A CLASS OF $\mathcal{I}$-CONSERVATIVE MATRICES

CELAL ÇAKAN AND HÜSAMETTİN ÇOŞKUN

Received 7 April 2005 and in revised form 20 September 2005

By using the concept of $\mathcal{I}$-convergence defined by Kostyrko et al. in 2001, the $\mathcal{I}$-limit superior of real sequences was introduced and the inequality $\mathcal{I}-\limsup(Ax)\le \mathcal{I}-\limsup(x)$ for all $x\in\ell_\infty$ was studied by Demirci in 2001. In this paper, we have characterized a class of $\mathcal{I}$-conservative matrices by studying some new inequalities related to the $\mathcal{I}$-limit superior.

1. Introduction

Let ℓ_∞ and c be the Banach spaces of bounded and convergent sequence $x=(x_k)$ with the usual supremum norm. Let σ be a one-to-one mapping of $\mathbb{N}$, the set of positive integers, into itself and $T:\ell_\infty\to\ell_\infty$ a linear operator defined by $Tx=(Tx_k)=(x_{\sigma(k)})$. An element $\phi\in\ell'_\infty$, the conjugate space of ℓ_∞, is called an invariant mean or a σ-mean if and only if (i) $\phi(x)\ge 0$ when the sequence $x=(x_k)$ has $x_k\ge 0$ for all k, (ii) $\phi(e)=1$ where $e=(1,1,1,\ldots)$, and (iii) $\phi(Tx)=\phi(x)$ for all $x\in\ell_\infty$. Let M be the set of all σ-means on ℓ_∞. A sublinear functional P on ℓ_∞ is said to generate σ-means if $\phi\in\ell'_\infty$ and $\phi\le P\Rightarrow\phi$ is a σ-mean, and to dominate σ-means if $\phi\le P$ for all $\phi\in M$, where $\phi\le P$ means that $\phi(x)\le P(x)$ for all $x\in\ell_\infty$.

It is shown [8] that the sublinear functional

$$V(x)=\sup_n \limsup_p t_{pn}(x) \tag{1.1}$$

both generates and dominates σ-means, where

$$t_{pn}(x)=\frac{1}{p+1}\left(x_n+x_{\sigma(n)}+\cdots+x_{\sigma^p(n)}\right),\quad t_{-1,n}(x)=0. \tag{1.2}$$

A bounded sequence x is called σ-convergent to s if $V(x)=-V(-x)=s$. In this case, we write $\sigma-\lim x=s$. Let V_σ be the set of all σ-convergent sequences. We assume throughout this paper that $\sigma^p(n)\ne n$ for all $n\ge 0$ and $p\ge 1$, where $\sigma^p(n)$ is the pth iterate of

Copyright © 2005 Hindawi Publishing Corporation
International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences 2005:21 (2005) 3443–3452
DOI: 10.1155/IJMMS.2005.3443

σ at n. Thus, a σ-mean extends the limit functional onto c in the sense that $\phi(x) = \lim x$ for all $x \in c$ [9]. Consequently, $c \subset V_\sigma$.

By (iii), it is clear that $(Tx - x) \in Z$ for $x \in \ell_\infty$, where Z is the set of all σ-convergent sequences with σ-limit zero.

For $x \in \ell_\infty$, we write

$$l(x) = \liminf x, \qquad L(x) = \limsup x, \qquad W(x) = \inf_{z \in Z} L(x+z). \tag{1.3}$$

It is known that $V(x) = W(x)$ on ℓ_∞ [8].

Let $A = (a_{nk})$ be an infinite matrix of real numbers and $x = (x_k)$ a real sequence such that $Ax = (A_n(x)) = (\sum_k a_{nk}x_k)$ exists for each n. Then, the sequence $Ax = (A_n(x))$ is called an A-transform of x. For two sequence spaces E and F, we say that the matrix A maps E into F if Ax exits and belongs to F for each $x \in E$. By (E,F), we denote the set of all matrices which map E into F.

A matrix $A \in (c,c)$ is said to be conservative. It is known [1, page 21] that A is conservative if and only if $\|A\| = \sup_n \sum_k |a_{nk}| < \infty$, $a_k = \lim_n a_{nk}$ for each k, and $a = \lim_n \sum_k a_{nk}$. If A is conservative, the number $\chi = \chi(A) = a - \sum_k a_k$ called the characteristic of A is of importance in summability [1, page 46].

Let E be a subset of $\mathbb{N}$. Natural density δ of E is defined by

$$\delta(E) = \lim_n \frac{1}{n} \left| \{k \le n : k \in E\} \right|, \tag{1.4}$$

where the vertical bars indicate the number of elements in the enclosed set. The number sequence $x = (x_k)$ is said to be statistically convergent to the number l if for every ε, $\delta\{k : |x_k - l| \ge \varepsilon\} = 0$ [4]. In this case, we write $st - \lim x = l$.

A matrix $A \in (c,c)_{\text{reg}}$ is said to be regular and it is known [1, page 21] that A is regular if and only if $\|A\| < \infty$, $\lim_n a_{nk} = 0$ for each k, and $\lim_n \sum_k a_{nk} = 1$. For a given nonnegative regular matrix A, the number

$$\delta_A(E) = \lim_n \sum_{k \in E} a_{nk} \tag{1.5}$$

is said to be the A-density of $E \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ [5]. A sequence $x = (x_k)$ is said to be A-statistical convergent to a number s if for every $\varepsilon > 0$, the set $\{k : |x_k - s| \ge \varepsilon\}$ has A-density zero [5]. In this case, we write $st_A - \lim x = s$. By st_A, we denote the set of all A-statistically convergent sequences.

Let $\mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{B}_i) = (b_{nk}(i))$ be a sequence of infinite matrices. Then, a bounded sequence x is said to be $\mathcal{B}$ summable to the value l if

$$\lim_n \mathcal{B}x = \lim_n \sum_k b_{nk}(i)x_k = l \quad \text{uniformly in } i. \tag{1.6}$$

The matrix $\mathcal{B}$ is regular [11] if and only if $\|\mathcal{B}\| < \infty$, $\lim_n b_{nk}(i) = 0$ for all k, uniformly in i, and $\lim_n \sum_k b_{nk}(i) = 1$ uniformly in i, where $\|\mathcal{B}\| = \sup_{n,i} \sum_k |b_{nk}(i)|$. For a given nonnegative regular matrix sequence $\mathcal{B}$, Kolk [6] introduced the $\mathcal{B}$-density of a subset of $\mathbb{N}$ as follows.

The number

$$\delta_{\mathcal{B}}(E) = \lim_n \sum_{k\in E} b_{nk}(i) = d \quad \text{uniformly in } i \tag{1.7}$$

is said to be $\mathcal{B}$-density of E if it exists. In the cases $\mathcal{B} = (A)$ and $\mathcal{B} = (C,1)$, the Cesàro matrix, the $\mathcal{B}$-density reduces to the A-density and natural density, respectively. A sequence $x = (x_k)$ is said to be $\mathcal{B}$-statistically convergent [6] to a number s if for every $\varepsilon > 0$, the set $\{k : |x_k - s| \geq \varepsilon\}$ has $\mathcal{B}$-density zero. The set of all $\mathcal{B}$-statistically convergent sequences is denoted by $st_{\mathcal{B}}$.

Let $X \neq \emptyset$. A class $S \subset 2^X$ of subsets of X is said to be an ideal in X if S satisfies the conditions (i) $\emptyset \in S$, (ii) $Y \cup Z \in S$ whenever $Y, Z \in S$, (iii) $Y \in S$ and $Z \subseteq Y$ implies that $Z \in S$. An ideal is called nontrivial if $X \notin S$. A nontrivial ideal is called admissible if $\{x\} \in S$ for each $x \in X$ [7].

Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a nontrivial ideal in $\mathbb{N}$. A sequence $x = (x_k)$ is said to be $\mathcal{I}$-convergent to a number l if for every $\varepsilon > 0$, $\{k : |x_k - l| > \varepsilon\} \in \mathcal{I}$ [7]. In this case, we write $\mathcal{I} - \lim x = l$. It is clear that a $\mathcal{I}$-convergent sequence need not be bounded. Let $F_{\mathcal{I}}(b)$ be the set of all $\mathcal{I}$-convergent and bounded sequences.

Note that in the cases $\mathcal{I}_\delta = \{E \subseteq \mathbb{N} : \delta(E) = 0\}$, $\mathcal{I}_{\delta_A} = \{E \subseteq \mathbb{N} : \delta_A(E) = 0\}$, and $\mathcal{I}_{\delta_{\mathcal{B}}} = \{E \subseteq \mathbb{N} : \delta_{\mathcal{B}}(E) = 0\}$, the $\mathcal{I}$-convergence is reduced to the statistically convergence, A-statistically convergence, and $\mathcal{B}$-statistically convergence, respectively.

An admissible ideal $\mathcal{I}$ in $\mathbb{N}$ is said to satisfy the additive property if for every countable system $\{Y_1, Y_2, \ldots\}$ of mutually disjoint sets in $\mathcal{I}$, there exist sets $Z_j \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ $(j = 1,2,\ldots)$ such that the symmetric differences $Y_j \Delta Z_j$ $(j = 1,2,\ldots)$ are finite and $\bigcup_j Z_j \in \mathcal{I}$ [7].

Demirci [3] has introduced the concepts $\mathcal{I}$-limit superior and inferior. For a real number sequence x, let B_x and A_x denote the sets $\{b \in \mathbb{R} : \{k : x_k > b\} \notin \mathcal{I}\}$ and $\{a \in \mathbb{R} : \{k : x_k < a\} \notin \mathcal{I}\}$, respectively, and also let $\mathcal{I}$ be admissible. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I} - \limsup x &= \begin{cases} \sup B_x & \text{if } B_x \neq \emptyset, \\ -\infty & \text{if } B_x = \emptyset, \end{cases} \\ \mathcal{I} - \liminf x &= \begin{cases} \inf A_x & \text{if } A_x \neq \emptyset, \\ \infty & \text{if } A_x = \emptyset. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{1.8}$$

It is shown [3] that $\mathcal{I} - \limsup x = \beta$ if and only if for every $\varepsilon > 0$, $\{k : x_k < \beta - \varepsilon\} \notin \mathcal{I}$ and $\{k : x_k > \beta + \varepsilon\} \in \mathcal{I}$. Also, $\mathcal{I} - \liminf x = \alpha$ if and only if for every $\varepsilon > 0$, $\{k : x_k < \alpha + \varepsilon\} \notin \mathcal{I}$ and $\{k : x_k < \alpha - \varepsilon\} \in \mathcal{I}$. Recall that a sequence $x = (x_k)$ is said to be $\mathcal{I}$-bounded if there exists an $N > 0$ such that $\{k : |x_k| > N\} \in \mathcal{I}$. It is proved in [3] that a $\mathcal{I}$-bounded sequence x is $\mathcal{I}$-convergent if and only if $\mathcal{I} - \limsup x = \mathcal{I} - \liminf x$.

For all $x \in \ell_\infty$, the inequality

$$\mathcal{I} - \limsup A(x) \leq \mathcal{I} - \limsup(x) \tag{1.9}$$

has been studied in [3].

In this paper, we have characterized a class of matrices $A \in (c, F_{\mathcal{I}}(b))$ by studying some new inequalities related to the $\mathcal{I}$-limit superior and limit inferior.

2. The main results

Firstly, we will begin with the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *$A \in (c, F_{\mathcal{I}}(b))$ if and only if*

$$\sup_n \sum_k |a_{nk}| < \infty, \tag{2.1}$$

$$\mathcal{I} - \lim_n a_{nk} = t_k \quad \text{for every } k, \tag{2.2}$$

$$\mathcal{I} - \lim_n \sum_k a_{nk} = t. \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. Assume that $A \in (c, F_{\mathcal{I}}(b))$. Then, (2.1) follows from the fact that $(c, F_{\mathcal{I}}(b)) \subset (\ell_\infty, \ell_\infty)$. For the necessity of the other conditions it is enough to consider the sequences (e_k) and e, respectively, where (e_k) is the sequence whose kth place is 1 and the others are all zero.

Conversely, suppose that the conditions (2.1)–(2.3) hold. Let $x \in c$ and $\lim x = l$. Then, for any given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|x_k - l| \leq \varepsilon$ whenever $k \geq k_0$. Now, we can write

$$Ax = \sum_k a_{nk}(x_k - l) + l \sum_k a_{nk}. \tag{2.4}$$

By an easy calculation, one can see that

$$\mathcal{I} - \lim_n \sum_k a_{nk}(x_k - l) = \sum_k t_k(x_k - l). \tag{2.5}$$

So, by applying $\mathcal{I} - \lim_n$ in (2.4), we get that

$$\mathcal{I} - \lim_n Ax = lt + \sum_k t_k(x_k - l). \tag{2.6}$$

This completes the proof. □

In what follows, a matrix $A \in (c, F_{\mathcal{I}}(b))$ is said to be $\mathcal{I}$-conservative. In the case A is $\mathcal{I}$-conservative, the number

$$K_{\mathcal{I}} = K_{\mathcal{I}}(A) = t - \sum_k t_k \tag{2.7}$$

is said to be $\mathcal{I}$-characteristic of A.

To the proof of our main results, we need two lemmas which can be proved by the same technique used in [2, Lemmas 2.3-2.4], respectively.

Lemma 2.2. *Let A be $\mathcal{I}$-conservative and $\lambda > 0$. Then,*

$$\mathcal{I} - \limsup_n \sum_k |a_{nk} - t_k| \leq \lambda \tag{2.8}$$

if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}-\limsup_n \sum_k (a_{nk}-t_k)^+ &\le \frac{\lambda+K_{\mathcal{I}}}{2}, \\ \mathcal{I}-\limsup_n \sum_k (a_{nk}-t_k)^- &\le \frac{\lambda-K_{\mathcal{I}}}{2}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\|A\|<\infty$ and $\mathcal{I}-\lim_n |a_{nk}|=0$. Then there exists a $y\in\ell_\infty$ such that $\|y\|\le 1$ and*

$$\mathcal{I}-\limsup_k \sum a_{nk}y_k = \mathcal{I}-\limsup_k \sum |a_{nk}|. \tag{2.10}$$

Theorem 2.4. *Let A be $\mathcal{I}$-conservative. Then, for some constant $\lambda\ge|K_{\mathcal{I}}|$ and for all $x\in\ell_\infty$,*

$$\mathcal{I}-\limsup_n \sum_k (a_{nk}-t_k)x_k \le \frac{\lambda+K_{\mathcal{I}}}{2}L(x)-\frac{\lambda-K_{\mathcal{I}}}{2}l(x) \tag{2.11}$$

if and only if

$$\mathcal{I}-\limsup_n \sum_k |a_{nk}-t_k| \le \lambda. \tag{2.12}$$

Proof. Let (2.11) hold. Define $B=(b_{nk})$ by $b_{nk}=(a_{nk}-t_k)$ for all n,k. Then, since A is $\mathcal{I}$-conservative, the matrix B satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 2.3. Hence, we have from (2.11) for a $y\in\ell_\infty$ with $\|y\|\le 1$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}-\limsup_n \sum_k |b_{nk}| &= \mathcal{I}-\limsup_n \sum_k b_{nk}y_k \\ &\le \frac{\lambda+K_{\mathcal{I}}}{2}L(y)-\frac{\lambda-K_{\mathcal{I}}}{2}l(y) \\ &\le \left(\frac{\lambda+K_{\mathcal{I}}}{2}+\frac{\lambda-K_{\mathcal{I}}}{2}\right)\|y\|=\lambda, \end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

which yields (2.12).

Conversely, let (2.12) hold and $x\in\ell_\infty$. Then, for any $\varepsilon>0$, there exits a $k_0\in\mathbb{N}$ such that $l(x)-\varepsilon<x_k<L(x)+\varepsilon$ whenever $k>k_0$. Now, we can write

$$\sum_k (a_{nk}-t_k)x_k = \sum_{k\le k_0}(a_{nk}-t_k)x_k + \sum_{k>k_0}(a_{nk}-t_k)^+x_k - \sum_{k>k_0}(a_{nk}-t_k)^-x_k. \tag{2.14}$$

Since A is $\mathcal{I}$-conservative and by Lemma 2.2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}-\limsup_n \sum_k (a_{nk}-t_k)x_k &\le (L(x)+\varepsilon)\left(\frac{\lambda+K_{\mathcal{I}}}{2}\right)-(l(x)-\varepsilon)\left(\frac{\lambda-K_{\mathcal{I}}}{2}\right) \\ &= \frac{\lambda+K_{\mathcal{I}}}{2}L(x)-\frac{\lambda-K_{\mathcal{I}}}{2}l(x)+\lambda\varepsilon, \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

which yields (2.11), since ε is arbitrary. □

When $K_{\mathcal{I}} > 0$ and $\lambda = K_{\mathcal{I}}$, we can conclude from Theorem 2.4 the following result.

THEOREM 2.5. *Let A be $\mathcal{I}$-conservative. Then, for all $x \in \ell_\infty$,*

$$\mathcal{I} - \limsup_n \sum_k (a_{nk} - t_k)x_k \le K_{\mathcal{I}} L(x) \tag{2.16}$$

if and only if

$$\mathcal{I} - \lim_n \sum_k |\, a_{nk} - t_k \,| \le K_{\mathcal{I}}. \tag{2.17}$$

In the cases $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_{\delta_{\mathcal{B}}}$ and $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_{\delta_A}$, we respectively have the following results from Theorem 2.4.

THEOREM 2.6. (a) *Let $A \in (c, st_{\mathcal{B}} \cap \ell_\infty)$. Then, for some constant $\lambda \ge |K_{\mathcal{B}}|$ and for all $x \in \ell_\infty$,*

$$st_{\mathcal{B}} - \limsup_n \sum_k (a_{nk} - t_k)x_k \le \frac{\lambda + K_{\mathcal{B}}}{2} L(x) - \frac{\lambda - K_{\mathcal{B}}}{2} l(x) \tag{2.18}$$

if and only if

$$st_{\mathcal{B}} - \limsup_n \sum_k |\, a_{nk} - t_k \,| \le \lambda. \tag{2.19}$$

(b) *Let $A \in (c, st_A \cap \ell_\infty)$. Then, for some constant $\lambda \ge |K_A|$ and for all $x \in \ell_\infty$,*

$$st_A - \limsup_n \sum_k (a_{nk} - t_k)x_k \le \frac{\lambda + K_A}{2} L(x) - \frac{\lambda - K_A}{2} l(x) \tag{2.20}$$

if and only if

$$st_A - \limsup_n \sum_k |\, a_{nk} - t_k \,| \le \lambda. \tag{2.21}$$

Also, if $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_\delta$, Theorem 2.4 appears as in [2, Theorem 2.5].

THEOREM 2.7. *Let A and λ be as in Theorem 2.4. Then, for all $x \in \ell_\infty$,*

$$\mathcal{I} - \limsup_n \sum_k (a_{nk} - t_k)x_k \le \frac{\lambda + K_{\mathcal{I}}}{2} V(x) + \frac{\lambda - K_{\mathcal{I}}}{2} V(-x) \tag{2.22}$$

if and only if (2.12) holds and

$$\mathcal{I} - \lim_n \sum_k |\, a_{nk} - a_{n,\sigma(k)} - t_k + t_{\sigma(k)} \,| = 0. \tag{2.23}$$

Proof. Let (2.22) hold. Then, since $V(x) \le L(x)$ and $V(-x) \le -l(x)$ for all $x \in \ell_\infty$, (2.12) follows from Theorem 2.4.

Define a matrix $C = (c_{nk})$ by $c_{nk} = (b_{nk} - b_{n,\sigma(k)})$ for all n, k, where b_{nk} is defined as in Theorem 2.4. Then, we have the hypothesis of Lemma 2.3. Now, choose the sequence y such that $y_k = 0$ for $k \notin \sigma(\mathbb{N})$. Then, $(y_k - y_{\sigma(k)}) \in Z$ and also, by the same argument used in [10, Theorem 23], one can easily see that

$$\sum_k b_{nk}(y_k - y_{\sigma(k)}) = \sum_k c_{nk} y_{\sigma(k)}. \tag{2.24}$$

Hence, (2.22) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I} - \limsup_n \sum_k |c_{nk}| &= \mathcal{I} - \limsup_n \sum_k c_{nk} y_{\sigma(k)} \\ &= \mathcal{I} - \limsup_n \sum_k b_{nk}(y_k - y_{\sigma(k)}) \\ &\le \frac{\lambda + K_{\mathcal{I}}}{2} V(y_k - y_{\sigma(k)}) + \frac{\lambda - K_{\mathcal{I}}}{2} V(y_{\sigma(k)} - y_k) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.25}$$

This yields (2.23).

Conversely, suppose that (2.12) and (2.23) hold. Then, for any $x \in \ell_\infty$, we have (2.24). Hence, since $(x_k - x_{\sigma(k)}) \in Z$, (2.23) implies that $B \in (Z, F_{\mathcal{I}}(b))$ with $\mathcal{I} - \lim Bz = 0$, $(z \in Z)$. We also see from the assumption that (2.11) holds. Thus, by taking infimum over $z \in Z$ in (2.11), we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{z \in Z} \left(\mathcal{I} - \limsup_n \sum_k b_{nk}(x_k + z_k) \right) &\le \frac{\lambda + K_{\mathcal{I}}}{2} L(x+z) - \frac{\lambda - K_{\mathcal{I}}}{2} l(x+z) \\ &= \frac{\lambda + K_{\mathcal{I}}}{2} W(x) + \frac{\lambda - K_{\mathcal{I}}}{2} W(-x). \end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

On the other hand, since $\mathcal{I} - \lim Bz = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{z \in Z} \left(\mathcal{I} - \limsup_n \sum_k b_{nk}(x_k + z_k) \right) &\ge \mathcal{I} - \limsup_n \sum_k b_{nk} x_k + \inf_{z \in Z} \left(\mathcal{I} - \limsup_n \sum_k b_{nk} z_k \right) \\ &= \mathcal{I} - \limsup_n \sum_k b_{nk} x_k. \end{aligned} \tag{2.27}$$

Since $W(x) = V(x)$ for all $x \in \ell_\infty$, we conclude that (2.22) holds and the proof is completed. □

When $K_{\mathcal{I}} > 0$ and $\lambda = K_{\mathcal{I}}$, we have the following result.

Theorem 2.8. *Let A be $\mathcal{I}$-conservative. Then, for all $x \in \ell_\infty$,*

$$\mathcal{I} - \limsup_n \sum_k (a_{nk} - t_k) x_k \le K_{\mathcal{I}} V(x) \tag{2.28}$$

if and only if (2.17) and (2.23) hold.

The following results can be derived from Theorem 2.7 for the special cases $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_{\delta_{\mathcal{B}}}$ and $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_{\delta_A}$.

THEOREM 2.9. (a) *Let $A \in (c, st_{\mathcal{B}} \cap \ell_\infty)$. Then, for some constant $\lambda \geq |K_{\mathcal{B}}|$ and for all $x \in \ell_\infty$,*

$$st_{\mathcal{B}} - \limsup_n \sum_k (a_{nk} - t_k)x_k \leq \frac{\lambda + K_{\mathcal{B}}}{2} V(x) + \frac{\lambda - K_{\mathcal{B}}}{2} V(-x) \tag{2.29}$$

if and only if (2.19) holds and

$$st_{\mathcal{B}} - \lim_n \sum_k \left| a_{nk} - a_{n,\sigma(k)} - t_k + t_{\sigma(k)} \right| = 0. \tag{2.30}$$

(b) *Let $A \in (c, st_A \cap \ell_\infty)$. Then, for some constant $\lambda \geq |K_A|$ and for all $x \in \ell_\infty$,*

$$st_A - \limsup_n \sum_k (a_{nk} - t_k)x_k \leq \frac{\lambda + K_A}{2} V(x) + \frac{\lambda - K_A}{2} V(-x) \tag{2.31}$$

if and only if (2.21) holds and

$$st_A - \lim_n \sum_k \left| a_{nk} - a_{n,\sigma(k)} - t_k + t_{\sigma(k)} \right| = 0. \tag{2.32}$$

Further, for $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_\delta$, Theorem 2.7 is reduced to [2, Theorem 2.7].

THEOREM 2.10. *Let A and λ be as in Theorem 2.4. Then, for all $x \in \ell_\infty$,*

$$\mathcal{I} - \limsup_n \sum_k (a_{nk} - t_k)x_k \leq \frac{\lambda + K_{\mathcal{I}}}{2} \gamma(x) + \frac{\lambda - K_{\mathcal{I}}}{2} \gamma(-x) \tag{2.33}$$

if and only if (2.12) holds and

$$\mathcal{I} - \lim_n \sum_{k \in E} \left| a_{nk} - t_k \right| = 0 \tag{2.34}$$

for every $E \in \mathcal{I}$, where $\gamma(x) = \mathcal{I} - \limsup_k x_k$.

Proof. If (2.33) holds, since $\gamma(x) \leq L(x)$ and $\gamma(-x) \leq -l(x)$, (2.12) follows from Theorem 2.4. To show the necessity of (2.34), for any $E \in \mathcal{I}$, let us define a matrix $D = (d_{nk})$ by $d_{nk} = a_{nk} - t_k$, $k \in E$; otherwise, it equals zero for all n. Then, clearly, D satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2.2, and therefore there exists a $y \in \ell_\infty$ such that $\|y\| \leq 1$ and

$$\mathcal{I} - \limsup_n \sum_k d_{nk} y_k = \mathcal{I} - \limsup_n \sum_k \left| d_{nk} \right|. \tag{2.35}$$

Now, for the same E, we choose the sequence y as

$$y_k = \begin{cases} 1, & k \in E, \\ 0, & k \notin E. \end{cases} \tag{2.36}$$

Then, since $\mathcal{I}-\lim y=\gamma(y)=\gamma(-y)=0$, (2.33) implies that

$$\mathcal{I}-\limsup_n \sum_{k\in E}|d_{nk}| \le \frac{\lambda+K_{\mathcal{I}}}{2}\gamma(y)+\frac{\lambda-K_{\mathcal{I}}}{2}\gamma(-y)=0, \tag{2.37}$$

which yields (2.34).

Conversely, suppose that the conditions of the theorem hold and $x\in\ell_\infty$. Let $E_1=\{k: x_k>\gamma(x)+\varepsilon\}$ and $E_2=\{k: x_k<\gamma(x)-\varepsilon\}$. Then, since $E_1,E_2\in\mathcal{I}$, $E=E_1\cap E_2\in\mathcal{I}$. Now, we can write

$$\sum_k (a_{nk}-t_k)x_k=\sum_{k\in E}(a_{nk}-t_k)x_k+\sum_{k\notin E}(a_{nk}-t_k)^+x_k-\sum_{k\notin E}(a_{nk}-t_k)^-x_k. \tag{2.38}$$

Thus, by (2.34) and Lemma 2.2, (2.33) is obtained since

$$\mathcal{I}-\limsup_n \sum_k (a_{nk}-t_k)x_k \le \frac{\lambda+K_{\mathcal{I}}}{2}\gamma(x)+\frac{\lambda-K_{\mathcal{I}}}{2}\gamma(-x)+\lambda\varepsilon \tag{2.39}$$

and ε is arbitrary. □

When $K_{\mathcal{I}}>0$ and $\lambda=K_{\mathcal{I}}$, we have the following result.

Theorem 2.11. *Let A be $\mathcal{I}$-conservative. Then, for all $x\in\ell_\infty$,*

$$\mathcal{I}-\limsup_n \sum_k (a_{nk}-t_k)x_k \le K_{\mathcal{I}}\gamma(x) \tag{2.40}$$

if and only if (2.17) and (2.34) hold.

We can choose $\mathcal{I}=\mathcal{I}_{\delta_{\mathcal{B}}}$ and $\mathcal{I}=\mathcal{I}_{\delta_A}$ in Theorem 2.10 to obtain the following results.

Theorem 2.12. (a) *Let $A\in(c,st_{\mathcal{B}}\cap\ell_\infty)$. Then, for some constant $\lambda\ge|K_{\mathcal{B}}|$ and for all $x\in\ell_\infty$,*

$$st_{\mathcal{B}}-\limsup_n \sum_k (a_{nk}-t_k)x_k \le \frac{\lambda+K_{\mathcal{B}}}{2}\gamma(x)+\frac{\lambda-K_{\mathcal{B}}}{2}\gamma(-x) \tag{2.41}$$

if and only if (2.19) holds and

$$st_{\mathcal{B}}-\lim_n \sum_{k\in E}|a_{nk}-t_k|=0, \tag{2.42}$$

for every $E\in\mathcal{I}$.

(b) *Let $A\in(c,st_A\cap\ell_\infty)$. Then, for some constant $\lambda\ge|K_A|$ and for all $x\in\ell_\infty$,*

$$st_A-\limsup_n \sum_k (a_{nk}-t_k)x_k \le \frac{\lambda+K_A}{2}\gamma(x)+\frac{\lambda-K_A}{2}\gamma(-x) \tag{2.43}$$

if and only if (2.21) holds and

$$st_A - \lim_n \sum_{k\in E} |a_{nk} - t_k| = 0, \tag{2.44}$$

for every $E \in \mathcal{I}$.

Moreover, Theorem 2.10 is a dual case of [2, Theorem 2.6] for $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_\delta$.

Acknowledgment

We wish to thank the referees for valuable suggestions and comments which improved the paper considerably.

References

[1] J. Boos, *Classical and Modern Methods in Summability*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2000.
[2] H. Çoşkun and C. Çakan, *A class of statistical and σ-conservative matrices*, Czechoslovak Math. J. **55(130)** (2005), no. 3, 791–801.
[3] K. Demirci, *$\mathcal{I}$-limit superior and limit inferior*, Math. Commun. **6** (2001), no. 2, 165–172.
[4] H. Fast, *Sur la convergence statistique*, Colloq. Math. **2** (1951), 241–244.
[5] A. R. Freedman and J. J. Sember, *Densities and summability*, Pacific J. Math. **95** (1981), no. 2, 293–305.
[6] E. Kolk, *Inclusion relations between the statistical convergence and strong summability*, Acta Comment. Univ. Tartu. Math. (1998), no. 2, 39–54.
[7] P. Kostyrko, T. Šalát, and W. Wilczyński, *$\mathcal{I}$-convergence*, Real Anal. Exchange **26** (2001), no. 2, 669–685.
[8] S. Mishra, B. Satapathy, and N. Rath, *Invariant means and σ-core*, J. Indian Math. Soc. (N.S.) **60** (1994), no. 1–4, 151–158.
[9] M. Mursaleen, *On some new invariant matrix methods of summability*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2) **34** (1983), no. 133, 77–86.
[10] R. A. Raimi, *Invariant means and invariant matrix methods of summability*, Duke Math. J. **30** (1963), no. 1, 81–94.
[11] M. Stieglitz, *Eine Verallgemeinerung des Begriffs der Fastkonvergenz*, Math. Japon. **18** (1973), 53–70.

Celal Çakan: Faculty of Education, Inönü University, 44280 Malatya, Turkey
E-mail address: ccakan@inonu.edu.tr

Hüsamettin Çoşkun: Faculty of Education, Inönü University, 44280 Malatya, Turkey
E-mail address: hcoskun@inonu.edu.tr

Journal of Applied Mathematics and Decision Sciences

Special Issue on
Intelligent Computational Methods for Financial Engineering

Call for Papers

As a multidisciplinary field, financial engineering is becoming increasingly important in today's economic and financial world, especially in areas such as portfolio management, asset valuation and prediction, fraud detection, and credit risk management. For example, in a credit risk context, the recently approved Basel II guidelines advise financial institutions to build comprehensible credit risk models in order to optimize their capital allocation policy. Computational methods are being intensively studied and applied to improve the quality of the financial decisions that need to be made. Until now, computational methods and models are central to the analysis of economic and financial decisions.

However, more and more researchers have found that the financial environment is not ruled by mathematical distributions or statistical models. In such situations, some attempts have also been made to develop financial engineering models using intelligent computing approaches. For example, an artificial neural network (ANN) is a nonparametric estimation technique which does not make any distributional assumptions regarding the underlying asset. Instead, ANN approach develops a model using sets of unknown parameters and lets the optimization routine seek the best fitting parameters to obtain the desired results. The main aim of this special issue is not to merely illustrate the superior performance of a new intelligent computational method, but also to demonstrate how it can be used effectively in a financial engineering environment to improve and facilitate financial decision making. In this sense, the submissions should especially address how the results of estimated computational models (e.g., ANN, support vector machines, evolutionary algorithm, and fuzzy models) can be used to develop intelligent, easy-to-use, and/or comprehensible computational systems (e.g., decision support systems, agent-based system, and web-based systems)

This special issue will include (but not be limited to) the following topics:

- **Computational methods**: artificial intelligence, neural networks, evolutionary algorithms, fuzzy inference, hybrid learning, ensemble learning, cooperative learning, multiagent learning
- **Application fields**: asset valuation and prediction, asset allocation and portfolio selection, bankruptcy prediction, fraud detection, credit risk management
- **Implementation aspects**: decision support systems, expert systems, information systems, intelligent agents, web service, monitoring, deployment, implementation

Authors should follow the Journal of Applied Mathematics and Decision Sciences manuscript format described at the journal site http://www.hindawi.com/journals/jamds/. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking System at http://mts.hindawi.com/, according to the following timetable:

Manuscript Due	December 1, 2008
First Round of Reviews	March 1, 2009
Publication Date	June 1, 2009

Guest Editors

Lean Yu, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China; Department of Management Sciences, City University of Hong Kong, Tat Chee Avenue, Kowloon, Hong Kong; yulean@amss.ac.cn

Shouyang Wang, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China; sywang@amss.ac.cn

K. K. Lai, Department of Management Sciences, City University of Hong Kong, Tat Chee Avenue, Kowloon, Hong Kong; mskklai@cityu.edu.hk