

Weak disjointness of hypercyclic operators

Jian Li, Qijing Liao, and Yonghang Ruan

ABSTRACT. We study the weak disjointness of hypercyclic operators to advance the classifications of hypercyclic operators. We establish an analogue of the Weiss-Akin-Glasner Theorem from topological dynamics within the framework of linear dynamics, which gives a characterization of the weak disjointness of each class of mixing operators with respect to a given Furstenberg family. The key ingredient is the analogues of Weiss-Akin-Glasner Lemma from topological dynamics, which gives a characterization of subsets of non-negative integers which can be realized by the return time sets of mixing operators with respect to a given Furstenberg family. We also provide several examples to distinguish some classes of hypercyclic operators and end with the characterization of the weak disjointness of backward shifts on Fréchet sequence spaces.

1. INTRODUCTION

In 1967, Furstenberg introduced the concept of disjointness in topological dynamics and ergodic theory in the seminal paper [15], and characterized some certain classes of systems by their disjointness relations. Two compact dynamical systems (X, T) and (Y, S) (continuous self-maps on compact metric spaces) are said to be disjoint if $X \times Y$ is the only closed $T \times S$ -invariant subset whose coordinate projections are surjective. It is easy to see that if two transitive compact dynamical systems (X, T) and (Y, S) are disjoint, then the product system $(X \times Y, T \times S)$ is transitive. Later in 1972, Peleg introduced the concept of weak disjointness in topological dynamics in [24], which, as the name suggests, is a condition weaker than disjointness. Two compact dynamical systems (X, T) and (Y, S) are said to be weakly disjoint provided that the product system $(X \times Y, T \times S)$ is transitive.

In 2000, Weiss characterized in [26] the compact dynamical systems which are weakly disjoint from all weakly mixing systems, are exactly the syndetically transitive ones. Let \mathcal{F} be a Furstenberg family (a hereditary upward collection of subsets of non-negative integers). A topological dynamical system (X, T) is said to be \mathcal{F} -transitive provided that $N(U, V) := \{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : T^n U \cap V \neq \emptyset\} \in \mathcal{F}$ for any non-empty open subsets U, V of X ; and \mathcal{F} -mixing provided that the product system $(X \times X, T \times T)$ is \mathcal{F} -transitive. In 2001, Akin and Glasner studied in [2] the \mathcal{F} -transitivity of compact dynamical systems and provided a method to characterize the compact dynamical systems which are weakly disjoint from a prescribed class of compact dynamical systems, generalizing Weiss' result. The

Date: December 10, 2025.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 47A16; Secondary: 47B37, 37B20.

Key words and phrases. Weak disjointness, hypercyclic operators, Furstenberg families, Fréchet sequence spaces, weighted backward shifts.

key ingredient is the realization of every set in a shift-invariant thick Furstenberg family \mathcal{F} by the return time sets of \mathcal{F} -transitive compact dynamical systems. The corresponding result of the characterization of compact dynamical systems is known as the Weiss-Akin-Glasner Theorem, and the realization result is called the Weiss-Akin-Glasner Lemma, see e.g. [22] and [23]. It turns out that the notion of weak disjointness plays a significant role in the classification of transitive compact dynamical systems, see e.g. [2, 18, 22].

Furstenberg showed in [15] that the return time sets of any weakly mixing system form a filter base. By this result it is easy to see that a topological dynamical system (X, T) is weakly mixing if and only if $N(U, V)$ is thick for any non-empty open subset U and V of X , and (X, T) is \mathcal{F} -mixing if and only if it is \mathcal{F} -transitive and weakly mixing. This implies that for a thick family \mathcal{F} , the \mathcal{F} -transitivity is equivalent to the \mathcal{F} -mixing. Then the \mathcal{F} -transitive system in the Weiss-Akin-Glasner Lemma is in fact \mathcal{F} -mixing. On the other hand, the family generated by the return time sets of a non-trivial \mathcal{F} -mixing system must be a shift-invariant thick family. Therefore, the Weiss-Akin-Glasner Lemma gives a characterization of subsets of non-negative integers which can be realized by the return time sets of \mathcal{F} -mixing compact dynamical systems (see Lemma 2.12), and the Weiss-Akin-Glasner Theorem characterize the compact dynamical systems which are weakly disjoint from \mathcal{F} -mixing compact dynamical systems (see Theorem 2.13).

Linear dynamics has become an active area of research in the last decades, see the monographs [5] and [20] for the introduction of dynamics of linear operators. In particular, the study of hypercyclic operators constitutes a subject of considerable interest. A linear dynamical system (a continuous linear operator on an infinite-dimensional Fréchet space over \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C}) is said to be hypercyclic provided that the orbit of some vector is dense. Although linear dynamical systems lack compactness compared to compact dynamical systems, by different methods and techniques many conclusions in linear dynamical systems are parallel to those in compact dynamical systems.

As every linear dynamical system has a fixed point, two linear dynamical systems can never be disjoint in the sense of Furstenberg. In [7] and [9] the authors introduced the notion of disjoint hypercyclicity, which is weaker than disjointness. In [7, 9, 11, 12, 25], the authors studied the hypercyclicity of direct sums, which is in fact the weak disjointness in linear dynamics. In 1992, Herrero asked in [21], whether $T \oplus T$ is hypercyclic or not provided that T is hypercyclic. In 1995, Salas gave an affirmative answer in [25] for the case where T is a weighted backward shift on $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_0)$ or $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, and also provided two hypercyclic operators T, S on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ such that $T \oplus S$ is not hypercyclic. De la Rosa and Read [14] constructed a hypercyclic operator on a suitable Banach space such that the direct sum is not hypercyclic, while Bayart and Matheron [4] showed that this kind of operators exists on many classical Banach spaces like $\ell^p(\mathbb{N}_0)$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, $c_0(\mathbb{N}_0)$, etc. To provide more hypercyclic operators without hypercyclic direct sums, it is natural to ask: which operators are weakly disjoint from a given class of hypercyclic operators?

In [11], Bès et al. studied the \mathcal{F} -transitivity of operators. They formulated a criterion for an operator to be \mathcal{F} -transitive and characterized the \mathcal{F} -transitivity of weighted backward shifts. In [12], Cardeccia studied the hypercyclicity of the direct sum of an operator and its iterates. Cardeccia also proved that the operators which are weakly disjoint from all weakly mixing operators, are exactly the syndetically transitive ones, and that the operators which are weakly disjoint from all syndetically transitive operators, are exactly the piecewise syndetically transitive ones.

The aim of this paper is to study the weak disjointness of hypercyclic operators, advancing the classifications of hypercyclic operators. Motivated by the Weiss-Akin-Glasner Theorem from topological dynamics and Cardeccia's results for operators, we characterize the weak disjointness of more classes of operators. We first present some preliminaries in Section 2. In Section 3, we state some basic properties of weak disjointness in linear dynamics, and give sufficient conditions for \mathcal{F} -mixing operators (Theorem 3.9) and mild mixing operators (Proposition 3.15). We also illustrate some examples to show that a weak mixing operator may not be weakly disjoint from its iterates. In Section 4, as the analogues of Weiss-Akin-Glasner theorem from topological dynamics, we formulate the corresponding results (Theorem 4.3) in linear dynamics, which gives a characterization of the weak disjointness of \mathcal{F} -mixing operators. The key ingredient of the proof is the analogues of Weiss-Akin-Glasner Lemma from topological dynamics, see Lemma 4.1, which gives a characterization of subsets of non-negative integers which can be realized by the return time sets of \mathcal{F} -mixing operators. We also provide several examples of operators with some prescribed properties. In Section 5, we characterize the weak disjointness of unilateral and bilateral backward shifts on Fréchet sequence spaces, by the basis of the spaces.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we recall some basic notions and results that will be used consistently throughout the paper.

2.1. Subsets of non-negative integers. By \mathbb{N} , \mathbb{N}_0 and \mathbb{Z} , we denote respectively the set of positive integers, the set of non-negative integers, and the set of integers.

Before proceeding further, we briefly recall the relevant notations concerning a Furstenberg family (detailed discussions can be found in [1] and [16]). Let \mathcal{F} be a collection of subsets of \mathbb{N}_0 . We say that \mathcal{F} is a *Furstenberg family* (or *family* for short) provided that it is hereditary upward, that is, for any $A \in \mathcal{F}$ and $B \subset \mathbb{N}_0$ with $A \subset B$ we have $B \in \mathcal{F}$. Denote the family of all infinite subsets of \mathbb{N}_0 by \mathcal{F}_{inf} and the family of all cofinite subsets of \mathbb{N}_0 by \mathcal{F}_{cf} . For a family \mathcal{F} , we say that a collection \mathcal{F}' of subsets of \mathbb{N}_0 is a *subfamily* of \mathcal{F} if \mathcal{F}' is a family with $\mathcal{F}' \subset \mathcal{F}$.

Throughout this paper, for each Furstenberg family \mathcal{F} , we adopt the conventions that $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F} \neq \emptyset$.

For a subset F of \mathbb{Z} and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $F \pm i = \{m \pm i : m \in F\}$. We say that a family \mathcal{F} is

- *shift₊-invariant* if $F + i \in \mathcal{F}$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $F \in \mathcal{F}$;

- *shift₋-invariant* if $(F - i) \cap \mathbb{N}_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $F \in \mathcal{F}$;
- *shift-invariant* if $(F + i) \cap \mathbb{N}_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $F \in \mathcal{F}$.

Definition 2.1. Let \mathcal{F} be a family. The *dual family* \mathcal{F}^* is given by:

$$\mathcal{F}^* = \{A \subset \mathbb{N}_0 : A \cap B \neq \emptyset \text{ for all } B \in \mathcal{F}\}.$$

We say that \mathcal{F} is a *full family* if $F \cap F'$ is infinite for any $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $F' \in \mathcal{F}^*$; \mathcal{F} is a *filter* if $F_1 \cap F_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ for any $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{F}$.

Remark 2.2. The following statements can be checked easily.

- (1) A family \mathcal{F} is full if and only if $F \cap F' \in \mathcal{F}$ for any $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $F' \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{cf}}$;
- (2) each shift-invariant family is full;
- (3) for each full family \mathcal{F} , we must have $\mathcal{F}_{\text{cf}} \subset \mathcal{F}$;
- (4) a family \mathcal{F} is full if and only if \mathcal{F}^* is full.

We recall some standard families:

- \mathcal{F}_{t} : the family of subsets of \mathbb{N}_0 containing intervals of arbitrary length, which are said to be *thick*;
- \mathcal{F}_{s} : the family of subsets of \mathbb{N}_0 with bounded gaps, which are said to be *syndetic*;
- \mathcal{F}_{ps} : the family of subsets of \mathbb{N}_0 with the form $F_1 \cap F_2$, where $F_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{s}}$ and $F_2 \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{t}}$, and these are said to be *piecewise syndetic*;
- \mathcal{F}_{ts} : the family of subsets A of \mathbb{N}_0 such that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{s}}$ with $\bigcup_{i=0}^k (F + i) \subset A$, and these are said to be *thickly syndetic*.

It is easy to see that $\mathcal{F}_{\text{s}}^* = \mathcal{F}_{\text{t}}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{ps}}^* = \mathcal{F}_{\text{ts}}$.

We turn to a property of families (see [1, 2]) which plays a significant role in our later discussion.

Definition 2.3. Let \mathcal{F} be a family. We say that \mathcal{F} is a *thick family* if for any $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\bigcap_{i=0}^k (F - i) \cap \mathbb{N}_0 \in \mathcal{F}.$$

Remark 2.4. We have the following easy facts:

- (1) each thick family is shift₋-invariant;
- (2) each thick family is a subfamily of \mathcal{F}_{t} ;
- (3) each shift-invariant filter is a thick family.
- (4) a family \mathcal{F} is a shift-invariant thick family if and only if for each $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and any $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \{n - k_1, n - k_1 + 1, \dots, n + k_2\} \subset F\} \in \mathcal{F};$$

- (5) both \mathcal{F}_{t} and \mathcal{F}_{ts} are shift-invariant thick families.

Following [11], for a given family \mathcal{F} , we denote

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \left\{ F \in \mathcal{F} : \text{for any } k \in \mathbb{N}_0, \bigcap_{i=-k}^k (F + i) \cap \mathbb{N}_0 \in \mathcal{F} \right\}.$$

Then $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is the maximal shift-invariant thick subfamily of \mathcal{F} provided that it is not empty. Note that if \mathcal{F} is full, then $\mathcal{F}_{\text{cf}} \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$.

2.2. Topological dynamics. For a *topological dynamical system*, we mean a pair (X, T) , where X is a metric space and T is a continuous map of X into X . If in addition X is a compact metric space, then we say that (X, T) is a *compact dynamical system*. See [15, 16] for details of compact dynamics.

A topological dynamical system (X, T) is said to be *topologically transitive* (or *transitive* for short) if for any pair U, V of non-empty open subsets of X , the return time set $N_T(U, V) = N(U, V) := \{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : T^n U \cap V \neq \emptyset\}$ is non-empty. A topological dynamical system (X, T) is said to be *weakly mixing* if the product system $(X \times X, T \times T)$ is transitive, and *strongly mixing* if for any pair U, V of non-empty open subsets of X , $N(U, V) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{cf}}$.

Given a family \mathcal{F} , we say that a topological dynamical system (X, T) is

- \mathcal{F} -*transitive* if for any non-empty open subsets U, V of X , $N(U, V) \in \mathcal{F}$;
- \mathcal{F} -*mixing* if the product system $(X \times X, T \times T)$ is \mathcal{F} -transitive.

For each family \mathcal{F} , since $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{F}$, the \mathcal{F} -transitivity is stronger than topological transitivity. It can be verified that a topological dynamical system is transitive if and only if it is \mathcal{F}_{inf} -transitive. A topological dynamical system is said to be *topologically ergodic* if it is \mathcal{F}_s -transitive.

We have the following characterization of weak mixing of topological dynamical systems, which is essentially contained in the proof of [15, Proposition II.3].

Proposition 2.5. *Let (X, T) be a topological dynamical system. Then (X, T) is weakly mixing if and only if it is \mathcal{F}_t -transitive and if and only if*

$$\mathcal{N}_T = \{A \subset \mathbb{N}_0 : N(U, V) \subset A \text{ for some non-empty open subsets } U, V \text{ of } X\}$$

is a filter.

By Proposition 2.5, it is easy to see that a topological dynamical system (X, T) is \mathcal{F} -mixing if and only if it is \mathcal{F} -transitive and weakly mixing. We have the following folklore result on the return time sets of \mathcal{F} -mixing systems, see e.g. [11, Lemma 2.3] in setting of linear dynamics.

Proposition 2.6. *Let (X, T) be a topological dynamical system where X is not a singleton and \mathcal{F} be a family. Then (X, T) is \mathcal{F} -mixing if and only if*

$$\mathcal{N}_T = \{A \subset \mathbb{N}_0 : N(U, V) \subset A \text{ for some non-empty open subsets } U, V \text{ of } X\}$$

is a shift-invariant thick subfamily of \mathcal{F} .

Proof. On the one hand, suppose that T is \mathcal{F} -mixing. It is clear that \mathcal{N}_T is a subfamily of \mathcal{F} . By Proposition 2.5, \mathcal{N}_T is a filter. By Remark 2.4, it suffices to show that \mathcal{N}_T is a shift-invariant family. Let U, V be non-empty open subsets of X and $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Since T is transitive, it has a dense range and then $T^{-i}U \neq \emptyset$ and $T^{-i}V \neq \emptyset$. Since T is weakly mixing and X is not a singleton, we have that X has no isolated points. Then there are non-empty open subsets $W_1 \subset T^{-i}U, W_2 \subset V$

with $N(W_1, W_2) \subset [i, +\infty)$. Note that $N(T^{-i}U, V) \cap [i, +\infty) \subset N(U, V) + i$. So we have

$$N(W_1, W_2) \subset N(T^{-i}U, V) \cap [i, +\infty) \subset N(U, V) + i,$$

and

$$N(U, T^{-i}V) \subset (N(U, V) - i) \cap \mathbb{N}_0.$$

By the fact that \mathcal{N}_T is a filter, \mathcal{N}_T is a shift-invariant thick family.

On the other hand, suppose that \mathcal{N}_T is a shift-invariant thick subfamily of \mathcal{F} . Then we have $\mathcal{N}_T \subset \mathcal{F}_i$. By Proposition 2.5, T is weakly mixing. Since T is \mathcal{F} -transitive, we have that T is \mathcal{F} -mixing. \square

Remark 2.7. Let \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 be two families. If there exists an \mathcal{F}_1 -mixing (X, T) which is not \mathcal{F}_2 -transitive, then by Proposition 2.6, there exists a shift-invariant thick subfamily \mathcal{F}_0 of \mathcal{F} such that $\mathcal{F}_0 \setminus \mathcal{F}_2 \neq \emptyset$.

Definition 2.8. Two topological dynamical systems (X, T) and (Y, S) are said to be *weakly disjoint* provided that their product $(X \times Y, T \times S)$ is topologically transitive.

In 2000, Weiss found in [26] that the compact dynamical systems which are weakly disjoint from all weakly mixing compact dynamical systems, are exactly the topologically ergodic ones. Later in 2001, Akin and Glasner generalized Weiss' result, to more classes of compact dynamical systems in [2], and the generalized result is known as the Weiss-Akin-Glasner Theorem. In this theorem, they characterized the weak disjointness of \mathcal{F} -transitive compact dynamical systems where \mathcal{F} is a shift-invariant thick family, and connected the study of topological dynamics and combinatorial number theory.

Theorem 2.9 (Weiss-Akin-Glasner Theorem, [2, Theorem 4.15]). *Let (X, T) be a compact dynamical system and \mathcal{F} be a shift-invariant thick family. Then (X, T) is \mathcal{F}^* -transitive if and only if (X, T) is weakly disjoint from all \mathcal{F} -transitive compact dynamical systems.*

The key ingredient of the proof of the Weiss-Akin-Glasner Theorem is the following lemma.

Lemma 2.10 (Weiss-Akin-Glasner Lemma, [2, Lemma 4.16]). *Suppose that \mathcal{F} is a shift-invariant thick family and $F \in \mathcal{F}$. Then there exists an \mathcal{F} -transitive compact dynamical system (X, T) , and a non-empty open subset U of X such that*

$$N(U, U) = F \cup \{0\}.$$

Remark 2.11. As \mathcal{F} is a shift-invariant thick family, by Remark 2.4 the \mathcal{F} -transitive compact dynamical system (X, T) in the Weiss-Akin-Glasner Lemma is in fact \mathcal{F} -mixing.

By Proposition 2.6, the family generated by the return time sets of an \mathcal{F} -mixing system whose underlying space is not a singleton must be a shift-invariant thick family. So the condition that \mathcal{F} is a shift-invariant thick family in the Weiss-Akin-Glasner Lemma is necessary for all sets in \mathcal{F} to be realized by the return time sets of \mathcal{F} -mixing systems.

Recall that $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is the maximal shift-invariant thick subfamily of a full \mathcal{F} . Then we can restate the Weiss-Akin-Glasner Lemma as follows:

Lemma 2.12. *Suppose that \mathcal{F} be a full family and $F \subset \mathbb{N}_0$. Then $F \in \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ if and only if there exists an \mathcal{F} -mixing compact dynamical system (X, T) , and a non-empty open subset U of X such that*

$$N(U, U) = F \cup \{0\}.$$

We also restate the Weiss-Akin-Glasner Theorem as follows:

Theorem 2.13. *Let (X, T) be a compact dynamical system and \mathcal{F} be a full family. Then (X, T) is $(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}})^*$ -transitive if and only if (X, T) is weakly disjoint from all \mathcal{F} -mixing compact dynamical systems.*

The concept of mild mixing was originally introduced by Furstenberg and Weiss in the context of ergodic theory [17], and was later introduced independently in topological dynamics by Glasner [18] and by Huang and Ye [23], inspired by its ergodic-theoretic counterpart.

Definition 2.14. A compact dynamical system (X, T) is said to be *mildly mixing* if it is weakly disjoint from all transitive compact dynamical systems.

The return time sets of mild mixing systems are related to IP-sets. For a sequence $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathbb{N} , the *finite sum set* of $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is given by

$$FS((x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}) = \{x_{i_1} + x_{i_2} + \cdots + x_{i_n} : i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

A set $A \subset \mathbb{N}_0$ is called an *IP-set* if there is a sequence $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathbb{N}_0 with infinitely many non-zero terms such that $FS((x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}) \subset A$. Denote by \mathcal{F}_{ip} the family of all IP-sets, and by Δ_{ip} the family of the sets of the form $(F - F) \cap \mathbb{N}_0$, where $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{ip}}$ and $F - F = \{m - n : m \neq n \in F\}$. We denote the dual family of Δ_{ip} by Δ_{ip}^* . For a topological dynamical system (X, T) , $x \in X$ and a subset U of X , we denote $N_T(x, U) = N(x, U) = \{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : T^n x \in U\}$. Recall that a point $x \in X$ is *recurrent* if for every neighborhood U of x , $N(x, U)$ is infinite. In 1981, Furstenberg proved the following result for compact dynamical systems, which is in fact true for topological dynamical systems.

Theorem 2.15 ([16, Theorem 2.17]). *Let (X, T) be a topological dynamical system. If a point $x \in X$ is recurrent, then for any neighborhood U of x , we have $N(x, U) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{ip}}$.*

The following characterization of mild mixing was obtained by Glasner [18], and by Huang and Ye [23], independently.

Theorem 2.16 ([18, Theorem 10.7] or [23, Theorem 6.6]). *A compact dynamical system is mildly mixing if and only if it is Δ_{ip}^* -transitive.*

2.3. Linear dynamics. In recent years, there has been growing interest in the study of linear dynamical systems, see [5] and [20] for further information.

Let X be an infinite-dimensional separable Fréchet space over \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C} . For an operator (i.e. a continuous linear self-map) T on X , the pair (X, T) is called a *linear dynamical system*. Usually we simply call the operator T or $T: X \rightarrow X$ a linear dynamical system. If in addition T is an invertible map such that T^{-1} is also an

operator on X , then we say that (X, T) (or T for short) is *invertible*. In this paper, for a Fréchet space X , the symbol $\|\cdot\|_X = \|\cdot\|$ denotes an F-norm defining the topology of X . If in particular X is a Banach space, then the symbol $\|\cdot\|_X = \|\cdot\|$ denotes a norm defining the topology of X .

While infinite-dimensional Fréchet spaces are lack of compactness, many results in linear dynamical systems remain similar to their counterparts from compact dynamical systems, despite being obtained by different methods.

Definition 2.17. An operator $T: X \rightarrow X$ is said to be *hypercyclic* provided that there is some $x \in X$ whose orbit under T is dense in X . Such x is called a *hypercyclic vector* for T . We denote the set of hypercyclic vectors for T by $HC(T)$.

Remark 2.18. By the Birkhoff transitivity theorem (see e.g. [20, Theorem 1.16]) we know that for a separable infinite-dimensional Fréchet space X , an operator T on X is hypercyclic if and only if it is topologically transitive and if and only if $HC(T)$ is a dense G_δ subset of X .

A well-known result to imply the weak mixing of a given operator is the so-called Hypercyclicity Criterion.

Theorem 2.19 (Hypercyclicity Criterion, see e.g. [20, Theorem 3.12]). *Let $T: X \rightarrow X$ be an operator. If there exist dense subsets $X_0, Y_0 \subset X$, a sequence $(n_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathbb{N} and a sequence of maps $S_{n_k}: Y_0 \rightarrow X$ such that for any $x_0 \in X_0, y_0 \in Y_0$,*

- (1) $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} T^{n_k} x_0 = 0$;
- (2) $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} S_{n_k} y_0 = 0$;
- (3) $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} T^{n_k} S_{n_k} y_0 = y_0$,

then T is weakly mixing.

A remarkable feature of the Hypercyclicity Criterion is that it is actually equivalent to an operator being weakly mixing. In [8], Bès and Peris achieved this result by hereditarily hypercyclic operators.

Theorem 2.20 ([8, Theorem 2.3]). *Let $T: X \rightarrow X$ be an operator. Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) *T satisfies the Hypercyclicity Criterion;*
- (2) *T is weakly mixing;*
- (3) *T is hereditarily hypercyclic.*

Unlike the case for compact dynamical systems, a tool for the study of linear dynamical systems is provided by the neighborhoods of 0. We recall the Blow up/Collapse condition for weak mixing.

Theorem 2.21 ([20, Theorem 2.47]). *Let $T: X \rightarrow X$ be an operator. Then T is weakly mixing if and only if for any non-empty open sets $U, V \subset X$ and any neighborhood W of 0,*

$$N(U, W) \cap N(W, V) \neq \emptyset.$$

Let $X = c_0(\mathbb{N}_0)$ or $\ell^p(\mathbb{N}_0)$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, and let $w = (w_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be a bounded sequence of positive real numbers. Define a map $B_w: X \rightarrow X$ by

$$(x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots) \mapsto (w_1 x_1, w_2 x_2, \dots).$$

The map B_w is clearly an operator on X , and is called a *unilateral weighted backward shift*. Similarly one can define *bilateral weighted backward shift* on each space of $c_0(\mathbb{Z})$ or $\ell^p(\mathbb{Z})$, $1 \leq p < \infty$. In [11], Bès et al. characterized the \mathcal{F} -transitivity of such operators, and one of their results is restated here.

Proposition 2.22 ([11, Proposition 3.1]). *Let \mathcal{F} be a family and B_w be a bilateral weighted backward shift on $X = c_0(\mathbb{Z})$ or $\ell^p(\mathbb{Z})$, $1 \leq p < \infty$. Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) B_w is \mathcal{F} -transitive;
- (2) B_w is \mathcal{F} -mixing (i.e. \mathcal{F} -transitive and weakly mixing);
- (3) for any $M > 0$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $A_{M,j} \cap \bar{A}_{M,j} \in \mathcal{F}$, where

$$A_{M,j} = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : w_{j+1}w_{j+2} \cdots w_{j+n} > M\}, \bar{A}_{M,j} = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : w_j w_{j-1} \cdots w_{j-n+1} < \frac{1}{M}\}.$$

We denote by ω the Fréchet space of all sequences in \mathbb{K} (equals \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C}), that is,

$$\omega := \mathbb{K}^{\mathbb{N}_0} = \{(x_n)_n; x_n \in \mathbb{K}, n \in \mathbb{N}_0\},$$

with the topology given by the seminorms: $p_n(x) = \sup_{i \leq n} |x_i|$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. The canonical basis of ω is denoted by $e_n = (\delta_{i,n})_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Let X be an infinite-dimensional separable Fréchet space. If X can be embedded continuously (by a linear map, θ say) into ω , then X is called a *unilateral Fréchet sequence space*. Roughly speaking, the convergence in a Fréchet sequence space implies the convergence of each coefficient in \mathbb{K} . Since for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $E_n = \theta^{-1}e_n \in X$ must be unique, we denote it still by e_n .

Let X be a unilateral Fréchet sequence space in which $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is a basis (i.e. $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} x_i e_i$ converges for each $x \in X$). Define a linear map $B : X \rightarrow \omega$ by:

$$(x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots) \mapsto (x_1, x_2, \dots),$$

where $x = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} x_i e_i \in X$. If B maps X into X , then it must be continuous and we say that B is the *unilateral backward shift* on X . Define a map $F : \{x \in X : \text{there is } l \in \mathbb{N}_0 \text{ such that } x_i = 0 \text{ for each } i \geq l\} \rightarrow X$ by:

$$(x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_l, 0 \dots) \mapsto (0, x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_l, 0 \dots).$$

The map F is called the *unilateral forward shift for finite sequences* of X . *Bilateral backward (and forward) shifts* on *bilateral Fréchet sequence spaces* are defined similarly. See [10], [11], [20] and [25] for more details of weighted backward shifts.

3. WEAK DISJOINTNESS IN LINEAR DYNAMICS

In this section we introduce the notion of weak disjointness of linear dynamical systems. We will give a criterion for \mathcal{F} -mixing, and a sufficient condition for mild mixing. Also, we illustrate that a weakly mixing operator may not be weakly disjoint from its iterates.

Definition 3.1. Let $T : X \rightarrow X$ and $S : Y \rightarrow Y$ be two operators. We say that T and S are *weakly disjoint* provided that their direct sum $T \oplus S$ is hypercyclic.

Weak disjointness of finitely many operators is defined similarly. By Remark 2.18, two operators $T: X \rightarrow X$ and $S: Y \rightarrow Y$ are weakly disjoint if and only if for every non-empty open subsets U_1, U_2 of X and non-empty open subsets V_1, V_2 of Y , $N(U_1, U_2) \cap N(V_1, V_2) \neq \emptyset$. In fact we have the following observation, which is in fact true for topological dynamical systems. Recall that for a given family \mathcal{F} , an operator $T: X \rightarrow X$ is \mathcal{F} -transitive if $N(U, V) \in \mathcal{F}$ for any non-empty open subsets U and V of X .

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that \mathcal{F} is a shift_+ -invariant family. Let $T: X \rightarrow X$ and $S: Y \rightarrow Y$ be two operators. If S is hypercyclic, then $T \oplus S$ is \mathcal{F} -transitive if and only if for any non-empty open subsets U_1, U_2 of X and non-empty open subset V of Y , we have*

$$N(U_1, U_2) \cap N(V, V) \in \mathcal{F}.$$

Proof. The condition is obviously necessary.

Conversely, by the hypothesis, both T and S are hypercyclic. Fix non-empty open subsets U_1, U_2 of X and non-empty open subsets V_1, V_2 of Y . By the hypercyclicity of S , there must be $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $V_1 \cap S^{-m}V_2 \neq \emptyset$. By the hypercyclicity of T , $T^{-m}U_2 \neq \emptyset$. Let $V = V_1 \cap S^{-m}V_2$. We then have $N(V, V) + m \subset N(V_1, V_2)$ and $N(U_1, T^{-m}U_2) + m \subset N(U_1, U_2)$. Finally

$$(N(U_1, T^{-m}U_2) \cap N(V, V)) + m \subset N(U_1, U_2) \cap N(V_1, V_2).$$

We are done since $N(U_1, T^{-m}U_2) \cap N(V, V) \in \mathcal{F}$ and \mathcal{F} is shift_+ -invariant. \square

Since the family of non-empty subsets of \mathbb{N}_0 is shift_+ -invariant, applying Lemma 3.2 we have the following version for weak disjointness.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $T: X \rightarrow X$ and $S: Y \rightarrow Y$ be two operators. If S is hypercyclic, then T and S are weakly disjoint if and only if for any non-empty open subsets U_1, U_2 of X and non-empty open subset V of Y , we have*

$$N(U_1, U_2) \cap N(V, V) \neq \emptyset.$$

Given a hypercyclic operator T and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider the weak disjointness of T and T^k . We will see in the following examples, that T may not be weakly disjoint from T^k , even if T is weakly mixing.

Example 3.4. Let $X = c_0(\mathbb{N}_0)$ or $\ell^p(\mathbb{N}_0)$, $1 \leq p < \infty$. Then there is a weighted backward shift B_w on X such that B_w is weakly mixing but $B_w \oplus B_w^2$ is not hypercyclic.

Proof. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define two finite blocks \mathcal{A}_n and \mathcal{B}_n by

$$\mathcal{A}_n = \underbrace{[2, 2, 2, \dots, 2, \frac{1}{2^n}]}_{n \text{ terms}}, \mathcal{B}_n = \underbrace{[1, 1, 1, \dots, 1]}_{n \text{ terms}}.$$

Define a sequence $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of positive integers by

$$b_1 = 2, b_{n+1} = 2b_n + n + 2, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let B_w be the unilateral weighted backward shift on X defined by the weight w , where $w = (w_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is given by

$$w = (\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{B}_{b_1}, \mathcal{A}_2, \mathcal{B}_{b_2}, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_{b_n}, \dots).$$

For a finite block u , denote the length of u by $|u|$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, one has

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (|\mathcal{A}_i| + |\mathcal{B}_{b_i}|) = 2b_n.$$

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it is easy to see that for each $k \in [b_n - 1, 2b_n] \cap \mathbb{N}_0$, $w_1 w_2 \cdots w_k = 1$, and for each $k \in [2b_n + 1, 2b_n + n + 1] \cap \mathbb{N}_0$, $w_1 w_2 \cdots w_k = 2^{k-2b_n}$. Then $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} w_1 w_2 \cdots w_k = \infty$. By [20, Example 4.9], B_w is weakly mixing.

For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $w_1 w_2 \cdots w_k \geq 2$, we have either $k = 1$ or $k \in [2b_n + 1, 2b_n + n + 1]$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $k = 1$ then $w_1 w_2 \cdots w_{2k} = w_1 w_2 = 1$. If $k \in [2b_n + 1, 2b_n + n + 1]$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, since $2k \in [4b_n + 2, 4b_n + 2n + 2] \subset [b_{n+1} - 1, 2b_{n+1}]$, we have $w_1 w_2 \cdots w_{2k} = 1$. Consider the non-empty open set

$$W = \{x \in X : \|x - e_0\| < \frac{1}{3}\}.$$

Assume that there is $m \in N_{B_w \oplus B_w^2}(W \oplus W, W \oplus W) \setminus \{0\}$. Then there is a pair $(x, y) \in W \oplus W$ with $B_w \oplus B_w^2(x, y) \in W \oplus W$. Since $x, y \in W$ and $m \neq 0$, we have $|x_m| < \frac{1}{3}$ and $|y_{2m}| < \frac{1}{3}$. Since $B_w^m x \in W$, we have $|w_1 w_2 \cdots w_m x_m - 1| < \frac{1}{3}$, and then $w_1 w_2 \cdots w_m = \frac{w_1 w_2 \cdots w_m |x_m|}{|x_m|} > 2$. Then $w_1 w_2 \cdots w_{2m} = 1$ by the above analysis. Since $B_w^{2m} y \in W$, we have $|w_1 w_2 \cdots w_{2m} y_{2m} - 1| < \frac{1}{3}$, and then again $w_1 w_2 \cdots w_{2m} > 2$, which is a contradiction. Then $N_{B_w \oplus B_w^2}(W \oplus W, W \oplus W) = \{0\}$, which implies that $B_w \oplus B_w^2$ is not hypercyclic. \square

Example 3.5. Let $X = c_0(\mathbb{N}_0)$ or $\ell^p(\mathbb{N}_0)$, $1 \leq p < \infty$. Then there is a weighted backward shift B_w on X such that $B_w \oplus B_w^2$ is weakly mixing but $B_w \oplus B_w^3$ is not hypercyclic.

Proof. Assume that $X = c_0(\mathbb{N}_0)$, the case $X = \ell^p(\mathbb{N}_0)$, $1 \leq p < \infty$ is similar. For any n and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we define three finite blocks $\mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_{n,m}$ and C_n by

$$\mathcal{A}_n = \underbrace{[2, 2, 2, \dots, 2]}_{n \text{ terms}}, \quad \mathcal{B}_{n,m} = \underbrace{[1, 1, 1, \dots, 1, \frac{1}{2^m}]}_{n \text{ terms}}, \quad C_n = \underbrace{[1, 1, 1, \dots, 1]}_{n \text{ terms}}.$$

Let $s_0 = 1, s_1 = 3$ and $s_{n+1} = 2(3(s_n - 1) + n + 1) + n$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Define two sequences $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(c_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of positive integers by

$$b_n = s_n - 1 - [3(s_{n-1} - 1) + n], \quad c_n = 2(s_n - 1) - 1, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let B_w be the unilateral weighted backward shift on X defined by the weight w , where $w = (w_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is given by

$$w = (C_1, \mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{B}_{b_1,1}, C_{c_1}, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n, \mathcal{B}_{b_n,n}, C_{c_n}, \dots).$$

Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. One has $w_{s_n} = 2^{-n}$. If $k \in [s_n, 3(s_n - 1)] \cap \mathbb{N}_0$ then $w_1 w_2 \cdots w_k = 1$. If $k \in [3(s_n - 1) + 1, 3(s_n - 1) + n] \cap \mathbb{N}_0$ then $w_1 w_2 \cdots w_k = 2^{k-3(s_n-1)}$. If $k \in [3(s_n - 1) + n + 1, s_{n+1} - 1] \cap \mathbb{N}_0$ then $w_1 w_2 \cdots w_k = 2^{n+1}$.

For each finite sequence $x = (x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_l, 0, \dots) \in X$, let

$$S_w x = (0, \frac{x_0}{w_1}, \frac{x_1}{w_2}, \frac{x_2}{w_3}, \dots, \frac{x_l}{w_{l+1}}, 0, \dots).$$

Denote $T = B_w \oplus B_w^2$, $S = S_w \oplus S_w^2$ and $Y = X \oplus X$. Let X_0 be the set of finite sequences in X . Then $Y_0 = X_0 \oplus X_0$ is a dense subset of Y . Put $a_n = 3(s_{n-1} - 1) + n$

for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We shall show that T satisfies the Hypercyclicity Criterion (Theorem 2.19) with S , Y_0 and $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

To see this, fix $(u, v) \in Y_0$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Write $u = (u_0, u_1, \dots, u_l, 0, 0, \dots)$ and $v = (v_0, v_1, \dots, v_l, 0, 0, \dots)$. Let $M_1 = \max(\{|u_i| : i \in \mathbb{N}_0\} \cup \{|v_i| : i \in \mathbb{N}_0\}) + 1$, $M_2 = \max\{w_1 w_2 \cdots w_i : i \in \mathbb{N}_0, i \leq l\}$. Pick $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n > N_1$ implies $s_n - 2n - 7 > l$. For any $n > N_1$ we have $l + 2a_n - a_n < s_n - 1 - (3(s_{n-1} - 1) + n)$ and then $\{a_n, a_n + 1, \dots, 2a_n, \dots, l + 2a_n\} \subset [3(s_{n-1} - 1) + n, s_n - 1]$. By the above analysis, we have $w_1 \cdots w_{a_n} = w_1 \cdots w_{a_n+1} = \dots = w_1 \cdots w_{l+2a_n} = 2^n$. Pick $N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n > N_2$ implies $\frac{1}{2^n} < \frac{\epsilon}{M_1 M_2}$. Put $N = \max\{N_1, N_2\}$. For any $n > N$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_w^{a_n} u\| &= \sup_{j \leq l} \frac{|u_j|}{w_{j+1} \cdots w_{j+a_n}} = \sup_{j \leq l} \frac{w_1 w_2 \cdots w_j |u_j|}{w_1 w_2 \cdots w_j w_{j+1} \cdots w_{j+a_n}} \\ &= \sup_{j \leq l} \frac{w_1 w_2 \cdots w_j |u_j|}{2^n} < \sup_{j \leq l} \frac{w_1 w_2 \cdots w_j |u_j|}{2 M_1 M_2} \epsilon \\ &< \frac{\epsilon}{2} < \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_w^{2a_n} v\| &= \sup_{j \leq l} \frac{|v_j|}{w_{j+1} \cdots w_{j+2a_n}} = \sup_{j \leq l} \frac{w_1 w_2 \cdots w_j |v_j|}{w_1 w_2 \cdots w_j w_{j+1} \cdots w_{j+2a_n}} \\ &= \sup_{j \leq l} \frac{w_1 w_2 \cdots w_j |v_j|}{2^n} < \sup_{j \leq l} \frac{w_1 w_2 \cdots w_j |v_j|}{2 M_1 M_2} \epsilon \\ &< \frac{\epsilon}{2} < \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

This gives that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S^{a_n}(u, v) = 0$, while it is clear that $TS(u, v) = (u, v)$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T^{a_n} y_0 = 0$ for each $y_0 \in Y_0$. So T satisfies the Hypercyclicity Criterion (Theorem 2.19) and then it is weakly mixing.

But whenever there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $w_1 w_2 \cdots w_n \geq 2$, we have either $n \in \{1, 2\}$ or $n \in [3(s_k - 1) + 1, s_{k+1} - 1]$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If $n \in \{1, 2\}$ then $w_1 w_2 \cdots w_{3n} = 1$. If $n \in [3(s_k - 1) + 1, s_{k+1} - 1]$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, since $3n \in [9(s_k - 1) + 3, 3(s_{k+1} - 1)] \subset [s_{k+1}, 3(s_{k+1} - 1)]$, we have $w_1 w_2 \cdots w_{3n} = 1$. Consider the non-empty open set

$$W = \{x \in X : \|x - e_0\| < \frac{1}{3}\}.$$

As in Example 3.4, $N_{B_w \oplus B_w^3}(W \oplus W, W \oplus W) = \{0\}$ and then $B_w \oplus B_w^3$ is not hypercyclic. \square

Remark 3.6. By the similar method, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $X = c_0(\mathbb{N}_0)$ or $\ell^p(\mathbb{N}_0)$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, one can construct a unilateral weighted backward shift B_w on X such that $B_w \oplus B_w^2 \oplus \cdots \oplus B_w^k$ is weakly mixing but $B_w \oplus B_w^{k+1}$ is not hypercyclic.

3.1. The \mathcal{F} -Mixing Criterion. It is easy to observe that an operator is weakly mixing if and only if it is weakly disjoint from itself. We consider how is a weakly mixing operator weakly disjoint from itself. In the aspect of families, we study the \mathcal{F} -transitivity of the direct sum of an operator and itself when a family \mathcal{F} is given.

Definition 3.7. Let \mathcal{F} be a family. An operator $T: X \rightarrow X$ is said to be \mathcal{F} -mixing provided that $T \oplus T$ is \mathcal{F} -transitive.

Recall that the Blow up/Collapse condition characterizes the weak mixing of operators (see Theorem 2.21). We formulate here the Blow up/Collapse condition for \mathcal{F} -mixing.

Lemma 3.8. Let \mathcal{F} be a family. Then an operator $T: X \rightarrow X$ is \mathcal{F} -mixing if and only if for any non-empty open subsets U, V of X and neighborhood W of 0 , we have

$$N(U, W) \cap N(W, V) \in \mathcal{F}.$$

Proof. The condition is obviously necessary.

Conversely, let U, V be a pair of non-empty open subsets of X . Pick non-empty open subsets $U' \subset U, V' \subset V$ and a neighborhood W of 0 such that $U' + W \subset U, V' + W \subset V$. The observation $N(U', W) \cap N(W, V') \subset N(U, V)$ gives that T is \mathcal{F} -transitive. Since $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{F}$, by Theorem 2.21, T is weakly mixing. So T is \mathcal{F} -mixing. \square

Inspired by the Hypercyclicity Criterion (Theorem 2.19), we formulate a criterion for \mathcal{F} -mixing in the aspect of limitations, which is especially applicable to backward shifts. Before this, we need a notion, which requires the specific shape of the indices of convergent subsequences.

Suppose that X is a metric space and \mathcal{F} is a family. Let $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be a sequence in X . We say that a point $x \in X$ is the \mathcal{F} -limit of $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, denoted by $\mathcal{F}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$, if for any neighborhood U of x we have

$$\{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : x_n \in U\} \in \mathcal{F}.$$

In [11], Bès et.al. gave a criterion [11, Theorem 2.4] for an operator to be \mathcal{F} -mixing, requiring that $\{F \subset \mathbb{N}_0 : \bigcap_{i=-k}^k (F + i) \cap \mathbb{N}_0 \in \mathcal{F} \text{ for any } k \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ is a filter. The following criterion has a strong requirement on the limitations but no requirement for the family.

Theorem 3.9 (\mathcal{F} -Mixing Criterion). Let $T: X \rightarrow X$ be an operator and \mathcal{F} be a family. If there exist dense subsets $X_0, Y_0 \subset X$ and a sequence $(S_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ of maps of Y_0 into X such that for any $x_0 \in X_0, y_0 \in Y_0$,

$$\mathcal{F}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (T^n x_0, S_n y_0, T^n S_n y_0) = (0, 0, y_0),$$

then T is \mathcal{F} -mixing.

Proof. Let U, V be non-empty open subsets of X and let $W \subset X$ be a neighborhood of 0 . Pick $x_0 \in X_0 \cap U$ and $y_0 \in Y_0 \cap V$. Then

$$A = \{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : T^n x_0 \in W, S_n y_0 \in W, T^n S_n y_0 \in V\} \in \mathcal{F}.$$

Since $A \subset N(U, W) \cap N(W, V)$, T is \mathcal{F} -mixing, by Lemma 3.8. \square

Remark 3.10. It is clear that an operator satisfying the Hypercyclicity Criterion (Theorem 2.19) must satisfy the \mathcal{F}_{inf} -Mixing Criterion. Once an operator satisfied the \mathcal{F}_{inf} -Mixing Criterion, it is weakly mixing and then by Theorem 2.20 it satisfies the Hypercyclicity Criterion (Theorem 2.19). The \mathcal{F}_{cf} -Mixing Criterion coincides

with Kitai's Criterion ([20, Theorem 3.4]). Generally, the \mathcal{F} -Mixing Criterion is not equivalent to \mathcal{F} -mixing. For example, Grivaux has construed a strong mixing operator who does not satisfy Kitai's Criterion (see [19, Theorem 2.5]).

3.2. Mild mixing. It is natural to consider the property of operators which are weakly disjoint from a given class of operators. In 2024, Cardeccia characterized in [12] the operators which are weakly disjoint from all weakly mixing operators, and the operators which are weakly disjoint from all topologically ergodic operators. We restate these results, in the language of weak disjointness.

Theorem 3.11 ([12, Theorem 5.3]). *Let $T: X \rightarrow X$ be an operator. The following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) *T is topologically ergodic;*
- (2) *T is weakly disjoint from all weakly mixing operators;*
- (3) *$T \oplus S$ is weakly mixing for each weakly mixing operator $S: Y \rightarrow Y$.*

Theorem 3.12 ([12, Theorem 5.4]). *An operator $T: X \rightarrow X$ is \mathcal{F}_{ps} -transitive if and only if T is weakly disjoint from all topologically ergodic operators.*

It is clear that the operators which are weakly disjoint from all strongly mixing operators, are exactly the hypercyclic ones. We wonder if there is a non-mixing operator which is weakly disjoint from all hypercyclic operators? We introduce the concept of mild mixing in the frame work of linear dynamical systems, and show that the mild mixing of operators is a property which lies strictly between strong mixing and weak mixing.

Definition 3.13. An operator $T: X \rightarrow X$ is said to be *mildly mixing* provided that it is weakly disjoint from all hypercyclic operators.

Proposition 3.14. *Let $T: X \rightarrow X$ and $S: Y \rightarrow Y$ be two operators. Then $T \oplus S$ is mildly mixing if and only if both T and S are mildly mixing.*

Proof. The condition is obviously necessary.

Conversely, fix a hypercyclic operator $R: Z \rightarrow Z$. Since S is mildly mixing, we have that $S \oplus R$ is hypercyclic. Since T is mildly mixing, we have that $T \oplus (S \oplus R)$ is hypercyclic. This gives that $(T \oplus S) \oplus R$ is hypercyclic and then $T \oplus S$ is mildly mixing. \square

Next we deduce a sufficient condition for an operator to be mildly mixing.

Proposition 3.15. *Each Δ_{ip}^* -transitive operator is mildly mixing.*

Proof. Suppose that $T: X \rightarrow X$ is a Δ_{ip}^* -transitive operator. Fix a hypercyclic operator $S: Y \rightarrow Y$. Let U_1, U_2 be non-empty open subsets of X and let V be a non-empty open subset of Y . Let $x \in V$ be a hypercyclic vector for S . Since each hypercyclic vector is recurrent, by Theorem 2.15, we have $N(x, V) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{ip}}$ and $N(V, V) = (N(x, V) - N(x, V)) \cap \mathbb{N}_0$ (i.e. $N(V, V) \in \Delta_{\text{ip}}$). Since $N(U_1, U_2) \in \Delta_{\text{ip}}^*$, we have that $N(U_1, U_2) \cap N(V, V) \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma 3.3, T is weakly disjoint from S and then T is mildly mixing. \square

Recall in Theorem 2.16 we know that the mild mixing of compact dynamical systems is equivalent to the Δ_{ip}^* -transitivity. In Proposition 3.15 we have shown that each Δ_{ip}^* -transitive operator is mildly mixing, so we ask:

Question 3.16. Is each mildly mixing operator Δ_{ip}^* -transitive?

Now we deduce that for linear dynamical systems, mixing is not equivalent to mild mixing. Let $\Delta = \{A \subset \mathbb{N}_0 : \text{there is } F \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}} \text{ with } (F - F) \cap \mathbb{N}_0 \subset A\}$. Since $\mathcal{F}_{\text{ip}} \subset \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$, by Proposition 3.15, each Δ^* -transitive operator is mildly mixing. Bès et al. have constructed a Δ^* -transitive weighted backward shift on $c_0(\mathbb{N}_0)$ or $\ell^p(\mathbb{N}_0)$, $1 \leq p < \infty$ which is not strongly mixing in [11, Proposition 5.5]. So we have the following.

Proposition 3.17. *There exists a mildly mixing operator which is not strongly mixing.*

Remark 3.18. For an operator T on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, it is natural to consider the weak disjointness of T and its adjoint T^* . But it can be easily checked that this will never happen, see e.g. [20, Remark 4.17].

Salas constructed in [25, Corollary 2.6] two weakly mixing operators T, S on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ such that T and S are not weakly disjoint. He also constructed in [25, Corollary 2.3] an operator T on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ such that both T and T^* are weakly mixing, while T and T^* can never be weakly disjoint by Remark 3.18. It is illustrated in Example 3.5 that there is a weakly mixing operator T on $\ell^1(\mathbb{N}_0)$ such that T and T^2 are not weakly disjoint. All of the above examples show that mild mixing is not equivalent to weak mixing.

Proposition 3.19. *There exist some weakly mixing operators which are not mildly mixing.*

It is observed that each strongly mixing operator is mildly mixing and each mildly mixing operator is weakly mixing. By Propositions 3.17 and 3.19, the mild mixing of operators lies strictly between strong mixing and weak mixing. In 1993, Ansari has shown in [3] that an operator is hypercyclic if and only if each of its iterates is hypercyclic.

Theorem 3.20 ([3, Theorem 1]). *Let $T: X \rightarrow X$ be an operator and $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $HC(T) = HC(T^p)$.*

By Ansari's result, we have the following two more sufficient conditions for mild mixing. Recall that an operator is said to be *chaotic in the sense of Devaney* (or *chaotic* for short) if it is hypercyclic and has a dense set of periodic points. In 2007, Badea and Grivaux constructed in [13, Corollary 4.7] a chaotic operator which is not strongly mixing, by which we know that chaos does not imply strong mixing. But we have that chaos does imply mild mixing. We also obtain that an operator is mildly mixing if some iterate of it is mildly mixing.

Proposition 3.21. *Let $T: X \rightarrow X$ be an operator.*

- (1) *If T is chaotic, then it is mildly mixing;*
- (2) *If T^p is mildly mixing for some $p \in \mathbb{N}$, then T is mildly mixing.*

Proof. (1). Let $S: Y \rightarrow Y$ be a hypercyclic operator. Fix a non-empty open subset V of X and two non-empty open subsets U_1, U_2 of Y . Since T is chaotic, there is $v \in V$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $T^p v = v$. By Theorem 3.20, S^p is hypercyclic, then there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $S^{pn} U_1 \cap U_2 \neq \emptyset$. Since $T^{pn} v = v$, we have $pn \in N(V, V) \cap N(U_1, U_2)$. By Lemma 3.3, T is weakly disjoint from S . Thus T is mildly mixing.

(2). Let $S: Y \rightarrow Y$ be a hypercyclic operator. By Theorem 3.20, S^p is also hypercyclic. Since T^p is mildly mixing, we have that T^p is weakly disjoint from S^p . Then T is weakly disjoint from S . This implies that T is mildly mixing. \square

It is natural to consider the following question.

Question 3.22. Let $T: X \rightarrow X$ be a mildly mixing operator. Is T^p mildly mixing for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$?

4. THE WEISS-AKIN-GLASNER THEOREM FOR OPERATORS AND SOME APPLICATIONS

In this section, by showing an analogue of the Weiss-Akin-Glasner Lemma, we formulate the counterpart of the Weiss-Akin-Glasner Theorem within the framework of linear dynamical systems, and provide some applications.

4.1. The Weiss-Akin-Glasner Theorem for operators. We have the following characterizations of subsets of non-negative integers which can be realized by the return time sets of \mathcal{F} -mixing operators, which is an analogue of the Weiss-Akin-Glasner Lemma (Lemma 2.12) from topological dynamics.

Lemma 4.1. *Let \mathcal{F} be a full family and $F \subset \mathbb{N}_0$. Then $F \in \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ if and only if there is an invertible \mathcal{F} -mixing weighted backward shift B_w on X , and a non-empty open subset W of X such that*

$$N_{B_w}(W, W) \subset F \cup \{0\},$$

where $X = c_0(\mathbb{Z})$ or $\ell^p(\mathbb{Z})$, $1 \leq p < \infty$.

Proof. \Leftarrow . By Proposition 2.6, \mathcal{N}_{B_w} is a shift-invariant thick subfamily of \mathcal{F} . Then $F \cup \{0\} \in \mathcal{N}_{B_w} \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$. It is observed that $(F \cup \{0\}) \cap \mathbb{N} \subset F$. Since \mathcal{F} is full, $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is also full. Then $(F \cup \{0\}) \cap \mathbb{N} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$. So $F \in \mathcal{F}$.

\Rightarrow . We divide the proof into two cases.

Case A: $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{cf}}$. Let $L \in \mathbb{N}_0$ be such that $[L, +\infty) \cap \mathbb{N}_0 \subset F$. Let w be the bilateral weight given by

$$w_n = \begin{cases} 2, & n \in [L, +\infty), \\ 1, & n \in [0, L-1], \\ \frac{1}{2}, & n \in -\mathbb{N}. \end{cases}$$

Let B_w be the bilateral weighted backward shift on X defined by the weight w . Since both $(w_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $(\frac{1}{w_{i+1}})_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are bounded, B_w is an invertible operator on X . By [20, Example 4.15], B_w is strongly mixing and then \mathcal{F} -mixing. Note that for each $n \in [L, +\infty)$, $w_1 w_2 \cdots w_n \geq 2$ and for each $n \in [0, L-1]$, $w_1 w_2 \cdots w_n = 1$.

Consider the following non-empty open set

$$W = \{x \in X: \|x - e_0\| < \frac{1}{3}\}.$$

Fix $m \in N_{B_w}(W, W) \setminus \{0\}$. Then there is a vector $x = (\dots, x_{-1}, x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots) \in W$ such that $B_w^m x \in W$, which gives that $|x_m| < \frac{1}{3}$ and $|w_1 w_2 \cdots w_m x_m - 1| < \frac{1}{3}$. Then we have $w_1 w_2 \cdots w_m |x_m| > \frac{2}{3}$ and then $w_1 w_2 \cdots w_m = \frac{w_1 w_2 \cdots w_m |x_m|}{|x_m|} > 2$, which gives that $m \in [L, +\infty) \cap \mathbb{N}_0 \subset F$. That is, $N_{B_w}(W, W) \subset F \cup \{0\}$.

Case B: $F \in \widetilde{\mathcal{F}} \setminus \mathcal{F}_{\text{cf}}$. Write F as the disjoint union of a sequence $(I_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of maximal finite integer intervals. By the definition of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$, it is easy to see that $\{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \{n-1, n\} \subset F\} \in \mathcal{F}$. Without loss of generality, we require that $0 \notin F$ and $|I_k| \geq 2$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Also we assume that the sequence $(\min I_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is increasing. Let $J_1 = [0, \min I_1 - 1] \cap \mathbb{N}_0$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $J_{k+1} = [\max I_k + 1, \min I_{k+1} - 1] \cap \mathbb{N}_0$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$\mathcal{I}_n = \begin{cases} [2, 2, \dots, 2, \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \dots, \frac{1}{2}}_{m \text{ terms}}], & \text{if } |I_n| = 2m \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{N}, \\ [2, 2, \dots, 2, \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \dots, \frac{1}{2}}_{m \text{ terms}}, 1], & \text{if } |I_n| = 2m + 1 \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{N}, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\mathcal{J}_n = \underbrace{[1, 1, \dots, 1]}_{|J_n| \text{ terms}}.$$

Let B_w be the bilateral weighted backward shift on X defined by the weight w , where $w = (w_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is given by

$$w = (\underbrace{\dots, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}}_{-\mathbb{N}}, \underbrace{\mathcal{J}_1, \mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{J}_n, \mathcal{I}_n, \dots}_{\mathbb{N}_0}).$$

Since both $(w_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $(\frac{1}{w_{i+1}})_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are bounded, B_w is an invertible operator on X .

We claim that if $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ satisfies $\{m-r, m-r+1, \dots, m+r+1\} \subset F$ for some $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$, then $w_1 \cdots w_m \geq 2^r$. Since $(I_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ are disjoint, there is a unique $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\{m-r, m-r+1, \dots, m+r+1\} \subset I_k$. Denote $a = \min I_k$ and $b = \max I_k$. Then $|I_k| \geq 2r+2$ and $m \in [a+r, b-r-1]$. Suppose $|I_k|$ is even. If $a+r \leq m \leq \frac{b+a-1}{2}$, then $w_1 \cdots w_m \geq w_1 \cdots w_{a+r} = 2^{r+1}$. If $\frac{b+a-1}{2} + 1 \leq m \leq b-r-1$, then $w_1 \cdots w_m \geq w_1 \cdots w_{b-(r+1)} = 2^{r+1}$. Suppose $|I_k|$ is odd. If $a+r \leq m \leq \frac{b+a}{2} - 1$, then $w_1 \cdots w_m \geq w_1 \cdots w_{a+r} = 2^{r+1}$. If $\frac{b+a}{2} \leq m \leq b-r-1$, then $w_1 \cdots w_m \geq w_1 \cdots w_{(b-1)-r} = 2^r$. So the claim holds. Also, it is observed that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}_0 \setminus F$ we have $w_1 \cdots w_m = 1$.

To show that B_w is \mathcal{F} -mixing, by Proposition 2.22 it suffices to show that for any $M > 0$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $A_{M,j} \cap \overline{A}_{M,j} \in \mathcal{F}$, where

$$A_{M,j} = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : w_{j+1} w_{j+2} \cdots w_{j+n} > M\}, \overline{A}_{M,j} = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : w_j w_{j-1} \cdots w_{j-n+1} < \frac{1}{M}\}.$$

Now fix $M > 0$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$. There is $q \in \mathbb{N}$ with $2^q > M w_1 w_2 \cdots w_j$. Consider the set

$$E = \{m \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \{m-q-j-1, m-q-j, \dots, m+q+j+1\} \subset F\}.$$

Recall that $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is the maximal shift-invariant thick subfamily of \mathcal{F} and $F \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$, by Remark 2.4, $E \in \mathcal{F}$. Fix $n \in E$. We have $\{(j+n)-q, (j+n)-q+1, \dots, (j+n)+q+1\} \subset F$. By the above analysis, $w_1 w_2 \cdots w_{j+n} \geq 2^q > M w_1 w_2 \cdots w_j$. That is

$$w_{j+1} w_{j+2} \cdots w_{j+n} = \frac{w_1 w_2 \cdots w_{j+n}}{w_1 w_2 \cdots w_j} > \frac{M w_1 w_2 \cdots w_j}{w_1 w_2 \cdots w_j} = M.$$

It can be easily seen that $E \subset [q+j+1, +\infty) \cap \mathbb{N}_0 \subset \bar{A}_{M,j}$. So $E \subset A_{M,j} \cap \bar{A}_{M,j}$. This gives that $A_{M,j} \cap \bar{A}_{M,j} \in \mathcal{F}$. Hence B_w is \mathcal{F} -mixing, by Proposition 2.22. This ends the construction of the \mathcal{F} -mixing operator B_w .

Consider the following non-empty open set

$$W = \{x \in X : \|x - e_0\| < \frac{1}{3}\}.$$

Fix $m \in N_{B_w}(W, W) \setminus \{0\}$. Then there is a vector $x = (\dots, x_{-1}, x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots) \in W$ such that $B_w^m x \in W$, which gives that $|x_m| < \frac{1}{3}$ and $|w_1 w_2 \cdots w_m x_m - 1| < \frac{1}{3}$. Then we have $w_1 w_2 \cdots w_m |x_m| > \frac{2}{3}$ and then $w_1 w_2 \cdots w_m = \frac{w_1 w_2 \cdots w_m |x_m|}{|x_m|} > 2$, which gives that $m \in F$. That is, $N_{B_w}(W, W) \subset F \cup \{0\}$. \square

Remark 4.2. Given a full family \mathcal{F} and $F \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$, by the similar strategy as in the proof of Lemma 4.1 one can find an \mathcal{F} -mixing unilateral weighted backward shift B_w on X , and a non-empty open subset W of X such that $N_{B_w}(W, W) \subset F \cup \{0\}$, where $X = c_0(\mathbb{N}_0)$ or $\ell^p(\mathbb{N}_0)$, $1 \leq p < \infty$.

By Lemma 4.1, for a given full family \mathcal{F} , we characterize the operators which are weakly disjoint from all \mathcal{F} -mixing operators, which is an analogue of the Weiss-Akin-Glasner Theorem (Theorem 2.13) from topological dynamics.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $T: X \rightarrow X$ be an operator and let \mathcal{F} be a full family. Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) T is $(\tilde{\mathcal{F}})^*$ -transitive;
- (2) T is weakly disjoint from all \mathcal{F} -mixing operators;
- (3) T is weakly disjoint from all invertible \mathcal{F} -mixing bilateral weighted backward shifts on Y , where $Y = c_0(\mathbb{Z})$ or $\ell^p(\mathbb{Z})$, $1 \leq p < \infty$.

Proof. The implications (1) \Rightarrow (2) \Rightarrow (3) are clear.

(3) \Rightarrow (1). Let U, V be a pair of non-empty open subset of X . Our goal is to show that $N_T(U, V)$ intersects each member in $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$. Fix $F \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$. By Lemma 4.1, there exists an invertible \mathcal{F} -mixing bilateral weighted backward shift S on Y , and a non-empty open subset W of Y such that $N_S(W, W) \subset F \cup \{0\}$. Since $T \oplus S$ is hypercyclic, $N_T(U, V) \cap N_S(W, W)$ is an infinite set, while $N_T(U, V) \cap N_S(W, W) \subset N_T(U, V) \cap (F \cup \{0\}) = (N_T(U, V) \cap F) \cup (N_T(U, V) \cap \{0\})$. Consequently, $N_T(U, V) \cap F$ is an infinite set, and then $N_T(U, V) \in (\tilde{\mathcal{F}})^*$. Hence T is $(\tilde{\mathcal{F}})^*$ -transitive. \square

For a shift-invariant thick family \mathcal{F} , if every \mathcal{F}^* -transitive operator is weakly mixing, then the characterization of the weak disjointness of \mathcal{F} -transitive operator can be strengthened as follows.

Proposition 4.4. *Let $T: X \rightarrow X$ be an operator and let \mathcal{F} be a shift-invariant thick family. If every \mathcal{F}^* -transitive operator is weakly mixing, then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) T is \mathcal{F}^* -transitive;
- (2) for any \mathcal{F} -transitive operator $S: Y \rightarrow Y$, $T \oplus S$ is weakly mixing;
- (3) for any invertible \mathcal{F} -transitive bilateral weighted backward shift S on Y , where $Y = c_0(\mathbb{Z})$, or $\ell^p(\mathbb{Z})$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, $T \oplus S$ is weakly mixing.

Proof. The implication (2) \Rightarrow (3) is clear. (3) \Rightarrow (1) follows from Theorem 4.3.

(1) \Rightarrow (2). Let $S: Y \rightarrow Y$ be an \mathcal{F} -transitive operator. Fix non-empty open subsets U_1, V_1 of X , and U_2, V_2 of Y . Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. By the hypothesis, T is weakly mixing and \mathcal{F}^* -transitive. So T is \mathcal{F}^* -mixing. Then $A = \{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \{n, n+1, \dots, n+k\} \subset N_T(U_1, V_1)\} \in \mathcal{F}^*$. By the \mathcal{F} -transitivity of S and the thickness of \mathcal{F} , we have $B = \{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \{n, n+1, \dots, n+k\} \subset N_S(U_2, V_2)\} \in \mathcal{F}$. Now $\emptyset \neq A \cap B \subset \{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \{n, n+1, \dots, n+k\} \subset N_T(U_1, V_1) \cap N_S(U_2, V_2)\}$ and then $N_T(U_1, V_1) \cap N_S(U_2, V_2) \in \mathcal{F}_t$. By Proposition 2.5, $T \oplus S$ is weakly mixing. \square

Since \mathcal{F}_{ts} and \mathcal{F}_t are shift-invariant thick families, and the topological ergodicity of operators implies weak mixing, by Theorem 4.3 and Proposition 4.4, we can strengthen Cardecia's results (Theorems 3.11 and 3.12) as follows.

Corollary 4.5. *Let $T: X \rightarrow X$ be an operator. Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) T is topologically ergodic;
- (2) T is weakly disjoint from all weakly mixing operators;
- (3) T is weakly disjoint from all invertible weakly mixing bilateral weighted backward shifts on Y , where $Y = c_0(\mathbb{Z})$ or $\ell^p(\mathbb{Z})$, $1 \leq p < \infty$;
- (4) for any invertible weakly mixing bilateral weighted backward shift S on Y , where $Y = c_0(\mathbb{Z})$ or $\ell^p(\mathbb{Z})$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, $T \oplus S$ is weakly mixing;
- (5) for any weakly mixing operator $S: Y \rightarrow Y$, $T \oplus S$ is weakly mixing.

Corollary 4.6. *Let $T: X \rightarrow X$ be an operator. Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) T is \mathcal{F}_{ps} -transitive;
- (2) T is weakly disjoint from all topologically ergodic operators;
- (3) T is weakly disjoint from all invertible topologically ergodic bilateral weighted backward shifts on Y , where $Y = c_0(\mathbb{Z})$ or $\ell^p(\mathbb{Z})$, $1 \leq p < \infty$.

As we can see, if a family \mathcal{F} can be realized by the return time sets of \mathcal{F} -transitive operators, then the \mathcal{F}^* -transitivity of an operator is equivalent to the weak disjointness from all \mathcal{F} -transitive operators. By Lemma 4.1, each shift-invariant thick family can be realized completely by \mathcal{F} -mixing operators. However, one can construct a family \mathcal{F} which can be realized by the return time sets of \mathcal{F} -transitive operators but is not thick, using the following result.

Theorem 4.7 ([14, Theorem 4.1] or [6, Theorem 1.2]). *There is a hypercyclic operator which is not weakly mixing.*

Let $T: X \rightarrow X$ be a hypercyclic operator which is not weakly mixing and let $\mathcal{N}_T = \{A \subset \mathbb{N}_0: N(U, V) \subset A \text{ for some non-empty open subsets } U, V \text{ of } X\}$. It is easy to check that an operator $S: Y \rightarrow Y$ is \mathcal{N}_T^* -transitive if and only if it is weakly disjoint from all \mathcal{N}_T -transitive operators if and only if it is weakly disjoint from T . But since T is not weakly mixing, we have $N(U_0, V_0) \notin \mathcal{F}_t$ for some non-empty open subsets U_0, V_0 of X and then \mathcal{N}_T is not a thick family. Lemma 4.1 gives a characterizations of subsets of non-negative integers which can be realized by the return time sets of \mathcal{F} -mixing operators. But the characterization of return time sets remains open for hypercyclic operators which are not weak mixing. This raises the following question:

Question 4.8. Besides shift-invariant thick families, what kind of family \mathcal{F} can be realized by the return time sets of \mathcal{F} -transitive operators?

By the Weiss-Akin-Glasner Theorem (Theorem 2.9), there is no family \mathcal{F} such that the \mathcal{F} -transitivity of compact dynamical systems is equivalent to the weak disjointness from all \mathcal{F} -transitive compact dynamical systems, since there exists a topologically ergodic compact dynamical system which is not weakly mixing. But things change under the framework of linear dynamical systems, since each topologically ergodic operators must be \mathcal{F}_{ts} -transitive, thus weakly mixing, so we ask:

Question 4.9. Is there a family \mathcal{F} such that an operator is \mathcal{F} -transitive if and only if it is weakly disjoint from all \mathcal{F} -transitive operators?

In 1995, Salas provided in [25, Corollary 2.3] a hypercyclic operator T on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ such that T^* is also hypercyclic. In Lemma 4.1, if we restrict the underlying space X to $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, require that $\mathbb{N}_0 \setminus F$ is large enough, and modify our construction slightly, then the operator we obtain possesses a hypercyclic adjoint.

Proposition 4.10. *Let \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 be shift-invariant thick families. If there are $F_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2$ with $F_1 \cap F_2 = \emptyset$, then there is an invertible operator T on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ such that T is \mathcal{F}_1 -transitive and T^* is \mathcal{F}_2 -transitive.*

Proof. Let $F = F_1$. It is clear that both F and $\mathbb{N}_0 \setminus F$ are not cofinite. Write F as the disjoint union of a sequence $(I_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of maximal finite integer intervals. Since $\{n \in \mathbb{N}_0: \{n-2, n\} \subset F\} \in \mathcal{F}_1$, without loss of generality, we require that $0 \notin F, 1 \notin F$ and $|I_k| \geq 3$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Also we assume that the sequence $(\min I_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is increasing. Let $J_1 = [1, \min I_1 - 1] \cap \mathbb{N}_0$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $J_{k+1} = [\max I_{k-1} + 1, \min I_{k+1} - 1] \cap \mathbb{N}_0$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$\mathcal{I}_n = \begin{cases} \underbrace{[2, 2, \dots, 2]}_{m \text{ terms}}, \underbrace{[\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \dots, \frac{1}{2}]}_{m \text{ terms}}, & \text{if } |I_n| = 2m \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{N}, \\ \underbrace{[2, 2, \dots, 2]}_{m \text{ terms}}, \underbrace{[\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \dots, \frac{1}{2}]}_{m \text{ terms}}, [1], & \text{if } |I_n| = 2m + 1 \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{N}, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\mathcal{J}_n = \begin{cases} [\underbrace{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \dots, \frac{1}{2}}_{m \text{ terms}}, \underbrace{2, 2, \dots, 2}_{m \text{ terms}}], & \text{if } |J_n| = 2m \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{N}, \\ [\underbrace{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \dots, \frac{1}{2}}_{m \text{ terms}}, \underbrace{2, 2, \dots, 2}_{m \text{ terms}}, 1], & \text{if } |J_n| = 2m + 1 \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{N}, \\ [1], & \text{if } |J_n| = 1. \end{cases}$$

Also, let

$$\bar{\mathcal{I}}_n = \begin{cases} [\underbrace{2, 2, \dots, 2}_{m \text{ terms}}, \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \dots, \frac{1}{2}}_{m \text{ terms}}], & \text{if } |I_n| = 2m \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{N}, \\ [\underbrace{1, 2, 2, \dots, 2}_{m \text{ terms}}, \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \dots, \frac{1}{2}}_{m \text{ terms}}], & \text{if } |I_n| = 2m + 1 \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{N}, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\bar{\mathcal{J}}_n = \begin{cases} [\underbrace{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \dots, \frac{1}{2}}_{m \text{ terms}}, \underbrace{2, 2, \dots, 2}_{m \text{ terms}}], & \text{if } |J_n| = 2m \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{N}, \\ [1, \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \dots, \frac{1}{2}}_{m \text{ terms}}, \underbrace{2, 2, \dots, 2}_{m \text{ terms}}], & \text{if } |J_n| = 2m + 1 \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{N}, \\ [1], & \text{if } |J_n| = 1. \end{cases}$$

Let B_w be the bilateral weighted backward shift on X defined by the weight w , where $w = (w_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is given by

$$w = (\underbrace{\dots \bar{\mathcal{I}}_n, \bar{\mathcal{J}}_n, \dots \bar{\mathcal{I}}_1, \bar{\mathcal{J}}_1}_{-\mathbb{N}}, \underbrace{[1]}_0, \underbrace{\mathcal{J}_1, \mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{J}_n, \mathcal{I}_n, \dots}_{\mathbb{N}}).$$

For each $n \in -\mathbb{N}$, we have $w_n = \frac{1}{w_{-n}}$. Since both $(w_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $(\frac{1}{w_{n+1}})_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are bounded, B_w is an invertible operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$. Let $v = (w_{1-n})_n$. It is easy to see that the adjoint of B_w is conjugate to B_v .

By the same argument as the one in Case B of the proof of Lemma 4.1, we have the following facts:

- if $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ satisfies $\{m - r, m - r + 1, \dots, m + r + 1\} \subset F$ for some $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$, then $w_1 \cdots w_m \geq 2^r$;
- if $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ satisfies $\{m - r, m - r + 1, \dots, m + r + 1\} \subset \mathbb{N} \setminus F$ for some $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$, then $w_1 \cdots w_m \leq \frac{1}{2^r}$.

To show that B_w is \mathcal{F}_1 -transitive, by Proposition 2.22 it suffices to show that for any $M > 0$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $A_{M,j}(w) \cap \bar{A}_{M,j}(w) \in \mathcal{F}_1$, where

$$A_{M,j}(w) = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : w_{j+1}w_{j+2} \cdots w_{j+n} > M\}, \bar{A}_{M,j}(w) = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : w_j w_{j-1} \cdots w_{j-n+1} < \frac{1}{M}\}.$$

Fix $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $M > 0$. There is $q_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $2^{q_1} > Mw_1 \cdots w_j$. Consider the set

$$E_1 = \{m \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \{m - q_1 - j - 1, m - q_1 - j + 1, \dots, m + q_1 + j + 1\} \subset F\}.$$

Since \mathcal{F}_1 is a shift-invariant thick family and $F \in \mathcal{F}_1$, by Remark 2.4, $E_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1$. Fix $n \in E_1$, we have $\{(n+j)-q_1, (n+j)-q_1+1, \dots, (n+j)+q_1+1\} \subset F$ and $\{(n-j-1)-q_1, (n-j-1)-q_1+1, \dots, (n-j-1)+q_1+1\} \subset F$. Then $w_1 w_2 \cdots w_{j+n} \geq 2^{q_1}$ and $w_1 w_2 \cdots w_{n-j-1} \geq 2^{q_1}$. We have

$$w_{j+1} w_{j+2} \cdots w_{j+n} = \frac{w_1 w_2 \cdots w_{j+n}}{w_1 w_2 \cdots w_j} \geq \frac{2^{q_1}}{w_1 w_2 \cdots w_j} > M,$$

and

$$w_j w_{j-1} \cdots w_0 w_{-1} \cdots w_{j-n+1} = w_0 w_1 \cdots w_j \frac{1}{w_1 \cdots w_{n-j-1}} \leq \frac{w_1 \cdots w_j}{2^{q_1}} < \frac{1}{M}.$$

This gives that $E_1 \subset A_{M,j}(w) \cap \bar{A}_{M,j}(w)$. Then $A_{M,j}(w) \cap \bar{A}_{M,j}(w) \in \mathcal{F}_1$, and B_w is \mathcal{F}_1 -transitive by Proposition 2.22.

To show that B_v is \mathcal{F}_2 -transitive, by Proposition 2.22 it suffices to show that for any $M > 0$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $A_{M,j}(v) \cap \bar{A}_{M,j}(v) \in \mathcal{F}_2$, where

$$A_{M,j}(v) = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : v_{j+1} v_{j+2} \cdots v_{j+n} > M\}, \bar{A}_{M,j}(v) = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : v_j v_{j-1} \cdots v_{j-n+1} < \frac{1}{M}\}.$$

Fix $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $M > 0$. There is $q_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $2^{q_2} > M \max\{w_0 w_{-1} \cdots w_{-j+1}, v_j v_{j-1} \cdots v_2\}$. Consider the set

$$E_2 = \{m \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \{m - q_2 - j, m - q_2 - j + 1, \dots, m + q_2 + j + 1\} \subset \mathbb{N} \setminus F\}.$$

Since $\mathbb{N}_0 \setminus F \in \mathcal{F}_2$ and \mathcal{F}_2 is full, we have $\mathbb{N} \setminus F \in \mathcal{F}_2$. Since \mathcal{F}_2 is a shift-invariant thick family, by Remark 2.4, $E_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2$. Fix $n \in E_2$. We have $\{(n+j)-q_2, (n+j)-q_2+1, \dots, (n+j)+q_2+1\} \subset \mathbb{N} \setminus F$ and $\{(n-j)-q_2, (n-j)-q_2+1, \dots, (n-j)+q_2+1\} \subset \mathbb{N} \setminus F$. By the above analysis, we have $w_1 w_2 \cdots w_{j+n-1} \leq \frac{1}{2^{q_2}}$ and $w_1 w_2 \cdots w_{n-j} \leq \frac{1}{2^{q_2}}$. Note that

$$v_1 \cdots v_{j+n} = \frac{1}{w_1 w_2 \cdots w_{j+n-1}} = \frac{1}{w_0 w_1 w_2 \cdots w_{j+n-1}}.$$

We have

$$v_{j+1} \cdots v_{j+n} = \frac{\frac{1}{w_1 w_2 \cdots w_{j+n-1}}}{v_1 \cdots v_j} \geq \frac{2^{q_2}}{w_0 w_{-1} \cdots w_{-j+1}} > M,$$

and

$$v_j v_{j-1} \cdots v_0 v_{-1} \cdots v_{j-n+1} = v_j v_{j-1} \cdots v_2 w_0 w_1 w_2 \cdots w_{-j+n} \leq \frac{v_j v_{j-1} \cdots v_2}{2^{q_2}} < \frac{1}{M}.$$

This gives that $E_2 \subset A_{M,j}(v) \cap \bar{A}_{M,j}(v)$. Then $A_{M,j}(v) \cap \bar{A}_{M,j}(v) \in \mathcal{F}_2$, and B_v is \mathcal{F}_2 -transitive by Proposition 2.22. \square

4.2. Some Examples. Applying Lemma 4.1, we can provide a large amount of operators with some prescribed properties. We give firstly two general results and then provide certain examples.

Proposition 4.11. *Let \mathcal{F}_1 be a shift invariant thick family and \mathcal{F}_2 be a family. Then there exists an invertible \mathcal{F}_1 -transitive operator which is not \mathcal{F}_2 -transitive if and only if $\mathcal{F}_1 \setminus \mathcal{F}_2 \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. \Rightarrow . Let $T: X \rightarrow X$ be an invertible \mathcal{F}_1 -transitive operator which is not \mathcal{F}_2 -transitive. Then there are non-empty open subsets U, V of X with $N(U, V) \notin \mathcal{F}_2$. We are done since $N(U, V) \in \mathcal{F}_1$.

\Leftarrow . By Lemma 4.1, there exists an invertible \mathcal{F}_1 -transitive operator $T: X \rightarrow X$, and a non-empty open subset W of X such that:

$$N(W, W) \subset F_1 \cup \{0\}.$$

It is clear that $N(W, W) \cap F_2 \subset (F_1 \cup \{0\}) \cap F_2 \subset (F_1 \cap F_2) \cup \{0\} = \{0\}$.

Since X has no isolated points, there are non-empty open sets $W', W'' \subset W$ with $N(W', W'') \subset [1, +\infty)$. Finally we have $N_T(W', W'') \cap F_2 = \emptyset$. Hence T is not \mathcal{F}_2^* -transitive. \square

Proposition 4.12. *Let \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 be shift invariant thick families. Then there exists an invertible \mathcal{F}_1 -transitive operator $T: X \rightarrow X$ and an invertible \mathcal{F}_2 -transitive operator $S: Y \rightarrow Y$ such that T is not weakly disjoint from S if and only if there are $F_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1$ and $F_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2$ such that $F_1 \cap F_2 = \emptyset$.*

Proof. On the one hand, let $T: X \rightarrow X$ be an invertible \mathcal{F}_1 -transitive operator and $S: Y \rightarrow Y$ be an invertible \mathcal{F}_2 -transitive operator such that T is not weakly disjoint from S . Then there are non-empty open subsets U_1, V_1 of X and U_2, V_2 of Y with $N(U_1, V_1) \cap N(U_2, V_2) = \emptyset$. We are done since $N(U_1, V_1) \in \mathcal{F}_1$ and $N(U_2, V_2) \in \mathcal{F}_2$.

Conversely, by the hypothesis, $F_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1 \setminus \mathcal{F}_2^*$. By Proposition 4.11, there exists an invertible \mathcal{F}_1 -transitive operator which is not \mathcal{F}_2^* -transitive. Since \mathcal{F}_2 is a shift-invariant thick family, by Theorem 4.3, there exists an invertible \mathcal{F}_2 -transitive operator $S: Y \rightarrow Y$ such that T is not weakly disjoint from S . \square

In 2019, Bès et al. has constructed several operators to distinguish the transitivity along some different families [11]. We provide here more invertible operators of such kind. We recall the definitions of density and Banach density of a subset of \mathbb{N}_0 .

Definition 4.13. Let $A \subset \mathbb{N}_0$.

- The upper and lower density of A are given by

$$\overline{D}(A) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\{j \in A : j \leq n-1\}|}{n}, \quad \underline{D}(A) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\{j \in A : j \leq n-1\}|}{n};$$

- The upper and lower Banach density of A are given by

$$\overline{BD}(A) = \limsup_{n-m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\{j \in A : m \leq j \leq n-1\}|}{n-m}, \quad \underline{BD}(A) = \liminf_{n-m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\{j \in A : m \leq j \leq n-1\}|}{n-m}.$$

It is observed that for any $A \subset \mathbb{N}_0$, we have $\underline{BD}(A) \leq \underline{D}(A) \leq \overline{D}(A) \leq \overline{BD}(A)$. We denote

- $\mathcal{F}_{\text{pud}} = \{A \subset \mathbb{N}_0 : \overline{D}(A) > 0\};$ $\mathcal{F}_{\text{pld}} = \{A \subset \mathbb{N}_0 : \underline{D}(A) > 0\};$
- $\mathcal{F}_{\text{ud1}} = \{A \subset \mathbb{N}_0 : \overline{D}(A) = 1\};$ $\mathcal{F}_{\text{ld1}} = \{A \subset \mathbb{N}_0 : \underline{D}(A) = 1\};$
- $\mathcal{F}_{\text{pubd}} = \{A \subset \mathbb{N}_0 : \overline{BD}(A) > 0\};$ $\mathcal{F}_{\text{lb1}} = \{A \subset \mathbb{N}_0 : \underline{BD}(A) = 1\}.$

It can be checked that the above six families are shift-invariant and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{ld1}}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{lbdl}}$ are filters. By Remark 2.4(5), both \mathcal{F}_{ld1} and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{lbdl}}$ are shift-invariant thick families. Besides, we have $\mathcal{F}_{\text{ld1}}^* = \mathcal{F}_{\text{pud}}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{lbdl}}^* = \mathcal{F}_{\text{pubd}}$. By Proposition 4.11, once we have found a subset of \mathbb{N}_0 with some prescribed properties, we will obtain an operator to distinguish certain classes of hypercyclic operators.

Proposition 4.14. *Let $X = c_0(\mathbb{Z})$ or $\ell^p(\mathbb{Z})$, $1 \leq p < \infty$.*

- (1) *There exists an invertible weakly mixing operator on X which is not \mathcal{F}_{pud} -transitive.*
- (2) *There exists an invertible topologically ergodic operator on X which is not $\mathcal{F}_{\text{ip}}^*$ -transitive.*
- (3) *There exists an invertible topologically ergodic operator on X which is not \mathcal{F}_{ud1} -transitive.*
- (4) *There exists an invertible \mathcal{F}_{ld1} -transitive operator on X which is not topologically ergodic.*
- (5) *There exists an invertible $\mathcal{F}_{\text{lbdl}}$ -transitive operator on X which is not strongly mixing.*
- (6) *There exists an invertible $\mathcal{F}_{\text{ip}}^*$ -transitive operator on X which is not Δ^* -transitive.*
- (7) *There exists an invertible Δ_{ip}^* -transitive operator on X which is not $\mathcal{F}_{\text{ip}}^*$ -transitive.*

Proof. (1). Let $F = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{2^n, 2^n + 1, \dots, 2^n + n\}$. It is clear that $F \in \mathcal{F}_t \setminus \mathcal{F}_{\text{pud}}$. Since \mathcal{F}_t is a shift-invariant thick family, the result follows from Proposition 4.11.

(2). Let $F = \mathbb{N}_0 \setminus FS((10^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}})$. It can be verified that $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{ts}} \setminus \mathcal{F}_{\text{ip}}^*$. Since \mathcal{F}_{ts} is a shift-invariant thick family, the result follows from Proposition 4.11.

(3). For each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, let $F_n = \{(n3^n)k + i : k \in \mathbb{N}, i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}\}$. Then F_n is syndetic and $\overline{D}(F_n) = \underline{D}(F_n) = \frac{1}{3^n}$. Let $F = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n$. Then F is thickly syndetic and $\overline{D}(F) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \overline{D}(F_n) = \frac{2}{3}$. This shows that $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{ts}} \setminus \mathcal{F}_{\text{ud1}}$. Since \mathcal{F}_{ts} is a shift-invariant thick family, the result follows from Proposition 4.11.

(4). Let $F = \mathbb{N}_0 \setminus \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{2^n, 2^n + 1, \dots, 2^n + n\}$. By the proof of (1), $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{ld1}} \setminus \mathcal{F}_s$. Since \mathcal{F}_{ld1} is a shift-invariant thick family, the result follows from Proposition 4.11.

(5). Let $F = \mathbb{N}_0 \setminus \{2^n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. It is clear that $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{lbdl}} \setminus \mathcal{F}_{\text{cf}}$. Since $\mathcal{F}_{\text{lbdl}}$ is a shift-invariant thick family, the result follows from Proposition 4.11.

(6). Let $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of positive integers such that $s_{n+1} > 4(\sum_{i=1}^n s_i + n)$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Put $S = \{s_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $A = \mathbb{N}_0 \setminus (S - S)$. The family

$$\mathcal{F}_A = \left\{ B \subset \mathbb{N}_0 : \text{there exist } m_1, m_2, \dots, m_k \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ with } \bigcap_{i=1}^k (A + m_i) \right\}$$

is a shift-invariant thick subfamily of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{ip}}^*$ (see [23, Example B]). Now we have $A \in \mathcal{F}_A \setminus \Delta^*$. Then the result follows from Proposition 4.11.

(7). Let $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the same sequence as the one in the proof of (6). Put $A = \mathbb{N}_0 \setminus FS((s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}})$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $A_k = \bigcap_{i=-k}^k (A + i)$. The family

$$\mathcal{F}_A = \left\{ B \subset \mathbb{N}_0 : \text{there exists } k \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ with } A_k \subset B \right\}$$

is a shift-invariant thick subfamily of Δ_{ip}^* (see [23, Example C]). Now we have $A \in \mathcal{F}_A \setminus \mathcal{F}_{\text{ip}}^*$. Then the result follows from Proposition 4.11. \square

We provide examples of weakly mixing operators without hypercyclic direct sums.

Corollary 4.15. *There exist an invertible weakly mixing operator T and an invertible \mathcal{F}_{Id1} -transitive operator S such that T is not weakly disjoint from S .*

Proof. Since there are $F_1 \in \mathcal{F}_t$ and $F_2 \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{Id1}}$ with $F_1 \cap F_2 = \emptyset$ (see the proof of Proposition 4.14(4)), the result follows from Proposition 4.12. \square

In Section 3 we have demonstrated that the mild mixing of operator lies strictly between strong mixing and weak mixing. By Proposition 4.14 and Corollary 4.15, we immediately obtain that the mild mixing of invertible operators lies strictly between strong mixing and weak mixing.

Corollary 4.16.

- (1) *There exists an invertible \mathcal{F}_{Id1} -transitive operator which is not mildly mixing.*
- (2) *There exists an invertible mildly mixing operator T which is not strongly mixing.*

Proof. (1). The \mathcal{F}_{Id1} -transitive operator $S: Y \rightarrow Y$ in Corollary 4.15 is not mildly mixing since it is not weakly disjoint from some weakly mixing operator.

(2). By Proposition 4.14(7), there exists an invertible Δ_{ip}^* -transitive operator $T: X \rightarrow X$ which is not $\mathcal{F}_{\text{ip}}^*$ -transitive. By Proposition 3.15, T is mildly mixing. It is clear that T is not strongly mixing. \square

We provide a further example of weakly mixing operator with weakly mixing adjoint. By Proposition 3.18, this is also an example of weakly mixing operator $T: X \rightarrow X$ such that both T and T^* are not mildly mixing.

Corollary 4.17. *There exists an invertible \mathcal{F}_{Id1} -transitive operator T on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ such that T^* is weakly mixing.*

Proof. Since there exist $F_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{Id1}}$ and $F_2 \in \mathcal{F}_t$ with $F_1 \cap F_2 = \emptyset$ (see the proof of Proposition 4.14(4)), the result follows from Proposition 4.10. \square

5. WEAK DISJOINTNESS OF BACKWARD SHIFTS

In this section, we characterize the weak disjointness of (bilateral and unilateral) backward shifts on Fréchet sequence spaces. And we show that the \mathcal{F} -mixing of the direct sums of such operators, is equivalent to the \mathcal{F} -Mixing Criterion.

Recall that in 1995 Salas gave in [25] a characterization of the weak disjointness of weighted backward shifts on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ and $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_0)$. Indeed, the weak disjointness of weighted backward shifts on $c_0(\mathbb{Z})$ and $\ell^p(\mathbb{Z})$, $1 \leq p < \infty$ (or $c_0(\mathbb{N}_0)$ and $\ell^p(\mathbb{N}_0)$, $1 \leq p < \infty$) is already characterized by Salas in [25], although he only give a proof for $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_0)$. We restate these results in the language of weak disjointness.

Theorem 5.1 ([25, Theorem 2.5]). *Two weighted backward shifts B_w, B_v on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ are weakly disjoint if and only if for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $q \in \mathbb{N}_0$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $|j| \leq q$,*

$$\min\{w_{j+1}w_{j+2}\cdots w_{j+n}, v_{j+1}v_{j+2}\cdots v_{j+n}\} > \frac{1}{\epsilon},$$

and

$$\max\{w_jw_{j-1}\cdots w_{j-n+1}, v_jv_{j-1}\cdots v_{j-n+1}\} < \epsilon.$$

Theorem 5.2 ([25, Theorem 2.8]). *Two weighted backward shifts B_w and B_v on $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_0)$ are weakly disjoint if and only if*

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \{\min\{\prod_{s=1}^n w_s, \prod_{s=1}^n v_s\}\} = \infty.$$

Let X be a bilateral Fréchet sequence space in which $\{\dots, e_{-2}, e_{-1}, e_0, e_1, e_2, \dots\}$ is a basis. Given a bilateral weighted backward shift B_w on X , it is not hard to see that B_w is conjugate to a (non-weighted) backward shift on a Fréchet sequence space with the basis

$$\{\dots, \frac{e_{-2}}{w_{-1}w_0}, \frac{e_{-1}}{w_0}, e_0, w_1e_1, w_1w_2e_2, \dots\}.$$

This strategy works also for unilateral weighted backward shifts. Since the weak disjointness and the \mathcal{F} -transitivity of operators are preserved under conjugacy, in what follows we consider the weak disjointness of backward shifts, and then transfer the results into the form of weighted backward shifts.

5.1. Weak disjointness of bilateral backward shifts. We first discuss the weak disjointness of bilateral backward shifts on Fréchet sequence spaces.

Theorem 5.3. *Let X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k be bilateral Fréchet sequence spaces in which $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a basis and B_1, B_2, \dots, B_k be the backward shifts on X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k respectively. Let \mathcal{F} be a family. Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k B_i$ is \mathcal{F} -transitive;
- (2) $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k B_i$ is \mathcal{F} -mixing;
- (3) $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k B_i$ satisfies the \mathcal{F} -Mixing Criterion;
- (4) for each $\epsilon > 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\bigcap_{j=-N}^N \bigcap_{i=1}^k (C_{\epsilon,j}^+(X_i) \cap C_{\epsilon,j}^-(X_i)) \in \mathcal{F}$, where for $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$,

$$C_{\epsilon,j}^+(X_i) = \{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \|e_{j+n}\|_{X_i} < \epsilon\}, C_{\epsilon,j}^-(X_i) = \{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \|e_{j-n}\|_{X_i} < \epsilon\}.$$

Proof. The implications (3) \Rightarrow (2) \Rightarrow (1) are clear.

(1) \Rightarrow (4). Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, since $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a basis of X_i , we have that $\{h_n e_n : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is bounded for each $h = (h_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \in X_i$. By the Banach-Steinhaus Theorem ([20, Theorem A.10]), for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, there exists $\delta_i > 0$ such that for any $x^{(i)} \in X_i$ with $\|x^{(i)}\|_{X_i} < \delta_i$, we have that

$$\|x_n^{(i)} e_n\|_{X_i} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z},$$

and

$$|x_j^{(i)}| \leq \frac{1}{3}, \quad |j| \leq N.$$

Let $\delta = \min\{\delta_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, k\}$ and $u = \sum_{i=-N}^N e_i$. For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, denote $U_i = \{y \in X_i : \|y - u\|_{X_i} < \delta\}$. Since $B_1 \oplus B_2$ is hypercyclic, we have

$$Q := \bigcap_{i=1}^k N_{B_i}(U_i, U_i) \cap [2N + 1, +\infty) \neq \emptyset.$$

Fix $n \in Q$. There is a vector $(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}, \dots, x^{(k)}) \in U_1 \oplus U_2 \oplus \dots \oplus U_k$ such that:

$$(B_1^n x^{(1)}, B_2^n x^{(2)}, \dots, B_k^n x^{(k)}) \in U_1 \oplus U_2 \oplus \dots \oplus U_k.$$

That is, we have $|j - n| > N, j + n > N$ for $|j| \leq N$ and for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, we have the following:

- (i) $|x_j^{(i)} - 1| \leq \frac{1}{3}$ for $|j| \leq N$;
- (ii) $|x_k^{(i)}| \leq \frac{1}{3}$ for $|k| > N$;
- (iii) $\|(x_j^{(i)} - 1)e_j\|_{X_i} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ for $|j| \leq N$;
- (iv) $\|x_k^{(i)} e_k\|_{X_i} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ for $|k| > N$;
- (v) $|x_{n+j}^{(i)} - 1| \leq \frac{1}{3}$ for $|j| \leq N$;
- (vi) $|x_{n+k}^{(i)}| \leq \frac{1}{3}$ for $|k| > N$;
- (vii) $\|(x_{n+j}^{(i)} - 1)e_j\|_{X_i} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ for $|j| \leq N$;
- (viii) $\|x_{n+k}^{(i)} e_k\|_{X_i} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ for $|k| > N$.

Fix $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. By (viii), we have that $\|x_j^{(i)} e_{j-n}\|_{X_i} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ for $|j| \leq N$. Then by (ii), we have that for $|j| \leq N$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_{j-n}\|_{X_i} &= \left\| \left(\frac{1}{x_j^{(i)}} - 1 \right) x_j^{(i)} e_{j-n} + x_j^{(i)} e_{j-n} \right\|_{X_i} \\ &\leq \left| \frac{1}{x_j^{(i)}} - 1 \right| \cdot \|x_j^{(i)} e_{j-n}\|_{X_i} + \|x_j^{(i)} e_{j-n}\|_{X_i} \\ &< \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

By (iv), we have that $\|x_{j+n}^{(i)} e_{j+n}\|_{X_i} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ for $|j| \leq N$. Then by (v), we have that for $|j| \leq N$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_{j+n}\|_{X_i} &= \left\| \left(\frac{1}{x_{j+n}^{(i)}} - 1 \right) x_{j+n}^{(i)} e_{j+n} + x_{j+n}^{(i)} e_{j+n} \right\|_{X_i} \\ &\leq \left\| \left(\frac{1}{x_{j+n}^{(i)}} - 1 \right) x_{j+n}^{(i)} e_{j+n} \right\|_{X_i} + \|x_{j+n}^{(i)} e_{j+n}\|_{X_i} \\ &\leq \|x_{j+n}^{(i)} e_{j+n}\|_{X_i} + \|x_{j+n}^{(i)} e_{j+n}\|_{X_i} \\ &< \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have that

$$Q \subset \bigcap_{j=-N}^N \bigcap_{i=1}^k (C_{\epsilon, j}^+(X_i) \cap C_{\epsilon, j}^-(X_i)).$$

Since $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k X_i$ has no isolated points, for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ there are non-empty open subsets W_i and V_i of U_i such that

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^k N_{B_i}(W_i, V_i) \subset [2N + 1, +\infty).$$

Then

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^k N_{B_i}(W_i, V_i) \subset Q \subset \bigcap_{j=-N}^N \bigcap_{i=1}^k (C_{\epsilon, j}^+(X_i) \cap C_{\epsilon, j}^-(X_i)).$$

We are done since the hypothesis gives that $\bigcap_{i=1}^k N_{B_i}(W_i, V_i) \in \mathcal{F}$.

(4) \Rightarrow (3). Let $a = (a^{(1)}, a^{(2)}, \dots, a^{(k)})$ and $b = (b^{(1)}, b^{(2)}, \dots, b^{(k)})$ be two k -tuples of finite sequences in $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k X_i$. For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, write

$$\begin{aligned} a^{(i)} &= (\dots, 0, 0, a_{-l}^{(i)}, \dots, a_0^{(i)}, a_1^{(i)}, \dots, a_l^{(i)}, 0, 0, \dots), \\ b^{(i)} &= (\dots, 0, 0, b_{-l}^{(i)}, \dots, b_0^{(i)}, b_1^{(i)}, \dots, b_l^{(i)}, 0, 0, \dots). \end{aligned}$$

Let F_1, F_2, \dots, F_k be the forward shifts for finite sequences of X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k respectively. Denote $T = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k B_i$ and $S = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k F_i$. Fix $\delta > 0$. For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, there exists $\epsilon_i > 0$ such that for any $z^{(i)} \in X_i$ with $\|z^{(i)}\|_{X_i} < \epsilon_i$, we have for $|j| \leq l$,

$$\|a_j^{(i)} z^{(i)}\|_{X_i} < \frac{\delta}{2l+1}, \quad \|b_j^{(i)} z^{(i)}\|_{X_i} < \frac{\delta}{2l+1}.$$

Let $\epsilon = \min\{\epsilon_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, k\}$. Fix $n \in \bigcap_{j=-l}^l \bigcap_{i=1}^k (C_{\epsilon, j}^+(X_i) \cap C_{\epsilon, j}^-(X_i))$ and $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. We have

$$\|F_i^n a^{(i)}\|_{X_i} = \left\| \sum_{j=-l}^l a_j^{(i)} e_{j+n} \right\|_{X_i} \leq \sum_{j=-l}^l \|a_j^{(i)} e_{j+n}\|_{X_i} < (2l+1) \frac{\delta}{2l+1} = \delta,$$

and

$$\|B_i^n b^{(i)}\|_{X_i} = \left\| \sum_{j=-l}^l b_j^{(i)} e_{j-n} \right\|_{X_i} \leq \sum_{j=-l}^l \|b_j^{(i)} e_{j-n}\|_{X_i} < (2l+1) \frac{\delta}{2l+1} = \delta.$$

Then we obtain:

$$\mathcal{F}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (T^n b, S^n a, T^n S^n a) = (0, 0, a).$$

Hence T satisfies the \mathcal{F} -Mixing Criterion. \square

We immediately obtain a characterization of the weak disjointness of bilateral backward shifts.

Corollary 5.4. *Let X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k be bilateral Fréchet sequence spaces in which $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a basis. Let B_1, B_2, \dots, B_k be the backward shifts on X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k respectively. Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) B_1, B_2, \dots, B_k are weakly disjoint;
- (2) $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k B_i$ is weakly mixing;

(3) there is a strictly increasing sequence $(n_r)_r$ in \mathbb{N} such that for any $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \|e_{j+n_r}\|_{X_i} = 0, \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \|e_{j-n_r}\|_{X_i} = 0, i = 1, \dots, k.$$

Proof. By Theorem 5.3, it suffices to show that (3) is equivalent to (4) in Theorem 5.3 with $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$.

Suppose that (3) holds. To show (4) in Theorem 5.3 with $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$, we fix $\epsilon > 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$. By (3), for each $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $|j| \leq N$, there exists $R_j > 0$ such that for each $r \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r > R_j$ we have $\|e_{j+n_r}\|_{X_i} < \epsilon$ and $\|e_{j-n_r}\|_{X_i} < \epsilon, i = 1, \dots, k$. Let $R = \max\{R_j : |j| \leq N\}$. It is observed that for $r > R$, we have $n_r \in \bigcap_{j=-N}^N \bigcap_{i=1}^k (C_{\epsilon,j}^+(X_i) \cap C_{\epsilon,j}^-(X_i))$.

Conversely, suppose that (4) in Theorem 5.3 holds with $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{\text{inf}}$. Let $\epsilon_1 = 1$ and $N_1 = 1$. By Theorem 5.3(4), we can choose

$$n_1 \in \bigcap_{j=-N_1}^{N_1} \bigcap_{i=1}^k (C_{\epsilon_1,j}^+(X_i) \cap C_{\epsilon_1,j}^-(X_i)).$$

Let $\epsilon_2 = \frac{1}{2}$ and $N_2 = 2$. By Theorem 5.3(4), we can choose

$$n_2 \in \bigcap_{j=-N_2}^{N_2} \bigcap_{i=1}^k (C_{\epsilon_2,j}^+(X_i) \cap C_{\epsilon_2,j}^-(X_i)) \setminus \{0, 1, 2, \dots, n_1\}.$$

Now for $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $|j| \leq 2$, we have $\|e_{j+n_2}\|_{X_i} < \frac{1}{2}$ and $\|e_{j-n_2}\|_{X_i} < \frac{1}{2}, i = 1, \dots, k$. Assume that $n_1 < n_2 < \dots < n_r$ are chosen such that for $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $|j| \leq r$, we have $\|e_{j+n_r}\|_{X_i} < \frac{1}{r}$ and $\|e_{j-n_r}\|_{X_i} < \frac{1}{r}, i = 1, \dots, k$. Let $\epsilon_{r+1} = \frac{1}{r+1}$ and $N_{r+1} = r + 1$. By Theorem 5.3(4), we can choose

$$n_{r+1} \in \bigcap_{j=-N_{r+1}}^{N_{r+1}} \bigcap_{i=1}^k (C_{\epsilon_{r+1},j}^+(X_i) \cap C_{\epsilon_{r+1},j}^-(X_i)) \setminus \{0, 1, 2, \dots, n_r\}.$$

Inductively we obtain a strictly increasing sequence $(n_r)_r$ in \mathbb{N} .

Now we fix $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Then there exists $R > 0$ such that $\frac{1}{R} < \epsilon$ and $|j| \leq R$. For any $r > R$, since $|j| \leq r$, we have $\|e_{j+n_r}\|_{X_i} < \frac{1}{r} < \frac{1}{R} < \epsilon$ and $\|e_{j-n_r}\|_{X_i} < \frac{1}{r} < \frac{1}{R} < \epsilon, i = 1, \dots, k$. \square

5.2. Weak disjointness of unilateral backward shifts. Now we turn to the weak disjointness of unilateral backward shifts on Fréchet sequence spaces.

Theorem 5.5. Let X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k be unilateral Fréchet sequence spaces in which $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is a basis and B_1, B_2, \dots, B_k be the backward shifts on X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k respectively. Let \mathcal{F} be a family. Then the following assertions are equivalent:

- (1) $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k B_i$ is \mathcal{F} -transitive;
- (2) $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k B_i$ is \mathcal{F} -mixing;
- (3) $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k B_i$ satisfies the \mathcal{F} -Mixing Criterion;
- (4) for each $\epsilon > 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\bigcap_{j=0}^N \bigcap_{i=1}^k C_{\epsilon,j}(X_i) \in \mathcal{F}$, where for $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$,

$$C_{\epsilon,j}(X_i) = \{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \|e_{n+j}\|_{X_i} < \epsilon\}.$$

Proof. The implications (3) \Rightarrow (2) \Rightarrow (1) are clear.

(1) \Rightarrow (4). Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, since $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is a basis of X_i , we have that $\{h_n e_n : n \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ is bounded for each $h = (h_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in X_i$. By the Banach-Steinhaus Theorem ([20, Theorem A.10]), for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, there exists $\delta_i > 0$ such that for any $x^{(i)} \in X_i$ with $\|x^{(i)}\|_{X_i} < \delta_i$, we have that

$$\|x_n^{(i)} e_n\|_{X_i} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

and

$$|x_j^{(i)}| < \frac{1}{3}, \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N.$$

Let $\delta = \min\{\delta_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, k\}$ and $u = \sum_{j=0}^N e_j$.

For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, denote $Z_i = \{y \in X_i : \|y\|_{X_i} < \delta\}$ and $U_i = \{y \in X_i : \|y - u\|_{X_i} < \delta\}$. Now we fix $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ and $n \in N_{B_i}(Z_i, U_i)$, there is a vector $x^{(i)} \in Z_i$ with $B_i^n x^{(i)} \in U_i$. That is for $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N$, $\|x_{n+j}^{(i)} e_{n+j}\|_{X_i} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ and $|x_{n+j}^{(i)} - 1| < \frac{1}{3}$. Finally for $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_{n+j}\|_{X_i} &\leq \left\| \left(\frac{1}{x_{n+j}^{(i)}} - 1 \right) x_{n+j}^{(i)} e_{n+j} \right\|_{X_i} + \|x_{n+j}^{(i)} e_{n+j}\|_{X_i} \\ &\leq \|x_{n+j}^{(i)} e_{n+j}\|_{X_i} + \|x_{n+j}^{(i)} e_{n+j}\|_{X_i} \\ &< \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

That is $N_{B_i}(Z_i, U_i) \subset \bigcap_{j=0}^N C_{\epsilon, j}(X_i)$ and then $\bigcap_{i=1}^k N_{B_i}(Z_i, U_i) \subset \bigcap_{j=0}^N \bigcap_{i=1}^k C_{\epsilon, j}(X_i)$.

Since $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k B_i$ is \mathcal{F} -transitive, we have $\bigcap_{i=1}^k N_{B_i}(Z_i, U_i) \in \mathcal{F}$. Finally $\bigcap_{j=0}^N \bigcap_{i=1}^k C_{\epsilon, j}(X_i) \in \mathcal{F}$.

(4) \Rightarrow (1). For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, let W_i, V_i be non-empty open subsets of X_i . Let $a = (a^{(1)}, a^{(2)}, \dots, a^{(k)}) \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^k W_i$ and $b = (b^{(1)}, b^{(2)}, \dots, b^{(k)}) \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^k V_i$ be two k -tuples of finite sequences. Pick $\delta > 0$ such that for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, we have $\{y \in X_i : \|y - a^{(i)}\|_{X_i} < \delta\} \subset W_i$.

For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, write

$$\begin{aligned} a^{(i)} &= (a_0^{(i)}, a_1^{(i)}, \dots, a_l^{(i)}, 0, 0, \dots), \\ b^{(i)} &= (b_0^{(i)}, b_1^{(i)}, \dots, b_l^{(i)}, 0, 0, \dots). \end{aligned}$$

For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, let

$$Q_i = \{a_j^{(i)} : j \in \mathbb{N}_0\} \cup \{b_j^{(i)} : j \in \mathbb{N}_0\} \cup \{a_t^{(i)} - b_s^{(i)} : s, t \in \mathbb{N}_0\}.$$

Then Q_i is a finite set for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $a^{(i,0)} = b^{(i)}$ and

$$a^{(i,k)} = (a_0^{(i)}, a_1^{(i)}, a_2^{(i)}, \dots, a_{k-1}^{(i)}, b_0^{(i)}, b_1^{(i)}, b_2^{(i)}, \dots, b_l^{(i)}, 0, 0, \dots).$$

Now for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, $B_i^k a^{(i,k)} = b^{(i)}$.

For any $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, pick $\epsilon_i > 0$ such that for any $z_i \in X_i$ with $\|z_i\|_{X_i} < \epsilon_i$, we have for any $q_i \in Q_i$,

$$\|q_i z_i\|_{X_i} < \frac{\delta}{l+1}.$$

Let $\epsilon = \min\{\epsilon_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, k\}$. Fix $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ and $n \in \bigcap_{j=0}^l \bigcap_{i=1}^k C_{\epsilon,j}(X_i)$. If $n-1 \geq l$, we have that

$$\|a^{(i,n)} - a^{(i)}\|_{X_i} \leq \sum_{j=0}^l \|b_j^{(i)} e_{n+j}\|_{X_i} < (l+1) \frac{\delta}{l+1} = \delta.$$

If $n-1 < l$, we have that

$$\|a^{(i,n)} - a^{(i)}\|_{X_i} \leq \sum_{j=0}^l \|(a_{n+j}^{(i)} - b_j^{(i)}) e_{n+j}\|_{X_i} < (l+1) \frac{\delta}{l+1} = \delta.$$

That is

$$\bigcap_{j=0}^l \bigcap_{i=1}^k C_{\epsilon,j}(X_i) \subset \{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : a^{(i,n)} \in W_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, k\} \subset \bigcap_{i=1}^k N_{B_i}(W_i, V_i).$$

Then $\bigcap_{i=1}^k N_{B_i}(W_i, V_i) \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k B_i$ is \mathcal{F} -transitive.

(1) \Rightarrow (3). Let $B = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k B_i$ and $S = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k F_i$, where F_1, F_2, \dots, F_k are respectively the forward shifts for finite sequences of X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k . As in the proof of (1) \Rightarrow (4), for each $\epsilon > 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there are non-empty open subsets U^* and V^* of $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k X_i$ with

$$N_T(U^*, V^*) \subset \bigcap_{j=0}^N \bigcap_{i=1}^k C_{\epsilon,j}(X_i).$$

Since $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k X_i$ has no isolated points, there are non-empty open subsets $U^{**} \subset U^*$ and $V^{**} \subset V^*$ such that

$$N_T(U^{**}, V^{**}) \subset [N+1, +\infty).$$

Then $G_{N,\epsilon} := \bigcap_{j=0}^N \bigcap_{i=1}^k C_{\epsilon,j}(X_i) \cap [N+1, +\infty) \in \mathcal{F}$. For any finite sequences $a = (a^{(1)}, a^{(2)}, \dots, a^{(k)})$ and $b = (b^{(1)}, b^{(2)}, \dots, b^{(k)}) \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^k X_i$, write them as in the proof of (4) \Rightarrow (1). Fix $\delta > 0$. For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, there exists $\epsilon_i > 0$ such that for any $z_i \in X_i$ with $\|z_i\|_{X_i} < \epsilon_i$, we have for any $t \leq l$,

$$\|a_t^{(i)} z_i\|_{X_i} < \frac{\delta}{l+1}.$$

Let $\epsilon = \min\{\epsilon_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, k\}$ and $n \in G_{l,\epsilon}$. It is clear that $T^n b = 0$ and $T^n F^n a = a$. For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, we have

$$\|F_i^n a^{(i)}\| = \left\| \sum_{j=0}^l a_j^{(i)} e_{n+j} \right\|_{X_i} \leq \sum_{j=0}^l \|a_j^{(i)} e_{n+j}\|_{X_i} < \delta.$$

Hence we obtain

$$\mathcal{F}\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (T^n b, S^n a, T^n S^n a) = (0, 0, a).$$

Then the \mathcal{F} -Mixing Criterion is satisfied. \square

We immediately obtain a characterization of the weak disjointness of unilateral backward shifts.

Corollary 5.6. *Let X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k be unilateral Fréchet sequence spaces in which $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is a basis. Let B_1, B_2, \dots, B_k be the backward shifts on X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k respectively. Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) B_1, B_2, \dots, B_k are weakly disjoint;
- (2) $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k B_i$ is weakly mixing;
- (3) there is a strictly increasing sequence $(n_r)_r$ in \mathbb{N} such that for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \|e_{j+n_r}\|_{X_i} = 0, i = 1, 2, \dots, k.$$

Proof. By Theorem 5.5, it suffices to show that (3) is equivalent to Theorem 5.5(4) with \mathcal{F}_{inf} , which can be done by the same strategy as the one in the proof of Corollary 5.4. \square

Acknowledgments: The authors were partially supported by National Key R&D Program of China (2024YFA1013601), NSF of China (12222110, 12171298) and a grant from the Guangdong Provincial Department of Education (2025KCXTD013).

REFERENCES

- [1] Akin, Ethan. Recurrence in topological dynamics. Furstenberg families and Ellis actions. The University Series in Mathematics. Plenum Press, New York, 1997. 3, 4
- [2] Akin, Ethan; Glasner, Eli. Residual properties and almost equicontinuity. J. Anal. Math. 84 (2001), 243–286. 1, 2, 4, 6
- [3] Ansari, Shamim I. Hypercyclic and cyclic vectors. J. Funct. Anal. 128 (1995), no. 2, 374–383. 15
- [4] Bayart, F.; Matheron, É. Hypercyclic operators failing the hypercyclicity criterion on classical Banach spaces. J. Funct. Anal. 250 (2007), no. 2, 426–441. 2
- [5] Bayart, Frédéric; Matheron, Étienne. Dynamics of linear operators. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, 179. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2009. 2, 7
- [6] Bayart, Frédéric; Matheron, Étienne. (Non-)weakly mixing operators and hypercyclicity sets. Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 59 (2009), no. 1, 1–35. 19
- [7] Bernal-González, Luis. Disjoint hypercyclic operators. Studia Math. 182 (2007), no. 2, 113–131. 2
- [8] Bès, Juan; Peris, Alfredo. Hereditarily hypercyclic operators. J. Funct. Anal. 167 (1999), no. 1, 94–112. 8
- [9] Bès, Juan; Peris, Alfredo. Disjointness in hypercyclicity. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 336 (2007), no. 1, 297–315. 2
- [10] Bès, Juan; Menet, Quentin; Peris, Alfredo; Puig, Yunied. Recurrence properties of hypercyclic operators. Math. Ann. 366 (2016), no. 1-2, 545–572. 9
- [11] Bès, Juan; Menet, Quentin; Peris, Alfredo; Puig, Yunied. Strong transitivity properties for operators. J. Differential Equations 266 (2019), no. 2-3, 1313–1337. 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 13, 15, 23
- [12] Cardeccia, Rodrigo. Disjoint hypercyclicity, Sidon sets and weakly mixing operators. Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 44 (2024), no. 5, 1315–1329. 2, 3, 14
- [13] Catalin Badea and Sophie Grivaux. Unimodular eigenvalues, uniformly distributed sequences and linear dynamics. Adv. Math. 211, no. 2 (2007): 766–93. 15
- [14] de la Rosa, Manuel; Read, Charles. A hypercyclic operator whose direct sum $T \oplus T$ is not hypercyclic. J. Operator Theory 61 (2009), no. 2, 369–380. 2, 19
- [15] Furstenberg, Harry. Disjointness in ergodic theory, minimal sets, and a problem in Diophantine approximation. Math. Systems Theory 1 (1967), 1–49. 1, 2, 5

- [16] Furstenberg, Hillel. Recurrence in ergodic theory and combinatorial number theory. M. B. Porter Lectures. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1981. 3, 5, 7
- [17] Furstenberg, Hillel; Weiss, Benjamin. The finite multipliers of infinite ergodic transformations. The structure of attractors in dynamical systems (Proc. Conf., North Dakota State Univ., Fargo, N.D., 1977), pp. 127–132, Lecture Notes in Math., 668, Springer, Berlin-New York, 1978. 7
- [18] Glasner, Eli. Classifying dynamical systems by their recurrence properties. Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal. 24 (2004), no. 1, 21–40. 2, 7
- [19] Grivaux, Sophie. Hypercyclic operators, mixing operators, and the bounded steps problem. Journal of Operator Theory 54, no. 1 (2005): 147–68. 14
- [20] Grosse-Erdmann, Karl-G.; Peris Manguillot, Alfredo. Linear chaos. Universitext. Springer, London, 2011. 2, 7, 8, 9, 11, 14, 15, 16, 26, 30
- [21] Herrero, Domingo A. Hypercyclic operators and chaos. J. Operator Theory 28 (1992), no. 1, 93–103. 2
- [22] Huang, Wen; Ye, Xiangdong. An explicit scattering, non-weakly mixing example and weak disjointness. Nonlinearity 15 (2002), no. 3, 849–862. 2
- [23] Huang, Wen; Ye, Xiangdong. Topological complexity, return times and weak disjointness. Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 24 (2004), no. 3, 825–846. 2, 7, 24, 25
- [24] Peleg, Reuven. Weak disjointness of transformation groups. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 33 (1972), 165–170. 1
- [25] Salas, Héctor N. Hypercyclic weighted shifts. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 347 (1995), no. 3, 993–1004. 2, 9, 15, 20, 25, 26
- [26] Weiss, Benjamin. A survey of generic dynamics. Descriptive set theory and dynamical systems (Marseille-Luminy, 1996), 273–291, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., 277, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2000. 1, 6

(J. Li) INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES AND ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE & DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHANTOU UNIVERSITY, SHANTOU, 515821, GUANGDONG, CHINA
Email address: lijian09@mail.ustc.edu.cn
URL: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8724-3050>

(Q. Liao) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHANTOU UNIVERSITY, SHANTOU, 515821, GUANGDONG, CHINA
Email address: liaojing1@outlook.com

(Y. Ruan) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHANTOU UNIVERSITY, SHANTOU, 515821, GUANGDONG, CHINA
Email address: yonghangruan@outlook.com