

## ON BEST APPROXIMATIONS FOR MULTIVALUED MAPPINGS IN PSEUDOCONVEX METRIC SPACES

**Olga Hadžić**

Institute of Mathematics, University of Novi Sad  
Trg Dositeja Obradovića 4, 21000 Novi Sad, Yugoslavia

### **Abstract**

We prove a generalization of the Ky Fan [1] best approximations theorem for multivalued mappings in pseudoconvex metric spaces.

*AMS Mathematics Subject Classification (1991):* 47H10

*Key words and phrases:* Best approximations, multivalued mappings.

### **1. Introduction**

Best approximations theorems for multivalued mappings are proved in [4] and [5] in locally convex Hausdorff topological vector spaces . It is well known that KKM theory is very useful in the fixed point theory and in the best approximations theory. Using a generalization of the KKM principle, proved by Ch. Horvath [3], we shall prove a best approximations theorem for multivalued mappings in pseudoconvex metric spaces. As an application a theorem on the approximate fixed point for multivalued mappings is proved.

## 2. Preliminaries

In [3] the following definition is introduced.

**Definition 1.** Let  $X$  be a topological space and  $h : X \times X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow X$  so that:

- (i)  $h(x, y, 0) = y$ ,  $h(x, y, 1) = x$ , for every  $(x, y) \in X \times X$ .
- (ii) For every finite subset  $A \subset X$ ,  $h|_{\text{co}_h(A) \times \text{co}_h(A) \times [0, 1]}$  is continuous, where  $\text{co}_h(A)$  is the convex hull of  $A$  with respect to  $h$ .

Then  $h$  is a pseudoconvex structure on  $X$  and  $(X, h)$  a pseudoconvex space.

Let  $(X, h)$  be a pseudoconvex space and  $R : X \rightarrow 2^X$  ( the family of all nonempty subsets of  $X$ ). The mapping  $R$  is said to be an element of  $KKM_h(X)$  [3] if for every finite subset  $A \subset X$ :

$$\text{co}_h(A) \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in A} R(x).$$

In [3] the following theorem is proved.

**Theorem A.** Let  $(X, d, h)$  be a complete pseudometric space and  $R \in KKM_h(X)$  such that  $R(x)$  is closed for every  $x \in X$ . If for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a finite set  $A$  such that  $\alpha(\bigcap_{x \in A} R(x)) < \varepsilon$ , where  $\alpha$  is the Kuratowski measure of noncompactness, then

$$M = \bigcap_{x \in X} R(x) \neq \emptyset$$

and  $M$  is compact.

Every normed space is a pseudoconvex space, if  $h(x, y, \lambda) = \lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y$ . In 1970. [6] Takahashi introduced the notion of a metric space with a convex structure.

**Definition 2.** Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space and  $W : X \times X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ . The mapping  $W$  is a convex structure on  $X$  if for all  $x, y \in X$  and  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$

$$d(u, W(x, y, \lambda)) \leq \lambda d(u, x) + (1 - \lambda)d(u, y)$$

for every  $u \in X$ . Then  $(X, d, W)$  is a convex metric space.

If  $W$  is continuous or  $\text{cow}(A)$  is compact for every finite  $A \subset X$  then  $(X, d, W)$  is a pseudoconvex metric space.

Talman introduced in [7] the notion of a strongly convex metric space in the following way.

**Definition 3.** Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space and

$$P = \{(t_1, t_2, t_3) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \times [0, 1], t_1 + t_2 + t_3 = 1\}.$$

A strongly convex structure (SCS) on  $X$  is a continuous function  $K : X \times X \times X \times P \rightarrow X$  with the property that for each  $(x_1, x_2, x_3, t_1, t_2, t_3) \in X \times X \times X \times P$ ,  $K(x_1, x_2, x_3, t_1, t_2, t_3)$  is the unique point of  $X$  which satisfies

$$d(y, K(x_1, x_2, x_3, t_1, t_2, t_3)) \leq \sum_{k=1}^3 t_k d(y, x_k),$$

for every  $y \in X$ .

If  $(X, d, W)$  is strongly convex metric space and  $K$  its SCS then  $W_K : X \times X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ , defined by:

$$W_K(x_1, x_2, t) = K(x_1, x_2, x_1, t, 1 - t, 0)$$

is a Takahashi convex structure.

If  $(X, d, W)$  is strongly convex metric space  $\text{cow}(A)$  is compact for every finite  $A$ .

### 3. A theorem on best approximations

**Definition 4.** Let  $(X, d, h)$  be a pseudoconvex metric space,  $M$  a nonempty convex subset of  $X$  and  $g : M \rightarrow X$ . The mapping  $g$  is said to be generalized  $h$ -almost affine if the following condition (a) is satisfied:

For every compact and convex subset  $A \subset X$ , every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , every  $\{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n\} \subset A$  and every  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\} \subset M$  :

$$(a) \quad \min_{z \in A} d(g(y), z) \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} d(g(x_i), z_i),$$

where  $y$  is an arbitrary element from  $\text{co}_h\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ .

**Remark.** If  $A = \{z\}$ , (a) reduces to the condition:

$$d(g(y), z) \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} d(g(x_i), z)$$

i.e.  $g$  is also an  $h$ -almost affine mapping [2].

**Lemma 1.** *If  $(X, \|\cdot\|)$  is a normed space,  $M$  a nonempty, convex subset of  $X$ , and  $g : M \rightarrow X$  such that (b) holds:*

(b) *For every  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \geq 0$ ,  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = 1$ , every  $x_1, x_2 \in M$  and every  $z_1, z_2 \in X$  :*

$$\|g(\lambda_1 x_1 + \lambda_2 x_2) - \lambda_1 z_1 - \lambda_2 z_2\| \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq 2} d(g(x_i), z_i)$$

then (a) holds for  $h(x, y, \lambda) = \lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y$  ( $x, y \in X$ ;  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ ).

*Proof.* By induction in  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we shall prove that (b) implies (c):

(c) *For every  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n \geq 0$ ,  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \dots + \lambda_n = 1$ , and every  $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) \in M^n \times X^n$  :*

$$\|g(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i z_i\| \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} d(g(x_i), z_i)$$

Indeed, suppose that (c) holds for  $n = m$  and prove (c) for  $n = m + 1$ . We have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \|g(\sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \lambda_i x_i) - \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \lambda_i z_i\| &= \|g[(1 - \lambda_{m+1})(\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\lambda_i}{1 - \lambda_{m+1}} x_i) + \lambda_{m+1} x_{m+1}] \\ &\quad - [(1 - \lambda_{m+1})(\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\lambda_i}{1 - \lambda_{m+1}} z_i) + \lambda_{m+1} z_{m+1}]\|. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $M$  is convex and  $\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\lambda_i}{1 - \lambda_{m+1}} = 1$  it follows that  $\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\lambda_i}{1 - \lambda_{m+1}} x_i = x \in M$  and if  $z = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\lambda_i}{1 - \lambda_{m+1}} z_i$  we have that (b) implies:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|g[(1 - \lambda_{m+1})x + \lambda_{m+1} x_{m+1}] - [(1 - \lambda_{m+1})z + \lambda_{m+1} z_{m+1}]\| \\ &\leq \max\{\|g(x) - z\|, \|g(x_{m+1}) - z_{m+1}\|\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since (c) holds for  $n = m$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|g(x) - z\| &= \left\| g\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\lambda_i}{1 - \lambda_{m+1}} x_i\right) - \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\lambda_i}{1 - \lambda_{m+1}} z_i \right\| \leq \\ &\leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \|g(x_i) - z_i\| \end{aligned}$$

and so:

$$\left\| g\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \lambda_i x_i\right) - \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \lambda_i z_i \right\| \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq m+1} \|g(x_i) - z_i\|.$$

Suppose now that  $A$  is a compact and convex subset of  $X$ ,  $\{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n\} \subset A$ ,  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\} \subset M$  and  $y = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{z \in A} \|g(y) - z\| &\leq \left\| g\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i\right) - \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i z_i \right\| \leq \\ &\leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|g(x_i) - z_i\| \end{aligned}$$

since  $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i z_i \in A$ .

**Lemma 2.** *If  $(X, d, h)$  is a convex metric space, where  $h = W$  satisfies (d):*

$$\begin{aligned} (d) \quad d(W(x_1, x_2, \lambda), W(z_1, z_2, \lambda)) &\leq \lambda d(x_1, z_1) + (1 - \lambda) d(x_2, z_2), \\ &\text{for every } x_i, z_i \in X \ (i \in \{1, 2\}), \lambda \in [0, 1] \end{aligned}$$

then (a) holds for  $g(x) = x$ , for every  $x \in X$ .

*Proof.* Let  $A$  be a compact and convex subset of  $X$ . It is known that for every  $B \subset X$  :

$$\text{co}B = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbf{N}} \tilde{W}^n(B)$$

where  $\tilde{W}^n(B) = W(\tilde{W}^{n-1}(B))$ ,  $n \geq 2$ ,

$$\tilde{W}^1(B) = \{W(x, y; \lambda); \lambda \in [0, 1]; x, y \in B\}.$$

It is easy to see that for  $B = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\}$ ,  $z \in \bar{W}^n(B)$  if and only if  $z$  is of the form:

$$z = \bar{W}(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \dots, \bar{x}_{2^n}; \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{2^n-1}),$$

for some  $\lambda_i \in [0, 1]$  ( $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2^n - 1\}$ ), where  $\bar{x}_i \in B$  ( $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2^n\}$ ) and  $\bar{W}(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \dots, \bar{x}_{2^n}; \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{2^n-1})$  is defined by:

$$\bar{W}(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \lambda) = W(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \lambda)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{W}(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \dots, \bar{x}_{2^n}; \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{2^n-1}) = \\ \bar{W}(\bar{W}(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \dots, \bar{x}_{2^{n-1}}; \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{2^{n-1}-1}), \\ \bar{W}(\bar{x}_{2^{n-1}+1}, \bar{x}_{2^{n-1}+2}, \dots, \bar{x}_{2^n}; \lambda_{2^{n-1}}, \lambda_{2^{n-1}+1}, \dots, \lambda_{2^n-2}), \lambda_{2^n-1}). \end{aligned}$$

We shall prove that for every  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\} \subset X$ , every  $y \in \text{cow}\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\}$  and  $\{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m\} \subset A$ :

$$\min_{z \in A} d(y, z) \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} d(x_i, z_i).$$

If  $y \in \text{cow}\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\}$  then

$$y \in \bar{W}^n(\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\})$$

for some  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ , which means that

$$y = \bar{W}(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \dots, \bar{x}_{2^n}; \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{2^n-1}),$$

$\bar{x}_i \in \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\}$  ( $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2^n\}$ ) and  $\lambda_i \geq 0$  ( $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2^n - 1\}$ ).

Let  $z = \bar{W}(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2, \dots, \bar{z}_{2^n}; \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{2^n-1})$ , where  $\bar{z}_i = z_{k(i)} \in \{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m\}$  if and only if  $\bar{x}_i = x_{k(i)} \in \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\}$ .

We shall prove that (d) implies:

$$(1) \quad d(\bar{W}(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \dots, \bar{x}_{2^n}; \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{2^n-1}), \bar{W}(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2, \dots, \bar{z}_{2^n}; \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{2^n-1})) \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} d(x_i, z_i).$$

From (d) it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} d(\bar{W}(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \lambda_1), \bar{W}(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2, \lambda_1)) &= d(W(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \lambda_1), W(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2, \lambda_1)) \\ &\leq \lambda_1 d(\bar{x}_1, \bar{z}_1) + (1 - \lambda_1) d(\bar{x}_2, \bar{z}_2) \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} d(x_i, z_i). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that (1) holds for  $n = k$  and prove (1) for  $n = k + 1$ .

We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & d\left( \bar{W}(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \dots, \bar{x}_{2^{k+1}}; \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{2^{k+1}-1}), \right. \\
 & \quad \left. \bar{W}(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2, \dots, \bar{z}_{2^{k+1}}; \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{2^{k+1}-1}) \right) = \\
 & = d\left( \bar{W}\left( \bar{W}(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \dots, \bar{x}_{2^k}; \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{2^k-1}), \right. \right. \\
 & \quad \left. \left. \bar{W}(\bar{x}_{2^k+1}, \dots, \bar{x}_{2^{k+1}}; \lambda_{2^k}, \dots, \lambda_{2^{k+1}-2}), \lambda_{2^{k+1}-1} \right), \right. \\
 & \quad \left. \bar{W}\left( \bar{W}(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2, \dots, \bar{z}_{2^k}; \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{2^k-1}), \right. \right. \\
 & \quad \left. \left. \bar{W}(\bar{z}_{2^k+1}, \dots, \bar{z}_{2^{k+1}}; \lambda_{2^k}, \dots, \lambda_{2^{k+1}-2}), \lambda_{2^{k+1}-1} \right) \right) \leq \\
 & \leq \lambda_{2^{k+1}-1} d\left( \bar{W}(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \dots, \bar{x}_{2^k}; \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{2^k-1}), \right. \\
 & \quad \left. \bar{W}(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2, \dots, \bar{z}_{2^k}; \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{2^k-1}) \right) + \\
 & + (1 - \lambda_{2^{k+1}-1}) d\left( \bar{W}(\bar{x}_{2^k+1}, \dots, \bar{x}_{2^{k+1}}; \lambda_{2^k}, \dots, \lambda_{2^{k+1}-2}), \right. \\
 & \quad \left. \bar{W}(\bar{z}_{2^k+1}, \dots, \bar{z}_{2^{k+1}}; \lambda_{2^k}, \dots, \lambda_{2^{k+1}-2}) \right) \\
 & \leq \lambda_{2^{k+1}-1} \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} d(x_i, z_i) + (1 - \lambda_{2^{k+1}-1}) \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} d(x_i, z_i) = \\
 & \quad = \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} d(x_i, z_i).
 \end{aligned}$$

From (1) we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \min_{u \in A} d(y, u) & \leq d(y, z) = d(\bar{W}(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \dots, \bar{x}_{2^n}; \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{2^n-1}), \\
 & \quad \bar{W}(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2, \dots, \bar{z}_{2^n}; \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{2^n-1}))
 \end{aligned}$$

since  $A$  is convex and  $z = W(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2, \dots, \bar{z}_{2^n}; \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{2^n-1}) \in coA$ . Hence (1) implies that

$$\min_{u \in A} d(y, u) \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} d(x_i, z_i).$$

In the next theorem  $\mathcal{K}(X)$  is the family of all nonempty, convex and compact subsets of  $X$ .

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $(X, d, h)$  be a pseudoconvex metric space,  $\emptyset \neq M$  a convex and complete subset of  $X$ ,  $g$  a continuous generalized  $h$ -almost affine mapping of  $M$  onto  $M$  and  $F : M \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(X)$  a continuous mapping such that:*

$$\inf_{x \in M} \alpha\{\{y; y \in M, d(g(y), F(y)) \leq d(g(x), F(y))\}\} = 0.$$

Then there exists  $y_0 \in M$  such that

$$d(g(y_0), F(y_0)) = \inf_{x \in M} d(x, F(y_0)).$$

*Proof.* We shall prove that all the conditions of Theorem A are satisfied for  $R(x)$  ( $x \in M$ ) defined by:

$$R(x) = \{y; y \in M, d(g(y), F(y)) \leq d(g(x), F(y))\}.$$

First, we shall prove that  $R$  is a  $KKM_h(M)$  mapping. Let  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\} \subset M$  and  $y \in \text{co}_h\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\}$ . If  $y \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^m R(x_i)$  i.e.  $y \notin R(x_i)$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$  then

$$(2) \quad d(g(y), F(y)) > d(g(x_i), F(y)), \quad i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}.$$

From (2) it follows that there exists  $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_m\} \subset F(y)$  such that

$$(3) \quad d(g(y), F(y)) > d(g(x_i), v_i), \quad i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}.$$

Since  $F(y)$  is compact and convex subset of  $X$  and  $g$  is generalized  $h$ -almost affine it follows that

$$d(g(y), F(y)) = \min_{z \in F(y)} d(g(y), z) \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} d(g(x_i), v_i),$$

which contradicts (3). Hence

$$\text{co}_h\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^m R(x_i)$$

which means that  $R \in KKM_h(M)$ . In order to prove that  $R(x)$  is closed for every  $x \in M$  we shall prove that the mapping  $y \rightarrow d(g(y), F(y))$  ( $y \in M$ ) is lower semicontinuous and for every  $x \in M$ ,  $y \rightarrow d(g(x), F(y))$  is upper semicontinuous.

Since  $F(y)$  is compact it follows that for  $\gamma > 0$ :

$$P_\gamma = \{y; y \in M, d(g(y), F(y)) > \gamma\} = \{y; y \in M, (g(y), F(y)) \subset \{(z, v); (z, v) \in M \times X; d(z, v) > \gamma\}\}.$$



The set  $\{(z, v); (z, v) \in M \times X; d(z, v) > \gamma\}$  is open and the mapping  $y \rightarrow (g(y), F(y))$  is upper semicontinuous, hence  $P_\gamma$  is open and so  $y \rightarrow d(g(y), F(y))$  is lower semicontinuous.

Similarly, if

$$Q_\gamma = \{y; y \in M, d(g(x), F(y)) < \gamma\} = \\ \{y; y \in M, F(y) \cap \{v; v \in X; d(g(x), v) < \gamma\} \neq \emptyset\}$$

then  $Q_\gamma$  is open, since  $F$  is lower semicontinuous and  $\{v; v \in X; d(g(x), v) < \gamma\}$  is open.

Hence  $y \rightarrow d(g(x), F(y))$  ( $y \in M$ ) is upper semicontinuous.

From Theorem A it follows that  $\bigcap_{x \in M} R(x) \neq \emptyset$ . If  $y_0 \in R(x)$ , for every  $x \in M$  then

$$d(g(y_0), F(y_0)) \leq d(g(x), F(y_0))$$

for every  $x \in M$  and so

$$d(g(y_0), F(y_0)) = \inf_{x \in M} d(x, F(y_0)).$$

**Corollary 1.** Let  $(X, \|\cdot\|)$  be a normed space,  $\emptyset \neq M$  a convex and complete subset of  $X$ ,  $g$  a continuous mapping from  $M$  onto  $M$  such that (b) holds and  $F : M \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(X)$  a continuous mapping such that

$$\inf_{x \in M} \alpha[\{y; y \in M, d(g(y), F(y)) \leq d(g(x), F(y))\}] = 0.$$

Then there exists  $y_0 \in M$  such that

$$d(g(y_0), F(y_0)) = \inf_{x \in M} d(x, F(y_0)).$$

**Corollary 2.** Let  $(X, d, W)$  be a convex metric space such that (d) holds, and  $W$  is continuous or  $\text{cow}(A)$  is compact for every finite  $A \subset X$ . Let  $\emptyset \neq M$  be a convex and complete subset of  $X$ , and  $F : M \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(X)$  a continuous mapping such that

$$\inf_{x \in M} \alpha[\{y; y \in M, d(y, F(y)) \leq d(g(x), F(y))\}] = 0.$$

Then there exists  $y_0 \in M$  such that

$$(4) \quad d(y_0, F(y_0)) = \inf_{x \in M} d(x, F(y_0)).$$

*Proof.* Since  $W$  is continuous or  $\text{co}_W(A)$  is compact for every finite  $A \subset X$  it follows that  $W|_{\text{co}_W(A) \times \text{co}_W(A) \times [0, 1]}$  is continuous and so  $(X, d, W)$  is a pseudoconvex metric space, where  $h = W$ . From Lemma 2 it follows that  $g(x) = x$ ,  $x \in M$  is a generalized  $h$ -almost affine mapping and so from Theorem 1 it follows the existence of an element  $y_0 \in M$  such that (4) holds.

**Remark.** If in Theorem 1 we suppose that  $F : M \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(X)$  so that  $F(y) \cap M \neq \emptyset$ , for every  $y \in M$  then we obtain the existence of an element  $y_0 \in M$  such that  $g(y_0) \in F(y_0)$ .

Hence, if in Corollary 2 we suppose that  $F(y) \cap M \neq \emptyset$ , for every  $y \in M$  we obtain that  $y_0 \in F(y_0)$ .

#### 4. A theorem on approximate fixed points

In the next theorem  $N_\varepsilon(K) = \{x; x \in X, d(x, K) < \varepsilon\}$  ( $K \subset X, \varepsilon > 0$ ).

**Theorem 2.** Let  $(X, d, W)$  be a convex metric space such that (d) holds, and  $\text{co}_W(A)$  is compact for every finite  $A \subset X$ . Let  $\emptyset \neq M$  be a convex and complete subset of  $X$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $F : M \rightarrow 2^{N_\varepsilon(M)} \cap \mathcal{K}(X)$  a continuous mapping such that  $F(M)$  is bounded. Then

$$(5) \quad \inf_{x \in M} d(x, F(x)) \leq \varepsilon + \alpha[F(M)].$$

*Proof.* Let  $\delta > 0$  and  $\{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n\} \subset F(M)$  ( $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ ) be an  $\alpha[F(M)] + \frac{\delta}{2}$ -net of the set  $F(M)$ . Let  $u_i \in F(x_i)$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . Since  $\{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n\}$  is an  $\alpha[F(M)] + \frac{\delta}{2}$ -net of the set  $F(M)$

$$F(M) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n L(u_i, \alpha[F(M)] + \frac{\delta}{2})$$

and from  $F(x_i) \subseteq N_\varepsilon(M)$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  it follows the existence of  $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\} \subset M$  such that

$$d(u_i, v_i) < \varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{2}, \quad i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}.$$

The set  $H = \text{co}_W(\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\})$  is a compact and convex subset of  $M$  and from Corollary 2 it follows the existence of an  $y_0 \in H$  such

that

$$(6) \quad d(y_0, F(y_0)) = \inf_{x \in H} d(x, F(y_0)).$$

We shall prove that  $\inf_{x \in H} d(x, F(y_0)) \leq \varepsilon + \alpha[F(M)]$  which implies (5). For every  $u \in F(y_0)$  there exists  $u_i (i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\})$  such that  $u_i \in F(x_i)$  and  $d(u, u_i) < \alpha[F(M)] + \frac{\delta}{2}$ , and  $v_i (i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\})$  such that  $d(u_i, v_i) < \varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{2}$ . Then  $d(u, v_i) < \alpha[F(M)] + \varepsilon + \delta$  and so  $d(v_i, F(y_0)) < \alpha[F(M)] + \varepsilon + \delta$ . Hence

$$\inf_{x \in H} d(x, F(y_0)) < \alpha[F(M)] + \varepsilon + \delta.$$

and since  $\delta$  is an arbitrary positive number we obtain (5).

**Corollary 3.** *Let  $(X, d, K)$  be a strongly convex metric space and for  $W_K(d)$  holds. Let  $\emptyset \neq M$  be a convex and complete subset of  $X$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $F : M \rightarrow 2^{N_c(M)} \cap \mathcal{K}(X)$  a continuous mapping such that  $F(M)$  is bounded. Then (5) holds.*

*Proof:* In a strongly convex metric space  $\text{co}_{W_K}(A)$  is compact, for every finite subset of  $X$ .

## References

- [1] Fan, Ky, Extensions of two fixed point theorems of F.E.Browder, Math.Z.,112(1969),234-240.
- [2] Hadžić, O., Some remarks on a theorem on best approximations, Anal.Num.Théor.Approx.,15,1(1986),27-35.
- [3] Horvath, Ch., Point fixes et coïncidences pour les applications multivoques sans convexité, C.R.Acad.Sc.Paris,2296.Série I(1983),403-406.
- [4] Sehgal, V.M., Singh, S.P., A theorem on the minimization of a condensing multifunction and fixed points, J.Math.Anal.Appl.,107(1985),96-102.
- [5] Sehgal, V.M., Singh, S.P., A generalization to multifunction of Fan's best approximation theorem, Proc.Amer.Math.Soc.,102,3(1988),534-537.

- [6] Takahashi, W., A convexity in metric spaces and nonexpansive mappings, I, Kodai Math.Sem.Rep.,29(1977),62-70.
- [7] Talman, L., Fixed points for condensing multifunctions in metric spaces with convex structure, Kodai Math.Sem.Rep.,29(1977),62-70.

## REZIME

### O NAJBOLJIM APROKSIMACIJAMA ZA VIŠEZNAČNA PRESLIKAVANJA U PSEUDOKONVEKSNIM METRIČKIM PROSTORIMA

Dokazano je uopštenje Ky Fanove [1] teoreme o najboljim aproksimacijama za višeznačna preslikavanja u pseudokonveksnim metričkim prostorima.

*Received by the editors December 14, 1993*