

## Generalised Statistical Convergence For Double Sequences

A. M. Brono, Z. U. Siddiqui

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Maiduguri, Nigeria

**Abstract:** Recently, the concept of  $\beta$ -statistical Convergence was introduced considering a sequence of infinite matrices  $\beta = (b_{nk}(i))$ . Later, it was used to define and study  $\beta$ -statistical limit point,  $\beta$ -statistical cluster point,  $st_{\beta}$  - limit inferior and  $st_{\beta}$  - limit superior. In this paper we analogously define and study  $2\beta$ -statistical limit,  $2\beta$ -statistical cluster point,  $st_{2\beta}$  - limit inferior and  $st_{2\beta}$  - limit superior for double sequences.

**Keywords:** Double sequences, Statistical convergence,  $\beta$ -statistical Convergence Regular matrices, RH-regular matrices.

### I. Introduction

A double sequence  $x = [x_{jk}]_{j,k=0}^{\infty}$  is said to be convergent in the Pringsheim sense or p-convergent if for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exist  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $|x_{jk} - L| < \varepsilon$  whenever  $j, k > N$  and L is called the Pringsheim limit [1], denoted  $P\text{-lim} x = L$ .

A double sequence  $x$  is bounded if there exist a positive number M such that  $|x_{jk}| < M$  for all  $j, k$  i.e if  $\|x\| = \sup_{j,k} |x_{jk}| < \infty$ . Note that in contrast to the case for single sequences, a convergent double sequence need not be bounded.

Let  $A = (a_{nk})_{n,k=1}^{\infty}$  be a non-negative regular matrix. Then A-density of a set  $K \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  is defined if  $\delta_A(K) = \lim_n \sum_{k \in K} a_{nk}$  exists [2].

A sequence  $x = (x_k)$  is said to be A-statistically convergent to L if for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  the set  $K(\varepsilon) = \{k \in \mathbb{N} : |x_k - L| \geq \varepsilon\}$  has A-density zero [3], (see also [4] and [5]).

Recently, Kolk [6] generalized the idea of A-statistical convergent to  $\beta$ -statistical Convergence by using the idea of  $\beta$ -summability or  $F_{\beta}$ -convergence due to Stieglitz [7].

Let  $A = [a_{jk}^{mn}]_{j,k=0}^{\infty}$  be a regular doubly infinite matrix of real numbers for all  $m, n = 0, 1, \dots$ . In the similar manner as in [2], we define 2A-density of the set  $K = \{(j, k) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}\}$  if for  $m, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

$$\delta_{2A}(K) = \lim_{p,q \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=0}^p \sum_{k=0}^q a_{jk}^{mn} \quad (1.1)$$

exists and a double sequence  $x = (x_{jk})$  is said to be 2A-statistically convergent to L if for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  the set  $K(\varepsilon)$  has 2A-density zero.

Let  $\beta = (\beta_i)$  be a sequence of infinite matrices with  $\beta_i = (b_{jk}(i))$ . Then  $x = (x_{jk}) \in \ell_{\infty}^2$ , the space of bounded double sequences, is said to be F-convergent ( $2\beta$ -summable) to the value  $2\beta\text{-lim} x$  (denotes the generalized limit) if

$$\lim_n (\beta_i x)_n = \lim_{p,q \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=0}^p \sum_{k=0}^q b_{jk}^{mn}(i) = 2\beta\text{-lim} x \quad (1.2)$$

uniformly for  $i > 0, m, n = 0, 1, \dots$ . The method  $2\beta$  is regular if  $\beta = [b_{jk}^{mn}]_{j,k=0}^{\infty}$  is RH-Regular. (see [8]).

Kolk [6] introduced the following:

An index set K is said to have  $\beta$ -density  $\delta_{\beta}(K)$  equal to  $d$ , if the characteristic sequence of K is  $\beta$ -summable to  $d$ , i.e.

$$\lim_n \sum_{k \in K} b_{nk}(i) = d, \quad (1.3)$$

uniformly in  $i$ , where by index set we mean a set  $K = \{k_i\} \subset \mathbb{N}$ ,  $k_i < k_{i+1}$  for all  $i$ .

Now we extend this definition as follows:

An indexed set  $K = \{(j, k)\} \subseteq \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ ,  $j_i < j_{i+1}$ ,  $k_i < k_{i+1}$  for all  $i$ , is said to have  $2\beta$ -density  $\delta_{2\beta}(K) = d$ , if the characteristic sequence of K is  $2\beta$ -summable to  $d$ , i. e., if

$$\lim_{mn} \sum_{j \in K} \sum_{k \in K} b_{jk}^{mn}(i) = d \quad (1.4)$$

uniformly in  $i$ .

Let  $\mathcal{R}^*$  denote the set of all RH-regular methods  $2\beta$  with  $b_{jk}^{mn}(i) \geq 0$  for all  $j, k$  and  $i$ . let  $\beta \in \mathcal{R}^*$ , A double sequence  $x = (x_{jk})$  is called  $2\beta$ -statistically convergent to the number L if for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exist a subset  $K = \{(j, k)\} \subseteq \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ ,  $j, k = 1, 2, \dots$  such that

$$\delta_{2\beta}\{(j, k), j \leq n, k \leq m : |x_{jk} - L| \geq \varepsilon\} = 0 \tag{1.5}$$

and we write  $st_{2\beta}\text{-lim } x = L$ .

We denote by  $st(2\beta)$ , the space of all  $2\beta$ -statistically convergent sequences.

In particular, if  $\beta = (C_1)$ , the Cesaro matrix, the  $\beta$ -statistical convergence is reduced to  $C_{11}$ -statistical convergence.

## II. $2\beta$ -Statistical Cluster And Limit Points

We use the following examples to show that neither of the two methods, statistical convergence and  $2\beta$ -statistical convergence, implies the other.

**Example 2.1:** Consider the sequence of infinite matrices  $\beta = (\beta_i)$  with

$$b_{jk}^{mn}(i) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{i} + \frac{1}{ij}, & \text{if } k = j^2 \forall m, n \\ 1 - \frac{j}{i(j+1)}, & \text{if } k = j^2 + 1 \forall m, n \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

It is clear that  $\beta \in \mathcal{R}^*$ ,

Now let the sequence  $x = (x_{jk})$  and  $y = (y_{jk})$  be defined by

$$x_{jk} = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } k = n^2, \text{ for all } j \text{ and some } n \in \mathbb{N} \\ \frac{1}{k}, & \text{if } k = n^2 + 1, \text{ for all } j \text{ and some } n \in \mathbb{N} \\ k, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and

$$y_{jk} = \begin{cases} k, & \text{if } k = n^2, \text{ for all } j \text{ and some } n \in \mathbb{N} \\ 0, & \text{if } k = n^2 + 1, \text{ for all } j \text{ and some } n \in \mathbb{N} \\ 1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Then  $x$  is not statistically convergent to zero as  $\delta\{(i, j): |x_{ij}| \geq \varepsilon\} \neq 0$  but it is  $2\beta$ -statistically convergent to zero; and on the other hand  $y$  is statistically convergent but not  $2\beta$ -statistically convergent.

We now give some definitions for the method  $2\beta$ .

**Definition 2.2:** Let  $\beta \in \mathcal{R}^*$ . Then number  $\gamma$  is said to be  $2\beta$ -statistical cluster point of a sequence  $x_{jk}$  if for given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the set  $\{(j, k); |x_{jk} - \gamma| < \varepsilon\}$  does not have  $2\beta$ -density zero.

**Definition 2.3:** Let  $\beta \in \mathcal{R}^*$ . The number  $\lambda$  is said to be  $2\beta$ -statistical limit point of a sequence  $x_{jk}$  if there is a subsequence of  $x_{jk}$  which convergence to  $\lambda$  such that whose indices do not have  $2\beta$ -density zero.

Denote by  $\Gamma_x(2\beta)$ , the set of  $2\beta$ -statistical cluster points and by  $\Lambda_x(2\beta)$  the set of  $2\beta$ -statistical limit points of  $x = (x_{jk})$  it is clear from the above examples, that  $\Gamma_x(2\beta) = \{0\}$  and  $\Lambda_x(2\beta) = \{0\}$ ,  $\Gamma_y(2\beta) = \{0\}$  and  $\Lambda_y(2\beta) = \{0\}$ . Throughout this paper we will consider  $\beta \in \mathcal{R}^*$ .

**Definition 2.4:** Let us write  $G_x = \{g \in \mathcal{R}: \delta_{2\beta}(\{(j, k): x_{jk} > g\}) \neq 0\}$  and  $F_x = \{f \in \mathcal{R}: \delta_{2\beta}(\{(j, k): x_{jk} < f\}) \neq 0\}$  for a double sequence  $x = x_{jk}$ . Then we define  $2\beta$ -statistical limit superior and  $2\beta$ -statistical limit inferior of  $x = (x_{jk})$  as follows:

$$st_{2\beta}\text{-lim Sup } x = \begin{cases} \text{Sup } G_x, & \text{if } G_x \neq \emptyset \\ -\infty, & \text{if } G_x = \emptyset \end{cases}$$

$$st_{2\beta}\text{-lim Inf } x = \begin{cases} \text{Inf } F_x, & \text{if } F_x \neq \emptyset \\ +\infty, & \text{if } F_x = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

**Definition 2.5:** The double sequence  $x = (x_{jk})$  is said to be  $2\beta$ -statistically bounded if there is a number  $d$  such that  $\delta_{2\beta}\{(j, k): |x_{jk}| > d\} = 0$ .

**Definition 2.6:** Consider the same  $\beta$  as defined in example 2.1, define the sequence  $z = (z_{jk})$  by

$$z_{jk} = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } k = n^2, \text{ for all } k \text{ and some } n \in \mathbb{N} \\ 1, & \text{if } k = n^2 + 1, \text{ for all } k \text{ and some } n \in \mathbb{N} \\ k, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Here we see that  $z$  is not bounded above but it is  $2\beta$ -statistically bounded for  $\delta_{2\beta}\{(j, k): |z_{jk}| > 1\} = 0$ . Also  $z$  is not statistically bounded. Thus  $G_x = (-\infty, 1)$  and  $F_x = (0, \infty)$  so that  $st_{2\beta}\text{-lim Sup } z =$

1 and  $st_{2\beta} - \lim Inf z$ . Moreover  $\Gamma_x(2\beta) = \{0,1\} = \Lambda_x(2\beta)$  and  $z$  is neither  $2\beta$  –statistically nor statistically convergent. In this example we see that  $z$  is  $2\beta$  –statistically bounded but not  $2\beta$  –statistically convergent. On the other hand in example 2.1  $y$  is statistically convergent and not  $2\beta$  –statistically bounded.

Also note that  $st_{2\beta} - \lim Supz$  equals the greatest element of  $\Gamma_x(2\beta)$  while  $st_{2\beta} - \lim Inf z$  is the least element  $\Gamma_x(2\beta)$ . This observation suggests the following.

**Theorem 2.7**

- (a) If  $l_1 = st_{2\beta} - \lim Supx$  is finite, then for every positive number  $\varepsilon$ 
  - (i)  $\delta_{2\beta}\{(j, k): |z_{jk}| > l_1 - \varepsilon\} \neq 0$  and  $\delta_{2\beta}\{(j, k): |z_{jk}| > l_1 + \varepsilon\} = 0$ .

Conversely, if (i) holds for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , then  $l_1 = st_{2\beta} - \lim Supx$ .
- (b) if  $l_2 = st_{2\beta} - \lim Inf x$  is finite, then from every positive number  $\varepsilon$ 
  - (ii)  $\delta_{2\beta}\{(j, k): |z_{jk}| > l_2 + \varepsilon\} \neq 0$  and  $\delta_{2\beta}\{(j, k): |z_{jk}| > l_2 - \varepsilon\} = 0$ .

Conversely, if (ii) holds for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  then  $l_2 = st_{2\beta} - \lim Inf x$ .

From definition 2.2 we see that the above theorem can be interpreted as showing that  $st_{2\beta} - \lim Supx$  and  $st_{2\beta} - \lim Inf x$  are the greatest and the least  $2\beta$  –statistical cluster points of  $x$ .

Note that  $2\beta$  –statistical boundedness implies that  $st_{2\beta} - \lim Supx$  and  $st_{2\beta} - \lim Inf x$  are finite, so that properties (i) and (ii) of Theorem 2.7 hold.

**III. The Main Results**

Throughout this paper by  $\delta_{2\beta}(K) \neq 0; K = \{(j, k) \in N \times N\}$  we mean that either  $\delta_{2\beta}(K) > 0$  or  $K$  does not have  $2\beta$  –density.

**Theorem 3.1:** For every real number sequence  $x, st_{2\beta} - \lim Inf x \leq st_{2\beta} - \lim Supx$ .

**Proof:** First consider the case in which  $st_{2\beta} - \lim Supx = -\infty$ , This implies that  $G_x = \emptyset$ , Therefore for every  $g \in R, \delta_{2\beta}\{(j, k): x_{jk} > g\} = 0$ , which implies that  $\delta_{2\beta}\{(j, k): x_{jk} \leq g\} = 1$ . So that for every  $f \in R, \delta_{2\beta}\{(j, k): x_{jk} < f\} \neq 0$ . Hence  $st_{2\beta} - \lim Inf x = -\infty$ ,

Now consider  $st_{2\beta} - \lim Supx = +\infty$ . This implies that for every  $\in R, \delta_{2\beta}\{(j, k): x_{jk} > g\} \neq 0$ . This implies that  $\delta_{2\beta}\{(j, k): x_{jk} \leq g\} = 0$ . Therefore for every  $f \in R, \delta_{2\beta}\{(j, k): x_{jk} < f\} = 0$ , which implies that  $F_x = \emptyset$ . Hence  $st_{2\beta} - \lim Inf x = +\infty$ .

Next assume that  $l_1 = st_{2\beta} - \lim Supx < +\infty$  and let  $l_2 = st_{2\beta} - \lim Inf x$ . Given  $\varepsilon > 0$  we show that  $l_1 + \varepsilon \in F_x$ , so that  $l_2 \leq l_1 + \varepsilon$ . By Theorem 2.7(a),  $\delta_{2\beta}\{(j, k): x_{jk} > l_1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\} = 0$ , since  $l_1 = \text{lub } G_x$ . This implies that  $\delta_{2\beta}\{(j, k): x_{jk} \leq l_1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\} = 1$ , which in turn gives  $\delta_{2\beta}\{(j, k): x_{jk} < l_1 + \varepsilon\} = 1$ . Hence  $l_1 + \varepsilon \in F_x$  and so that  $l_2 \leq l_1 + \varepsilon$  i.e  $l_2 \leq l_1$  since  $\varepsilon$  was arbitrary.

**Remark:** For any double sequence  $x = (x_{jk})$

$$st_2 - \lim Inf x \leq st_{2\beta} - \lim Inf x \leq st_{2\beta} - \lim Supx \leq st_2 - \lim Supx$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} st_2 - \lim Supx &= p - \lim Supx \\ st_2 - \lim Inf x &= p - \lim Inf x \end{aligned}$$

**Theorem 3.2:** For any double sequence  $x = x_{jk}$ ,  $2\beta$  –statistical boundness implies  $2\beta$  –statistical convergence if and only if

$$st_{2\beta} - \lim Inf x = st_{2\beta} - \lim Supx.$$

**Proof:** Let  $l_1 = st_{2\beta} - \lim Supx$  and  $l_2 = st_{2\beta} - \lim Inf x$ . First assume that  $st_{2\beta} - \lim x = L$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then  $\delta_{2\beta}\{(j, k): |x_{jk} - L| \geq \varepsilon\} = 0$ . So that

$$\delta_{2\beta}\{(j, k): x_{jk} > L + \varepsilon\} = 0,$$

which implies that  $l_1 \leq L$ . Also

$$\delta_{2\beta}\{(j, k): x_{jk} > L - \varepsilon\} = 0,$$

which implies that  $L \leq l_2$ . By theorem 3.1, we finally have  $l_1 = l_2$

Conversely, suppose  $l_1 = l_2 = L$  and  $x$  be  $2\beta$  –statistically bounded. Then for  $\varepsilon > 0$ , by Theorem 2.7 we have  $\delta_{2\beta}\{(j, k): x_{jk} > l_1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\} = 0$  and  $\delta_{2\beta}\{(j, k): x_{jk} < l_1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\} = 0$ . Hence  $st_{2\beta} - \lim x = L$

**Theorem 3.3:** If a double sequence  $x = x_{jk}$  is bounded above and  $2\beta$  –summable to the number  $L = st_{2\beta} - \lim Supx$ , then  $x$  is  $2\beta$  –statistically convergent to  $L$ .

**Proof:** Suppose that  $x = x_{jk}$  is not  $2\beta$  –stistically convergent to  $L$ . Then by Theorem 3.2  $st_{2\beta} - \lim Inf x < L$ . So there is a number  $M < L$  such that  $\delta_{2\beta}\{(j, k): x_{jk} < M\} \neq 0$ .

Let  $K_1 = \{(j, k): x_{jk} < M\}$ , then for every  $\varepsilon > 0, \delta_{2\beta}\{(j, k): x_{jk} > L + \varepsilon\} = 0$ .

We write  $K_2 = \{(j, k): M \leq x_{jk} \leq L + \varepsilon\}$  and  $K_3 = \{(j, k): x_{jk} > L + \varepsilon\}$ , and let  $G = \text{Sup}_{jk} x_{jk} < \infty$ , since  $\delta_{2\beta}(K_1) \neq 0$ , there are many  $n$  such that

$$\lim \text{Sup}_n \sum_{jk=0,0}^{\infty} b_{mnjk}(i) \geq d > 0$$

and for each  $n, i$

$$\sum_{j,k=1,1}^{\infty} |b_{mnjk}(i)x_{jk}| < \infty.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{jk=1,1}^{\infty} b_{mnjk}(i)x_{jk} &= (\sum_{jk \in K_1} + \sum_{jk \in K_2} + \sum_{jk \in K_3}) b_{mnjk}(i)x_{jk} \\ &\leq M \sum_{jk \in K_1} b_{mnjk}(i) + (L + \varepsilon) \sum_{jk \in K_2} b_{mnjk}(i) + G \sum_{jk \in K_3} b_{mnjk}(i) \\ &= M \sum_{jk \in K_1} b_{mnjk}(i) + (L + \varepsilon) \sum_{jk=1,1}^{\infty} b_{mnjk}(i) - (L + \varepsilon) \sum_{jk \in K_1} b_{mnjk}(i) + O(i) \\ &= - \sum_{jk \in K_1} b_{mnjk}(i)[-M + (L + \varepsilon)] + (L + \varepsilon) \sum_{jk=1,1}^{\infty} b_{mnjk}(i) + O(1) \\ &\leq L \sum_{jk=1,1}^{\infty} b_{mnjk}(i) - d(L - M) + \varepsilon(\sum_{jk=1,1}^{\infty} b_{mnjk}(i) - d) + O(1) \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\varepsilon$  is arbitrarily, it follows that

$$\lim \text{Inf} 2\beta x \leq L - d(L - M) < L.$$

Hence  $x$  is not  $2\beta$  – summable to  $L$

**Theorem 3.4:** If the double sequence  $x = (x_{jk})$  is bounded below and  $2\beta$  – summable to the number  $L = st_{2\beta} - \lim \text{Inf} x$ , then  $x$  is  $2\beta$  – statistically convergent to  $L$ .

**Proof.** The proof follows on the same lines as that of Theorem 3.3.

**Note:** It is easy to observe that in the above Theorems 3.3 and 3.4 the boundedness of  $x = (x_{jk})$  can not be omitted or even replaced by the  $2\beta$  – statistical boundedness.

For example consider the matrix  $\beta = A = (a_{nk})_{n,k=1}^{\infty}$  and define  $x = (x_{jk})$  by

$$x = x_{jk} = \begin{cases} 2k - 1, & \text{if } k \text{ is an odd square for all } j \\ 2, & \text{if } k \text{ is an even square for all } j \\ 1, & \text{if } k \text{ is an odd nonsquare for all } j \\ 0, & \text{if } k \text{ is an even nonsquare for all } j \end{cases}$$

Then,  $\text{Sup } x_{jk} = \infty$ , but  $G_x = [2, \infty), F_x = (-\infty, 0]$ ,

$$st_{2\beta} - \lim \text{Sup} x = 2, \text{ and } st_{2\beta} - \lim \text{Inf} x = 0. \text{ [see [9]]}$$

This makes it clear that every bounded double sequence is  $st_2$  – bounded and every  $st_2$  – bounded sequence is  $st_{2\beta}$  – bounded, but not conversely, in general.

#### IV. Conclusion

The double sequence which is bounded above and  $2\beta$ -summable to the number  $L = st_{2\beta} - \lim \text{sup} x$ , then it is  $2\beta$ -statistically convergent to  $L$ . Similarly, a double sequence which is bounded below and  $2\beta$ -summable to the number  $\ell = st_{2\beta} - \lim \text{inf} x$ , then it is  $2\beta$ -statistically convergent to  $\ell$ .

#### References

- [1] A. Pringsheim, Zur theorie der zweifach unendlichen zahlenfolgen, *Mathematical Annals*, 53, 1900, 289–321.
- [2] A. R. Freedman and J. J. Sember, Densities and summability, *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 95, no. 2, 1981, 293–305.
- [3] R. C. Buck, Generalized asymptotic density, *American Journal of Mathematics*, 75, 1953, 335 – 346
- [4] J. S. Connor, The statistical and strong p-Cesàro convergence of sequences, *Analysis*, 8, no. 1-2, 1988, 47–63.
- [5] E. Kolk, Matrix summability of statistically convergent sequences, *Analysis*, 13, 1981, 77–83.
- [6] E. Kolk, Inclusion relations between the statistical convergence and strong summability, *Acta et. Comm. Univ. Tartu. Math.* 2, 1998, 39–54.
- [7] M. Steiglitz, Eine verallgemeinerung des begriffs der fastdonvergenz, *Math. Japon*, 18, 1973, 53–70.
- [8] M. Mursaleen and O. H. H. Edely, Generalized statistical convergence, *Information Science*, no. 162, 2004, 287 – 294.
- [9] A. M. Alotaibi, Cesàro statistical core of complex number sequences, *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Science*, Hindawi Publishing Corporation, 2007, Article ID 29869, 2007, pp 1–9.