

Isometric, symmetric and isosymmetric commuting d -tuples of Banach space operators

B.P. Duggal, I.H. Kim

Abstract

Generalising the definition to commuting d -tuples of operators, a number of authors have considered structural properties of m -isometric, n -symmetric and (m, n) -isosymmetric commuting d -tuples in the recent past. This note is an attempt to take the mystique out of this extension and show how a large number of these properties follow from the more familiar arguments used to prove the single operator version of these properties.

1. Introduction

Let $B(\mathcal{H})$ (resp., $B(\mathcal{X})$) denote the algebra of operators, i.e. bounded linear transformations, on an infinite dimensional complex Hilbert space \mathcal{H} into itself (resp., on an infinite dimensional complex Banach space \mathcal{X} into itself), \mathbb{C} denote the complex plane, $B(\mathcal{H})^d$ (resp., $B(\mathcal{X})^d$ and \mathbb{C}^d) the product of d copies of $B(\mathcal{H})$ (resp., $B(\mathcal{X})$ and \mathbb{C}) for some integer $d \geq 1$, \bar{z} the conjugate of $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_d) \in \mathbb{C}^d$. For a given polynomial \mathbf{P} in \mathbb{C}^d and a d -tuple \mathbb{A} of commuting operators in $B(\mathcal{H})^d$, \mathbb{A} is a hereditary root of \mathbf{P} if $\mathbf{P}(\mathbb{A}) = 0$. Two particular operator classes of hereditary roots which have been studied extensively are those of m -symmetric (also called m -selfadjoint in the literature) and m -isometric operators, where $A \in B(\mathcal{H})$ is m -symmetric (for some integer $m \geq 1$) if

$$\sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} A^{*(m-j)} A^j = 0$$

and $A \in B(\mathcal{H})$ is m -isometric if

$$\sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} A^{*j} A^j = 0.$$

Combining these two classes, we say $A \in B(\mathcal{H})$ is an (m, n) -isosymmetry (equivalently, the pair (A^*, A) is (m, n) -isosymmetric) for some integers $m, n \geq 1$ if

$$\sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} A^{*j} \left(\sum_{k=0}^n (-1)^k \binom{n}{k} A^{*(n-k)} A^k \right) A^j$$

AMS(MOS) subject classification (2010). Primary: 47A05, 47A55; Secondary: 47A11, 47B47.

Keywords: Hilbert space, Left/right multiplication operator, m -left invertible, m -isometric and m -selfadjoint operators, product of operators, perturbation by nilpotents, commuting operators.

The second named author was supported by Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) funded by the Ministry of Education (NRF-2019R1F1A1057574)

$$= \sum_{k=0}^n (-1)^k \binom{n}{k} A^{*(n-k)} \left(\sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} A^{*j} A^j \right) A^k = 0.$$

It is clear that m -symmetric operators arise as solutions of $P(z) = (\bar{z} - z)^m = 0$, m -isometric operators arise as solutions of $P(z) = (\bar{z}z - 1)^m = 0$ and (m, n) -isosymmetric operators arise as solutions of $(\bar{z}z - 1)^m (\bar{z} - z)^n = 0$. The class of m -symmetric operators was introduced by Helton [25] (*albeit* not as operator solutions of the polynomial equation $(\bar{z} - z)^m = 0$), and the class of m -isometric operators was introduced by Agler [1]. These classes of operators, and their variants, have since been studied by a multitude of authors, amongst them Agler and Stankus [2, 3, 4], Sid Ahmed [5], Bayart [7], Bermudez *et al* [9, 10, 11], Botelho and Jamison [8], Duggal [14, 15], Gu [21, 22] and Gu and Stankus [24], Stankus [28] and Trieu Le [29].

A generalisation of the m -isometric property of operators $A \in B(\mathcal{H})$ to commuting d -tuples $\mathbb{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_d) \in B(\mathcal{H})^d$, $[A_i, A_j] = A_i A_j - A_j A_i = 0$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq d$, is obtained as follows [20]: \mathbb{A} is m -isometric if

$$\sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} \sum_{|\beta|=j} \frac{j!}{\beta!} \mathbb{A}^{*\beta} \mathbb{A}^\beta = 0,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \beta &= (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_d), \quad |\beta| = \sum_{i=1}^d \beta_i, \quad \beta! = \prod_{i=1}^d \beta_i!, \\ \mathbb{A}^\beta &= \prod_{i=1}^d A_i^{\beta_i}, \quad \mathbb{A}^{*\beta} = \prod_{i=1}^d A_i^{*\beta_i}; \end{aligned}$$

\mathbb{A} is n -symmetric if

$$\sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} (A_1^* + \dots + A_d^*)^{n-j} (A_1 + \dots + A_d)^j = 0.$$

These generalisations, and certain of their variants (including (m, n) -isosymmetric operators), have recently been the subject matter of a number of studies, see [6, 12, 13, 19] for further references.

This paper studies (X, m) -isometric, (X, n) -symmetric and $(X, (m, n))$ -isosymmetric commuting Banach space d -tuples from the point of view of operators defined by elementary operators (of left and right multiplication) and shows how the arguments from the single operator case work just as well in proving a number of the structural properties of these classes of operators. The plan of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we introduce our generalised definition of (X, m) -isometric, (X, n) -symmetric and $(X, (m, n))$ -isosymmetric commuting d -tuples in $B(\mathcal{X})^d$, and prove some well known and some not so well known (possibly new) results on the structure of these operators. Section 3 considers perturbation by commuting nilpotent d -tuples, and Section 4 considers commuting products.

2. Definitions and introductory properties

For $A, B \in B(\mathcal{X})$, let L_A and $R_B \in B(B(\mathcal{X}))$ denote respectively the operators

$$L_A(X) = AX \text{ and } R_B(X) = XB$$

of left multiplication by A and right multiplication by B . A d -tuple $\mathbb{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_d) \in B(\mathcal{X})^d$ is a commuting d -tuple if

$$[A_i, A_j] = A_i A_j - A_j A_i = 0, \text{ all } 1 \leq i, j \leq d.$$

Given commuting d -tuples $\mathbb{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_d)$ and $\mathbb{B} = (B_1, \dots, B_d)$, define operators $\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}}$ and $\mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}}$ by

$$\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}}^\alpha = \prod_{i=1}^d L_{A_i}^{\alpha_i}, \quad \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}}^\alpha = \prod_{i=1}^d R_{B_i}^{\alpha_i}$$

where

$$\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d), \quad |\alpha| = \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i, \quad \alpha_i \geq 0 \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq d.$$

For d -tuples \mathbb{A} and \mathbb{B} , and an operator $X \in B(\mathcal{X})$, let “ $*$ ” and “ \times ” denote, respectively, the multiplication operations

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}})^j(X) &= \left(\sum_{|\alpha|=j} \frac{j!}{\alpha!} \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}}^\alpha \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}}^\alpha \right) (X) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^d L_{A_i} R_{B_i} \right)^j (X) \\ &\text{(all integers } j \geq 0, \alpha! = \alpha_1! \cdots \alpha_d!) \text{ and} \\ (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} \times \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}})(X) &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^d L_{A_i} \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^d R_{B_i} \right) (X). \end{aligned}$$

We say that the d -tuples \mathbb{A} and \mathbb{B} commute, $[\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}] = 0$, if

$$[A_i, B_j] = 0 \text{ for all } 1 \leq i, j \leq d.$$

Evidently,

$$[\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}}, \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}}] = 0$$

and if $[\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}] = 0$, then

$$[\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}}, \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{B}}] = [\mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{A}}, \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}}] = 0.$$

A pair (\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}) of commuting d -tuples \mathbb{A} and \mathbb{B} is said to be (X, m) -isometric, $(\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}) \in (X, m)$ -isometric, for some positive integer m and operator $X \in B(\mathcal{X})$, if

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(X) &= (I - \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}})^m(X) \\ &= \left(\sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}})^j \right) (X) \\ &= \left(\sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d L_{A_i} R_{B_i} \right)^j \right) (X) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} \left(\sum_{|\alpha|=j} \frac{j!}{\alpha!} \mathbb{A}^\alpha X \mathbb{B}^\alpha \right) \\ &= 0; \end{aligned}$$

(\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}) is (X, n) -symmetric, for some positive integer n and operator $X \in B(\mathcal{X})$, if

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^n(X) &= (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} - \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}})^n(X) \\
&= \left(\sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j \binom{n}{j} \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}}^{n-j} \times \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}}^j \right) (X) \\
&= \left(\sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j \binom{n}{j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d L_{A_i} \right)^{n-j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d R_{B_i} \right)^j \right) (X) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^{m-j} \binom{n}{j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d A_i \right)^{n-j} X \left(\sum_{i=1}^d B_i \right)^j \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Commuting tuples of (X, m) -isometric, similarly (X, n) -symmetric operators, share a large number of properties with their single operator counterparts. However, there are instances where a property holds for the single operator version but fails for the d -tuple version. For example, whereas

$$\Delta_{A,B}^m(X) = 0 \iff \Delta_{A^t, B^t}^m(X) \text{ for all integers } t \geq 1$$

and

$$\Delta_{A,B}^m(X) = 0 \iff \Delta_{A^{-1}, B^{-1}}^m(X) = 0 \text{ for all invertible } A \text{ and } B,$$

these properties fail for d -tuples, as the following example shows.

Example 2.1 If we define operators A_i, B_i ($i = 1, 2$) by $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{B} = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}I, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}I \right)$, then $\mathbb{A} = (A_1, A_2)$ and $\mathbb{B} = (B_1, B_2)$ are commuting, invertible 2-tuples such that (\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}) is 1-isometric, i.e. $(I, 1)$ -isometric, but neither of $(\mathbb{A}^2, \mathbb{B}^2)$, $\mathbb{A}^2 = \mathbb{B}^2 = (A_1^2, A_1A_2, A_2A_1, A_2^2)$, and $(\mathbb{A}^{-1}, \mathbb{B}^{-1})$, $\mathbb{A}^{-1} = \mathbb{B}^{-1} = (\sqrt{2}I, \sqrt{2}I)$, is m -isometric for any m .

In the following we show that where a property is shared by the single operator and the d -tuple versions, a proof of the d -tuple version of the result is obtained from the argument of the single operator version of the result (if not by a transliteration of the argument, then by a simple additional argument). We remark here that a number of authors have considered (X, m) -isometric and (X, n) -symmetric Hilbert space tuples with the operator X replaced by a positive operator P . The consideration of a general operator X , rather than $P \geq 0$, does not involve extra argument and does not, in general, result in loss of information. Any additional information that may result from a consideration with $P \geq 0$ is usually a result of additional hypotheses on P , such as injectivity, which lead to additional structure on the underlying Hilbert space. We start in the following with a couple of basic observations. The definitions imply

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^t(X) = \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{t-m}(\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(X)), \quad \delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^t(X) = \delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{t-n}(\delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^n(X)),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{t_1} \left(\delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{t_2}(X) \right) &= \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{t_1-m} \left[\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m \left(\delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{t_2}(X) \right) \right] \\
&= \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{t_1-m} \left[\delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{t_2} \left(\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(X) \right) \right] \\
&= \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{t_1} \left[\delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{t_2-n} \left(\delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^n(X) \right) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^{t_1} \left(\delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^{t_2} (X) \right) &= \Delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^{t_1-m} \left[\Delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^m \left(\delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^{t_2-n} (\delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^n (X)) \right) \right] \\ &= \Delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^{t_1-m} \left[\delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^{t_2-n} \left(\Delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^m (\delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^n (X)) \right) \right]\end{aligned}$$

for all integers $t_1 \geq m$ and $t_2 \geq n$. Thus:

Proposition 2.2 *Given commuting d -tuples \mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B} in $B(\mathcal{X})^d$ and an operator $X \in B(\mathcal{X})$,*

$(\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}) \in (X, m) - \text{isometric} \implies (\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}) \in (X, t_1) - \text{isometric}$ for all integers $t_1 \geq m$;

$(\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}) \in (X, n) - \text{symmetric} \implies (\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}) \in (X, t_2) - \text{symmetric}$ for all integers $t_2 \geq n$;

$$\begin{aligned}\{(\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}) \in (X, m) - \text{isometric}\} \vee \{(\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}) \in (X, n) - \text{symmetric}\} \\ \implies (\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}) \in (X, (t_1, t_2)) - \text{isosymmetric} \text{ for all integers } t_1 \geq m, t_2 \geq n.\end{aligned}$$

If $(\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}) \in (X, m)$ -isometric, then

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^m (X) = 0 &\iff (I - \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}}) \left(\Delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^{m-1} (X) \right) = 0 \\ &\iff (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}}) \left(\Delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^{m-1} (X) \right) = \Delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^{m-1} (X) \\ &\implies (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}})^2 \left(\Delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^{m-1} (X) \right) = (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}}) \left(\Delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^{m-1} (X) \right) = \Delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^{m-1} (X) \\ &\dots \\ &\implies (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}})^t \left(\Delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^{m-1} (X) \right) = \Delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^{m-1} (X).\end{aligned}$$

for all integers $t \geq 0$. Since $\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}}$ commutes with $\Delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^{m-1}$, we also have

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^{m-1} \left((\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}})^t (X) \right) = \Delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^{m-1} (X)$$

for all integers $t \geq 0$.

Again, if $(\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}) \in (X, n)$ -symmetric, then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^n (X) = 0 &\iff (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} - \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}}) \left(\delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^{n-1} (X) \right) = 0 \\ &\iff \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} \left(\delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^{n-1} (X) \right) = \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}} \left(\delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^{n-1} (X) \right) \\ &\dots \\ &\implies \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}}^t \left(\delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^{n-1} (X) \right) = \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}}^t \left(\delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^{n-1} (X) \right)\end{aligned}$$

for all integers $t \geq 0$. Here

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} \left(\delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^{n-1} (X) \right) &= \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^j \binom{n-1}{j} \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}}^{n-1-j} \times \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}}^j \right) (X) \\ &= \left(\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^j \binom{n-1}{j} \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}}^{n-j} \times \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}}^j \right) (X)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}} \left(\delta_{\mathbb{A},\mathbb{B}}^{n-1} (X) \right) = \left(\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^j \binom{n-1}{j} \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}}^{n-1-j} \times \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}}^{j+1} \right) (X).$$

Proposition 2.3 *Given commuting d -tuples $\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B} \in B(\mathcal{X})^d$ and an operator $X \in B(\mathcal{X})$, if $(\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}) \in (X, m)$ -isometric, then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\binom{t}{m-1}} (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}})^t(X) = \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m-1}(X).$$

*In particular, if $(\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}})$ is invertible, then $\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m-1}(X) = 0$.*

Proof. The identity

$$(a-1)^m = a^m - \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \binom{m}{j} (a-1)^j$$

applied to $\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(X) = (I - \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}})^m(X) = 0$ implies

$$(\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}})^m(X) = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \binom{m}{j} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^j(X).$$

Observing

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}})^{m+1}(X) &= \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \binom{m}{j} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{j+1}(X) + \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \binom{m}{j} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^j(X) \\ &= \binom{m}{m-1} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(X) + \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \binom{m+1}{j} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^j(X) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \binom{m+1}{j} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^j(X), \end{aligned}$$

an induction argument shows that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}})^t(X) &= \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \binom{t}{j} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^j(X) \\ &= \binom{t}{m-1} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m-1}(X) + \sum_{j=0}^{m-2} \binom{t}{j} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^j(X) \end{aligned}$$

for all integers $t \geq m$. Since $\binom{t}{m-1}$ is of the order of t^{m-1} and $\binom{t}{j}$, $0 \leq j \leq m-2$, is of the order of t^{m-2} as $t \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m-1}(X) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\binom{t}{m-1}} \left[(\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}})^t(X) - \sum_{j=0}^{m-2} \binom{t}{j} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^j(X) \right] \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\binom{t}{m-1}} (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}})^t(X). \end{aligned}$$

As seen above $(\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}})^t \left(\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m-1}(X) \right) = \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m-1}(X)$ for all integers $t \geq 0$. Hence, if $\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}}$ is invertible, then $\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m-1}(X) = (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}})^{-t} \left(\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m-1}(X) \right)$ for all integers $t \geq 0$. Consequently, if $\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}}$ is invertible, then

$$X = \binom{t}{m-1} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m-1}(X) + \sum_{j=0}^{m-2} \binom{t}{j} (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}})^{-t} \left(\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^j(X) \right).$$

Since

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\binom{t}{m-1}} \left[\sum_{j=0}^{m-2} \binom{t}{j} (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}})^{-t} \left(\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^j(X) \right) - X \right] = 0,$$

we have $\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m-1}(X) = 0$. \square

The case $\mathbb{B} = (B_1, \dots, B_d) \in B(\mathcal{H})^d$, $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{B}^*$, $X = I$ and $m = 2$ of Proposition 2.3 is of some interest: if $(\mathbb{A}^*, \mathbb{A})$ is $(I, 2)$ -isometric and $0 \notin \sigma \left(\sum_{i=1}^d |A_i|^2 \right)$, then \mathbb{A} is a spherical isometry (i.e., $(\mathbb{A}^*, \mathbb{A})$ is $(I, 1)$ -isometric). For tuples $\mathbb{A} \in B(\mathcal{H})^d$ such that $(\mathbb{A}^*, \mathbb{A})$ is $(I, 2)$ -symmetric, we have the following analogue of the well known result that $(I, 2)$ -symmetric operators $A \in B(\mathcal{H})$ are self-adjoint [26].

Recall that an operator $A \in B(\mathcal{H})$ is hyponormal if $AA^* \leq A^*A$. Hyponormal pairs (A, B^*) satisfy the Putnam-Fuglede commutativity property, namely that $\delta_{A, B}(I) = 0$ implies $\delta_{A^*, B^*}(I) = 0$. Indeed, more is true [27]: if $\delta_{A, B}^n(I) = 0$ for hyponormal $A, B^* \in B(\mathcal{H})$ and some positive integer n , then $\delta_{A, B}(I) = \delta_{A^*, B^*}(I) = 0$.

Proposition 2.4 *If $(\mathbb{A}^*, \mathbb{A})$ is $(I, 2)$ -symmetric, then $\sum_{i=1}^d A_i$ is self-adjoint.*

Proof. For convenience, let

$$\sum_{i=1}^d A_i = \Sigma \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^d A_i^* = \Sigma^*.$$

The hypothesis $\delta_{\mathbb{A}^*, \mathbb{A}}^2(I) = 0$ then implies

$$\Sigma^{*2} - 2\Sigma^* \Sigma + \Sigma^2 = 0.$$

Since already

$$0 \leq \delta_{\mathbb{A}^*, \mathbb{A}}(I)^* \delta_{\mathbb{A}^*, \mathbb{A}}(I) = \Sigma^{*2} - \Sigma^* \Sigma - \Sigma \Sigma^* + \Sigma^2,$$

we have (upon combining)

$$\Sigma \Sigma^* \leq \Sigma^* \Sigma,$$

i.e., Σ is hyponormal. Evidently,

$$\delta_{\mathbb{A}^*, \mathbb{A}}^2(I) = \sum_{j=0}^2 (-1)^{2-j} \binom{2}{j} \Sigma^{*j} \Sigma^{2-j} = 0 = \delta_{\Sigma, \Sigma^*}^2(I),$$

the Putnam-Fuglede commutativity theorem applies and we conclude $\delta_{\Sigma, \Sigma^*}(I) = \delta_{\Sigma^*, \Sigma}(I) = 0$. Thus $\Sigma = \Sigma^*$. \square

Proposition 2.4 is a particular case of the following more general result, which for the case of the single operator says that an (I, m) -symmetric operator $T \in B(\mathcal{H})$, m an even positive integer, is $(I, m - 1)$ -symmetric [26]. Let $T - \lambda I = T - \lambda$.

Proposition 2.5 *If $\mathbb{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_d) \in B(\mathcal{H})^d$ satisfies $\delta_{\mathbb{A}^*, \mathbb{A}}^m(I) = 0$ for some positive even integer m , then $\delta_{\mathbb{A}^*, \mathbb{A}}^{m-1}(I) = 0$.*

Proof. The idea of the proof below is to reduce the problem to that of a single operator. For this, we start by determining the approximate point spectrum $\sigma_a(\mathbb{A})$. Recall that a d -tuple $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d) \in \mathbb{C}^d$ is in $\sigma_a(\mathbb{A})$ if there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}$ of unit vectors in \mathcal{H} such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^d \|(A_i - \lambda_i)x_n\| = 0 \quad \left(\iff \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|(A_i - \lambda_i)x_n\| = 0 \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq d \right).$$

Suppose $\lambda \in \sigma_a(\mathbb{A})$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|(A_i - \lambda_i)x_n\| = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$. Then

$$\delta_{\mathbb{A}^*, \mathbb{A}}^m(I) = \sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d A_i^* \right)^{m-j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d A_i \right)^j = 0$$

implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} \left\langle \left(\sum_{i=1}^d A_i^* \right)^{m-j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d A_i \right)^j x_n, x_n \right\rangle \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} \left\langle \left(\sum_{i=1}^d A_i \right)^j x_n, \left(\sum_{i=1}^d A_i \right)^{m-j} x_n \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \right)^j \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \bar{\lambda}_i \right)^{m-j} \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \bar{\lambda}_i - \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i \right)^m \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i$ is real for all $\lambda \in \sigma_a(\mathbb{A})$. The spectrum $\sigma(\mathbb{A}) = \sigma_a(\mathbb{A}) \cup \sigma_a(\mathbb{A}^*)$ being a compact subset of \mathbb{C} , there exists a real $\lambda = (\lambda, \dots, \lambda) \notin \sigma(\mathbb{A})$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^d (A_i - \lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^d A_i - d\lambda$ is invertible.

Let $\sum_{i=1}^d A_i - d\lambda = A_\lambda$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\mathbb{A}^*, \mathbb{A}}^m(I) &= (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}^*} - \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{A}})^m(I) \\ &= (\mathbb{L}_{(\mathbb{A}-\lambda)^*} - \mathbb{R}_{(\mathbb{A}-\lambda)})^m(I) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d A_i^* - d\lambda \right)^{m-j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d A_i - d\lambda \right)^j \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} A_\lambda^{*(m-j)} A_\lambda^j \\ &= \delta_{A_\lambda^*, A_\lambda}^m(I) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

The operator A_λ being invertible,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \delta_{\mathbb{A}^*, \mathbb{A}}^m(I) = 0 &\iff \delta_{\mathbb{A}_\lambda^*, \mathbb{A}_\lambda}^m(I) = 0 \\
 &\iff \sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} A_\lambda^{*(m-j)} A_\lambda^j = 0 \\
 &\iff \sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} A_\lambda^{*(-j)} A_\lambda^j = 0 \\
 &\quad \text{(multiply by } A_\lambda^{*-m} \text{ on the right)} \\
 &\iff \Delta_{A_\lambda^{*-1}, A_\lambda}^m(I) = 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Arguing as in the proof of [16, Theorem 3], see also Proposition 2.3, this implies (recall: m is even)

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Delta_{A_\lambda^{*-1}, A_\lambda}^{m-1}(I) = 0 &\iff \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} (-1)^j \binom{m-1}{j} A_\lambda^{*(-j)} A_\lambda^j = 0 \\
 &\iff \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} (-1)^j \binom{m-1}{j} A_\lambda^{*(m-1-j)} A_\lambda^j = 0 \\
 &\quad \text{(multiply on the left by } A_\lambda^{*(m-1)}) \\
 &\iff \delta_{A_\lambda^*, A_\lambda}^{m-1}(I) = 0 \iff \delta_{\mathbb{A}^*, \mathbb{A}}^{m-1}(I) = 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Given a sequence of operators $\{A_n\} \in B(\mathcal{X})$, we write

$$A_n \xrightarrow{s} A, \text{ } A_n \text{ converges strongly to } A,$$

if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|A_n - A\| = 0.$$

The d -tuple $\mathbb{A}_n = (A_{1n}, \dots, A_{dn})$ converges strongly to $\mathbb{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_d)$, $\mathbb{A}_n \xrightarrow{s} \mathbb{A}$, if $A_{in} \xrightarrow{s} A_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$. The following proposition is an analogue of a result on the norm closure of the class of m -isometric, similarly, m -symmetric, operators.

Proposition 2.6 *If $\mathbb{A}_n = (A_{1n}, \dots, A_{dn})$ and $\mathbb{B} = (B_{1n}, \dots, B_{dn})$ are sequences of d -tuples in $B(\mathcal{X})^d$ such that $A_{in} \xrightarrow{s} A_i$ and $B_{in} \xrightarrow{s} B_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$ and if either of $\Delta_{\mathbb{A}_n, \mathbb{B}_n}^{m_1}(X)$ and $\delta_{\mathbb{A}_n, \mathbb{B}_n}^{m_2}(X)$ equals 0 for all n , then $\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m_1}(\delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m_2}(X)) = 0$.*

Proof. We start by proving that $\Delta_{\mathbb{A}_n, \mathbb{B}_n}^{m_1}(X) = 0$ for all n implies $\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m_1}(X) = 0$ and $\delta_{\mathbb{A}_n, \mathbb{B}_n}^{m_2}(X) = 0$ for all n implies $\delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m_2}(X) = 0$. The hypotheses $\mathbb{A}_n \xrightarrow{s} \mathbb{A}$ and $\mathbb{B}_n \xrightarrow{s} \mathbb{B}$ implies

$$\begin{aligned}
 \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|A_{in} - A_i\| &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|B_{in} - B_i\| = 0 \\
 \implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^d (A_{in} - A_i) \right\| &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^d (B_{in} - B_i) \right\| = 0
 \end{aligned}$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq d$ and integers $j \geq 1$. Since

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \Delta_{\mathbb{A}_n, \mathbb{B}_n}^{m_1}(X) - \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m_1}(X) \right\| \\
& \leq \left\| \Delta_{\mathbb{A}_n, \mathbb{B}_n}^{m_1}(X) - \Delta_{\mathbb{A}_n, \mathbb{B}}^{m_1}(X) \right\| + \left\| \Delta_{\mathbb{A}_n, \mathbb{B}}^{m_1}(X) - \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m_1}(X) \right\| \\
& \leq \sum_{j=0}^{m_1} \binom{m_1}{j} \left(\left\| \sum_{i=1}^d A_{in}^j X (B_{in}^j - B_i^j) \right\| + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^d (A_{in}^j - A_i^j) X B_i^j \right\| \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{j=0}^{m_1} \binom{m_1}{j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \|A_{in}\| \|X\| \|B_{in}^j - B_i^j\| + \|A_{in}^j - A_i^j\| \|X\| \|B_i^j\| \right) \longrightarrow 0 \\
& \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

$\Delta_{\mathbb{A}_n, \mathbb{B}_n}^{m_1}(X) = 0$ implies $\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m_1}(X) = 0$. Considering next $\delta_{\mathbb{A}_n, \mathbb{B}_n}^{m_2}(X)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \delta_{\mathbb{A}_n, \mathbb{B}_n}^{m_2}(X) - \delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m_2}(X) \right\| \\
& \leq \left\| \delta_{\mathbb{A}_n, \mathbb{B}_n}^{m_2}(X) - \delta_{\mathbb{A}_n, \mathbb{B}}^{m_2}(X) \right\| + \left\| \delta_{\mathbb{A}_n, \mathbb{B}}^{m_2}(X) - \delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m_2}(X) \right\| \\
& \leq \sum_{j=0}^{m_2} \binom{m_2}{j} \left(\left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^d A_{in} \right)^{m_2-j} X \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^d B_{in} \right)^j - \left(\sum_{i=1}^d B_i \right)^j \right] \right\| + \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \left\| \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^d A_{in} \right)^{m_2-j} - \left(\sum_{i=1}^d A_i \right)^{m_2-j} \right] X \left(\sum_{i=1}^d B_i \right)^j \right\| \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^d B_{in} \right)^j - \left(\sum_{i=1}^d B_i \right)^j \right\| \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^d (B_{in} - B_i) \right\| \left\| P \left(\sum_{i=1}^d B_{in}, \sum_{i=1}^d B_i \right) \right\|$$

for some polynomial (P, \cdot) ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^d B_{in} \right)^j - \left(\sum_{i=1}^d B_i \right)^j \right\| = 0.$$

Similarly,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^d A_{in} \right)^{m_2-j} - \left(\sum_{i=1}^d A_i \right)^{m_2-j} \right\| = 0.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_{\mathbb{A}_n, \mathbb{B}_n}^{m_2}(X) = 0 \text{ for all } n & \implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \delta_{\mathbb{A}_n, \mathbb{B}_n}^{m_2}(X) - \delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m_2}(X) \right\| = 0 \\
& \implies \delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m_2}(X) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, since

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}_n, \mathbb{B}_n}^{m_1} \left(\delta_{\mathbb{A}_n, \mathbb{B}_n}^{m_2}(X) \right) & = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}_n, \mathbb{B}_n}^{m_1} \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_{\mathbb{A}_n, \mathbb{B}_n}^{m_2}(X) \right) \\
& = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_{\mathbb{A}_n, \mathbb{B}_n}^{m_2} \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}_n, \mathbb{B}_n}^{m_1}(X) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

the proof is complete. \square

Proposition 2.6 is a generalisation of a number of extant results, amongst them [6, Theorem 2].

Remark 2.7 Let $\mathbb{U} = [U_{ij}]_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}$ be a unitary operator in $B(\mathcal{H})^d$. Given a d -tuple $\mathbb{T} = (T_1, \dots, T_d) \in B(\mathcal{H})^d$, define the d -tuple $\mathbb{S} = (S_1, \dots, S_d)$ by $S_j = \sum_{i=1}^d U_{ji} T_i$; $1 \leq j \leq d$. Then $\sum_{i=1}^d U_{ij}^* U_{ik} = 1$ if $1 \leq j = k \leq d$ and 0 otherwise. [19, Proposition 2.2] claims that if $(\mathbb{T}^*, \mathbb{T})$ is (A, m) -isometric for some positive operator $A \in B(\mathcal{H})$, then $(\mathbb{S}^*, \mathbb{S})$ is (A, m) -isometric. This is false, even for single operators, as the following example shows.

Example 2.8 Consider operators $T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, $A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and $U = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Then $A \geq 0$, U is unitary and $\Delta_{T^*, T}^2(A) = 0$. However,

$$S^* A S = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad S^{*2} A S^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1-i \\ 1+i & 2 \end{pmatrix}$$

and $\Delta_{S^*, S}^2(A) \neq 0$.

We observe here that if $\Delta_{\mathbb{T}^*, \mathbb{T}}^m(I) = 0$, and the d -tuple \mathbb{S} and the unitary \mathbb{U} are as in the remark above, then $\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^*, \mathbb{S}}^m(I) = 0$, as the following argument shows. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\mathbb{S}^*, \mathbb{S}}^m(I) &= \sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d S_i^* S_i \right)^j \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \left(\sum_{1 \leq s, t \leq d} T_s^* U_{is}^* U_{it} T_t \right) \right)^j \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \left(\sum_{1 \leq s \leq d} T_s^* U_{is}^* U_{is} T_t \right) \right)^j \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d T_i^* T_i \right)^j \\ &= \Delta_{\mathbb{T}^*, \mathbb{T}}^m(I), \end{aligned}$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^d \left(\sum_{1 \leq s, t \leq d} T_s^* U_{is}^* U_{it} T_t \right) &= \sum_{1 \leq s, t \leq d} T_s^* \left(\sum_{i=1}^d U_{is}^* U_{it} \right) T_t \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq s \leq d} T_s^* \left(\sum_{i=1}^d U_{is}^* U_{is} \right) T_s = \sum_{1 \leq s \leq d} T_s^* T_s. \end{aligned}$$

(A_i, B_i) is (X, m) -isometric, even $(X, 1)$ -isometric, for all $1 \leq i \leq d$ does not imply (\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}) is (X, m) -isometric. Consider $A_i = B_i = I$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$, when it is seen that (A_i, B_i) is $(X, 1)$ -isometric for all $X \in B(\mathcal{X})$ and $\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}(X) = (d-1)X \neq 0$. The following proposition goes some way towards explaining this phenomenon.

Proposition 2.9 (a) If (A_i, B_i) is $(X, 1)$ -isometric for all $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, then (\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}) is (X, m) -isometric if and only if $((d-2)I + L_{A_d}R_{B_d})^m(X) = 0$.
 (b) If (A_i, B_i) is $(X, 1)$ -symmetric for all $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, then (\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}) is (X, m) -symmetric if and only if (A_d, B_d) is (X, m) -symmetric.

Proof. (a) If $\Delta_{A_1, B_1}(X) = 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(X) &= (I - \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}})^m(X) = \left(I - \sum_{i=1}^d L_{A_i} R_{B_i} \right)^m(X) \\ &= \left[(I - L_{A_1} R_{B_1}) - \left(\sum_{i=2}^d L_{A_i} R_{B_i} \right) \right]^m(X) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} \Delta_{A_1, B_1}^{m-j} \left(\sum_{i=2}^d L_{A_i} R_{B_i} \right)^j(X) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} \left(\sum_{i=2}^d L_{A_i} R_{B_i} \right)^j \left(\Delta_{A_1, B_1}^{m-j}(X) \right) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

for all $m-j \neq 0$, and if $j = m$, then $\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(X) = 0$ if and only if

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(X) = \left(\sum_{i=2}^d L_{A_i} R_{B_i} \right)^m(X) = 0.$$

Assume next that (also) $\Delta_{A_2, B_2}(X) = 0$. Then $\left(\sum_{i=2}^d L_{A_i} R_{B_i} \right)^m(X) = 0$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} (-1)^m \left(\sum_{i=2}^d L_{A_i} R_{B_i} \right)^m(X) &= \left[(I - L_{A_2} R_{B_2}) - \left(I + \sum_{i=3}^d L_{A_i} R_{B_i} \right) \right]^m(X) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} \left(I + \sum_{i=3}^d L_{A_i} R_{B_i} \right)^j \left(\Delta_{A_2, B_2}^{m-j}(X) \right) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\left(\sum_{i=2}^d L_{A_i} R_{B_i} \right)^m(X) = 0$ if and only if $\left(I + \sum_{i=3}^d L_{A_i} R_{B_i} \right)^m(X) = 0$. Repeating the argument, we have eventually that $\left((d-3)I + \sum_{i=d-1}^d L_{A_i} R_{B_i} \right)^m(X) = 0$ if and only if $((d-2)I + L_{A_d}R_{B_d})^m(X) = 0$. Conclusion:

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(X) = 0 \iff ((d-2)I + L_{A_d}R_{B_d})^m(X) = 0.$$

(b) If $\delta_{A_1, B_1}(X) = 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}(X) &= (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} - \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}})^m(X) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^d (L_{A_i} - R_{B_i}) \right)^m(X) \\ &= \left[\sum_{i=2}^d \delta_{A_i, B_i} + \delta_{A_1, B_1} \right]^m(X) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \sum_{j=0}^m \binom{m}{j} \left(\sum_{i=2}^d \delta_{A_i, B_i} \right)^j \left(\delta_{A_1, B_1}^{m-j}(X) \right) \\
 &= 0
 \end{aligned}$$

for all $m-j \neq 0$, and if $j = m$, then $\delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(X) = 0$ if and only if $\left(\sum_{i=2}^d \delta_{A_i, B_i} \right)^m(X) = 0$. Repeating the argument, we have eventually that $\delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(X) = 0$ if and only if $\delta_{A_d, B_d}^m(X) = 0$. \square

Proposition 2.9 subsumes [6, Proposition 3], and proves that an analogous result holds for (X, M) -symmetric tuples.

3. Perturbation by commuting nilpotents

The single operator techniques extend to proving results on perturbation by commuting nilpotents of commuting tuples of operators satisfying an isometric or symmetric property. A commuting d -tuple $\mathbb{N} = (N_1, \dots, N_d) \in B(\mathcal{X})^d$ is an n -nilpotent for some positive integer n if

$$\mathbb{N}^\alpha = \prod_{i=1}^d N_i^{\alpha_i} = 0$$

for all d -tuples $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d)$ of non-negative integers α_i such that $|\alpha| = \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i = n$ and $\mathbb{N}^\alpha \neq 0$ for at least one α with $|\alpha| \leq n-1$. As usual, given d -tuples $\mathbb{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_d)$ and $\mathbb{N} = (N_1, \dots, N_d)$, we define

$$\mathbb{A} + \mathbb{N} = (A_1 + N_1, \dots, A_d + N_d).$$

Recall that $[\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{N}] = 0$ if and only if $[A_i, N_j] = 0$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq d$.

Theorem 3.1 *Given commuting d -tuples $\mathbb{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_d)$ and $\mathbb{B} = (B_1, \dots, B_d)$ in $B(\mathcal{X})^d$ such that $\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m_1} \left(\delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m_2}(X) \right) = 0$ for some positive integers m_1 and m_2 , let*

$$\mathbb{N}_i = (N_{i1}, \dots, N_{id}), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

be two commuting n_i -nilpotent d -tuples such that

$$[\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{N}_1] = [\mathbb{B}, \mathbb{N}_2] = 0.$$

Then

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{A} + \mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{B} + \mathbb{N}_2}^{t_1} \left(\delta_{\mathbb{A} + \mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{B} + \mathbb{N}_2}^{t_2}(X) \right) = 0; \quad t_i = m_i + n_1 + n_2 - 2, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Proof. The commutativity hypotheses on \mathbb{A} , \mathbb{B} , \mathbb{N}_1 and \mathbb{N}_2 , taken along with the commutativity of the left and the right multiplication operators, imply

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{A} + \mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{B} + \mathbb{N}_2}^{s_1} \left(\delta_{\mathbb{A} + \mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{B} + \mathbb{N}_2}^{s_2}(X) \right) = \delta_{\mathbb{A} + \mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{B} + \mathbb{N}_2}^{s_2} \left(\Delta_{\mathbb{A} + \mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{B} + \mathbb{N}_2}^{s_1}(X) \right)$$

for all positive integers s_1 and s_2 . We prove the theorem in two steps. In the first step we let $\delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m_2}(X) = Y$; then $\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m_1}(Y) = 0$, and we prove that $\Delta_{\mathbb{A} + \mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{B} + \mathbb{N}_2}^{t_1}(Y) = 0$. In the second step, we let $\Delta_{\mathbb{A} + \mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{B} + \mathbb{N}_2}^{t_1}(Y) = Z$. Then $\Delta_{\mathbb{A} + \mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{B} + \mathbb{N}_2}^{t_1}(Y) = \delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m_2}(Z) = 0$, and we prove that $\delta_{\mathbb{A} + \mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{B} + \mathbb{N}_2}^{t_2}(Z) = 0$.

Considering $\Delta_{\mathbb{A}+\mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{B}+\mathbb{N}_2}^{t_1}(Y)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}+\mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{B}+\mathbb{N}_2}^{t_1} &= (I - \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}+\mathbb{N}_1} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}+\mathbb{N}_2})^{t_1} \\ &= [(I - \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}}) - ((\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{N}_1} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}+\mathbb{N}_2}) + (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{N}_2}))]^{t_1} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{t_1} (-1)^j \binom{t_1}{j} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{t_1-j} \left[\sum_{k=0}^j \binom{j}{k} (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{N}_1} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}+\mathbb{N}_2})^{j-k} (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{N}_2})^k \right] \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{t_1} (-1)^j \binom{t_1}{j} \left[\sum_{k=0}^j \binom{j}{k} (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{N}_1} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}+\mathbb{N}_2})^{j-k} (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{N}_2})^k \right] \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{t_1-j}. \end{aligned}$$

The operator \mathbb{N}_i being n_i -nilpotent, $(\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{N}_1} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}+\mathbb{N}_2})^k = 0$ for all $k \geq n_1$ and $(\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{N}_2})^{j-k} = 0$ for all $j - k \geq n_2$, or, $k \leq j - n_2$. Hence

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{A}+\mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{B}+\mathbb{N}_2}^{t_1}(Y) = 0$$

for all $n_1 \leq k \leq j - n_2$. This leaves us with the case $n_1 - 1 \geq k \geq j - n_2 + 1$. But then $j \leq n_1 + n_2 - 2$ implies $t_1 - j \geq m_1 + n_1 + n_2 - 2 - (n_1 + n_2 - 2) = m_1$, and this, since $\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{m_1}(X) = 0$, forces $\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{t_1-j}(Y) = 0$. Conclusion: $\Delta_{\mathbb{A}+\mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{B}+\mathbb{N}_2}^{t_1}(Y) = 0$.

Consider now $\delta_{\mathbb{A}+\mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{B}+\mathbb{N}_2}^{t_2}(Z)$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\mathbb{A}+\mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{B}+\mathbb{N}_2}^{t_2} &= (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}+\mathbb{N}_1} - \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}+\mathbb{N}_2})^{t_2} = ((\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} - \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}}) + (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{N}_1} - \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{N}_2}))^{t_2} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{t_2} \binom{t_2}{j} \left[\sum_{k=0}^j \binom{j}{k} (-1)^k \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{N}_1}^{j-k} \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{N}_2}^k \right] \delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{t_2-j}, \end{aligned}$$

and since $\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{N}_1}^{j-k} \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{N}_2}^k = 0$ for all $j - k \geq n_1$ and $k \geq n_2$, $\delta_{\mathbb{A}+\mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{B}+\mathbb{N}_2}^{t_2}(Z) = 0$ for all $n_2 \leq k \leq j - n_1$. If $j - n_1 + 1 \leq k \leq n_2 - 1$ (implies $j \leq n_1 + n_2 - 2$), then $t_2 - j = m_2 + n_1 + n_2 - 2 - j \geq m_2$ and $\delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{t_2-j}(Z) = 0$. Hence $\delta_{\mathbb{A}+\mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{B}+\mathbb{N}_2}^{t_2}(Z) = 0$, and the proof is complete. \square

Theorem 3.1 subsume a number of extant results, amongst them [19, Theorem 3.1] and [6, Theorem 3]. The d -tuples \mathbb{A} and \mathbb{B} in the theorem, in the presence of suitable commutativity hypotheses, may be replaced by d -tuples \mathbb{A}_i and \mathbb{B}_i ; $i = 1, 2$. The argument of the proof of the theorem implies the following corollary.

Corollary 3.2 *Given commuting d -tuples \mathbb{A}_i , \mathbb{B}_i and \mathbb{N}_i in $B(\mathcal{X})^d$, $i = 1, 2$, such that*

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbb{A}_i, \mathbb{N}_1] &= [\mathbb{B}_i, \mathbb{N}_2] = [\mathbb{A}_1, \mathbb{A}_2] = [\mathbb{B}_1, \mathbb{B}_2] = 0, \\ \text{if } \Delta_{\mathbb{A}_1, \mathbb{B}_1}^{m_1}(X) &= 0, \text{ then } \Delta_{\mathbb{A}_1+\mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{B}_1+\mathbb{N}_2}^{m_1+n_1+n_2-2}(X) = 0, \\ \text{if } \delta_{\mathbb{A}_2, \mathbb{B}_2}^{m_2}(X) &= 0, \text{ then } \delta_{\mathbb{A}_2+\mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{B}_2+\mathbb{N}_2}^{m_2+n_1+n_2-2}(X) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\text{if } \Delta_{\mathbb{A}_1, \mathbb{B}_1}^{m_1} \left(\delta_{\mathbb{A}_2, \mathbb{B}_2}^{m_2}(X) \right) = 0, \text{ then } \Delta_{\mathbb{A}_1+\mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{B}_1+\mathbb{N}_2}^{m_1+n_1+n_2-2} \left(\delta_{\mathbb{A}_2+\mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{B}_2+\mathbb{N}_2}^{m_2+n_1+n_2-2}(X) \right) = 0.$$

For the case in which $\mathbb{A}^* = \mathbb{B} = \mathbb{T} \in B(\mathcal{H})^d$ and $\mathbb{N}_1 = \mathbb{N}_2 = \mathbb{N} \in B(\mathcal{H})^d$ for some commuting n -nilpotent d -tuple \mathbb{N} such that $[\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{N}] = [\mathbb{B}, \mathbb{N}] = 0$, Theorem 3.1 translates to:

Corollary 3.3 $\Delta_{\mathbb{T}^*, \mathbb{T}}^{m_1} \left(\delta_{\mathbb{T}^*, \mathbb{T}}^{m_2}(X) \right) = 0$ implies $\Delta_{\mathbb{T}^*+\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{T}+\mathbb{N}}^{m_1+2n-2} \left(\delta_{\mathbb{T}^*+\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{T}+\mathbb{N}}^{m_2+2n-2}(X) \right) = 0$.

4. Isosymmetric products

If $\mathbb{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_{d_1})$ and $\mathbb{S} = (S_1, \dots, S_{d_2})$ are two commuting d_i tuples in $B(\mathcal{X})^{d_i}$, $i = 1, 2$, then the product $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{A}$ is the operator

$$\mathbb{S}\mathbb{A} = (S_1 A_1, \dots, S_1 A_{d_1}, S_2 A_1, \dots, S_2 A_{d_1}, \dots, S_{d_2} A_1, \dots, S_{d_2} A_{d_1}).$$

The tuples \mathbb{A} and \mathbb{S} commute, $[\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{S}] = 0$, if

$$[A_i, S_j] = 0 \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq d_1 \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq d_2.$$

If $\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B} \in B(\mathcal{X})^{d_1}$ are commuting d_1 -tuples and $\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T} \in B(\mathcal{X})^{d_2}$ are commuting d_2 -tuples such that

$$[\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{S}] = [\mathbb{B}, \mathbb{T}] = 0,$$

then $(\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{A}} = \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}\mathbb{S}}, \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{T}\mathbb{B}} = \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}\mathbb{T}})$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{T}\mathbb{B}}(X) &= \sum_{j=1}^{d_2} S_j \left[\sum_{i=1}^{d_1} A_i X B_i \right] T_j \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{d_2} S_j ((\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}})(X)) T_j \\ &= (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{S}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{T}})((\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}})(X)), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{T}\mathbb{B}}(X) &= (I - \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{T}\mathbb{B}})(X) \\ &= (I - \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}} \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{T}})(X) \\ &= ((\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{S}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{T}})(I - \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}}) + (I - \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{S}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{T}}))(X) \\ &= ((\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{S}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{T}}) \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}} + \Delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}})(X) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$((\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{S}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{T}}) \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}})^n(X) = (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{S}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{T}})^n(\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^n(X)).$$

Again, if $\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}, \mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}$ are the tuples above, then

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{T}\mathbb{B}}(X) &= (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{A}} - \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{T}\mathbb{B}})(X) \\ &= \left[\sum_{j=1}^{d_2} L_{S_j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_1} L_{A_i} \right) - \sum_{j=1}^{d_2} R_{T_j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_1} R_{B_i} \right) \right] (X) \\ &= [\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{S}} \times \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} - \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{T}} \times \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}}](X) \\ &= [\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{S}} \times (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{A}} - \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}}) + \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}} \times (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{S}} - \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{T}})](X) \\ &= [\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{S}} \times \delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}} + \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}} \times \delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}](X), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{S}} \times \delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}})^n(X) &= \left[\sum_{j=1}^{d_2} L_{S_j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_1} L_{A_i} - R_{B_i} \right) \right]^n (X) \\ &= \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^{d_2} L_{S_j} \right)^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_1} (L_{A_i} - R_{B_i}) \right)^n \right] (X) \\ &= (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{S}}^n \times \delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^n)(X) = \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{S}}^n \times \delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^n(X) \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$(\mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}} \times \delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}})^n(X) = \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{B}}^n \times \delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^n(X).$$

It is well known, see for example [9, 18, 16, 21, 29], that if $[A_1, A_2] = [B_1, B_2] = 0$ and $\Delta_{A_i, B_i}^{m_i}(X) = 0$ (similarly, $\delta_{A_i, B_i}^{m_i}(X) = 0$) for $i = 1, 2$, then $\Delta_{A_1 A_2, B_1 B_2}^{m_1 + m_2 - 1}(X) = 0$ (resp., $\delta_{A_1 A_2, B_1 B_2}^{m_1 + m_2 - 1}(X) = 0$). Using an argument similar in spirit to the one used to prove Theorem 3.1 (see also [16]), we prove in the following an analogous result for products $(\mathbb{S}\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{T}\mathbb{B})$ of commuting d -tuples $\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}, \mathbb{S}$ and \mathbb{T} . We remark that the order d_i , $i = 1, 2$ of the d -tuples plays no role in the workings of our argument: there is no loss of generality in assuming $d_1 = d_2 = d$.

Theorem 4.1 *Let $\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}, \mathbb{S}$ and \mathbb{T} be commuting d -tuples in $B(\mathcal{X})^d$ such that*

$$[\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{S}] = [\mathbb{B}, \mathbb{T}] = 0.$$

If

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(\delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^n(X)) = 0 = \Delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^r(\delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^s(X))$$

and

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^r(\delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^n(X)) = 0 = \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(\delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^s(X))$$

for some positive integers m, n, r and s , then

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{T}\mathbb{B}}^{t_1}(\delta_{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{T}\mathbb{B}}^{t_2}(X)) = 0,$$

where $t_1 = m + r - 1$ and $t_2 = n + s - 1$.

Proof. The commutativity hypothesis $[\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{S}] = [\mathbb{B}, \mathbb{T}] = 0$, taken alongwith the commutativity of the left and the right multiplication operators implies

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{n_1}(\delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^{n_2}(X)) &= \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{n_1 - m} \left[\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(\delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^{n_2 - n}(\delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^n(X))) \right] \\ &= \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{n_1 - m} \left[\delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^{n_2 - n}(\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(\delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^n(X))) \right] \end{aligned}$$

for all integers $n_1 \geq m$ and $n_2 \geq n$. Hence

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(\delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^n(X)) = 0 \implies \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{n_1}(\delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^{n_2}(X)) = 0$$

for all integers $n_1 \geq m$ and $n_2 \geq n$. Similarly,

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^r(\delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^n(X)) = 0 \implies \Delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^{n_1}(\delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{n_2}(X)) = 0$$

for all integers $n_1 \geq r$ and $n_2 \geq n$.

The proof below is divided into two parts. In the first part we prove

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{T}\mathbb{B}}^{t_1}(\delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^n(X)) = 0, \quad t_1 = m + r - 1,$$

and in the second part we prove

$$\delta_{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{T}\mathbb{B}}^{t_2}(\Delta_{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{T}\mathbb{B}}^{t_1}(X)) = 0, \quad t_2 = n + s - 1.$$

Set $\delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^n(X) = Y$. Then $\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(Y) = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{T}\mathbb{B}}^{t_1}(Y) &= (\Delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}} + (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{S}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{T}})\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}})^{t_1}(Y) \\ &= \left(\sum_{j=0}^{t_1} \binom{t_1}{j} (\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{S}} * \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{T}})^{t_1 - j} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^{t_1 - j} \Delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^j \right) (Y). \end{aligned}$$

The commutativity hypotheses ensure

$$\left[(\mathbb{L}_S * \mathbb{R}_T)^{t_1-j} \Delta_{A,B}^{t_1-j}, \Delta_{S,T}^j \right] = 0;$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{L}_S * \mathbb{R}_T)^{t_1-j} \Delta_{A,B}^{t_1-j} \Delta_{S,T}^j(Y) &= (\mathbb{L}_S * \mathbb{R}_T)^{t_1-j} \left(\Delta_{A,B}^{t_1-j} \Delta_{S,T}^j(Y) \right) \\ &= (\mathbb{L}_S * \mathbb{R}_T)^{t_1-j} \left(\Delta_{S,T}^j \Delta_{A,B}^{t_1-j}(Y) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\Delta_{S,T}^j(Y) = \Delta_{S,T}^j(\delta_{A,B}^n(X)) = 0$$

for all $j \geq r$ and

$$\Delta_{A,B}^{t_1-j}(Y) = \Delta_{A,B}^{t_1-j}(\delta_{A,B}^n(X)) = 0$$

for all $t_1 - j \geq m$, equivalently $j \leq t_1 - m = r - 1$, we have

$$\Delta_{SA,TB}^{t_1}(\delta_{A,B}^n(X)) = 0.$$

Now set $\delta_{S,T}^s(X) = M$. Then $\Delta_{A,B}^m(M) = 0$. Arguing as above, it is seen that

$$\Delta_{SA,TB}^{t_1}(M) = \left[\sum_{j=0}^{t_1} \binom{t_1}{j} (\mathbb{L}_S * \mathbb{R}_T)^{t_1-j} \Delta_{A,B}^{t_1-j} \Delta_{S,T}^j \right] (M).$$

Since $\Delta_{S,T}^j(M) = 0$ for all $j \geq r$ and $\Delta_{A,B}^{t_1-j}(M) = 0$ for all $t_1 - j \geq m$, equivalently $j \leq r - 1$, we have

$$\Delta_{SA,TB}^{t_1}(\delta_{S,T}^s(X)) = 0.$$

To conclude the proof, set $\Delta_{SA,TB}^{t_1}(X) = Z$. Then $\Delta_{SA,TB}^{t_1}(\delta_{SA,TB}^{t_2}(X)) = \delta_{SA,TB}^{t_2}(Z)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{SA,TB}^{t_2}(Z) &= (\mathbb{L}_{SA} - \mathbb{R}_{TB})^{t_2}(Z) \\ &= (\mathbb{L}_S \times \delta_{A,B} + \mathbb{R}_T \times \delta_{S,T})^{t_2}(Z) \\ &= \left[\sum_{j=0}^{t_2} \binom{t_2}{j} (\mathbb{L}_S^{t_2-j} \times \delta_{A,B}^{t_2-j}) (\mathbb{R}_T^j \times \delta_{S,T}^j) \right] (Z). \end{aligned}$$

Evidently,

$$[\mathbb{L}_S \times \delta_{A,B}, \mathbb{R}_S \times \delta_{S,T}] = 0.$$

Since

$$\mathbb{R}_S \times \delta_{S,T}^j(Z) = \mathbb{R}_S \times \left[\delta_{S,T}^j(\Delta_{SA,TB}^{t_1}(X)) \right] = 0$$

for all $j \geq s$ and

$$\mathbb{L}_S^{t_2-j} \times \delta_{A,B}^{t_2-j}(Z) = \mathbb{L}_S^{t_2-j} \times \left(\delta_{A,B}^{t_2-j}(\Delta_{SA,TB}^{t_1}(X)) \right) = 0$$

for all $t_2 - j \geq n$, equivalently for all $j \leq t_2 - n = s - 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{SA,TB}^{t_2}(Z) &= \delta_{SA,TB}^{t_2}(\Delta_{SA,TB}^{t_1}(X)) \\ &= \Delta_{SA,TB}^{t_1}(\delta_{SA,TB}^{t_2}(X)) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 4.1 is a generalisation of a number of currently available results on products of operators. The theorem implies, in particular the following corollaries.

Corollary 4.2 *If $\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}, \mathbb{S}$ and \mathbb{T} are commuting d -tuples in $B(\mathcal{X})^d$ such that $[\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{S}] = [\mathbb{B}, \mathbb{T}] = 0$, then*

- (i) $\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(X) = \Delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^n(X) = 0 \implies \Delta_{\mathbb{AS}, \mathbb{BT}}^{m+n-1}(X) = 0$;
- (ii) $\delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(X) = \delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^n(X) = 0 \implies \delta_{\mathbb{AS}, \mathbb{BT}}^{m+n-1}(X) = 0$.

Let C be a conjugation of \mathcal{H} . (Thus $C : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is a conjugate linear operator such that $C^2 = I$ and $\langle Cx, y \rangle = \langle Cy, x \rangle$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$.) The first part of the following corollary has been proved in [6, Theorem 4].

Corollary 4.3 *Let \mathbb{S} and \mathbb{T} be commuting d -tuples in $B(\mathcal{X})^d$ such that $[\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}] = [\mathbb{S}^*, C\mathbb{T}C] = 0$. Then*

- (i) $\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^*, C\mathbb{S}C}^m(X) = \Delta_{\mathbb{T}^*, C\mathbb{T}C}^n(X) = 0 \implies \Delta_{\mathbb{S}^*\mathbb{T}^*, C\mathbb{S}\mathbb{T}C}^{m+n-1}(X) = 0$;
- (ii) $\delta_{\mathbb{S}^*, C\mathbb{S}C}^m(X) = \delta_{\mathbb{T}^*, C\mathbb{T}C}^n(X) = 0 \implies \delta_{\mathbb{S}^*\mathbb{T}^*, C\mathbb{S}\mathbb{T}C}^{m+n-1}(X) = 0$.

If $\mathbb{A} = A \in B(\mathcal{X})$ and $\mathbb{B} = B \in B(\mathcal{X})$ are single operators, then the products \mathbb{AS} and \mathbb{BT} are the d -tuples

$$\mathbb{AS} = (AS_1, \dots, AS_d) \text{ and } \mathbb{BT} = (BT_1, \dots, BT_d).$$

If also $[A, \mathbb{S}] = [B, \mathbb{T}] = 0$, then:

Corollary 4.4 (i) $\Delta_{A, B}^m(X) = \Delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^n(X) = 0 \implies \Delta_{\mathbb{AS}, \mathbb{BT}}^{m+n-1}(X) = 0$;
(ii) $\delta_{A, B}^m(X) = \delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^n(X) = 0 \implies \delta_{\mathbb{AS}, \mathbb{BT}}^{m+n-1}(X) = 0$.

Part (i) of the corollary is a generalisation of [6, Theorem 6] and part (ii) of the corollary, in so far as the authors can ascertain, is new.

Tensor products $\Delta_{\mathbb{A} \otimes \mathbb{S}, \mathbb{B} \otimes \mathbb{T}}^t(I)$ and $\delta_{\mathbb{A} \otimes \mathbb{S}, \mathbb{B} \otimes \mathbb{T}}^t(I)$

Let $\mathcal{X} \overline{\otimes} \mathcal{X}$ denote the completion, endowed with a reasonable cross norm, of the algebraic tensor product of \mathcal{X} with itself. Let $S \otimes T$ denote the tensor product of $S \in B(\mathcal{X})$ and $T \in B(\mathcal{X})$. The tensor product of the d -tuples $\mathbb{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_d)$ and $\mathbb{B} = (B_1, \dots, B_d)$ is the d^2 -tuple

$$\mathbb{A} \otimes \mathbb{B} = (A_1 \otimes B_1, \dots, A_1 \otimes B_d, A_2 \otimes B_1, \dots, A_2 \otimes B_d, \dots, A_d \otimes B_1, \dots, A_d \otimes B_d).$$

Let \mathbb{A} and \mathbb{B} be commuting d -tuples such that $\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(I) = 0$ (i.e., the pair (\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}) is m -isometric). Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(I) = 0 &\iff \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(I) \otimes I = 0 \\ &\iff \sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d A_i B_i \right)^j \otimes I \\ &\iff \sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d (A_i \otimes I)(B_i \otimes I) \right)^j = 0 \\ &\iff \Delta_{\mathbb{A} \otimes I, \mathbb{B} \otimes I}^m(\mathbb{I}) = 0, \mathbb{I} = I \otimes I. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(I) = 0 \iff \Delta_{I \otimes \mathbb{A}, I \otimes \mathbb{B}}^m(\mathbb{I}) = 0.$$

Considering m -symmetric pairs (\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}) , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(I) = 0 &\iff \sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^d A_i \right)^{m-j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d B_i \right)^j \right] \otimes I = 0 \\
 &\iff \sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d A_i \otimes I \right)^{m-j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d B_i \otimes I \right)^j = 0 \\
 &\iff \delta_{\mathbb{A} \otimes I, \mathbb{B} \otimes I}^m(\mathbb{I}) = 0 \\
 &\iff \delta_{I \otimes \mathbb{A}, I \otimes \mathbb{B}}^m(\mathbb{I}) = 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

The extension of Theorem 4.1 to tensor products is now almost automatic.

Theorem 4.5 *Given tuples $\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}, \mathbb{S}$ and \mathbb{T} in $B(\mathcal{X})^d$, if*

(i) $\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(I) = \Delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^n(I) = 0$ (resp., $\delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(I) = \delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^n(I) = 0$), then $\Delta_{\mathbb{A} \otimes \mathbb{S}, \mathbb{B} \otimes \mathbb{T}}^{m+n-1}(\mathbb{I}) = 0$ (resp., $\delta_{\mathbb{A} \otimes \mathbb{S}, \mathbb{B} \otimes \mathbb{T}}^{m+n-1}(\mathbb{I}) = 0$);

(ii) $\Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m(\delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^n(I)) = \Delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^r(I) = \delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^s(I) = 0$ for some positive integers m, n, r and s , then $\Delta_{\mathbb{A} \otimes \mathbb{S}, \mathbb{B} \otimes \mathbb{T}}^{m+r-1}(\delta_{\mathbb{A} \otimes \mathbb{S}, \mathbb{B} \otimes \mathbb{T}}^{n+s-1}(\mathbb{I})) = 0$.

Proof. Define operators \mathbf{A} , \mathbf{B} , \mathbf{S} and \mathbf{T} by

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbb{A} \otimes I, \quad \mathbf{B} = \mathbb{B} \otimes I, \quad \mathbf{S} = I \otimes \mathbb{S}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{T} = I \otimes \mathbb{T}.$$

Then $[\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{S}] = [\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{S}] = [\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{T}] = 0$,

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}}^m(I) = \Delta_{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{T}}^n(I) = 0 \iff \Delta_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}}^m(\mathbb{I}) = \Delta_{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{T}}^n(\mathbb{I}) = 0$$

and

$$\delta_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}}^m(I) = \delta_{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{T}}^n(I) = 0 \iff \delta_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}}^m(\mathbb{I}) = \delta_{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{T}}^n(\mathbb{I}) = 0.$$

Applying Corollary 4.4,

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{AS}, \mathbf{BT}}^{m+n-1}(\mathbb{I}) = \Delta_{\mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{S}, \mathbf{B} \otimes \mathbf{T}}^{m+n-1}(\mathbb{I}) = 0$$

and

$$\delta_{\mathbf{AS}, \mathbf{BT}}^{m+n-1}(\mathbb{I}) = \delta_{\mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{S}, \mathbf{B} \otimes \mathbf{T}}^{m+n-1}(\mathbb{I}) = 0.$$

This proves (i).

To prove (ii), we start by observing that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Delta_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}}^m(\delta_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}}^n(I)) &= \sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} \sum_{k=0}^n (-1)^k \binom{n}{k} \times \\
 &\quad \times \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^d L_{A_i} R_{B_i} \right)^j \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^d L_{A_i} \right)^{n-k} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d R_{B_i} \right)^k \right) \right] (I) \\
 &= \sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d (-1)^k \binom{n}{k} P(\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}) \right) (I),
 \end{aligned}$$

where $P(\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B})$ is a polynomial with entries which are constant multiples of terms of type $A_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots A_d^{\alpha_d} B_1^{\beta_1} \cdots B_d^{\beta_d}$ for some non-negative integers α_i, β_i ($1 \leq i \leq d$). Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m (\delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^n(I)) = 0 &\implies \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m (\delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^n(I)) \otimes I = 0 \\ &\iff \Delta_{\mathbb{A} \otimes I, \mathbb{B} \otimes I}^m (\delta_{\mathbb{A} \otimes I, \mathbb{B} \otimes I}^n(\mathbb{I})) = 0 \\ &\iff \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m (\delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^n(\mathbb{I})) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Again

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^r(I) = 0 &\iff \Delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^r(\mathbb{I}) = 0 \implies \delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^n (\Delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^r(\mathbb{I})) = 0, \\ \delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^s(I) = 0 &\iff \delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^s(\mathbb{I}) = 0 \implies \Delta_{\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}}^m (\delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^s(\mathbb{I})) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^r (\delta_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}}^s(\mathbb{I})) = 0.$$

Since \mathbb{A} , \mathbb{B} , \mathbb{S} and \mathbb{T} satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 4.1, the proof of (ii) follows. \square

References

- [1] J. Agler, *An abstract approach to model theory*. Survey of some Recent Results in Operator Theory: J.B. Conway and B.B. Morrel Editors, Pitman, NJ, USA, Volume II (1988), 1-24.
- [2] J. Agler and M. Stankus, *m-Isometric transformations of Hilbert space I*, Integr. Equat. Oper. Theory **21**(1995), 383-420.
- [3] J. Agler and M. Stankus, *m-Isometric transformations of Hilbert space II*, Integr. Equat. Oper. Theory **23**(1995), 1-48.
- [4] J. Agler and M. Stankus, *m-Isometric transformations of Hilbert space III*, Integr. Equat. Oper. Theory **24**(1996), 379-421.
- [5] O.A.M. Sid Ahmed, *Some properties of m-isometries and m-invertible operators in Banach spaces*, Acta Math. Sci. Ser. B English Ed. **32**(2012), 520-530.
- [6] O.A.M. Sid Ahmed, M.Cho and J.E. Lee, *On (m, C)-isometric commuting tuples of operators on a Hilbert space*, Res.Math. (2018) 73:51. (doi:10.1007/s00025-018-0810-0)
- [7] F. Bayart, *m-isometries on Banach Spaces*, Math. Nachr. **284**(2011), 2141-2147.
- [8] F. Botelho and J. Jamison, *Isometric properties of elementary operators*, Linear Alg. Appl. **432**(2010), 357-365.
- [9] T. Bermúdez, A. Martínón and J.N. Noda, *Products of m-isometries*, Lin. Alg. Appl. **408**(2013) 80-86.
- [10] T. Bermúdez, A. Martínón and J.N. Noda, *An isometry plus a nilpotent operator is an m-isometry*, Applications, J. Math. Anal Appl. **407**(2013) 505-512.
- [11] T. Bermúdez, A. Martínón, V. Müller and J.N. Noda, *Perturbation of m-isometries by nilpotent operators*, Abstract and Applied Analysis, Volume 2014, Article ID 745479(6pages).
- [12] M. Cho and O.A.M. Sid ahmed, *(A, m)-Symmetric commuting tuples of operators on a Hilbert space*, Math. Inequalities Applications **22**(3)(2019), 931-947.
- [13] M. Cho, H. Motoyoshi and B. Nacevska Nastovska, *On the joint spectra of commuting tuples of operators and a conjugation*, Functional Anal., Approx. and Computation **9**(2)(2017), 21-26.

- [14] B. P. Duggal, *Tensor product of n -isometries*, Linear Alg. Appl. **437**(2012), 307-318.
- [15] B.P. Duggal, *Tensor product of n -isometries III*, Functional Anal. Approx. and Computation **4**:2(2012), 61-67.
- [16] B.P. Duggal and I.H. Kim, *Structure of Iso-Symmetric Operators* Axioms **2021**, 10,256. <https://doi.org/10.3390/axioms10040256>.
- [17] B.P. Duggal and I.H. Kim, *Structure of elementary operators defining m -left invertible, m -selfadjoint and related classes of operators*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **495**(2020), 124718.
- [18] B.P. Duggal and V. Müller, *Tensor product of left n -invertible operators*, Studia Math. **215**(2)(2013), 113-125.
- [19] S. Ghribi, N. Jeridi and R. Rabaoui, *On (A, m) -isometric commuting tuples of operators on a Hilbert space*, Lin. Multilinear Algebra . (doi:10.1030/03081087.2020.1786489)
- [20] J. Gleeson and S. Richter, *m -Isometric commuting tuples of operators on a Hilbert space*, Integr. Equat. Oper. Th. **56**(2) (2006), 181-196.
- [21] C. Gu, *Structure of left n -invertible operators and their applications*, Studia Math. **226**(2015), 189-211.
- [22] C. Gu, *Elementary operators which are m -isometric*, Lin. Alg. Appl. **451**(2014), 49-64.
- [23] C. Gu, *Examples of m -Isometric tuples of operators on a Hilbert space*, J. Korean Math. Soc. **55**(1) (2018), 225-251.
- [24] C. Gu and M. Stankus, *m -isometries and n -symmetries: products and sums with a nilpotent*, Linear Alg. Appl. **469**(2015), 49-64.
- [25] J.W. Helton, *Infinite dimensional Jordan operators and Sturm-Liouville conjugate point theory*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **170**(1972), 305-331.
- [26] Scott A. McClough and Leiba Rodman, *Hereditary classes of operators and matrices*, Amer. Math. Monthly **104**(1977), 415-430.
- [27] M. Radjabalipour, *An extension of Putnam-Fuglede theorem for hyponormal operators*, Maths. Zeits. **194**(1987), 117-120.
- [28] M. Stankus, *m -isometries, n -symmetries and linear transformations which are hereditary roots*, Integr. Equat. Oper. Th. **75**(2013), 301-321.
- [29] Trieu Le, *Algebraic properties of operator roots of polynomials*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **421**(2015), 1238-1246.

B.P. Duggal, University of Niš, Faculty of Sciences and Mathematics, P.O. Box 224, 18000 Niš, Serbia.

e-mail: bpduggal@yahoo.co.uk

I. H. Kim, Department of Mathematics, Incheon National University, Incheon, 22012, Korea.

e-mail: ihkim@inu.ac.kr