

F_g -Metric Spaces

Ansari Shakeel Anjum and Chintaman Tukaram Aage

Abstract — This paper introduces the concept of F_g -metric Space. We generalize the concept of G-metric space. Some supporting examples are given.

Keywords — F_g -metric space, F_g -metric, Generalized metric space.

I. INTRODUCTION

2-metric spaces as a generalization of metric spaces were introduced by Gahler [1]-[2]. The definition is as follows,

Definition 1.1. Let X be a nonempty set. A function $d: X \times X \times X \rightarrow R$ satisfying the following properties:

- (A1) For distinct points $x, y \in X$, there is $z \in X$, such that $d(x, y, z) \neq 0$,
- (A2) $d(x, y, z) = 0$ if two of the triple $x, y, z \in X$ are equal,
- (A3) $d(x, y, z) = d(x, z, y) = d(y, z, x) = \dots$, (symmetry in all three variables),
- (A4) $d(x, y, z) \leq d(x, y, a) + d(x, a, z) + d(a, y, z)$ for all $x, y, z, a \in X$, (rectangle inequality),

is called 2-metric, on X . The set X equipped with such 2-metric is called a 2-metric space. Some authors disproved Gahler's claim that a 2-metric is a generalization of the usual notion of a metric. They proved that these spaces have no relation [3]. Bapurao Dhage tried to rectify these flaws and introduced a new class of generalized metrics called D-metrics [4]-[8].

Definition 1.2. A function $D: X \times X \times X \rightarrow R$ is a D-metric if it satisfies axioms (A3) and (A4), but with (A1) and (A2) replaced by the single axiom:

- (A0) $D(x, y, z) = 0$ if and only if $x = y = z$.

An additional property sometimes imposed by Dhage on a D-metric is,

- (A5) $D(x, y, y) \leq D(x, z, z) + D(z, y, y)$ for all $x, y, z \in X$.

Dhage claimed that metric functions are special case of D-metrics and proved many fixed point results in D-metric spaces as a generalization of such results in metric spaces. But Zead Mustafa and Brailey Sims pointed some flaws in claims of Dhage regarding fundamental topological properties of D-metric spaces, D-convergence of a sequence (x_n) to x and continuity of D metric function in its variables[9]. Keeping these flaws in mind Zead Mustafa and Brailey Sims came up with more appropriate notion of generalized metric space.

Definition 1.3. Let X be a nonempty set and let $G: X \times X \times X \rightarrow R$, be a function satisfying the following:

- (G1) $g(x, y, z) = 0$ if $x = y = z$,
- (G2) $0 < g(x, x, y)$; for all $x, y \in X$, with $x \neq y$,
- (G3) $g(x, x, y) \leq g(x, y, z)$, for all $x, y, z \in X$ with $z \neq y$,
- (G4) $g(x, y, z) = g(x, z, y) = g(y, z, x) = \dots$, (symmetry in all three variables),
- (G5) $g(x, y, z) \leq g(x, a, a) + g(a, y, z)$ for all $x, y, z, a \in X$, (rectangle inequality)

In 2018 M. Jleli and B. Samet coined the concept of F-metric space as generalization of the metric space and they did comparative study of F-metric space with existing generalization of metric spaces. Also, they discussed natural topology on these spaces and proved a new version of the Banach contraction principle in the setting of F-metric spaces [10].

II. PRELIMINARIES

Reference [11] considered a nonlinear function $F: (0, \infty) \rightarrow R$ with the following characteristics:

- (F1) F is strictly increasing,
- (F2) for any sequence $\{t_n\} \subset (0, \infty)$, we have

Published on March 11, 2023.

A. Shakeel Anjum, Maharashtra College of Arts, Science and Commerce, Mumbai, India.

(e-mail: shakeelansari9763@gmail.com)

C. Tukaram Aage, KBC North Maharashtra University, Jalgaon, India.

(corresponding e-mail: caage17@gmail.com)

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t_n = 0 \Leftrightarrow \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(t_n) = -\infty,$$

(F3) there exists $l \in (0,1)$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} t^l F(t) = 0$.

Let $B = \{F: (0, \infty) \rightarrow R/F \text{ satisfies } (F_1) - (F_2)\}$.

Definition 2.1. Let X be a nonempty set. Suppose that there exists $(f, \alpha) \in B \times [0, \infty)$ and let $g : X \times X \times X \rightarrow R$, be a function satisfying the following:

- (g1) $g(x, y, z) = 0$ if $x = y = z$,
- (g2) $0 < g(x, x, y)$; for all $x, y \in X$, with $x \neq y$,
- (g3) $g(x, x, y) \leq g(x, y, z)$, for all $x, y, z \in X$ with $z \neq y$,
- (g4) $g(x, y, z) = g(x, z, y) = g(y, z, x) = \dots$, (symmetry in all three variables),
- (g5) for every $x, y, z \in X$ and $(u_i)_{i=1}^m \subset X, m \in N, m \geq 2$, with $u_1 = x$, we have
- (g6)

$$g(x, y, z) > 0 \text{ implies } f(g(x, y, z)) \leq f \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} (g(u_i, u_{i+1}, u_{i+1})) \right) + g(u_m, y, z) \right] + \alpha.$$

Then g is said to be F_g -metric and the pair (X, g) is said to be F_g -metric space.

It is important to note that $g(x, x, y)$ and $g(x, y, y)$ need not be equal in F_g -metric space. Consider the following example.

Example 2.2. Let $X = \{a, b\}$ and define g on X as $g(a, a, a) = g(b, b, b) = 0, g(a, a, b) = g(a, b, a) = g(b, a, a) = 2$ and $g(a, b, b) = g(b, a, b) = g(b, b, a) = 1$. It can be easily verified that with $f = \log$ and $\alpha = 0$, (X, g) forms F_g -metric space, where $g(a, a, b) \neq g(a, b, b)$.

Definition 2.3. A F_g -metric space (X, g) is said to be symmetric if

$$g(x, x, y) = g(x, y, y) \text{ for all } x, y \in X.$$

We can see that F_g -metric space is generalization of G -metric space. To prove this, first we will prove that every G -metric space is F_g -metric space.

If g is a G -metric spaces then (g1) to (g4) follows directly. Also, from (G5) of G -metric space we have, for $u_1 = x, m \geq 2, m \in N$ and $(u_i)_{i=1}^m, y, z \in X$

$$g(x, y, z) \leq \left[\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} g(u_i, u_{i+1}, u_{i+1}) \right] + g(u_m, y, z).$$

If $g(x, y, z) > 0$, then

$$\log (g(x, y, z)) \leq \log \left(\left[\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} g(u_i, u_{i+1}, u_{i+1}) \right] + g(u_m, y, z) \right).$$

So g satisfies (g5) with $f = \log$ and $\alpha = 0$. Now we present examples of F_g -metric spaces which are not G -metric spaces.

Example 2.4. Let $X = N$. Let us define g as

$$g(x, y, z) = \begin{cases} 0 & : \text{if } x = y = z \\ \exp (|x - y| + |y - z| + |z - x|) & : \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Here we can observe that $g(1,2,4) = \exp (6), g(1,3,3) = \exp (4)$ and $g(3,2,4) = \exp (4)$. So clearly g is not G - metric as it doesn't satisfy (G5),

$$g(1,2,4) = \exp (6) > 2 \exp (4) = g(1,3,3) + g(3,2,4).$$

Now we will prove that g is F_g -metric space. It can be easily verified that g satisfies (g1), (g2) and (g4). We will just verify (g3) and (g5). By the definition of g , we have

$$\begin{aligned} g(x, y, y) &= \exp (|x - y| + |y - x|) \\ g(x, y, z) &= \exp (|x - y| + |y - z| + |z - x|). \end{aligned}$$

Also, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} |x - y| &\leq |x - z| + |z - y| \\ |x - y| + |x - y| &\leq |x - y| + |x - z| + |z - y| \\ \exp(|x - y| + |x - y|) &\leq \exp(|x - y| + |x - z| + |z - y|) \\ g(x, y, y) &\leq g(x, y, z). \end{aligned}$$

Thus (g3) is satisfied here. Now we will prove (g5). Let us fix certain $x, y, z \in X$ with $g(x, y, z) > 0$. Let $(u_i)_{i=1}^m \subset X$, where $m \in \mathbb{N}, m \geq 2$, and $u_1 = x$. Let in the range of $i = 1$ to $i = m - 1$ sum runs over index set I if all three points are equal and sum runs over index set J otherwise.

$$\begin{aligned} &1 + f\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} (g(u_i, u_{i+1}, u_{i+1})) + g(u_m, y, z)\right) - f(g(x, y, z)) \\ = &1 - \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} (g(u_i, u_{i+1}, u_{i+1})) + g(u_m, y, z)} + \frac{1}{g(x, y, z)} \\ = &1 - \frac{1}{\sum_J (|u_i - u_{i+1}| + |u_{i+1} - u_{i+1}| + |u_{i+1} - u_i|) + g(u_m, y, z)} + \frac{1}{\exp(|x - y| + |x - z| + |z - y|)}. \end{aligned}$$

Also, we have $g(u_m, y, z)$ has value 0 if $u_m = y = z$ otherwise it has value $\exp(|u_m - y| + |y - z| + |z - u_m|)$. So, in any case we have

$$\frac{1}{\sum_J (|u_i - u_{i+1}| + |u_{i+1} - u_{i+1}| + |u_{i+1} - u_i|) + g(u_m, y, z)} \leq 1.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} &1 + f\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} (g(u_i, u_{i+1}, u_{i+1})) + g(u_m, y, z)\right) - f(g(x, y, z)) \\ &\geq 1 - 1 + \frac{1}{\exp(|x - y| + |x - z| + |z - y|)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\exp(|x - y| + |x - z| + |z - y|)} \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$f(g(x, y, z)) \leq f\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} (g(u_i, u_{i+1}, u_{i+1})) + g(u_m, y, z)\right) + 1.$$

That is, (g5) is satisfied and (X, g) is F_g -metric space with $f = \frac{-1}{t}$ and $\alpha = 1$.

Example 2.5. Let $X =$ Set of nonnegative integers. Let us define $g: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$g(x, y, z) = \begin{cases} \max\{(x - y)^2, (y - z)^2, (z - x)^2\} & : \text{if } x, y, z \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\} \\ \max\{|x - y|, |y - z|, |z - x|\} & : \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Here we can observe that $g(0, 1, 3) = 9, g(0, 2, 2) = 4$ and $g(2, 1, 3) = 4$. So clearly g is not G metric. Since it doesn't satisfy (G5), as

$$g(0, 1, 3) = 9 > 4 + 4 = g(0, 2, 2) + g(2, 1, 3).$$

Now we will prove that g is F_g -metric space. It can be easily verified that g satisfies (g1), (g2) and (g4). We will just verify (g3) and (g5). By the definition of g , we have

$$g(x, x, y) = \begin{cases} (x - y)^2 & : \text{if } x, y, z \in \{0,1,2,3\} \\ |x - y| & : \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$g(x, y, z) = \begin{cases} \max\{(x - y)^2, (y - z)^2, (z - x)^2\} & : \text{if } x, y, z \in \{0,1,2,3\} \\ \max\{|x - y|, |y - z|, |z - x|\} & : \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since $|x - y| \leq \max\{|x - y|, |y - z|, |z - x|\}$ and $(x - y)^2 \leq \max\{(x - y)^2, (y - z)^2, (z - x)^2\}$, we have

$$g(x, x, y) \leq g(x, y, z), \text{ for all } x, y, z \in X \text{ with } z \neq y.$$

Let us fix certain $x, y, z \in X$ with $g(x, y, z) > 0$. Let $(u_i)_{i=1}^m \subset X$, where $m \in \mathbb{N}, m \geq 2$ and $u_1 = x$. Let in the range of $i = 1$ to $i = m - 1$ sum runs over index set I if all three points lies in the set $\{0,1,2,3\}$ and sum runs over index set J otherwise.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} g(u_i, u_{i+1}, u_{i+1}) &= \sum_{i \in I} g(u_i, u_{i+1}, u_{i+1}) + \sum_{i \in J} g(u_i, u_{i+1}, u_{i+1}) \\ &= \sum_{i \in I} \max\{(u_i - u_{i+1})^2, (u_{i+1} - u_{i+1})^2, (u_{i+1} - u_i)^2\} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \in J} \max\{|u_i - u_{i+1}|, |u_{i+1} - u_{i+1}|, |u_{i+1} - u_i|\}. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the following two cases,

Case I: If $(x, y, z) \notin \{0,1,2,3\}$.

$$\begin{aligned} g(x, y, z) &= \max\{|x - y| + |y - z| + |z - x|\} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \max\{|u_i - u_{i+1}| + |u_{i+1} - u_{i+1}| + |u_{i+1} - u_i|\} \\ &\quad + \max\{|u_m - y| + |y - z| + |z - u_m|\} \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in I} \max\{|u_i - u_{i+1}|, |u_{i+1} - u_{i+1}|, |u_{i+1} - u_i|\} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \in J} \max\{|u_i - u_{i+1}|, |u_{i+1} - u_{i+1}|, |u_{i+1} - u_i|\} \\ &\quad + \max\{|u_m - y|, |y - z|, |z - u_m|\}. \end{aligned}$$

Using inequality, $|x - y| \leq (x - y)^2$ for all $x, y \in Z$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g(x, y, z) &\leq \sum_{i \in I} \max\{(u_i - u_{i+1})^2, (u_{i+1} - u_{i+1})^2, (u_{i+1} - u_i)^2\} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \in J} \max\{|u_i - u_{i+1}|, |u_{i+1} - u_{i+1}|, |u_{i+1} - u_i|\} \\ &\quad + \max\{|u_m - y|, |y - z|, |z - u_m|\}, \text{ if } u_m, y, z \notin \{0,1,2,3\}. \end{aligned}$$

And

$$\begin{aligned} g(x, y, z) &\leq \sum_{i \in I} \max\{(u_i - u_{i+1})^2, (u_{i+1} - u_{i+1})^2, (u_{i+1} - u_i)^2\} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \in J} \max\{|u_i - u_{i+1}|, |u_{i+1} - u_{i+1}|, |u_{i+1} - u_i|\} \\ &\quad + \max\{(u_m - y)^2, (y - z)^2, (z - u_m)^2\}, \text{ if } u_m, y, z \in \{0,1,2,3\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$g(x, y, z) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} (g(u_i, u_{i+1}, u_{i+1})) + g(u_m, y, z).$$

Case II: If $x, y, z \in \{0,1,2,3\}$.

$$g(x, y, z) = \max\{(x - y)^2, (y - z)^2, (z - x)^2\} \\ \leq 3\max\{|x - y|, |y - z|, |z - x|\}.$$

Following same steps as in Case I, we get,

$$g(x, y, z) \leq 3 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} (g(u_i, u_{i+1}, u_{i+1})) + g(u_m, y, z) \right).$$

So, in any case, for every $x, y, z \in X, (u_i)_{i=1}^m \subset X$, where $m \in \mathbb{N}, m \geq 2$ and $u_1 = x$, we have,

$$g(x, y, z) \leq 3 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} (g(u_i, u_{i+1}, u_{i+1})) + g(u_m, y, z) \right).$$

If $g(x, y, z) > 0$, then

$$\log g(x, y, z) \leq \log \left[3 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} (g(u_i, u_{i+1}, u_{i+1})) + g(u_m, y, z) \right) \right] \\ = \log 3 + \log \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} (g(u_i, u_{i+1}, u_{i+1})) + g(u_m, y, z) \right).$$

This proves that g satisfies (g_5) with $f(t) = \log t, t > 0$ and $\alpha = \log 3$. Thus g is an F_g -metric on X .

III. THE F_g -METRIC TOPOLOGY

Definition 3.1. Let (X, g) be an F_g -metric space and $\{x_n\}$ be sequence of points of X . A point $x \in X$ is said to be the limit of the sequence $\{x_n\}$ if for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $g(x, x_n, x_n) < \epsilon$ or $g(x, x, x_n) < \epsilon$ for all $n \geq N$. We say that the sequence $\{x_n\}$ is F_g -convergent to x .

Definition 3.2. Let (X, g) be an F_g -metric space. Then the sequence $\{x_n\}$ is said to be F_g -Cauchy if for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $g(x_l, x_m, x_n) < \epsilon$ for all $n, m, l \geq N$.

Definition 3.3. A F_g -metric space (X, g) is said to be F_g -complete or complete F_g -metric space if every F_g -Cauchy sequence in (X, g) is F_g -convergent in (X, g) .

Definition 3.4. Let (X, g) be an F_g -metric space. Then for $x_0 \in X, r > 0, F_g$ -open ball $B(x_0, r)$ and F_g -close ball $B(x_0, r)$ are defined as

$$B(x_0, r) = \{y \in X: g(x_0, y, y) < r\}, \\ B(x_0, r) = \{y \in X: g(x_0, y, y) \leq r\}.$$

Definition 3.5. Let (X, g) be an F_g -metric space.

- i. A set $O \subset X$ is said to be F_g -open in X , iff for every $x \in O$ there exist $r > 0$ such that $B(x_0, r) \subset O$.
- ii. A set $C \subset X$ is said to be F_g -close in X if $X \setminus C$ is F_g -open in X .

Proposition 3.6. Let (X, g) be an F_g -metric space. Then collection of all F_g -open sets in X forms topology, that is natural topology generated by F_g -metric g on X .

Proposition 3.7. Let (X, g) be an F_g -metric space. A set $A \subset X$ is F_g -close in X if and only if for every sequence $\{x_n\}$ in A ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(x, x_n, x_n) = 0, x \in X \text{ implies } x \in A. \tag{1}$$

Proof. Let A is F_g -closed and $\{x_n\}$ be a sequence in A such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(x, x_n, x_n) = 0, x \in X$. Suppose, if possible, $x \in X \setminus A$. But $X \setminus A$ is F_g -open. So there exist some $r > 0$ such that $B(x, r) \subset X \setminus A$. That is, $B(x, r) \cap A = \phi$. Moreover, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(x, x_n, x_n) = 0$ implies, for $r > 0$ there exist some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $g(x, x_n, x_n) < r$, for all $n \geq N$. That is, $x_n \in B(x, r)$ for all $n \geq N$. So $x_n \in B(x, r) \cap A$. This is a contradiction. Hence our supposition $x \in X \setminus A$ is wrong and $x \in A$.

Now we prove converse part. Let "(1)" is satisfied. To prove A is F_g -closed, it is equivalent to prove $X \setminus A$ is F_g -open. Let $y \in X \setminus A$. Suppose, if possible, for each $r > 0$, there exist $x_r \in A$ such that $x_r \in B(y, r) \cap A$. So, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $x_n \in B(y, \frac{1}{n}) \cap A$. That is, $\{x_n\}$ is a sequence in $X \setminus A$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(y, x_n, x_n) = 0$. By "(1)" we have $y \in A$. Which is contradiction to the fact that $y \in X \setminus A$. Hence our supposition, for each $r > 0$, there exist $x_r \in A$ such that $x_r \in B(y, r) \cap A$, is wrong. Which proves that there exist some F_g -open ball containing y and contained in $y \in X \setminus A$. That is, $X \setminus A$ is F_g -open and consequently A is F_g -closed.

Proposition 3.8. Let (X, g) be an F_g -metric space. If for any sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(x, x_n, x_n) = 0, x \in X \text{ implies } g(y, x, x) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(y, x_n, x_n), y \in X. \quad (2)$$

Then $B(a, r)$ is F_g -close in X .

Proof. Let $\{x_n\}$ be a sequence in $B(a, r)$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(x, x_n, x_n) = 0$. In the light of proposition (7), to prove that $B(a, r)$ is F_g -close in X , it is sufficient to prove that $x \in B(a, r)$. As $\{x_n\} \subset B(a, r)$, we have $g(a, x_n, x_n) \leq r$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Which implies,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(a, x_n, x_n) \leq r$$

Using condition "(2)", we have

$$g(a, x, x) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(a, x_n, x_n) \leq r.$$

It implies $g(a, x, x) \leq r$. That is, $x \in B(a, r)$. Which proves $B(a, r)$ is F_g -closed in X .

Example 3.9. Consider the function $h: R_2 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ defined by:

$$h(a, b) = \begin{cases} 2|a| & \text{if } b = 0 \\ |a| + |b| & \text{if } b \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

It can be noted that, $h(a, b) = h(-a, b) = h(a, -b) = h(-a, -b)$. Define g as

$$g(x, y, z) = \max \{h(x - y), h(y - z), h(z - x)\}, \text{ for all } x, y, z \in R_2. \quad (3)$$

Then (R_2, g) is an F_g -metric space. Indeed, (g1) to (g4) are trivial and easy to check. To check (g5), let $P_1 = (a_1, b_1), P_2 = (a_2, b_2), \dots, P_N = (a_N, b_N) \in R_2$. If $\sum_{i=1}^N b_i = 0$, then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} h\left(\sum_{i=1}^N P_i\right) &= h\left(\sum_{i=1}^N a_i, \sum_{i=1}^N b_i\right) = 2 \left| \sum_{i=1}^N a_i \right| \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^N |a_i| \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^N h(a_i, b_i) \\ &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^N h(p_i). \end{aligned}$$

If $\sum_{i=1}^N b_i \neq 0$, then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} h\left(\sum_{i=1}^N P_i\right) &= h\left(\sum_{i=1}^N a_i, \sum_{i=1}^N b_i\right) = \left|\sum_{i=1}^N a_i\right| + \left|\sum_{i=1}^N b_i\right| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N |a_i + b_i| \\ &\leq 2\left(\sum_{i=1}^N h(a_i, b_i)\right) \\ &= 2\left(\sum_{i=1}^N h(pi)\right) \end{aligned}$$

From both the cases, we have

$$h(\sum_{i=1}^N P_i) \leq 2(\sum_{i=1}^N h(pi)). \tag{4}$$

Let us fix certain $x, y, z \in R_2$ with $g(x, y, z) > 0$. Let $(u_i)_{i=1}^m \subset R_2$, where $m \in \mathbf{N}, m \geq 2$ and $u_1 = x$. We can observe that for any $x, y \in R_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} g(x, y, y) &= \max\{h(x - y), h(y - y), h(y - x)\} & (5) \\ &= \max\{h(x - y), h(0), h(y - x)\} & (6) \\ &= h(x - y). & (7) \end{aligned}$$

Consider, $g(x, y, z) = \max\{h(x - y), h(y - z), h(z - x)\}$. We have three cases:

Case I: If $g(x, y, z) = h(x - y)$

$$\begin{aligned} &= h(x - u_2 + u_2 - u_3 + u_3 - \dots + u_m - y) \\ &\leq 2\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} h(u_i - u_{i+1})\right) + 2h(u_m - y) \text{ (from "(4))"} \\ &\leq 2\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} g(u_i, u_{i+1}, u_{i+1})\right) + 2g(u_m, y, z) \text{ (from "(3)" and "(7))"} \\ &= 2\left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} g(u_i, u_{i+1}, u_{i+1})\right) + g(u_m, y, z)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Case II: If $g(x, y, z) = h(y - z)$

$$\begin{aligned} &= h(z - y) \\ &= h(x - y + z - x) \\ &= h(x - u_2 + u_2 - u_3 + u_3 - \dots + u_m - y + z - x) \\ &\leq 2\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} h(u_i - u_{i+1})\right) + 2h(u_m - y) + 2h(z - x) \text{ (from "(4))"} \\ &\leq 2\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} h(u_i - u_{i+1})\right) + 2h(u_m - y) + 2h(y - z) \\ &\leq 2\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} g(u_i, u_{i+1}, u_{i+1})\right) + 4g(u_m, y, z) \text{ (from "(3)" and "(7))"} \\ &= 4\left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} g(u_i, u_{i+1}, u_{i+1})\right) + g(u_m, y, z)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Case III: If $g(x, y, z) = h(z - x)$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= h(x - z) \\
 &= h(x - y + y - z) \\
 &= h(x - u_2 + u_2 - u_3 + u_3 - \dots + u_m - y + y - z) \\
 &\leq 2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} h(u_i - u_{i+1}) \right) + 2h(u_m - y) + 2h(y - z) \text{ (from "(4)")} \\
 &\leq 2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} g(u_i, u_{i+1}, u_{i+1}) \right) + 4g(u_m, y, z) \text{ (from "(3)" and "(7)")} \\
 &= 4 \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} g(u_i, u_{i+1}, u_{i+1}) \right) + g(u_m, y, z) \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, from all three cases, we have

$$g(x, y, y) = 4 \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} g(u_i, u_{i+1}, u_{i+1}) \right) + g(u_m, y, z) \right)$$

If $g(x, y, z) > 0$, then

$$\log(g(x, y, z)) \leq \log \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} g(u_i, u_{i+1}, u_{i+1}) \right) + g(u_m, y, z) \right) + \log 4.$$

So g satisfies (g5) with $f = \log$ and $\alpha = \log 4$.

It can be easily verified that $(1, 1/n)$ converges to $(1, 0)$ in F_g -metric space (R_2, g) . But

$$\begin{aligned}
 g((1, 1/n), (0, 0), (0, 0)) &= \max\{h(1, 1/n), h(0, 0), h(1, 1/n)\} \\
 &= h(1, 1/n) \\
 &= 1 + 1/n \\
 &= 1, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.
 \end{aligned}$$

And

$$\begin{aligned}
 g((1, 0), (0, 0), (0, 0)) &= \max\{h(1, 0), h(0, 0), h(1, 0)\} \\
 &= h(1, 0) \\
 &= 2(1) \\
 &= 2
 \end{aligned}$$

So g is not a jointly continuous function.

Remark 3.10. F_g -metric is not a jointly continuous function.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Authors declare that they do not have any conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- [1] Siegfried GA. 2-metriche raume urid ihre topologische structure. *Mathematische Nachrichten*. 1963; 26: 115-148. German.
- [2] Siegfried GA. Zur geometric 2-metriche raume, *Revue Roumaine de Mathematiques Pures et Appliquees XI*, 1966; 664-669. German.
- [3] Admir HU, Risto MA, Ljupcho NA, Biljana NA. Strictly convex and 2-convex 2-normed spaces. *Mathematica Japonica*. 1988; 33(3): 375-384.
- [4] Dhage BC. Generalized Metric Space and Mapping with Fixed Point. *Bulletin of the Calcutta Mathematical Society*. 1992; 84: 329-336.
- [5] Dhage BC. Generalized Metric Space and Topological Structure I. *Analele Stiintifice ale Universitatii Al I Cuza din Iasi-Matematica*. 2000; 46: 3-24.
- [6] Dhage BC. On Generalized Metric Spaces and Topological Structure 11. *Pure and Applied Mathematics Journal*. 1994; 40: 37-41.
- [7] Dhage BC. On Continuity of Mappings in D-metric Spaces. *Bulletin of the Calcutta Mathematical Society*. 1994; 86: 503-508.

- [8] Dhage BC. Generalized D-Metric Spaces and Multi-valued Contraction mappings. *Analele Stiintifice ale Universitatii Al I Cuza din Iasi-Matematica*. 1998; 44: 179500.
- [9] Mustafa ZE, Sims BR. A new approach to generalized metric spaces. *Journal of Nonlinear and Convex Analysis*. 2006; 7(2): 289-297.
- [10] Mohamed JL, Bessem SA. On a new generalization of metric spaces. *Journal of Fixed Point Theory and Applications*. 2018; 20:128.
- [11] Wardowski DA. Fixed points of a new type of contractive mappings in complete metric spaces. *Journal of Fixed Point Theory and Applications*. 2012: 94.
- [12] Naidu SV, Rao KP, Rao NS. On the concepts of balls in a D-metric space. *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*. 2005; 1: 133-141.
- [13] Uryshon P. Sur Les Classes (L) de hiI. Frkchet, *L'Ens. Math*. 1926: 77-83.
- [14] Tran VA, Luong QT, Nguyen VA. Stone-type theorem on b-metric spaces and applications. *Topology and Its Applications*. 2015; 50-64.
- [15] Branciari A. A fixed point theorem of Banach-Caccioppoli type on a class of generalized metric spaces. *Publicationes Mathematicae Debrecen*. 2000; 57: 31-37.
- [16] Stefan CZ. Contraction mappings in b-metric spaces. *Acta Mathematica et Informatica Universitatis Ostraviensis*. 1993; 1(1): 5-11.
- [17] Ronald FA, Ravi KU, Sivakumar D. Comparing top k lists. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*. 2003; 17(1): 134-160.
- [18] Mohamed JL, Bessem SA. A generalized metric space and related fixed point theorems. *Journal of Fixed Point Theory and Applications*. 2015: 14.
- [19] Khamisi MA, Hussain N. KKM mappings in metric type spaces. *Nonlinear Analysis*. 2010; 7(9): 3123-3129.
- [20] William KI, Naseer SH. Fixed point theory in distance spaces. *Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing*. 2014.
- [21] Matthews SG. Partial metric topology. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*. 1994; 728: 183-197.
- [22] Mustafa Z, Sims B. Some remarks concerning D-metric spaces. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Fixed Point Theory and Applications 2003 Jul 13 (pp. 189-198).



A. Shakeel Anjum completed his M.Sc., (Mathematics) in 2014 from North Maharashtra University, Jalgaon. He has 06 years of teaching experience. Presently, he is working as an Assistant Professor (on adhoc basis) in Department of Mathematics, Maharashtra College of Arts, Science and Commerce, Mumbai.



C. Tukaram Aage completed his M.Sc., (Mathematics) in 2002, Ph.D. in 2011 from North Maharashtra University, Jalgaon. He has 17 years teaching experience. Presently, he is working as an Associate Professor in Department of Mathematics, KBCNMU, Jalgaon. He published more than 38 research articles in various National and International Journals.