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Abstract
In this study, for double set sequences, we present the notions of Wijsman asymptotic lacunary invariant equivalence, Wijsman asymptotic lacunary $I_2$-invariant equivalence and Wijsman asymptotic lacunary $I_2^*$-invariant equivalence. Also, we examine the relations between these notions and Wijsman asymptotic lacunary invariant statistical equivalence studied in this field before.
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1 Introduction
The notion of convergence for double sequences was firstly introduced by Pringsheim Pringsheim (1900). Then, this notion was extended to the notion of lacunary statistical convergence by Patterson and Savaş Patterson and Savaş (2005) and the notion of $I$-convergence by Das et al. Das et al. (2008).

The notion of asymptotic equivalence for double sequences was introduced by Patterson Patterson (2002). Then, this notion was extended to the notion of asymptotic double lacunary statistical equivalence by Esi Esi (2009) and the notion of asymptotic $I$-equivalence by Hazarika and Kumar Hazarika and Kumar (2013).

Over the years, many authors have studied on the notions of various convergence for set sequences. One of them, discussed in this study, is the notion of convergence in the Wijsman sense Baronti and Papini (1986), Beer (1985, 1994), Wijsman (1964, 1966). Using the notions of lacunary statistical convergence, invariant mean and $I$-convergence, the notion of convergence in the Wijsman sense was extended to new convergence notions for double set sequences by some authors Nuray et al. (2014, 2016), Tortop and Dündar (2018).

The notions of asymptotic equivalence in the Wijsman sense for double set sequences were firstly introduced by Nuray et al. Nuray et al. (2016) and studied by many authors. In this paper, using invariant mean, we study new asymptotic equivalence notions for double set sequences.

More study on the notions of convergence or asymptotic equivalence for real sequences or set sequences can be found in Çakan et al. (2006), Dündar and Altay (2014), Et and Şengül (2016), Fridy and Orhan (1993), Hazarika et al. (2013), Hazarika (2015), Kara et al. (2017), Kişi and Nuray (2013a,b), Kumar (2007), Marouf (1993), Mursaleen and Edely (2009), Nuray and Rhoades (2012), Pancaroğlu and Nuray (2013a,b), Pancaroğlu et al. (2013); Pancaroğlu Akın et al. (2020), Patterson and Savaş (2006), Raj and Anand (2017), Raj et al. (2018), Raj and Jamwal (2019), Savaş (1990), Savaş and Nuray (1993), Savaş and Patterson (2006), Savaş and Patterson (2009), Sever et al. (2014), Şengül (2018), Şengül et al. (2019), Şengül et al. (2020), Ulusu and Nuray (2012, 2013a,b), Ulusu and Savaş (2014), Ulusu and Dündar (2016, 2019).

2 Definitions and notations
The fundamental definitions and notations required for this study are following (see, Baronti and Papini (1986), Beer (1985), Das et al. (2008), Dündar et al. (2020), Kostyrko et al. (2000), Mursaleen (1979, 1983), Nuray et al. (2014, 2016).
Let $\sigma$ be a mapping such that $\sigma : \mathbb{N}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^+$ (the set of positive integers). A continuous linear functional $\psi$ on $\ell_\infty$ is said to be an invariant mean or a $\sigma$-mean if it satisfies the following conditions:

1. $\psi(x_n) \geq 0$, when the sequence $(x_n)$ has $x_n \geq 0$ for all $n$,
2. $\psi(e) = 1$, where $e = (1, 1, 1, \ldots)$ and
3. $\psi(x_{\sigma(n)}) = \psi(x_n)$ for all $(x_n) \in \ell_\infty$.

The mappings $\sigma$ are assumed to be one to one and such that $\sigma^n(n) \neq n$ for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, where $\sigma^n(n)$ denotes the $m$ th iterate of the mapping $\sigma$ at $n$. Thus, $\psi$ extends the limit functional on $c$, in the sense that $\psi(x_n) = \lim x_n$ for all $(x_n) \in c$.

A family of sets $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^\mathbb{N}$ is said to be an ideal if it satisfies the following conditions:

(i) $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{I}$, (ii) $E, F \in \mathcal{I} \Rightarrow E \cup F \in \mathcal{I}$, (iii) $(E \in \mathcal{I}) \wedge (E \subseteq F) \Rightarrow F \in \mathcal{I}$.

An ideal $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^\mathbb{N}$ is said to be nontrivial if $\mathbb{N} \notin \mathcal{I}$ and a nontrivial ideal is said to be admissible if $\{n\} \notin \mathcal{I}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

A nontrivial ideal $\mathcal{I}_2 \subseteq 2^{\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}}$ is said to be strongly admissible if $\{n\} \times \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{N} \times \{n\}$ belong to $\mathcal{I}_2$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Obviously, a strongly admissible ideal is admissible.

Throughout the study, $\mathcal{I}_2 \subseteq 2^{\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}}$ will be considered as a strongly admissible ideal.

Let $\mathcal{I}^0_2 = \{A \subset \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} : (\exists m(A) \in \mathbb{N})(i, j \geq m(A) \Rightarrow (i, j) \notin A)\}$. Then, $\mathcal{I}^0_2$ is a strongly admissible ideal and clearly an ideal $\mathcal{I}_2 \subseteq 2^{\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}}$ is strongly admissible if and only if $\mathcal{I}^0_2 \subseteq \mathcal{I}_2$.

An admissible ideal $\mathcal{I}_2 \subseteq 2^{\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the property (AP2) if every countable family of mutually disjoint sets $\{E_1, E_2, \ldots\}$ belonging to $\mathcal{I}_2$, there exists a countable family of sets $\{F_1, F_2, \ldots\}$ such that $E_i \Delta F_i \in \mathcal{I}^0_2$, i.e., $E_i \Delta F_i$ is included in the finite union of rows and columns in $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $F = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i \in \mathcal{I}_2$ (hence, $F_i \in \mathcal{I}_2$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$).

A family of sets $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^\mathbb{N}$ is said to be a filter if it satisfies the following conditions:

(i) $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{F}$, (ii) $E, F \in \mathcal{F} \Rightarrow E \cap F \in \mathcal{F}$, (iii) $(E \in \mathcal{F}) \wedge (E \supseteq F) \Rightarrow F \in \mathcal{F}$.

For any ideal $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^\mathbb{N}$, there is a filter $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{I})$ corresponding with $\mathcal{I}$ such that

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{I}) = \{M \subset \mathbb{N} : (\exists E \in \mathcal{I})(M = \mathbb{N} \setminus E)\}.$$ 

A double sequence $\theta_2 = \{(k_r, j_u)\}$ is said to be double lacunary sequence if there exist two increasing sequences of integers $(k_r)$ and $(j_u)$ such that $k_0 = 0$, $h_r = k_r - k_{r-1} \to \infty$ and $j_0 = 0$, $h_u = j_u - j_{u-1} \to \infty$ as $r, u \to \infty$.

For any double lacunary sequence $\theta_2 = \{(k_r, j_u)\}$, the following notations are used in general:

$$k_r = k_r j_u, \quad h_r = h_r \tilde{h}_u, \quad I_{ru} = \{(k, j) : k_{r-1} < k \leq k_r \quad \text{and} \quad j_{u-1} < j \leq j_u\}.$$ 

Throughout the study, $\theta_2 = \{(k_r, j_u)\}$ will be considered as a double lacunary sequence.

Let $\theta = \{(k_r, j_u)\}$ be a double lacunary sequence, $A \subseteq \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ and

$$s_{ru} := \min_{m, n} |A \cap \{(\sigma^k(m), \sigma^j(n)) : (k, j) \in I_{ru}\}|$$

and

$$S_{ru} := \max_{m, n} |A \cap \{(\sigma^k(m), \sigma^j(n)) : (k, j) \in I_{ru}\}|.$$ 

If the following limits exist

$$V^\theta(A) := \lim_{r, u \to \infty} \frac{s_{ru}}{h_r h_u} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{V}^\theta(A) := \lim_{r, u \to \infty} \frac{S_{ru}}{h_r h_u},$$

then they are said to be a lower lacunary $\sigma$-uniform density and an upper lacunary $\sigma$-uniform density of the set $A$, respectively. If $V^\theta(A) = \overline{V}^\theta(A)$, then $V^\theta(A) = V^\theta(A) = \overline{V}^\theta(A)$ is said to be lacunary $\sigma$-uniform density of the set $A$.

The class of all $A \subseteq \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ with $V^\theta(A) = 0$ is denoted by $\mathcal{I}_2^0$. Obviously $\mathcal{I}_2^0$ is strongly admissible ideal in $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$.

Two nonnegative double sequences $(x_{k_j})$ and $(y_{k_j})$ are said to be asymptotically equivalent if

$$\lim_{k, j \to \infty} \frac{x_{k_j}}{y_{k_j}} = 1.$$

It is denoted by $x_{k_j} \sim y_{k_j}$.

For a nonempty set $X$, let a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow 2^X$ (the power set of $X$) be defined by $f(k) = U_k \in 2^X$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, the sequence $\{U_k\} = (U_1, U_2, \ldots)$, which are the codomain elements of $f$, is said to be set sequences.

For a metric space $(X, \rho)$, $\mu(x, U)$ denote the distance from $x$ to $U$ where

$$\mu(x, U) = \inf_{u \in U} \rho(x, u).$$

for any $x \in X$ and any nonempty set $U \subseteq X$.

Throughout the study, $(X, \rho)$ will be considered as a metric space and $U, U_{k_j}, V_{k_j}$ as any nonempty closed subsets of $X$. 
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The double sequence \( \{U_{kj}\} \) is said to be Wijsman convergent to \( U \) if each \( x \in X \),
\[
\lim_{k, j \to \infty} \mu(x, U_{kj}) = \mu(x, U).
\]

The double sequence \( \{U_{kj}\} \) is said to be Wijsman lacunary invariant convergent to \( U \) if each \( x \in X \),
\[
\lim_{r, u \to \infty} \frac{1}{h_{ru}} \sum_{(k, j) \in I_{ru}} \mu(x, U_{\sigma^k(m)\sigma^j(n)}) = \mu(x, U)
\]
uniformly in \( m, n \in \mathbb{N} \).

The double sequence \( \{U_{kj}\} \) is said to be Wijsman strongly lacunary invariant convergent to \( U \) if each \( x \in X \),
\[
\lim_{r, u \to \infty} \frac{1}{h_{ru}} \sum_{(k, j) \in I_{ru}} |\mu(x, U_{\sigma^k(m)\sigma^j(n)}) - \mu(x, U)| = 0
\]
uniformly in \( m \) and \( n \).

Let \( 0 < p < \infty \). The double sequence \( \{U_{kj}\} \) is said to be Wijsman strongly \( p \)-lacunary invariant convergent to \( U \) if each \( x \in X \),
\[
\lim_{r, u \to \infty} \frac{1}{h_{ru}} \sum_{(k, j) \in I_{ru}} |\mu(x, U_{\sigma^k(m)\sigma^j(n)}) - \mu(x, U)|^p = 0
\]
uniformly in \( m \) and \( n \).

The double sequence \( \{U_{kj}\} \) is said to be Wijsman lacunary \( T_2 \)-invariant convergent or \( T_2^\theta \)-convergent to \( U \) if every \( \varepsilon > 0 \) and each \( x \in X \), the set
\[
A^\varepsilon := \{(k, j) \in I_{ru} : |\mu(x, U_{kj}) - \mu(x, U)| \geq \varepsilon\}
\]
belongs to \( T_2^\theta \), i.e.,
\[
V^\theta(A^\varepsilon) = 0.
\]
It is denoted by \( U_{kj} \overset{\varepsilon}{\longrightarrow} T_2 \).

The term \( \mu_x\left(\frac{U_{kj}}{V_{kj}}\right) \) is defined as follows:
\[
\mu_x\left(\frac{U_{kj}}{V_{kj}}\right) = \begin{cases}
\mu(x, U_{kj}) - \mu(x, V_{kj}) & , x \notin U_{kj} \cup V_{kj} \\
L & , x \in U_{kj} \cup V_{kj}.
\end{cases}
\]

The double sequences \( \{U_{kj}\} \) and \( \{V_{kj}\} \) are said to be Wijsman asymptotically equivalent of multiple \( L \) if each \( x \in X \),
\[
\lim_{k, j \to \infty} \mu_x\left(\frac{U_{kj}}{V_{kj}}\right) = L.
\]

As an example, consider the following sequences of circles in the \((x, y)\)-plane:
\[
U_{kj} = \{(x, y) : x^2 + y^2 + 2kx + 2y = 0\}
\]
and
\[
V_{kj} = \{(x, y) : x^2 + y^2 - 2kx - 2y = 0\}.
\]

Then, the double sequences \( \{U_{kj}\} \) and \( \{V_{kj}\} \) are Wijsman asymptotically equivalent, i.e., \( U_{kj} \sim V_{kj} \).

The double sequences \( \{U_{kj}\} \) and \( \{V_{kj}\} \) are Wijsman asymptotically lacunary invariant statistical equivalent of multiple \( L \) if every \( \varepsilon > 0 \) and each \( x \in X \),
\[
\lim_{r, u \to \infty} \frac{1}{h_{ru}} \sum_{(k, j) \in I_{ru}} \left| \mu_x\left(\frac{U_{\sigma^k(m)\sigma^j(n)}}{V_{\sigma^k(m)\sigma^j(n)}}\right) - \mu_x\left(\frac{U_{\sigma^k(m)\sigma^j(n)}}{V_{\sigma^k(m)\sigma^j(n)}}\right) \right| \geq \varepsilon \right| = 0
\]
uniformly in \( m \) and \( n \) and it is denoted by \( U_{kj} \sim W(S_{2L}) V_{kj} \), and simply is said to be Wijsman asymptotically lacunary invariant statistical equivalent if \( L = 1 \).

### 3 Main results

In this section, for double set sequences, we present the notions of Wijsman asymptotic lacunary invariant equivalence \( (W(N^\theta_{2L}), W[N^\theta_{2L}], W[N^\theta_{2L}]^p) \), Wijsman asymptotic lacunary \( T_2 \)-invariant equivalence and Wijsman asymptotic lacunary \( T_2^\theta \)-invariant equivalence. Also, we examine the relations between these notions and Wijsman asymptotic lacunary invariant statistical equivalence studied in this field before.

**Definition 1** Two double set sequences \( \{U_{kj}\} \) and \( \{V_{kj}\} \) are Wijsman asymptotically lacunary invariant equivalent of multiple \( L \) if each \( x \in X \),
\[
\lim_{r, u \to \infty} \frac{1}{h_{ru}} \sum_{(k, j) \in I_{ru}} \mu_x\left(\frac{U_{\sigma^k(m)\sigma^j(n)}}{V_{\sigma^k(m)\sigma^j(n)}}\right) = L
\]
uniformly in \( m \) and \( n \). In this case, we write \( U_{kj} \overset{w\left(N^\theta_{2L}\right)}{\sim} V_{kj} \) and simply say Wijsman asymptotically lacunary invariant equivalent if \( L = 1 \).

**Definition 2** Two double set sequences \( \{U_{kj}\} \) and \( \{V_{kj}\} \) are Wijsman asymptotically lacunary \( T_2 \)-invariant equivalent of multiple \( L \) if every \( \varepsilon > 0 \) and each \( x \in X \), the set
\[\tilde{\Delta}(\varepsilon, x) := \left\{ (k, j) \in I_{ru} : \left| \mu_x \left( \frac{U_{kj}}{V_{kj}} \right) - L \right| \geq \varepsilon \right\} \]

belongs to \(I_{2,1}^{\omega} \), i.e., \(V_2^\omega \tilde{\Delta}(\varepsilon, x) = 0\). In this case, we write \(U_{kj} \overset{W(I_{2,1}^{\omega})}{\sim} V_{kj}\) and simply say Wijsman asymptotically lacunary invariant equivalent if \(L = 1\).

**Theorem 1** If \(\mu_x(U_{kj}) = O(\mu_x(V_{kj}))\), then
\[U_{kj} \overset{W(I_{2,1}^{\omega})}{\sim} V_{kj} \iff U_{kj} \overset{W(N(I_{2,1}^{\omega}))}{\sim} V_{kj}.\]

**Proof** Let \(m, n \in \mathbb{N}\) be arbitrary and \(\varepsilon > 0\) is given. Also, we assume that \(U_{kj} \overset{W(I_{2,1}^{\omega})}{\sim} V_{kj}\). Now, we calculate
\[S(m, n) := \frac{1}{h_{ru}} \sum_{(k, j) \in I_{ru}} \left| \mu_x \left( \frac{U_{kj}}{V_{kj}} \right) - L \right|.\]

For every \(m, n = 1, 2, \ldots\) and each \(x \in X\), we have
\[S(m, n) \leq S_1(m, n) + S_2(m, n),\]
where
\[S_1(m, n) := \frac{1}{h_{ru}} \sum_{(k, j) \in I_{ru}} \left| \mu_x \left( \frac{U_{kj}}{V_{kj}} \right) - L \right| \geq \varepsilon\]
and
\[S_2(m, n) := \frac{1}{h_{ru}} \sum_{(k, j) \in I_{ru}} \left| \mu_x \left( \frac{U_{kj}}{V_{kj}} \right) - L \right| < \varepsilon\]

For every \(m, n = 1, 2, \ldots\) and each \(x \in X\), it is obvious that \(S_2(m, n) < \varepsilon\). Since \(\mu_x(U_{kj}) = O(\mu_x(V_{kj}))\), there exists a \(\lambda > 0\) such that
\[\left| \mu_x \left( \frac{U_{kj}}{V_{kj}} \right) - L \right| \leq \lambda,\]
for each \(x \in X\) and \((k, j) \in I_{ru}, m, n = 1, 2, \ldots\), so we have
\[S_1(m, n) \leq \lambda \frac{1}{h_{ru}} \left\{ (k, j) \in I_{ru} : \left| \mu_x \left( \frac{U_{kj}}{V_{kj}} \right) - L \right| \geq \varepsilon \right\}\]
\[= \lambda \frac{1}{h_{ru}} \max_{m, n} \left\{ (k, j) \in I_{ru} : \left| \mu_x \left( \frac{U_{kj}}{V_{kj}} \right) - L \right| \geq \varepsilon \right\}\]
\[= \lambda \frac{S_{ru}}{h_{ru}}.\]

\[\frac{1}{h_{ru}} \sum_{(k, j) \in I_{ru}} \left| \mu_x \left( \frac{U_{kj}}{V_{kj}} \right) - L \right| = 0\]

Hence, due to our assumption, \(U_{kj} \overset{W(N(I_{2,1}^{\omega}))}{\sim} V_{kj}\).

**Definition 3** Two double set sequences \(\{U_{kj}\}\) and \(\{V_{kj}\}\) are Wijsman asymptotically strongly lacunary invariant equivalent of multiple \(L\) if each \(x \in X\),
\[\lim_{r, u \to \infty} \frac{1}{h_{ru}} \sum_{(k, j) \in I_{ru}} \left| \mu_x \left( \frac{U_{kj}}{V_{kj}} \right) - L \right| = 0\]
uniformly in \(m\) and \(n\). In this case, we write \(U_{kj} \overset{W(N(I_{2,1}^{\omega}))}{\sim} V_{kj}\) and simply say Wijsman asymptotically strongly lacunary invariant equivalent if \(L = 1\).

**Definition 4** Let \(0 < p < \infty\). Two double set sequences \(\{U_{kj}\}\) and \(\{V_{kj}\}\) are Wijsman asymptotically strongly \(p\)-lacunary invariant equivalent of multiple \(L\) if each \(x \in X\),
\[\lim_{r, u \to \infty} \frac{1}{h_{ru}} \sum_{(k, j) \in I_{ru}} \left| \mu_x \left( \frac{U_{kj}}{V_{kj}} \right) - L \right|^p = 0\]
uniformly in \(m\) and \(n\). In this case, we write \(U_{kj} \overset{W(N(I_{2,1}^{\omega}))}{\sim} V_{kj}\) and simply say Wijsman asymptotically strongly \(p\)-lacunary invariant equivalent if \(L = 1\).

**Theorem 2** If \(U_{kj} \overset{W(N(I_{2,1}^{\omega}))}{\sim} V_{kj}\), then \(U_{kj} \overset{W(I_{2,1}^{\omega})}{\sim} V_{kj}\).

**Proof** Let \(0 < p < \infty\) and \(\varepsilon > 0\) is given. Also, we assume that \(U_{kj} \overset{W(N(I_{2,1}^{\omega}))}{\sim} V_{kj}\). For every \(m, n = 1, 2, \ldots\) and each \(x \in X\), we have
\[\sum_{(k, j) \in I_{ru}} \left| \mu_x \left( \frac{U_{kj}}{V_{kj}} \right) - L \right|^p \geq \sum_{(k, j) \in I_{ru}} \left| \mu_x \left( \frac{U_{kj}}{V_{kj}} \right) - L \right|^p \geq \varepsilon^p \]
\[\geq \varepsilon^p \max_{m, n} \left\{ (k, j) \in I_{ru} : \left| \mu_x \left( \frac{U_{kj}}{V_{kj}} \right) - L \right| \geq \varepsilon \right\}\]
\[\geq \varepsilon^p \max_{m, n} \left\{ (k, j) \in I_{ru} : \left| \mu_x \left( \frac{U_{kj}}{V_{kj}} \right) - L \right| \geq \varepsilon \right\}\]
\[\geq \varepsilon^p \left\{ (k, j) \in I_{ru} : \left| \mu_x \left( \frac{U_{kj}}{V_{kj}} \right) - L \right| \geq \varepsilon \right\} \]
and so

$$\frac{1}{h_{ru}} \sum_{(k,j) \in I_{ru}} \left| \mu_x \left( \frac{U_{o(k(m),/)(n)}}{V_{o(k(m),/)(n)}} - L \right) \right|^p$$

$$\geq \varepsilon^p \sum_{(k,j) \in I_{ru}} \left| \mu_x \left( \frac{U_{o(k(m),/)(n)}}{V_{o(k(m),/)(n)}} - L \right) \right|$$

$$\geq \varepsilon^p \frac{\sum_{(k,j) \in I_{ru}} \left| \mu_x \left( \frac{U_{o(k(m),/)(n)}}{V_{o(k(m),/)(n)}} - L \right) \right|}{h_{ru}}$$

$$\geq \varepsilon^p \frac{S_{ru}}{h_{ru}}.$$ 

Hence, due to our assumption, $U_{kj} \sim W(T_2^0) V_{kj}$. □

**Theorem 3** If $\mu_x(U_{kj}) = O(\mu_x(V_{kj}))$, then $U_{kj} \sim W(T_2^0) V_{kj}$ implies $U_{kj} \sim W(N_2^0) V_{kj}$.

**Proof** Let $\mu_x(U_{kj}) = O(\mu_x(V_{kj}))$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ is given.

Also, we assume that $U_{kj} \sim W(T_2^0) V_{kj}$. Since $\mu_x(U_{kj}) = O(\mu_x(V_{kj}))$, there exists a $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$\left| \mu_x \left( \frac{U_{o(k(m),/)(n)}}{V_{o(k(m),/)(n)}} - L \right) \right| \leq \lambda,$$

for each $x \in X$ and $(k,j) \in I_{ru}$, $m,n = 1,2,...$, so we have

$$\frac{1}{h_{ru}} \sum_{(k,j) \in I_{ru}} \left| \mu_x \left( \frac{U_{o(k(m),/)(n)}}{V_{o(k(m),/)(n)}} - L \right) \right|^p$$

$$= \frac{1}{h_{ru}} \sum_{(k,j) \in I_{ru}} \left| \mu_x \left( \frac{U_{o(k(m),/)(n)}}{V_{o(k(m),/)(n)}} - L \right) \right|^p$$

$$+ \frac{1}{h_{ru}} \sum_{(k,j) \in I_{ru}} \left| \mu_x \left( \frac{U_{o(k(m),/)(n)}}{V_{o(k(m),/)(n)}} - L \right) \right|^p$$

$$\leq \lambda \frac{S_{ru}}{h_{ru}} + \varepsilon^p.$$ 

Hence, due to our assumption, $U_{kj} \sim W(N_2^0) V_{kj}$. □

**Theorem 4** If $\mu_x(U_{kj}) = O(\mu_x(V_{kj}))$, then $U_{kj} \sim W(T_2^0) V_{kj}$ implies $U_{kj} \sim W(N_2^0) V_{kj}$.

**Proof** The proof is obvious from Theorem 2 and Theorem 3. □

Now, without proof, we shall present a theorem that gives a relationship between the notions of Wijsman asymptotic lacunary $T_2$-invariant equivalence of multiple $L$ and Wijsman asymptotic lacunary invariant statistical equivalence of multiple $L$.

**Theorem 5** For any double set sequences $\{U_{kj}\}$ and $\{V_{kj}\}$.

$$U_{kj} \sim W(T_2^0) V_{kj} \Leftrightarrow U_{kj} \sim W(N_2^0) V_{kj}.$$ 

**Definition 5** Two double sequences $\{U_{kj}\}$ and $\{V_{kj}\}$ are Wijsman asymptotically lacunary $T_2$-invariant equivalent if $L$ and only if there exists a set $M_2 \in F(T_2^0)$ ($N \times N \setminus M_2 = H \in T_2^0$) such that each $x \in X$,

$$\lim_{k,j \to \infty, (k,j) \in M_2} \mu_x \left( \frac{U_{kj}}{V_{kj}} \right) = L.$$ 

In this case, we write $U_{kj} \sim W(T_2^0) V_{kj}$ and simply say Wijsman asymptotically lacunary $T_2$-invariant equivalent if $L = 1$.

**Theorem 6** If $U_{kj} \sim W(T_2^0) V_{kj}$, then $U_{kj} \sim W(N_2^0) V_{kj}$.

**Proof** Let $U_{kj} \sim W(T_2^0) V_{kj}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ is given. Then, there exists a set $M_2 \in F(T_2^0)$ ($N \times N \setminus M_2 = H \in T_2^0$) such that each $x \in X$,

$$\lim_{k,j \to \infty, (k,j) \in M_2} \mu_x \left( \frac{U_{kj}}{V_{kj}} \right) = L,$$

and so there exist $k_0, j_0 \in N$ such that

$$\left| \mu_x \left( \frac{U_{kj}}{V_{kj}} \right) - L \right| < \varepsilon,$$

for all $(k,j) \in M_2$ where $k \geq k_0, j \geq j_0$. Hence, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and each $x \in X$ it is obvious that

$$S(\varepsilon) := \left\{ (k,j) \in I_{ru} : \left| \mu_x \left( \frac{U_{kj}}{V_{kj}} \right) - L \right| \geq \varepsilon \right\}$$

$$\subset H \cup \left( M_2 \cap \left( \{(1,2,\ldots,k_0 - 1) \times N \right) \cup \{(N \times \{1,2,\ldots,(k_0 - 1)\}) \} \right).$$ 

(Springer)
Since $T_2^{\sigma^0} \subset 2^{\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}}$ is a strongly admissible ideal,

$$H \cup \left(M_2 \cap \left(\{(1, 2, \ldots, (k_0 - 1)) \times \mathbb{N}\right) \right) \cup (\mathbb{N} \times \{(1, 2, \ldots, (k_0 - 1))\}) \in T_2^{\sigma^0}$$

and so we have $S(\varepsilon) \in T_2^{\sigma^0}$. Consequently, $U_{kj} \xrightleftharpoons{W(I_2^{\sigma^0})} V_{kj}$. \hfill \Box

If $T_2^{\sigma^0}$ has property $(AP2)$, then the converse of Theorem 6 is hold.

**Theorem 7** If $T_2^{\sigma^0}$ has property $(AP2)$, then

$$U_{kj} \xrightleftharpoons{W(I_2^{\sigma^0})} V_{kj}$$

implies $U_{kj} \xrightleftharpoons{W(I_2^{\sigma^0})} V_{kj}$.

**Proof** Let $T_2^{\sigma^0}$ satisfies condition $(AP2)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ is given.

Also, suppose that $U_{kj} \xrightleftharpoons{W(I_2^{\sigma^0})} V_{kj}$. Then, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and each $x \in X$ we have

$$\{(k, j) \in I_{ru} : |\mu_x(U_{kj}/V_{kj}) - L| \geq \varepsilon\} \in T_2^{\sigma^0}.$$

For every $x \in X$, denote $E_1, \ldots, E_n$ as follows

$$E_1 := \{(k, j) \in I_{ru} : |\mu_x(U_{kj}/V_{kj}) - L| \geq 1\}$$

and

$$E_n := \{(k, j) \in I_{ru} : \frac{1}{n} \leq |\mu_x(U_{kj}/V_{kj}) - L| < \frac{1}{n - 1}\},$$

where $n \geq 2 (n \in \mathbb{N})$. For each $x \in X$, note that $E_i \cap E_j = \emptyset (i \neq j)$ and $E_i \in T_2^{\sigma^0}$ (for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$). Since $T_2^{\sigma^0}$ satisfies condition $(AP2)$, there exists a sequence of sets $\{F_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $E_i \Delta F_i$ is included in finite union of rows and columns in $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ (for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$) and $F = \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i\right) \in T_2^{\sigma^0}$.

Now, to complete the proof, it is enough to prove that for each $x \in X$

$$\lim_{k, j \to \infty} \mu_x(U_{kj}/V_{kj}) = L \quad \text{for } (k, j) \in M_2 \setminus F.$$ \hfill (1)

where $M_2 = \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \setminus F$. Let $\gamma > 0$ is given. Choose $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\frac{1}{n} < \gamma$. Then, for each $x \in X$ we have

$$\left\{(k, j) \in I_{ru} : |\mu_x(U_{kj}/V_{kj}) - L| \geq \gamma\right\} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} E_i.$$
