



# An elementary best proximity point theorem in metric spaces

Sankar Raj Vaithilingam<sup>1</sup> · A. Dhana Lakshmi<sup>1</sup>

Received: 5 April 2022 / Accepted: 19 September 2022 / Published online: 29 September 2022  
© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to The Forum D'Analystes 2022

## Abstract

Let us consider two nonempty compact subsets  $A$  and  $B$  of a metric space  $X$  and a continuous mapping  $f : A \cup B \rightarrow A \cup B$  satisfying  $f(A) \subseteq B$ ,  $f(B) \subseteq A$ . In this manuscript, we provide sufficient conditions for the existence of a point  $x_0 \in A$  holding the condition that  $d(x_0, fx_0) = \inf\{d(a, b) : a \in A, b \in B\}$ . When  $A = B$ , our main result reduces to the well-known fixed point theorem for continuous mapping (Lemma 1) in metric spaces.

**Keywords** Fixed point ·  $\varepsilon$ -close mapping ·  $P$ -property ·  $UC$ -property · Best proximity point

## 1 Introduction

A topological space  $X$  is said to have the *fixed point property* if every continuous function  $f : X \rightarrow X$  has at least one point  $x \in X$  such that  $x = f(x)$ . Using intermediate value theorem, it is easy to see that a closed and bounded interval  $[a, b]$  in  $\mathbb{R}$  has fixed point property. More generally, in 1910, Brouwer [2] proved that the closed unit ball  $\mathbf{B} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x\| \leq 1\}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  has fixed point property. Since the fixed point property is a topological property, one can generally say that every nonempty closed bounded convex subset of a finite dimensional normed linear space has fixed point property. For different proofs of Brouwer's fixed point theorem one may refer [3, 4].

Due to the wide applications in Economics, Game Theory, etc., Brouwer's theorem has attracted many researchers to obtain interesting generalizations of it. Schauder's fixed point theorem [5] is one of such novel generalizations of Brouwer's Theorem. In 1930, Schauder extended Brouwer's theorem to infinite dimensional

---

Communicated by S Ponnusamy.

---

A. Dhana Lakshmi contributed equally to this work.

---

Extended author information available on the last page of the article

spaces. It states that every nonempty compact convex subset of a normed linear space has fixed point property. The following elementary fixed point lemma is used to prove the Schauder fixed point theorem. (See [6]).

**Lemma 1** [1] *Let  $X$  be a compact metric space. Suppose that for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a continuous function  $g_\varepsilon : X \rightarrow X$  satisfying:*

1.  $d(x, g_\varepsilon(x)) < \varepsilon$ , for all  $x \in X$ ,
2.  $g_\varepsilon(X)$  has the fixed point property.

Then  $X$  has the fixed point property.

One may refer [6] for the proof of Lemma 1. In [1], the author used the Lemma 1 and established a Brouwer type fixed point theorem which ensures the existence of a fixed point for a continuous function on a nonempty star-like compact subset of  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .

Now, let us consider two nonempty compact subsets  $A$  and  $B$  of a metric space  $X$  and a continuous mapping  $T : A \cup B \rightarrow A \cup B$  satisfying the cyclic condition  $T(A) \subseteq B$ ,  $T(B) \subseteq A$ . Let  $\text{dist}(A, B) := \inf\{d(a, b) : a \in A, b \in B\}$ . If  $\text{dist}(A, B) > 0$ , then there is no  $x \in A \cup B$  which satisfies  $x = T(x)$ , since  $0 < \text{dist}(A, B) \leq d(x, T(x))$ . In this juncture, any  $x \in A \cup B$  satisfying the condition  $d(x, T(x)) = \text{dist}(A, B)$  is an optimal solution to the minimization problem

$$\min_{x \in A \cup B} d(x, T(x)).$$

A point  $x \in A \cup B$  satisfying  $d(x, T(x)) = \text{dist}(A, B)$  is known as a best proximity point of  $T$ . If  $\text{dist}(A, B) = 0$ , then the best proximity points of  $T$  are nothing but the fixed points of  $T$ . In this context, best proximity point theorems are considered as generalized fixed point theorems. The following example shows that, in general, the cyclic continuous mapping on  $A \cup B$  need not have best proximity point.

**Example 1** Consider  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with usual metric. Let  $A := \{(x, y) : x \in \{-2, 1\}, 0 \leq y \leq 1\}$  and  $B := \{(x, y) : x \in \{-1, 2\}, 0 \leq y \leq 1\}$ . Then  $A$  and  $B$  are nonempty compact subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with  $\text{dist}(A, B) = 1$ . Let  $T : A \cup B \rightarrow A \cup B$  be a mapping defined by  $T(x, y) = (-x, y)$ , for all  $(x, y) \in A \cup B$ . Clearly  $T$  is a continuous mapping satisfying  $T(A) \subseteq B$ ,  $T(B) \subseteq A$ . Since  $d((x, y), T(x, y)) \geq 2$ , for all  $(x, y) \in A \cup B$ ,  $T$  has no best proximity point.

Hence, it is of interest to investigate sufficient conditions to ensure the existence of at least one best proximity point of a cyclic continuous mapping. In this manuscript, first we prove that every pair  $(A, B)$  of compact subsets of a metric space having  $P$ -property (Definition 1) also satisfies the  $UC$ -property (Definition 2). Using this geometric idea, we provide sufficient conditions for the existence of best proximity points of a cyclic continuous mapping on a pair of compact subsets. Our main result serves as a generalization of Lemma 1, by considering  $A = B = X$  in our main result.

## 2 Preliminaries

This section provides few known results and standard notations which we use in our main results. Let  $A$  and  $B$  be two nonempty subsets of a metric space  $X$ . Let us fix the following notations :

$$A_0 := \{x \in A : d(x, y) = \text{dist}(A, B), \text{ for some } y \in B\},$$

$$B_0 := \{y \in B : d(x, y) = \text{dist}(A, B), \text{ for some } x \in A\}.$$

In general, the sets  $A_0$  and  $B_0$  may be empty. If  $A_0$  and  $B_0$  is nonempty, then the pair  $(A_0, B_0)$  is known as the proximal pair associated with the given pair  $(A, B)$  of subsets. It is easy to see that if  $A, B$  are compact subsets of  $X$ , then  $A_0, B_0$  are nonempty subsets of  $A, B$  respectively. For any subset  $A$  of  $X$  and  $x \in X$ , the distance between the set  $A$  and  $x$  is defined as  $\text{dist}(x, A) := \inf\{d(x, a) : a \in A\}$ .

Let  $A$  be a nonempty compact subset of  $X$ . We recall the metric projection mapping  $P_A : X \rightarrow 2^A$  such that  $P_A(x) := \{a \in A : d(x, a) = \text{dist}(x, A)\}$ , where  $2^A$  denotes the set of all nonempty subsets of  $A$ . i.e.,  $P_A$  is a multivalued mapping. Suppose that  $A, B$  are nonempty compact subsets of  $X$ . Then, let us define a mapping  $P : A \cup B \rightarrow 2^B \cup 2^A$  called *projection operator* as follows:

$$P(x) := \begin{cases} P_B(x), & \text{if } x \in A, \\ P_A(x), & \text{if } x \in B. \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

Thus,  $P(A_0) \subseteq B_0$  and  $P(B_0) \subseteq A_0$ . We use the following  $P$ -property to restrict the above operator  $P$  to be a single valued mapping on  $A_0 \cup B_0$ .

**Definition 1** [7] A pair  $(A, B)$  of nonempty subsets of a metric space  $X$  is said to have  $P$ -property if and only if for any  $x_1, x_2 \in A$  and  $y_1, y_2 \in B$  with

$$\left. \begin{aligned} d(x_1, y_1) = \text{dist}(A, B) \\ d(x_2, y_2) = \text{dist}(A, B) \end{aligned} \right\} \Rightarrow d(x_1, x_2) = d(y_1, y_2).$$

It is well-known fact, see [8], that every pair  $(A, B)$  of nonempty closed convex subsets of a strictly convex Banach space has  $P$ -property. Also, for any nonempty subset  $A$  of a metric space  $X$ , the pair  $(A, A)$  has  $P$ -property. Suppose that  $A$  and  $B$  are nonempty compact subsets of a metric space  $X$  such that the pair  $(A, B)$  has  $P$ -property. Then it is easy to verify the following facts.

1.  $A_0, B_0$  are nonempty compact subsets of  $A, B$  respectively (the  $P$ -property is not necessary to prove this statement).
2. the projection operator  $P : A_0 \cup B_0 \rightarrow A_0 \cup B_0$  is single valued and  $P(A_0) \subseteq B_0$  and  $P(B_0) \subseteq A_0$ .
3. Let  $x_0 \in A_0$  and  $y_0 \in B_0$ . Then  $d(x_0, y_0) = \text{dist}(A, B)$  if and only if  $x_0 = P(y_0)$ .

We use the following  $UC$ -property in our main result.

**Definition 2** [9] Let  $A, B$  be nonempty subsets of a metric space  $X$ . The pair  $(A, B)$  is said to satisfy  $UC$ -property if the following holds:

If  $\{x_n\}$  and  $\{z_n\}$  are sequences in  $A$  and  $\{y_n\}$  is a sequence in  $B$  such that

$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, y_n) = \text{dist}(A, B)$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(z_n, y_n) = \text{dist}(A, B)$ , then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, z_n) = 0$  holds.

In [9], the authors proved that if  $\text{dist}(A, B) = 0$ , then the pair  $(A, B)$  has  $UC$ -property. Also, every pair  $(A, B)$  of nonempty closed convex subsets of a uniformly convex Banach space has  $UC$ -property.

Let  $A$  and  $B$  be two nonempty subsets of a metric space  $X$ . A mapping  $T : A \cup B \rightarrow A \cup B$  is said to be a relatively nonexpansive mapping if it satisfies the following conditions:

1.  $T(A) \subseteq B$  and  $T(B) \subseteq A$ ,
2.  $d(T(x), T(y)) \leq d(x, y)$ , for all  $x \in A$  and  $y \in B$ .

It is worth mentioning that a relatively nonexpansive need not be continuous. Also, it is easy to see that if  $d(x_0, y_0) = \text{dist}(A, B)$ , then  $d(T(x), T(y)) = \text{dist}(A, B)$ . In [10], the authors introduced a geometric notion called proximal normal structure and provided sufficient conditions for the existence of best proximity points for relatively nonexpansive mappings.

### 3 Main results

We begin our main results with the following proposition.

**Proposition 1** *Let  $A$  and  $B$  be two nonempty compact subsets of a metric space  $X$  such that the pair  $(A, B)$  has  $P$ -property. Then  $(A, B)$  has  $UC$ -property.*

**Proof** Let  $\{x_n\}$  and  $\{z_n\}$  be sequences in  $A$  and  $\{y_n\}$  be a sequence in  $B$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, y_n) = \text{dist}(A, B)$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(z_n, y_n) = \text{dist}(A, B)$ . Suppose  $d(x_n, z_n) \not\rightarrow 0$ . Then there is an  $\varepsilon > 0$  and subsequences  $\{x_{n_k}\}, \{z_{n_k}\}$  such that  $d(x_{n_k}, z_{n_k}) \geq \varepsilon$ , for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since  $A$  and  $B$  are compact, without loss of generality, let us assume that  $x_{n_k} \rightarrow x$ ,  $z_{n_k} \rightarrow z$  and the corresponding  $y_{n_k} \rightarrow y$ . Then  $d(x, z) \geq \varepsilon$  and  $d(x, y) = \text{dist}(A, B)$ ,  $d(z, y) = \text{dist}(A, B)$ , which contradict the  $P$ -property of  $(A, B)$ . Hence  $(A, B)$  has  $UC$ -property.  $\square$

**Proposition 2** *Let  $A$  and  $B$  be two nonempty compact subsets of a metric space  $X$ . Suppose that the pair  $(A, B)$  has  $P$ -property. Then, the projection operator  $P : A_0 \cup B_0 \rightarrow A_0 \cup B_0$  is a continuous single valued mapping and satisfy  $P(A_0) \subseteq B_0$  and  $P(B_0) \subseteq A_0$ .*

**Proof** Let us show that  $P$  is continuous.

Let  $x_0 \in A_0$  and  $\{x_n\}$  be a sequence in  $A_0$  such that  $x_n \rightarrow x_0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then, for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exist  $y_0, y_n \in B_0$  such that  $d(x_0, y_0) = \text{dist}(A, B)$  and  $d(x_n, y_n) = \text{dist}(A, B)$ . Thus,  $P(x_0) = y_0$  and  $P(x_n) = y_n$ , for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then, by  $P$ -property, we have

$$d(P(x_n), P(x_0)) = d(y_n, y_0) = d(x_n, x_0) \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence  $P(x_n) \rightarrow P(x_0)$ . i.e.,  $P$  is continuous on  $A_0$ . Similarly,  $P$  is continuous on  $B_0$  also. □

Let us define a new notion called  $\varepsilon$ -close mapping.

**Definition 3** Let  $A$  and  $B$  be nonempty subsets of a metric space  $X$  such that  $A_0 \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . A mapping  $h : A \cup B \rightarrow A \cup B$  is said to be  $\varepsilon$ -close mapping if

1.  $h(A_0) \subseteq B_0$  and  $h(B_0) \subseteq A_0$ ,
2.  $d(x, h(x)) < \text{dist}(A, B) + \varepsilon$ , for all  $x \in A_0 \cup B_0$ .

Let us give some examples of  $\varepsilon$ -close mappings.

**Example 2** Let  $A$  and  $B$  be nonempty compact subsets of a metric space  $X$  such that the pair  $(A, B)$  has  $P$ -property. Then the mapping defined in (1) is  $\varepsilon$ -close mapping, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

**Example 3** Let  $A$  and  $B$  be nonempty weakly compact convex subsets of a strictly convex Banach space. Then the mapping defined in (1) is  $\varepsilon$ -close mapping, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

**Example 4** Let  $A := \{(0, 0)\}$  and  $B := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x^2 + y^2 = 1\}$ . Clearly,  $\text{dist}(A, B) = 1$  and  $A_0 = A, B_0 = B$ . Then any mapping  $h : A \cup B \rightarrow A \cup B$  satisfying  $h(A) \subseteq B, h(B) \subseteq A$  is an  $\varepsilon$ -close mapping.

Now, we define a new class of  $\varepsilon$ -perturbed cyclic mapping.

**Definition 4** Let  $A$  and  $B$  be two nonempty subsets of a metric space  $X$  with  $A_0 \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . A relatively nonexpansive mapping  $T : A \cup B \rightarrow A \cup B$  is said to be  $\varepsilon$ -perturbed mapping if  $T(x_0) \in B(y_0, \varepsilon)$  and  $T(y_0) \in B(x_0, \varepsilon)$ , whenever  $d(x_0, y_0) = \text{dist}(A, B)$ .

**Example 5** Let  $A := \{(0, x) : x \in \mathbb{R}\}$  and  $B := \{(1, y) : y \in \mathbb{R}\}$ . Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be given. Let  $T : A \cup B \rightarrow A \cup B$  be mapping defined by

$$T(x, y) := \begin{cases} \left(1, y + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right), & \text{if } x = 0, \\ \left(0, y + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right), & \text{if } x = 1. \end{cases}$$

Then  $T$  is a  $\varepsilon$ -perturbed mapping.

**Proposition 3** Let  $A$  and  $B$  be nonempty subsets of a metric space  $X$  such that the pair  $(A, B)$  has  $P$ -property. Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then every  $\varepsilon$ -perturbed mapping is  $\varepsilon$ -close.

**Proof** Let  $T : A \cup B \rightarrow A \cup B$  be an  $\varepsilon$ -perturbed mapping. Being relatively nonexpansive, it satisfies the condition  $T(A_0) \subseteq B_0$  and  $T(B_0) \subseteq A_0$ . Now, let  $x_0 \in A_0$ . By  $P$ -property, there is unique  $y_0 \in B_0$  such that  $d(x_0, y_0) = \text{dist}(A, B) =$

$d(T(x_0), T(y_0))$  and  $T(y_0) \in B(x_0, \varepsilon)$ . Then,  $d(x_0, T(x_0)) \leq d(x_0, T(y_0)) + d(T(y_0), T(x_0)) < \varepsilon + \text{dist}(A, B)$ . i.e.,  $T$  is  $\varepsilon$ -close.  $\square$

The following example shows that a cyclic continuous mapping on a pair  $(A, B)$  of nonempty compact subsets need not be  $\varepsilon$ -close.

**Example 6** Let  $A := \{(0, x) : 0 \leq x \leq 1\}$  and  $B := \{(1, x) : 0 \leq x \leq 1\}$ . Clearly,  $A$  and  $B$  are nonempty compact convex subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^2$  such that  $A_0 = A, B_0 = B$ . Let  $h : A \cup B \rightarrow A \cup B$  be a mapping defined as

$$h(u, v) = \begin{cases} (1, 1), & \text{if } u = 0, \\ (0, 0), & \text{if } u = 1. \end{cases}$$

Then  $h(A) \subseteq B, h(B) \subseteq A$  and  $h$  is continuous. But, for any  $0 < \varepsilon < (\sqrt{2} - 1)$ ,  $h$  is not an  $\varepsilon$ -close mapping.

**Definition 5** A pair  $(A, B)$  of nonempty subsets of a metric space is said to have the best proximity point property if every cyclic continuous mapping  $h : A \cup B \rightarrow A \cup B$  has at least one best proximity point on  $A \cup B$ .

Now, let us state our main result.

**Theorem 1** Let  $A$  and  $B$  be nonempty compact subsets of a metric space  $X$  such that the pair  $(A, B)$  has the  $P$ -property. Assume that, for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is a continuous,  $\varepsilon$ -close function  $h_\varepsilon : A \cup B \rightarrow A \cup B$  such that the pair  $(h_\varepsilon(B_0), h_\varepsilon(A_0))$  has best proximity point property. Then, for any cyclic continuous function  $h : A \cup B \rightarrow A \cup B$  satisfying  $h(A_0) \subseteq B_0, h(B_0) \subseteq A_0$  has at least one best proximity point in  $A \cup B$ .

**Proof** Let  $h : A \cup B \rightarrow A \cup B$  be a continuous mapping satisfying  $h(A_0) \subseteq B_0$  and  $h(B_0) \subseteq A_0$ . Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be fixed. Then there is a  $\varepsilon$ -close mapping  $h_\varepsilon : A \cup B \rightarrow A \cup B$  satisfying  $h_\varepsilon(A_0) \subseteq B_0, h_\varepsilon(B_0) \subseteq A_0$  and  $d(x, h_\varepsilon(x)) < \text{dist}(A, B) + \varepsilon$ , for all  $x \in A_0 \cup B_0$ .

Note that  $h_\varepsilon(P(h(A_0))) \subseteq h_\varepsilon(P(B_0)) \subseteq h_\varepsilon(A_0)$ , where  $P$  is the mapping given in (1). Also, in similar manner we have  $h_\varepsilon(P(h(B_0))) \subseteq h_\varepsilon(B_0)$ .

Consider the mapping  $f := h_\varepsilon \circ P \circ h : A_0 \cup B_0 \rightarrow h_\varepsilon(A_0) \cup h_\varepsilon(B_0)$ . By Proposition 2, the mapping  $f$  is continuous. Restricting  $f$  to  $h_\varepsilon(A_0) \cup h_\varepsilon(B_0)$ , we get  $f : h_\varepsilon(A_0) \cup h_\varepsilon(B_0) \rightarrow h_\varepsilon(A_0) \cup h_\varepsilon(B_0)$ .

Now,  $f(h_\varepsilon(A_0)) \subseteq f(B_0) = h_\varepsilon(P(h(B_0))) \subseteq h_\varepsilon(B_0)$ . Similarly,  $f(h_\varepsilon(B_0)) \subseteq f(A_0) = h_\varepsilon(P(h(A_0))) \subseteq h_\varepsilon(A_0)$ . Thus,  $f : h_\varepsilon(A_0) \cup h_\varepsilon(B_0) \rightarrow h_\varepsilon(A_0) \cup h_\varepsilon(B_0)$  is a cyclic continuous function satisfying  $f(h_\varepsilon(A_0)) \subseteq h_\varepsilon(B_0)$  and  $f(h_\varepsilon(B_0)) \subseteq h_\varepsilon(A_0)$ . By assumption, there is  $x_\varepsilon \in h_\varepsilon(B_0)$  such that  $d(x_\varepsilon, f(x_\varepsilon)) = \text{dist}(A, B)$ . i.e., for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is  $x_\varepsilon \in h_\varepsilon(B_0)$  such that

$$d(x_\varepsilon, h_\varepsilon(P(h(x_\varepsilon)))) = \text{dist}(A, B). \tag{2}$$

Since  $h_\varepsilon$  is  $\varepsilon$ -close, we have

$$d(P(h(x_\varepsilon)), h_\varepsilon(P(h(x_\varepsilon)))) < \text{dist}(A, B) + \varepsilon. \tag{3}$$

Hence, from (2) and (3), we have  $d(x_\varepsilon, h_\varepsilon(P(h(x_\varepsilon)))) \rightarrow \text{dist}(A, B)$  and  $d(P(h(x_\varepsilon)), h_\varepsilon(P(h(x_\varepsilon)))) \rightarrow \text{dist}(A, B)$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . By applying *UC*-property, we get

$$d(x_\varepsilon, P(h(x_\varepsilon))) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \tag{4}$$

By the compactness of  $A_0$ , without loss of generality, there is  $x_0 \in A_0$  such that  $x_\varepsilon \rightarrow x_0$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . From the continuity of  $P \circ h$ , we have  $P(h(x_\varepsilon)) \rightarrow P(h(x_0))$ . By (4), we have  $d(x_0, P(h(x_0))) = 0$ . i.e.,  $x_0 = P(h(x_0))$  and hence  $d(x_0, h(x_0)) = \text{dist}(A, B)$ .  $\square$

Let us illustrate the above theorem with the following example.

**Example 7** Consider  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with usual metric. Let  $A = \{(0, x) : 0 \leq x \leq 1\}$  and  $B = \{(1, x) : 0 \leq x \leq 1\}$  be nonempty compact subsets  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with  $A_0 = A, B_0 = B$ . For each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , define

$$P_\varepsilon(x) := \begin{cases} P_B(x), & \text{if } x \in A, \\ P_A(x), & \text{if } x \in B. \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

It is easy to see that  $P_\varepsilon$  is a single valued continuous and  $\varepsilon$ -close mapping satisfies Theorem 1. Hence, any cyclic continuous function on  $A \cup B$  has best proximity point.

Now, let  $A$  be a nonempty compact subset of a metric space  $X$ . Then the pair  $(A, A)$  has both *P*-property and *UC*-property. Also,  $A_0 = A$  and  $\text{dist}(A, A) = 0$ . Using these fact in Theorem 1, we obtain the following fixed point theorem.

**Corollary 1** *Let  $A$  be a nonempty compact subset of a metric space  $X$ . Suppose that for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a continuous function  $g_\varepsilon : A \rightarrow A$  satisfying:*

1.  $d(x, g_\varepsilon(x)) < \varepsilon$ , for all  $x \in A$ ,
2.  $g_\varepsilon(A)$  has the fixed point property.

Then every continuous function  $f : A \rightarrow A$  has at least one fixed point in  $A$ .

## Declarations

**Conflict of interest** The first author declares that he has no conflict of interest. The second author declares that she has no conflict of interest.

**Ethical approval** This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors

## References

1. Joó, I. 1989. A Brouwer type theorem. *Acta Math. Hungar.* 53: 385–387.
2. Brouwer, L.E.J. 1911. Über Abbildung von Mannigfaltigkeiten. *Math. Ann.* 71: 97–115.
3. Naber, G.L. 2000. *Topological methods in Euclidean spaces*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications Inc.
4. Franklin, Joel. 1980. *Methods of mathematical economics. Linear and nonlinear programming, fixed-point theorems* Springer-Verlag.
5. Schauder, J. 1930. Der Fixpunktsatz in Funktionalräumen. *Studia Mathematica* 2: 171–180.

6. Smart, D.R. 1974. *Fixed point theorems*. London: Cambridge University Press.
7. Sankar Raj, V. 2011. A best proximity point theorem for weakly contractive non-self mappings, *Nonlinear Analysis*, 74: 4804–4808.
8. Sankar Raj, V., A. Anthony Eldred. 2014. A characterization of strictly convex spaces and applications, *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 160: 703–710.
9. Suzuki, T., M. Kikkawa, and C. Vetro. 2009. The existence of best proximity points in metric spaces with the property UC, *Nonlinear Analysis* 71: 2918–2926.
10. Anthony Eldred, A., W.A. Kirk, P. Veeramani. 2005. Proximal normal structure and relatively non-expansive mappings. *Studia Math.* 171(3): 283–293.

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Springer Nature or its licensor 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.

## Authors and Affiliations

Sankar Raj Vaithilingam<sup>1</sup>  · A. Dhana Lakshmi<sup>1</sup>

✉ Sankar Raj Vaithilingam  
sankarrajv@gmail.com

A. Dhana Lakshmi  
dhanamarumugam96@gmail.com

<sup>1</sup> Department of Mathematics, Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tirunelveli 627012, Tamilnadu, India