

## Bounded linear operators for some new matrix transformations

M. Aiyub<sup>1</sup>

### Abstract

In this paper, we define  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -convergence and characterize  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -conservative,  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -regular,  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -coercive matrices and we also determine the associated bounded linear operators for these matrix classes.

**Mathematics Subject Classification:** 46A45, 40H05

**Keywords:** Sequence spaces, invariant mean, matrix transformation, bounded linear operators

## 1 Introduction and preliminaries

We shall write  $w$  for the set of all complex sequences  $x = (x_k)_{k=0}^{\infty}$ . Let  $\phi, \ell_{\infty}, c$  and  $c_0$  denote the sets of all finite, bounded, convergent and null sequences respectively; and  $cs$  be the set of all convergent series. We write  $\ell_p := \{x \in w : \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |x_k|^p < \infty\}$  for  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . By  $e$  and  $e^{(n)} (n \in \mathbb{N})$ ,

---

<sup>1</sup> Department of Mathematics, University of Bahrain, P.O. Box-32038, Kingdom of Bahrain, email: maiyub2002@yahoo.com

we denote the sequences such that  $e_k = 1$  for  $k = 0, 1, \dots$ , and  $e_n^{(n)} = 1$  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  $\ell_\infty$  are Banach spaces with the sup-norm  $\|x\|_\infty = \sup_k |x_k|$ , and  $\ell_p$  ( $1 \leq p < \infty$ ) are Banach spaces with the norm  $\|x\|_p = (\sum |x_k|^p)^{1/p}$ ; while  $\phi$  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 *Schauder basis* if for every  $x \in X$ , there is a unique sequence  $(\beta_n)_{n=0}^\infty$  of scalars such that  $x = \sum_{n=0}^\infty \beta_n b^{(n)}$ .

Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be two sequence spaces and  $A = (a_{nk})_{n,k=1}^\infty$  be 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 by  $(X, Y)$  we denote the class of such matrices.

Let  $\sigma$  be a one-to-one mapping from the set  $\mathbb{N}$  of natural numbers into itself. A continuous linear functional  $\varphi$  on the space  $\ell_\infty$  is said to be an *invariant mean* or a  $\sigma$ -*mean* if and only if (i)  $\varphi(x) \geq 0$  if  $x \geq 0$  (i.e.  $x_k \geq 0$  for all  $k$ ), (ii)  $\varphi(e) = 1$ , where  $e = (1, 1, 1, \dots)$ , (iii)  $\varphi(x) = \varphi((x_{\sigma(k)}))$  for all  $x \in \ell_\infty$ .

Throughout this paper we consider the mapping  $\sigma$  which has no finite orbits, that is,  $\sigma^p(k) \neq k$  for all integer  $k \geq 0$  and  $p \geq 1$ , where  $\sigma^p(k)$  denotes the  $p$ th iterate of  $\sigma$  at  $k$ . Note that, a  $\sigma$ -mean extends the limit functional on the space  $c$  in the sense that  $\varphi(x) = \lim x$  for all  $x \in c$ , (cf [10]). 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  $x \in V_\sigma$ .

$$V_\sigma = \{x \in \ell_\infty : \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} t_{pn}(x) = L, \text{ uniformly in } n\}.$$

where  $L = \sigma - \lim x$ , where

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

Using the concept of Schaefer [17] defined and characterized the  $\sigma$ -conservative,  $\sigma$ -regular and  $\sigma$ -coercive matrices. If  $\sigma$  is translation then the  $\sigma$ -mean often called Banach Limit [2] and the set  $V_\sigma$  reduces to the set  $f$  of almost convergent sequence studied by Lorenz [9]. By a lacunary sequence we mean an increasing

sequence  $\theta = (k_r)$  of integers such that  $k_0 = 0$  and  $h_r = k_r - k_{r-1} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ . 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[8]). Recently, Aydin[1] defined the concept of almost lacunary convergent as follow: A bounded sequence  $x = (x_k)$  is said be almost lacunary convergent to the number  $\ell$  if and only if

$$\lim_r \frac{1}{h_r} \sum_{j \in I_r} x_{j+n} = \ell, \text{ uniformly in } n.$$

the idea of  $\sigma$ -convergence for double sequences was introduced in [4] and further studied recently in [3] and [15]. In [11]-[14] we study various classes of four dimensional matrices, e.g.  $\sigma$ -regular,  $\sigma$ -conservative, regularly  $\sigma$ -conservative, boundedly  $\sigma$ -conservative and  $\sigma$ -coercive matrices.

In this paper, we define  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -convergence. We also generalize the above matrices by characterizing the  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -conservative,  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -regular and  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -coercive matrices. Further, we also determine the associated bounded linear operators for these matrix classes, which is the generalized result of Mursaleen, M.A. Jarrah and S.Mouhiddin in [15].

## 2 $(\sigma, \theta)$ -Lacunary convergent sequences

We define the following:

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

$$V_\sigma(\theta) = \{x \in \ell_\infty : \lim_r \frac{1}{h_r} \sum_{j \in I_r} x_{\sigma^j(n)} = \ell, \text{ uniformly in } n\}$$

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

**Definition 2.2.** A bounded sequence  $x = (x_k)$  of real numbers 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

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

Where

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

Note that  $c \subset V_\sigma(\theta) \subset V_\sigma^\infty(\theta) \subset \ell_\infty$ .

**Definition 2.3.** An infinite matrix  $A = (a_{nk})$  is said to be  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -conservative if and only if  $Ax \in V_\sigma(\theta)$  for all  $x = (x_k) \in c$  and we denote this by  $A \in (c, V_\sigma(\theta))$ .

**Definition 2.4.** We say that, infinite matrix  $A = (a_{nk})$  is said to be  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -regular if and only if it is  $V_\sigma(\theta)$ -conservative and  $(\sigma, \theta)$ - $\lim Ax = \lim x$  for all  $x \in c$  and we denote this by  $A \in (c, V_\sigma(\theta))_{reg}$ .

**Definition 2.5.** A matrix  $A = (a_{nk})$  is said to be  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -coercive if and only if  $Ax \in V_\sigma(\theta)$  for all  $x = (x_k) \in \ell_\infty$  and we denote this by  $A \in (\ell_\infty, V_\sigma(\theta))$ .

**Remark 2.6.** If we take  $h_r = r$  then  $V_\sigma(\theta)$  is reduced to the space  $V_\sigma$  and  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -conservative,  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -regular,  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -coercive matrices are respectively reduced to  $\sigma$ -conservative,  $\sigma$ -regular,  $\sigma$ -coercive matrices (cf [15]); and in addition if  $\sigma(n) = n + 1$  then the space  $V_\sigma(\theta)$  is reduced to the space  $f$  of almost convergent sequences (cf [9]) and these matrices are reduced to the almost conservative, almost regular (cf [7]) and almost coercive matrices respectively (cf [6]).

### 3 $(\sigma, \theta)$ -conservative matrices and bounded linear operators

In the following theorem we characterize  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -conservative matrices and find the associated bounded linear operator.

**Theorem 3.1.** *A matrix  $A = (a_{nk})$  is  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -conservative, i.e.  $A \in (c, V_\sigma(\theta))$  if and only if it satisfies the condition*

$$(i) \quad \|A\| = \sup_n \sum_k |a_{nk}| < \infty;$$

$$(ii) \quad a_{(k)} = (a_{nk})_{n=1}^\infty \in V_\sigma(\theta), \text{ for each } k;$$

$$(iii) \quad a = \left( \sum_k a_{nk} \right)_{n=1}^\infty \in V_\sigma(\theta).$$

In this case, the  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -limit of  $Ax$  is

$$\lim x \left[ u - \sum_k u_k \right] + \sum_k x_k u_k,$$

where  $u = (\sigma, \theta)$ - $\lim a$  and  $u_k = (\sigma, \theta)$ - $\lim a_k, k = 1, 2, \dots$ .

*Proof. Sufficiency.* Let the conditions hold. Let  $r$  be any non-negative integer and  $x = (x_k) \in c$ . For every positive integer  $n$ ; write

$$\tau_{rn}(x) = \frac{1}{h_r} \sum_{k=1}^\infty \sum_{j \in I_r} a_{\sigma^j(n), k} x_k$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\tau_{rn}(x)| &\leq \frac{1}{h_r} \sum_{k=1}^\infty \sum_{j \in I_r} |a_{\sigma^j(n), k}| |x_k| \\ &\leq \frac{\|x\|}{h_r} \sum_{k=1}^\infty \sum_{j \in I_r} |a_{\sigma^j(n), k}| \leq \|A\| \|x\|. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\tau_{rn}$  is obviously linear on  $c$ , it follows that  $\tau_{rn} \in c'$  and  $\|\tau_{rn}\| \leq \|A\|$ .

Now,

$$\tau_{rn}(e) = \frac{1}{h_r} \sum_{k=1}^\infty \sum_{j \in I_r} a_{\sigma^j(n), k} = \frac{1}{h_r} \sum_{j \in I_r} \sum_{k=1}^\infty a_{\sigma^j(n), k}$$

that is,  $\lim_r \tau_{rn}(e)$  exists uniformly in  $n$  and  $\lim_r \tau_{rn}(e) = u$  uniformly in  $n$ , the  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -limit of  $a$ , since  $a \in V_\sigma(\theta)$ . Similarly,  $\lim_r \tau_{rn}e^k = u_k$ , the  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -limit of  $a_{(k)}$  for each  $k$ , uniformly in  $n$ . Since  $\{e, e^1, e^2, \dots\}$  is a fundamental set in  $c$ , and  $\sup_r |\tau_{r,n}(x)|$  is finite for each  $x \in c$ , it follows that

$$\lim_r \tau_{rn}(x) = \tau_n(x),$$

exists for all  $x \in c$  (cf [5]). Furthermore,  $\|\tau_n\| \leq \liminf_r \|\tau_{rn}\| \leq \|A\|$  for each  $n$  and  $\tau_n \in c'$ . Thus, each  $x \in c$  has a unique representation

$$\begin{aligned} x &= (\lim x) \left[ e - \sum_k e_k \right] + \sum_k x_k e_k \\ \tau_n(x) &= (\lim x) \left[ t_n(e) - \sum_k t_n(e_k) \right] + \sum_k x_k t_n(e_k) \\ \tau_n(x) &= (\lim x) \left[ u - \sum_k u_k \right] + \sum_k x_k u_k. \end{aligned}$$

By  $L(x)$ , we denote the right hand side of the above expression which is independent of  $n$ . Now, we have to show that  $\lim_r \tau_{rn}(x) = L(x)$  uniformly in  $n$ . Put

$$F_{rn}(x) = \tau_{rn}(x) - L(x).$$

Then  $F_{rn} \in c'$ ,  $\|F_{rn}\| \leq 2\|A\|$  for all  $r, n$ ,  $\lim_r F_{rn}(e) = 0$  uniformly in  $n$ , and  $\lim_r F_{rn}(e^k) = 0$  uniformly in  $n$  for each  $k$ . Let  $K$  be an arbitrary positive integer. Then

$$x = (\lim x)e + \sum_{k=1}^K (x_k - \lim x)e^k + \sum_{k=K+1}^{\infty} (x_k - \lim x)e^k.$$

Now applying  $F_{rn}$  on both sides of the above equality, we have

$$F_{rn}(x) = (\lim x)F_{rn}(e) + \sum_{k=1}^K (x_k - \lim x)F_{rn}(e^k) + F_{rn}\left(\sum_{k=K+1}^{\infty} (x_k - \lim x)e^k\right). \quad (3.1.1)$$

Now,

$$\left| F_{rn}\left(\sum_{k=K+1}^{\infty} (x_k - \lim x)e^k\right) \right| \leq 2\|A\| \sum_{k \geq K+1} \{|x_k - \lim x|\},$$

for all  $r, n$ . After choosing fixed  $K$  large enough, it is easy to see that the absolute value of each term on the right hand side of (3.1.1) can be made

uniformly small for all sufficiently large  $r$ . Therefore,  $\lim_r F_{rn}(x) = 0$  uniformly in  $n$ ; so that  $Ax \in V_\sigma(\theta)$  and the matrix  $A$  is  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -conservative.

*Necessity.* Suppose that  $A$  is  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -conservative. Then

$$Ax = (A_n(x))_{n=1}^\infty = \left( \sum_k a_{nk} x_k \right)_{n=1}^\infty \in V_\sigma(\theta),$$

for all  $x \in c$ . Let  $x = (x_k) = e^k$ . Therefore

$$(\sigma, \theta)\text{-}\lim_n \sum_k a_{nk} e^k = (\sigma, \theta)\text{-}\lim_n a_{nk} = a_{(k)}.$$

Hence (ii) holds. Now, let  $x = e$ . Then

$$(\sigma, \theta)\text{-}\lim_n \sum_k a_{nk} e = (\sigma, \theta)\text{-}\lim_n \sum_k a_{nk} = a,$$

so that (iii) must hold. Since  $Ax = (A_n(x)) \in V_\sigma(\theta) \subset \ell_\infty$ . It follows that  $\sup_n |A_n(x)| < \infty$ ,  $(A_n)$  is a sequence of bounded operators. Therefore, by Banach-Steinhaus theorem,  $\sup_n |A_n| < \infty$ , which implies  $\sup_n \sum_k |a_{nk}| < \infty$  and hence  $\|A\| = \sup_n \sum_k |a_{nk}| < \infty$ , i.e. (i). This completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

Now, we deduce the following.

**Corollary 3.2.**  *$A = (a_{nk})$  is  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -regular if and only if the conditions (i), (ii) with  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -limit zero for each  $k$ , and (iii) with  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -limit 1 of Theorem 3.1 hold.*

*Proof.* For  $x \in c$ ,  $(\sigma, \theta)\text{-}\lim Ax = L(x)$ , which reduces to  $\lim x$ , since  $u = 1$  and  $u_k = 0$  for each  $k$ . Hence  $A$  is  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -regular.

Conversely, let  $A$  be  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -regular. Then  $(\sigma, \theta)\text{-}\lim Ae = 1 = (\sigma, \theta)\text{-}\lim Aa$ ,  $(\sigma, \theta)\text{-}\lim Ae^k = 0 = (\sigma, \theta)\text{-}\lim A_{(k)}$  and  $\|A\|$  is finite as condition (i) of Theorem 3.1. This completes the proof of the Corollary 3.2.  $\square$

## 4 $(\sigma, \theta)$ -coercive matrices

We use the following lemma in our next theorem.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $B(n) = (b_{mk}(n))$ ,  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  be a sequence of infinite matrices such that*

(i)  $\|B(n)\| < H < +\infty$  for all  $n$ ; and

(ii)  $\lim_m b_{mk}(n) = 0$  for each  $k$ , uniformly in  $n$ .

Then

$$\lim_m \sum_k b_{mk}(n)x_k = 0 \text{ uniformly in } n \text{ for each } x \in \ell_\infty \quad (4.1.1)$$

if and only if

$$\lim_m \sum_k |b_{mk}(n)| = 0 \text{ uniformly in } n. \quad (4.1.2)$$

**Theorem 4.2.** *A matrix  $A = (a_{nk})$  is  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -coercive, i.e.  $A \in (\ell_\infty, V_\sigma(\theta))$  if and only if (i) and (ii) of Theorem 3.1 hold, and*

(iii)  $\lim_r \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left| \sum_{j \in I_r} a_{\sigma^j(n), k} - u_k \right|$  uniformly in  $n$ .

In this case, the  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -limit of  $Ax$  is

$$\sum_k x_k u_k \quad \forall x \in \ell_\infty,$$

where  $u_k = (\sigma, \theta)$ - $\lim a_k$ .

*Proof. Sufficiency.* Let the conditions hold. For any positive integer  $K$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^K |u_k| &= \sum_{k=1}^K \lim_r \left| \sum_{j \in I_r} a_{\sigma^j(n), k} \right| / h_r = \lim_r \sum_{k=1}^K \left| \sum_{j \in I_r} a_{\sigma^j(n), k} \right| / h_r \\ &\leq \limsup_r \sum_{j \in I_r} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left| a_{\sigma^j(n), k} \right| / h_r \leq \|A\|. \end{aligned}$$



This shows that  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |u_k|$  converges, and that  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} u_k x_k$  is defined for every  $x = (x_k) \in \ell_{\infty}$ .

Let  $x = (x_k)$  be any arbitrary bounded sequence. For every positive integer  $r$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{1}{h_r} \sum_{j \in I_r} a_{\sigma^j(n),k} - u_k \right) x_k \right\| \\ &= \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left[ \sum_{j \in I_r} [a_{\sigma^j(n),k} - u_k] / h_r \right] x_k \right\| \\ &\leq \sup_n \left[ \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left[ \sum_{j \in I_r} [a_{\sigma^j(n),k} - u_k] / h_r \right] x_k \right\| \right] \\ &\leq \|x\| \sup_r \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left| \sum_{j \in I_r} [a_{\sigma^j(n),k} - u_k] \right| / h_r \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $r \rightarrow \infty$  and using condition (iii), we get

$$\frac{1}{h_r} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j \in I_r} a_{\sigma^j(n),k} x_k \longrightarrow \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} u_k x_k.$$

Hence  $Ax \in V_{\sigma}(\theta)$  with  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -limit  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} u_k x_k$ .

*Necessity.* Let  $A$  be  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -coercive matrix. This implies that  $A$  is  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -conservative, then we have condition (i) and (ii) from Theorem 3.1. Now we have to show that (iii) holds.

Suppose that for some  $n$ , we have

$$\limsup_r \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left| \sum_{j \in I_r} [a_{\sigma^j(n),k} - u_k] \right| / h_r = N > 0.$$

Since  $\|A\|$  is finite, therefore  $N$  is also finite. We observe that since  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |u_k| < +\infty$  and  $A$  is  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -coercive, the matrix  $B = (b_{nk})$ , where  $b_{nk} = a_{nk} - u_k$ , is also  $(\sigma, \theta)$ -coercive matrix. By an argument similar to that of Theorem 2.1 in [6], one can find  $x \in \ell_{\infty}$  for which  $Bx \notin V_{\sigma}(\theta)$ . This contradiction implies the necessity of (iii).

Now, we use Lemma 4.1 to show that this convergence is uniform in  $n$ . Let

$$t_{rk}(n) = \sum_{j \in I_r} [a_{\sigma^j(n),k} - u_k] / h_r$$

and let  $T(n)$  be the matrix  $(t_{rk}(n))$ . It is easy to see that  $\|H(n)\| \leq 2\|A\|$  for every  $n$ ; and from condition (ii)

$$\lim_r t_{rk}(n) = 0 \text{ for each } k, \text{ uniformly in } n.$$

For any  $x \in \ell_\infty$

$$\lim_r \sum_{j \in I_r} t_{rk}(n)x_k = (\sigma, \theta)\text{-}\lim Ax - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} u_k x_k$$

and the limit exists uniformly in  $n$ , since  $Ax \in V_\sigma(\theta)$ . Moreover, this limit is zero since

$$\left| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} t_{rk}(n)x_k \right| \leq \|x\| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left| \sum_{j \in I_r} [a_{\sigma^j(n),k} - u_k] \right| / h_r.$$

Hence

$$\lim_r \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |t_{rk}(n)| = 0 \text{ uniformly in } n;$$

i.e. the condition (iii) holds. This completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

**Acknowledment:** I would like to thank to the Deanship of scientific research for supporting the research project 14/2011.

## References

- [1] B. Aydin, Lacunary almost summability in certain linear topological spaces, *Bull. Malays Math. Sci. Soc.*, **2**, (2004), 217-223.
- [2] S.Banach, *Theorie des operations lineaires*, Warsaw, 1932.
- [3] C. Çakan, B. Altay and H. Çoşkun,  $\sigma$ -regular matrices and a  $\sigma$ -core theorem for double sequences, *Hacetatepe J. Math. Stat.*, **38**(1), (2009), 51-58.
- [4] C. Cakan, B. Altay and M. Mursaleen, The  $\sigma$ -convergence and  $\sigma$ -core of double sequences, *Applied Mathematics Letters*, **19**, (2006), 1122-1128.

- [5] N. Dunford and J.T. Schwartz, *Linear Operators: General theory, Pure and Appl. Math.*, **7**, Interscience, New York, 1958.
- [6] C. Eizen and G. Laush, Infinite matrices and almost convergence, *Math. Japon.*, **14**, (1969), 137-143.
- [7] J.P. King, Almost summable sequences, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **17**, (1966), 1219-1225.
- [8] A.R. Freedman, J.J. Sember and M. Raphael, Some cesaro type summability space, *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, **37**, (1978), 508-520.
- [9] G.G. Lorentz, A contribution to theory of divergent sequences, *Acta Math.*, **80**, (1948), 167-190.
- [10] M. Mursaleen, On some new invariant matrix methods of summability, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford*, **34**, (1983), 77-86.
- [11] M. Mursaleen, Some matrix transformations on equence space of invariant means, *Hacettepe. J. Math and Stat.*, **38**(3), (2009), 259-264.
- [12] M. Mursaleen and S.A. Mohiuddine, Double  $\sigma$ -multiplicative matrices, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **327**, (2007), 991-996.
- [13] M. Mursaleen and S.A. Mohiuddine, Regularly  $\sigma$ -conservative and  $\sigma$ -coercive four dimensional matrices, *Computers and Mathematics with Applications*, **56**, (2008), 1580-1586.
- [14] M. Mursaleen and S.A. Mohiuddine, On  $\sigma$ -conservative and boundedly  $\sigma$ -conservative four dimensional matrices, *Computers and Mathematics with Applications*, **59**, (2009), 880-885.
- [15] M. Mursaleen and S.A. Mohiuddine, Some inequalities on sublinear functionals related to the invariant mean for double sequences, *Math. Ineq. Appl.*, **139**(1), (2010), 157-163.
- [16] M. Mursaleen and S.A. Mohiuddine, Some new double sequence spaces of invariant means, *Glasnik Matematicki*, **45**(1), (2010), 139-153.
- [17] P. Schaefer, Infinite matrices and invariant means, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **36**, (1972), 104-110.