a common fixed point of two self-mappings $T, g: X \rightarrow X$ on a partial metric space $X$ under certain conditions.

We start some definitions and results needed in the sequel.
A partial metric on a nonempty set $X$ is a mapping $p: X \times X \rightarrow[0, \infty)$ such that
(PM1) $x=y$ if and only if $p(x, x)=p(x, y)=p(y, y)$,
(PM2) $p(x, x) \leq p(x, y)$,
(PM3) $p(x, y)=p(y, x)$,
(PM4) $p(x, y) \leq p(x, z)+p(z, y)-p(z, z)$.
for all $x, y, z \in X$. A pair $(X, p)$ is said to be partial metric space.
Notice also that if $p$ is a partial metric on $X$, then the functions $d_{p}, d_{m}: X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{+}$given by

$$
\begin{align*}
& d_{p}(x, y)=2 p(x, y)-p(x, x)-p(y, y)  \tag{1}\\
& p(x, y)-p(x, x), p(x, y)-p(y, y) \tag{2}
\end{align*}
$$

are equivalent (usual) metrics on $X$. For details see e.g.[? ].
Example 1.5. (See e.g. $[1,3,20,24]$ ) Consider $X=[0, \infty)$ with $p(x, y)=\max \{x, y\}$. Then $(X, p)$ is a partial metric space. It is clear that $p$ is not a (usual) metric. Note that in this case $d_{p}(x, y)=|x-y|$.

Example 1.6. (See e.g. [24]) Let $X=\{[a, b]: a, b, \in \mathbb{R}, a \leq b\}$ and define $p([a, b],[c, d])=\max \{b, d\}-\min \{a, c\}$. Then $(X, p)$ is a partial metric spaces.

Lemma 1.7. (See e.g. $[14,15])$ Let $(X, p)$ be a PMS. Then
(A) If $p(x, y)=0$ then $x=y$,
(B) If $x \neq y$, then $p(x, y)>0$.

Example 1.8. (See e.g.[? ]) Let $(X, d)$ and $(X, p)$ be a metric space and a partial metric space, respectively. Mappings $p_{i}: X \times X \longrightarrow[0, \infty)(i \in\{1,2,3\})$ defined by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& p_{1}(x, y)=d(x, y)+p(x, y) \\
& p_{2}(x, y)=d(x, y)+\max \{\omega(x), \omega(y)\} \\
& p_{3}(x, y)=d(x, y)+a
\end{aligned}
$$

induce partial metrics on $X$, where $\omega: X \longrightarrow[0, \infty)$ is an arbitrary function and $a \geq 0$.
We notice also that each partial metric $p$ on $X$ generates a $T_{0}$ topology $\tau_{p}$ on $X$ which has a family of open $p$-balls

$$
\left\{B_{p}(x, \varepsilon): x \in X, \varepsilon>0\right\}
$$

as a base where $B_{p}(x, \varepsilon)=\{y \in X: p(x, y)<p(x, x)+\varepsilon\}$ for all $x \in X$ and $\varepsilon>0$.
Definition 1.9. (See e.g. [24]) Let ( $X, p$ ) be a partial metric space.
(i) A sequence $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ in $X$ converges to $x \in X$ whenever $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} p\left(x, x_{n}\right)=p(x, x)$,
(ii) A sequence $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ in $X$ is called Cauchy whenever $\lim _{n, m \rightarrow \infty} p\left(x_{n}, x_{m}\right)$ exists (and finite),
(iii) $(X, p)$ is said to be complete if every Cauchy sequence $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ in $X$ converges, with respect to $\tau_{p}$, to a point $x \in X$, that is, $\lim _{n, m \rightarrow \infty} p\left(x_{n}, x_{m}\right)=p(x, x)$.

We define $L\left(x_{n}\right)=\left\{x \mid x_{n} \rightarrow x\right\}$ where $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ is a sequence in a partial metric space $(X, p)$. The example below shows that a convergent sequence $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ in a partial metric space may not be a Cauchy. In particular, it shows that the limit of a convergent sequence is not unique.
Example 1.10. (See e.g.[? ]) Let $X=[0, \infty)$ and $p(x, y)=\max \{x, y\}$. Let

$$
x_{n}= \begin{cases}0, & n=2 k \\ 1, & n=2 k+1\end{cases}
$$

Then clearly it is convergent sequence and for every $x \geq 1$ we have $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} p\left(x_{n}, x\right)=p(x, x)$, therefore $L\left(x_{n}\right)=$ $[1, \infty)$. But $\lim _{n, m \rightarrow \infty} p\left(x_{n}, x_{m}\right)$ does not exist.

We state a lemma that shows the limit of a convergent sequence $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ in a partial metric space is unique.
Lemma 1.11. (See e.g.[? ]) Let $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ be a convergent sequence in partial metric space $X$ such that $x_{n} \rightarrow x$ and $x_{n} \rightarrow y$. If

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} p\left(x_{n}, x_{n}\right)=p(x, x)=p(y, y)
$$

then $x=y$.
Lemma 1.12. (See e.g.[? ]) Let $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ and $\left\{y_{n}\right\}$ be two sequences in partial metric space $X$ such that

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} p\left(x_{n}, x\right)=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} p\left(x_{n}, x_{n}\right)=p(x, x)
$$

and

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} p\left(y_{n}, y\right)=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} p\left(y_{n}, y_{n}\right)=p(y, y)
$$

then $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} p\left(x_{n}, y_{n}\right)=p(x, y)$. In particular, $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} p\left(x_{n}, z\right)=p(x, z)$ for every $z \in X$.

Lemma 1.13. (See e.g. [24],[26]) Let $(X, p)$ be a partial metric space.
(a) $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $(X, p)$ if and only if it is a Cauchy sequence in the metric space $\left(X, d_{p}\right)$.
(b) A partial metric space $(X, p)$ is complete if and only if the metric space $\left(X, d_{p}\right)$ is complete. Furthermore, $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} d_{p}\left(x_{n}, x\right)=0$ if and only if

$$
p(x, x)=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} p\left(x_{n}, x\right)=\lim _{n, m \rightarrow \infty} p\left(x_{n}, x_{m}\right) .
$$

Lemma 1.14. (See e.g.[? ]) If $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ is a convergent sequence in $\left(X, d_{p}\right)$, then it is a convergent sequence in the partial metric space $(X, p)$.

In this paper, we prove a common fixed point theorem on the class of the partial metric spaces as a generalization of Theorem 1.4 and the main theorem of [31].

## 2. Main Result

We start this section with the following definition for two self-mappings $T, g: X \rightarrow X$.
Definition 2.1. Let $X$ be a nonempty set, $m$ be a positive integer and $T, g: X \rightarrow X$ be two mappings. $X=\cup_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}$ is said to be a cyclic representation of $X$ with respect to $(T-g)$ if
(i) $A_{i}, i=1,2, \cdots, m$ are nonempty sets.
(ii) $T\left(A_{1}\right) \subset g\left(A_{2}\right), \cdots, T\left(A_{m-1}\right) \subset g\left(A_{m}\right), T\left(A_{m}\right) \subset g\left(A_{1}\right)$.

Definition 2.2. Let $(X, p)$ be a partial metric space, $m$ be a positive integer, $A_{1}, A_{2}, \cdots, A_{m}$ be nonempty subsets of $X$ and $X=\cup_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}$. Two operators $T, g: X \rightarrow X$ are cyclic $(\phi-\psi)$-contraction if
(i) $X=\cup_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}$ is a cyclic representation of $X$ with respect to $(T-g)$,
(ii) $\phi(p(T x, T y)) \leq \phi(p(g x, g y))-\psi(p(g x, g y))$, for any $x \in A_{i}, y \in A_{i+1}, i=1,2, \cdots, m$, where $A_{m+1}=A_{1}$ and $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{F}$.

Our main result is the following.
Theorem 2.3. Let $(X, p)$ be a complete partial metric space, $m$ be a positive integer, $A_{1}, A_{2}, \cdots, A_{m}$ be nonempty subsets of $X$ and $X=\cup_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}$. Let $T, g: X \rightarrow X$ be two cyclic $(\phi-\psi)$-contraction such that $g\left(A_{i}\right)$ closed subsets of $X$.
i) If $g$ is one to one then there exists $z \in \cap_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}$ such that $g z=T z$.
ii) If the pair $(T, g)$ are weakly compatible,
then $T$ and $g$ has a unique common fixed point $z \in \cap_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}$.
Proof. Let $x_{1}$ be an arbitrary point in $A_{1}$. By cyclic representation of $X$ with respect to pair $(T, g)$, we choose a point $x_{2}$ in $A_{2}$ such that $T x_{1}=g x_{2}$. For this point $x_{2}$ there exists a point $x_{3}$ in $A_{3}$ such that $T x_{2}=g x_{3}$, and so on. Continuing in this manner we can define a sequence $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ as follows

$$
T x_{n}=g x_{n+1},
$$

for $n=1,2, \cdots$. We prove that $\left\{g x_{n}\right\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. If there exists $n_{0} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $g x_{n_{0}+1}=g x_{n_{0}}$ then, since $g x_{n_{0}+1}=T x_{n_{0}}=g x_{n_{0}}$, the part of existence of the coincidence point of $T$ and $g$ is proved. Suppose that $g x_{n+1} \neq g x_{n}$ for any $n=1,2, \cdots$. Then, since $X=\cup_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}$, for any $n>0$ there exists $i_{n} \in\{1,2, \cdots, m\}$ such that $x_{n-1} \in A_{i_{n}}$ and $x_{n} \in A_{i_{n+1}}$. Since $(T, g)$ are cyclic $(\phi-\psi)$-contraction, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\phi\left(p\left(g x_{n}, g x_{n+1}\right)\right) & =\phi\left(p\left(T x_{n-1}, T x_{n}\right)\right) \\
& \leq \phi\left(p\left(g x_{n-1}, g x_{n}\right)\right)-\psi\left(p\left(g x_{n-1}, g x_{n}\right)\right) \\
& \leq \phi\left(p\left(g x_{n-1}, g x_{n}\right)\right) \tag{3}
\end{align*}
$$

From (3) and taking into account that $\phi$ is nondecreasing we obtain

$$
p\left(g x_{n}, g x_{n+1}\right) \leq p\left(g x_{n-1}, g x_{n}\right) \text { for any } n=2,3, \cdots
$$

Thus $\left\{p\left(g x_{n}, g x_{n+1}\right)\right\}$ is a nondecreasing sequence of nonnegative real numbers. Consequently, there exists $\gamma \geq 0$ such that $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} p\left(g x_{n}, g x_{n+1}\right)=\gamma$. Taking $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (3) and using the continuity of $\phi$ and $\psi$, we have

$$
\phi(\gamma) \leq \phi(\gamma)-\psi(\gamma) \leq \phi(\gamma)
$$

and, therefore, $\psi(\gamma)=0$. Since $\psi \in \mathcal{F}, \gamma=0$, that is,

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} p\left(g x_{n}, g x_{n+1}\right)=0
$$

Since $p\left(g x_{n}, g x_{n}\right) \leq p\left(g x_{n}, g x_{n+1}\right)$ and $p\left(g x_{n+1}, g x_{n+1}\right) \leq p\left(g x_{n}, g x_{n+1}\right)$, hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} p\left(g x_{n}, g x_{n}\right)=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} p\left(g x_{n+1}, g x_{n+1}\right)=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} p\left(g x_{n}, g x_{n+1}\right)=0 . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since

$$
d_{p}\left(g x_{n}, g x_{n+1}\right)=2 p\left(g x_{n}, g x_{n+1}\right)-p\left(g x_{n}, g x_{n}\right)-p\left(g x_{n+1}, g x_{n+1}\right) .
$$

This shows that $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} d_{p}\left(g x_{n}, g x_{n+1}\right)=0$.
In the sequel, we prove that $\left\{g x_{n}\right\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in the metric space $\left(X, d_{p}\right)$.
First, we prove the following claim.
Claim: For every $\epsilon>0$ there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $b, q \geq n$ with $b-q \equiv 1(m)$ then $d_{p}\left(x_{b}, x_{q}\right)<\epsilon$.
In fact, suppose the contrary case. This means that there exists $\epsilon>0$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we can find $b_{n}>q_{n} \geq n$ with $b_{n}-q_{n} \equiv 1(m)$ satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{p}\left(g x_{q_{n}}, g x_{b_{n}}\right) \geq \epsilon . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now, we take $n>2 m$. Then, corresponding to $q_{n} \geq n$ use can choose $b_{n}$ in such a way that it is the smallest integer with $b_{n}>q_{n}$ satisfying $b_{n}-q_{n} \equiv 1(m)$ and $d_{p}\left(g x_{q_{n}}, g x_{b_{n}}\right) \geq \epsilon$. Therefore, $d_{p}\left(g x_{q_{n}}, g x_{b_{n-m}}\right) \leq \epsilon$. Using the triangular inequality

$$
\epsilon \leq d_{p}\left(g x_{q_{n}}, g x_{b_{n}}\right) \leq d_{p}\left(g x_{q_{n}}, g x_{b_{n-m}}\right)+\sum_{i=1}^{m} d_{p}\left(g x_{b_{n-i}} g x_{b_{n-i+1}}\right)<\epsilon+\sum_{i=1}^{m} d_{p}\left(g x_{b_{n-i}}, g x_{b_{n-i+1}}\right) .
$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the last inequality and taking into account that $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} d_{p}\left(g x_{n}, g x_{n+1}\right)=0$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} d_{p}\left(g x_{q_{n}}, g x_{b_{n}}\right)=\epsilon \Longrightarrow \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} p\left(g x_{q_{n}}, g x_{b_{n}}\right)=\frac{\epsilon}{2} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Again, by the triangular inequality

$$
\begin{align*}
\epsilon & \leq d_{p}\left(g x_{q_{n}}, g x_{b_{n}}\right) \\
& \leq d_{p}\left(g x_{q_{n}}, g x_{q_{n+1}}\right)+d_{p}\left(g x_{q_{n+1}}, g x_{b_{n+1}}\right)+d_{p}\left(g x_{b_{n+1}}, g x_{b_{n}}\right)  \tag{7}\\
& \leq d_{p}\left(g x_{q_{n}}, g x_{q_{n+1}}\right)+d_{p}\left(g x_{q_{n+1}}, g x_{q_{n}}\right) \\
& +d_{p}\left(g x_{q_{n}}, g x_{b_{n}}\right)+d_{p}\left(g x_{b_{n}}, g x_{b_{n+1}}\right)+d_{p}\left(g x_{b_{n+1}}, g x_{b_{n}}\right) \\
& =2 d_{p}\left(g x_{q_{n}}, g x_{q_{n+1}}\right)+d_{p}\left(g x_{q_{n}}, g x_{b_{n}}\right)+2 d_{p}\left(g x_{b_{n}}, g x_{b_{n+1}}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (6) and taking into account that $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} d_{p}\left(g x_{n}, g x_{n+1}\right)=0$ and (6), we get

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} d_{p}\left(g x_{q_{n+1}} g x_{b_{n+1}}\right)=\epsilon .
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} p\left(g x_{q_{n+1}}, g x_{b_{n+1}}\right)=\frac{\epsilon}{2} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $g x_{q_{n}}$ and $g x_{b_{n}}$ lie in different adjacently labeled sets $A_{i}$ and $A_{i+1}$ for certain $1 \leq i \leq m$, using the fact that $T$ and $g$ are cyclic $(\phi-\psi)$-contraction, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\phi\left(p\left(g x_{q_{n+1}}, g x_{b_{n+1}}\right)\right) & =\phi\left(p\left(T x_{q_{n}}, T x_{b_{n}}\right)\right. \\
& \leq \phi\left(p\left(g x_{q_{n}}, g x_{b_{n}}\right)\right)-\psi\left(p\left(g x_{q_{n}}, g x_{b_{n}}\right)\right) \\
& \leq \phi\left(p\left(g x_{q_{n}}, g x_{b_{n}}\right)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Taking into account (6) and (8) and the continuity of $\phi$ and $\psi$, letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the last inequality, we obtain

$$
\phi\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \leq \phi\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right)-\psi\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \leq \phi\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right)
$$

and consequently, $\psi\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right)=0$. Since $\psi \in \mathcal{F}$, then $\epsilon=0$ which is contradiction. Therefore, our claim is proved.
In the sequel, we will prove that $\left\{g x_{n}\right\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in metric space $\left(X, d_{p}\right)$. Fix $\epsilon>0$. By the claim, we find $n_{0} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $b, q \geq n_{0}$ with $b-q \equiv 1(m)$

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{p}\left(g x_{b}, g x_{q}\right) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} d_{p}\left(g x_{n}, g x_{n+1}\right)=0$ we also find $n_{1} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{p}\left(g x_{n}, g x_{n+1}\right) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2 m} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

for any $n \geq n_{1}$.
Suppose that $r, s \geq \max \left\{n_{0}, n_{1}\right\}$ and $s>r$. Then there exists $k \in\{1,2, \cdots, m\}$ such that $s-r \equiv k(m)$. Therefore, $s-r+j \equiv 1(m)$ for $j=m-k+1$. So, we have

$$
d_{p}\left(g x_{r}, g x_{s}\right) \leq d_{p}\left(g x_{r}, g x_{s+j}\right)+d_{p}\left(g x_{s+j}, g x_{s+j-1}\right)+\cdots+d_{p}\left(g x_{s+1}, g x_{s}\right)
$$

By (9) and (10) and from the last inequality, we get

$$
d_{p}\left(g x_{r}, g x_{s}\right) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}+j \frac{\epsilon}{2 m} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}+m \frac{\epsilon}{2 m}=\epsilon
$$

This proves that $\left\{g x_{n}\right\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in metric space $\left(X, d_{p}\right)$. Since $(X, p)$ is complete then from Lemma 1.13, the sequence $\left\{g x_{n}\right\}$ converges in the metric space $\left(X, d_{p}\right)$, say $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} d_{p}\left(g x_{n}, x\right)=0$ for some $x \in X$. Therefore, by Lemma 1.13 we have

$$
p(x, x)=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} p\left(g x_{n}, x\right)=\lim _{n, m \rightarrow \infty} p\left(g x_{n}, g x_{m}\right) .
$$

That is, there exists $x \in X$ such that $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} g x_{n}=x$ in partial metric $(X, p)$. Since $g\left(A_{i}\right)$ are closed subsets of $X$, we have $x \in g\left(A_{i}\right)$ for every $i \in\{1,2, \cdots, m\}$. That is, $x \in \cap_{i=1}^{m} g\left(A_{i}\right)$. Hence, there exists $z_{i} \in A_{i}$ such that $g z_{i}=x$. Since g is one to one we have

$$
g\left(z_{1}\right)=g\left(z_{2}\right)=\cdots=g\left(z_{m}\right)=x \Longrightarrow z_{1}=z_{2}=\cdots=z_{m}=z .
$$

Therefore, $g(z)=x$ for $z \in \cap_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}$. In fact, $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} g x_{n}=g z$. On the other hand since the sequence $\left\{g x_{n}\right\}$ has infinite terms in each $A_{i}$ for $i \in\{1,2, \cdots, m\}$, we take a subsequence $\left\{g x_{n_{k}}\right\}$ of $\left\{g x_{n}\right\}$ with $g x_{n_{k}} \in g\left(A_{i-1}\right)$ where $x_{n_{k}} \in A_{i-1}$. Using the contractive condition, we can obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\phi\left(p\left(g x_{n_{k+1}}, T z\right)\right) & =\phi\left(p\left(T x_{n_{k}}, T z\right)\right) \\
& \leq \phi\left(p\left(g x_{n_{k}}, g z\right)\right)-\psi\left(p\left(g x_{n_{k}}, g z\right)\right) \\
& \leq \phi\left(p\left(g x_{n_{k}}, g z\right)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $g x_{n_{k}} \rightarrow g z$ and $\phi$ and $\psi$ belong to $\mathcal{F}$, letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ in the last inequality, we have

$$
\phi(p(g z, T z)) \leq \phi(p(g z, g z))-\psi(p(g z, g z)) \leq \phi(p(g z, g z))
$$

Moreover, we obtain $p(g z, T z)=p(g z, g z)$, because $\phi$ is nondecreasing and $p(g z, g z) \leq p(g z, T z)$. Hence, if $p(g z, g z) \neq 0$ then by the last inequality we have,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\phi(p(g z, g z)) & =\phi(p(g z, T z)) \\
& \leq \phi(p(g z, g z))-\psi(p(g z, g z)) \\
& <\phi(p(g z, g z))
\end{aligned}
$$

which is contradiction. Since $\phi \in \mathcal{F}$, then, $p(T z, T z)=p(g z, g z)=p(g z, T z)=0$, it follows that, $T z=g z=x$.
ii) Since $g$ and $T$ are two weakly compatible mappings, we have $T T z=T g z=g T z=g g z$. That is $T x=g x$. Next, we prove that $T x=x$. Since $T z \in X$ hence there exists some $i$ such that $T z \in A_{i}$. By $z \in \cap_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}$ we have $z \in A_{i-1}$, by using the contractive condition we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\phi(p(T z, T T z)) & \leq \phi(p(g z, g T z))-\psi(p(g z, g T z)) \\
& \leq \phi(p(g z, g T z))=\phi(p(T z, T T z))
\end{aligned}
$$

from the last inequality we have

$$
\psi(p(T z, T T z))=0
$$

Since $\psi \in \mathcal{F}, p(T z, T T z)=0$ and, consequently, $x=T z=T T z=T x=g x$.
Finally, in order to prove the uniqueness of a fixed point, we have $y, z \in X$ with $y$ and $z$ common fixed points of $T$ and $g$. The cyclic character of $T-g$ and the fact that $y, z \in X$ are common fixed points of $T$ and $g$, imply that $y, z \in \cap_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}$. If $p(y, z) \neq 0$ then by using the contractive condition we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\phi(p(y, z)) & =\phi(p(T y, T z)) \leq \phi(p(g y, g z))-\psi(p(g y, g z)) \\
& <\phi(p(g y, g z))=\phi(p(y, z))
\end{aligned}
$$

which is a contradiction. Since $\phi \in \mathcal{F}, p(y, z)=0$ and, consequently, $y=z$. This finishes the proof.
Corollary 2.4. Let $(X, p)$ be a complete partial metric space, $m$ be a positive integer, $A_{1}, A_{2}, \cdots, A_{m}$ be nonempty closed subsets of $X$ and $X=\cup_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}$. Let $T: X \rightarrow X$ be a cyclic weak $(\phi-\psi)$-contraction. Then $T$ has a unique fixed point $z \in \cap_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}$.

Proof. Take $g(x)=x$ in Theorem 2.3.

Corollary 2.5. Let $(X, p)$ be a complete partial metric space, $m$ be a positive integer, $A_{1}, A_{2}, \cdots, A_{m}$ be nonempty closed subsets of $X$. Suppose that $T: X \rightarrow X$ is a self-mapping and $X=\cup_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}$ is a cyclic representation of $X$ with respect to $T$. Further, $T$ satisfies $d(T x, T y) \leq d(x, y)-\psi(d(x, y))$, for any $x \in A_{i}, y \in A_{i+1}, i=1,2, \cdots, m$, where $A_{m+1}=A_{1}$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{F}$. Then $T$ has a unique fixed point $z \in \cap_{i=1}^{m} A_{i}$.

Proof. Take $\phi(t)=t$ in Corollary 2.4.
Example 2.6. Let $X=[0,1]$ and $g, T: X \rightarrow X$ such that $T x=\frac{x^{2}}{12}$ and $g x=\frac{x}{3}$. Suppose that $\psi, \phi:[0, \infty) \rightarrow$ $[0, \infty)$ are defined as follows $\psi(t)=\frac{t}{2}$ and $\psi(t)=\frac{t}{3}$. For $A_{i}=[0,1],(i=1,2, \ldots, m)$ all conditions of Theorem 2.3 are satisfied. It is clear that $x=0$ is the common fixed point of $T$ and $g$.
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