# SOME MATRIX TRANSFORMATIONS ON SEQUENCE SPACES OF INVARIANT MEANS

Mursaleen\*

Received 30:01:2009: Accepted 05:08:2009

### Abstract

In this paper we define new sequence spaces  $V_{\sigma}(\theta)$  and  $V_{\sigma}^{\infty}(\theta)$  which are related to the concept of  $\sigma$ -mean and lacunary sequence  $\theta = (k_r)$ , and characterize the matrix classes  $(l_1, V_{\sigma}^{\infty}(\theta))$  and  $(l_{\infty}, V_{\sigma}^{\infty}(\theta))$ .

**Keywords:** Lacunary sequence, Matrix transformation, Invariant mean, Almost lacunary convergence.

2000 AMS Classification: 40 C 05, 40 H 05, 46 A 45.

## 1. Introduction and preliminaries

We shall write w for the set of all complex sequences  $x=(x_k)_{k=0}^\infty$ . Let  $\varphi,\, l_\infty,\, c$  and  $c_0$  denote the sets of all finite, bounded, convergent and null sequences respectively. We write  $l_p:=\{x\in w: \sum_{k=0}^\infty |x_k|^p<\infty\}$  for  $1\leq p<\infty$ . By e and  $e^{(n)}$   $(n\in\mathbb{N})$ , we denote the sequences such that  $e_k=1$  for  $k=0,1,\ldots,\,e_n^{(n)}=1$  and  $e_k^{(n)}=0$   $(k\neq n)$ . For any sequence  $x=(x_k)_{k=0}^\infty$ , let  $x^{[n]}=\sum_{k=0}^n x_k e^{(k)}$  be its n-section.

Note that  $c_0$ , c, and  $l_{\infty}$  are Banach spaces with the sup-norm  $||x||_{\infty} = \sup_k |x_k|$ , and  $l^p$   $(1 \le p < \infty)$  are Banach spaces with the norm  $||x||_p = (\sum |x_k|^p)^{1/p}$  while  $\varphi$  is not a Banach space with respect to any norm.

A sequence  $(b^{(n)})_{n=0}^{\infty}$  in a linear metric space X is called a  $Schauder\ basis$  if for every  $x\in X$  there is a unique sequence  $(\beta_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$  of scalars such that  $x=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\beta_nb^{(n)}$ . A sequence space X with a linear topology is called a K-space if each of the maps  $p_i:X\to\mathbb{C}$  defined by  $p_i(x)=x_i$  is continuous for all  $i\in\mathbb{N}$ . A K-space is called an FK-space if X is a complete linear metric space, and a BK-space is a normed FK-space. An FK-space  $X\supset\varphi$  is said to have AK if every sequence  $x=(x_k)_{k=0}^{\infty}\in X$  has a unique representation  $x=\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}x_ke^{(k)}$ , that is,  $x=\lim_{n\to\infty}x^{[n]}$ . We use here standard notations as in [7].

<sup>\*</sup>Department of Mathematics, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh-202002, India. E-mail: mursaleenm@gmail.com

260 Mursaleen

Let  $\sigma$  be a one-to-one mapping from the set  $\mathbb N$  of natural numbers into itself. A continuous linear functional  $\phi$  on the space  $l_{\infty}$  is said to be an *invariant mean* or a  $\sigma$ -mean if and only if

- (i)  $\phi(x) \geq 0$ , when the sequence  $x = (x_k)$  has  $x_k \geq 0$  for all k,
- (ii)  $\phi(e) = 1$ , where e = (1, 1, 1, ...), and
- (iii)  $\phi(x) = \phi((x_{\sigma(k)}))$  for all  $x \in \ell_{\infty}$ .

Throughout this paper we assume the mapping  $\sigma$  has no finite orbits, that is,  $\sigma^p(k) \neq k$  for all integers  $k \geq 0$  and  $p \geq 1$ , where  $\sigma^p(k)$  denotes the  $p^{\text{th}}$  iterate of  $\sigma$  at k. Note that, a  $\sigma$ -mean extends the limit functional on the space c in the sense that  $\phi(x) = \lim x$  for all  $x \in c$ , (cf. [6]). Consequently  $c \subset V_{\sigma}$ , the set of bounded sequences all of whose  $\sigma$ -means are equal. We say that a sequence  $x = (x_k)$  is  $\sigma$ -convergent if and only if  $x \in V_{\sigma}$ , where

$$V_{\sigma} := \{x \in l_{\infty} : \lim_{n \to \infty} t_{pn}(x) = L \text{ uniformly in } n; \ L = \sigma\text{-}\lim x\}, \text{ where}$$

$$t_{pn}(x) = \frac{1}{p+1} \sum_{m=0}^{p} x_{\sigma^m(n)}.$$

Using this concept, Schaefer [8] defined and characterized the  $\sigma$ -conservative,  $\sigma$ -regular and  $\sigma$ -coercive matrices. If  $\sigma$  is translation then the  $\sigma$ -mean is often called a Banach limit [2] and the set  $V_{\sigma}$  reduces to the set f of almost convergent sequences studied by Lorentz [5].

By a lacunary sequence we mean an increasing sequence  $\theta = (k_r)$  of integers such that  $k_0 = 0$  and  $h_r := k_r - k_{r-1} \to \infty$  as  $r \to \infty$ . Throughout this paper the intervals determined by  $\theta$  will be denoted by  $I_r := (k_{r-1}, k_r]$ , and the ratio  $k_r/k_{r-1}$  will be abbreviated by  $q_r$  (see Fredman et al [4]). Recently, Aydin [1] defined the concept of almost lacunary convergence as follows: A bounded sequence  $x = (x_k)$  is said to be almost lacunary convergent to the number l if and only if

$$\lim_{r} \frac{1}{h_r} \sum_{j \in I_r} x_{j+n} = l, \text{ uniformly in } n.$$

Quite recently, this idea has been studied for double sequences by Çakan et al [3]. In this paper, we define new sequence spaces  $V_{\sigma}(\theta)$  and  $V_{\sigma}^{\infty}(\theta)$ , which are related to the concept of  $\sigma$ -mean and the lacunary sequence  $\theta = (k_r)$ , and characterize the matrix classes  $(l_1, V_{\sigma}^{\infty}(\theta))$  and  $(l_{\infty}, V_{\sigma}^{\infty}(\theta))$ .

### 2. $\sigma$ -lacunary convergent sequences

We define the following:

**2.1. Definition.** A bounded sequence  $x = (x_k)$  is said to be  $\sigma$ -lacunary convergent to the number l if and only if  $\lim_{r} \frac{1}{h_r} \sum_{j \in I_r} x_{\sigma^j(n)} = l$ , uniformly in n, and we let  $V_{\sigma}(\theta)$  denote the set of all such sequences, i.e.

$$V_{\sigma}(\theta) := \{ x \in l_{\infty} : \lim_{r} \frac{1}{h_{r}} \sum_{j \in I_{r}} x_{\sigma^{j}(n)} = l, \text{ uniformly in } n \}.$$

Note that for  $\sigma(n) = n + 1$ ,  $\sigma$ -lacunary convergence is reduced to almost lacunary convergence. Results similar to that of Aydin [1] can easily be proved for the space  $V_{\sigma}(\theta)$ .

**2.2. Definition.** A bounded sequence  $x=(x_k)$  is said to be  $\sigma$ -lacunary bounded if and only if  $\sup_{r,n} \left| \frac{1}{h_r} \sum_{j \in I_r} x_{\sigma^j(n)} \right| < \infty$ , and we let  $V_{\sigma}^{\infty}(\theta)$  denote the set of all such sequences,

i.e.

$$V_{\sigma}^{\infty}(\theta) := \{ x \in l_{\infty} : \sup_{r,n} |\tau_{rn}(x)| < \infty \},$$

where

$$\tau_{rn}(x) =: \frac{1}{h_r} \sum_{j \in I_r} x_{\sigma^j(n)}.$$

Note that  $c \subset V_{\sigma}(\theta) \subset V_{\sigma}^{\infty}(\theta) \subset l_{\infty}$ .

**2.3. Theorem.** The spaces  $V_{\sigma}(\theta)$  and  $V_{\sigma}^{\infty}(\theta)$  are both BK spaces with the norm

(2.1) 
$$||x|| = \sup_{r,n} |\tau_{rn}(x)|.$$

Proof. We consider the space  $V_{\sigma}(\theta)$ . The case  $V_{\sigma}^{\infty}(\theta)$  can be proved similarly. Let  $(x^{(i)}) = ((x_k^{(i)})_{k=0}^{\infty})$  be a Cauchy sequence in  $V_{\sigma}(\theta)$ , i.e. for  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is an N > 0 such that  $\|x^{(i)} - x^{(m)}\| = \sup_{r,n} |\tau_{rn}(x^{(i)} - x^{(m)})| < \varepsilon$  for all  $i, m \ge N$ . Since  $|x_k^{(i)}| \le \|x^{(i)}\|$  for each i, and  $V_{\sigma}(\theta) \subset l_{\infty}$ , we have  $|x^{(i)} - x^{(m)}| < \varepsilon$  for all  $i, m \ge N$ . So  $(x^{(i)})$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $\mathbb{R}$ , and hence convergent in  $\mathbb{R}$  (since  $\mathbb{R}$  is complete). That is, for each k,  $x_k^{(i)} \to x_k$ , say, as  $i \to \infty$ . Let  $x = (x_k)_{k=0}^{\infty}$ . Then by the definition of  $V_{\sigma}(\theta)$ , we have  $\|x^{(i)} - x\| = \sup_{m,n} |\tau_{mn}(x^{(i)} - x)| \to 0$ ,  $(i \to \infty)$ , since  $x_n^{(i)} \to x_n$  and  $\tau_{rn}(x^{(i)} - x) = \frac{1}{h_r} \sum_{j \in I_r} T^j(x_n^{(i)} - x_n) \to 0$ , where  $T^j x_n$  means  $x_{\sigma^j(n)}$ .

Now, we have to show that  $x \in V_{\sigma}(\theta)$ . Since  $(x^{(i)})$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $V_{\sigma}(\theta)$ , we have that for a given  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is a positive integer N depending upon  $\varepsilon$  such that, for all  $i, m \geq N$ ,

$$||x^{(i)} - x^{(m)}|| < \varepsilon.$$

Hence by (2.1) we have

$$\sup_{r,n} |\tau_{rn}(x^{(i)} - x^{(m)})| < \varepsilon.$$

This implies that

(2.2) 
$$|\tau_{rn}(x^{(i)} - x^{(m)})| < \varepsilon$$
, for each  $r, n$ ;

or

$$(2.3) |L^{(i)} - L^{(m)}| < \varepsilon.$$

where  $L^{(i)} = \sigma - \lim x^{(i)}$ . Let  $L = \lim_{m \to \infty} L^{(m)}$ . Then the  $\sigma$ -mean of x is  $\phi(x) = \lim_i \phi(x^{(i)})$  (since  $x = \lim_i x^{(i)}$  and  $\phi$  is continuous and linear). Further  $\lim_i \phi(x^{(i)}) = \lim_i L^{(i)} = L$  (since  $\phi(x^{(i)})$  means  $\sigma$ - $\lim_i x^{(i)}$ ). Now letting  $m \to \infty$  in (2.2) and (2.3), we get

(2.4) 
$$|\tau_{rn}(x^{(i)}-x)| < \varepsilon$$
, for each  $r, n$ ; (since  $x = \lim_{m} x^{(m)}$ )

and

(2.5) 
$$|L^{(i)} - L| < \varepsilon$$
, (since  $\lim_{m} L^{(m)} = L$ )

for i > N. Now fix i in the above inequalities. Since  $x^{(i)} \in V_{\sigma}(\theta)$  for fixed i, we obtain  $\lim_{r} \tau_{rn}(x^{(i)}) = L^{(i)}$ , uniformly in n

(since  $L^{(i)} = \sigma$ -  $\lim x^{(i)} = \lim_r \tau_{rn}(x^{(i)})$  uniformly in n). Hence, for a given  $\varepsilon$ , there exists a positive integer  $r_0$  (depending upon i and  $\varepsilon$  but not on n) such that

(2.6) 
$$|\tau_{rn}(x^{(i)}) - L^{(i)}| < \varepsilon$$
, (since  $x = \lim_{m} x^{(m)}$ )

262 Mursaleen

for  $r \geq r_0$  and for all n. Now by (2.4), (2.5) and (2.6), we get

$$|\tau_{rn}(x) - L| \le |\tau_{rn}(x) - \tau_{rn}(x^{(i)}) + \tau_{rn}(x^{(i)}) - L^{(i)} + L^{(i)} - L|$$

$$\le |\tau_{rn}(x) - \tau_{rn}(x^{(i)})| + |\tau_{rn}(x^{(i)}) - L^{(i)}| + |L^{(i)} - L|$$

$$< \varepsilon + \varepsilon + \varepsilon = 3\varepsilon.$$

for  $r \geq r_0$  and for all n. Then  $x \in V_{\sigma}(\theta)$ , which proves the completeness of  $V_{\sigma}(\theta)$ .

Now, let  $||x^{(m)} - x|| \to 0$  as  $m \to \infty$ . Then, for given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is  $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$||x^{(m)} - x|| < \varepsilon \text{ for all } m \ge m_0,$$

which implies

$$\sup_{r,n} |\tau_{rn}(x^{(m)} - x)| < \varepsilon \text{ for all } m \ge m_0,$$

and so that

$$|L^{(m)} - L| < \varepsilon$$
 for all  $m \ge m_0$ , as above in (2.5).

Hence we easily get

$$|x_k^{(m)} - x_k| < \varepsilon$$
 for all  $m \ge m_0$ , and for all  $k$ ,

that is  $|x_k^{(m)} - x_k| \to 0$  as  $m \to \infty$ , and this proves the continuity of the coordinate projection. Hence  $V_{\sigma}(\theta)$  is a BK space.

This completes the proof of the theorem.

# 3. Matrix transformations into $V_{\sigma}^{\infty}(\theta)$

Let X and Y be two sequence spaces and  $A = (a_{nk})_{n;k=1}^{\infty}$  an infinite matrix of real or complex numbers. We write  $Ax = (A_n(x))$ ,  $A_n(x) = \sum_k a_{nk}x_k$  provided that the series on the right converges for each n. If  $x = (x_k) \in X$  implies that  $Ax \in Y$ , then we say that A defines a matrix transformation from X into Y and we denote the class of such matrices by (X,Y).

In this section, we characterize the matrix classes  $(l_1, V_{\sigma}^{\infty}(\theta))$  and  $(l_{\infty}, V_{\sigma}^{\infty}(\theta))$ .

Let Ax be defined. Then, for all r, n, we write

$$\tau_{rn}(Ax) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} t(n, k, r) x_k,$$

where

$$t(n,k,r) = \frac{1}{h_r} \sum_{j \in I_r} a(\sigma^j(n),k),$$

and a(n,k) denotes the element  $a_{nk}$  of the matrix A.

**3.1. Theorem.**  $A \in (l_1, V_{\sigma}^{\infty}(\theta))$  if and only if

$$(3.1) \qquad \sup_{n,k,r} |t(n,k,r)| < \infty.$$

*Proof. Sufficiency.* Suppose that  $x = (x_k) \in l_1$ . We have

$$|\tau_{rn}(Ax)| \le \sum_{k} |t(n, k, r)x_{k}|$$

$$\le (\sup_{k} |t(n, k, r)|) \Big(\sum_{k} |x_{k}|\Big).$$

Taking the supremum over n, r on both sides and using (3.1), we get  $Ax \in V_{\sigma}^{\infty}(\theta)$  for  $x \in l_1$ .

*Necessity.* Let us define a continuous linear functional  $Q_{rn}$  on  $l_1$  by

$$Q_{rn}(x) = \tau_{rn}(Ax) = \sum_{k} t(n, k, r) x_k.$$

Now

$$(3.2) |Q_{rn}(x)| \le \sup_{k} |t(n,k,r)| ||x||_1,$$

$$||Q_{rn}|| = \sup_{||x||_1=1} \frac{|Q_{rn}(x)|}{||x||_1}$$

and hence

(3.3) 
$$||Q_{rn}|| \le \sup_{k} |t(n,k,r)|,$$

by (3.2). For any fixed r and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , define  $x = (x_i)$  by

(3.4) 
$$x_i = \begin{cases} \operatorname{sgn} t(n, k, r); & \text{for } i = k \\ 0; & \text{for } i \neq k; \end{cases}$$

Then  $||x||_1 = 1$ , and

$$|Q_{rn}(x)| = |t(n, k, r)x_k|$$
$$= |t(n, k, r)|.$$

Further,

$$||Q_{rn}|| = \sup_{|||x||_1=1} \frac{||Q_{rn}(x)||}{||x||_1}$$

$$= ||Q_{rn}(x)||, \text{ since } ||x||_1=1$$

$$= \sup_{r,n} |Q_{rn}(x)| \ge |Q_{rn}(x)|$$

$$= \left|\sum_{i} t(n, i, r)x_i\right|$$

$$= |t(n, k, r)|,$$

for  $x_i$  as defined in (3.4), hence

(3.5) 
$$||Q_{rn}|| \ge \sup_{k} |t(n, k, r)|.$$

Now, by (3.3) and (3.5),

$$||Q_{rn}|| = \sup_{k} |t(n,k,r)|.$$

Therefore, by the Banach-Steinhauss Theorem

$$\sup_{r,n} \|Q_{rn}\| = \sup_{r,n,k} |t(n,k,r)| < \infty,$$

since  $A \in (l_1, V_{\sigma}^{\infty}(\theta))$  gives

$$\sup_{r,n} |Q_{rn}(x)| = \sup_{r,n} \left| \sum_{k} t(n,k,r) x_k \right| < \infty.$$

This completes the proof of the theorem.

**3.2. Theorem.**  $A \in (l_{\infty}, V_{\sigma}^{\infty}(\theta))$  if and only if

$$(3.6) \qquad \sup_{n,r} \sum_{k} |t(n,k,r)| < \infty.$$

264 Mursaleen

*Proof. Sufficiency.* Suppose that (3.6) holds and  $x = (x_k) \in l_{\infty}$ . We have

$$|\tau_{rn}(Ax)| \le \sum_{k} |t(n,k,r)x_{k}|$$

$$\le \left(\sum_{k} |t(n,k,r)|\right) (\sup_{k} |x_{k}|).$$

Taking the supremum over n, r on both sides and using (3.6), we get  $Ax \in V_{\sigma}^{\infty}(\theta)$  for  $x \in l_{\infty}$ .

Necessity. Let  $A \in (l_{\infty}, V_{\sigma}^{\infty}(\theta))$ . Write  $q_n(x) = \sup_r |\tau_{rn}(Ax)|$ . It is easy to see that  $q_n$  is a continuous seminorm on  $l_{\infty}$ , since for  $x \in l_{\infty}$ 

$$|q_n(x)| \le M ||x||, M > 0.$$

Suppose (3.6) is not true. Then there exists  $x \in l_{\infty}$  with  $\sup_{n} q_{n}(x) = \infty$ . By the principle of condensation of singularities (cf. [9]), the set  $\{x \in l_{\infty} : \sup_{n} q_{n}(x) = \infty\}$  is of the second category in  $l_{\infty}$ , and hence non-empty, that is, there is  $x \in l_{\infty}$  with  $\sup_{n} q_{n}(x) = \infty$ . But this contradicts the fact that  $q_{n}$  is pointwise bounded on  $l_{\infty}$ . Now by the Banach-Steinhauss Theorem, there is a constant M such that

$$(3.7) q_n(x) \le M \|x\|_1.$$

Now define  $x = (x_k)$  by

$$x_k = \begin{cases} \operatorname{sgn} t(n, k, r); & \text{for each } r, n \ (1 \le k \le k_0), \\ 0; & \text{for } k > k_0. \end{cases}$$

Then  $x \in l_{\infty}$ . Applying this sequence to (3.7), we get (3.6).

This completes the proof of the theorem.

**Acknowledgment**: The present research was supported by the Department of Science and Technology, New Delhi, under grant number SR S4 MS:505 07.

### References

- Aydin, B. Lacunary almost summability in certain linear topological spaces, Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc. (2), 217–223, 2004.
- [2] Banach, S. Théorie des operations linéaires (Warsaw, 1932).
- [3] Çakan, C., Altay, B. and Çoşkun, H. Double lacunary density and lacunary statistical convergence of double sequences, Studia Sci. Math. Hung. DOI:10.1556/SScMath.2009.1110.
- [4] Freedman, A. R., Sember, J. J. and Raphael, M. Some Cesàro type summability spaces, Proc. London Math. Soc. 37, 508–520, 1978.
- [5] Lorentz, G. G. A contribution to the theory of divergent sequences, Acta Math. 80,167–190, 1948.
- [6] Mursaleen, Some new invariant matrix methods of summability, Quart. J. Math. Oxford 34 (2), 77–86, 1983.
- [7] Mursaleen, Elements of Metric Spaces (Anamaya Publ., New Delhi, 2005).
- [8] Schaefer, P. Infinite matrices and invariant means, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 36, 104--110.
- [9] Yosida, Y. Functional Analysis (Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, New York, 1966).