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

Alexander Sostak[1]

1 University of Latvia

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper should be rejected since it has basic errors which make the whole work meaningless. Below I explain my decision.

The authors define a dislocated metric, i.e., the main notion of their work, as follows. A dislocated metric on a set X is a mapping d: X \times X \to R+ such that (1) d(x,y)=0 if x=y; (2)d(x,y) = d(y,x); (3) d(x,z) \leq d(x,y) + d(y,z). (Note: Changed d(y,x) to d(y,z) for consistency with the inequality relation.)

Unfortunately, it is not a dislocated metric, a new important introduced by Hitzler and Seda (ref [14] in the author's paper), but just a pseudometric, a well-known (since the beginning of the 20th century!) generalization of a metric and studied by many authors, in particular, fixed points of fuzzy contractive mappings.

On the other hand, the first axiom in a dislocated metric is given by (1') if x\not=y then d(x,y) \not = 0. Thus there is a principal difference between metrics, pseudometrics, quasimetrics, and other classical generalizations of metrics on one side and dislocated metrics on the other. In particular, in a dislocated metric, the distance from a point to itself can be not equal to 0 - this is the reason why they are called dislocated. The technique appropriate for the study of dislocated metrics is completely different from the standard tools used for metrics and their classical generalizations.

To conclude, there is nothing related to dislocated metrics in the paper, and this, in particular, proves the ignorance of the authors in the subject they pretend to study. The paper should be rejected.