

Cesàro Operators on Rooted Directed Trees

Mankunikuzhiyil Abhinand, Sameer Chavan, Sophiya S. Dharan,
and Thankarajan Prasad

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we introduce and investigate the notion of the Cesàro operator $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ on a rooted directed tree \mathcal{T} . When \mathcal{T} is the rooted tree with no branching vertex, then $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ is unitarily equivalent to the classical Cesàro operator C_0 on the sequence space $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$. We prove that for every narrow rooted directed tree \mathcal{T} , $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ is bounded, with norm bounded above by twice the width of \mathcal{T} . When the tree is not narrow, this boundedness result no longer holds. Beyond several spectral properties, assuming \mathcal{T} is leafless and narrow, we show that $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ is subnormal if and only if \mathcal{T} is isomorphic to the rooted directed tree without any branching vertex. In particular, this demonstrates that the verbatim analogue of Kriete-Trutt theorem fails in the context of Cesàro operators on rooted directed trees. Nonetheless, under the same hypotheses, $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ is always a compact perturbation of a subnormal operator.

1. Introduction

As mentioned in [20], there has been renewed interest in the classical Cesàro operator C_0 first explored in [13] and systematically studied in [3] (for its generalizations as of late, see [10, 15, 18, 19]). The purpose of this paper is to discuss yet another generalization of C_0 , which is equally motivated by some recent developments in the graph-theoretic operator theory (see [4, 5, 7, 14]).

Let $\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{Z}_+, \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}$ and \mathbb{C} denote the set of all positive integers, non-negative integers, integers, real numbers and complex numbers, respectively. For a set X , $\text{card}(X)$ denotes the cardinality of X . For $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ and $r > 0$, let $\mathbb{D}_r(\lambda_0)$ denote the open disc $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : |\lambda - \lambda_0| < r\}$. Let \mathcal{H} be a complex Hilbert space and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ denote the C^* -algebra of all bounded linear operators on \mathcal{H} . For a nonempty subset M of \mathcal{H} , let $\text{span } M$ and $\bigvee M$ denote the linear span and closed linear span of M in \mathcal{H} , respectively. Let $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. The Hilbert space adjoint of T is denoted by T^* . The notation $\ker(T)$ is reserved for the kernel of T . Let $\sigma_p(T)$, $\sigma_w(T)$ and $\sigma(T)$ denote the point spectrum, Weyl spectrum and spectrum of T , respectively. Given $S \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$, we say that S is *essentially equivalent* to T if there exists a unitary operator $U : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ and compact operator $K \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $S = U^*TU + K$. For $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, let $[A, B] = AB - BA$ denote the *cross commutator* of A and B . An operator $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is called *normal* if $[T^*, T] = 0$,

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 47B37, 47B20; Secondary 47A10, 05C20.

Key words and phrases. rooted directed tree, Cesàro operator, subnormal operator, spectrum.

essentially normal if $[T^*, T]$ is a compact operator, and *hyponormal* if $[T^*, T] \geq 0$. An operator $S \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is said to be *subnormal* if there exist a Hilbert space \mathcal{K} containing \mathcal{H} (an isometric embedding) and a normal operator $N \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ such that $Nh = Sh$ for every $h \in \mathcal{H}$. Any subnormal operator on a finite dimensional Hilbert space is normal. The reader is referred to [9] for the basic properties of subnormal and related operators. It is important to note that, in an infinite-dimensional separable Hilbert space, the class of essentially normal operators and the class of operators that are essentially equivalent to subnormal ones do not contain one another (see [6, Corollaries 1.5.3 & 5.2.3]).

Let $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ denote the complex Hilbert space of all square-summable complex sequences on \mathbb{N} . The *Cesáro operator* C_0 is formally defined by

$$C_0(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots) := \left(x_1, \frac{x_1 + x_2}{2}, \frac{x_1 + x_2 + x_3}{3}, \dots\right). \quad (1)$$

It turns out that C_0 extends as a bounded linear operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$. Indeed, we have the following (the reader is referred to [20] for a survey of the various aspects of the Cesáro operator):

THEOREM 1.1. [13, Theorem 9.8.26], [3, Theorems 1-2], [16, Theorems 1 & 4 and Lemma 1]. *The Cesáro operator C_0 defines a bounded linear operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ with operator norm equal to 2. Moreover, we have the following statements:*

- (a) $\sigma_p(C_0) = \emptyset$, $\sigma(C_0) = \overline{\mathbb{D}_1(1)}$,
- (b) if $x_\lambda(0) = 1$ and $x_\lambda(n) = \prod_{j=1}^n \left(1 - \frac{1}{j\lambda}\right)$, $n \geq 1$, then

$$\ker(C_0^* - \lambda I) = \begin{cases} \text{span}\{x_\lambda\} & \text{if } \lambda \in \mathbb{D}_1(1), \\ \{0\} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

- (c) C_0 is a cyclic subnormal operator.

To introduce the notion of the Cesáro operator on a rooted directed tree, we briefly recall some terms from graph-theory (the reader is referred to [14] for more details). A *directed graph* $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ is a pair, where V is a nonempty set of *vertices* and E is a subset of $V \times V \setminus \{(v, v) : v \in V\}$ of *edges*. For a subset W of V and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we denote $\text{Chi}(W) = \bigcup_{u \in W} \{v \in V : (u, v) \in E\}$ and

$\text{Chi}^{(n)}(W) = \text{Chi}(\text{Chi}^{(n-1)}(W))$. Note that, $\text{Chi}(v) = \text{Chi}(\{v\})$ and $\text{Chi}^{(n)}(v) = \text{Chi}(\text{Chi}^{(n-1)}(\{v\}))$, where $v \in V$. Any element in the set $\text{Chi}(v)$ is called *child of* v . If there exists a unique vertex $u \in V$ such that $(u, v) \in E$, then u is called the *parent of* v and it is denoted by $\text{par}(v)$. For an integer $k \geq 1$, the k -fold composition of par with itself is denoted by par^k . We will write $\text{par}^k(u)$ only when $u \in V$ belongs to the domain of par^k . We set $\text{par}^0(v) = v$ for $v \in V$. A vertex $v \in V$ is called the *root* of \mathcal{T} if there is no $u \in V$ such that $(u, v) \in E$. Let $\text{Root}(\mathcal{T})$ denote the collection of all roots of \mathcal{T} . Set $V^\circ := V \setminus \text{Root}(\mathcal{T})$. A *directed tree* is a connected directed graph $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ without circuits and each vertex $v \in V^\circ$ has a parent. It turns out that a rooted directed tree has a unique root (see [14, p. 10]). A directed tree \mathcal{T} is called *rooted* if it has a root. A directed tree $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ is called *locally finite* if $\text{card}(\text{Chi}(u))$ is finite for all $u \in V$. A *leafless* directed tree is a directed tree in which every vertex has atleast one child. A rooted directed tree is *narrow* if there exists a positive integer m such that

$$\text{card}(\text{Chi}^{(n)}(\text{root})) \leq m, \quad n \geq 0. \quad (2)$$

The smallest positive integer m , to be denoted by $\text{width}(\mathcal{T})$, satisfying (2) will be referred to as the *width* of \mathcal{T} .

Let $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ be a rooted directed tree with root root . Then

$$V = \bigsqcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \text{Chi}^{(n)}(\text{root}) \text{ (disjoint union)} \quad (3)$$

(see [14, Proposition 2.1.2]). For each $u \in V$, let $\text{dep}(u)$ denote the unique non-negative integer such that $u \in \text{Chi}^{(\text{dep}(u))}(\text{root})$. We refer to $\text{dep}(u)$ as the *depth* of u . Note that for any $u \in V$, $\text{par}^j(u)$ is defined for $j = 0, \dots, \text{dep}(u)$. For a rooted directed tree $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$, let $V_{\prec} = \{u \in V : \text{card}(\text{Chi}(u)) \geq 2\}$ denote the set of all *branching vertices*. The *branching index* of \mathcal{T} , denoted by $k_{\mathcal{T}}$, is defined by

$$k_{\mathcal{T}} = \begin{cases} 1 + \sup\{\text{dep}(w) : w \in V_{\prec}\} & \text{if } V_{\prec} \text{ is nonempty,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

A subtree $\mathcal{P} = (V_{\mathcal{P}}, E_{\mathcal{P}})$ of $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ is called a *path* if $\text{root} \in V_{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\text{card}(\text{Chi}_{\mathcal{P}}(v)) = 1$ for all $v \in V_{\mathcal{P}}$, where $\text{Chi}_{\mathcal{P}}(v)$ denotes the child of v with respect to the subtree \mathcal{P} .

REMARK 1.2. Let $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ be a narrow rooted directed tree. Then

- (1) Since $\text{Chi}^{(j)}(w) \subseteq \text{Chi}^{(j+\text{dep}(w))}(\text{root})$ for any integer $j \geq 0$,

$$\sup_{j \geq 0} \text{card}(\text{Chi}^{(j)}(w)) < \infty, \quad w \in V.$$

- (2) \mathcal{T} is locally finite, and if in addition \mathcal{T} is leafless, then \mathcal{T} is of finite branching index. For an example of narrow rooted directed tree, which is not of finite branching index, see Figure 1.




FIGURE 1. A narrow tree $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$, which is not of finite branching index

All the directed trees in this paper are rooted and countably infinite.

For a nonempty set X , let $\ell^2(X)$ denote the Hilbert space of all square summable complex functions on X with the standard inner product

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \sum_{x \in X} f(x) \overline{g(x)}, \quad f, g \in \ell^2(X).$$

For each $x \in X$, consider the function $e_x : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined by

$$e_x(y) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } y = x, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that the set $\{e_x : x \in X\}$ forms an orthonormal basis for $\ell^2(X)$. By the *support* of $f \in \ell^2(X)$, we understand the subset $\{x \in X : f(x) \neq 0\}$ of X .

DEFINITION 1.3. Let $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ be a directed tree. We define the linear operator $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ in $\ell^2(V)$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}(C_{\mathcal{T}}) &:= \{f \in \ell^2(V) : C_{\mathcal{T}}f \in \ell^2(V)\}, \\ C_{\mathcal{T}}f &:= \Lambda_{\mathcal{T}}f, \quad f \in \mathcal{D}(C_{\mathcal{T}}),\end{aligned}\tag{5}$$

where $\Lambda_{\mathcal{T}}$ is the mapping on the functions $f : V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ given by

$$(\Lambda_{\mathcal{T}}f)(v) = \frac{1}{\text{dep}(v) + 1} \sum_{j=0}^{\text{dep}(v)} f(\text{par}^j(v)), \quad v \in V.$$

The operator $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ will be called the *Cesáro operator* on the directed tree \mathcal{T} .

REMARK 1.4. Since the convergence in $\ell^2(V)$ yields the pointwise convergence, $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ is a closed linear operator. If $e_w \in \mathcal{D}(C_{\mathcal{T}})$, then

$$\begin{aligned}C_{\mathcal{T}}e_w &= \sum_{v \in V} \frac{1}{\text{dep}(v) + 1} \sum_{j=0}^{\text{dep}(v)} e_w(\text{par}^j(v))e_v \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\text{dep}(w) + j + 1} \sum_{v \in \text{Chi}^{(j)}(w)} e_v, \quad w \in V.\end{aligned}\tag{6}$$

Thus, for $w \in V$, $e_w \in \mathcal{D}(C_{\mathcal{T}})$ if and only if

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{\text{card}(\text{Chi}^{(j)}(w))}{(\text{dep}(w) + j + 1)^2} < \infty.\tag{7}$$

Thus, if \mathcal{T} is a narrow directed tree, then by Remark 1.2(1), $e_w \in \mathcal{D}(C_{\mathcal{T}})$.

Assume that $e_w \in \mathcal{D}(C_{\mathcal{T}})$ for every $w \in V$. Then $\mathcal{D}(C_{\mathcal{T}})$ contains the linear span of $\{e_v : v \in V\}$, and hence $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ is a densely defined linear operator. Since

$$\begin{aligned}\langle C_{\mathcal{T}}f, e_w \rangle &= \frac{1}{\text{dep}(w) + 1} \sum_{j=0}^{\text{dep}(w)} f(\text{par}^j(w)) \\ &= \left\langle f, \frac{1}{\text{dep}(w) + 1} \sum_{j=0}^{\text{dep}(w)} e_{\text{par}^j(w)} \right\rangle, \quad f \in \mathcal{D}(C_{\mathcal{T}}),\end{aligned}$$

we may conclude that $e_w \in \mathcal{D}(C_{\mathcal{T}}^*)$ and

$$C_{\mathcal{T}}^*e_w = \frac{1}{\text{dep}(w) + 1} \sum_{j=0}^{\text{dep}(w)} e_{\text{par}^j(w)}.\tag{8}$$

This shows that $C_{\mathcal{T}}^*e_{\text{root}} = e_{\text{root}}$, and consequently, $1 \in \sigma_p(C_{\mathcal{T}}^*)$.

If \mathcal{T} is the rooted tree with no branching vertex, then $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ is unitarily equivalent to the classical Cesáro operator C_0 on the sequence space $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$.

EXAMPLE 1.5. Consider the directed tree \mathcal{T}_1 with the set of vertices $V := \mathbb{N}$ and $\text{root} = 1$. We further require that $\text{Chi}(n) = \{n + 1\}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that $\text{Chi}^{(j)}(n) = \{n + j\}$ for $n, j \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\text{dep}(n) = n - 1$ and $\text{par}^j(n) = n - j$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \leq j \leq n$, it follows that for any $f \in \mathcal{D}(C_{\mathcal{T}_1})$,

$$(C_{\mathcal{T}_1}f)(n) = \frac{1}{\text{dep}(n) + 1} \sum_{j=0}^{\text{dep}(n)} f(\text{par}^j(n)) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n f(j).$$

It turns out that $C_{\mathcal{T}_1}$ extends as a bounded linear operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$. Indeed, $C_{\mathcal{T}_1}$ is unitarily equivalent to the Cesàro operator C_0 (see (1)). ■

As in the classical case (see Example 1.5), $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ extends as a bounded linear operator on $\ell^2(V)$ provided $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ is a narrow rooted directed tree. Moreover, the following main result of this paper provides a variant of Theorem 1.1.

THEOREM 1.6. *Let $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ be a narrow rooted directed tree. Then the Cesàro operator $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ defines a bounded linear operator on $\ell^2(V)$ satisfying*

$$2 \leq \|C_{\mathcal{T}}\| \leq 2\sqrt{\text{width}(\mathcal{T})}. \quad (9)$$

Moreover, we have

- (a) $\sigma_p(C_{\mathcal{T}}) = \emptyset$ if and only if \mathcal{T} is leafless,
- (b) any $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}_1(1)$ is an eigenvalue of $C_{\mathcal{T}}^*$, and if \mathcal{T} has at least two paths, then $\dim \ker(C_{\mathcal{T}}^* - \lambda I) \geq 2$ for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}_1(1) \setminus \{1\}$.

Furthermore, if \mathcal{T} is a leafless rooted directed tree, then

- (c) $\sigma(C_{\mathcal{T}}) = \overline{\mathbb{D}_1(1)}$,
- (d) $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ is subnormal if and only if \mathcal{T} is isomorphic to the directed tree \mathcal{T}_1 ,
- (e) $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ is essentially equivalent to a subnormal operator.

In general, the norm of the Cesàro operator $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ could be bigger than 2 (see Example 3.1). Also, the assumption that \mathcal{T} is narrow can not be dropped (see Example 3.2). Parts (a) and (c) are consistent with the classical case (see Theorem 1.1(a)). Part (b) shows that when \mathcal{T} has a branching vertex, the eigenvalues of $C_{\mathcal{T}}^*$, except 1, are no longer simple. Also, as shown in part (d), except for the directed tree \mathcal{T} without branching vertices, subnormality of $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ fails rather suprisingly. Nevertheless, the part (e) ensures essential subnormality of $C_{\mathcal{T}}$.

Our proof of Theorem 1.6 is fairly long and hinges crucially on Theorem 1.1. It comprises several intermediate results (see Lemmata 2.1–2.6) and will be given in Section 2. In Section 3, we present two examples and discuss several natural problems that emerge along the way.

2. Boundedness, spectral properties and subnormality

We begin with the boundedness of the Cesàro operator in case of narrow directed trees.

LEMMA 2.1. *If $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ is a narrow rooted directed tree, then $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ is a bounded linear operator satisfying $\|C_{\mathcal{T}}\| \leq 2\sqrt{\text{width}(\mathcal{T})}$.*

PROOF. Assume that \mathcal{T} is a narrow rooted directed tree. We first note that

$$\|f\|^2 = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|f \cdot \chi_{\text{Chi}^{(n)}(\text{root})}\|^2, \quad f \in \ell^2(V). \quad (10)$$

This is a consequence of (3). Assume now that \mathcal{T} is a narrow rooted directed tree. For an integer n , let l_n denote the cardinality of $\text{Chi}^{(n)}(\text{root})$. Since \mathcal{T} is locally

finite, $l_n < \infty$ for all integers $n \geq 0$. Let $f \in \ell^2(V)$, and note that

$$\begin{aligned} (C_{\mathcal{T}}f) \cdot \chi_{\text{Chi}^{(n)}(\text{root})} &= \sum_{v \in \text{Chi}^{(n)}(\text{root})} \left(\frac{1}{\text{dep}(v) + 1} \sum_{j=0}^{\text{dep}(v)} f(\text{par}^j(v)) \right) e_v \\ &= \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{v \in \text{Chi}^{(n)}(\text{root})} \left(\sum_{j=0}^n f(\text{par}^j(v)) \right) e_v \\ &= \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{j=0}^n \left(\sum_{v \in \text{Chi}^{(n)}(\text{root})} f(\text{par}^j(v)) e_v \right). \end{aligned}$$

This combined with $|f(w)| \leq \|f \cdot \chi_{\text{Chi}^{(n)}(\text{root})}\|$, $w \in \text{Chi}^{(n)}(\text{root})$, implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(C_{\mathcal{T}}f) \cdot \chi_{\text{Chi}^{(n)}(\text{root})}\| &\leq \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{j=0}^n \left\| \sum_{v \in \text{Chi}^{(n)}(\text{root})} f(\text{par}^j(v)) e_v \right\| \\ &= \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{j=0}^n \left(\sum_{v \in \text{Chi}^{(n)}(\text{root})} |f(\text{par}^j(v))|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{l_n}}{n+1} \sum_{j=0}^n \|f \cdot \chi_{\text{Chi}^{(n-j)}(\text{root})}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Since \mathcal{T} is a narrow tree, this yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|C_{\mathcal{T}}f\|^2 &\stackrel{(10)}{=} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|(C_{\mathcal{T}}f) \cdot \chi_{\text{Chi}^{(n)}(\text{root})}\|^2 \\ &\leq \left(\sup_{k \geq 0} l_k \right) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{j=0}^n \|f \cdot \chi_{\text{Chi}^{(j)}(\text{root})}\| \right)^2 \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{\leq} 4 \text{width}(\mathcal{T}) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|f \cdot \chi_{\text{Chi}^{(n)}(\text{root})}\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(10)}{=} 4 \text{width}(\mathcal{T}) \|f\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality in $(*)$ follows from Hardy's inequality (see [12]): *If $\{a_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is a sequence of non-negative real numbers, then*

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{j=0}^n a_j \right)^2 \leq 4 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n^2.$$

Since $f \in \ell^2(V)$ is arbitrary, this completes the proof. \square

We show below that $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ has no eigenvalues unless \mathcal{T} has a leaf.

LEMMA 2.2. *Let $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ be a locally finite rooted directed tree. Then $\sigma_p(C_{\mathcal{T}}) = \emptyset$ if and only if \mathcal{T} is leafless.*

PROOF. Assume that \mathcal{T} is leafless. Suppose for some $f \in \ell^2(V)$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, $C_{\mathcal{T}}f = \lambda f$. Let $v \in V$ be a vertex of smallest depth for which $f(v) \neq 0$. It follows

from (5) that

$$\lambda f(v) = \frac{1}{\text{dep}(v) + 1} \sum_{j=0}^{\text{dep}(v)} f(\text{par}^j v) = \frac{1}{\text{dep}(v) + 1} f(v).$$

As a consequence, $\lambda = \frac{1}{\text{dep}(v) + 1}$. Let $v_1 \in \text{Chi}(v)$. Once again by (5),

$$\lambda f(v_1) = \frac{1}{\text{dep}(v_1) + 1} \sum_{j=0}^{\text{dep}(v_1)} f(\text{par}^j(v_1)) = \frac{1}{\text{dep}(v_1) + 1} (f(v_1) + f(v)).$$

However, since $\lambda = \frac{1}{\text{dep}(v) + 1}$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\text{dep}(v) + 1} f(v_1) = \frac{1}{\text{dep}(v) + 2} (f(v_1) + f(v)).$$

This shows that $f(v_1) \neq 0$ and $f(v_1) = f(v)(\text{dep}(v) + 1)$. In view of

$$\frac{k + n + 1}{k + 1} \binom{k + n}{n} = \binom{k + n + 1}{n}, \quad k \geq 0, n \geq 1,$$

a mathematical induction on n yields a sequence $\{v_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ such that $v_n \in \text{Chi}^{(n)}(v)$ and $f(v_n) = f(v) \binom{\text{dep}(v) + n}{n}$. However, since $f \in \ell^2(V)$, we have $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |f(v_n)|^2 < \infty$. This is not possible unless $f(v) = 0$, which is contrary to the choice of v . Finally, if \mathcal{T} has a leaf, say, v , then $C_{\mathcal{T}} e_v = \frac{1}{\text{dep}(v) + 1} e_v$, that is, $\sigma_p(C_{\mathcal{T}}) \neq \emptyset$. \square

Let us analyze the eigenspectrum of $C_{\mathcal{T}}^*$.

LEMMA 2.3. *Let $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ be a locally finite rooted directed tree. Then $\mathbb{D}_1(1) \subseteq \sigma_p(C_{\mathcal{T}}^*)$. Moreover, if \mathcal{T} has two paths, then every $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}_1(1) \setminus \{1\}$ is not a simple eigenvalue. In particular, $\|C_{\mathcal{T}}\| \geq 2$.*

PROOF. Let $\mathcal{P} = (V_{\mathcal{P}}, E_{\mathcal{P}})$ be any path in \mathcal{T} , where $V_{\mathcal{P}} = \{v_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the vertex set of \mathcal{P} such that $v_0 = \text{root}$ and $\text{Chi}_{\mathcal{P}}(v_n) = \{v_{n+1}\}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows from (8) that $C_{\mathcal{T}}^*(\ell^2(V_{\mathcal{P}})) \subseteq \ell^2(V_{\mathcal{P}})$. Define the unitary transformation $U : \ell^2(V_{\mathcal{P}}) \rightarrow \ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ by setting

$$U e_{v_n} = e_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (11)$$

Note that by (8), for $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$U C_{\mathcal{T}}^* e_{v_n} = \frac{1}{\text{dep}(v_n) + 1} \sum_{j=0}^{\text{dep}(v_n)} U e_{\text{par}^j(v_n)} = \frac{1}{n + 1} \sum_{j=0}^n e_j = C_0^* e_n = C_0^* U e_{v_n}.$$

It follows that

$$U C_{\mathcal{T}}^*|_{\ell^2(V_{\mathcal{P}})} = C_0^* U. \quad (12)$$

Since every $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}_1(1)$ is an eigenvalue of C_0^* (see Theorem 1.1(b)), λ is also an eigenvalue of $C_{\mathcal{T}}^*|_{\ell^2(V_{\mathcal{P}})}$. The inclusion $\sigma_p(C_{\mathcal{T}}^*|_{\ell^2(V_{\mathcal{P}})}) \subseteq \sigma_p(C_{\mathcal{T}}^*)$ now yields the first part.

Assume that \mathcal{T} has two paths and let $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}_1(1) \setminus \{1\}$. Note that the eigenvector of C_0^* corresponding to the eigenvalue λ does not have finite support (see Theorem 1.1(b)). By (11) and (12), the eigenvector of $C_{\mathcal{T}}^*$ corresponding to the eigenvalue λ does not have finite support. Also, any two paths in \mathcal{T} can have at most finitely many common vertices (since if v belongs to the intersection of any two paths, then so does $\text{par}^j(v)$ for any $0 \leq j \leq \text{dep}(v)$). Combining these facts,

we may conclude that there are at least two linearly independent eigenvectors corresponding to λ . This together with the fact that operator norm is bigger than or equal to the spectral radius completes now the proof. \square

Let $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ be a locally finite rooted directed tree with root \mathbf{root} . Assume that \mathcal{T} is of finite branching index. Recall from [8, Proof of Lemma 5.3] that V decomposes as

$$V = \left(\bigsqcup_{j=0}^{k_{\mathcal{T}}-1} \text{Chi}^{(j)}(\mathbf{root}) \right) \sqcup \left(\bigsqcup_{i=1}^d \{v_{i,n} : n \geq 0\} \right), \quad (13)$$

where $d := \text{card}(\text{Chi}^{(k_{\mathcal{T}})}(\mathbf{root})) \in \mathbb{N}$, $\text{Chi}^{(k_{\mathcal{T}})}(\mathbf{root}) = \{v_{i,0} : i = 1, 2, \dots, d\}$ and $\text{Chi}(v_{i,n}) = \{v_{i,n+1}\}$ for all integers $n \geq 0$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$.

We now use (13) to see that the Cesàro operator $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ is a compact perturbation of a finite direct sum of the classical Cesàro operator C_0 provided the rooted directed tree \mathcal{T} is locally finite and of finite branching index.

LEMMA 2.4. *Let $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ be a locally finite rooted directed tree with root \mathbf{root} . Assume that \mathcal{T} is of finite branching index $k_{\mathcal{T}}$ and let $d := \text{card}(\text{Chi}^{(k_{\mathcal{T}})}(\mathbf{root})) < \infty$. Then $\ell^2(V)$ decomposes as*

$$\ell^2(V) = \mathcal{M} \oplus \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{H}_d, \quad (14)$$

where $\mathcal{M} = \bigvee \{e_v : v \in \bigsqcup_{j=0}^{k_{\mathcal{T}}-1} \text{Chi}^{(j)}(\mathbf{root})\}$ is a finite dimensional subspace of $\ell^2(V)$ and $\mathcal{H}_i = \bigvee \{e_{v_{i,n}} : n \geq 0\}$, $i = 1, \dots, d$ (see (13)). Moreover, with respect to the decomposition (14), $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ decomposes as

$$C_{\mathcal{T}} = \begin{bmatrix} T & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ A_1 & B_1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A_d & 0 & \dots & B_d \end{bmatrix}, \quad (15)$$

where $B_i : \mathcal{H}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_i$ is essentially equivalent to C_0 , $T : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ and $A_i : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_i$ are bounded linear finite rank operators.

PROOF. The decomposition (14) is clear from (13). Since $\text{Chi}(v_{i,n}) = \{v_{i,n+1}\}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, by (6),

$$C_{\mathcal{T}}(\text{span} \{e_{v_{i,n}} : n \geq 0\}) \subseteq \text{span} \{e_{v_{i,n}} : n \geq 0\}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, d.$$

We claim that the restriction B_i of $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ to $\text{span} \{e_{v_{i,n}} : n \geq 0\}$ extends as a bounded linear operator on \mathcal{H}_i and this extension is essentially equivalent to C_0 . To see that, fix $i = 1, \dots, d$, and consider the unitary transformation $U_i : \mathcal{H}_i \rightarrow \ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ mapping $e_{v_{i,n}}$ to n th basis vector e_n in the standard basis of $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that by (6), for $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} U_i B_i e_{v_{i,n}} &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\text{dep}(v_{i,n}) + j + 1} \sum_{v \in \text{Chi}^{(j)}(v_{i,n})} U_i e_v \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k_{\mathcal{T}} + n + j + 1} e_{n+j}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by (1), $C_0 e_n = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n+j+1} e_{n+j}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows that

$$(C_0 - U_i B_i U_i^*) e_n = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{k_{\mathcal{T}}}{(k_{\mathcal{T}} + n + j + 1)(n + j + 1)} e_{n+j}.$$

Thus $C_0 - U_i B_i U_i^*$ has the matrix representation $\mathfrak{A} := (\mathfrak{a}_{m,n})_{m,n \geq 0}$ with

$$\mathfrak{a}_{m,n} = \begin{cases} \frac{k_{\mathcal{T}}}{(k_{\mathcal{T}} + m + 1)(m + 1)}, & \text{if } m \geq n, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that $\delta(m) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathfrak{a}_{m,n}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, is a bounded sequence and $\gamma(n) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \mathfrak{a}_{m,n}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is a null sequence. It now follows from [17, Examples V.17.4] that \mathfrak{A} is a compact operator. This also shows that B_i extends to the bounded linear operator $U_i^*(C_0 - \mathfrak{A})U_i$. Moreover, since \mathcal{M} is finite dimensional, T and A_i , $i = 1, \dots, d$, are finite rank (bounded) linear operators. This gives the decomposition (15) of $C_{\mathcal{T}}$. This completes the proof. \square

As an application of Lemma 2.3, we see that the closed unit disc centered at 1 is contained in the spectrum of the Cesàro operator. It turns out that actually equality holds.

LEMMA 2.5. *Let $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ be a leafless, locally finite rooted directed tree of finite branching index. Then $\sigma(C_{\mathcal{T}}) = \overline{\mathbb{D}_1(1)}$.*

PROOF. By assumption, $d := \text{card}(\text{Chi}^{(k_{\mathcal{T}})}(\text{root})) < \infty$. Hence, by Lemma 2.4, $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ is essentially equivalent to d -fold direct sum $C_0^{(d)}$ of C_0 . Since Weyl spectrum is invariant under compact perturbation, we have,

$$\sigma_w(C_{\mathcal{T}}) = \sigma_w(C_0^{(d)}). \quad (16)$$

Since C_0 is hyponormal and $\sigma_p(C_0) = \emptyset$ (see parts (a) and (c) of Theorem 1.1), by [2, Corollary 5.6] (or [9, Proposition II.4.11]), $\sigma(C_0^{(d)}) = \sigma_w(C_0^{(d)})$. Hence, by Theorem 1.1(a), $\sigma(C_0^{(d)}) = \sigma(C_0) = \overline{\mathbb{D}_1(1)}$. This combined with (16) shows that $\sigma_w(C_{\mathcal{T}}) = \overline{\mathbb{D}_1(1)}$. However, since $\sigma_p(C_{\mathcal{T}}) = \emptyset$ (see Lemma 2.2), by [2, Proposition 2.10], $\sigma(C_{\mathcal{T}}) = \sigma_w(C_{\mathcal{T}}) = \overline{\mathbb{D}_1(1)}$. This yields the first part. \square

The proof above shows that $\sigma_w(C_{\mathcal{T}}) = \overline{\mathbb{D}_1(1)}$. The same conclusion holds for the essential spectrum. It turns out except the classical case, there are no subnormal Cesàro operators.

LEMMA 2.6. *Let $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ be a locally finite rooted directed tree of finite branching index. If the Cesàro operator $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ is hyponormal, then \mathcal{T} is isomorphic to the directed tree \mathcal{T}_1 .*

PROOF. Suppose that \mathcal{T} is not isomorphic to \mathcal{N} . This together with (4) implies that there exists a vertex $u \in V_{<}$ such that $\text{dep}(u) + 1 = k_{\mathcal{T}}$. For $i = 1, 2$, choose distinct vertices $v_i \in \text{Chi}(u)$ such that $\text{dep}(v_i) = k_{\mathcal{T}}$. It follows that $\text{Chi}^{(j)}(v_i) = \{v_{i,j}\}$ for some vertices $v_{i,j} \in V$, $i = 1, 2$, $j \geq 0$. By (6) and (8),

$$C_{\mathcal{T}} e_{v_i} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k_{\mathcal{T}} + j + 1} e_{v_{i,j}}, \quad C_{\mathcal{T}}^* e_{v_i} = \frac{1}{k_{\mathcal{T}} + 1} \sum_{j=0}^{k_{\mathcal{T}}} e_{\text{par}^j(v_i)}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

It follows that for $f = e_{v_1} + e_{v_2}$,

$$\|C_{\mathcal{T}}f\|^2 = 2 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(k_{\mathcal{T}} + j + 1)^2}, \quad \|C_{\mathcal{T}}^*f\|^2 = \frac{2}{(k_{\mathcal{T}} + 1)^2} + \frac{4k_{\mathcal{T}}}{(k_{\mathcal{T}} + 1)^2}.$$

Consequently,

$$\|C_{\mathcal{T}}f\|^2 - \|C_{\mathcal{T}}^*f\|^2 = 2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(k_{\mathcal{T}} + j + 1)^2} - \frac{4k_{\mathcal{T}}}{(k_{\mathcal{T}} + 1)^2}. \quad (17)$$

Now, we consider two cases. If $k_{\mathcal{T}} = 1$, then we have

$$\|Cf\|^2 - \|C^*f\|^2 = 2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(j+2)^2} - 1 = \frac{\pi^2}{3} - \frac{7}{2} \approx -0.2101,$$

which clearly shows that $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ is not hyponormal in this case. We may now assume that $k_{\mathcal{T}} > 1$. By the integral test (see [1, Theorem 9.2.6]),

$$\sum_{j=k_{\mathcal{T}}+2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j^2} \leq \int_{k_{\mathcal{T}}+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{x^2} dx = \frac{1}{k_{\mathcal{T}}+1},$$

and hence by (17),

$$\|C_{\mathcal{T}}f\|^2 - \|C_{\mathcal{T}}^*f\|^2 \leq \frac{2}{k_{\mathcal{T}}+1} \left(1 - \frac{2k_{\mathcal{T}}}{k_{\mathcal{T}}+1}\right) = 2 \left(\frac{1-k_{\mathcal{T}}}{(k_{\mathcal{T}}+1)^2}\right) < 0.$$

This shows that $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ is not hyponormal in this case also. \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 1.6. The boundedness of $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ and the estimates (9) follow from Lemmata 2.1&2.3. The part (a) follows from Lemma 2.2. The part (b) is precisely stated in Lemma 2.3. To see the remaining parts, note that if \mathcal{T} is a leafless narrow rooted directed tree, then by Remark 1.2(2), \mathcal{T} is of finite branching index. Parts (c)-(e) are now consequences of Lemmata 2.5&2.6 and Theorem 1.1(c). \square

We conclude this section with a generalization of [11, Main Theorem].

COROLLARY 2.7. *Let $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ be a locally finite rooted directed tree of finite branching index. Then $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ is essentially normal.*

PROOF. By Lemma 2.4,

$$C_{\mathcal{T}} \text{ is essentially equivalent to the } d\text{-fold direct sum } C_0^{(d)} \text{ of } C_0, \quad (18)$$

where $d := \text{card}(\text{Chi}^{(k_{\mathcal{T}})}(\text{root})) \in \mathbb{N}$. Since C_0 is a cyclic subnormal operator (see Theorem 1.1(c)), by the Berger-Shaw theorem (see [9, Theorem IV.2.1]), $[C_0^*, C_0]$ is a trace-class operator. One may now apply (18) and use the fact that a trace-class operator is compact. \square

3. Two examples and concluding remarks

In this short section, we show with the help of an example that there exists a locally finite rooted directed tree \mathcal{T} of finite branching index such that the Cesàro operator $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ has norm as big as one may wish.

EXAMPLE 3.1. For a positive integer $k \geq 2$, consider now the directed tree \mathcal{T}_k with set of vertices

$$V := \{(0,0)\} \cup \{(1,j), \dots, (k,j), : j \geq 1\}$$

and $\text{root} = (0,0)$. We further require that $\text{Chi}(0,0) = \{(1,1), \dots, (k,1)\}$ and

$$\text{Chi}(i,j) = \{(i,j+1)\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \quad j \geq 1.$$

Since $\text{dep}(i,j) = j$ and $\text{par}^l(i,j) = (i,j-l)$ for $i = 1, \dots, k, j \geq 1$ and $0 \leq l \leq j$, it follows that for any $f \in \mathcal{D}(C_{\mathcal{T}_k})$,

$$(C_{\mathcal{T}_k} f)(0,0) = f(0,0),$$

$$(C_{\mathcal{T}_k} f)(i,j) = \frac{1}{j+1} \left(f(0,0) + \sum_{k=1}^j f(i,k) \right), \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \quad j \geq 1.$$

It is worth comparing the matrix representations of $C_{\mathcal{T}_1}$ (see Example 1.5) with that of $C_{\mathcal{T}_2}$ (with respect to the ordered basis $\{e_{(0,0)}, e_{(1,1)}, e_{(2,1)}, e_{(1,2)}, e_{(2,2)}, \dots\}$):

$$C_{\mathcal{T}_1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & 0 & \cdots \\ \frac{1}{5} & \frac{1}{5} & \frac{1}{5} & \frac{1}{5} & \frac{1}{5} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}, \quad C_{\mathcal{T}_2} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & 0 & \frac{1}{3} & 0 & \cdots \\ \frac{1}{3} & 0 & \frac{1}{3} & 0 & \frac{1}{3} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}.$$

An inspection of these matrices suggests that although both these matrices have the same set of entries, in the latter case, each branch of the directed tree replicates a row from $C_{\mathcal{T}_1}$ more than once with “additional” zeros with a particular pattern (cf. [18, Eq. (2.5)]).

To estimate the norm of $C_{\mathcal{T}_k}$, note that by (6),

$$C_{\mathcal{T}_k}(e_{(0,0)}) = e_{(0,0)} + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j+1} \sum_{i=1}^k e_{(i,j)},$$

and hence

$$\|C_{\mathcal{T}_k}(e_{(0,0)})\|^2 = 1 + k \left(\frac{\pi^2}{6} - 1 \right).$$

In particular, unlike the case of $C_{\mathcal{T}_1}$ (see Theorem 1.1), we have $\|C_{\mathcal{T}_k}\| > 2$ provided $k \geq 5$. Since the spectral radius of $C_{\mathcal{T}_k}$ is always 2 (see Lemma 2.5), $C_{\mathcal{T}_k}$ is not normaloid for $k \geq 5$. \blacksquare

A careful examination of Example 3.1 shows that for any locally finite rooted directed tree \mathcal{T} of finite branching index, the norm of the Cesàro operator $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ satisfies

$$\|C_{\mathcal{T}}\| \geq \sup_{w \in V_{\prec}} \text{card}(\text{Chi}(w)) \left(\sum_{j=\text{dep}(w)+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

It would be interesting to find a handy formula for the norm of $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ for a locally finite rooted directed tree \mathcal{T} of finite branching index. When $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ is normaloid? Another unanswered question is whether the point spectrum of $C_{\mathcal{T}}^*$ contains any point from the complement of $\mathbb{D}_1(1)$?

The following example shows that the assumption that \mathcal{T} is a narrow directed tree can not be relaxed.




FIGURE 2. A rooted directed tree which is not narrow

EXAMPLE 3.2. Let $V = \{v_n : n \in \mathbb{Z}_+\} \cup \{w_{n,j} : n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq n\}$. Consider the rooted directed tree $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$, where E is governed by

$$\text{Chi}(v_0) = \{v_1\}, \quad \text{Chi}(v_n) = \{v_{n+1}\} \cup \{w_{n,j} : n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq n\}, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}$$

(see Figure 2). For $f \in \ell^2(V)$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, let $K_n = \sum_{j=0}^n f(v_j)$. Observe that for $1 \leq j \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned} (C_{\mathcal{T}}f)(w_{n,j}) &= \frac{1}{\text{depth}(w_{n,j}) + 1} \sum_{j=0}^{\text{depth}(w_{n,j})} f(\text{par}^j(w_{n,j})) \\ &= \frac{1}{n+2} \left(f(w_{n,j}) + \sum_{j=0}^n f(v_j) \right) \\ &= \frac{f(w_{n,j}) + K_n}{n+2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we see that

$$\|C_{\mathcal{T}}f\|^2 \geq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^n \left| \frac{f(w_{n,j}) + K_n}{n+2} \right|^2. \quad (19)$$

Consider the function $f \in \ell^2(V)$ given by

$$f(v) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n} & \text{if } v = v_n, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It now follows from (19) that

$$\|C_{\mathcal{T}}f\|^2 \geq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^n \left| \frac{K_n}{n+2} \right|^2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \left| \frac{K_n}{n+2} \right|^2,$$

which is divergent. This shows that $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ is not a bounded linear operator on \mathcal{T} . ■

Let $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ be a directed tree. For $\alpha \in [0, \infty)$, set

$$M_{\alpha,j} := \frac{\text{card}(\text{Chi}^{(j)}(\text{root}))}{(j+1)^\alpha}, \quad j \geq 0,$$

and note the following:

- If $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ is a bounded linear operator, then by (7), $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} M_{2,j} = 0$.
- We have seen in Theorem 1.6 that if $\sup_{j \geq 0} M_{0,j} < \infty$, then the Cesàro operator $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ is bounded.
- In Example 3.2, we construct a rooted directed tree with $\sup_{j \geq 0} M_{1,j} < \infty$ for which $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ is unbounded.

This leads us to ask: under the assumption that there exists some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ for which $\sup_{j \geq 0} M_{\alpha,j} < \infty$, is the operator $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ on the rooted directed tree \mathcal{T} necessarily bounded?

References

- [1] R. G. Bartle, D. R. Sherbert, *Introduction to real analysis*, John Wiley and sons, New York, 2000.
- [2] S. K. Berberian, The Weyl spectrum of an operator, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **20** (1970/71), 529-544.
- [3] A. Brown, P. R. Halmos, A. L. Shields, Cesàro Operators, *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **26** (1965), 125-137.
- [4] P. Budzyński, Z. J. Jabłoński, I. B. Jung, J. Stochel, Subnormality of unbounded composition operators over one-circuit directed graphs: exotic examples, *Adv. Math.* **310** (2017), 484-556.
- [5] S. Chavan, R. Gupta, K. B. Sinha, Weighted join operators on directed trees, *Complex Anal. Oper. Theory* **17** (2023), Paper No. 36, pp 102.
- [6] S. Chavan, G. Misra, *Notes on the Brown-Douglas-Fillmore Theorem*, Cambridge-IISc Series, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2021, xi+246 pp.
- [7] S. Chavan, D. Pradhan, S. Trivedi, Multishifts on Directed Cartesian Product of Rooted Directed Trees, *Dissertationes Mathematicae*, **527** (2017), pp 102.
- [8] S. Chavan, S. Trivedi, An analytic model for left-invertible weighted shifts on directed trees, *J. London Math. Soc.*, **94** (2016), 1-27.
- [9] J. B. Conway, *The Theory of Subnormal Operators*, Math. Surveys Monogr. **36**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI 1991.
- [10] E. A. Gallardo-Gutiérrez, J. R. Partington, Insights on the Cesàro operator: shift semigroups and invariant subspaces, *J. Anal. Math.* **152** (2024), 595-614.
- [11] U. Gül, The Cesàro operator in ℓ^2 is essentially normal, preprint, 2023.
- [12] G. H. Hardy, Note on a theorem of Hilbert, *Math. Z.* **6** (1920), 314-317.
- [13] G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood, G. Pólya, *Inequalities*, Cambridge University Press, 1952.
- [14] Z. Jabłoński, I. Bong Jung, J. Stochel, Weighted shifts on directed trees, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **216** (2012), no. 1017, viii+106.
- [15] E. Kizgut, The Cesàro operator on weighted Bergman Fréchet and (LB)-spaces of analytic functions, *Filomat* **35** (2021), 4049-4060.
- [16] T. L. Kriete, III, David Trutt, The Cesàro Operator in ℓ^2 is Subnormal, *Amer. J. Math.* **93**, (1971), 215-225.
- [17] B. V. Limaye, *Functional analysis*, Second edition. New Age International Publishers Limited, New Delhi, 1996, x+612 pp.
- [18] J. Mashreghi, H. Roopaei, Factorization of infinite L -matrices, *Results Math.* **78** (2023), Paper No. 207, 14 pp.
- [19] A.-M. Persson, On the spectrum of the Cesàro operator on spaces of analytic functions, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **340** (2008), 1180-1203.
- [20] W. T. Ross, *The Cesàro operator*, Recent progress in function theory and operator theory, Contemp. Math., **799**, 185-215, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2024

INDIAN STATISTICAL INSTITUTE, STATISTICS AND MATHEMATICS UNIT, 8TH MILE, MYSORE ROAD, BANGALORE 560059, INDIA.

Email address: `abhinandmkrishnan@gmail.com`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY KANPUR, INDIA.

Email address: `chavan@iitk.ac.in`

GOVERNMENT POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE, KALAMASSERY, KERALA, INDIA.

Email address: `sophysasi@gmail.com`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT, KERALA-673635, INDIA.

Email address: `prasadvalapil@gmail.com`