

# On Star Convergences of $r$ -Convergences in Ranked Spaces

Masato HIKIDA

*Department of Applied Mathematics, Okayama University of Science  
Ridai-cho, Okayama 700, Japan*

(Received September 21, 1979)

Prof. K. Kunugi has given the definitions of the ranked space and convergences in this space (see [1]). Fundamental one of convergences is what is called the  $r$ -convergence. In a ranked space of indicator  $\omega_0$  the  $r$ -convergence is Fréchet's  $L$ -convergence as long as every sequence is  $r$ -convergent to at most one point, but generally is not  $L^*$ -convergence. In this paper, for a ranked space with some property, we will give a necessary and sufficient condition for which the  $r$ -convergence is the star convergence.

Throughout this paper a "ranked space" means a ranked space of indicator  $\omega_0$ . Terminologies and notations which will be used in this paper are stated in Appendix.

1. Let  $R$  be a ranked space and  $p$  be a point of  $R$ .

DEFINITION. Let  $\{p_i\}$  ( $i=0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) be a sequence of points of  $R$  and  $V = \{v_i\} \in F(p)$ . If for any  $v_i$  there is an integer  $i' \geq 0$  such that  $p_j \in v_i$  for all  $j \geq i'$ , then we say that  $\{p_i\}$  is  $r$ -convergent to  $p$  with respect to  $V$  and denote this by  $p_i \xrightarrow[r]{r} p(V)$ . Also,  $\{p_i\}$  is said to be  $r$ -convergent to  $p$ , denoted  $p_i \xrightarrow[r]{r} p$ , if  $p_i \xrightarrow[r]{r} p(V)$  for some  $V \in F(p)$ .

DEFINITION. If  $p_i \not\xrightarrow[r]{r} p$  (i. e. it is false that  $p_i \xrightarrow[r]{r} p$ ), then there is a subsequence  $\{s_j\}$  of  $\{p_i\}$  such that for any subsequence  $\{t_k\}$  of  $\{s_j\}$ ,  $t_k \not\xrightarrow[r]{r} p$ , we say that  $\{p_i\}$  is  $r$ -star convergent to  $p$  or an  $r$ -convergence to  $p$  of  $\{p_i\}$  is a star convergence.

DEFINITION. A subset  $S$  of  $F(p)$  is said to be essentially countable if the quotient set  $S/\sim$  is countable.

DEFINITION. A subset  $S$  of  $F(p)$  is said to be cofinal in  $F(p)$  if for any  $V \in F(p)$  there is an  $U \in S$  such that  $V < U$ .

THEOREM. *If there exists an essentially countable subset  $S$  of  $F(p)$  which is cofinal in  $F(p)$ , then the  $r$ -convergence to  $p$  is the star convergence if and only if  $S$  is directed (i. e. for any two  $V, U \in S$  there is a  $W \in S$  such that  $V < W$  and  $U < W$ ).*

PROOF. (a) The "if" part. Suppose that there exists a sequence  $\{p_i\}$  such that

every subsequence of  $\{p_i\}$  contains a subsequence which is  $r$ -convergent to  $p$ , but  $\{p_i\}$  is not  $r$ -convergent to  $p$ . First, we will show that there exists a sequence  $\{V_k\}$  ( $k=0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) of elements of  $\mathcal{S}$  such that  $V_0 < V_1 < \dots < V_k < \dots$  and the set  $\{V_k | k=0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  is cofinal in  $F(p)$ . Indeed, put  $S/\sim = \{S_i | i=0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  and let  $U_i$  be any element of  $S_i$ . Put  $V_0 = U_0$ ,  $1^* = \min\{i | U_0, U_1 < U_i\}$ ,  $V_1 = U_{1^*}$ ,  $2^* = \min\{i | U_0, \dots, U_{i_2} < U_i\}$  and  $V_2 = U_{2^*}$ , where  $i_2 = \max\{2, 1^*\}$ . Generally, for  $k=2, 3, \dots$  put  $k^* = \min\{i | U_0, \dots, U_{i_k} < U_i\}$  and  $V_k = U_{k^*}$ , where  $i_k = \max\{k, (k-1)^*\}$ . Then, by induction, we have a sequence  $\{V_k\}$  of elements of  $\mathcal{S}$  which possesses the desired property. Now, put  $V_k = \{v_k(p, m_{i_0}^k)\}$  ( $k, i=0, 1, 2, \dots$ ). As  $p_i \not\rightarrow_r p(V_k)$  (i. e. it is false that  $p_i \rightarrow_r p(V_k)$ ), there exist a member  $v_k(p, m_{i_0}^k)$  of  $V_k$  and a subsequence  $\{p_{i_j}^k\}$  ( $j=0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) of  $\{p_i\}$  such that  $p_{i_j}^k \not\in v_k(p, m_{i_0}^k)$  for all  $j$ . Since  $V_0 < V_1$ , there exists a member  $v_0(p, m_{i_1}^0)$  of  $V_0$  such that  $v_0(p, m_{i_0}^0) \cap v_1(p, m_{i_1}^1) \supset v_0(p, m_{i_1}^0)$  and  $m_{i_0}^0 < m_{i_1}^0$ . Assume that for an integer  $k \geq 0$  we get the members  $v_l(p, m_{i_0}^l), v_l(p, m_{i_1}^l), \dots, v_l(p, m_{i_{k-l}}^l)$  of  $V_l$  ( $l=0, \dots, k$ ) such that  $v_l(p, m_{i_0}^l) \supset v_l(p, m_{i_1}^l) \supset \dots \supset v_l(p, m_{i_{k-l}}^l)$ ,  $0 \leq m_{i_0}^l < m_{i_1}^l < \dots < m_{i_{k-l}}^l$  and  $v_l(p, m_{i_n}^l) \supset v_{l-1}(p, m_{i_{n+1}}^{l-1})$ , where  $n=0, \dots, l-1$ . Since  $V_0 < \dots < V_k < V_{k+1}$ , there exist the members  $v_l(p, m_{i_{k+1-l}}^l)$  of  $V_l$ ,  $l=0, \dots, k+1$ , such that  $v_l(p, m_{i_{k-l}}^l) \supset v_l(p, m_{i_{k+1-l}}^l)$ ,  $m_{i_{k-l}}^l < m_{i_{k+1-l}}^l$  and  $v_{k+1}(p, m_{i_0}^{k+1}) \supset v_k(p, m_{i_1}^k) \supset \dots \supset v_0(p, m_{i_{k+1}}^0)$ . Therefore, by induction, putting  $u_n^k = v_k(p, m_{i_n}^k)$  ( $k, n=0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) we get the  $p$ -f.s.'s  $U_k = \{u_n^k\}$  ( $n=0, 1, 2, \dots$ ),  $k=0, 1, 2, \dots$  such that  $U_k \sim V_k$  and  $u_n^{k+1} \supset u_{n+1}^k$  for all  $k, n$ . Now choose a subsequence  $\{q_k\}$  of  $\{p_i\}$  such that  $q_k$  is a member of  $\{p_{i_j}^k\}$ . Then,  $\{q_k\}$  contains no subsequence which is  $r$ -convergent to  $p$ . This contradicts the supposition.

(b) The “only if” part. Suppose that  $\mathcal{S}$  is not directed. Then there would exist two  $V, U \in \mathcal{S}$  which have no common upper element in  $\mathcal{S}$ . Hence, for each  $W \in \mathcal{S}$  we have  $V \not\leq W$  or  $U \not\leq W$ . Put  $A = \{W \in \mathcal{S} | V \not\leq W\}$  and  $B = \{W \in \mathcal{S} | U \not\leq W\}$ . Since  $A \cup B = \mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{S}$  is essentially countable,  $A$  and  $B$  are essentially countable. We only treat the case that both  $A/\sim$  and  $B/\sim$  are infinite, because an argument which will be done in this case is applied analogously to other cases. Let  $A/\sim = \{A_k | k=0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ ,  $B/\sim = \{B_k | k=0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  and  $W'_k, W^*_k$  be any elements of  $A_k, B_k$  respectively. Put  $V = \{v_i\}$ ,  $U = \{u_i\}$ ,  $W'_k = \{w'_{i^k}\}$  and  $W^*_k = \{w^*_{i^k}\}$ . Since  $V \not\leq W'_k$ , there exist a  $w'_{i_V}{}^k \in W'_k$  and a sequence  $\{p_i^k\}$  ( $i=0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) such that  $p_i^k \in v_i - w'_{i_V}{}^k$  for all  $i$ . Similarly, since  $U \not\leq W^*_k$ , there exist a  $w^*_{i_U}{}^k \in W^*_k$  and a sequence  $\{q_i^k\}$  ( $i=0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) such that  $q_i^k \in u_i - w^*_{i_U}{}^k$  for all  $i$ . For  $j=0, 1, 2, \dots$ , put  $s_n = p_j^k$  and  $t_n = q_j^k$ , where  $0 \leq k \leq j$  and  $n = j(j+1)/2 + k$ . Then  $s_n \rightarrow_r p(V)$ ,  $t_n \rightarrow_r p(U)$  and  $s_n \not\rightarrow_r p(W)$  or  $t_n \not\rightarrow_r p(W)$  for any  $W \in \mathcal{S}$ , so for any  $W \in F(p)$ . However, for the sequence  $\{x_n\}$ ,

where  $x_{2n}=s_n$  and  $x_{2n-1}=t_n$  ( $n=0, 1, 2, \dots$ ), we have, by the hypothesis,  $x_n \xrightarrow[r]{p}$ , or there is a  $W_0 \in \mathbf{F}(p)$  such that  $x_n \xrightarrow[r]{p}(W_0)$ . This is a contradiction.

**COROLLARY 1.** *If there exists a  $V \in \mathbf{F}(p)$  such that  $U < V$  for any  $U \in \mathbf{F}(p)$ , then the  $r$ -convergence to  $p$  is the star convergence.*

**DEFINITION.** For a subset  $A$  of  $R$ , denote by  $\lambda(A)$  the set  $\{p \in R \mid p_i \xrightarrow[r]{p} p \text{ for some sequence } \{p_i\} \text{ in } A\}$ .

**COROLLARY 2.** *If there exists a  $V = \{v_i\} \in \mathbf{F}(p)$  such that  $p \in R - \lambda(R - v_i)$  ( $i=0, 1, 2, \dots$ ), then the  $r$ -convergence to  $p$  is the star convergence.*

**COROLLARY 3.** *If  $\mathbf{F}(p)$  is essentially one (i. e.  $\mathbf{F}(p)/\sim$  consists of only one element), then the  $r$ -convergence to  $p$  is the star convergence.*

**COROLLARY 4.** *If every preneighborhood  $v(p)$  of  $p$  which has a rank is  $r$ -open (i. e.  $v(p) = R - \lambda(R - v(p))$ ), then the  $r$ -convergence to  $p$  is the star convergence.*

From the well-known fact relating the convergence and the star convergence (e. g. see[2]), we immediately have the following proposition.

**PROPOSITION.** *A sequence  $\{p_i\}$  is  $r$ -star convergent to  $p$  if and only if  $p_i \xrightarrow[r]{p} p$  is identical with that for any subset  $G$  of  $R$ ,  $p \in R - \lambda(R - G)$ , there is an integer  $i' \geq 0$  such that  $p_i \in G$  for all  $i \geq i'$ .*

## 2. Examples.

**EXAMPLE 1.** Let  $E = \{(x, y) \mid x, y \text{ are real numbers}\}$ . For a  $p \in E$ , define preneighborhoods of  $p$  as follows: (1) the sets  $v(p; \varepsilon, \alpha, \theta) = \{(\delta \cos \varphi, \delta \sin \varphi) \mid 0 \leq \delta < \varepsilon, \alpha < \varphi < \alpha + \theta\}$ , where  $\varepsilon, \alpha, \theta$  are any real numbers such that  $0 < \varepsilon, 0 \leq \alpha < 2\pi$  and  $0 < \theta < 2\pi$ , if  $p = (0, 0)$ . (2) the sets  $v(p; \varepsilon) = \{(x, y) \mid (a-x)^2 + (b-y)^2 < \varepsilon\}$ , where  $\varepsilon$  is any positive real number, if  $p = (a, b) \neq (0, 0)$ . Now, define  $v(p; \varepsilon, \alpha, \theta), v(p; \varepsilon)$  as the preneighborhoods of rank  $n$  ( $n=0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) if  $[1/\varepsilon] = n$ . Then  $E$  becomes a ranked space. In this space, by the Theorem, the  $r$ -convergence to  $p = (0, 0)$  is not the star convergence, because every essentially countable subset of  $\mathbf{F}(p)$  which is cofinal in  $\mathbf{F}(p)$  (in fact, such a subset exists at least one) is not directed.

**EXAMPLE 2.** Let  $R$  be a ranked union space of the ranked spaces  $R_\alpha$  ( $\alpha \in \Sigma$ ) (see [3]). For a  $p \in R$ , let  $\mathbf{F}_\alpha(p)$  be the totality of  $p$ -f. s.'s in  $R_\alpha$ . Now assume that  $p_i \xrightarrow[r]{p} p$  in  $R$  implies  $p_i \xrightarrow[r]{p} p$  in some  $R_\alpha$ . Then  $p_i \xrightarrow[r]{p} p$  in  $R$  is equivalent to  $p_i \xrightarrow[r]{p} p$  in some  $R_\alpha$ . Hence, by the Theorem, the  $r$ -convergence to  $p (\in R)$  in  $R$  is the star convergence, if for each  $\alpha \in \Sigma$  there exists an essentially countable subset of  $\mathbf{F}_\alpha(p)$  which is cofinal in  $\mathbf{F}_\alpha(p)$  and directed.

### Appendix

Let  $R$  be a *preneighborhoods space*, or a set  $R$  such that each point  $p$  of  $R$  possesses a non-empty family  $\mathfrak{N}_p = \{v(p)\}$  of subsets of  $R$ , called *preneighborhoods* of  $p$ , which satisfies the axiom (A): (A)  $p \in v(p)$  for any  $p \in R$  and any  $v(p) \in \mathfrak{N}_p$ . Then  $R$  is said to be a *ranked space* of *indicator*  $\omega_0$  ( $\omega_0$  is the first transfinite ordinal number), if, to each integer  $n \geq 0$ , there corresponds a subfamily  $\mathfrak{B}_n$  of  $\bigcup_{p \in R} \mathfrak{N}_p$  satisfying the axiom(a): (a) For any  $p \in R$ , any  $u(p) \in \mathfrak{N}_p$ , and any integer  $m \geq 0$ , there exists a  $v(p) \in \mathfrak{N}_p$  such that  $v(p) \subset u(p)$  and  $v(p) \in \mathfrak{B}_n$  for some  $n \geq m$ . An element which belongs to  $\mathfrak{B}_n$  is said to be a *preneighborhood of rank  $n$* . Preneighborhoods of  $p \in R$  of rank  $n$  are denoted by  $v(p, n)$ ,  $u(p, n)$ , etc.. For a  $p \in R$ , a sequence  $V = \{v(p, n_i)\}$  ( $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ), or in short,  $\{v_i\}$ , of elements of  $\mathfrak{N}_p \cap (\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathfrak{B}_n)$  is called a  *$p$ -fundamental sequence* (abbreviated to  *$p$ -f. s.*) if  $v(p, n_i) \supset v(p, n_{i+1})$ ,  $n_i \leq n_{i+1}$  and  $\sup n_i = \omega_0$ . Denote by  $F(p)$  the totality of  $p$ -f.s.'s. For two elements  $V = \{v_i\}$ ,  $U = \{u_i\}$  of  $F(p)$ , the notation  $V < U$  means that for any  $u_i$  there is a  $v_j$  such that  $v_j \subset u_i$ , further the notation  $V \sim U$  means that both  $V < U$  and  $U < V$ . The negation of  $V < U$  is written  $V \not< U$ .

### References

- [1] K. Kunugi: Sur la méthode des espaces rangés. I, Proc. Japan Acad., **42** (1966), 318-322.
- [2] J. Kisyński: Convergence du type  $L$ , Colloq. Math., **7** (1959-60), 205-211.
- [3] S. Nakanishi: On ranked union spaces, Math. Japonica, **23** (1978), 249-257.