



COMMENTS ON THE PAPER “BEST PROXIMITY POINT RESULTS FOR P-PROXIMAL CONTRACTIONS”

S. SOM

Department of Mathematics, School of Basic and Applied Sciences, Adamas University,
Barasat-700126, India
e-mail: somkagdwp@gmail.com

(Received May 15, 2022; revised September 12, 2022; accepted September 12, 2022)

Abstract. Recently, Altun et al. [1] introduced the notion of p -proximal contractions and p -proximal contractive mappings and discussed about best proximity point results for this two classes of mappings. After that, Gabeleh and Markin [3] showed that the best proximity point theorem for p -proximal contractions proved in [1] follows from the same conclusion fixed point theory. In this short note, we show that the best proximity point theorem for p -proximal contractive mappings follows from the corresponding fixed point result for metric spaces.

1. Introduction

Let A and B be non-empty subsets of a metric space (M, d) and $Q: A \rightarrow B$ be a non-self mapping. A necessary condition, to guarantee the existence of solutions of the equation $Qx = x$, is $Q(A) \cap A \neq \emptyset$. If $Q(A) \cap A = \emptyset$ then the equation $Qx = x$ has no solutions. In this case, one seeks for an element in the domain space whose distance from its image is minimum i.e, one interesting problem is to minimize $d(x, Qx)$ such that $x \in A$. Since $d(x, Qx) \geq \text{dist}(A, B) = \inf\{d(x, y) : x \in A, y \in B\}$, so, one searches for an element $x \in A$ such that $d(x, Qx) = \text{dist}(A, B)$. Best proximity point problems deal with this situation. Authors usually discover best proximity point theorems to generalize the corresponding fixed point results in metric spaces. Recently, Altun et al. [1] introduced the notion of p -proximal contractions and p -proximal contractive mappings and discussed about best proximity point results for these two classes of mappings. After that, Gabeleh and Markin [3] showed that the best proximity point theorem

Key words and phrases: best proximity point, p -proximal contractive mapping, p -contractive mapping, fixed point.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 54H25, 47H10.

proved in [1] for p -proximal contractions follows from a result in fixed point theory. Then, we showed in [4] that if the p -proximal contraction constant $k < \frac{1}{3}$ then the best proximity point result for p -proximal contractions in [1] follows from the Banach contraction principle. In this short note, we consider the case of p -proximal contractive mappings and show that the best proximity point result for p -proximal contractive mappings follows from a fixed point result proved in [2] for metric spaces.

2. Main results

We first recall the following definition of p -proximal contractive mapping from [1] as follows.

DEFINITION 2.1 [1, Definition 5]. Let (A, B) be a pair of non-empty subsets of a metric space (M, d) . A mapping $T: A \rightarrow B$ is said to be a p -proximal contractive mapping if

$$\left. \begin{aligned} d(u_1, Tx_1) &= \text{dist}(A, B) \\ d(u_2, Tx_2) &= \text{dist}(A, B) \end{aligned} \right\} \implies d(u_1, u_2) < d(x_1, x_2) + |d(u_1, x_1) - d(u_2, x_2)|$$

for all $u_1, u_2, x_1, x_2 \in A$ with $x_1 \neq x_2$.

In this paper, the following notations will be needed. Let (M, d) be a metric space and A, B be non-empty subsets of M . Then

$$\begin{aligned} A_0 &= \{x \in A : d(x, y) = \text{dist}(A, B) \text{ for some } y \in B\}; \\ B_0 &= \{y \in B : d(x, y) = \text{dist}(A, B) \text{ for some } x \in A\}. \end{aligned}$$

In [1, Theorem 4], Altun et al. proved the following best proximity point result for p -proximal contractive mappings.

THEOREM 2.2 [1, Theorem 4]. *Let (M, d) be a metric space, A, B be non-empty subsets of M and the mapping $T: A \rightarrow B$ be a p -proximal contractive mapping. Assume that (A, B) has the P -property and $T(A_0) \subseteq B_0$. If there exist $p, q \in A_0$ such that*

$$d(q, Tp) = \text{dist}(A, B) \quad \text{and} \quad d(p, q) \leq d(Tp, Tq)$$

then $p = q$ and so T has a unique best proximity point.

In [2], Altun et al. proved the following fixed point theorem.

THEOREM 2.3 [2, Theorem 2.9]. *Let (M, d) be a metric space. Let $T: M \rightarrow M$ be a p -contractive self mapping and f be a function defined by $f(x) = d(x, Tx)$. If there exists $x_0 \in M$ such that $f(x_0) \leq f(Tx_0)$, then T has a unique fixed point in M .*

Altun et al. proved Theorem 2.2 to generalize the above fixed point result in case of non-self mappings. In our next main result, we show that the best proximity point result (Theorem 2.2) follows from the corresponding fixed point result for metric spaces.

THEOREM 2.4. *Theorem 2.2 is a straightforward consequence of Theorem 2.3.*

PROOF. Let $x \in A_0$. As $T(A_0) \subseteq B_0$, so, $Tx \in B_0$. This implies that there exists $y \in A_0$ such that $d(y, Tx) = \text{dist}(A, B)$. We show that $y \in A_0$ is unique. Suppose there exists $y_1, y_2 \in A_0$ such that $d(y_1, Tx) = \text{dist}(A, B)$ and $d(y_2, Tx) = \text{dist}(A, B)$. Since the pair (A, B) have the P -property so, we have

$$d(y_1, y_2) = d(Tx, Tx) \implies d(y_1, y_2) = 0 \implies y_1 = y_2.$$

Define a mapping $S: A_0 \rightarrow A_0$ by $Sx = y$ having the property that $d(Sx, Tx) = \text{dist}(A, B)$. Now, we show that $S: A_0 \rightarrow A_0$ is a p -contractive mapping. Let $x_1, x_2 \in A_0$ with $x_1 \neq x_2$. Since $d(Sx_1, Tx_1) = \text{dist}(A, B)$ and $d(Sx_2, Tx_2) = \text{dist}(A, B)$ and $T: A \rightarrow B$ is a p -proximal contractive mapping, so we have,

$$d(Sx_1, Sx_2) < d(x_1, x_2) + |d(Sx_1, x_1) - d(Sx_2, x_2)|.$$

This shows that $S: A_0 \rightarrow A_0$ is a p -contractive mapping. It is given that there exist $p, q \in A_0$ such that

$$d(q, Tp) = \text{dist}(A, B) \quad \text{and} \quad d(p, q) \leq d(Tp, Tq).$$

Now, since $d(Sp, Tp) = \text{dist}(A, B)$ and the pair (A, B) has the P -property so,

$$d(Sp, q) = d(Tp, Tp) \implies q = Sp.$$

Also, since $d(Sp, Tp) = \text{dist}(A, B)$ and $d(Sq, Tq) = \text{dist}(A, B)$, so, we have

$$d(Sp, Sq) = d(Tp, Tq).$$

Let $f: A_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined by $f(x) = d(x, Sx)$, $x \in A_0$. Then by the given condition we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(p, q) \leq d(Tp, Tq) &\implies d(p, Sp) \leq d(Sp, Sq) \\ \implies d(p, Sp) \leq d(Sp, S(Sp)) &\implies f(p) \leq f(Sp). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that there exists $p \in A_0$ such that $f(p) \leq f(Sp)$. So, by [2, Theorem 2.9], the mapping $S: A_0 \rightarrow A_0$ has a fixed point in A_0 , i.e, there exists $z \in A_0$ such that $Sz = z$. So, $d(z, Tz) = d(Sz, Tz) = \text{dist}(A, B)$. This shows

that $z \in A_0$ is a best proximity point of the mapping $T: A \rightarrow B$. Uniqueness of best proximity points already proved in [1, Theorem 4], so omitted. \square

Now, we apply our result to [1, Example 2] to validate our claim. In, [1, Example 2], Altun et al. considered the metric space $M = [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ with respect to usual standard metric, $A = [0, 1] \times \{1\}$ and $B = [0, 1] \times \{0\}$. It is clear that $\text{dist}(A, B) = 1$ and $A_0 = A$. In [1, Example 2], authors considered the mapping $T: A \rightarrow B$ defined by

$$T(t, 1) = \left(\frac{t}{2}, 0\right), \quad (t, 1) \in A.$$

Now, we construct the function $S: A_0 \rightarrow A_0$. Let $(t_0, 1) \in A_0$ and $(s, 1) \in A_0$ be such that

$$\begin{aligned} d((s, 1), T(t_0, 1)) = \text{dist}(A, B) &\implies d\left((s, 1), \left(\frac{t_0}{2}, 0\right)\right) = 1 \\ \implies \sqrt{\left(s - \frac{t_0}{2}\right)^2 + 1} = 1 &\implies s = \frac{t_0}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

So, $S: A_0 \rightarrow A_0$ be defined by $S(t_0, 1) = \left(\frac{t_0}{2}, 1\right)$, $(t_0, 1) \in A_0$ and $(0, 1)$ is the unique fixed point of the mapping S . So, $(0, 1)$ is the unique best proximity point of the mapping $T: A \rightarrow B$.

Acknowledgement. I thank the referee for giving several constructive suggestions which have improved the presentation of the paper.

References

- [1] I. Altun, M. Aslantas and H. Sahin, Best proximity point results for p -proximal contractions, *Acta Math. Hungar.*, **162** (2020), 393–402.
- [2] I. Altun, G. Durmaz and M. Olgun, P-contractive mappings on metric spaces, *J. Non-linear Funct. Anal.*, **2018** (2018) 1–7.
- [3] M. Gabeleh and J. Markin, A note on the paper “Best proximity point results for p -proximal contractions,” *Acta Math. Hungar.*, **164** (2021), 326–329.
- [4] S. Som, A remark on the paper “A note on the paper Best proximity point results for p -proximal contractions,” *Acta Math. Hungar.*, **166** (2022), 103–106.

Springer Nature or its licensor (e.g. a society or other partner) holds exclusive rights to this article under a publishing agreement with the author(s) or other rightsholder(s); author self-archiving of the accepted manuscript version of this article is solely governed by the terms of such publishing agreement and applicable law.