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Introduction

The establishment of common fixed point principle was initiated by Jungck (1976). In the same reference, the commutativity of one pair of maps was introduced. Sessa (1982) later introduced weak commutativity of maps. Jungck (1986) improved on this by initiating compatibility. Furthermore, weak compatibility was inaugurated by Jungck (1996). Many researchers employed the concept of weakly compatible maps currently for proving common fixed point theorems in various spaces. Existence and uniqueness of common fixed points of contractive maps was first proved in metric spaces. Subsequently, many authors developed interest in this area and enlarged the space. Matthews (1992) extended the metric space to partial metric space by including the non-zero self-distance to the assumption of metric spaces. Additionally, the literature on metric space has also been improved by Mustafa and Sims (2006) where every triplet of an arbitrary set is being given as real numbers. The general view of G-metric space has additionally been improved by Eke and Olaleru (2013) where the non-zero self-distance to the condition of G-metric space leading to G-partial metric space. The authors proved that Banach constriction principle has unique fixed point in ordered G-partial metric spaces. The literature has also been enriched with new theorems on fixed and common fixed point of contractive and expansive operators in this space. For instance, fixed point of ciric-type contractive operators was proved in ordered G-partial metric spaces (Olaleru et al., 2014). Eke (2015) establishes some fixed point theorems for two expansive operators in G-partial metric spaces. Existence of coincidence point for contractive operators in generalized metric space is proved (Abbas and Rhoades, 2009). The existence of common fixed point for four mappings that satisfy generalized contractive conditions in cone metric space without allowing the continuity of any of the maps has also been proved (Abbas et al., 2010).

Motivated by these results, we establish some common fixed point theorems for two set of operators satisfying certain enlarged contractive conditions in G-partial metric spaces. Consistent with Eke and Olaleru (2013), we present the following definitions and results.

Definition 1.1

Suppose $A$ is a nonempty set and further if $G_p : A \times A \times A \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is a function fulfilling the following:

- $(G_{p1}) G_p(a,b,c) \geq G_p(a,a,a) \geq 0$ for all $a,b,c \in A$ (small self-distance)
- $(G_{p2}) G_p(a,b,c) = G_p(a,a,b) = G_p(b,b,c) = G_p(c,c,a)$ if and only if $a = b = c$ (equality)
- $(G_{p3}) G_p(a,b,c) = G_p(c,a,b) = G_p(b,c,a)$ (symmetry in all three variables)
- $(G_{p4}) G_p(a,b,c) \leq G_p(a,e,e) + G_p(e,b,c) - G_p(e,e,e)$ (rectangle inequality)

Then we have G-partial metric space which comprises of the set $(A, G_p)$, where $G_p$ is called G-partial metric.
Example 1.2

Suppose \( A = \mathbb{R} \) and \( G_p : A \times A \times A \to \mathbb{R} \) is a G-partial metric characterized by \( G_p(a, b, c) = \max\{a, b, c\} \) then \((A, G_p)\) is a G-partial metric space.

Introducing the following:

Definition 1.3

If a sequence \( \{a_n\} \) of points in a G-partial metric space \((A, G_p)\) has a limit at a point \( e \in A \) then we have 
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} G_p(a_n, a, e) = \lim_{n \to \infty} G_p(a, a_n, a) = G_p(e, e, e).
\]

Definition 1.4

A sequence \( \{a_n\} \) of points in a G-partial metric space \((A, G_p)\) is Cauchy if the number \( G_p(a_n, a_m, a) \) converges to some \( e \in A \) as \( n, m \) approach infinity.

The proof of the following proposition easily follows from definition.

Proposition 1.5

Let \( \{a_n\} \) be a sequence in G-partial metric space \( A \) and \( e \in A \). If \( \{a_n\} \) converges to \( e \in A \), then \( \{a_n\} \) is a Cauchy sequence.

Definition 1.6

A G-partial metric space \((A, G_p)\) is said to be complete if every Cauchy sequence in \((A, G_p)\) converges to an element in \((A, G_p)\). That is, 
\[
G_p(a, a, a) = \lim_{n \to \infty} G_p(a_n, a_n, a) = \lim_{n \to \infty} G_p(a_n, a_n, a_n) = G_p(a_n, a_n, a_n).
\]

Definition 1.7

Let \( h \) and \( j \) be self-maps on a set \( A \). If \( u = ha = ja \), for some \( a \in A \), then \( a \) is called coincidence point of \( h \) and \( j \).

Where \( u \) is called a point of coincidence of \( h \) and \( j \).

Definition 1.8

Let \( h \) and \( j \) be two self-maps defined on a set \( A \). Then \( h \) and \( j \) are said to be weakly compatible if they commute at every coincidence point.

Main Results

Theorem 2.1

Let \( h, j, K \) and \( L \) be self-maps of a G-partial metric space \( A \) satisfying \( h(A) \subseteq L(A), j(A) \subseteq K(A) \) and \( G_p(ha, ha, jb) \leq G_p(a_n, a_n, b) \) \((h, j, K, L)\), where \( q \in (0, 1) \).

and:

\[
u_{u, a, b}(h, j, K, L) \in \begin{cases} G_p(Ka, Kb, Lb), G_p(ha, ha, Ka), \\ G_p(jb, jb, Lb), \\ G_p(ha, ha, lb) + G_p(jb, jb, Ka) \end{cases}
\]

for all and \( a, b \in A \). If one of \( h(A), j(A), K(A) \) or \( L(A) \) is complete subspace of \( A \), then \( h, j, K \) and \( L \) have a unique point of coincidence in \( A \). Moreover, if \( h, K \) and \( j, L \) are weakly compatible, then \( h, j, K \) and \( L \) have a unique common fixed point.

Proof

For any arbitrary point \( a_0 \in A \), since \( h(A) \subseteq L(A) \) then there exists \( a_1 \in A \) such that \( ha_0 \subseteq L a_1 \). If the range of \( j(A) \) is contained in the range of \( K(A) \) then there exists \( a_2 \in A \) such that \( ja_1 \subseteq K a_2 \). Continue the process, we can construct two sequences \( \{a_n\} \) and \( \{a_n\} \) in \( A \) such that:

\[
ha_{2k} = L a_{2k-1} = b_{2k-1},
ja_{2k} = K a_{2k-1} = b_{2k-1}
\]

For a given \( n \in N \), if \( n \) is even, say \( n = 2k \) for some \( k \in N \) then, using (1), we obtain:

\[
G_p(ha_{2k}, ha_{2k}, Ka_{2k}), G_p(ha_{2k+1}, ha_{2k+1}, Ka_{2k+1})
\]

where:

\[
u_{u, a, b}(h, j, K, L) \in \begin{cases} G_p(Ka_{2k}, Kb_{2k}, Lb_{2k}), G_p(ha_{2k}, ha_{2k}, Ka_{2k}), \\ G_p(ja_{2k+1}, ja_{2k+1}, Lb_{2k+1}), \\ G_p(ha_{2k+1}, ha_{2k+1}, Lb_{2k+1}) + G_p(ja_{2k+1}, ja_{2k+1}, Ka_{2k+1}) \end{cases}
\]
If \( u_{a,\alpha}(h, j, K, L) = G_p = (b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) \) then \( G_p = (b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) \) then \( G_p = (b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) \), a contradiction. 

\[
G_p = \frac{G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) + G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}})}{2} \leq \frac{q}{2} \left[ G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) + G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) \right] \\
\left[ 1 - \frac{q}{2} \right] G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) = \frac{q}{2} \left[ G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) \right] \\
\left[ 2 - q \right] G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) \leq 2 \left[ G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) \right] \\
G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) \leq \frac{q}{2-q} \left[ G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) \right] \\
\text{Let } \hat{\delta} = \max \left\{ q, \frac{q}{2-q} \right\} < 1, \text{ then:} \\
G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) \leq \hat{\delta} G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) 
\] (3)

If \( n \) is odd, so \( n = 2k+1 \) for some \( k \in \mathbb{N} \). Then using (1) we obtain:

\[
G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) = G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) = G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) = G_f \left( h_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}, a_{a,\alpha}} \right) \leq u_{a,\alpha}(h, j, K, L), n \geq 1
\]

where:

\[
u_{a,\alpha}(h, j, K, L) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
G_f \left( h_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}, a_{a,\alpha}} \right) + G_f \left( h_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}, a_{a,\alpha}} \right) \\
G_f \left( h_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}, a_{a,\alpha}} \right) + G_f \left( h_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}, a_{a,\alpha}} \right) \\
2
\end{array} \right.
\]

Following the similar argument as above we obtain:

\[
G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) \leq \hat{\delta} G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) 
\] (4)

Consequently, we obtain:

\[
G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) = \hat{\delta} G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}})
\]

For \( m > n \) and using the rectangle inequality, we get:

\[
G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) \leq G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) + G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) + \cdots + G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) \\
- G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) - G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) - \cdots - G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) \\
\leq G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) + G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) + \cdots + G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) \\
\leq \delta^m G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) + \delta^{m-1} G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) + \cdots + \delta G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) \\
\leq \delta^m G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) + \delta^{m-1} G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) + \cdots + \delta G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) \\
\leq G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) + \delta G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) \\
\leq \delta G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}})
\]

This shows that \( G_f(b_{a, \alpha, b_{a,\alpha}}) \) converges to zero as \( m \) and \( n \) tend to infinity. Thus \( \{b_n\} \) is a Cauchy sequence in \( A \). Suppose \( K(A) \) is complete, then there exists a \( u \) in \( K(A) \) such that \( K_{a,\alpha} = b_{a,\alpha} \rightarrow u \) as \( k \rightarrow \infty \). It is equivalent to
K_{2k} = ja_{2k-1} = b_{2k-1} \implies u and b_{2k-1} = La_{2k-1} = ha_{2k-2} \implies u as 
k \to \infty.

Also

\[ G_p(u, u, u) = \lim_{k \to \infty} G_p(b_{2k-1}, u, u) = \lim_{k \to \infty} G_p(b_{2k-1}, b_{2k-1}, b_{2k-1}) = 0. \]

is

Suppose there is \( v \in A \) such that \( Kv = u \). Then we show that \( hv = u \). On the contrary, we have:

\[
G_p(hv, hv, u) \leq G_p(hv, hv, ja_{2k-1}) + G_p(ja_{2k-1}, ja_{2k-1}, u) \\
- G_p(ja_{2k-1}, ja_{2k-1}, ja_{2k-1}) \\
\leq G_p(hv, hv, ja_{2k-1}) + G_p(ja_{2k-1}, ja_{2k-1}, u) \\
\leq qu_{v, v, v}(h, j, K, L) + G_p(ja_{2k-1}, ja_{2k-1}, u)
\]

where:

\[
u_{v, v, v}(h, j, K, L) = \begin{cases} 
G_p(Kv, Kv, La_{2k-1}), & G_p(hv, hv, Kv), \\
G_p(ja_{2k-1}, ja_{2k-1}, La_{2k-1}), & G_p(hv, hv, La_{2k-1}), \\
G_p(ha_{2k-1}, ha_{2k-1}, Kv), & 2
\end{cases}
\]

for \( k \in \mathbb{N} \). Minimum of one from four possible elements could result from the set \( u_{v, v, v}(h, j, K, L) \) many times. Hence, four possible outcome can occur.

If \( u_{v, v, v}(h, j, K, L) = G_p(Kv, Kv, La_{2k-1}) \) then we have

\[ G_p(hv, hv, u) \leq qG_p(Kv, Kv, La_{2k-1}) + G_p(ja_{2k-1}, ja_{2k-1}, u). \]

As \( k \to \infty \) we obtain \( G_p(hv, hv, u) = 0 \). This implies that \( G_p(hv, hv, u) = 0 \).

If \( u_{v, v, v}(h, j, K, L) = G_p(hv, hv, Kv) \) then we have

\[ G_p(hv, hv, u) \leq qG_p(hv, hv, Kv) + (ja_{2k-1}, ja_{2k-1}, u). \]

As \( k \to \infty \) we get \( G_p(hv, hv, u) = 0 \). This implies that \( G_p(hv, hv, u) = 0 \).

If \( u_{v, v, v}(h, j, K, L) = G_p(ja_{2k-1}, ja_{2k-1}, La_{2k-1}) \) then we have

\[ G_p(ja_{2k-1}, ja_{2k-1}, u) \leq G_p(ja_{2k-1}, ja_{2k-1}, La_{2k-1}) + G_p(ja_{2k-1}, ja_{2k-1}, u). \]

As \( k \to \infty \) we get \( G_p(ja_{2k-1}, ja_{2k-1}, u) = 0 \). This implies that \( G_p(ja_{2k-1}, ja_{2k-1}, u) = 0 \).

If \( u_{v, v, v}(h, j, K, L) = G_p(ha_{2k-1}, ha_{2k-1}, Kv) \) then we have

\[ G_p(ha_{2k-1}, ha_{2k-1}, u) \leq G_p(ha_{2k-1}, ha_{2k-1}, Kv) + G_p(ja_{2k-1}, ja_{2k-1}, u). \]

As \( k \to \infty \) we get \( G_p(ha_{2k-1}, ha_{2k-1}, u) = 0 \). This implies that \( G_p(ha_{2k-1}, ha_{2k-1}, u) = 0 \).

Thus, in all four cases we have that \( G_p(hv, hv, u) = 0 \). This implies that \( u = h = k_v \). Therefore \( u \) is a point of coincidence of \( h \) and \( K \). Since \( u \in h(A) \subseteq L(A) \), then there exists a \( v \in A \) such that \( Lw = u \). We claim that \( jw = u \). On the contrary, let \( jw \neq u \), then using (1) we have:

\[
G_p(jw, jw, u) \leq G_p(jw, jw, ha_{2k-2}) + G_p(ha_{2k-2}, ha_{2k-2}, jw) \\
- G_p(ha_{2k-2}, ha_{2k-2}, jw) \\
\leq G_p(jw, jw, ha_{2k-2}) + G_p(ha_{2k-2}, ha_{2k-2}, jw) \\
\leq G_p(jw, jw, u) + qu_{v, v, v}(h, j, K, L)
\]

where:

\[
u_{v, v, v}(h, j, K, L) = \begin{cases} 
G_1(K_a, K_a, Lw), G_2(ha_{2k-2}, Lw), \\
G_3(ha_{2k-2}, Lw), G_4(jw, jw, K_a)
\end{cases}
\]

for \( k \in \mathbb{N} \). Minimum of one from four possible elements could result from the set \( u_{v, v, v}(h, j, K, L) \) many times. Hence, four possible outcome can occur.

If \( u_{v, v, v}(h, j, K, L) = (K_a, K_a, Lw) \) then we have

\[ G_p(jw, jw, u) \leq G_1(K_a, K_a, Lw) + G_2(ha_{2k-2}, Lw) \]

As \( k \to \infty \) we obtain \( G_p(jw, jw, u) = 0 \). This implies that \( G_p(jw, jw, u) = 0 \).

If \( u_{v, v, v}(h, j, K, L) = G_p(ha_{2k-2}, ha_{2k-2}) \) then we have

\[ G_p(jw, jw, u) \leq G_3(ha_{2k-2}, ha_{2k-2}) \]

As \( k \to \infty \) we obtain \( G_p(jw, jw, u) = 0 \). This implies that \( G_p(jw, jw, u) = 0 \).

If \( u_{v, v, v}(h, j, K, L) = G_p(ha_{2k-2}, ha_{2k-2}, Lw) \) then we have

\[ G_p(jw, jw, u) \leq G_4(jw, jw, K_a) \]

As \( k \to \infty \) we obtain \( G_p(jw, jw, u) = 0 \). This implies that \( G_p(jw, jw, u) = 0 \).

If \( u_{v, v, v}(h, j, K, L) = G_p(jw, jw, K_a) \)

As \( k \to \infty \) we have \( G_p(jw, jw, u) = 0 \). This implies that \( G_p(jw, jw, u) = 0 \).
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If \( u_{2k,v,w}(h, j, K, L) = G_p(ha_{2k}, Ka_{2k}, Ka_{2k}) \) then \( G_p(u, jw, jw) \leq G_p(u, ha_{2k}, ha_{2k}) + qG_p(ha_{2k}, ha_{2k}, Ka_{2k}) \).

As \( k \to \infty \) we have \( G_p(u, jw, jw) \leq 0 \). This implies that \( G_p(u, jw, jw) = 0 \).

If \( u_{2k,v,w}(h, j, K, L) = G_j(jw, Lw, Lw) \) then \( G_p(u, jw, jw) \leq G_p(u, ha_{2k}, ha_{2k}) + qG_p(jw, Lw, Lw) \).

As \( k \to \infty \) we have \( G_p(u, jw, jw) \leq qG_p(jw, u, u) = qG_p(u, jw, jw) \).

If \( u_{2k,v,w}(h, j, K, L) = \frac{G_p(ha_{2k}, Lw, Lw)}{2} + G_p(jw, Ka_{2k}, Ka_{2k}) \) then \( G_p(u, jw, jw) \leq \frac{q}{2} G_p(jw, u, u) = \frac{q}{2} G_p(u, jw, jw) \).

Let \( \max \left\{ q, \frac{q}{2} \right\} = q \). Then:

\[
G_p(u, jw, jw) \leq qG_p(u, u, jw)
\]

Combining (3) and (4) yields:

\[
G_p(u, u, jw) \leq qG_p(u, jw, jw) \leq q^2G_p(u, u, jw)
\]

This is a contradiction since \( q < 1 \), hence \( u = jw = Lw \).

Thus \( \{h, K\} \) and \( \{j, L\} \) have common point of coincidence in \( A \). Now, if \( \{h, K\} \) and \( \{j, L\} \) are weakly compatible then \( hu = hKv = Khv = Ku = w_1 \) (say) and \( jv = Ljv = Lu = w_2 \) (say).

Now we show that the points of coincidence are unique:

\[
G_p(w_1, w_2, w_1) \leq G_p(hu, hu, ju) \leq qu_{u,v,u}(h, j, K, L)
\]

where:

\[
u_{u,v,u}(h, j, K, L) = \begin{cases} G_p(Ku, Ku, Lu), & G_p(hu, hu, Ku), G_p(ju, ju, Lu) \\ \frac{G_p(hu, hu, Lu) + G_p(ju, ju, Ku)}{2} \\ \frac{G_p(w_1, w_1, w_1), G_p(w_1, w_1, w_1)}{2} \\ \frac{G_p(w_1, w_1, w_1) + G_p(w_2, w_2, w_2)}{2} \\ \frac{G_p(w_1, w_1, w_1) + G_p(w_2, w_2, w_2)}{2} \end{cases}
\]

If \( u_{u,v,u}(h, j, K, L) = \frac{G_p(w_1, w_1, w_1) + G_p(w_2, w_2, w_2)}{2} \), then

\[
G_p(w_1, w_1, w_1) \leq \frac{q}{2} G_p(w_1, w_1, w_1) + G_p(w_1, w_1, w_1)\]

\[
\leq \frac{q}{2 - q} G_p(w_2, w_2, w_2)
\]

(5)

In like manner, we rely on (2) and follow same step to achieve next result:

\[
G_p(w_1, w_1, w_1) \leq \frac{q}{2 - q} G_p(w_1, w_1, w_1)
\]

(6)

Combining (5) and (6) gives:

\[
G_p(w_1, w_1, w_1) \leq \left( \frac{q}{2 - q} \right)^2 G_p(w_1, w_1, w_1)
\]

A contradiction. Thus \( w_1 = w_2 \) and hence \( hu = ju = Ku = Lu \).

Next, we show that \( u \) is the common fixed point of \( h, j, K \) and \( L \). We claim that \( u = ju \):

\[
G_p(u, u, ju) = G_p(hv, hv, ju) \leq qu_{u,v,u}(h, j, K, L)
\]

where:

\[
u_{u,v,u}(h, j, K, L) = \begin{cases} G_p(Kv, Kv, Lu), G_p(hv, hv, Ku), G_p(ju, ju, Lu) \\ \frac{G_p(hv, hv, Lu) + G_p(ju, ju, Ku)}{2} \\ \frac{G_p(u, u, u), G_p(u, u, u), G_p(ju, ju, u)}{2} \\ \frac{G_p(ju, ju, u) + G_p(ju, ju, u)}{2} \end{cases}
\]

If \( u_{u,v,u}(h, j, K, L) = G_p(ju, ju, u) \) then

\[
G_p(u, u, ju) \leq qG_p(ju, ju, u) = qG_p(u, u, ju)
\]

If \( u_{u,v,u}(h, j, K, L) = \frac{1}{2} G_p(ju, ju, u) \) then

\[
G_p(u, u, ju) \leq \frac{q}{2} G_p(ju, ju, u) = \frac{q}{2} G_p(u, u, ju)
\]

Let \( \max \left\{ q, \frac{q}{2} \right\} = q \) then:

\[
G_p(u, u, ju) \leq qG_p(u, u, ju)
\]

(7)

With the aid of (2) and following the same procedure as above yields the understated:
Combining (7) and (8) gives, \( G_p(u, ju, ju) \leq qG_p(u, u, u) \), a contradiction.

Hence:

\[
    u = hu = ju = Ku = Lu
\]

Suppose there is a different common fixed point of \( h, j, K \) and \( L \) say \( u = hu = jv = K = L \), then:

\[
    G_p(u, u, t) = G_p(hu, hu, jt) \leq qG_p(h, j, K, L)
\]

Let:

\[
    u_{n, u}(h, j, K, L) = G_p(u, u, t) \text{ then } G_p(u, u, t) \leq qG_p(u, u, t)
\]

a contradiction \( u_{n, u}(h, j, K, L) = \frac{G_p(u, u, t) + G_p(t, t, u)}{q} \) then:

\[
    G_p(u, u, t) \leq \frac{q}{2} \left( G_p(u, u, t) + G_p(t, t, u) \right)
\]

Let \( \max \left\{ q, \frac{q}{2} \right\} = q \) then:

\[
    G_p(u, u, t) \leq qG_p(t, t, u) = qG_p(u, u, t)
\]

Similarly, we have:

\[
    G_p(u, t, t) \leq qG_p(t, t, u)
\]

Combining (9) and (10) yields \( G_p(u, u, t) \leq qG_p(u, u, t) \), a contradiction since \( q < 1 \). Thus, the uniqueness is proved.

**Corollary 2.2**

Let \( h, j \) and \( L \) be self-maps of a G-partial metric space \( A \) satisfying \( h(A) \cup j(A) \subseteq L(A) \) and \( G_p(ha, ha, jb) \leq qG_p(h, j, L) \), where \( q \in (0, 1) \) and:

\[
    u_{n, u}(h, j, K, L) \in \begin{cases} G_p(ha, ha, Lb) + G_p(hb, j, La) \end{cases}
\]

and \( G_p(ha, ha, jb) \leq qG_p(ha, j, L) \) where \( q \in (0, 1) \) and:

\[
    u_{n, u}(h, j, K, L) \in \begin{cases} G_p(ha, La, La) + G_p(jb, j, La) \end{cases}
\]

for all \( a, b \in A \). If one of \( h(A), j(A) \) or \( L(A) \) is a complete subspace of \( A \), then \( h, j, K \) and \( j, L \) have a unique point of coincidence in \( A \). Additionally, if \( h, L \) and \( j, L \) are weakly compatible, then \( h, j, L \) and \( K, L \) have a unique common fixed point.

**Theorem 2.3**

Let \( h, j, K \) and \( L \) be self-maps of a G-partial metric space \( A \) satisfying \( h(A) \subseteq L(A), j(A) \subseteq K(A) \) and:

\[
    G_p(ha, ha, jb) \leq pG_p(Ka, Ka, Lb) + qG_p(ha, ha, Ka) + rG_p(jb, jb, Lb)
\]

and:

\[
    G_p(ha, ha, jb) \leq pG_p(Ka, Lb, Lb) + qG_p(ha, Ka, Ka) + rG_p(jb, Lb, Lb)
\]

for all \( a, b \in A \), where \( p, q, r, t \in (0, 1) \) satisfy \( p + q + r + t < 1 \).

If one of \( h(A), j(A), K(A) \) or \( L(A) \) is a complete subspace of \( A \), then \( h, K \) and \( j, L \) have a unique point of coincidence in \( A \). Additionally, if \( h, K \) and \( j, L \) are weakly compatible, then \( h, j, K \) and \( L \) have a unique common fixed point.

**Proof**

For any arbitrary \( a_0 \in A \), we can generate two sequence \( \{a_n\} \) and \( \{b_n\} \) in \( A \) as in the proof of Theorem 1. Then:

\[
    G_p(b_{n+1}, a_{n+1}, b_n)
\]

\[
    = G_p(b_{2n+1}, b_{2n+1}, b_{2n})
\]

\[
    = G_p(h_{2n+1}, h_{2n+1}, j_{2n+1})
\]

\[
    \leq qG_p(K_{2n+1}, h_{2n+1}, La_{2n+1}) + qG_p(ha_{2n+1}, h_{2n+1}, Ka_{2n+1})
\]
\[+rG_p(ja_{2k+1}, ja_{2k+1}, Ka_{2k+1})
+ \alpha G_p(ha_{2k+1}, ha_{2k+1}, Ka_{2k+1})
+ G_p(ja_{2k+1}, ja_{2k+1}, Kj_a_{2k+1}) \leq pG_p(b_{2k}, b_{2k}, b_{2k+1})
+ qG_p(b_{2k+1}, b_{2k+1}, b_{2k+1})
\]

Consequently, we obtain \(G_p(b_{n+1}, b_{n+1}, b_n) \leq \lambda^n G_p(b_1, b_1, b_0)\).

For \(m > n\) and using the rectangle inequality we get:

\[G_p(b_{n+1}, b_{n+1}, b_n) \leq G_p(b_{n+1}, b_{n+1}, b_n) + G_p(b_{n+1}, b_{n+1}, b_n)
+ \ldots + G_p(b_{n+1}, b_{n+1}, b_n)
\]

This implies that \(G_p(b_m, b_m, b_n) \to 0\) as \(m, n \to \infty\). Thus \(\{b_n\}\) is a Cauchy sequence in \(A\). Suppose \(K(A)\) such that \(K_{a_{2k-1}} = b_{2k-1} \to u\) as \(k \to \infty\). It is equivalent to \(K(a_{2k+1}) = b_{2k+1} \to u\) and \(b_{2k+1} = L_{a_{2k+1}} = b_{2k+2} \to v\) as \(k \to \infty\). Also \(G_p(u, u, u) = \lim_{k \to \infty} G_p(b_{2k}, b_{2k}, b_0) = \lim_{m \to \infty} G_p(b_m, b_m, b_0) = 0\).

Consequently, we can find a \(v \in A\) such that \(Kv = u\). We claim that \(hv = u\). On the contrary we have:

\[G_p(hv, hv, u) \leq G_p(hv, hv, ja_{2k-1}) + G_p(ja_{2k-1}, ja_{2k-1}, u)
- G_p(ja_{2k-1}, ja_{2k-1}, ja_{2k-1}) \leq G_p(hv, hv, ja_{2k-1}) + G_p(ja_{2k-1}, ja_{2k-1}, u)
\]

As \(k \to \infty\) we obtain:

\[\lambda^k \in [0, 1]\]
where:
\[ z = \frac{t}{1-p-1} \leq 1 \]  \hspace{1cm} (15)

Using (12) we have:
\[ G_p (w_i, w_j, w_k) = G_p (hu, ju, ku) \]
\[ \leq pG_p (Ku, Lu, Ku) + qG_p (hu, Ku, Ku) \]
\[ + rG_p (ju, ku, Ku) \]
\[ + tG_p (hu, ku, ku) \]
\[ = pG_p (w_i, w_j, w_k) + qG_p (w_i, w_j, w_k) \]
\[ + rG_p (w_i, w_j, w_k) \]
\[ + tG_p (w_i, w_j, w_k) \]
\[ = (p + t)G_p (w_i, w_j, w_k) + rG_p (w_i, w_j, w_k) \]
\[ \leq zG_p (w_i, w_j, w_k) \]

where:
\[ z = \frac{t}{1-1-p} < 1 \]  \hspace{1cm} (16)

Combining (15) and (16) yields:
\[ G_p (w_i, w_j, w_k) \leq zG_p (w_i, w_j, w_k) \leq z^2G_p (w_i, w_j, w_k) \]

This implies that \( G_p(w_i, w_j, w_k) = 0 \). Hence \( w_i = w_j = w_k \).

Since the point of coincidence is unique we have
\( Ku = hu = Lu = ju = 0 \).

Now we shall show that \( u = ju \).

Using (11):
\[ G_p (u, u, ku) = G_p (hu, hu, ju) \]
\[ \leq pG_p (Ku, Lu, ku) + qG_p (hu, ku, ku) \]
\[ + rG_p (ju, ku, ku) \]
\[ + tG_p (hu, ku, ku) \]
\[ = pG_p (u, u, w_i) + qG_p (u, u, w_i) \]
\[ + rG_p (u, u, w_i) \]
\[ + tG_p (u, u, w_i) \]
\[ = (p + t)G_p (u, u, w_i) + rG_p (u, u, w_i) \]
\[ \leq zG_p (u, u, w_i) \]

Using (12):
\[ G_p(u, u, ju) = G_j(hu, ju, ju) \]
\[ \leq pG_j(Ku, Lu, Lu) + qG_p(hu, Ku, Ku) \]
\[ + pG_j(ju, La, Lu) \]
\[ + t\left[ G_p(hu, Ku, Ku) + G_j(ju, Ku, Ku) \right] \]
\[ = pG_j(u, u, u) + qG_j(u, u, u) \]
\[ + rG_j(ju, u, u) \]
\[ + t\left[ G_j(u, u, u) + G_j(ju, u, u) \right] \]
\[ = (r + t)G_j(u, u, u) = (r + t)G_p(u, u, ju) \]  \hspace{1cm} (18)

From (17) and (18) we obtain \( Gp(u, u, ju) \leq (r+t)Gp(u, u, ju) \).

Since \( (r+t)<1 \) then \( Gp(u, u, ju) = 0 \). Thus \( ju = u \); \( u \) is the common fixed point of \( h, j, K \) and \( L \). The uniqueness of the common fixed point of \( h, j, K \) and \( L \) is proveable.

**Corollary 2.4**

Let \( h \) and \( L \) be self-maps of a \( G \)-partial metric space \( A \) satisfying \( h(A) \subset L(A) \) and:

\[ G_p(ha, ha, hb) \leq pG_j(La, La, Lb) + qG_p(ha, La) \]
\[ + pG_j(hb, hb, Lb) \]
\[ + t\left[ G_p(ha, La, La) + G_j(hb, La, La) \right] \]  \hspace{1cm} (19)

and

\[ G_p(ha, hb, hb) \leq pG_j(La, Lb, Lb) + qG_p(ha, La) \]
\[ + pG_j(hb, Lb, Lb) \]
\[ + t\left[ G_p(ha, La, Lb) + G_j(hb, Lb, La) \right] \]  \hspace{1cm} (20)

for all \( a, b \in A \), where \( p, q, r, t \in [0, 1) \) satisfy \( p+q+r+t<1 \).

If one of \( h(A) \) or \( L(A) \) is a complete subspace of \( A \), then \( h \) and \( L \) have a unique point of coincidence in \( A \). Moreover if \( h \) and \( L \) are weakly compatible, then \( h \) and \( L \) have a unique common fixed point.

**Conclusion**

We prove that the common fixed point exist and it’s unique for four maps which satisfy some generalized contractive maps in \( G \)-partial metric spaces. We avoided the use of any map to arrive at our outcome.
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