

On Best Proximity Point Theorems for New Cyclic Maps

Ing-Jer Lin¹, Hossein Lakzian² and Yi Chou¹

¹Department of Mathematics
National Kaohsiung Normal University
Kaohsiung 824, Taiwan
ijlin@nknknu.edu.tw (I.-J. Lin)

²Department of Mathematics
Payame Noor University
19395-4697 Tehran, Iran

Abstract

In this paper, we first introduce the concept of $\mathcal{MT} - K$ condition. Some best proximity point theorems for mappings satisfying $\mathcal{MT} - K$ condition instead of K -cyclic mappings are established in metric spaces. Our results generalize and improve some main results in [5] and references therein.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 54H25

Keywords: \mathcal{MT} function, Cyclic map, best proximity point, $\mathcal{MT} - K$ condition

1. Introduction

Throughout this paper, we denote by \mathbb{N} and \mathbb{R} the sets of positive integers and real numbers, respectively. Let A and B be nonempty subsets of a nonempty set E . A map $S : A \cup B \rightarrow A \cup B$ is called a *cyclic* map if $S(A) \subset B$ and $S(B) \subset A$. Let (X, d) be a metric space and $T : A \cup B \rightarrow A \cup B$ a cyclic map. For any nonempty subsets A and B of X , let

$$\text{dist}(A, B) = \inf\{d(x, y) : x \in A, y \in B\}.$$

A point $x \in A \cup B$ is called to be a best proximity point for T if $d(x, Tx) = \text{dist}(A, B)$.

Definition 1.1. [12] Let A and B be nonempty subsets of a metric space (X, d) . A map $T : A \cup B \rightarrow A \cup B$ is called a cyclic contraction if the following conditions hold:

- (1) $T(A) \subset B$ and $T(B) \subset A$;
- (2) There exists $k \in (0, 1)$ such that $d(Tx, Ty) \leq kd(x, y) + (1 - k)dist(A, B)$ for all $x \in A, y \in B$.

Remark 1.1. Let A and B be nonempty closed subsets of a complete metric space (X, d) and $T : A \cup B \rightarrow A \cup B$ is a cyclic contraction. If $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$, then $dist(A, B) = 0$ and T is a contraction on the complete metric space $(A \cap B, d)$. Hence, applying the Banach contraction principle, we know that T has a unique fixed point in $A \cap B$.

Since the equation $Tx = x$, where T is a self-mapping, does not necessarily have a solution, we can turn to the existence of approximate solutions for the best proximity point. Recently, the existence, uniqueness and convergence of iterates to the best proximity point were investigated by many authors; see [1-5,12-33] and references therein. In [12], Eldred and Veeramani first proved the following interesting best proximity point theorem.

Theorem EV. [12, Proposition 3.2] Let A and B be nonempty closed subsets of a complete metric space X . Let $T : A \cup B \rightarrow A \cup B$ be a cyclic contraction map, $x_1 \in A$ and define $x_{n+1} = Tx_n, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $\{x_{2n-1}\}$ has a convergent subsequence in A . Then there exists $x \in A$ such that $d(x, Tx) = dist(A, B)$.

In this paper, we first introduce the concept of $\mathcal{MT} - K$ condition. Some best proximity point theorems for mappings satisfying $\mathcal{MT} - K$ condition (see Def. 2.4 below) instead of K -cyclic mappings are established in metric spaces. Our results generalize and improve some main results in [5] and references therein.

2. Preliminaries

For $c \in \mathbb{R}$, we recall that

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow c} f(x) = \inf_{\varepsilon > 0} \sup_{0 < |x - c| < \varepsilon} f(x)$$

and

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow c^+} f(x) = \inf_{\varepsilon > 0} \sup_{0 < x - c < \varepsilon} f(x).$$

Definition 1.1. [6-7, 15-17] A function $\varphi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1)$ is said to be an \mathcal{MT} -function if it satisfies Mizoguchi-Takahashi's condition (i.e. $\limsup_{s \rightarrow t^+} \varphi(s) < 1$ for all $t \in [0, \infty)$).

It is obvious that if $\varphi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1)$ is a nondecreasing function or a nonincreasing function, then φ is an \mathcal{MT} -function. So the set of \mathcal{MT} -functions is a rich class. But it is worth to mention that there exist functions which are not \mathcal{MT} -functions.

Example 1.1. [11, 16, 17] Let $\varphi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1)$ be defined by

$$\varphi(t) := \begin{cases} \frac{\sin t}{t} & , \text{ if } t \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2}] \\ 0 & , \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since $\limsup_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \varphi(s) = 1$, φ is not an \mathcal{MT} -function.

Very recently, Du [11] first proved some characterizations of \mathcal{MT} -functions.

Theorem D. [11, Theorem 2.1] Let $\varphi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1)$ be a function. Then the following statements are equivalent.

- (a) φ is an \mathcal{MT} -function.
- (b) For each $t \in [0, \infty)$, there exist $r_t^{(1)} \in [0, 1)$ and $\varepsilon_t^{(1)} > 0$ such that $\varphi(s) \leq r_t^{(1)}$ for all $s \in (t, t + \varepsilon_t^{(1)})$.
- (c) For each $t \in [0, \infty)$, there exist $r_t^{(2)} \in [0, 1)$ and $\varepsilon_t^{(2)} > 0$ such that $\varphi(s) \leq r_t^{(2)}$ for all $s \in [t, t + \varepsilon_t^{(2)}]$.
- (d) For each $t \in [0, \infty)$, there exist $r_t^{(3)} \in [0, 1)$ and $\varepsilon_t^{(3)} > 0$ such that $\varphi(s) \leq r_t^{(3)}$ for all $s \in (t, t + \varepsilon_t^{(3)}]$.
- (e) For each $t \in [0, \infty)$, there exist $r_t^{(4)} \in [0, 1)$ and $\varepsilon_t^{(4)} > 0$ such that $\varphi(s) \leq r_t^{(4)}$ for all $s \in [t, t + \varepsilon_t^{(4)})$.
- (f) For any nonincreasing sequence $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $[0, \infty)$, we have $0 \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \varphi(x_n) < 1$.

- (g) φ is a **function of contractive factor** [8]; that is, for any strictly decreasing sequence $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $[0, \infty)$, we have $0 \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \varphi(x_n) < 1$.

For a cyclic map $T : A \cup B \rightarrow A \cup B$, Du et al. [15] introduced the notion of \mathcal{MT} -cyclic contraction with respect to φ on $A \cup B$ and then they proved new existence and convergence theorems of iterates of best proximity points for \mathcal{MT} -cyclic contractions.

Definition 2.1. [15] Let A and B be nonempty subsets of a metric space (X, d) . If a map $T : A \cup B \rightarrow A \cup B$ satisfies

(MT1) $T(A) \subset B$ and $T(B) \subset A$;

(MT2) there exists a \mathcal{MT} -function $\varphi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1)$ such that

$$d(Tx, Ty) \leq \varphi(d(x, y))d(x, y) + (1 - \varphi(d(x, y)))dist(A, B) \text{ for any } x \in A \text{ and } y \in B,$$

then T is called a \mathcal{MT} -cyclic contraction with respect to φ on $A \cup B$.

Afterward, Lakzian and Lin in [16] using of concept of weak \mathcal{MT} -cyclic Kannan contractions with respect to φ on $A \cup B$ established some new convergent and existence theorems of best proximity point theorems for these contractions in uniformly Banach spaces that generalized theorem by Petric [18].

Definition 2.1.[16] Let A and B be nonempty subsets of a metric space (X, d) . If a map $T : A \cup B \rightarrow A \cup B$ satisfies

(MTK1) $T(A) \subset B$ and $T(B) \subset A$;

(MTK2) there exists a \mathcal{MT} -function $\varphi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1)$ such that

$$d(Tx, Ty) \leq \frac{1}{2}\varphi(d(x, y))[d(x, Tx) + d(y, Ty)] + (1 - \varphi(d(x, y)))dist(A, B)$$

for any $x \in A$ and $y \in B$,

then T is called a weak \mathcal{MT} -cyclic Kannan contraction with respect to φ on $A \cup B$.

In [5], the authors, independently, for two mappings S and T that $T : A \rightarrow B$ and $T : B \rightarrow A$, this notion is defined by S. Sadiq Basha et al.

Definition 2.2.[5] A pair of mappings $T : A \rightarrow B$ and $S : B \rightarrow A$ is said to form a K -Cyclic mapping between A and B if there exists a nonnegative real number $k < 1/2$ such that

$$d(Tx, Sy) \leq k[d(x, Tx) + d(y, Sy)] + (1 - 2k)d(A, B),$$

for all $x \in A$ and $y \in B$.

Motivated by the concepts of K -cyclic mappings and \mathcal{MT} -function, we first introduce the concept of $\mathcal{MT} - K$ condition as follows:

Definition 2.3. Let A and B be non-empty subsets of a metric space (X, d) and $T : A \rightarrow B$ and $S : B \rightarrow A$ be maps. We call the pair of maps T and S satisfy $\mathcal{MT} - K$ condition if there exists an \mathcal{MT} -function $\varphi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1)$ such that

$$d(Tx, Sy) \leq \frac{1}{2}\varphi(d(x, y))[d(x, Tx) + d(y, Sy)] + (1 - \varphi(d(x, y)))d(A, B),$$

for all $x \in A, y \in B$.

3. Main results

In this section, we first prove an existence theorem.

Theorem 3.1. Let A and B be nonempty subsets of a metric space (X, d) . Let $T : A \rightarrow B$ and $S : B \rightarrow A$ be maps. If the pair of maps T and S satisfy $\mathcal{MT} - K$ condition, then there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, x_{n+1}) = d(A, B).$$

Proof. Since maps T and S satisfy $\mathcal{MT} - K$ condition, there exists an \mathcal{MT} -function $\varphi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1)$ such that

$$d(Tx, Sy) \leq \frac{1}{2}\varphi(d(x, y))[d(x, Tx) + d(y, Sy)] + (1 - \varphi(d(x, y)))d(A, B), \quad (1)$$

for all $x \in A, y \in B$. Let $x_0 \in A$ be given. Define $x_{2n+1} = Tx_{2n}$ and $x_{2n} = Sx_{2n-1}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. Then $x_{2n} \in A$ and $x_{2n+1} \in B$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. By (1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_1, x_2) &= d(Tx_0, Sx_1) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\varphi(d(x_0, x_1))[d(x_0, Tx_0) + d(x_1, Sx_1)] + (1 - \varphi(d(x_0, x_1)))d(A, B) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\varphi(d(x_0, x_1))[d(x_0, x_1) + d(x_1, x_2)] + (1 - \varphi(d(x_0, x_1)))d(A, B). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $[1 - \frac{1}{2}\varphi(d(x_0, x_1))]d(x_1, x_2) \leq [\frac{1}{2}\varphi(d(x_0, x_1))]d(x_0, x_1) + (1 - \varphi(d(x_0, x_1)))d(A, B)$,
 which implies that

$$d(x_1, x_2) \leq \frac{\varphi(d(x_0, x_1))}{2 - \varphi(d(x_0, x_1))}d(x_0, x_1) + [1 - \frac{\varphi(d(x_0, x_1))}{2 - \varphi(d(x_0, x_1))}]d(A, B). \quad (2)$$

By (2), we obtain that

$$d(x_1, x_2) - d(A, B) \leq \frac{\varphi(d(x_0, x_1))}{2 - \varphi(d(x_0, x_1))}(d(x_0, x_1) - d(A, B)).$$

By (1) again, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_2, x_3) &= d(Sx_1, Tx_2) = d(Tx_2, Sx_1) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\varphi(d(x_2, x_1))[d(x_2, Tx_2) + d(x_1, Sx_1)] + [1 - \varphi(d(x_2, x_1))]d(A, B) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\varphi(d(x_2, x_1))[d(x_2, x_3) + d(x_1, x_2)] + [1 - \varphi(d(x_2, x_1))]d(A, B), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$[1 - \frac{1}{2}\varphi(d(x_2, x_1))]d(x_2, x_3) \leq \frac{1}{2}\varphi(d(x_2, x_1))d(x_1, x_2) + [1 - \varphi(d(x_2, x_1))]d(A, B),$$

and hence

$$d(x_2, x_3) \leq \frac{\varphi(d(x_2, x_1))}{2 - \varphi(d(x_2, x_1))}d(x_2, x_1) + [1 - \frac{\varphi(d(x_2, x_1))}{2 - \varphi(d(x_2, x_1))}]d(A, B)$$

or

$$d(x_3, x_2) - d(A, B) \leq \frac{\varphi(d(x_2, x_1))}{2 - \varphi(d(x_2, x_1))}(d(x_2, x_1) - d(A, B)).$$

By induction, we have

$$d(x_n, x_{n+1}) - d(A, B) \leq \frac{\varphi(d(x_{n-1}, x_n))}{2 - \varphi(d(x_{n-1}, x_n))}(d(x_{n-1}, x_n) - d(A, B)). \quad (3)$$

Since $\varphi(t) < 1$ for all $t \in [0, \infty)$, we have $\frac{\varphi(t)}{2 - \varphi(t)} < 1$ for all $t \in [0, \infty)$. By (3), we get

$$d(x_n, x_{n+1}) - d(A, B) < d(x_{n-1}, x_n) - d(A, B),$$

which implies $d(x_n, x_{n+1}) < d(x_{n-1}, x_n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. So $\{d(x_n, x_{n+1})\}$ is a strictly decreasing sequence in $[0, \infty)$. Since φ is an \mathcal{MT} -function, by Theorem D, we obtain

$$0 \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \varphi(d(x_n, x_{n+1})) < 1.$$

Let $\lambda = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \varphi(d(x_n, x_{n+1}))$. So $0 \leq \lambda < 1$. Since $\varphi(d(x_n, x_{n+1})) \leq \lambda$, we have

$$2 - \varphi(d(x_n, x_{n+1})) \geq 2 - \lambda.$$

Then

$$\frac{\varphi(d(x_n, x_{n+1}))}{2 - \varphi(d(x_n, x_{n+1}))} \leq \frac{\lambda}{2 - \lambda},$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
So

$$0 \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{\varphi(d(x_n, x_{n+1}))}{2 - \varphi(d(x_n, x_{n+1}))} \leq \frac{\lambda}{2 - \lambda} < 1.$$

Let

$$\gamma = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{\varphi(d(x_n, x_{n+1}))}{2 - \varphi(d(x_n, x_{n+1}))}.$$

Then $\gamma \in [0, 1)$. By (3) again, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_n, x_{n+1}) - d(A, B) &\leq \frac{\varphi(d(x_{n-1}, x_n))}{2 - \varphi(d(x_{n-1}, x_n))} (d(x_{n-1}, x_n) - d(A, B)) \\ &\leq \gamma (d(x_{n-1}, x_n) - d(A, B)) \\ &\leq \gamma^2 (d(x_{n-2}, x_{n-1}) - d(A, B)) \\ &\leq \dots \\ &\leq \gamma^n (d(x_0, x_1) - d(A, B)). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\gamma \in [0, 1)$, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma^n = 0$. By (4),

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, x_{n+1}) = d(A, B).$$

The proof is completed. □

As a direct consequence of Theorem 3.1, we obtain the following.

Corollary 3.1. [5] Let A and B be nonempty subsets of a metric space (X, d) . Let $T : A \rightarrow B$ and $S : B \rightarrow A$ be maps. If the pair of maps T and S satisfy K condition, then there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, x_{n+1}) = d(A, B).$$

Theorem 3.2. Let A and B be two non-empty subsets of a metric space (X, d) and $T : A \rightarrow B$ and $S : B \rightarrow A$ be maps. If the pair of maps T and S satisfies $\mathcal{MT} - K$ condition. If $x_0 \in A$, define $x_{2n+1} = Tx_{2n}$ and $x_{2n} = Sx_{2n-1}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then the sequence $\{x_n\}$ is bounded.

Proof. By Theorem 3.1, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, x_{n+1}) = d(A, B).$$

Since $\{d(x_{2n-1}, x_{2n})\}$ is a subsequence of $\{d(x_n, x_{n+1})\}$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_{2n-1}, x_{2n}) = d(A, B).$$

Hence $\{d(x_{2n-1}, x_{2n})\}$ is bounded. So there exists $L > 0$ such that

$$d(x_{2n-1}, x_{2n}) \leq L,$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_{2n}, Tx_0) &= d(Sx_{2n-1}, Tx_0) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\varphi(d(x_{2n-1}, x_0))[d(x_{2n-1}, Sx_{2n-1}) + d(x_0, Tx_0)] + [1 - \varphi(d(x_{2n-1}, x_0))]d(A, B) \\ &< \frac{1}{2}[d(x_{2n-1}, x_{2n}) + d(x_0, Tx_0)] + d(A, B) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}[L + d(x_0, Tx_0)] + d(A, B). \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$M = \frac{1}{2}[L + d(x_0, Tx_0)] + d(A, B).$$

Hence $x_{2n} \in \overline{B}(Tx_0, M)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, since

$$d(x_{2n+1}, Tx_0) \leq d(x_{2n}, x_{2n+1}) + d(x_{2n}, Tx_0) \leq L + M.$$

We obtain $x_{2n+1} \in \overline{B}(Tx_0, L + M)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. On the other hand, since

$$x_{2n} \in \overline{B}(Tx_0, M) \subseteq \overline{B}(Tx_0, L + M),$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we also have $x_{2n} \in \overline{B}(Tx_0, L + M)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence

$$x_n \in \overline{B}(Tx_0, L + M)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, which means that $\{x_n\}$ is bounded. The proof is completed. \square

As a direct consequence of Theorem 3.2, we obtain the following.

Corollary 3.2. [5] Let A and B be two non-empty closed subsets of a metric space. Let the mappings $T : A \rightarrow B$ and $S : B \rightarrow A$ form a K -Cyclic map between A and B . For a fixed element x_0 in A , let $x_{2n+1} = Tx_{2n}$ and $x_{2n} = Sx_{2n-1}$. Then the sequence $\{x_n\}$ is bounded.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to express their hearty thanks to Professor Wei-Shih Du for their valuable suggestions and comments.

References

- [1] M. A. Al-Thagafi and N. Shahzad, "Convergence and existence results for best proximity points", *Nonlinear Analysis*, vol.70, no.10, pp.3665-3671, 2009.
- [2] M. A. Al-Thagafi and N. Shahzad, "Best proximity pairs and equilibrium pairs for Kakutani multimaps", *Nonlinear Analysis*, vol.70, no.3, pp.1209-1216, 2009.
- [3] M. A. Al-Thagafi and N. Shahzad, "Best proximity sets and equilibrium pairs for a finite family of multimaps", *Fixed Point Theory and Applications*, Article ID 457069, 10 pages, 2008.

- [4] C. Di Bari, T. Suzuki, and C. Vetro, "Best proximity points for cyclic Meir-Keeler contractions", *Nonlinear Analysis*, vol.69, no.11, pp.3790-3794, 2008.
- [5] S. Sadiq Basha, N. Shahzad, and R. Jeyaraj, "Optimal Approximate Solutions of Fixed Point Equations ", *Abstract and Applied Analysis*, Article ID 174560, 9 pages, 2011.
- [6] W.-S. Du, "Some new results and generalizations in metric fixed point theory", *Nonlinear Analysis*, vol.73, pp. 1439-1446, 2010.
- [7] W.-S. Du, "Coupled fixed point theorems for nonlinear contractions satisfied Mizoguchi-Takahashi's condition in quasiordered metric spaces", *Fixed Point Theory and Applications*, Article ID 876372, 9 pages, 2010.
- [8] W.-S. Du, "Nonlinear Contractive Conditions for Coupled Cone Fixed Point Theorems", *Fixed Point Theory and Applications*, Article ID 190606, 16 pages, 2010.
- [9] W.-S. Du, "New cone fixed point theorems for nonlinear multivalued maps with their applications", *Applied Mathematics Letters*, vol. 24, pp.172-178, 2011.
- [10] W.-S. Du and S.-X Zheng, " Nonlinear conditions for coincidence point and fixed point theorems", *Taiwanese J. Math.*, in press.
- [11] W.-S. Du, "On coincidence point and fixed point theorems for nonlinear multivalued maps", *Topology and its Applications*, vol.159, pp. 49-56, 2012.
- [12] A. A. Eldred and P. Veeramani, "Existence and convergence of best proximity points", *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol.323, no.2, pp.1001-1006, 2006.
- [13] A.A. Eldred, W.A. Kirk, and P. Veeramani, "Proximal normal structure and relatively nonexpansive mappings", *Studia Mathematica*, vol.171, no.3, pp.283-293, 2005.
- [14] K. Fan, "Extensions of two fixed point theorems of F. E. Browder", *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, vol.112, pp.234-240, 1969.
- [15] W.-S. Du, H. Lakzian, Nonlinear conditions and new inequalities for best proximity points, Submitted.
- [16] H. Lakzian, I.-J. Lin, Best proximity points for weak \mathcal{MT} -cyclic Kannan contractions with applications, Submitted.

- [17] Z. He, W.-S. Du, I.-J. Lin, The existence of fixed points for new non-linear multivalued maps and their applications, *Fixed Point Theory and Applications* 2011, 2011:84, doi:10.1186/1687-1812-2011-84.
- [18] M. A. Petric, Best proximity point theorems for weak cyclic Kannan contractions, *Filomat* 25:1 (2011), 145-154.

Received: February, 2012