

# Semigroups of matrices with dense orbits

Mohammad Javaheri  
Department of Mathematics  
Trinity College  
Hartford, CT 06106  
Mohammad.Javaheri@trincoll.edu

February 12, 2022

## Abstract

We give examples of  $n \times n$  matrices  $A$  and  $B$  over the field  $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{C}$  such that for almost every column vector  $x \in \mathbb{K}^n$ , the orbit of  $x$  under the action of the semigroup generated by  $A$  and  $B$  is dense in  $\mathbb{K}^n$ .

## 1 Main statements

Let  $X$  be a topological vector space and  $T : X \rightarrow X$  be a continuous linear operator on  $X$ . Then  $T$  is called *hypercyclic* if there exists a vector  $x \in X$  whose orbit  $\{x, Tx, T^2x, \dots\}$  is dense in  $X$ .

In [1], Ansari proved that all infinite-dimensional separable Banach spaces admit hypercyclic operators. On the other hand, Rolewicz [10] showed that no finite-dimensional Banach space admits a hypercyclic operator. This can be seen by looking at the Jordan normal form of the matrix of the operator; the details of this argument can be found in [8]. Hence, in the finite-dimensional case, one is motivated to consider a finitely-generated semigroup of operators instead of a single operator, and the following definition is the natural extension of hypercyclicity to semigroups of operators.

**Definition 1.1.** Let  $\Gamma = \langle T_1, T_2, \dots, T_k \rangle$  be a semigroup generated by continuous operators  $T_1, T_2, \dots, T_k$  on a finite-dimensional vector space  $X$  over  $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{C}$ . We say  $\Gamma$  is hypercyclic if there exists  $x \in \mathbb{K}^n$  so that  $\{Tx : T \in \Gamma\}$  is dense in  $\mathbb{K}^n$ .

In [5], Feldman initiated the study of hypercyclic semigroups of linear operators in the finite-dimensional case and proved that, in dimension  $n$ , there exists a hypercyclic semigroup generated by  $n + 1$  diagonalizable matrices (Costakis et al. [3] proved that it is not possible to reduce the number of generators to less than  $n + 1$ ). If one removes the diagonalizability condition, it is shown by Costakis et al. [4] that one can find a hypercyclic abelian semigroup of  $n$  matrices in dimension  $n$ . It is then natural to consider the non-commuting case. *What is the minimum number of linear maps on  $\mathbb{K}^n$  that generate a hypercyclic semigroup?* In Theorem 1.3, we show that the answer is 2 for all  $n \geq 1$ .

In the sequel, for a matrix  $A$ , let  $A_{ij}$  be the entry on the  $i$ 'th row and the  $j$ 'th column of  $A$ . The diagonal entries  $A_{ii}$  are denoted by  $A_i$  for short. Also let  $I$  be the identity matrix and  $\Delta$  be the  $n \times n$  matrix with  $\Delta_{11} = 1$ ,  $\Delta_{ij} = 0$  for  $(i, j) \neq (1, 1)$ . To state the Theorem 1.3, we need the following definition.

**Definition 1.2.** A pair  $(a, b) \in \mathbb{K}^2$  is called *generating*, if  $|a| < |b|$  and  $\{a^m b^n : m, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is dense in  $\mathbb{K}$ . We set

$$(a, b) \prec (c, d) ,$$

if and only if  $(a, b)$  and  $(c, d)$  are both generating pairs and

$$\frac{\ln |a|}{\ln |b|} < \frac{\ln |c|}{\ln |d|} . \quad (1.1)$$

The following theorem is the main result of this paper.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $A$  and  $B$  be  $n \times n$  matrices over  $\mathbb{K}$  so that  $A$  is lower triangular and  $B$  is diagonal. Suppose the following properties hold.*

i) *The diagonal entries of  $A$  and  $B$  satisfy*

$$0 < |B_n| < \dots < |B_2| < |B_1| < 1 < |A_1| < |A_2| < \dots < |A_n| , \quad (1.2)$$

$$\left( \frac{B_n}{B_1}, \frac{A_n}{A_1} \right) \prec \dots \prec \left( \frac{B_2}{B_1}, \frac{A_2}{A_1} \right) \prec (B_1, A_1) . \quad (1.3)$$

ii) *The entries on the first column of  $(A_1^{-1}A - I + \Delta)^{-1}$  are all non-zero.*

*Then the orbit of every column vector  $p = (p_1, \dots, p_n)^T \in \mathbb{K}^n$  with  $p_1 \neq 0$  under the action of the semigroup generated by  $A$  and  $B$  is dense in  $\mathbb{K}^n$ . In fact, the set*

$$\{B^{k_1} A^{l_1} \dots B^{k_n} A^{l_n} p : \forall i \ k_i, l_i \geq 0\} \quad (1.4)$$

*is dense in  $\mathbb{K}^n$ .*

To demonstrate that the set of pairs of matrices  $(A, B)$  satisfying conditions (i)-(ii) of Theorem 1.3 is nonempty, we give an explicit example of such a pair in both real and complex cases. In both real and complex cases, we let  $A$  be the matrix with  $A_k = 3^k$  and  $A_{k1} = 3$  for  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , and  $A_{kl} = 0$  when  $k \neq l$  and  $l \neq 1$ . In the real case, let  $B$  be the diagonal matrix with  $B_1 = -2^{-1}$  and  $B_k = 2^{-k^2}$  for  $k > 1$ . In the complex case, let  $B$  be the diagonal matrix with  $B_k = (2^{-1}e^i)^{k^2}$  for  $k \geq 1$ . Here  $e^i = \cos(1) + i\sin(1)$ . It is straightforward to check that conditions (i)-(ii) of Theorem 1.3 are satisfied.

Theorem 1.3 is related to a recent result of Costakis et al. [3] which states that in any finite dimension there are pairs of commuting matrices which form a locally hypercyclic, non-hypercyclic tuple; in other words, they prove that there exist linear maps  $A$  and  $B$  on  $\mathbb{K}^n$  and  $x \in \mathbb{K}^n$  so that for every  $y \in \mathbb{K}^n$  there exist sequences  $x_i \rightarrow x$  and  $y_i \rightarrow y$ , where  $y_i = A^{u_i} B^{v_i} x_i$  and  $u_i + v_i \rightarrow \infty$ .

It is worth mentioning that condition (ii) of Theorem 1.3 is a generic condition in the sense that it is satisfied by an open and dense subset of matrices. In particular, condition (ii) is satisfied when all of the entries of  $A$  on the main diagonal and the first column are non-zero while all of its other entries are zero.

In the next theorem, we consider semigroups of affine maps on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . An affine map is a linear map followed by a translation. We show that there exist affine maps  $x \rightarrow Bx$  and  $x \rightarrow Ax + v$  so that every orbit is dense. In dimension one, the semigroup of affine maps generated by

$$f(x) = ax, \quad g(x) = bx + c,$$

has dense orbits in  $\mathbb{R}$ , where  $ab < 0$ ,  $|a| > 1 \geq |b| > 0$ , and  $c \neq 0$ ; c.f. [7]. Hence, the following theorem can be thought of as a generalization to higher dimensions.

**Theorem 1.4.** *Suppose that  $A$  and  $B$  are  $n \times n$  matrices over  $\mathbb{K}$  and their diagonal entries satisfy the inequalities (1.2). Moreover, suppose that*

$$(B_n, A_n) \prec \dots \prec (B_2, A_2) \prec (B_1, A_1). \quad (1.5)$$

*If all of the entries of the column vector  $(A - I)^{-1}v$  are non-zero, then every orbit of the semigroup action generated by*

$$x \rightarrow Ax + v, \quad x \rightarrow Bx, \quad (1.6)$$

*is dense in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .*

## Acknowledgement

I would like to Thank George Costakis for reading this manuscript and his useful comments. I also would like to thank the referees who read an earlier version of this article and suggested many corrections.

## 2 Proofs

To prove Theorem 1.3, we need the following three lemmas.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{K}$  with*

$$|a|, |c| < 1 ; |b|, |d| > 1 ; \frac{\ln |a|}{\ln |b|} < \frac{\ln |c|}{\ln |d|} . \quad (2.1)$$

*Suppose  $(m_i, n_i) \rightarrow (\infty, \infty)$ . If the set  $\{|c^{m_i} d^{n_i}| : i \geq 1\}$  is bounded from above, then  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} a^{m_i} b^{n_i} = 0$ .*

*Proof.* Choose  $M > 0$  so that  $|c^{m_i} d^{n_i}| < M$  for some sequence  $(m_i, n_i) \rightarrow (\infty, \infty)$ . It follows that

$$m_i \ln |c| + n_i \ln |d| < \ln M \Rightarrow n_i < -\frac{\ln |c|}{\ln |d|} m_i + \frac{\ln M}{\ln |d|} .$$

And so

$$\begin{aligned} m_i \ln |a| + n_i \ln |b| &= \ln |b| \left( \frac{\ln |a|}{\ln |b|} m_i + n_i \right) \\ &\leq m_i \ln |b| \left( \frac{\ln |a|}{\ln |b|} - \frac{\ln |c|}{\ln |d|} \right) + \frac{(\ln M)(\ln |b|)}{\ln |d|} . \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

It follows from (2.1) and (2.2) that  $m_i \ln |a| + n_i \ln |b| \rightarrow -\infty$ , and equivalently  $a^{m_i} b^{n_i} \rightarrow 0$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.2.** *Suppose that  $A$  is a lower triangular  $n \times n$  matrix and its diagonal entries satisfy  $0 < |A_1| < \dots < |A_n|$ . Then there exists  $\lambda > 0$  (that depends only on  $A$ ) so that*

$$|(A^l)_{ij}| \leq \lambda |A_i|^l ; |(A^{-l})_{ij}| \leq \lambda |A_j|^{-l} , \forall i, j = 1, \dots, n , \forall l \geq 1 . \quad (2.3)$$

*Proof.* Proof is by induction on  $n$ . For  $n = 1$ , the statements are true for  $\lambda = 1$ . Suppose that inequalities (2.3) hold for any  $(n-1) \times (n-1)$  lower

triangular matrix satisfying the conditions of the lemma, and let  $A$  be the following  $n \times n$  matrix

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & 0 \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.4)$$

where  $D$  is an  $(n-1) \times (n-1)$  matrix. By applying the inductive hypothesis to  $D$ , we conclude that there exists  $\lambda_D > 0$  so that for  $i, j = 2, \dots, n$ ,

$$|(A^l)_{ij}| = |(D^l)_{ij}| \leq \lambda_D |A_i|^l; \quad |(A^{-l})_{ij}| = |(D^{-l})_{ij}| \leq \lambda_D |A_j|^{-l},$$

which imply the inequalities (2.3) for  $i, j > 1$ . Since (2.3) obviously holds when  $i = 1$  (for any  $\lambda \geq 1$ ), it is left to prove (2.3) for  $i > 1$  and  $j = 1$ . One has

$$A^l = \begin{pmatrix} A_1^l & 0 \\ C^l & D^l \end{pmatrix}; \quad C^l = \sum_{k=0}^{l-1} A_1^k D^{l-1-k} C.$$

It follows that for  $i > 1$ ,

$$(A^l)_{i1} = \sum_{k=0}^{l-1} \sum_{t=2}^n A_1^k (A^{l-1-k})_{it} A_{t1}$$

Let  $b = \sum_{k=2}^n |A_{k1}|$ . Then for  $i > 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |(A^l)_{i1}| &= \left| \sum_{k=0}^{l-1} \sum_{t=2}^n A_1^k (A^{l-1-k})_{it} A_{t1} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{l-1} b |A_1|^k \lambda_D |A_i|^{l-1-k} \\ &\leq \frac{b \lambda_D}{|A_i| - |A_1|} |A_i|^l. \end{aligned}$$

And so for  $\lambda$  defined by

$$\lambda = \max \left( 1, \lambda_D, \frac{b \lambda_D}{|A_2| - |A_1|} \right),$$

the entries on the  $i$ 'th row of  $A^l$  are all bounded from above by  $\lambda |A_i|^l$  in absolute value. The other inequality in (2.3) follows similarly.  $\square$

Recall that  $\Delta$  is the  $n \times n$  matrix with  $\Delta_{11} = 1$  and  $\Delta_{ij} = 0$  for  $(i, j) \neq (1, 1)$ . Also  $I$  denotes the  $n \times n$  identity matrix.

**Lemma 2.3.** *Suppose that  $A$  is a lower triangular matrix and its diagonal entries satisfy  $0 < |A_1| < \dots < |A_n|$ . Suppose that all of the entries on the first column of the matrix  $(A_1^{-1}A - I + \Delta)^{-1}$  are non-zero. Then as  $l \rightarrow \infty$  the matrix  $(A_1A^{-1})^l$  converges to a matrix that all of its entries on the first column are non-zero, while all of its other entries are zero.*

*Proof.* Let us set

$$A_1A^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ H & F \end{pmatrix} ; (A_1A^{-1})^l = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ H^l & F^l \end{pmatrix} , \quad (2.5)$$

where  $F$  is an  $n \times n$  matrix and  $F^l$  is the  $l$ 'th matrix power of  $F$ , while  $H$  is a column vector and  $H^l$  satisfies the recursive relation

$$H^l = (I + F + \dots + F^{l-1})H . \quad (2.6)$$

It follows from Lemma 2.2 (applied to  $A_1^{-1}A$ ) that, for  $i, j = 1, \dots, n-1$ ,

$$|(F^l)_{ij}| \leq |A_1^{-1}A_{j+1}|^{-l} .$$

It follows that  $I + F + F^2 + \dots$  converges absolutely to  $(I - F)^{-1}$ . Therefore, by (2.6), we have  $H^l \rightarrow (I - F)^{-1}H$  as  $l \rightarrow \infty$ . On the other hand,

$$(A_1^{-1}A - I + \Delta)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -(F - I)^{-1}H & (F - I)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} .$$

Since the entries on the first column of  $(A_1^{-1}A - I + \Delta)^{-1}$  are all assumed to be non-zero, it follows that all of the entries of the first column of  $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} (A_1A^{-1})^l$  are non-zero. The last statement in the lemma follows from the convergence  $F^l \rightarrow 0$  and (2.5).  $\square$

In the sequel, the  $i$ 'th component of a column vector  $x$  is denoted by  $x_i$ . Also  $\text{cl}(Y)$  denotes the closure of the set  $Y$ . Now, we are ready to prove Theorem 1.3.

*Proof of Theorem 1.3.* Let  $\Omega$  denote the closure of the orbit of the given vector  $p = (p_1, \dots, p_n)^T \in \mathbb{K}^n$ ,  $p_1 \neq 0$ . We prove by induction on  $s \geq 1$  that

$$\mathbb{K}^s \times \{0\}^{n-s} \subseteq \text{cl} \{ B^{\delta_s} A^{\gamma_s} \dots B^{\delta_1} A^{\gamma_1} p | \forall i \gamma_i, \delta_i \in \mathbb{N} \} \subseteq \Omega . \quad (2.7)$$

To prove (2.7) for  $s = 1$ , let  $x_1 \in \mathbb{K}$  be arbitrary. Since  $(B_1, A_1)$  is a generating pair, there exists a sequence  $(k_i, l_i)_{i=1}^\infty \rightarrow (\infty, \infty)$  so that  $B_1^{k_i} A_1^{l_i} p_1 \rightarrow x_1$ ,

that is  $(B^{k_i} A^{l_i} p)_1 \rightarrow x_1$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . By Lemma 2.2 there exists  $\lambda > 0$  (that depends only on  $A$ ) so that

$$|(B^{k_i} A^{l_i} p)_j| \leq \lambda |B_j|^{k_i} |A_j|^{l_i} \sum_{t=1}^n |p_t|. \quad (2.8)$$

It follows from inequalities (1.3) that

$$\frac{\ln |B_j|}{\ln |A_j|} < \frac{\ln |B_1|}{\ln |A_1|}, \quad \forall j > 1,$$

and so by Lemma 2.1 and inequality (2.8), we conclude that  $(B^{k_i} A^{l_i} p)_j \rightarrow 0$  for  $j \geq 2$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . It follows that  $(x_1, 0, \dots, 0)^T = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} B^{k_i} A^{l_i} p \in \Omega$ , and (2.7) follows for  $s = 1$ .

Next, suppose that (2.7) holds for some  $s < n$ , and we will show that (2.7) holds for  $s + 1$ . Write the matrices  $A$  and  $B$  in the forms

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} S & 0 \\ W & T \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} U & 0 \\ 0 & V \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.9)$$

where  $S$  and  $U$  are  $s \times s$  matrices. For  $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $O^{k,l}$  be the  $(n-s) \times s$  matrix defined by

$$\begin{pmatrix} I_s \\ O^{k,l} \end{pmatrix} = B^k A^l \begin{pmatrix} I_s \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} S^{-l} U^{-k}, \quad (2.10)$$

where  $\mathbf{0}$  is the  $(n-s) \times s$  zero matrix and  $I_s$  is the  $s \times s$  identity matrix. Let  $E$  denote the  $(n-s) \times s$  matrix with  $E_{11} = 1$  and  $E_{ij} = 0$  for  $(i, j) \neq (1, 1)$ . We show that, for any  $\alpha \in \mathbb{K}$ , there is a sequence  $(k_i, l_i) \rightarrow (\infty, \infty)$  so that  $O^{k_i, l_i} \rightarrow \alpha E$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . From the definition of  $O^{k,l}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} (O^{k,l})_{11} &= (B_{s+1}/B_1)^k \sum_{t=1}^s (A^l)_{s+1 \ t} \cdot (S^{-l})_{t1} \\ &= -(B_{s+1}/B_1)^k (A_{s+1})^l (A^{-l})_{s+1 \ 1} \\ &= -(B_{s+1}/B_1)^k (A_{s+1}/A_1)^l ((A_1 A^{-1})^l)_{s+1 \ 1}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

Next, let

$$\omega = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} ((A_1 A^{-1})^l)_{s+1 \ 1} \neq 0. \quad (2.12)$$

We have  $\omega \neq 0$  by condition (ii) of Theorem 1.3 and Lemma 2.3. Moreover, since  $(B_{s+1}/B_1, A_{s+1}/A_1)$  is a generating pair, for any  $\alpha \in \mathbb{K}$  there exists a sequence  $(k_i, l_i) \rightarrow (\infty, \infty)$  so that

$$(B_{s+1}/B_1)^{k_i} (A_{s+1}/A_1)^{l_i} \rightarrow -\alpha/\omega, \quad (2.13)$$

as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ , which by (2.11) implies that  $(O^{k_i, l_i})_{11} \rightarrow \alpha$ . We now show that all other entries in  $O^{k_i, l_i}$  converge to zero. By Lemma 2.3 (applied to  $A$ ) and equation (2.10), for  $j = 1, \dots, n-s$  and  $m = 1, \dots, s$ , we have

$$(O^{k, l})_{jm} \leq n\lambda^2 \left| \frac{B_{j+s}}{B_m} \right|^k \left| \frac{A_{j+s}}{A_m} \right|^l, \quad (2.14)$$

where  $\lambda > 0$  depends only on  $A$ . Moreover, we conclude from inequalities (1.3) that

$$\frac{\ln |B_{j+s}/B_m|}{\ln |A_{j+s}/A_m|} \leq \frac{\ln |B_{j+s}/B_1|}{\ln |A_{j+s}/A_1|} \leq \frac{\ln |B_{s+1}/B_1|}{\ln |A_{s+1}/A_1|}, \quad (2.15)$$

where both inequalities are equalities simultaneously only when  $(j, m) = (1, 1)$ . Inequalities (2.14) and (2.15) together with the convergence in (2.13) and Lemma 2.1 imply that  $O^{k_i, l_i} \rightarrow \alpha E$ . Now, from (2.10), we conclude that for any  $(y_1, \dots, y_{s+1}) \in \mathbb{K}^{s+1}$  with  $y_{s+1} = \alpha y_1$ , we have

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} B^{k_i} A^{l_i} (x_1, \dots, x_s, 0, \dots, 0)^T = (y_1, \dots, y_{s+1}, 0, \dots, 0)^T, \quad (2.16)$$

where  $(x_1, \dots, x_s)^T = S^{-l_i} U^{-k_i} (y_1, \dots, y_s)^T$ . It follows from the inductive hypothesis and (2.16) and by varying  $\alpha \in \mathbb{K}$  that

$$\mathbb{K}^{s+1} \times \{0\}^{n-s-1} \subseteq \text{cl} \bigcup_{k, l \in \mathbb{N}} B^k A^l (\mathbb{K}^s \times \{0\}^{n-s}),$$

which completes the proof of the inductive step. Theorem 1.3 follows when we reach  $s = n$ .  $\square$

Next, we present the proof of Theorem 1.4.

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* Let  $p = (p_1, \dots, p_n)^T$  be an arbitrary column vector. Choose  $a, b$  so that  $(B_1, A_1) \prec (b, a)$ . Define the matrices

$$A' = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ av & aA \end{pmatrix}, \quad B' = \begin{pmatrix} b & 0 \\ 0 & bB \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.17)$$

We first verify that Theorem 1.3 is applicable to the pair  $(A', B')$ . Condition (i) of Theorem 1.3 obviously holds for  $A'$  and  $B'$ . To check condition (ii) of Theorem 1.3, note that

$$(a^{-1}A' - I_{n+1} + \Delta)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ v & A - I_n \end{pmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -(A - I_n)^{-1}v & (A - I_n)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since all of the entries of the column vector  $(A - I_n)^{-1}v$  are non-zero, all of the entries on the first column of  $(a^{-1}A' - I_{n+1} + \Delta)^{-1}$  are non-zero, and so condition (ii) of Theorem 1.3 holds for  $A'$ .



By Theorem 1.3, the orbit of the column vector  $(1, p_1, \dots, p_n)^T$  is dense in  $\mathbb{K}^{n+1}$ . Let  $\Phi : (\mathbb{K} \setminus \{0\}) \times \mathbb{K}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$  be the following map

$$\Phi(y_1, \dots, y_{n+1})^T = (y_2/y_1, \dots, y_{n+1}/y_1)^T .$$

Also let  $\Psi : \mathbb{K}^n \rightarrow (\mathbb{K} \setminus \{0\}) \times \mathbb{K}^n$  be the partial inverse

$$\Psi(x_1, \dots, x_n)^T = (1, x_1, \dots, x_n)^T .$$

Then  $\Phi \circ A' \circ \Psi(x) = Ax + v = Dx$  and  $\Phi \circ B' \circ \Psi(x) = Bx$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{K}^n$ . Moreover, for any linear map  $L : \mathbb{K}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^{n+1}$  and  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_{n+1}) \in \mathbb{K}^{n+1}$  with  $y_1 \neq 0$ , we have

$$\Phi \circ L \circ \Psi \circ \Phi(y) = \Phi \circ L(1, y_2/y_1, \dots, y_{n+1}/y_1)^T = \Phi \circ L(y) .$$

The map  $L \rightarrow \Phi \circ L \circ \Psi$  is then a semigroup homomorphism from  $\langle A', B' \rangle$  to  $\langle D, B \rangle$ , since

$$(\Phi \circ L_1 \circ \Psi) \circ (\Phi \circ L_2 \circ \Psi) = (\Phi \circ L_1 \circ \Psi \circ \Phi) \circ L_2 \circ \Psi = \Phi \circ (L_1 \circ L_2) \circ \Psi ,$$

for all  $L_1, L_2 \in \langle A', B' \rangle$ . It follows that the orbit of  $p$  in  $\mathbb{K}^n$  is the  $\Phi$ -image of the orbit of  $\Psi(p)$  in  $\mathbb{K}^{n+1}$ . Since the orbit of  $\Psi(p)$  under the action of  $\langle A', B' \rangle$  is dense in  $\mathbb{K}^{n+1}$ , the orbit of  $p$  under the action of  $\langle D, B \rangle$  is dense in  $\mathbb{K}^n$ .  $\square$

### 3 Conclusion and open questions

In both real and complex cases, we have constructed  $n \times n$  matrices that have dense orbits. We say an orbit is *somewhere dense* if the closure of the orbit contains a non-empty open set. In [5], Feldman showed that there exist a  $2n$ -tuple of matrices with a somewhere dense orbit that is not dense in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Moreover, he proved that finite tuples with such property cannot exist on  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . In this direction, we propose the following problem.

**Problem 1.** *Show that in any dimension  $n \geq 1$  there exists a pair of real matrices with a somewhere dense but not dense orbit. Show that such a pair does not exist in the complex case.*

When  $n = 2$ , one can easily show (using the same ideas proving Theorem 1.3) that for real matrices

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ b & d \end{pmatrix} ; B = \begin{pmatrix} u & 0 \\ 0 & v \end{pmatrix} ,$$

with  $d > a > 1 > u > v > 0$ ,  $b > 0$ , and  $(-v, d) \prec (-u, a)$ , the orbit of every  $P = (P_1, P_2)^T \in (0, \infty)^2$  is dense in  $(0, \infty)^2$ , while it is obviously not dense in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .

The next problem considers the action of  $n \times n$  matrices on  $n \times k$  matrices.

**Problem 2.** *Are there  $n \times n$  matrices  $A$  and  $B$  and an  $n \times k$  matrix  $C$  over  $\mathbb{K}$  so that the orbit of  $C$  under the action of  $\langle A, B \rangle$  is dense in the set of  $n \times k$  matrices over  $\mathbb{K}$ ?*

In particular, Problem 2 is asking if there are matrices  $A$  and  $B$  so that the semigroup generated by  $A$  and  $B$  is dense in the set of  $n \times n$  matrices. When  $k > n$ , it is easy to see that such  $A, B$ , and  $C$  do not exist [7]; moreover, for  $k > 2$ , no pair of lower triangular matrices  $(A, B)$  would work, and a more complicated construction will be required.

To state the next problem, we need the following definition. A continuous linear operator  $T$  on a topological vector space  $X$  is called *multi-hypercyclic* if there exist vectors  $x_1, \dots, x_k \in X$  such that the union of the orbits of the  $x_i$ 's is dense in  $X$ . A. Herrero [6] conjectured that multi-hypercyclicity implies hypercyclicity. This conjecture was verified by Costakis [2] and later independently by Peris [9]. In this direction, the following problem arises.

**Problem 3.** Suppose that  $A$  and  $B$  are  $n \times n$  matrices over the field  $\mathbb{K}$  with the property that the union of the orbits of vectors  $v_1, \dots, v_k \in \mathbb{K}^n$  under the action of  $\langle A, B \rangle$  is dense in  $\mathbb{K}^n$ . Does it follow that there is a  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  so that the orbit of  $v_j$  is dense in  $\mathbb{K}^n$ ?

## References

- [1] S.I. Ansari, *Existence of hypercyclic operators on topological vector spaces*, J. Funct. Anal. 148 (1997), no. 2, 384–390.
- [2] G. Costakis, *On a conjecture of D. Herrero concerning hypercyclic operators*, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. 330 (2000), no. 3, 179–182.
- [3] G. Costakis, D. Hadjiloucas, and A. Manoussos, *Dynamics of tuples of matrices*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 137 (March 2009), no. 3, 1025–1034.
- [4] G. Costakis, D. Hadjiloucas, and A. Manoussos, *On the minimal number of matrices which form a locally hypercyclic, non-hypercyclic tuple*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 365 (2010) 229–237.

- [5] N.S. Feldman, *Hypercyclic tuples of operators and somewhere dense orbits*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 346 (2008), 82–98.
- [6] D.A. Herrero, *Hypercyclic operators and chaos*, J. Operator Theory 28 (1992), no. 1, 93–103.
- [7] M. Javaheri, *Topologically transitive semigroup actions of real linear fractional transformations*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., doi:10.1016/j.jmaa.2010.03.028
- [8] C. Kitai, *Invariant closed sets for linear operators*, Thesis, Univ. of Toronto, Toronto, 1982.
- [9] A. Peris, *Multi-hypercyclic operators are hypercyclic*, Math.Z. 236 (2001), no. 4, 779–786.
- [10] S. Rolewicz, *On orbits of elements*, Studia Math. 32 (1969), 17–22.