

## STATISTICAL DENSITY POINTS

WŁADYSŁAW WILCZYŃSKI<sup>‡</sup>

**Abstract.** In this note we shall introduce a new kind of density point of the measurable subset of the real line.

Throughout the paper  $\mathbf{N}$  will denote the set of positive integers,  $\mathbf{R}$  – the set of real numbers,  $\chi_A$  – the characteristic function of  $A \subset \mathbf{N}$  or  $A \subset [-1, 1]$ ,  $n \cdot A = \{nx : x \in A\}$  for  $n \in \mathbf{N}$  and  $A \subset \mathbf{R}$ ,  $A - x_0 = \{x - x_0 : x \in A\}$ ,  $\lambda$  – a Lebesgue measure on the real line.

1

Let  $A \subset \mathbf{R}$  be a measurable set. Put  $f_n = \chi_{n \cdot (A - x_0) \cap [-1, 1]}$ . It is well known that  $x_0$  is a density point of  $A$ , if and only if  $f_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \chi_{[-1, 1]}$  in measure, which means that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(\{x \in [-1, 1] : |f_n(x) - 1| \geq \epsilon\}) = 0$  for each  $\epsilon > 0$ , and taking into account that  $f_n$  are characteristic functions, simply that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(\{x \in [-1, 1] : f_n(x) = 0\}) = 0$  (compare [3]). The set of all density points of  $A$  will be denoted by  $\Phi(A)$ , as usual.

Take  $N \subset \mathbf{N}$ . Put  $d_n(N) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \chi_N(k)$  and  $d(N) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_n(N)$ . We shall say that a sequence  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  of real numbers converges statistically to  $g \in \mathbf{R}$  ( $g = n \rightarrow \infty \lim_{\text{stat}} x_n$ ), if and only if for each  $\epsilon > 0$  we have  $d(N(\epsilon)) = 0$ , where  $N(\epsilon) = \{n \in \mathbf{N} : |x_n - g| \geq \epsilon\}$  (compare [2]). Using this notion we shall introduce the following definition.

**Definition 1.** We shall say that  $x_0 \in \mathbf{R}$  is a point of of statistical density of a measurable set  $A \subset \mathbf{R}$ , if and only if  $n \rightarrow \infty \lim_{\text{stat}} \lambda(\{x \in [-1, 1] : f_n(x) = 0\}) = 0$  (where  $f_n = \chi_{(n(A - x_0)) \cap [-1, 1]}$ , as before).

**Remark 1.** According to [1] the condition in the definition is equivalent to  $\lim_{\text{stat}}_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) = 0$  a.e. in  $[-1, 1]$ .

Let  $\Phi_s(A) = \{x \in \mathbf{R} : x \text{ is a point of statistical density of } A\}$  for measurable set  $A$ . Obviously  $\Phi(A) \subset \Phi_s(A)$ . We shall show that the equality holds.

---

<sup>‡</sup>Faculty of Mathematics, University of Łódź, Banacha 22 St., 90–238 Łódź, Poland.  
E-mail: wwil@krysia.uni.lodz.pl.

Key words and phrases: density topology, statistical convergence.

AMS subject classifications: 28A05, 54A10.

**Theorem 1.** *For each measurable set  $A$  we have  $\Phi(A) = \Phi_s(A)$ .*

*Proof.* By virtue of the above observation it is sufficient to show that  $\Phi_s(A) \subset \Phi(A)$ . Suppose that  $x_0$  is not a density point of  $A$ . For simplicity of denotations assume that  $x_0 = 0$ . Then there exist a number  $a > 0$  and a sequence  $\{x_k\}_{k \in \mathbf{N}}$  convergent decreasingly to 0, such that for each  $k \in \mathbf{N}$  we have  $\frac{1}{2x_k} \cdot \lambda(A' \cap [-x_k, x_k]) > a$ . A moment of reflection shows, that we can assume (taking, if necessary, smaller  $a$ ) that  $x_k = (2n_k)^{-1}$ , where  $n_k \in \mathbf{N}$ . Of course,  $n_k \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} \infty$ . Let  $j \in \{n_k, n_k + 1, \dots, 2n_k\}$ . We have  $(j \cdot A') \cap [-1, 1] \supset (j \cdot A') \cap [-j \cdot (2n_k)^{-1}, j \cdot (2n_k)^{-1}] = j \cdot (A' \cap [-(2n_k)^{-1}, (2n_k)^{-1}])$ . Hence  $\lambda((j \cdot A') \cap [-1, 1]) \geq j \cdot \lambda(A' \cap [-(2n_k)^{-1}, (2n_k)^{-1}]) > j \cdot a \cdot (n_k)^{-1} \geq a > 0$ .

Hence for  $\epsilon \in (0, a)$  we have  $N(\epsilon) = \{n \in \mathbf{N} : \lambda(\{x \in [-1, 1] : f_n(x) = 0\}) > a\} \supset \{n_k, n_k + 1, \dots, 2n_k\}$  for each  $k \in \mathbf{N}$ , so  $d(N(\epsilon)) \geq \frac{1}{2}$  and 0 is not a point of statistical density of  $A$ .  $\square$

## 2

Recall now that the original definition of a density point looks as follows:  $x_0$  is a density point of a measurable set  $A \subset \mathbf{R}$ , if and only if  $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\lambda(A \cap [x_0 - h, x_0 + h])}{2h} = 1$ , which means that for each sequence  $\{h_n\}_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  of positive numbers convergent to 0 we have  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda(A \cap [x_0 - h_n, x_0 + h_n])}{2h_n} = 1$ , so for each such sequence the sequence of characteristic functions

$$\{\chi_{(\frac{1}{h_n} \cdot (A - x_0)) \cap [-1, 1]}\}_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$$

converges to  $\chi_{[-1, 1]}$  in measure. In 1. we have used the sequence  $h_n = n^{-1}$ , because this is, in some sense, a „universal” sequence, i.e. the convergence of the above described sequence of characteristic functions for  $\{n^{-1}\}_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  implies the convergence for each  $\{h_n\}_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$ . A sequence  $\{h_n\}_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  is a „universal” sequence, if and only if

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h_{n+1}}{h_n} > 0$$

(compare, for example [4]). For points of statistical density the situation is entirely different. Put  $f_n = \chi_{(\frac{1}{h_n} \cdot (A - x_0)) \cap [-1, 1]}$  for  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ .

**Definition 2.** *We shall say, that  $x_0 \in \mathbf{R}$  is a point of statistical density of a measurable set  $A \subset \mathbf{R}$  with respect to a sequence  $\{h_n\}_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  of positive numbers convergent decreasingly to 0, if and only if  $\lim \text{stat}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(\{x \in [-1, 1] : f_n(x) = 0\}) = 0$ .*

**Theorem 2.** *If  $h_n = 2^{-n}$  for  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ , then there exists a measurable set  $A \subset \mathbf{R}$  such that 0 is a point of statistical density of  $A$  with respect to  $\{h_n\}_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$ , but 0 is not a point of density of  $A$ .*

*Proof.* Choose an increasing sequence  $\{n_k\}_{k \in \mathbf{N}}$  of positive integers such that  $k : (n_k - n_{k-1}) \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} 0$ . Assume that  $n_0 = 1$ .

Put  $A = \mathbf{R} \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} [2^{-n_k}, 2^{-n_k+1}]$ . Obviously 0 is not a density point of  $A$ . If  $\epsilon_m \in [2^{-m-1}, 2^{-m})$ , then  $\lambda((2^j \cdot A') \cap [-1, 1]) > \epsilon_m$  for  $j \in \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \{n_k - m, n_k - m + 1, n_k - m + 2, \dots, n_k - 1, n_k\} = N(\epsilon_m)$ . It is not difficult to prove that  $d(N(\epsilon_m)) = 0$  for each  $m \in \mathbf{N}$ , so 0 is a point of statistical density of  $A$  with respect to  $\{2^{-n}\}_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$ .  $\square$

It would be interesting to characterize „universal” sequences for points of statistical density.

3

Let now  $\{h_n\}_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  be a sequence of positive numbers convergent decreasing to 0. Denote for measurable set by  $\Phi_s(A, \{h_n\})$  the set of all points of statistical density of  $A$  with respect to  $\{h_n\}_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$ .

**Theorem 3.** *The operator  $\Phi_s$  for fixed  $\{h_n\}$  has the following properties:*

- (1)  $\Phi_s(A, \{h_n\})$  is a measurable set for measurable  $A$ ,
- (2)  $\lambda(\Phi_s(A, \{h_n\}) \setminus A) = 0$ ,
- (3) if  $\lambda(A \Delta B) = 0$ , then  $\Phi_s(A, \{h_n\}) = \Phi_s(B, \{h_n\})$ ,
- (4)  $\Phi_s(\emptyset, \{h_n\}) = \emptyset$ ,  $\Phi_s(\mathbf{R}, \{h_n\}) = \mathbf{R}$ ,
- (5)  $\Phi_s(A \cap B, \{h_n\}) = \Phi_s(A, \{h_n\}) \cap \Phi_s(B, \{h_n\})$  for measurable  $A$  and  $B$ .

*Proof.*

Ad 2). Suppose that  $A$  is a measurable set and  $x_0 \in \Phi_s(A, \{h_n\})$ . Then there exists an increasing sequence  $\{n_k\}_{k \in \mathbf{N}}$  of positive integers such that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(\{s \in [-1, 1] : f_{n_k}(x) = 0\}) = 0$ . Hence  $x_0 \notin \Phi(\mathbf{R} \setminus A)$ , so  $\Phi_s(A, \{h_n\}) \subset \mathbf{R} \setminus \Phi(\mathbf{R} \setminus A)$  and  $\Phi_s(A, \{h_n\}) \setminus A \subset (\mathbf{R} \setminus A) \setminus \Phi(\mathbf{R} \setminus A)$ , and the conclusion follows from the Lebesgue Density Theorem.

Ad 1). We have  $\Phi(A) \subset \Phi_s(A, \{h_n\}) \subset \mathbf{R} \setminus \Phi(\mathbf{R} \setminus A)$ , so  $\Phi_s(A, \{h_n\})$  is included between two measurable sets which differ by the null set (again from LDT). The proofs of 3), 4) and 5) are standard.  $\square$

In this situation for arbitrary sequence  $\mathbf{h} = \{h_n\}$  decreasingly convergent to 0 we can define the family  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{h}} = \{A \subset \mathbf{R} : A \text{ is measurable and } A \subset \Phi_s(A, \{h_n\})\}$ . In a standard way one can prove that each  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{h}}$  is a topology stronger than the natural topology on the real line.

REFERENCES

[1] H. Fast, *Sur la convergence statistique*, Coll. Math. **2** (1951), pp. 241–244.  
 [2] P. Kostyrko, T. Šalát, W. Wilczyński, *I-convergence*, Real Analysis Exchange **26**, 2 (2000–2001), pp. 669–686.

- [3] W. Poreda, E. Wagner-Bojakowska, W. Wilczyński, *A category analogue of the density topology*, *Fund. Math.* **125** (1985), pp. 167–173.
- [4] W. Wilczyński, *Density Topologies. Handbook of Measure Theory*, Chapter XV, Vol. I, *Endre Pap. Elsevier, North-Holland* 2002, pp. 675–702.