



## *B*-Statistically *A*-Summability

Osama H. H. Edely

Department of Mathematics and Computer, Tafila Technical University  
P.O. Box 179, Tafila-66110, Jordan  
e-mail : [osamaedely@yahoo.com](mailto:osamaedely@yahoo.com)

**Abstract :** Recently, Edely and Mursaleen [1] defined statistically *A*-summability of a sequence  $x = (x_k)$ . In this paper we define *B*-statistically *A*-summability of  $x$ , that is,  $x$  is said to be *B*-statistically *A*-summable if  $Ax$  is *B*-statistically convergent; where *A* and *B* are non-negative regular matrices. We study here other related concepts and provide some interesting examples.

**Keywords :** statistical convergence; *A*-statistical convergence; *A*-summability; statistical *A*-summability; *B*-statistical *A*-summability.

**2010 Mathematics Subject Classification :** 40C05; 40H05.

---

## 1 Introduction and Preliminaries

Let  $l_\infty$  and  $c$  denote the spaces of all bounded and convergent sequences, respectively. Let  $A = (a_{nk})_{n,k=1}^\infty$  be an infinite matrix and  $x = (x_k)_{k=1}^\infty$  be a number sequence. By  $Ax = (A_n(x))$ , we denote the *A*-transform of the sequence  $x = (x_k)$ , where  $A_n(x) = \sum_{k=1}^\infty a_{nk}x_k$ . For any two sequence spaces *X* and *Y*, we denote by  $(X, Y)$  a class of matrices *A* such that  $Ax \in Y$  for  $x \in X$ , provided that the series  $\sum_{k=1}^\infty a_{nk}x_k$  converges for each *n*. If in addition  $\lim Ax = \lim x$ , then we denote such a class by  $(X, Y)_{reg}$ . A matrix *A* is called regular, i.e.  $A \in (c, c)_{reg}$  if  $A \in (c, c)$  and  $\lim_n A_n(x) = \lim_k x_k$  for all  $x \in c$ . The well-known necessary and sufficient conditions (Silverman-Toeplitz) for *A* to be regular are

- (i)  $\|A\| = \sup_n \sum_k |a_{nk}| < \infty$ ;
- (ii)  $\lim_n a_{nk} = 0$ , for each *k*;

(iii)  $\lim_n \sum_k a_{nk} = 1$ .

The concept of statistical convergence was first introduced by Fast [2]. In 1953, the concept arises as an example of convergence in density as introduced by Buck [3]. Schoenberg [4] studied statistical convergence as a summability method and Zygmund [5] established a relation between it and strong summability. This idea has grown a little fast after the paper of Salat [6], Fridy [7], Connor [8], Kolk [9], Mursaleen [10], Mursaleen and Edely [11] and many others.

Let  $K \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ , the set of natural numbers. Then the *natural density* of  $K$  is defined by

$$\delta(K) = \lim_n \frac{1}{n} | \{k \leq n : k \in K\} |,$$

if the limit exists, where the vertical bars denote the cardinality of the enclosed set. Notice that

$$\delta(K) = \lim_n \frac{1}{n} | K_n | = \lim_n (C_1 \chi_K)_n,$$

where  $C_1 = (C, 1)$  is the Cesàro matrix of order 1 and  $\chi_K$  denotes the characteristic sequence of  $K$  given by

$$(\chi_K)_i = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } i \notin K, \\ 1, & \text{if } i \in K. \end{cases}$$

A sequence  $x = (x_k)$  of real numbers is said to be *statistically convergent* to the number  $L$  provided that for every  $\epsilon > 0$  the set  $K(\epsilon) = \{k \in \mathbb{N} : |x_k - L| \geq \epsilon\}$  has natural density zero; in this case we write  $st\text{-}\lim x = L$ . By the symbol  $st$  we denote the set of all statistically convergent sequences. Notice that every convergent sequence is statistically convergent to the same limit but not conversely, for example let

$$x_k = \begin{cases} k; & \text{if } k \text{ is a square,} \\ 0; & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

here  $x$  is unbounded even so it is statistically convergent to zero.

Freedmann and Sember [12] generalized the natural density by replacing  $C_1$  with an arbitrary non-negative regular matrix  $A$ . A subset  $K$  of  $\mathbb{N}$  has  $A$ -density if

$$\delta_A(K) = \lim_n \sum_{k \in K} a_{nk}$$

exists. Connor [13, 14] and Kolk [9] extended the idea of statistical convergence to  $A$ -statistical convergence by using the notion of  $A$ -density.

A sequence  $x$  is said to be  $A$ -statistically convergent to  $L$  if  $\delta_A(K(\epsilon)) = 0$  for every  $\epsilon > 0$ . In this case we write  $st_A\text{-}\lim x_k = L$ . By the symbol  $st_A$  we denote the set of all  $A$ -statistically convergent sequences.

The idea of statistical  $(C, 1)$ -summability was introduced by Moricz [15]. In [1], Edely and Mursaleen generalized these statistical summability methods by defining the statistical  $A$ -summability and studied its relationship with  $A$ -statistical convergence. For more general case of  $A$ -statistical convergence, we refer to [16].

Let  $A = (a_{ij})$  be a non-negative regular matrix. A sequence  $x$  is said to be *statistically  $A$ -summable* to  $L$  if for every  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\delta(\{i \leq n : |y_i - L| \geq \epsilon\}) = 0$ , i.e.

$$\lim_n \frac{1}{n} |\{i \leq n : |y_i - L| \geq \epsilon\}| = 0,$$

where  $y_i = A_i(x)$ . Thus  $x$  is statistically  $A$ -summable to  $L$  if and only if  $Ax$  is statistically convergent to  $L$ . In this case we write  $L = (A)_{st}\text{-lim } x = st\text{-lim } Ax$ . By  $(A)_{st}$  we denote the set of all statistically  $A$ -summable sequences.

## 2 Some New Definitions and Examples

In this section we define  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -summable for a non-negative regular matrices  $A$  and  $B$ .

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $A = (a_{ij})$  and  $B = (b_{nk})$  be two non-negative regular matrices. A sequence  $x = (x_k)$  of real numbers is said to be  *$B$ -statistically  $A$ -summable* to  $L$ , if for every  $\epsilon > 0$ , the set  $K_\epsilon = \{i : |y_i - L| \geq \epsilon\}$  has  $B$ -density zero, thus

$$\delta_B(K_\epsilon) = \lim_n \sum_{k \in K_\epsilon} b_{nk} = \lim_n (B\chi_{K_\epsilon}) = \lim_n \sum_k b_{nk} \chi_{K_\epsilon}(k) = 0,$$

where  $y_i = A_i(x) = \sum_j a_{ij} x_j$ . In this case we denote by  $L = (A)_{st_B}\text{-lim } x = st_B\text{-lim } Ax$ . The set of all  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -summable sequences will be denoted by  $(A)_{st_B}$ .

**Remark 2.2.**

1. If  $B = (C, 1)$  matrix, then  $(A)_{st_B}$  is reduced to the set of statistically  $A$ -summable sequences due to Edely and Mursaleen [1].
2. If  $A = B = (C, 1)$  matrix, then  $(A)_{st_B}$  is reduced to the set of statistically  $(C, 1)$ -summable sequences due to Moricz [15].
3. If a sequence is convergent then it is  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -summable, since  $Ax$  converge and has  $B$ -density zero, but not conversely.
4. The spaces  $st$ ,  $st_B$ ,  $(A)_{st}$  and  $(A)_{st_B}$  are not comparable, even if  $A = B (\neq (C, 1))$ .
5. If a sequence is  $A$ -summable then it is  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -summable.
6. If a sequence is bounded and  $A$ -statistically convergent, then it is  $A$ -summable and hence statistically  $A$ -summable (see [1, Theorem 2.1]) and  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -summable but not conversely.

**Example 2.3.**

1. Let us define  $A = (a_{ij})$ ,  $B = (b_{nk})$  and  $x = (x_k)$  by

$$a_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1; & \text{if } j = i^2, \\ 0; & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$b_{nk} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \frac{1}{3} & 0 & \frac{1}{3} & 0 & \frac{1}{3} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \frac{1}{4} & 0 & \frac{1}{4} & 0 & \frac{1}{4} & 0 & \frac{1}{4} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & \cdot \\ \frac{1}{5} & 0 & \frac{1}{5} & 0 & \frac{1}{5} & 0 & \frac{1}{5} & 0 & \frac{1}{5} & 0 & 0 & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$x_k = \begin{cases} 1; & \text{if } k \text{ is an odd,} \\ 0; & \text{if } k \text{ is an even.} \end{cases}$$

Then

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_{ij} x_j = \begin{cases} 1; & \text{if } i \text{ is an odd,} \\ 0; & \text{if } i \text{ is an even.} \end{cases}$$

Here  $x \notin st$ ,  $x \notin (A)_{st}$ ,  $x \notin st_A$ ,  $x \notin (A)_{st_A}$  but  $x$  is  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -summable to 1, since  $\delta_B \{i : |y_i - 1| \geq \epsilon\} = 0$ . On the other hand we can see that  $x$  is  $B$ -summable and hence  $x$  is  $B$ -statistically  $B$ -summable,  $A$ -statistically  $B$ -summable,  $B$ -statistically convergent and statistically  $B$ -summable.

2. Let  $A = (a_{nk})$  and  $x = (x_k)$  be defined as

$$a_{nk} = \begin{cases} 1/2; & \text{if } n \text{ is a nonsquare and } k = n^2, k = n^2 + 1, \\ 1; & \text{if } n \text{ is a square and } k = n^2, \\ 0; & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$x_k = \begin{cases} 1; & \text{if } k = n^2, \\ k; & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

then

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_{nk} x_k = \begin{cases} 1/2; & \text{if } n \text{ is a nonsquare,} \\ n^2; & \text{if } n \text{ is a square.} \end{cases}$$

Here  $x$  is unbounded but statistically  $A$ -summable to  $1/2$ , also  $x$  is statistically  $A$ -bounded, since  $\delta \{i : |y_i| > \frac{1}{2}\} = 0$  but  $x$  is not  $A$ -summable. Now if we take  $B$  as in Example 2.3(1), we see that  $x$  is not  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -summable.

3. Let  $A = (a_{nk})$  and  $x = (x_k)$  be defined as Example 2.3(2) and define the matrix  $B$  as

$$b_{nk} = \begin{cases} 1; & n = k, n \text{ is a nonsquare,} \\ 1; & n = k - 1, n \text{ is a square,} \\ 0; & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

here  $x$  is  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -summable to  $\frac{1}{2}$ .

### 3 $B$ -Statistically $A$ -Cluster and Limit Points

The following definitions are analogue of statistical limit points, cluster points defined by Fridy [17].

**Definition 3.1.** The number  $\gamma$  is said to be  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -cluster point of a sequence  $x$  if for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  the set  $\{i : |y_i - \gamma| < \varepsilon\}$  does not have  $B$ -density zero.

**Definition 3.2.** The number  $\lambda$  is said to be  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -limit point of a sequence  $x$  if there is a subsequence of  $(y_i)$  which converges to  $\lambda$  such that whose indices do not have  $B$ -density zero.

We denote by  $\Gamma_{Ax}(B)$  the set of  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -cluster points and by  $\Lambda_{Ax}(B)$  the set of  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -limit points of  $x$ .

Like Fridy and Orhan [18], Demirci [19] has defined  $A$ -statistical limit superior (inferior) and statistical bounded. Here we define  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -limit superior (inferior) and  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -bounded.

**Definition 3.3.** Let us write

$$G = \{g \in \mathbb{R} : \delta_B(\{i : y_i > g\}) \neq 0\} \text{ and } F = \{f \in \mathbb{R} : \delta_B(\{i : y_i < f\}) \neq 0\},$$

for a number sequence  $x = (x_k)$ . Then we define the  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -limit superior and  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -limit inferior of  $x$  as follows:

$$st_B - \limsup Ax = \begin{cases} \sup G, & G \neq \emptyset, \\ -\infty, & G = \emptyset, \end{cases}$$

and

$$st_B - \liminf Ax = \begin{cases} \inf F, & F \neq \emptyset, \\ +\infty, & F = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

**Definition 3.4.** The number sequence  $x$  is said to be  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -bounded if there is a number  $M$  such that  $\delta_B(\{i : |y_i| > M\}) = 0$ .

**Example 3.5.**

1. From Example 2.3(1) we see that  $\Lambda_{Ax}(B) = \{1\} = \Gamma_{Ax}(B)$ , also  $st_B - \limsup Ax = 1 = st_B - \liminf Ax$ , since  $G = (-\infty, 1)$  and  $F = (1, \infty)$ . Moreover  $x$  is bounded and  $Ax$  is also bounded and hence  $x$  is  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -bounded.

2. From Example 2.3(2) we see that  $\Lambda_{Ax}(B) = \{\frac{1}{2}\} = \Gamma_{Ax}(B)$ , also  $st_B - \limsup Ax = \infty$ ,  $st_B - \liminf Ax = \frac{1}{2}$ , since  $G = \mathbb{R}$  and  $F = (\frac{1}{2}, \infty)$ . Moreover  $x$  is not  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -bounded, since  $\delta_B(\{i : |y_i| > M\}) \neq 0$  for every number  $M$ .

3. From Example 2.3(3) we see that  $\Lambda_{Ax}(B) = \{\frac{1}{2}\} = \Gamma_{Ax}(B)$ , also  $st_B - \limsup Ax = st_B - \liminf Ax = \frac{1}{2}$ , since  $G = (-\infty, \frac{1}{2})$  and  $F = (\frac{1}{2}, \infty)$ . Moreover  $x$  is  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -bounded, since the set  $\{i : |y_i| > \frac{1}{2}\}$  has  $B$ -density zero.

The following result can be proved by straightforward least upper bound argument.

**Theorem 3.6.**

(a) If  $l_1 = st_B\text{-lim sup } Ax$  is finite, then for every positive number  $\varepsilon$

$$\delta_B(\{i : y_i > l_1 - \varepsilon\}) \neq 0 \text{ and } \delta_B(\{i : y_i > l_1 + \varepsilon\}) = 0. \quad (3.1)$$

Conversely, if (3.1) holds for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  then  $l_1 = st_B\text{-lim sup } Ax$ .

(b) If  $l_2 = st_B\text{-lim inf } Ax$  is finite, then for every positive number  $\varepsilon$

$$\delta_B(\{i : y_i < l_2 + \varepsilon\}) \neq 0 \text{ and } \delta_B(\{i : y_i < l_2 - \varepsilon\}) = 0. \quad (3.2)$$

Conversely, if (3.2) holds for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  then  $l_2 = st_B\text{-lim inf } Ax$ .

From the definition we see that the above theorem can be interpreted as saying that  $st_B\text{-lim sup } Ax$  and  $st_B\text{-lim inf } Ax$  are the greatest and least  $B$ -statistical  $A$ -cluster points of  $x$ .

Note that  $B$ -statistical  $A$ -boundedness implies that  $st_B\text{-lim sup } Ax$  and  $st_B\text{-lim inf } Ax$  are finite, so that properties (3.1) and (3.2) of Theorem 3.6 hold good.

Now we produce  $B$ -analogue of the results of Fridy and Orhan [18]. By  $\delta_B(K) \neq 0$  we mean that either  $\delta_B(K) > 0$  or  $K$  fails to have  $B$ -density.

**Theorem 3.7.** For any real number sequence  $x$

$$st_B\text{-lim inf } Ax \leq st_B\text{-lim sup } Ax.$$

*Proof.* First consider the case in which  $st_B\text{-lim sup } Ax = -\infty$ . This implies that  $G = \emptyset$ . Therefore for every  $g \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\delta_B(\{i : y_i > g\}) = 0$ , which implies that  $\delta_B(\{i : y_i \leq g\}) = 1$ . So that for every  $f \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\delta_B(\{k : x_k < f\}) \neq 0$ . Hence  $st_B\text{-lim inf } Ax = -\infty$ .

Now consider  $st_B\text{-lim sup } x = +\infty$ . This implies that for every  $g \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\delta_B(\{i : y_i > g\}) \neq 0$ . This means that  $\delta_B(\{i : y_i \leq g\}) = 0$ . Therefore for every  $f \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\delta_B(\{i : y_i < f\}) = 0$ , which implies that  $F = \emptyset$ . Hence  $st_B\text{-lim inf } Ax = +\infty$ .

Next we assume that  $l_1 = st_B\text{-lim sup } Ax < \infty$  and let  $l_2 = st_B\text{-lim inf } Ax$ . Given  $\varepsilon > 0$  we show that  $l_1 + \varepsilon \in F$ , so that  $l_2 \leq l_1 + \varepsilon$ . By Theorem 3.6,  $\delta_B(\{i : y_i > l_1 + \varepsilon/2\}) = 0$ , since  $l_1 = lub G$ . This implies that  $\delta_B(\{i : y_i \leq l_1 + \varepsilon/2\}) = 1$ , which in turn gives  $\delta_B(\{i : y_i < l_1 + \varepsilon\}) = 1$ . Hence  $l_1 + \varepsilon \in F$  and so that  $l_2 \leq l_1 + \varepsilon$ , i.e.  $l_2 \leq l_1$  since  $\varepsilon$  was arbitrary.  $\square$

**Remark 3.8.** For any number sequence  $x$ ,

$$\liminf x \leq \liminf Ax \leq st_B\text{-lim inf } Ax \leq st_B\text{-lim sup } Ax \leq \limsup Ax \leq \limsup x.$$

**Theorem 3.9.** The  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -bounded sequence  $x$  is  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -summable if and only if

$$st_B\text{-lim inf } Ax = st_B\text{-lim sup } Ax.$$

*Proof.* Let  $l_1 = st_B\text{-lim sup } Ax$  and  $l_2 = st_B\text{-lim inf } Ax$ . First assume that  $st_B\text{-lim } Ax = l$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then  $\delta_B(\{i : |y_i - l| \geq \varepsilon\}) = 0$ , so that  $\delta_B(\{i : y_i > l + \varepsilon\}) = 0$ , which implies that  $l_1 \leq l$ . Also  $\delta_B(\{i : y_i < l - \varepsilon\}) = 0$ , which implies that  $l \leq l_2$ . By Theorem 3.7, we finally have  $l_1 = l_2$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $l_1 = l_2 = l$  and  $x$  are  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -bounded. Then for  $\varepsilon > 0$ , by Theorem 3.6, we have  $\delta_B(\{i : y_i > l + \varepsilon/2\}) = 0$ , and  $\delta_B(\{i : y_i < l - \varepsilon/2\}) = 0$ . Hence  $st_B\text{-lim } Ax = l$ .  $\square$

## 4 Relation Between $(A)_{st}$ , $(A)_{st_B}$ and $B$ -Summability

Now we establish some relations between  $B$ -summability,  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -summability and statistically  $A$ -summability.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $x$  be bounded sequence and  $x$  is statistically  $A$ -summable to  $l$ . Then  $Ax$  is  $B$ -summable to  $l$  if  $B$  is a non-negative regular matrix satisfies*

$$\lim_n \sum_{k \in K} b_{nk} = 0 \text{ for every set } K \subseteq \mathbb{N}, \text{ such that } \delta(K) = 0. \quad (4.1)$$

*Proof.* Let  $x \in l_\infty$ . Since  $A$  is regular then  $Ax \in l_\infty$ , and let  $x$  be statistically  $A$ -summable to  $l$  and  $K_\varepsilon = \{i : |y_i - l| \geq \varepsilon\}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} |(By)_n - l| &\leq \left| \sum_{k \notin K} b_{nk}(y_k - l) \right| + \left| \sum_{k \in K} b_{nk}(y_k - l) \right| \\ &\leq \varepsilon \sum_{k \notin K} b_{nk} + \sup_k |y_k - l| \sum_{k \in K} b_{nk}. \end{aligned}$$

Now by using the definition of statistically  $A$ -summability and the condition (4.1) we get  $\lim_n |(By)_n - l| = 0$ , since  $\varepsilon$  was arbitrary.  $\square$

**Remark 4.2.** *We can not replace  $x \in l_\infty$  by weaker assumption of a statistical bounded.*

**Example 4.3.** *Let*

$$a_{nk} = \begin{cases} 1; & \text{if } n \text{ is nonsquare, } k = n^2, \\ \frac{1}{2}; & \text{if } n \text{ is a square, } k = n^2, k = n^2 + 1, \\ 0; & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$x_k = \begin{cases} 0; & \text{if } k = n^2, \\ k; & \text{if } k = n^2 + 1, \\ 1; & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

then

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_{nk} x_k = \begin{cases} 0; & \text{if } n \text{ is nonsquare,} \\ \frac{1}{2}(n^2 + 1); & \text{if } n \text{ is a square.} \end{cases}$$

Here  $x$  is statistically bounded since the set  $\{k : |x_k| > 1\}$  has density zero, also  $x$  is statistically  $A$ -summable to zero. Take  $B = C_1$  the Cesaro matrix of order 1. It is clear that  $C_1$  satisfies all the conditions of  $B$  in Theorem 4.1, but  $Ax$  is not  $B$ -summable.

**Corollary 4.4.** *Let  $x$  be bounded sequence and  $x$  be  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -summable to  $l$ . Then  $Ax$  is  $B$ -summable to  $l$ .*

**Theorem 4.5.** *If the number sequence  $Ax$  is bounded above and  $B$ -summable to the number  $l = st_B\text{-lim sup } Ax$ , then  $x$  is  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -summable to  $l$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $Ax$  is not  $B$ -statistically  $A$ -summable to  $l$ . Then  $st_B\text{-lim inf } Ax < l$ , so there is a number  $M < l$  such that  $\delta_B(\{i : y_i < M\}) \neq 0$ . Let  $K_1 = \{i : y_i < M\}$ . Then for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\delta_B(\{i : y_i > l + \varepsilon\}) = 0$ . Write  $K_2 = \{i : M \leq y_i \leq l + \varepsilon\}$ ,  $K_3 = \{i : y_i > l + \varepsilon\}$ , and let  $G = \sup_i y_i < \infty$ . Since  $\delta_B(K_1) \neq 0$ , there are many  $n$  such that

$$\limsup_n \sum_{k \in K_1} b_{nk} \geq d > 0,$$

and for each  $n$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |b_{nk} y_k| < \infty.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_{nk} y_k &= \left( \sum_{k \in K_1} + \sum_{k \in K_2} + \sum_{k \in K_3} \right) b_{nk} y_k \\ &\leq M \sum_{k \in K_1} b_{nk} + (l + \varepsilon) \sum_{k \in K_2} b_{nk} + G \sum_{k \in K_3} b_{nk} \\ &= M \sum_{k \in K_1} b_{nk} + (l + \varepsilon) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_{nk} - (l + \varepsilon) \sum_{k \in K_1} b_{nk} + O(1) \\ &= - \sum_{k \in K_1} b_{nk} (-M + (l + \varepsilon)) + (l + \varepsilon) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_{nk} + O(1) \\ &\leq l \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_{nk} - d(l - M) + \varepsilon \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_{nk} - d \right) + O(1). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\varepsilon$  is arbitrary, it follows that

$$\liminf B y \leq l - d(l - M) < l.$$

Hence  $Ax$  is not  $B$ -summable to  $l$ . □

The following is the dual statement of Theorem 4.5.



**Theorem 4.6.** *If the number sequence  $Ax$  is bounded below and *B*-summable to the number  $l = st_B\text{-lim inf } Ax$ , then  $x$  is *B*-statistically *A*-summable to  $l$ .*

**Remark 4.7.** *The above Theorems 4.5 and 4.6, the boundedness of  $Ax$  can not be omitted or even replaced by the *B*-statistical boundedness.*

**Example 4.8.** *Define the sequence  $x = (x_k)$  by*

$$x_k = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } k \text{ is an even nonsquare,} \\ 0, & \text{if } k \text{ is an odd nonsquare,} \\ k, & \text{if } k \text{ is an even square,} \\ 1, & \text{if } k \text{ is an odd square,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$a_{nk} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } n \text{ is nonsquare and } k = n^2 + 1, \\ 1, & \text{if } n \text{ is a square and } k = n^2, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

then

$$\sum_k a_{nk}x_k = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } n \text{ is an odd nonsquare,} \\ 1, & \text{if } n \text{ is an odd square,} \\ 0, & \text{if } n \text{ is an even square,} \\ n^2, & \text{if } n \text{ is an even square.} \end{cases}$$

Now let us define a matrix  $B = (b_{nk})$  as

$$b_{nk} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } n = k, n \text{ is an even nonsquare,} \\ 1, & \text{if } n = k - 2, n \text{ is an even square,} \\ 1, & \text{if } n = k, n \text{ is an odd square,} \\ 1, & \text{if } n = k + 1, n \text{ is an odd and } (n - 1) \text{ nonsquare,} \\ 1, & \text{if } n = k - 1, n \text{ is an odd and } (n - 1) \text{ square,} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We can see that  $Ax$  is *B*-statistically bounded since the set  $\{i : |y_i| > 1\}$  has *B*-density zero, also  $Ax$  is *B*-summable to 1, but  $Ax$  is not *B*-statistically summable to any number  $l$ .

**Acknowledgement :** I would like to thanks Prof. M. Mursaleen for his kind help and encouragement during the preparation of this paper.

## References

- [1] O.H.H. Edely, M. Mursaleen, On statistical *A*-summability, Math. Comp. Model. 49 (2009) 672–680.

- [2] H. Fast, Sur la convergence statistique, *Colloq. Math.* 2 (1951) 241–244.
- [3] R.C. Buck, Generalized asymptotic density, *Amer. J. Math.* 75 (1953) 335–346.
- [4] I.J. Schoenberg, The integrability of certain functions and related summability methods, *Amer. Math. Monthly* 66 (1959) 361–375.
- [5] A. Zygmund, *Trigonometric Series*, Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1959.
- [6] T. Šalát, On statistically convergent sequences of real numbers, *Math. Slovaca* 30 (1980) 139–150.
- [7] J.A. Fridy, On statistical convergence, *Analysis* 5 (1985) 301–313.
- [8] J. Connor, The statistical and strong  $p$ -Cesàro convergence of sequences, *Analysis* 8 (1988) 47–63.
- [9] E. Kolk, Matrix summability of statistically convergent sequences, *Analysis* 13 (1993) 77–83.
- [10] M. Mursaleen,  $\lambda$ -statistical convergence, *Math. Slovaca* 50 (2000) 111–115.
- [11] M. Mursaleen, O.H.H. Edely, Statistical convergence of double sequences, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 288 (2003) 223–231.
- [12] A.R. Freedman, J.J. Sember, Densities and summability, *Pacific J. Math.* 95 (1981) 293–305.
- [13] J. Connor, On strong matrix summability with respect to a modulus and statistical convergence, *Canad. Math. Bull.* 32 (1989) 194–198.
- [14] J. Connor, J. Kline, On statistical limit points and the consistency of statistical convergence, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 197 (1996) 392–399.
- [15] F. Moricz, Tauberian conditions under which statistical convergence follows from statistical summability  $(C, 1)$ , *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 275 (2002) 277–287.
- [16] M. Mursaleen, O.H.H. Edely, Generalized statistical convergence, *Information Sciences* 162 (2004) 287–294.
- [17] J.A. Fridy, Statistical limit points, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 118 (1993) 1187–1192.
- [18] J.A. Fridy, C. Orhan, Statistical limit superior and limit inferior, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 125 (1997) 3625–3631.
- [19] K. Demirci,  $A$ -statistical core of a sequence, *Demonstr. Math.* 33 (2000) 343–353.

(Accepted 27 April 2012)