Serdica

Mathematical Journal

Сердика

Математическо списание

FRACTIONAL TRIGONOMETRIC KOROVKIN THEORY IN STATISTICAL SENSE

George A. Anastassiou, Oktay Duman

Communicated by S. T. Rachev

ABSTRACT. In the present paper, we improve the classical trigonometric Korovkin theory by using the concept of statistical convergence from the summability theory and also by considering the fractional derivatives of functions. We also show that our new results are more applicable than the classical ones.

1. Introduction. The classical trigonometric Korovkin theory (see, e.g., [1, 21]) has been developed by the second author (see [10]) with the help of the concept of statistical convergence instead of the usual convergence. In the recent paper [4], this theory has also been studied by the first author via the techniques from the fractional calculus. In this paper, we mainly combine

these results. More precisely, we obtain some statistical trigonometric Korovkin-type results by using the fractional derivatives of functions. We also display an example showing why our results are more applicable than the classical ones.

We first recall some basic definitions and notations used in the paper. Let $A := [a_{jn}]$, $j, n = 1, 2, \ldots$, be an infinite summability matrix and assume that, for a given sequence (x_n), the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_{jn} x_n$ converges for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, by the A-transform of x, we mean the sequence $((Ax)_j)$ such that, for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $(Ax)_j := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_{jn} x_n$. A summability matrix A is said to be regular (see [19]) if for every (x_n) for which $\lim_n x_n = L$ we get $\lim_j (Ax)_j = L$. For a given non-negative regular summability matrix A, we say that a sequence (x_n) is A-statistically convergent to a number L if, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, $\lim_{j \to \infty} \sum_{n \, : \, |x_n - L| \geq \varepsilon} a_{nj} = 0$, which is denoted by $st_A - \lim_n x_n = L$ (see [17]). Observe now that if $A = C_1 = [c_{jn}]$, the Cesáro matrix defined to be $c_{jn} = 1/j$ if $1 \leq n \leq j$, and $c_{jn} = 0$ otherwise, then C_1-statistical convergence coincides with the concept of statistical convergence, which was first introduced by Fast [14] (see also [15]). In this case, we use the notation $st - \lim$ instead of $st_{C_1} - \lim$ (see the last section for this situation). Notice that every convergent sequence is A-statistically convergent to the same value for any non-negative regular matrix A, however, the converse is not always true. Not all properties of convergent sequences hold true for A-statistical convergence (or statistical convergence). For instance, although it is well-known that a subsequence of a convergent sequence is convergent, this is not always true for A-statistical convergence. Another example is that every convergent sequence must be bounded, however it does not need to be bounded of an A-statistically convergent sequence. With these properties, in recent years, the statistical convergence has been used in many branches of mathematics, such as summability theory [9, 16], measure theory [8, 22], approximation theory [6, 13, 18], fuzzy logic theory [5, 7, 20], analytic functions theory [11, 12], and etc.

Throughout the paper we focus on the closed interval $[-\pi, \pi]$. We now recall the Caputo fractional derivatives. Let r be a positive real number and $m = \lceil r \rceil$, where $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ is the ceiling of the number. Let $AC([-\pi, \pi])$ denote the space of all real-valued absolutely continuous functions on $[-\pi, \pi]$. Consider the space

$$AC^m ([-\pi, \pi]) := \left\{ f : [-\pi, \pi] \to \mathbb{R} : f^{(m-1)} \in AC([-\pi, \pi]) \right\}.$$

Then, the left Caputo fractional derivative of a function f belonging to

$AC^m([-\pi, \pi])$ is defined by

$$(1.1) \qquad D^r_{*(-\pi)}f(y) := \frac{1}{\Gamma(m-r)} \int_{-\pi}^{y} (y-t)^{m-r-1} f^{(m)}(t)dt \quad \text{for} \quad y \in [-\pi, \pi],$$

where Γ is the usual Gamma function. Also, the right Caputo fractional derivative of a function f belonging to $AC^m([-\pi, \pi])$ is defined to be

$$(1.2) \qquad D^r_{\pi-}f(y) := \frac{(-1)^m}{\Gamma(m-r)} \int_{y}^{\pi} (\zeta - y)^{m-r-1} f^{(m)}(\zeta)d\zeta \quad \text{for} \quad y \in [-\pi, \pi].$$

In (1.1) and (1.2), we set $D^0_{*(-\pi)}f = f$ and $D^0_{\pi-}f = f$ on $[-\pi, \pi]$. Throughout the paper we consider the following assumptions:

$$D^r_{*(-\pi)}f(y) = 0 \text{ for every } y < -\pi$$

and

$$D^r_{\pi-}f(y) = 0 \text{ for every } y > \pi.$$

Then we know the following facts (see, e.g., [2, 3, 4]):

(1°) If $r > 0$, $r \notin \mathbb{N}$, $m = \lceil r \rceil$, $f \in C^{m-1}([-\pi, \pi])$ and $f^{(m)} \in L_\infty([-\pi, \pi])$, then we have $D^r_{*(-\pi)}f(-\pi) = 0$ and $D^r_{\pi-}f(\pi) = 0$.

(2°) Let $y \in [-\pi, \pi]$ be fixed. For $r > 0$, $m = \lceil r \rceil$, $f \in C^{m-1}([-\pi, \pi])$ with $f^{(m)} \in L_\infty([-\pi, \pi])$, consider the following Caputo fractional derivatives:

$$(1.3) \quad U_f(x, y) := D^r_{*x}f(y) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(m-r)} \int_{x}^{y} (y-t)^{m-r-1} f^{(m)}(t)dt \quad \text{for} \quad y \in [x, \pi]$$

and
(1.4)

$$V_f(x, y) := D^r_{x-}f(y) = \frac{(-1)^m}{\Gamma(m-r)} \int_{y}^{x} (\zeta - y)^{m-r-1} f^{(m)}(\zeta)d\zeta \quad \text{for} \quad y \in [-\pi, x].$$

Then, by [2, 4], for each fixed $x \in [-\pi, \pi]$, $U_f(x, \cdot)$ is continuous on the interval $[x, \pi]$, and also $V_f(x, \cdot)$ is continuous on $[-\pi, x]$. In addition, if $f \in C^m([-\pi, \pi])$, then, $U_f(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $V_f(\cdot, \cdot)$ are continuous on the set $[-\pi, \pi] \times [-\pi, \pi]$.

(**3°**) Let $\omega(f, \delta)$, $\delta > 0$, denote the usual modulus of continuity of a function f on $[-\pi, \pi]$. If $g \in C([-\pi, \pi] \times [-\pi, \pi])$, then, for any $\delta > 0$, both the functions $s(x) := \omega(g(x, \cdot), \delta)_{[-\pi, x]}$ and $t(x) := \omega(g(x, \cdot), \delta)_{[x, \pi]}$ are continuous at the point $x \in [-\pi, \pi]$.

(**4°**) If $f \in C^{m-1}([-\pi, \pi])$ with $f^{(m)} \in L_\infty([-\pi, \pi])$, then we get from [4] that, for any $\delta > 0$,

$$(1.5) \qquad \sup_{x \in [-\pi, \pi]} \omega(U_f(x, \cdot), \delta)_{[x, \pi]} < \infty$$

and

$$(1.6) \qquad \sup_{x \in [-\pi, \pi]} \omega(V_f(x, \cdot), \delta)_{[-\pi, x]} < \infty.$$

(**5°**) Now let $\Psi(y) := \Psi_x(y) = y - x$, $\Omega(y) := \Omega_x(y) = \sin\left(\dfrac{|y - x|}{4}\right)$ and $e_0(y) := 1$ on the interval $[-\pi, \pi]$. Following the paper by Anastassiou (see [4]) if $L_n : C([-\pi, \pi]) \to C([-\pi, \pi])$ is a sequence of positive linear operators and if $r > 0$, $r \notin \mathbb{N}$, $m = \lceil r \rceil$, $f \in AC^m([-\pi, \pi])$ with $f^{(m)} \in L_\infty([-\pi, \pi])$, then we obtain that ($\|\cdot\|$ is the supremum norm)

$$\|L_n(f) - f\| \leq \|f\| \, \|L_n(e_0) - e_0\| + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \frac{\|f^{(k)}\|}{k!} \left\| L_n\left(|\Psi|^k\right) \right\|$$

$$+ \left(\frac{(2\pi)^r}{\Gamma(r+1)} \|L_n(e_0) - e_0\|^{\frac{1}{r+1}} + \frac{(2\pi)^r(r+1+2\pi)}{\Gamma(r+2)} \right)$$

$$\times \left\| L_n\left(\Omega^{r+1}\right) \right\|^{\frac{r}{r+1}} \left\{ \sup_{x \in [-\pi, \pi]} \omega\left(U_f(x, \cdot), \left\| L_n\left(\Omega^{r+1}\right) \right\|^{\frac{1}{r+1}} \right)_{[x, \pi]} \right.$$

$$\left. + \sup_{x \in [-\pi, \pi]} \omega\left(V_f(x, \cdot), \left\| L_n\left(\Omega^{r+1}\right) \right\|^{\frac{1}{r+1}} \right)_{[-\pi, x]} \right\}.$$

Then setting

$$(1.7) \qquad \rho_{n,r} := \left\| L_n\left(\Omega^{r+1}\right) \right\|^{\frac{1}{r+1}},$$

and also using (1.5), (1.6) we may write that

(1.8)
$$\|L_n(f) - f\| \leq K_{m,r} \left\{ \|L_n(e_0) - e_0\| + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \left\| L_n\left(|\Psi|^k\right) \right\| \right.$$

$$+\rho_{n,r}^r \left(\sup_{x \in [-\pi,\pi]} \omega\left(U_f(x,\cdot), \rho_{n,r}\right)_{[x,\pi]} \right)$$

$$+\rho_{n,r}^r \left(\sup_{x \in [-\pi,\pi]} \omega\left(V_f(x,\cdot), \rho_{n,r}\right)_{[-\pi,x]} \right)$$

$$+\rho_{n,r}^r \|L_n(e_0) - e_0\|^{\frac{1}{r+1}} \left(\sup_{x \in [-\pi,\pi]} \omega\left(U_f(x,\cdot), \rho_{n,r}\right)_{[x,\pi]} \right)$$

$$\left. +\rho_{n,r}^r \|L_n(e_0) - e_0\|^{\frac{1}{r+1}} \left(\sup_{x \in [-\pi,\pi]} \omega\left(V_f(x,\cdot), \rho_{n,r}\right)_{[-\pi,x]} \right) \right\},$$

where

$$(1.9) \quad K_{r,m} := \max \left\{ \frac{(2\pi)^r}{\Gamma(r+1)}, \frac{(2\pi)^r(r+1+2\pi)}{\Gamma(r+2)}, \|f\|, \|f'\|, \right.$$

$$\left. \frac{\|f''\|}{2!}, \frac{\|f'''\|}{3!}, \ldots, \frac{\|f^{(m-1)}\|}{(m-1)!} \right\}.$$

We should note that the sum in the right hand-side of (1.8) collapses when $r \in (0,1)$.

Therefore, the next theorem is a fractional Korovkin-type approximation result for a sequence of positive linear operators.

Theorem A (see [4]).   *Let $L_n : C([-\pi,\pi]) \to C([-\pi,\pi])$ be a sequence of positive linear operators, and let $r > 0$, $r \notin \mathbb{N}$, $m = \lceil r \rceil$. If the sequence $\{\rho_{n,r}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ given by (1.7) is convergent to zero as n tends to infinity and $\{L_n(e_0)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges uniformly to e_0 on $[-\pi,\pi]$, then, for every $f \in AC^m([-\pi,\pi])$ with $f^{(m)} \in L_\infty([-\pi,\pi])$, the sequence $\{L_n(f)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges uniformly to f on the interval $[-\pi,\pi]$. Furthermore, this uniform convergence is still valid on $[-\pi,\pi]$ when $f \in C^m([-\pi,\pi])$.*

2. Fractional Korovkin results based on statistical convergence. In this section, we mainly obtain the statistical version of Theorem A. We first need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $A := [a_{jn}]$ be a non-negative regular summability matrix, and let $r > 0$, $r \notin \mathbb{N}$, $m = \lceil r \rceil$. Assume that $L_n : C([-\pi, \pi]) \to C([-\pi, \pi])$ is a sequence of positive linear operators. If*

(2.1) $$st_A - \lim_n \|L_n(e_0) - e_0\| = 0$$

and

(2.2) $$st_A - \lim_n \rho_{n,r} = 0,$$

where $\rho_{n,r}$ is the same as in (1.7), then we have, for every $k = 1, 2, \ldots, m-1$,

$$st_A - \lim_n \left\| L_n \left(|\Psi|^k \right) \right\| = 0.$$

P r o o f. Let $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m-1\}$ be fixed. Then, using Hölder's inequality for positive linear operators with $p = \dfrac{r+1}{k}$, $q = \dfrac{r+1}{r+1-k}$ $\left(\dfrac{1}{p} + \dfrac{1}{q} = 1 \right)$, we obtain that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\| L_n \left(|\Psi|^k \right) \right\| &= 2^k \left\| L_n \left(\left(\frac{|\Psi|}{2} \right)^k \right) \right\| \\
&\leq 2^k \left\| L_n \left(\left(\frac{|\Psi|}{2} \right)^{r+1} \right) \right\|^{\frac{k}{r+1}} \|L_n(e_0)\|^{\frac{r+1-k}{r+1}},
\end{aligned}
$$

which gives

$$\left\| L_n \left(|\Psi|^k \right) \right\| \leq 2^k \left\| L_n \left(\left(\frac{|\Psi|}{2} \right)^{r+1} \right) \right\|^{\frac{k}{r+1}} \left\{ \|L_n(e_0) - e_0\|^{\frac{r+1-k}{r+1}} + 1 \right\}.$$

Now using the fact that $|u| \leq \pi \sin(|u|/2)$ for $u \in [-\pi, \pi]$, we have

$$\left\| L_n \left(|\Psi|^k \right) \right\| \leq (2\pi)^k \left\| L_n \left(\sin^{r+1} \left(\frac{|\Psi|}{4} \right) \right) \right\|^{\frac{k}{r+1}} \left\{ \|L_n(e_0) - e_0\|^{\frac{r+1-k}{r+1}} + 1 \right\}.$$

Hence, for each $k = 1, 2, \ldots, m - 1$, we get the following inequality:

$$(2.3) \qquad \left\| L_n \left(|\Psi|^k \right) \right\| \leq (2\pi)^k \left(\rho_{n,r}^k \left\| L_n \left(e_0 \right) - e_0 \right\|^{\frac{r+1-k}{r+1}} + \rho_{n,r}^k \right).$$

Then, for a given $\varepsilon > 0$, define the following sets:

$$A \quad : \quad = \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \left\| L_n \left(|\Psi|^k \right) \right\| \geq \varepsilon \right\},$$

$$A_1 \quad : \quad = \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \rho_{n,r}^k \left\| L_n \left(e_0 \right) - e_0 \right\|^{\frac{r+1-k}{r+1}} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2 \left(2\pi \right)^k} \right\}$$

$$A_2 \quad : \quad = \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \rho_{n,r} \geq \frac{1}{2\pi} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{k}} \right\}.$$

Then, it follows from (2.3) that $A \subseteq A_1 \cup A_2$. Also, defining

$$A_1' \quad : \quad = \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \rho_{n,r} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2k}} \right\},$$

$$A_1'' \quad : \quad = \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \left\| L_n \left(e_0 \right) - e_0 \right\| \geq \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2 \left(2\pi \right)^k} \right)^{\frac{r+1}{2(r+1-k)}} \right\},$$

we observe that $A_1 \subseteq A_1' \cup A_2''$, which implies that

$$A \subseteq A_1' \cup A_1'' \cup A_2.$$

Hence, for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we get

$$\sum_{n \in A} a_{jn} \leq \sum_{n \in A_1'} a_{jn} + \sum_{n \in A_1''} a_{jn} + \sum_{n \in A_2} a_{jn}.$$

Letting $j \to \infty$ in the last inequality and also using the hypotheses (2.1) and (2.2) we immediately see that

$$\lim_j \sum_{n \in A} a_{jn} = 0.$$

Hence, we conclude that, for each $k = 1, 2, \ldots, m - 1$,

$$st_A - \lim_n \left\| L_n \left(|\Psi|^k \right) \right\| = 0,$$

whence the result. $\square$

Now we are ready to give our first fractional approximation result based on statistical convergence.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $A := [a_{jn}]$ be a non-negative regular summability matrix, and let $r > 0$, $r \notin \mathbb{N}$, $m = \lceil r \rceil$. Assume that $L_n : C([-\pi, \pi]) \to C([-\pi, \pi])$ is a sequence of positive linear operators. If (2.1) and (2.2) hold, then, for every $f \in AC^m([-\pi, \pi])$ with $f^{(m)} \in L_\infty([-\pi, \pi])$, we have*

$$(2.4) \qquad st_A - \lim_n \|L_n(f) - f\| = 0.$$

Proof. Let $f \in AC^m([-\pi, \pi])$ with $f^{(m)} \in L_\infty([-\pi, \pi])$. Then, using (1.5), (1.6) and (1.8), we get

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \|L_n(f) - f\| &\leq M_{m,r} \Big\{ \|L_n(e_0) - e_0\| + 2\rho_{n,r}^r \\ &\quad + 2\rho_{n,r}^r \|L_n(e_0) - e_0\|^{\frac{1}{r+1}} + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \left\| L_n\left(|\Psi|^k\right) \right\| \Big\}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$M_{m,r} := \max \Big\{ K_{m,r}, \sup_{x \in [-\pi, \pi]} \omega\left(U_f(x, \cdot), \rho_{n,r}\right)_{[x,\pi]}, $$
$$\sup_{x \in [-\pi, \pi]} \omega\left(V_f(x, \cdot), \rho_{n,r}\right)_{[-\pi, x]} \Big\}$$

and $K_{m,r}$ is given by (1.9). Now, for a given $\varepsilon > 0$, define the following sets:

$$B := \{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \|L_n(f) - f\| \geq \varepsilon \},$$

$$B_k := \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \left\| L_n\left(|\Psi|^k\right) \right\| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{(m+2)M_{m,r}} \right\}, \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots, m-1.$$

$$B_m := \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \|L_n(e_0) - e_0\| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{(m+2) M_{m,r}} \right\}$$

$$B_{m+1} := \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \delta_{n,r} \geq \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2(m+2)M_{m,r}} \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \right\},$$

$$B_{m+2} := \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \delta_{n,r}^r \|L_n(e_0) - e_0\|^{\frac{1}{r+1}} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2(m+2)M_{m,r}} \right\}.$$

Then, it follows from (2.5) that $B \subseteq \bigcup\limits_{i=1}^{m+2} B_i$. Also defining

$$B_{m+3} := \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \|L_n(e_0) - e_0\| \geq \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2(m+2)M_{m,r}} \right)^{\frac{r+1}{2}} \right\}$$

and

$$B_{m+4} := \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \delta_{n,r} \geq \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2(m+2)M_{m,r}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2r}} \right\}$$

we see that

$$B_{m+2} \subseteq B_{m+3} \cup B_{m+4},$$

which implies

$$B \subseteq \bigcup\limits_{i=1}^{m+4} B_i.$$

Hence, for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

(2.6)
$$\sum_{n \in B} a_{jn} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m+4} \sum_{n \in B_i} a_{jn}.$$

Taking limit as $n \to \infty$ in the both sides of (2.6) and also using (2.1), (2.2), and also considering Lemma 2.1 we conclude that

$$\lim_j \sum_{n \in B} a_{jn} = 0,$$

which gives (2.4). □

If we use the space $C^m([-\pi, \pi])$ instead of $AC^m([-\pi, \pi])$, then we can get a slight modification of Theorem 2.2. To see this we need the next lemma.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $A := [a_{jn}]$ be a non-negative regular summability matrix, and let $r > 0$, $r \notin \mathbb{N}$, $m = \lceil r \rceil$. Assume that $L_n : C([-\pi, \pi]) \to C([-\pi, \pi])$ is a sequence of positive linear operators. If (2.2) holds, then, for every $f \in C^m([-\pi, \pi])$, we have:*

(i) $st_A - \lim\limits_n \left(\sup\limits_{x \in [-\pi, \pi]} \omega \left(U_f(x, \cdot), \rho_{n,r} \right)_{[x, \pi]} \right) = 0,$

(ii) $st_A - \lim\limits_n \left(\sup\limits_{x \in [-\pi, \pi]} \omega \left(V_f(x, \cdot), \rho_{n,r} \right)_{[-\pi, x]} \right) = 0,$

where $\rho_{n,r}$ is the same as in (1.7); $U_f(\cdot,\cdot)$ and $V_f(\cdot,\cdot)$ are given respectively by (1.3) and (1.4).

P r o o f. We know from (**2°**) that if $f \in C^m([-\pi,\pi])$, then both $U_f(\cdot,\cdot)$ and $V_f(\cdot,\cdot)$ belong to $C([-\pi,\pi] \times [-\pi,\pi])$. Then, by (**3°**), the functions $\omega(U_f(x,\cdot),\delta_{n,r})_{[x,\pi]}$ and $\omega(V_f(x,\cdot),\delta_{n,r})_{[-\pi,x]}$ are continuous at the point $x \in [-\pi,\pi]$. Hence, there exist the points $x_0, x_1 \in [-\pi,\pi]$ such that

$$\sup_{x \in [-\pi,\pi]} \omega(U_f(x,\cdot),\rho_{n,r})_{[x,\pi]} = \omega(U_f(x_0,\cdot),\rho_{n,r})_{[x_0,\pi]} =: g(\rho_{n,r})$$

and

$$\sup_{x \in [-\pi,\pi]} \omega(V_f(x,\cdot),\rho_{n,r})_{[-\pi,x]} = \omega(V_f(x_1,\cdot),\rho_{n,r})_{[-\pi,x_1]} =: h(\rho_{n,r}).$$

Since $U_f(x_0,\cdot)$ and $V_f(x_1,\cdot)$ are continuous on $[-\pi,\pi]$, the functions g and h are right continuous at the origin. By (2.2), we get, for any $\delta > 0$, that

$$(2.7) \qquad \lim_j \sum_{n:\rho_{n,r} \geq \delta} a_{jn} = 0.$$

Now, by the right continuity of g and h at zero, for a given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $\delta_1, \delta_2 > 0$ such that $g(\delta_{n,r}) < \varepsilon$ whenever $\delta_{n,r} < \delta_1$ and that $h(\delta_{n,r}) < \varepsilon$ whenever $\delta_{n,r} < \delta_2$. Then, we may write that $g(\delta_{n,r}) \geq \varepsilon$ implies $\delta_{n,r} \geq \delta_1$, and also that $h(\delta_{n,r}) \geq \varepsilon$ implies $\delta_{n,r} \geq \delta_2$. Hence, we see that

$$(2.8) \qquad \{n \in \mathbb{N} : g(\rho_{n,r}) \geq \varepsilon\} \subseteq \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \rho_{n,r} \geq \delta_1\}$$

and

$$(2.9) \qquad \{n \in \mathbb{N} : h(\rho_{n,r}) \geq \varepsilon\} \subseteq \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \rho_{n,r} \geq \delta_2\}$$

So, it follows from (2.8) and (2.9) that, for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(2.10) \qquad \sum_{n:g(\rho_{n,r}) \geq \varepsilon} a_{jn} \leq \sum_{n:\rho_{n,r} \geq \delta_1} a_{jn}$$

and

$$(2.11) \qquad \sum_{n:h(\rho_{n,r}) \geq \varepsilon} a_{jn} \leq \sum_{n:\rho_{n,r} \geq \delta_2} a_{jn}$$

Then, taking limit as $j \to \infty$ on the both sides of the inequalities (2.10), (2.11); and also using (2.7) we immediately get, for every $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{j} \sum_{n:g(\rho_{n,r}) \geq \varepsilon} a_{jn} = \lim_{j} \sum_{n:h(\rho_{n,r}) \geq \varepsilon} a_{jn} = 0,$$

which means that

$$st_A - \lim_{n} \left(\sup_{x \in [-\pi,\pi]} \omega \left(U_f(x, \cdot), \rho_{n,r} \right)_{[x,\pi]} \right) = 0$$

and

$$st_A - \lim_{n} \left(\sup_{x \in [-\pi,\pi]} \omega \left(V_f(x, \cdot), \rho_{n,r} \right)_{[-\pi,x]} \right) = 0.$$

Therefore, the proof of Lemma is completed. □

Then, we get the following result.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $A := [a_{jn}]$ be a non-negative regular summability matrix, and let $r > 0$, $r \notin \mathbb{N}$, $m = \lceil r \rceil$. Assume that $L_n : C([-\pi,\pi]) \to C([-\pi,\pi])$ is a sequence of positive linear operators. If (2.1) and (2.2) hold, then, for every $f \in C^m([-\pi,\pi])$, we have (2.4).*

P r o o f. By (1.8), we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|L_n(f) - f\| \leq \ & K_{m,r} \left\{ \|L_n(e_0) - e_0\| + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \left\| L_n \left(|\Psi|^k \right) \right\| \right. \\
& + \rho_{n,r}^r g\left(\rho_{n,r}\right) + \rho_{n,r}^r h\left(\rho_{n,r}\right) \\
& + \rho_{n,r}^r g\left(\rho_{n,r}\right) \|L_n(e_0) - e_0\|^{\frac{1}{r+1}} \\
& \left. + \rho_{n,r}^r h\left(\rho_{n,r}\right) \|L_n(e_0) - e_0\|^{\frac{1}{r+1}} \right\},
\end{aligned}
$$

(2.12)

where $g(\rho_{n,r})$ and $h(\rho_{n,r})$ are the same as in the proof of Lemma 2.3. Now, for a

given $\varepsilon > 0$, consider the following sets

$$
\begin{aligned}
C &:= \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \|L_n(f) - f\| \geq \varepsilon\}, \\
C_k &:= \left\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \left\|L_n\left(|\Psi|^k\right)\right\| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{(m+4)K_{m,r}}\right\}, \ k = 1, 2, \ldots, m-1. \\
C_m &:= \left\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \|L_n(e_0) - e_0\| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{(m+4)\,K_{m,r}}\right\} \\
C_{m+1} &:= \left\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \rho_{n,r}^r g\left(\rho_{n,r}\right) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{(m+4)\,K_{m,r}}\right\}, \\
C_{m+2} &:= \left\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \rho_{n,r}^r h\left(\rho_{n,r}\right) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{(m+4)\,K_{m,r}}\right\}, \\
C_{m+3} &:= \left\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \rho_{n,r}^r g\left(\rho_{n,r}\right) \|L_n\left(e_0\right) - e_0\|^{\frac{1}{r+1}} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{(m+4)\,K_{m,r}}\right\} \\
C_{m+4} &:= \left\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \rho_{n,r}^r h\left(\rho_{n,r}\right) \|L_n\left(e_0\right) - e_0\|^{\frac{1}{r+1}} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{(m+4)\,K_{m,r}}\right\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Then, by (2.12), we have

$$
C \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{m+4} C_i.
$$

So, for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we get

(2.13) $$\sum_{n \in C} a_{jn} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m+4} \left(\sum_{n \in C_i} a_{jn}\right).$$

On the other hand, by (2.1), (2.2) and Lemmas 2.1, 2.3, we see that

$$
\begin{aligned}
st_A - \lim_n \left\|L_n\left(|\Psi|^k\right)\right\| &= 0, \ (k = 1, \ldots, m-1), \\
st_A - \lim_n \rho_{n,r}^r g\left(\rho_{n,r}\right) &= 0, \\
st_A - \lim_n \rho_{n,r}^r h\left(\rho_{n,r}\right) &= 0, \\
st_A - \lim_n \rho_{n,r}^r g\left(\rho_{n,r}\right) \|L_n\left(e_0\right) - e_0\|^{\frac{1}{r+1}} &= 0, \\
st_A - \lim_n \rho_{n,r}^r h\left(\rho_{n,r}\right) \|L_n\left(e_0\right) - e_0\|^{\frac{1}{r+1}} &= 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence, we observe that, for every $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m + 4$,

$$(2.14) \qquad \lim_j \sum_{n \in C_i} a_{jn} = 0.$$

Now, taking limit as $j \to \infty$ in the both sides of (2.13) and using (2.14) we obtain that

$$\lim_j \sum_{n \in C} a_{jn} = 0.$$

The last equality implies that

$$st_A - \lim_n \|L_n(f) - f\| = 0,$$

which completes the proof. $\square$

3. Concluding remarks. In this section we introduce a sequence of positive linear operators which satisfies all conditions of Theorem 2.2 but not Theorem A.

Now take $A = C_1 = [c_{jn}]$, the Cesáro matrix, and define the sequences (u_n) and (v_n) by

$$u_n := \begin{cases} \sqrt{n}, & \text{if } n = m^2 \ (m \in \mathbb{N}), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

and

$$v_n := \begin{cases} 1/2, & \text{if } n = m^2 \ (m \in \mathbb{N}), \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then observe that

$$(3.1) \qquad st - \lim_n u_n = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad st - \lim_n v_n = 1.$$

Let $r = \dfrac{1}{2}$. Then we get $m = \left\lceil \dfrac{1}{2} \right\rceil = 1$. Now consider the following Bernstein-like positive linear operators:

$$(3.2) \quad L_n(f; x) := (1 + u_n) \sum_{k=0}^{n} f\left(\frac{2\pi k}{n} - \pi \right) \binom{n}{k} \left(\frac{\pi + v_n x}{2\pi} \right)^k \left(\frac{\pi - v_n x}{2\pi} \right)^{n-k},$$

$$x \in [-\pi, \pi], \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

where $f \in AC\left([-\pi, \pi]\right)$ with $f' \in L_\infty\left([-\pi, \pi]\right)$. Since

$$L_n(e_0) = 1 + u_n,$$

we easily get,

$$st - \lim_n \|L_n(e_0) - e_0\| = st - \lim_n u_n = 0,$$

which gives (2.1). Also, by Hölder's inequality with $p = \dfrac{4}{3}$ and $q = 4$, since, for every $x \in [-\pi, \pi]$,

$$L_n\left(|\Psi|^{\frac{3}{2}}; x\right) = (1 + u_n) \sum_{k=0}^{n} \left|x + \pi - \frac{2\pi k}{n}\right|^{3/2} \binom{n}{k} \left(\frac{\pi + v_n x}{2\pi}\right)^k \left(\frac{\pi - v_n x}{2\pi}\right)^{n-k}$$

$$\leq (1 + u_n) \left(\sum_{k=0}^{n} \left(x + \pi - \frac{2\pi k}{n}\right)^2 \binom{n}{k} \left(\frac{\pi + v_n x}{2\pi}\right)^k \left(\frac{\pi - v_n x}{2\pi}\right)^{n-k}\right)^{3/4}$$

$$= (1 + u_n) \left(x^2(1 - v_n)^2 + \frac{\pi^2 - v_n^2 x^2}{n}\right)^{3/4},$$

we have

(3.3) $$\left\|L_n\left(|\Psi|^{\frac{3}{2}}\right)\right\| \leq \pi^{3/2}\left(1 + u_n\right)\left((1 - v_n)^2 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^{3/4}.$$

Since $|\sin u| \leq |u|$, it follows from (3.3) that
(3.4)
$$\rho_{n,\frac{1}{2}}^{3/2} = \left\|L_n\left(\Omega^{\frac{3}{2}}\right)\right\| \leq \frac{1}{8}\left\|L_n\left(|\Psi|^{\frac{3}{2}}\right)\right\| \leq \frac{\pi^{3/2}\left(1 + u_n\right)}{8}\left((1 - v_n)^2 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^{3/4}.$$

Now using (3.1), we get

$$st - \lim_n \frac{\pi^{3/2}\left(1 + u_n\right)}{8}\left((1 - v_n)^2 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^{3/4} = 0.$$

Hence, we obtain from (3.4) that

$$st - \lim_n \rho_{n,\frac{1}{2}} = 0,$$

which verifies (2.2). Therefore, by Theorem 2.2, for every $f \in AC([-\pi, \pi])$ with $f' \in L_\infty\left([-\pi, \pi]\right)$, we have

$$st_A - \lim_n \|L_n(f) - f\| = 0.$$

However, since neither (u_n) nor (v_n) converges to zero (in the usual sense), it is impossible to approximate f by the sequence $\{L_n(f)\}$ for every $f \in AC([-\pi, \pi])$ with $f' \in L_\infty([-\pi, \pi])$. This example clearly gives us that our statistical result in Theorem 2.2 is more applicable than Theorem A.

REFERENCES

[1] F. ALTOMARE, M. CAMPITI. Korovkin Type Approximation Theory and Its Application. Walter de Gruyter Publ., Berlin, 1994.

[2] G. A. ANASTASSIOU. Fractional Korovkin theory. *Chaos Solitons Fractals* **42** (2009), 2080–2094.

[3] G. A. ANASTASSIOU. Fractional Differentiation Inequalities. Springer, New York, 2009.

[4] G. A. ANASTASSIOU. Fractional trigonometric Korovkin theory. *Commun. Appl. Anal.* (accepted for publication).

[5] G. A. ANASTASSIOU, O. DUMAN. Statistical fuzzy approximation by fuzzy positive linear operators. *Comput. Math. Appl.* **55** (2008), 573–580.

[6] G. A. ANASTASSIOU, O. DUMAN. A Baskakov type generalization of statistical Korovkin theory. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **340** (2008), 476–486.

[7] M. BURGIN, O. DUMAN. Statistical fuzzy convergence. *Internat. J. Uncertain. Fuzziness Knowledge-Based Systems* **16** (2008), 879–902.

[8] J. S. CONNOR. Two valued measures and summability. *Analysis* **10** (1990), 373–385.

[9] J. S. CONNOR. *R*-type summability methods, Cauchy criteria, *P*-sets and statistical convergence, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **115** (1992), 319–327.

[10] O. DUMAN. Statistical approximation for periodic functions. *Demonstratio Math.* **36** (2003), 873–878.

[11] O. DUMAN. Statistical approximation theorems by *k*-positive linear operators. *Arch. Math.* (*Basel*) **86** (2006), 569–576.

[12] O. DUMAN. Strong versions of the theorems of Weierstrass, Montel and Hurwitz. *Hacettepe J. Math. Stat.* **38** (2009), 153–159.

[13] O. DUMAN, M. K. KHAN, C. ORHAN. *A*-Statistical convergence of approximating operators, *Math. Inequal. Appl.* **6** (2003), 689–699.

[14] H. FAST. Sur la convergence statistique, *Colloq. Math.* **2** (1951), 241–244.

[15] J. A. FRIDY. On statistical convergence. *Analysis* **5** (1985), 301–313.

[16] J. A. FRIDY, M. K. KHAN. Tauberian theorems via statistical convergence. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **228** (1998), 73–95.

[17] A. R. FREEDMAN, J. J. SEMBER. Densities and summability. *Pacific J. Math.* **95** (1981), 293–305.

[18] A. D. GADJIEV, C. ORHAN. Some approximation theorems via statistical convergence. *Rocky Mountain J. Math.* **32** (2002), 129–138.

[19] G. H. HARDY. Divergent Series. Oxford Univ. Press, London, 1949.

[20] S. KARAKUŞ, K. DEMIRCI, O. DUMAN. Statistical convergence on intuitionistic fuzzy normed spaces. *Chaos Solitons Fractals* **35** (2008), 763–769.

[21] P. P. KOROVKIN. Linear Operators and Approximation Theory. Hindustan Publ. Corp., Delhi, 1960.

[22] H. I. MILLER. A measure theoretical subsequence characterization of statistical convergence. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **347** (1995), 1811–1819.

George A. Anastassiou
Department of Mathematical Sciences
The University of Memphis
Memphis, TN 38152, USA
e-mail: `ganastss@memphis.edu`

Oktay Duman
TOBB Economics and Technology University
Faculty of Arts and Sciences
Department of Mathematics
Söğütözü TR-06530, Ankara, Turkey
e-mail: `oduman@etu.edu.tr`