Review of: "Common Fixed Point Results for Fuzzy F-Contractive Mappings in a Dislocated Metric Spaces With Application"

Sanjib Kumar Datta[1]

1 University of Kalyani

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Referee Report

Title of the paper: Common Fixed Point Results for Fuzzy F-Contractive Mappings in a Dislocated Metric Spaces With Application

Author's names: Muhammed Raji[1], Musa Adeku Ibrahim[2], Kamilu Rauf[3], Rotimi Kehinde[2]

After going through the paper, I have the following observations:

1. Overview : The paper focuses mainly on a new approach to proving the existence and uniqueness of a common fixed point for fuzzy mappings that satisfy Ciric type F-contraction and Hardy-Roger type F-contraction in a complete dislocated metric space. Also, the authors have applied their findings to obtain a common fixed-point result for multivalued mappings in dislocated metric spaces. Moreover, the authors have given an illustration to validate the result proved.

2. Key findings : The key findings of the paper are lying in the Theorems 3.1, 3.2, 3.8, 3.9 as proved by the authors which mostly focus on the existence and uniqueness of a common fixed point for fuzzy mappings that satisfy Ciric type F-contraction and Hardy-Roger type F-contraction in a complete dislocated metric space.

3. Title : Suitable for the paper.

4. Abstract : More or less okay.

5. Main Contribution : The main contribution of the paper is the generalization of the existing theories & results as discussed and sketched here.

6. Comparison with previous similar efforts : The results proved in the present paper are

comparable with previous similar efforts in terms of generalization of the theories & the methodologies as derived here. Those have actually enhanced and generalized some previous results.

5. Identification strategy : There are seven theorems in the paper which have been proved by the authors in generalizing the earlier results as mentioned in the existing literature. In my opinion, Theorem 3.1 & Theorem 3.2 is the key result from the view point of the identification strategy of the paper and it improves upon previous efforts in terms of generalization of existing results and methodologies.

6. Other attempts before : Done as shown in the 'References' section. The reference list is updated and resourceful. But the reference list is not listed in the conventional sequence.

7. Interest of the field of research : Considerable.

8. Importance of the results : Average.

9. Examples and counter examples : No counterexample, in fact, only one example is given in the paper.

10. Future scope of work & Open problem : Not explicitly stated in the 'Conclusion' part.

11. Others: The authors have clearly and nicely mentioned in their paper- 'Acknowledgement', 'Authors contributions' , 'Conflicting interests', 'Funding', 'Data availability', etc.. But there are some typographical errors like 'Rotimi Kehinde[2]' , 'Theorem 3.8' , 'Corollary 3.8' etc..

Therefore, in my opinion, the paper may be accepted in the journal after resubmission implementing proper modification and incorporation of the comments made above. The authors are suggested mainly to revise the

serial numbers 6, 9, 10 & 11 as above.

*****