

# 2-LINEAR OPERATORS ON 2-MODULAR SPACES

# Burhanudin Arif Nurnugroho<sup>1</sup>, Supama<sup>2,\*</sup> and Atok Zulijanto<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Mathematical Education Ahmad Dahlan University Yogyakarta, Indonesia e-mail: burhanarifmath@gmail.com

<sup>1,2,3</sup>Department of Mathematics Universitas Gadjah Mada Yogyakarta 55281, Indonesia e-mail: supama@ugm.ac.id atokzulijanto@ugm.ac.id

## Abstract

In this paper, we observe some topological properties of 2-modular spaces. Further, we introduce and characterize a 2-p-bounded 2-linear operator from a 2-modular space into a normed space as well.

# **1. Introduction and Preliminaries**

A modular space has important roles and applications in many areas, such as engineering, physics, economics, social sciences, etc. Therefore, it gains a lot of attention of many researchers from many fields. A concept of

\*Corresponding author

Received: July 7, 2017; Revised: July 22, 2017; Accepted: October 2, 2017

<sup>2010</sup> Mathematics Subject Classification: 46A80, 47Axx.

Keywords and phrases: 2-norm, 2-modular, 2-linear operator.

Communicated by Choonkil Park; Editor: International Journal of Functional Analysis, Operator Theory and Applications: Published by Pushpa Publishing House, Allahabad, India.

modular spaces was firstly initiated by Nakano in 1950 (see [6, 8, 12]). Later on, Mazur and Orlicz [7] and Musielak and Orlicz [9] modified the definition of the modular space proposed by Nakano, by avoiding the lattice structure in the space X on which the modular is defined as well as the monotonicity axiom for the modular.

As usual, the symbols  $\mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbb{R}^*$  denote the natural number system, the real number system and the extended real number system, respectively. As given in [9], we can rewrite the definition of the modular as the following. Let *X* be a real linear space over  $\mathbb{R}$ . A nonnegative function  $\rho : X \to \mathbb{R}^*$  is called a *modular* if for every  $x, y \in X$ , the following conditions hold:

(i)  $\rho(x) = 0$  if and only if x = 0,

(ii)  $\rho(-x) = \rho(x)$ , and

(iii) 
$$\rho(\alpha x + \beta y) \le \rho(x) + \rho(y)$$
 for every  $\alpha, \beta \ge 0$  with  $\alpha + \beta = 1$ .

If the condition (iii) is replaced by

(iii')  $\rho(\alpha x + \beta y) \le \alpha \rho(x) + \beta \rho(y)$  for every  $\alpha, \beta \ge 0$  with  $\alpha + \beta = 1$ ,

then the modular  $\rho$  is called a *convex modular*. A real linear space X equipped with a modular  $\rho$ , written  $(X, \rho)$  or X in short, is called a *modular space*.

Based on the definition of a modular as given above, we can easily check that every norm is a modular. Therefore, we can consider a modular as a generalization of a norm. As consequences, many concepts in normed spaces can be generalized into modular spaces.

In an earlier paper ([2] and [3]), Gahler introduced a concept of 2-norm spaces and *n*-norm spaces. One knows that every *n*-norm can define an n-1-norm. See [4] and [5]. Inductively, from an *n*-norm, we can derive a norm. Further, based on the theory of Gahler, Chu et al. [1] characterized 2-isometries on 2-norm spaces. Srivastava et al. [11] characterized linear

*n*-functionals in *n*-norm spaces. Moreover, they formulated the extension of Hanh-Banach theorem for linear *n*-functionals in *n*-norm spaces.

Modular spaces are closed related to normed spaces [12]. Meanwhile, as mentioned before, any *n*-norm can define a norm ([4, 5]). Based on these facts and analogously to the definition of an *n*-norm, Nourouzi and Shabanian [10] defined a notion of *n*-modular spaces. In the present paper, we observe some topological properties of 2-modular spaces. We also introduce a definition of a 2- $\rho$ -bounded 2-linear operator from a 2-modular space into a normed space. Furthermore, some properties of a 2- $\rho$ -bounded 2-linear operator from a 2-modular space are observed as well.

## 2. 2-modular Spaces

As usual, symbols  $\mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbb{R}^*$  denote a natural numbers system, a real number system and an extended real numbers system, respectively. For any linear space *X*, dim(*X*) means the dimension of *X*. In this paper, we always assume that for any linear space *X*, the dim(*X*)  $\geq$  2, unless otherwise mentioned.

Further, we give a definition of a 2-modular, analogously with those of a 2-norm.

**Definition 2.1.** Let *X* be a real linear space with  $\dim(X) \ge 2$ . A real valued function  $\rho(\cdot, \cdot) : X \times X \to \mathbb{R}^*$  is called a 2-modular on *X* if

- (i)  $\rho(x, y) = 0$  if and only if x and y are linearly dependent,
- (ii)  $\rho(x, y) = \rho(y, x)$  for every  $x, y \in X$ ,
- (iii)  $\rho(-x, y) = \rho(y, x)$  for every  $x, y \in X$ , and

(iv)  $\rho(\alpha x + \beta y, z) \le \rho(x, z) + \rho(y, z)$  for every  $x, y, z \in X$  and for every  $\alpha, \beta \ge 0$  with  $\alpha + \beta = 1$ .

If the condition (iv) is replaced by

(iv')  $\rho(\alpha x + \beta y, z) \le \alpha \rho(x, z) + \beta \rho(y, z)$  for every  $x, y, z \in X$  and for every  $\alpha, \beta \ge 0$  with  $\alpha + \beta = 1$ ,

then  $\rho(\cdot, \cdot)$  is called a *convex* 2-modular.

It is easy to prove that  $\rho(x, y) \ge 0$  for every  $x, y \in X$ . Moreover, following the condition (i) in Definition 2.1, we have

(i)  $\rho(x, 0) = 0$  for every  $x \in X$ , and

(ii) if  $\rho(x, y) = 0$  for every  $y \in X$ , then x = 0.

Following are examples of 2-modulars.

**Example 2.2.** Let  $X = \mathbb{R}^2$ . If the function  $\rho : X \times X \to \mathbb{R}^*$  is defined by

$$\rho(x, y) = \operatorname{abs}\left(\begin{vmatrix} x_1 & x_2 \\ y_1 & y_2 \end{vmatrix}\right),$$

then  $\rho$  is a 2-modular on *X*.

**Example 2.3.** Let *X* be a real linear space and  $\|\cdot, \cdot\|$  a 2-norm on *X*. Then

$$\rho(x, y) = \int_0^{\|x, y\|} (e^t - 1) dt$$

is a 2-modular on X.

It can be seen that every 2-norm on a linear space X is a 2-modular, but the converse is not true.

**Example 2.4.** Let  $X = \mathbb{R}^2$ . If the function  $\rho : X \times X \to \mathbb{R}^*$  is defined by

$$\rho(x, y) = \sqrt{\operatorname{abs}\left(\begin{vmatrix} x_1 & x_2 \\ y_1 & y_2 \end{vmatrix}\right)},$$

then  $\rho$  is a 2-modular on X. However,  $\rho$  is not a 2-norm on X.

**Theorem 2.5.** Any 2-modular on a real linear space X generates a modular on X.

**Proof.** Let  $\rho(\cdot, \cdot)$  be a 2-modular on a real linear space X. Take any linearly independent set of vectors  $\{a_1, a_2\}$  on X. Define a function  $\sigma: X \to \mathbb{R}^*$  by

$$\sigma(x) = \max\{\rho(x, a_1), \rho(x, a_2)\},\$$

then  $\sigma(-x) = \sigma(x)$  for every  $x \in X$  and

$$\sigma(x) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \max\{\rho(x, a_1), \rho(x, a_2)\}$$
$$\Leftrightarrow \rho(x, a_1) = \rho(x, a_2) = 0$$
$$\Leftrightarrow \{x, a_1\} \text{ and } \{x, a_2\} \text{ are linearly dependent}$$
$$\Leftrightarrow x = 0,$$

since  $\{a_1, a_2\}$  is linearly independent. Now, let  $x, y \in X$  and  $\alpha, \beta \ge 0$  be such that  $\alpha + \beta = 1$ . Then

$$\sigma(\alpha x + \beta y) = \max\{\rho(\alpha x + \beta y, a_1), \rho(\alpha x + \beta y, a_2)\}$$
  
$$\leq \max\{\rho(x, a_1), \rho(x, a_2)\} + \max\{\rho(y, a_1), \rho(y, a_2)\}$$
  
$$= \sigma(x) + \sigma(y).$$

Thus, the function  $\sigma$  is a modular.

The following theorem describes some basic properties of a 2-modular.

**Theorem 2.6.** If  $\rho$  is a 2-modular on a real linear space X, then

(i)  $\rho(\lambda x, y) \le \rho(x, y)$  for every  $x, y \in X$  and  $|\lambda| \le 1$ . (ii)  $\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i}\right) \le \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i}$ 

(ii) 
$$\rho\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_k x_k, y\right) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{m} \rho(x_k, y)$$
 for every  $x_k, y \in X$  and

 $\lambda_k \ge 0, \ k = 1, \ 2, \ ..., \ n, \ with \ \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k = 1.$ 

(iii)  $\rho(\alpha x, y) \leq \rho(\beta x, y)$  for every  $x, y \in X$  and  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $0 < \alpha \leq \beta$ .

**Proof.** (i) It is trivial for  $\lambda = 0$  or  $|\lambda| = 1$ . Now, let  $0 < \lambda < 1$ . Then

$$\rho(\lambda x, y) = \rho(\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)0, y) \le \rho(x, y).$$

Moreover, following the condition (iii) in Definition 2.1, then we have

$$\rho(\lambda x, y) \le \rho(x, y),$$

for every  $-1 < \lambda < 0$ . So, (i) is proved.

(ii) We are going to prove (ii) by mathematical induction. It is true for  $x_1, x_2, y$  and  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \ge 0$  with  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = 1$ , because of the condition (iv) in Definition 2.1. Assume that it is true for  $x_1, x_2, ..., x_n, y$  and  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, ..., \lambda_n \ge 0$  with  $\sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k = 1$ . Then

$$\rho\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k x_k, y\right) \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \rho(x_k, y).$$

Now, take any  $x_1, x_2, ..., x_{n+1}, y \in X$  and  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, ..., \lambda_{n+1} \ge 0$  such that  $\sum_{k=1}^{n+1} \lambda_k = 1$ , then there is a positive integer  $j, 1 \le j \le n+1$ , such that  $\lambda_j \ne 0$ . So, we have

$$\begin{split} \rho \Biggl( \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} \lambda_k x_k, \ y \Biggr) &= \rho \Biggl( (1 - \lambda_j) \sum_{k=1, \ k \neq j}^{n+1} \frac{\lambda_k x_k}{1 - \lambda_j} + \lambda_j x_j, \ y \Biggr) \\ &\leq \rho \Biggl( (1 - \lambda_j) \sum_{k=1, \ k \neq j}^{n+1} \frac{\lambda_k x_k}{1 - \lambda_j}, \ y \Biggr) + \rho(x_j, \ y) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1, \ k \neq j}^{n+1} \rho(x_k, \ y) + \rho(x_j, \ y) = \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} \rho(x_k, \ y) \end{split}$$

(iii) Following condition (iv) in Definition 2.1, then the assertion follows.  $\hfill \Box$ 

Let *X* be a real linear space. A 2-modular  $\rho$  on *X* is said to satisfy the  $\Delta_2$ -condition if there exists a constant K > 0 such that  $\rho(2x, y) \le K\rho(x, y)$  for every  $x, y \in X$ . The 2-modular  $\rho$  as given in Example 2.4 satisfies the  $\Delta_2$ -condition. However, the 2-modular  $\rho$  as given in Example 2.3 does not satisfy the  $\Delta_2$ -condition.

Throughout this paper, we always assume that the 2-modular  $\rho$  satisfies the  $\Delta_2$ -condition.

Let  $\rho$  be a 2-modular on a real linear space X. We define

$$X_{\rho} = \{x \in X : \rho(\lambda x, y) < \infty, \text{ for some } \lambda > 0 \text{ and for any } y \in X\}.$$
 (2.1)

It can easily be proved that  $X_{\rho}$  is a real linear space. Moreover,  $X_{\rho}$  is a 2-modular space with respect to  $\rho$ . We can also prove that  $\rho(x, y) < \infty$  for every  $x \in X_{\rho}$  and for every  $y \in X$ .

Throughout this paper,  $X_{\rho}$  is always meant as given in (2.1).

#### 3. Topological Properties of 2-modular Spaces

In this section, we introduce some topological concept with respect to a 2-modular. We begin our discussion by giving a notion of 2-modular convergent sequences in the space  $X_{\rho}$ .

Let  $X_{\rho}$  be a 2-modular space. A sequence  $\{x_n\}$  in  $X_{\rho}$  is said to be 2-modular convergent (or  $\rho$ -convergent) to some  $x \in X_{\rho}$ , denoted by

$$\rho - \lim x_n = x$$

if for every  $y \in X_{\rho}$ ,  $\lim \rho(x_n - x, y) = 0$ , i.e., for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists an  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for any integer  $n \ge N$ , we have  $\rho(x_n - x, y) < \varepsilon$ . In

this case, the vector x is called a 2-modular limit ( $\rho$ -limit) of the sequence  $\{x_n\}$ .

**Example 3.1.** Let X and  $\rho$  be as given in Example 2.4. It is clear that  $X_{\rho} = X$ . Let  $x_n = \left(\frac{1}{n}, 0\right)$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and x = (0, 0). For any  $y = (y_1, y_2) \in X$ , we have

$$\rho(x_n - x, y) = \sqrt{\operatorname{abs}\left(\begin{vmatrix} \frac{1}{n} & 0\\ y_1 & y_2 \end{vmatrix}\right)} = \sqrt{\frac{|y_2|}{n}}.$$

Given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we can choose a positive integer N such that  $\sqrt{\frac{|y_2|}{N}} < \varepsilon$ . Hence, the sequence  $\{x_n\}$   $\rho$ -converges to x.

We observe some basic properties of the  $\rho$ -convergence of a sequence in any 2-modular space. Let us see the following theorems:

**Theorem 3.2.** Let  $X_{\rho}$  be a 2-modular space and  $\{x_n\}$  be a sequence in  $X_{\rho}$ . If  $\{x_n\}$  is  $\rho$ -convergent, then its  $\rho$ -limit is unique.

**Proof.** Since the 2-modular  $\rho$  satisfies the  $\Delta_2$ -condition, there exists a constant K > 0 such that

$$\rho(2x, y) \le K\rho(x, y),$$

for every  $x, y \in X_{\rho}$ . Given any  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Suppose  $\{x_n\}$   $\rho$ -converges to x and z in  $X_{\rho}$ . For any  $y \in X_{\rho}$ , there exists an  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\rho(x_N - x, y) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2K} \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(x_N - z, y) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2K}.$$

These imply

$$\rho(x-z, y) \le \rho(2(x_N - x, y)) + \rho(2(x_N - z, y)) < \varepsilon.$$
 (3.1)

Since the expression (3.1) holds for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we obtain  $\rho(x - z, y) = 0$ for every  $y \in X_{\rho}$ . This implies x = z. **Theorem 3.3.** Let  $X_{\rho}$  be a 2-modular space and  $\{x_n\}$  be a sequence in  $X_{\rho}$ . If for every  $z \in X_{\rho}$ ,  $\lim \rho(x_n - x, z) = \lim \rho(x_n - y, z) = 0$  for some  $x, y \in X_{\rho}$ , then

- (i)  $\rho(\alpha x_n \alpha x, z) = 0$  for every real number  $\alpha$ , and
- (ii)  $\rho((x_n + y_n) (x + y, z)) = 0.$

**Proof.** Since the 2-modular  $\rho$  satisfies the  $\Delta_2$ -condition, there exists a constant K > 0 such that  $\rho(2x, y) \le K\rho(x, y)$  for every  $x, y \in X_{\rho}$ .

(i) It is trivial for  $\alpha = 0$ . Let  $\alpha > 0$  be an arbitrary, there is a positive integer p such that  $\alpha < 2^p$ . Given  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Since  $\rho(x_n - x, z) = 0$ , there exists an  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for every  $n \ge N$ , we have  $\rho(x_n - x, z) < \frac{\varepsilon}{K^p}$ . This implies

$$\rho(\alpha x_n - \alpha x, z) \le \rho(2^p(x_n - x), z) \le K^p \rho(x_n - x, z) < \varepsilon.$$

In other words,  $\lim \rho(\alpha x_n - \alpha x, z) = 0$ . Moreover, following the condition (iii) in Definition 2.1, we obtain  $\lim \rho(\alpha x_n - \alpha x, z) = 0$  for every  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ .

(ii) Since

$$\rho((x_n + y_n) - (x + y), z) \le \rho(2(x_n - x), z) + \rho(2(y_n - y), z)$$
$$\le K(\rho(x_n - x, z) + \rho(y_n - y, z)),$$

the assertion follows.

A sequence  $\{x_n\}$  in  $X_{\rho}$  is called a  $\rho$ -*Cauchy sequence* if for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is a positive integer N such that

$$\rho(x_n-x_m, y)<\varepsilon,$$

for every  $m, n \ge N$ . The correlation between  $\rho$ -convergent and  $\rho$ -Cauchy sequences is formulated in the following theorem:

**Theorem 3.4.** Every  $\rho$ -convergent sequence in  $X_{\rho}$  is a  $\rho$ -Cauchy sequence.

**Proof.** We can choose a constant K > 0 such that  $\rho(2x, y) \le K\rho(x, y)$ for all  $x, y \in X_{\rho}$ , since the 2-modular  $\rho$  satisfies the  $\Delta_2$ -condition. Now, let  $\{x_n\}$  be any sequence in  $X_{\rho}$  that  $\rho$ -converges, say to some  $x \in X_{\rho}$ . Given any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $y \in X_{rho}$ , then there is a positive integer N such that  $\rho(x_n - x, y) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3K}$  for every  $n \ge N$ . Further, for any  $m, n \ge N$ , we have  $\rho(x_n - x_m, y) \le \rho(2(x_n - x), y) + \rho(2(x - x_m), y)$  $\le K(\rho(x_n - x, y) + \rho(x_m - x, y)) < \varepsilon$ .

So, the proof is complete.

We also characterize  $\rho$ -Cauchy sequences, as given in the following theorem:

**Theorem 3.5.** A sequence  $\{x_n\}$  in  $X_{\rho}$  is  $\rho$ -Cauchy if and only if  $\{\alpha x_n\}$  is a  $\rho$ -Cauchy sequence for all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**Proof.** ( $\Leftarrow$ :) By taking  $\alpha = 1$ , the assertion follows.

(⇒:) It is trivial for  $\alpha = 0$ . Let  $\alpha > 0$  be an arbitrary. Then there is a positive integer *p* such that  $\alpha < 2^p$ . Since the 2-modular  $\rho$  satisfies the  $\Delta_2$ -condition, there is a constant K > 0 such that  $\rho(2x, y) \le K\rho(x, y)$  for all  $x, y \in X_{\rho}$ .

Let  $\{x_n\}$  be a  $\rho$ -Cauchy sequence. Given  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $y \in X_{\rho}$ , there exists an  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for every  $m, n \ge N$ , we have  $\rho(x_n - x_m, y) < \frac{\varepsilon}{K^p}$ . This implies

$$\rho(\alpha x_n - \alpha x_m, y) \le \rho(2^p(x_n - x_m), y) \le K^p \rho(x_n - x_m, y) < \varepsilon.$$

In other words,  $\{\alpha x_n\}$  is a  $\rho$ -Cauchy sequence. Moreover, following the condition (iii) in Definition 2.1, we obtain  $\{\alpha x_n\}$  is a  $\rho$ -Cauchy sequence for every  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ .

#### 4. 2-linear Operators

Let X be a real linear space. A notation  $X^2$  is meant  $X \times X$ . The following definition refers to [1, 11].

**Definition 4.1.** Let *X* and *Y* be real linear spaces. An operator  $T : X^2 \to Y$  is said to be 2-*linear* if for every *x*, *y*, *u*,  $v \in X$  and  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ , the following conditions hold:

(i) 
$$T(x + y, u + v) = T(x, u) + T(x, v) + T(y, u) + T(y, v)$$
.

(ii)  $T(\alpha x, \beta y) = \alpha \beta T(x, y)$ .

Analogous to the definition of a 2-bounded 2-linear operator on 2-norm spaces, we define a 2- $\rho$ -bounded 2-linear operator on 2-modular spaces. Let  $X_{\rho}$  be a 2-modular space and Y be a normed space. A 2-linear operator  $T: X_{\rho}^2 \rightarrow Y$  is said to be 2- $\rho$ -bounded if there exists a real constant M > 0such that

$$\|T(x, y)\| \le M\rho(x, y),$$

for every  $x, y \in X_{\rho}$ . Let us consider the following example.

**Example 4.2.** Let X and  $\rho$  be as given in Example 2.2. Note that  $X_{\rho} = X$ . If an operator  $T : X_{\rho}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$  is defined by

$$T(x, y) = \begin{vmatrix} x_1 & x_2 \\ y_1 & y_2 \end{vmatrix}, \quad x, y \in X_{\rho},$$

3204 Burhanudin Arif Nurnugroho, Supama and Atok Zulijanto then we can show that *T* is a 2-linear operator. Moreover, since

$$|T(x, y)| = \operatorname{abs}\left(\begin{vmatrix} x_1 & x_2 \\ y_1 & y_2 \end{vmatrix}\right) = \rho(x, y)$$

for every  $x, y \in X_{\rho}$ , T is 2- $\rho$ -bounded.

Let  $X_{\rho}$  be a 2-modular space and *Y* be a normed space. If  $T : X_{\rho}^2 \to Y$ is a 2- $\rho$ -bounded linear operator, then it is easy to prove that T(x, y) = 0 for every  $x, y \in X_{\rho}$  which are linearly dependent. The collection of all 2- $\rho$ bounded linear operators  $T : X_{\rho}^2 \to Y$  will be denoted by  $B(X_{\rho}^2, Y)$ . It is easy to check that  $B(X_{\rho}^2, Y)$  is a real linear space. Moreover, one can define a function  $\sigma : B(X_{\rho}^2, Y) \to \mathbb{R}^*$  by

$$\sigma(T) = \sup\left\{\frac{\|T(x, y)\|}{\rho(x, y)} : x, y \in X_{\rho}, \rho(x, y) \neq 0\right\}.$$
(4.1)

The theorem below shows that the function  $\sigma$  as given in (4.1) is a modular.

**Theorem 4.3.** The function  $\sigma : B(X^2_{\rho}, Y) \to \mathbb{R}^*$  as given in (4.1) is a modular on  $B(X^2_{\rho}, Y)$ .

**Proof.** (i) If T = 0, then the definition of  $\sigma$  is obviously followed by  $\sigma(T) = 0$ . Conversely, if  $\sigma(T) = 0$ , then T(x, y) = 0 for all  $x, y \in X_{\rho}$  which are not linearly dependent. Since T(x, y) = 0 for every  $x, y \in X_{\rho}$ , which are linearly dependent, we get T(x, y) = 0 for every  $x, y \in X_{\rho}$ . Hence, T = 0.

(ii) It is clear that  $\sigma(-T) = \sigma(T)$  for every  $T \in B(X_{\rho}^2, Y)$ .

(iii) Take any  $S, T \in B(X_{\rho}^2, Y)$  and  $\alpha, \beta \ge 0$  such that  $\alpha + \beta = 1$ . Then 2-linear Operators on 2-modular Spaces

$$\sigma(\alpha S + \beta T) = \sup \left\{ \frac{\| \alpha S(x, y) + \beta T(x, y) \|}{\rho(x, y)} : \rho(x, y) \neq 0, x, y \in X_{\rho} \right\}$$
$$\leq |\alpha| \sup \left\{ \frac{\| S(x, y) \|}{\rho(x, y)} : \rho(x, y) \neq 0, x, y \in X_{\rho} \right\}$$
$$+ |\beta| \sup \left\{ \frac{\| T(x, y) \|}{\rho(x, y)} : \rho(x, y) \neq 0, x, y \in X_{\rho} \right\}$$
$$\leq \sigma(S) + \sigma(T).$$

From (i), (ii) and (iii), the assertion follows.

The following theorem states necessary and sufficient conditions so that a 2-linear operator from a 2-modular space into a normed space is 2-p-bounded.

**Theorem 4.4.** Let  $X_{\rho}$  be a 2-modular space and Y be a normed space. A 2-linear operator  $T: X_{\rho}^2 \to Y$  is 2- $\rho$ -bounded if and only if there is a constant M > 0 such that

$$||T(x, y) - T(u, v)|| \le M \{\rho(x - u, y) + \rho(u, y - v)\}$$

and

$$||T(x, y) - T(u, v)|| \le M \{\rho(x - u, v) + \rho(x, y - v)\}$$

for all  $x, y, u, v \in X_{\rho}$ .

**Proof.** ( $\Rightarrow$ :) Since *T* is 2- $\rho$ -bounded, there exists a real constant M > 0 such that

$$||T(x, y)|| \le M\rho(x, y),$$

for every  $x, y \in X_{\rho}$ . Take any  $x, y, u, v \in X_{\rho}$ , we have

$$\|T(x, y) - T(u, v)\| = \|T(x - u, y) - T(u, y - v)\|$$
  
$$\leq M\{\rho(x - u, y) + \rho(u, y - v)\}$$

3205

$$|T(x, y) - T(u, v)|| = ||T(x - u, v) - T(x, y - v)||$$
  
$$\leq M \{\rho(x - u, v) + \rho(x, y - v)\}.$$

 $(\Leftarrow:)$  It is obvious.

**Theorem 4.5.** Let 
$$X_0$$
 be a 2-modular space and Y be a normed space. If

for any 2-linear operator  $T: X_{\rho}^2 \to Y, \sigma(T)$  is as defined in (4.1), then

$$\sigma(T) = \inf \{ M > 0 : \| T(x, y) \| \le M \rho(x, y), x, y \in X_{\rho} \}.$$

**Proof.** Since  $||T(x, y)|| \le \sigma(T)\rho(x, y)$  for every  $x, y \in X_{\rho}$ ,

$$\inf \{M > 0 : \|T(x, y)\| \le M\rho(x, y), x, y \in X_{\rho}\} \le \sigma(T).$$

Conversely, if  $K = \inf \{M > 0 : \|T(x, y)\| \le M\rho(x, y), x, y \in X_{\rho}\}$ , then

$$\frac{\|T(x, y)\|}{\rho(x, y)} \le K$$

for every  $x, y \in X_{\rho}$  with  $\rho(x, y) \neq 0$ . Hence,  $\sigma(T) \leq K$ .

Let  $X_{\rho}$  be a 2-modular space and *Y* be a normed space. An operator  $T: X_{\rho}^2 \to Y$  is said to be  $(n, \rho)$ -*continuous* at  $(x_0, y_0) \in X_{\rho}^2$  if for every real number  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that for every  $x, y \in X_{\rho}^2$  with

(i) 
$$\rho(x_0 - x, y_0) < \delta$$
 and  $\rho(x, y - y_0) < \delta$ , or

(ii) 
$$\rho(x_0 - x, y) < \delta$$
 and  $\rho(x_0, y - y_0) < \delta$ ,

we have  $||T(x, y) - T(x_0, y_0)|| < \varepsilon$ . The operator *T* is said to be  $(n, \rho)$ continuous on  $E \subset X_{\rho}^2$  if it is  $(n, \rho)$ -continuous at every  $(x, y) \in E$ . And *T* is said to be  $(n, \rho)$ -continuous if it is  $(n, \rho)$ -continuous on  $X_{\rho}^2$ .

**Example 4.6.** Let  $X, \rho, X_{\rho}$ , and  $T : X_{\rho}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$  be as given in Example 4.2. Take any  $(x_0, y_0) \in X_{\rho}^2$ . For any  $(x, y) \in X_{\rho}^2$ , we have

$$|T(x, y) - T(x_0, y_0)| \le \rho(x - x_0, y_0) + \rho(x, y - y_0)$$

and

$$|T(x, y) - T(x_0, y_0)| \le \rho(x - x_0, y) + \rho(x_0, y - y_0).$$

Thus, *T* is  $(n, \rho)$ -continuous at  $(x_0, y_0)$ .

**Theorem 4.7.** Let  $X_{\rho}$  be a 2-modular space and Y be a normed space. If a 2-linear operator  $T: X_{\rho}^2 \to Y$  is 2- $\rho$ -bounded, then it is  $(n, \rho)$ -continuous.

**Proof.** By Theorem 4.4, the assertion follows.  $\Box$ 

By adding the convex property to the 2-modular  $\rho$ , we can prove the equivalence between 2- $\rho$ -boundedness and  $(n, \rho)$ -continuity of a 2-linear operator  $T: X_{\rho}^2 \to Y$ . For proving this, we need the following lemma:

**Lemma 4.8.** Let  $X_{\rho}$  be a 2-modular space and Y be a normed space. A 2-linear operator  $T : X_{\rho}^2 \to Y$  is  $(n, \rho)$ -continuous at  $(0, 0) \in X_{\rho}^2$  if and only if for any sequence  $\{(x_n, y_n)\}$  that satisfies  $\lim \rho(x_n, y_n) = 0$ , we have  $\lim \|T(x_n, y_n)\| = 0$ .

**Proof.** The proof is standard, so it is omitted.

**Theorem 4.9.** Let  $X_{\rho}$  be a 2-modular space with  $\rho$  be convex, Y be a normed space, and  $T: X_{\rho}^2 \to Y$  be a 2-linear operator. The following statements are equivalent:

- (ii) The operator T is  $(n, \rho)$ -continuous at (0, 0).
- (iii) The set  $\{ \| T(x, y) \| : \rho(x, y) \le 1 \}$  is bounded.
- (iv) The operator T is 2-p-bounded.

**Proof.** (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii) is obvious. (iv)  $\Rightarrow$  (i) follows from Theorem 4.7. What remains to show are (ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii) and (iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iv).

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii) Suppose the set  $\{ \| T(x, y) \| : \rho(x, y) \le 1 \}$  is unbounded. Then

for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $(x_n, y_n) \in X_{\rho}^2$  such that  $\rho(x_n, y_n) \leq 1$ , but

$$\|T(x_n, y_n)\| \ge n^2.$$

Set  $u_n = \frac{x_n}{n}$  and  $v_n = \frac{y_n}{n}$ , then

$$\rho(u_n, v_n) \le \frac{1}{n^2} \rho(x_n, y_n) \le \frac{1}{n^2}$$

This follows from the convexity of  $\rho$ . So,  $\lim \rho(u_n, v_n) = 0$ . By Lemma 4.8, it must be  $\lim ||T(x_n, y_n)|| = 0$ . However, it is impossible because

$$||T(u_n, v_n)|| = \frac{1}{n^2} ||T(x_n, y_n)|| \ge 1.$$

So,  $\{||T(x, y)|| : \rho(x, y) \le 1\}$  is bounded.

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iv) By the hypothesis, there exists M > 0 such that  $||T(x, y)|| \le M$ , whenever  $\rho(x, y) \le 1$ .

Take any  $(x, y) \in X_{\rho}^2$ . It is trivial if  $\rho(x, y) \le 1$ . If  $\rho(x, y) > 1$ , then by the convexity of  $\rho$ ,

$$\rho\left(\frac{(x, y)}{\rho(x, y)}\right) \le 1.$$

Hence,

$$\|T(x, y)\| \le M\rho(x, y)$$

and the proof is finished.

# Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank the referees for their comments and suggestions on the manuscript.

#### References

- [1] H. Y. Chu, S. H. Ku and D. S. Kang, Characterizations on 2-isometries, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 340 (2008), 641-628.
- [2] S. Gähler, Lineare 2-normierte Räume, Math. Nachr. 28 (1964), 1-43.
- [3] S. Gähler, Untersuchungen über verallgemenerte *m*-metrische Räume, I, II, III, Math. Nachr. 40 (1969), 165-189.
- [4] H. Gunawan and M. Mashadi, On *n*-normed spaces, Int. J. Math. Math. Sci. 27 (2001), 631-639.
- [5] H. Gunawan and Mashadi, On finite-dimensional 2-normed spaces, Soochow J. Math. 27(3) (2011), 321-329.
- [6] M. A. Khamsi, A convexity property in modular function spaces, Department of Mathematical Sciences, The University of Texas at El Paso, 1980.
- [7] S. Mazur and W. Orlicz, On some classes of linear spaces, Studia Math. 17 (1958), 97-119.
- [8] J. Musielak, Orlicz spaces and modular spaces, Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 1034, Springer-Verlag, 1983.

- 3210 Burhanudin Arif Nurnugroho, Supama and Atok Zulijanto
  - [9] J. Musielak and W. Orlicz, On modular spaces, Studia Math. 18 (1959), 49-65.
- [10] K. Nourouzi and S. Shabanian, Operator defined on *n*-modular spaces, Mediterr. J. Math. 6 (2009), 431-446.
- [11] N. Srivastava, S. Bhattacharya and S. N. Lal, On Hahn-Banach extension of linear *n*-functionals in *n*-normed spaces, Math. Maced. 4 (2006), 25-32.
- [12] Supama, On some common fixed point theorems in modulared spaces, Int. Math. Forum 7(52) (2012), 2571-2579.