

# $k$ -bitransitive and compound operators on Banach spaces

Nareen Bamerni <sup>\*1</sup> and Adem Kılıçman <sup>†2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Department of Mathematics, University Putra Malaysia, 43400 UPM, Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia

## Abstract

In this this paper, we introduce new classes of operators in complex Banach spaces, which we call  $k$ -bitransitive operators and compound operators to study the direct sum of diskcyclic operators. We create a set of sufficient conditions for  $k$ -bitransitivity and compound. We show the relation between topologically mixing operators and compound operators. Also, we extend the Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion for topologically mixing operators to compound operators.

## 1 Introduction

A bounded linear operator  $T$  on a separable Banach space  $X$  is hypercyclic if there is a vector  $x \in X$  such that  $Orb(T, x) = \{T^n x : n \geq 0\}$  is dense in  $X$ , such a vector  $x$  is called hypercyclic for  $T$ , for more information on hypercyclic operators the reader may refer to [4, 9]. Similarly, an operator  $T$  is called diskcyclic if there is a vector  $x \in X$  such that the disk orbit  $\mathbb{D}Orb(T, x) = \{\alpha T^n x : \alpha \in \mathbb{C}, |\alpha| \leq 1, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is dense in  $X$ , such a vector  $x$  is called diskcyclic for  $T$ , for more details on diskcyclicity see [2, 3, 12].

In 1982, Kitai presented in her PhD thesis some sufficient conditions for hypercyclic operators which are then called hypercyclic criterion [11]. Then Gethner and Shapiro [7] gave another form of this criterion. In 1987, Godefroy and Shapiro [8] created another hypercyclic criterion which is called Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion, that is a set of sufficient condition in terms of the eigenvalues of an

---

\*nareen\_bamerni@yahoo.com

†akilicman@yahoo.com

operator to be hypercyclic.

It was proved that whenever the direct sum of  $n$  operators is hypercyclic, then every operator is hypercyclic [11]. However, for the converse, Salas constructed an operator  $T$  such that both it and its adjoint  $T^*$  were hypercyclic, and so that their direct sum  $T \oplus T^*$  was not. Moreover, Herrero asked in [10] whether  $T \oplus T$  is hypercyclic whenever  $T$  is. In 1999, Bés and Peris showed that an operator  $T$  satisfies the hypercyclic criterion if and only if  $T \oplus T$  is hypercyclic (see [5]) which gives a positive answer to the Herrero's question.

For diskcyclic operators, Zeana proved that if the direct sum of  $n$  operators is diskcyclic then every operator is diskcyclic [12]. However, the converse is unknown. Particularly, we have the following question:

**Question 1.** *If there are  $k$  diskcyclic operators, what about their direct sum?*

The main purpose of this paper is to give a partial answer to this question. We define and study  $k$ -bitransitive operators. We determine conditions that ensure a linear operator to be  $k$ -bitransitive which is called  $k$ -bitransitive criterion. Then, we define compound operators as a general form of topologically mixing operators [6]. However, we show by an example that not every compound operator is topologically mixing. Moreover, we define cross sets and junction sets to make the arguments involving  $k$ -bitransitive and compound operators more transparent. Then we extend Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion [8] for topologically mixing operators to compound operators. In particular, a special case of 2.12 is when  $p = 1$  which is Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion [4]. Moreover, we create compound criterion which is a set of sufficient conditions for compound. Finally, We use these operators to prove that in some cases if  $k$  operators are diskcyclic, then the direct sum of them is  $k$ -bitransitive which answer 1 for some special cases.

## 2 Main results

In this this paper, all Banach spaces are separable over the field  $\mathbb{C}$  of complex numbers. Let  $k \geq 1$  and  $T_i \in \mathcal{B}(X)$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , and let  $T = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k T_i : \bigoplus_{i=1}^k X \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^k X$  then we call each operator  $T_i$  a component of  $T$ . We denote by  $\mathbb{D}$  the closed unit disk in  $\mathbb{C}$  and by  $\mathbb{N}$  the set of all positive integers.

**Definition 2.1.** *An operator  $T \in \mathcal{B}(X)$  is called  $k$ -bitransitive if there exist  $T_1, T_2, \dots, T_k \in \mathcal{B}(X)$  such that  $T = T_1 \oplus \dots \oplus T_k$  and for any  $2k$ -tuples  $U_1, \dots, U_k, V_1, \dots, V_k \subset X$  of nonempty open sets, there exist some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$  such that*

$$(T_1 \oplus T_2 \oplus \dots \oplus T_k)^n(\alpha_1 U_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \alpha_k U_k) \cap (V_1 \oplus \dots \oplus V_k) \neq \phi$$

It is clear from the above definition that 1-bitransitive is identical to disk transitive which in turn identical to diskcyclic (see [2, Proposition 2.10]).

To simplify 2.1, we define the following concepts

**Definition 2.2.** A set  $A \subset \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{C}^p$  is called *bifinite* if there exist a cofinite set  $K = \{n_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \mathbb{N}$  and sequences  $\langle a_n^{(i)} \rangle_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{C}; i = 1, \dots, p$  such that  $\left\{ (n_k, a_{n_k}^{(1)}, \dots, a_{n_k}^{(p)}) : \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N} \right\} \subseteq A$

**Definition 2.3.** Let  $k \geq 1$  be fixed. For all  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , let  $T_i$  be bounded linear operators on a Banach space  $X$ , and  $A_i, B_i$  be non-empty subsets of  $X$ . Let  $T = T_1 \oplus \dots \oplus T_k$ ,  $A = A_1 \oplus A_2 \oplus \dots \oplus A_k$  and  $B = B_1 \oplus B_2 \oplus \dots \oplus B_k$ . The cross set from  $A$  to  $B$  is defined as

$$C_T(A, B) = C(A, B) = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : T^n(\alpha_1 A_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \alpha_k A_k) \cap (B_1 \oplus \dots \oplus B_k) \neq \phi\}$$

for some  $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}; i = 1, \dots, k$

In the above definition, if  $\alpha_i = \alpha_{i+1}$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, k-1$ , the return set  $N(\alpha A, B)$  (see [1]) is equivalent to  $C(A, B)$ .

**Definition 2.4.** Let  $k \geq 1$  be fixed. For all  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , let  $T_i$  be bounded linear operators on a Banach space  $X$ , and  $A_i, B_i$  be non-empty subsets of  $X$ . Let  $T = T_1 \oplus \dots \oplus T_k$ ,  $A = A_1 \oplus A_2 \oplus \dots \oplus A_k$  and  $B = B_1 \oplus B_2 \oplus \dots \oplus B_k$ . The junction set from  $A$  to  $B$  is defined as  $J_T(A, B) = J(A, B) = \{(n, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{D}^k \setminus \{(0, \dots, 0)\} : T^n(\alpha_1 A_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \alpha_k A_k) \cap (B_1 \oplus \dots \oplus B_k) \neq \phi\}$

The next proposition gives an equivalent definition to  $k$ -bitransitivity in terms of cross and junction sets

**Proposition 2.5.** Let  $T = T_1 \oplus \dots \oplus T_k$ . Then  $T$  is  $k$ -bitransitive, if and only if for any  $2k$ -tuples of nonempty open sets  $U_i, V_i \subset X, i = 1, \dots, k$

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^k C_{T_i}(U_i, V_i) \neq \phi$$

or if and only if for any  $2k$ -tuples of nonempty open sets  $U_i, V_i \subset X$ , there exists  $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$(n, \alpha_i) \in J_{T_i}(U_i, V_i)$$

The following theorem gives a set of sufficient conditions for  $r$ -bitransitivity.

**Theorem 2.6** ( $r$ -bitransitive criterion). Let  $T_1, \dots, T_r \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ , suppose that there exists an increasing sequence of positive integers  $\langle n_k \rangle$ , and suppose that for

all  $1 \leq i \leq r$  there exist sequences  $\langle \lambda_{n_k}^{(i)} \rangle \subset \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$  for all  $k \geq 1$ , dense sets  $X_i, Y_i \subset X$ , and maps  $S_i : Y_i \rightarrow X$  such that for all  $x_i \in X_i$  and  $y_i \in Y_i$

1.  $\bigoplus_{i=1}^r \lambda_{n_k}^{(i)} T_i^{n_k}(x_1, \dots, x_r) \rightarrow (0, \dots, 0)$ ;
2.  $\bigoplus_{i=1}^r \frac{1}{\lambda_{n_k}^{(i)}} S_i^{n_k}(y_1, \dots, y_r) \rightarrow (0, \dots, 0)$ ;
3.  $\bigoplus_{i=1}^r T_i^{n_k} S_i^{n_k}(y_1, \dots, y_r) \rightarrow (y_1, \dots, y_r)$ .

Then  $T_1 \oplus \dots \oplus T_r$  is  $r$ -bitransitive.

*Proof.* Let  $U_i, V_i$  be open sets for all  $1 \leq i \leq r$  then  $\bigoplus_{i=1}^r U_i$  is open in  $\bigoplus_{i=1}^r X$ . Also  $\bigoplus_{i=1}^r X_i$  and  $\bigoplus_{i=1}^r Y_i$  are dense in  $\bigoplus_{i=1}^r X$ . Let  $(x_1, \dots, x_r) \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^r U_i \cap \bigoplus_{i=1}^r X_i$  and  $(y_1, \dots, y_r) \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^r V_i \cap \bigoplus_{i=1}^r Y_i$ . By (2) we have

$$(x_1, \dots, x_r) + \bigoplus_{i=1}^r \frac{1}{\lambda_{n_k}^{(i)}} S_i^{n_k}(y_1, \dots, y_r) \rightarrow (x_1, \dots, x_r) \quad (1)$$

By (1) and (3) we have

$$\left( \bigoplus_{i=1}^r \lambda_{n_k}^{(i)} T_i^{n_k} \right) \left( (x_1, \dots, x_r) + \bigoplus_{i=1}^r \frac{1}{\lambda_{n_k}^{(i)}} S_i^{n_k}(y_1, \dots, y_r) \right) \rightarrow (y_1, \dots, y_r) \quad (2)$$

as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . From Equation (1) and Equation (2), there exist  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\left( \bigoplus_{i=1}^r \lambda_{n_k}^{(i)} T_i^{n_k} \right) \left( \bigoplus_{i=1}^r U_i \right) \cap \bigoplus_{i=1}^r V_i \neq \phi \text{ for all } k \geq N$$

which is equivalent to

$$(T_1 \oplus \dots \oplus T_r)^{n_k} (\lambda_{n_k}^{(1)} U_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \lambda_{n_k}^{(r)} U_r) \cap (V_1 \oplus \dots \oplus V_r) \neq \phi \text{ for all } k \geq N$$

that is

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^r C_{T_i}(U_i, V_i) \neq \phi$$

By 2.5,  $T_1 \oplus \dots \oplus T_r$  is  $r$ -bitransitive.  $\square$

The following proposition gives another criterion for  $r$ -bitransitive operators without the need of scalar sequences.

**Proposition 2.7.** *Let  $T_1, \dots, T_r \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ , suppose that there exists an increasing sequence of positive integers  $\langle n_k \rangle$ , and suppose that for all  $1 \leq i \leq r$  there exist dense sets  $X_i, Y_i \subset X$ , and maps  $S_i : Y_i \rightarrow X$  such that for all  $x_i \in X_i$  and  $y_i \in Y_i$*

1.  $\bigoplus_{i=1}^r T_i^{n_k}(x_1, \dots, x_r) \bigoplus_{i=1}^r S_i^{n_k}(y_1, \dots, y_r) \rightarrow (0, \dots, 0)$ ;

2.  $\bigoplus_{i=1}^r S_i^{n_k}(y_1, \dots, y_r) \rightarrow (0, \dots, 0)$ ;
3.  $\bigoplus_{i=1}^r T_i^{n_k} S_i^{n_k}(y_1, \dots, y_r) \rightarrow (y_1, \dots, y_r)$ .

Then  $T_1 \oplus \dots \oplus T_r$  is  $r$ -bitransitive.

The proof of the above proposition follows from the next proposition and 2.6

**Proposition 2.8.** *Both  $r$ -bitransitive criteria are equivalent.*

*Proof.* Let the hypothesis of 2.6 are given. By (1) and (2) in 2.6, we get (1) in 2.7. Since  $\left\langle \frac{1}{\lambda_{n_k}^{(i)}} \right\rangle \not\rightarrow 0$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq r$ , then (2) in 2.6 implies that  $\bigoplus_{i=1}^r S_i^{n_k}(y_1, \dots, y_r) \rightarrow (0, \dots, 0)$ ; i.e, (2) in 2.7 holds. It follows that the hypothesis of 2.7 hold true.

Conversely, suppose that the hypothesis of 2.7 are given. Then there exist a large  $p \in \mathbb{N}$  and a small positive integer  $\epsilon$  such that

$$\left\| \bigoplus_{i=1}^r T_i^{n_k}(x_1, \dots, x_r) \bigoplus_{i=1}^r S_i^{n_k}(y_1, \dots, y_r) \right\| \leq \epsilon^2 \quad (3)$$

and

$$\left\| \bigoplus_{i=1}^r S_i^{n_k}(y_1, \dots, y_r) \right\| \leq \epsilon \quad (4)$$

whenever  $k \geq p$ . Equation (4) implies that for all  $1 \leq i \leq r$  and  $k \geq p$

$$\|S_i^{n_k} y_i\| \leq \epsilon$$

Let  $\lambda_{n_k}^{(i)} = \frac{1}{\epsilon} S_i^{n_k} y_i$  which implies that  $|\lambda_{n_k}^{(i)}| \leq 1$  and  $\left\| \frac{1}{\lambda_{n_k}^{(i)}} S_i^{n_k} y_i \right\| = \epsilon$ . It follows that

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_{n_k}^{(i)}} S_i^{n_k} y_i \rightarrow 0 \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq r \text{ and } k \geq p$$

and so

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^r \frac{1}{\lambda_{n_k}^{(i)}} S_i^{n_k}(y_1, \dots, y_r) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty \quad (5)$$

Furthermore, by Equation (3)

$$\|(T_1^{n_k} x_1 S_1^{n_k} y_1, \dots, T_r^{n_k} x_r S_r^{n_k} y_r)\| = \|T_1^{n_k} x_1 S_1^{n_k} y_1\| + \dots + \|T_r^{n_k} x_r S_r^{n_k} y_r\| \leq \epsilon^2$$

Therefore,  $\|T_i^{n_k} x_i S_i^{n_k} y_i\| = \|T_i^{n_k} x_i\| |\lambda_{n_k}^{(i)}| \epsilon \leq \epsilon^2$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq r$  and  $k \geq p$ .

Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \|\lambda_{n_k}^{(i)} T_i^{n_k} x_i\| \leq r\epsilon$$

It follows that

$$\|(\lambda_{n_k}^{(1)} T_1^{n_k} x_1, \dots, \lambda_{n_k}^{(r)} T_r^{n_k} x_r)\| \leq r\epsilon$$

so

$$\left\| \bigoplus_{i=1}^r \lambda_{n_k}^{(i)} T_i^{n_k}(x_1, \dots, x_r) \right\| \leq r\epsilon$$

If we let  $\epsilon$  small enough we get

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^r \lambda_{n_k}^{(i)} T_i^{n_k}(x_1, \dots, x_r) \rightarrow (0, \dots, 0) \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty \quad (6)$$

The proof follows from Equation (5) and Equation (6)  $\square$

Now to answer 1, we will define another class of operators which is called compound operators.

**Definition 2.9.** *An operator  $T \in \mathcal{B}(X)$  is called compound if for any nonempty open sets  $U, V$ , there exist some  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and a sequence  $\langle \alpha_n \rangle \subset \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$  such that*

$$T^n(\alpha_n U) \cap V \neq \phi$$

for all  $n \geq N$

**Proposition 2.10.** *An operator  $T$  is compound, if and only if for any two nonempty open sets  $U, V \subset \mathcal{H}$ ,*

$$J(U, V) \text{ is bifinite}$$

It is clear that every compound operator is disk transitive. A special case of compound operator is when  $\alpha_n = 1$  for all  $n \geq N$ , and it is called topologically mixing operators (see [6]). Therefore every topologically mixing operator is compound. However, not every compound operator is topologically mixing as shown in the following example

**Example 2.11.** *Let  $T : \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$  be the bilateral forward weighted shift with the weight sequence*

$$w_n = \begin{cases} R_1 & \text{if } n \geq 0, \\ R_2 & \text{if } n < 0. \end{cases}$$

where  $R_1, R_2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$ ;  $R_1 < R_2$ . Then  $T$  is compound not topologically mixing.

*Proof.* Let  $U$  and  $V$  be two open sets. Since  $T$  satisfies diskcyclic criterion with respect to the sequence  $\langle n \rangle_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  (see [2, Example 2.20.]), then there exist two dense set  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  such that

1. For each  $y \in V$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|B^n y\| \rightarrow 0$  (where  $B$  is the bilateral backward weighted shift)
2. For all  $x \in D_1$  and  $y \in D_2$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|T^n x\| \|B^n y\| \rightarrow 0$  ;

3. For each  $y \in D_2$ ,  $T^n B^n y = y$  ;

Let  $x \in U \cap D_1$ ,  $y \in V \cap D_2$  and  $\lambda_n = \frac{\|B^n y\|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\|T^n x\|^{\frac{1}{2}}}$ . For an arbitrary large  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , suppose that  $z = x + \lambda_N^{-1} B^N y$ , then,  $\|z - x\| = (\|T^N x\| \|B^N y\|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow 0$  by (Item 1) and thus  $z \in U$ . Also,  $\lambda_N T^N z = \lambda_N T^N x + T^N B^N y = \lambda_N T^N x + y$  by (Item 3). Then  $\|\lambda_N T^N z - y\| = \lambda_N \|T^N x\| = (\|T^N x\| \|B^N y\|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow 0$  by (Item 2) and so  $\lambda_N T^N z \in V$ . Since  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|T^n x\| \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|B^n y\| \rightarrow 0$  then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n \rightarrow 0$ . Therefore  $\lambda_N T^N U \cap V \neq \emptyset$ . Since  $N$  is arbitrary, we can assume that  $J(U, V) = \{(\lambda_n, n) : n \geq N\}$  and hence  $T$  is compound. Since  $T$  is not topological transitive (see [2, Example 2.20.]), then  $T$  can not be topologically mixing.  $\square$

The following theorem extends the Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion [8] for topologically mixing operators to compound operators.

**Theorem 2.12.** *Let  $T \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ . If there exists a  $p \geq 1$  such that*

$$A = \text{span} \{x \in X : Tx = \alpha x \text{ for some } \alpha \in \mathbb{C}; |\alpha| < p\};$$

$$B = \text{span} \{y \in X : Ty = \lambda y \text{ for some } \lambda \in \mathbb{C}; |\lambda| > p\};$$

*are dense in  $X$ , then  $T$  is compound.*

*Proof.* Let  $U$  and  $V$  be nonempty open sets in  $X$ . Since  $A$  and  $B$  are dense, then there exist  $x \in A \cap U$  and  $y \in B \cap V$ . Then  $x = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i x_i$  and  $y = \sum_{i=1}^k b_i y_i$  where  $a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{C}$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . Also,  $T x_i = \alpha_i x_i$  and  $T y_i = \lambda_i y_i$  where  $|\alpha_i| < p$  and  $|\lambda_i| > p$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . Let  $c \in \mathbb{C}$  be a scalar such that  $p \leq |c| < |\lambda_i|$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , and let

$$z_n = \sum_{i=1}^k b_i \left(\frac{c}{\lambda_i}\right)^n y_i \text{ for all } n \geq 0$$

Then

$$\frac{1}{c^n} T^n x = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i \left(\frac{\alpha_i}{c}\right)^n x_i \rightarrow 0 \text{ and } z_n \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

and  $\frac{1}{c^n} T^n z_n = y$  for all  $n \geq 0$ . It follows that there is a positive integer  $r$  such that for all  $n \geq r$

$$x + z_n \in U \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{c^n} T^n (x + z_n) = \frac{1}{c^n} T^n x + \frac{1}{c^n} T^n z_n \in V \text{ for all } n \geq r$$

Therefore,  $\frac{1}{c^n} T^n U \cap V \neq \emptyset$  for all  $n \geq r$ . It follows that  $T$  is compound.  $\square$

Note that in the above theorem, if  $p = 1$ , then it will be a Godefroy-Shapiro criterion for topologically mixing operators.

The following theorem gives another criterion for compound operators.

**Theorem 2.13.** *Let  $T \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ , suppose that there exist a sequence  $\langle \lambda_n \rangle \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $|\lambda_n| \leq 1$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , two dense sets  $D_1, D_2 \subset \mathcal{H}$  and a sequence of maps  $S_n : Y \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  such that as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ :*

1.  $\lambda_n T^n x \rightarrow 0$  for all  $x \in D_1$ ;
2.  $\frac{1}{\lambda_n} S_n y \rightarrow 0$  for all  $y \in D_2$ ;
3.  $T^n S_n y \rightarrow y$  for all  $y \in D_2$ .

*Then  $T$  is compound and it is called compound with respect to the sequence  $\langle \lambda_n \rangle$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $U, V$  be non empty open sets, and let  $x \in U \cap D_1$  and  $y \in V \cap D_2$ . Then  $x + \frac{1}{\lambda_n} S_n y \rightarrow x \in U$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\lambda_n T^n (x + \frac{1}{\lambda_n} S_n y) = \lambda_n T^n x + y \rightarrow y \in V$ . Thus there exists a large positive integer  $N$  such that  $T^n \lambda_n U \cap V \neq \emptyset$  for all  $n \geq N$ . It follows that  $T$  is compound.  $\square$

The following theorem gives another criterion for compound operators.

**Theorem 2.14.** *Let  $T \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ . If there exist two dense sets  $D_1, D_2 \subset \mathcal{H}$  and a sequence of maps  $S_n : Y \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  such that:*

1.  $(T^n x)(S_n y) \rightarrow 0$  for all  $x \in D_1$  and  $y \in D_2$  ;
2.  $S_n y \rightarrow 0$  for all  $y \in D_2$ ;
3.  $T^n S_n y \rightarrow y$  for all  $y \in D_2$ .

*Then  $T$  is compound.*

The proof of the above theorem can be followed by showing that both compound criteria in 2.13 and 2.14 are equivalent by using the same lines in 2.8.

Now, the following two theorems give a partial answer to 1.

**Theorem 2.15.** *Let  $T = T_1 \oplus \dots \oplus T_k$ . If every component of  $T$  is disk transitive and at least  $(k - 1)$  of them is compound then  $T$  is  $k$ -bitransitive.*

*Proof.* We will prove the case  $k = 2$  and the other cases are same. Let  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  be disk transitive operators and let  $T_1$  be compound without loss of generality. Let  $U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2$  be nonempty open sets, then there exist  $N_1, N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\alpha_1 \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$  and a sequence  $\langle \beta_n \rangle_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $T_2^{N_1} \alpha_1 U_1 \cap U_2 \neq \emptyset$  and  $T_1^n \beta_n V_1 \cap V_2 \neq \emptyset$  for all  $n \geq N_2$ . Since  $J_{T_2}(U_1, U_2)$  is infinite then there exist  $N \in \mathbb{N}, N \geq N_2$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $T_2^N \alpha U_1 \cap U_2 \neq \emptyset$  and  $T_1^N \beta_N V_1 \cap V_2 \neq \emptyset$ . It follows that  $C_{T_1}(U_1, U_2) \cap C_{T_2}(V_1, V_2) \neq \emptyset$  and hence  $T$  is 2-bitransitive.  $\square$



**Theorem 2.16.** *If  $r$  operators satisfy diskcyclic criterion for the same sequence  $\langle n_k \rangle_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , then their direct sum is an  $r$ -bitransitive operator.*

*Proof.* Let  $T_i$  satisfies diskcyclic criterion with respect to the sequence  $\langle n_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq r$ . Then for all  $1 \leq i \leq r$ , there exist  $2k$  dense sets  $D_i, D'_i$ ,  $r$  maps  $S_i$  such that

$$T_i^{n_k} x_i S_i^{n_k} y_i \rightarrow 0 \quad (7)$$

$$S_i^{n_k} y_i \rightarrow 0 \quad (8)$$

$$T_i^{n_k} S_i^{n_k} y_i \rightarrow y_i \quad (9)$$

as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . By equation (7), we get

$$\begin{aligned} (T_1^{n_k} x_1 S_1^{n_k} y_1, \dots, T_r^{n_k} x_r S_r^{n_k} y_r) &\rightarrow (0, \dots, 0) \\ (T_1^{n_k} x_1, \dots, T_r^{n_k} x_r) (S_1^{n_k} y_1, \dots, S_r^{n_k} y_r) &\rightarrow (0, \dots, 0) \\ \bigoplus_{i=1}^r T_i^{n_k} (x_1, \dots, x_r) \bigoplus_{i=1}^r S_i^{n_k} (y_1, \dots, y_r) &\rightarrow (0, \dots, 0) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

By equation (10), condition (1) of 2.7 holds.

Also by equation (8), we get

$$\begin{aligned} (S_1^{n_k} y_1, \dots, S_r^{n_k} y_r) &\rightarrow (0, \dots, 0) \\ \bigoplus_{i=1}^r S_i^{n_k} (y_1, \dots, y_r) &\rightarrow (0, \dots, 0) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

It follows by equation (11), that condition (2) of 2.7 holds.

Finally, by equation (9), we get

$$\begin{aligned} (T_1^{n_k} S_1^{n_k} y_1, \dots, T_r^{n_k} S_r^{n_k} y_r) &\rightarrow (y_1, \dots, y_r) \\ \bigoplus_{i=1}^r T_i^{n_k} S_i^{n_k} (y_1, \dots, y_r) &\rightarrow (y_1, \dots, y_r) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

It follows by equation (12), that condition (3) of 2.7 holds. By 2.7,  $\bigoplus_{i=1}^r T_i$  is  $r$ -bitransitive.  $\square$

## Conclusion

We define new classes of operators on Banach spaces which are called  $k$ -bitransitive operators and compound operators. We create some criteria for them, and we extend the Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion for topologically mixing operators to compound operators. We use these operators to show that the direct sum of  $k$ -diskcyclic operators is  $k$ -bitransitive for some special cases. However, it seems

that the 1 remains open. Therefore, one may answer a special case of that question, that is, when all  $k$  diskcyclic operators are identical. Particularly.

*If  $T$  is a diskcyclic operator. What about the  $k$ -fold direct sum of  $T$ ?*

## References

- [1] E. Akin, E. Glasner, W. Huang, S. Shao, and X. Ye, Sufficient conditions under which a transitive system is chaotic, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* 30 (2010), no. 5, 1277-1310.
- [2] N. Bamerni, A. Kılıçman, M.S.M. Noorani, *A review of some works in the theory of diskcyclic operators*. *Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc.* doi:10.1007/s40840-015-0137-x.
- [3] N. Bamerni, A. Kılıçman, *Operators with Diskcyclic Vectors Subspaces*, *JTUSCI.*, **9** (2015), 414–419.
- [4] F. Bayart, É. Matheron, *Dynamics of Linear Operators*, Cambridge University Press 2009.
- [5] J. P. Bés and A. Peris. Hereditarily hypercyclic operators. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 167:94-112, 1999.
- [6] G. Costakis and M. Sambarino, Topologically mixing operators, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 132(2003), 385-389
- [7] R.M. Gethner and J. H. Shapiro, *Universal vectors for operators on spaces of holomorphic functions*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **100** (1987), 281–288.
- [8] G. Godefroy and J.H. Shapiro, Operators with dense, invariant, cyclic vector manifolds, *J. Funct. Anal.* 98 (1991), 229-269.
- [9] K.G. Grosse-Erdmann, A. Peris, *Linear Chaos*, Universitext, Springer, 2011.
- [10] D.A. Herrero, Hypercyclic operators and chaos, *J. Operator Theory* 28 (1992),93-103.
- [11] C. Kitai, *Invariant Closed Sets for Linear Operators*, Thesis, University of Toronto, 1982.
- [12] Z. J. Zeana, *Cyclic Phenomena of operators on Hilbert space*; Thesis, University of Baghdad, 2002.