

Some revisited results about composition operators on Hardy spaces

Pascal Lefèvre, Daniel Li, Hervé Queffélec, Luis Rodriguez-Piazza

► **To cite this version:**

Pascal Lefèvre, Daniel Li, Hervé Queffélec, Luis Rodriguez-Piazza. Some revisited results about composition operators on Hardy spaces. 21 pages. 2010. <hal-00448623>

HAL Id: hal-00448623

<https://hal-univ-artois.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00448623>

Submitted on 19 Jan 2010

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Some revisited results about composition operators on Hardy spaces

*Pascal Lefèvre, Daniel Li,
Hervé Queffélec, Luis Rodríguez-Piazza*

January 19, 2010

Abstract. *We generalize, on one hand, some results known for composition operators on Hardy spaces to the case of Hardy-Orlicz spaces H^Ψ : construction of a “slow” Blaschke product giving a non-compact composition operator on H^Ψ ; construction of a surjective symbol whose composition operator is compact on H^Ψ and, moreover, is in all the Schatten classes $S_p(H^2)$, $p > 0$. On the other hand, we revisit the classical case of composition operators on H^2 , giving first a new, and simpler, characterization of closed range composition operators, and then showing directly the equivalence of the two characterizations of membership in the Schatten classes of Luecking and Luecking and Zhu.*

Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 47B33 – Secondary: 47B10

Key-words. Blaschke product – Carleson function – Carleson measure – composition operator – Hardy-Orlicz space – Nevanlinna counting function – Schatten classes

1 Introduction

The study of composition operators on Hardy spaces is now a classical subject (see [18], [3] for example). In [8] (see also [7]), we considered a more general setting and studied composition operators on Hardy-Orlicz spaces; we gave there a characterization of their compactness in terms of the Carleson function of their symbol (and in terms of the Nevanlinna counting function in [11]). This work was continued in [10]: we compared the compactness on Hardy spaces versus the compactness on Hardy-Orlicz spaces. For instance, we showed that there is, for every $1 \leq p < \infty$, an Orlicz function Ψ such that $H^{p+\varepsilon} \subseteq H^\Psi \subseteq H^p$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$, and a composition operator C_φ such that C_φ is compact on H^p and $H^{p+\varepsilon}$, but which is not compact on H^Ψ .

We carry on this study in the present work. In a first part (Section 3 and Section 4), we shall improve, and extend to the Hardy-Orlicz case, results known for Hardy spaces; in a second part (Section 5 and Section 6), we shall give new

lights on some results concerning Hardy spaces. More precisely, the content of this paper is as following.

B. McCluer and J. Shapiro ([14], Theorem 3.10; see also [18], § 3.2) proved that, when their symbol φ is finitely-valent, compactness of composition operators C_φ on the Hardy space H^2 can be characterized by the behaviour of the modulus of φ near the frontier of \mathbb{D} : compactness is equivalent to $1 - |z| = 0$ ($1 - |\varphi(z)|$) as $|z| \rightarrow 1$, but that is not equivalent in general ([14], Example 3.8; see also [18], § 10.2). In [11], Theorem 5.3, we gave such a characterization for composition operators, with finitely-valent symbol, on Hardy-Orlicz spaces. In Section 3, we construct a “slow” Blaschke product (generalizing [18], § 10.2 and [8], Proposition 5.5) showing that this condition is not sufficient in general.

In Section 4, we construct a compact composition operator $C_\varphi: H^\Psi \rightarrow H^\Psi$ with surjective symbol φ and such that $C_\varphi: H^2 \rightarrow H^2$ is in all the Schatten classes $S_p(H^2)$, $p > 0$. This generalizes and improves a result of B. McCluer and J. Shapiro ([14], Example 3.12; see also the survey [16], § 2).

In Section 5, we give a characterization of composition operators $C_\varphi: H^p \rightarrow H^p$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, with a closed range, simpler than the former ones (see [1] and [20]).

Finally, based on the main result of [11], we show directly, in Section 6, the equivalence of Luecking’s and Luecking-Zhu’s criteria ([12], [13]) for the membership of $C_\varphi: H^2 \rightarrow H^2$ in the Schatten classes.

Acknowledgement. Part of this work was made during the fourth-named author visited the University of Lille 1 and the University of Artois (Lens) in June 2009. This fourth-named author is partially supported by a Spanish research project MTM2006-05622.

2 Notation

The open unit disk is denoted by $\mathbb{D} = \{z \in \mathbb{C}; |z| < 1\}$ and its boundary, the unit circle, by $\mathbb{T} = \{z \in \mathbb{C}; |z| = 1\}$. The normalized Lebesgue measure $dt/2\pi$ on \mathbb{T} is denoted by m . The normalized area measure $dx dy/\pi$ is denoted by A .

The Hardy space H^1 is the space of analytic functions $f: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $\sup_{r < 1} \int_0^{2\pi} |f(re^{i\theta})| d\theta < \infty$. Every $f \in H^1$ has almost everywhere boundary values on \mathbb{T} , which are denoted by f^* .

An Orlicz function is a convex nondecreasing function $\Psi: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that $\Psi(0) = 0$ and $\Psi(\infty) = \infty$. If μ is a positive measure on some measurable space S , the Orlicz space $L^\Psi(\mu)$ is the set of all (classes of) measurable functions $f: S \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $\int_S \Psi(|f|/C) d\mu < \infty$ for some $C > 0$; the norm $\|f\|_\Psi$ is defined as the infimum of the positive numbers C for which $\int_S \Psi(|f|/C) d\mu \leq 1$.

The Hardy-Orlicz space H^Ψ is the linear subspace of $f \in H^1$ such that $f^* \in L^\Psi(m)$ (see [8]).

Every analytic self-map $\varphi: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ defines a bounded composition operator $C_\varphi: f \in H^\Psi \mapsto f \circ \varphi \in H^\Psi$ (see [8]).

For every $\xi \in \mathbb{T}$ and $0 < h < 1$, the Carleson window is the set $W(\xi, h) = \{z \in \mathbb{D}; |z| \geq 1-h \text{ and } |\arg(z\bar{\xi})| \leq h\}$. The Carleson function ρ_φ of the analytic self-map $\varphi: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ is defined, for $0 < h < 1$, by:

$$\rho_\varphi(h) = \sup_{\xi \in \mathbb{T}} m(\{e^{i\theta} \in \mathbb{T}; \varphi^*(e^{i\theta}) \in W(\xi, h)\}).$$

Alternatively, $\rho_\varphi(h) = \sup_{\xi \in \mathbb{T}} m_\varphi[W(\xi, h)]$, where m_φ is the pull-back measure of m by φ . We shall also use, instead of $W(\xi, h)$, the set $S(\xi, h) = \{z \in \mathbb{D}; |z - \xi| \leq h\}$, which has an equivalent size.

The Nevanlinna counting function N_φ is defined, for $w \in \varphi(\mathbb{D}) \setminus \{\varphi(0)\}$, by

$$N_\varphi(w) = \sum_{\varphi(z)=w} \log \frac{1}{|z|},$$

each term $\log \frac{1}{|z|}$ being repeated according to the multiplicity of z , and $N_\varphi(w) = 0$ for the other $w \in \mathbb{D}$.

3 Slow Blaschke products

B. McCluer and J. Shapiro ([14], Theorem 3.10; see also [18], § 3.2) proved that, when φ is finitely-valent (meaning that, for some $s \geq 1$, the equation $\varphi(z) = w$ has at most s solutions), the composition operators $C_\varphi: H^p \rightarrow H^p$ is compact, $1 \leq p < \infty$, if and only if φ has an angular derivative at no point of \mathbb{T} ; that means that:

$$(3.1) \quad \lim_{|z| \rightarrow 1} \frac{1 - |z|}{1 - |\varphi(z)|} = 0.$$

In [11], Theorem 5.3, we generalized this result to Hardy-Orlicz spaces and proved that if φ is finitely-valent, the composition operator $C_\varphi: H^\Psi \rightarrow H^\Psi$ is compact if and only if:

$$(3.2) \quad \lim_{|z| \rightarrow 1} \frac{\Psi^{-1}\left[\frac{1}{1 - |\varphi(z)|}\right]}{\Psi^{-1}\left[\frac{1}{1 - |z|}\right]} = 0.$$

Without the assumption that φ is finitely-valent, condition (3.2) is no longer sufficient to ensure the compactness of $C_\varphi: H^\Psi \rightarrow H^\Psi$. Indeed, we are going to construct a Blaschke product satisfying (3.2), but whose associated composition operator is of course not compact on H^Ψ , as this is the case for every inner function. A Blaschke product satisfying (3.1) is constructed in [18], § 10.2; that construction uses Frostman's Theorem. Our construction, which is more general, is entirely elementary.

Theorem 3.1 Let $\delta: (0, 1) \rightarrow (0, 1/2]$ be any function such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \delta(t) = 0$. Then, there exists a Blaschke product B such that:

$$(3.3) \quad 1 - |B(z)| \geq \delta(1 - |z|), \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Corollary 3.2 For every Orlicz function Ψ there exists a Blaschke product B which satisfies:

$$\lim_{|z| \rightarrow 1} \frac{\Psi^{-1} \left[\frac{1}{1 - |B(z)|} \right]}{\Psi^{-1} \left[\frac{1}{1 - |z|} \right]} = 0.$$

though the composition operator $C_B: H^\Psi \rightarrow H^\Psi$ is not compact.

Proof. C_B is not compact since every compact composition operator should satisfy $|\varphi^*| < 1$ a.e. (see [8], Lemma 4.8). It suffices then to chose $\delta(t) = 1/\Psi(\sqrt{\Psi^{-1}(1/t)})$, which satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 3.1. Moreover:

$$\frac{\Psi^{-1}(1/\delta(t))}{\Psi^{-1}(1/t)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Psi^{-1}(1/t)}} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow 0} 0,$$

and condition (3.3) gives the result. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.1. We shall essentially construct our Blaschke product B as an infinite product of finite Blaschke products

$$\prod_n B_n,$$

where each finite Blaschke product B_n has p_n zeros equidistributed in the circumference of radius r_n . That is, we will have, writing $\theta_k = 2\pi k/p_n$ and $z_k = r_n e^{i\theta_k}$, for $k = 1, 2, \dots, p_n$:

$$(3.4) \quad B_n(z) = \prod_{k=1}^{p_n} \frac{|z_k|}{z_k} \frac{z_k - z}{1 - \bar{z}_k z} = \prod_{k=1}^{p_n} \frac{r_n - e^{-i\theta_k} z}{1 - r_n e^{-i\theta_k} z}.$$

We shall need the following estimate for the finite Blaschke product in (3.4).

Lemma 3.3 Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$, and $0 < r < 1$. Consider the finite Blaschke product

$$(3.5) \quad G(z) = \prod_{k=1}^p \frac{r - e^{-i\theta_k} z}{1 - r e^{-i\theta_k} z},$$

where $\theta_k = \frac{2k\pi}{p}$, for $k = 1, 2, \dots, p$.

(a) Then, for every $z \in \mathbb{D}$ with $|z| = r$,

$$(3.6) \quad |G(z)| \leq \frac{2r^p}{1 + r^{2p}} = 1 - \frac{(1 - r^p)^2}{1 + r^{2p}}.$$

(b) If besides we have $ph \leq 1/2$, where $h = 1 - r$, we also have, for every $z \in \mathbb{D}$ with $|z| = r$,

$$(3.7) \quad |G(z)| \leq 1 - \frac{(ph)^2}{2e}.$$

Let us continue the proof of the theorem. Define $\chi: (0, 1) \rightarrow (0, 1]$ by:

$$(3.8) \quad \chi(x) = \sup_{t \leq x} [\max\{2\delta(t), \sqrt{t}\}].$$

Then χ is non-decreasing, $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \chi(x) = 0$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow 1} \chi(x) = 1$. We can find a decreasing sequence $(h_n)_{n \geq 0}$ of point $h_n \in (0, 1)$, such that $\chi(h_n) \leq 2^{-n}$. This sequence converges to 0; in fact, $\sqrt{h_n} \leq \chi(h_n) \leq 2^{-n}$, by (3.8), and hence:

$$(3.9) \quad h_n \leq 2^{-2n}.$$

We now define, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, a positive integer p_n , by:

$$(3.10) \quad p_n = \min\{p \in \mathbb{N}; \frac{p^2 h_n^2}{2e} > 2^{-n}\}.$$

We have $p_n > 1$ because $h_n^2/2e < h_n^2 \leq 2^{-4n}$. So, for every n , we have $4(p_n - 1)^2 \geq p_n^2$, and then:

$$(3.11) \quad 4 \cdot 2^{-n} \geq \frac{4(p_n - 1)^2 h_n^2}{2e} \geq \frac{p_n^2 h_n^2}{2e}.$$

This yields, for $n \geq 7$, that $(p_n h_n)^2 \leq 8e 2^{-n} \leq 1/4$. Therefore $p_n h_n \leq 1/2$, and we can use the estimate in part (b) of Lemma 3.3.

Now, for $n \geq 7$, let B_n be the finite Blaschke product defined by (3.4), where $r_n = 1 - h_n$. Using (b) in Lemma 3.3, the Maximum Modulus Principle and the definition of p_n in (3.10), we have:

$$(3.12) \quad |B_n(z)| \leq 1 - \frac{p_n^2 h_n^2}{2e} < 1 - 2^{-n}, \quad \text{for } |z| \leq r_n.$$

Consider then the Blaschke product D defined by:

$$(3.13) \quad D(z) = \prod_{n=7}^{\infty} B_n(z).$$

This product is convergent since, by (3.11), we have:

$$\sum p_n(1 - r_n) = \sum p_n h_n \leq \sum \sqrt{8e 2^{-n}} < +\infty.$$

Finally, take $N \in \mathbb{N}$ big enough to have $r_6^N < 1/2$, and define:

$$(3.14) \quad B(z) = z^N D(z).$$

Thus B is a Blaschke product, and, if $|z| \leq r_6$, we have, since $\delta(t) \leq 1/2$:

$$(3.15) \quad |B(z)| \leq |z^N| \leq r_6^N < 1/2 \leq 1 - \delta(1 - |z|).$$

If $1 > |z| > r_6$, there exists $k \geq 7$ such that $r_k \geq |z| > r_{k-1}$. Therefore, thanks to (3.12),

$$(3.16) \quad |B(z)| \leq |D(z)| \leq |B_k(z)| \leq 1 - 2^{-k}.$$

On the other hand $r_k \geq |z| > r_{k-1}$ implies $h_k \leq 1 - |z| < h_{k-1}$, and so:

$$(3.17) \quad \delta(1 - |z|) \leq \frac{1}{2}\chi(1 - |z|) \leq \frac{1}{2}\chi(h_{k-1}) \leq 2^{-k}.$$

Combining (3.16) and (3.17) we get $|B(z)| \leq 1 - \delta(1 - |z|)$, when $1 > |z| > r_6$. From this and (3.15), Theorem 3.1 follows. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.3. It is obvious that, for all $a, z \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$\prod_{k=1}^p (z - ae^{i\theta_k}) = z^p - a^p.$$

Using this we have:

$$(3.18) \quad G(z) = \prod_{k=1}^p \frac{r - e^{-i\theta_k} z}{1 - re^{-i\theta_k} z} = \prod_{k=1}^p \frac{z - re^{i\theta_k}}{rz - e^{i\theta_k}} = \frac{z^p - r^p}{(rz)^p - 1}.$$

Now, if $|z| = r$, we can write $z^p = r^p u$, for some u with $|u| = 1$. Then $|G(z)| = |T(u)|$, where T is the Moebius transformation

$$T(u) = \frac{r^p(u - 1)}{r^{2p}u - 1}.$$

This transformation T maps the unit circle $\partial\mathbb{D}$ onto a circumference C . As T maps the extended real line \mathbb{R}_∞ to itself, and $\partial\mathbb{D}$ is orthogonal to \mathbb{R}_∞ at the intersection points 1 and -1 , C is the circumference orthogonal to \mathbb{R}_∞ crossing through the points $T(1) = 0$ and $T(-1) = \alpha$. It is easy to see that $|w| \leq |\alpha|$, for every $w \in C$; consequently:

$$|G(z)| \leq \sup_{u \in \partial\mathbb{D}} |T(u)| = |T(-1)| = \frac{2r^p}{1 + r^{2p}}.$$

This finishes the proof of the statement (a).

To prove part (b), observe that, $1 + r^{2p} \leq 2$, and so, for $|z| = r$,

$$(3.19) \quad |G(z)| \leq 1 - \frac{(1 - r^p)^2}{1 + r^{2p}} \leq 1 - \frac{(1 - r^p)^2}{2}.$$

Remember that $r = 1 - h$, so $r \leq e^{-h}$, and $r^p \leq e^{-ph}$. Thus $1 - r^p \geq 1 - e^{-ph}$. Now, if $x \in [0, 1/2]$, we have, by the Mean Value theorem:

$$1 - e^{-x} \geq \frac{x}{\sqrt{e}}.$$

Since $ph \leq 1/2$, we can apply this last estimate to (3.19) to get, as promised,

$$|G(z)| \leq 1 - \frac{(1 - e^{-ph})^2}{2} \leq 1 - \frac{p^2 h^2}{2e},$$

and ending the proof of Lemma 3.3. \square

Remark. The key point in the proof of Theorem 3.1 is the inequality (3.6) in Lemma 3.3. This inequality may be viewed as a consequence of the strong triangle inequality (applied to $a = z^p$, $b = r^p$ and $c = 0$):

$$(3.20) \quad d(a, b) \leq \frac{d(a, c) + d(c, b)}{1 + d(a, c)d(c, b)}$$

for the pseudo-hyperbolic distance $d(u, v) = \frac{|u-v|}{|1-\bar{u}v|}$ on \mathbb{D} . Let us recall a proof for the convenience of the reader: by conformal invariance, we may assume that $c = 0$; then:

$$1 - [d(a, b)]^2 = \frac{(1 - |a|^2)(1 - |b|^2)}{|1 - \bar{a}b|^2} \geq \frac{(1 - |a|^2)(1 - |b|^2)}{(1 + |a||b|)^2} = 1 - [d(|a|, -|b|)]^2,$$

so that:

$$d(a, b) \leq d(|a|, -|b|) = \frac{|a| + |b|}{1 + |a||b|},$$

proving (3.20), since $d(a, 0) = |a|$ and $d(0, b) = |b|$.

4 A compact composition operator with a surjective symbol

A well-known result of J. H. Schwartz ([17], Theorem 2.8) asserts that the composition operator $C_\varphi: H^\infty \rightarrow H^\infty$ is compact if and only if $\|\varphi\|_\infty < 1$. In particular, the compactness of $C_\varphi: H^\infty \rightarrow H^\infty$ prevents the surjectivity of φ . It may be therefore to be expected that, the bigger Ψ , the more difficult it will be to obtain both the compactness of $C_\varphi: H^\Psi \rightarrow H^\Psi$ and the surjectivity of φ . Nevertheless, this is possible, as says the following theorem, and the case H^∞ appears really as a singular case (corresponding to an ‘‘Orlicz function’’ which is discontinuous and can take the value infinity).

Theorem 4.1 *For every Orlicz function Ψ , there exists a symbol $\varphi: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ which is 4-valent and surjective and such that $C_\varphi: H^\Psi \rightarrow H^\Psi$ is compact. Moreover, φ can be taken so as $C_\varphi: H^2 \rightarrow H^2$ is in all the Schatten classes $S_p(H^2)$, $p > 0$.*

In the case of H^2 ($\Psi(x) = x^2$), B. McCluer and J. Shapiro ([14], Example 3.12) gave an example based on the Riemann mapping theorem and on the fact that, for a finitely valent symbol φ , we have the equivalence:

$$(4.1) \quad C_\varphi: H^2 \rightarrow H^2 \text{ compact} \iff \lim_{|z| \nearrow 1} \frac{1 - |\varphi(z)|}{1 - |z|} = \infty.$$

A specific example is as follows. Take

$$(4.2) \quad R = \left\{ z = x + iy \in \mathbb{C}; x > 0 \text{ and } \frac{1}{x} < y < \frac{1}{x} + 4\pi \right\},$$

let $g: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow R$ be a Riemann map and set $\varphi = e^{-g}$. Then, φ is 2-valent, $\varphi(\mathbb{D}) = \mathbb{D}^*$ (where $\mathbb{D}^* = \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$), and the validity of (4.1) is tested through the use of the Julia-Carathéodory theorem (see [16] for details). To get a fully surjective mapping φ_1 , just compose φ with the square of a Blaschke product:

$$\varphi_1(z) = B \circ \varphi, \quad \text{with } B(z) = \left(\frac{z - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}z} \right)^2, \quad \alpha \in D^* = \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$$

(note that $B(0) = B(2\alpha/1 + |\alpha|^2)$). Since $C_{\varphi_1} = C_\varphi \circ C_B$, we see that C_{φ_1} is compact as well and we are done.

Here, we can no longer rely on the Julia-Carathéodory theorem. But we shall use the following necessary and sufficient condition, in terms of the maximal Carleson function ρ_φ , which is valid for any symbol, finitely-valent or not (see [8], Theorem 4.18 – or [7], Théorème 4.2, where a different, but equivalent, formulation is given):

$$(4.3) \quad C_\varphi: H^\Psi \rightarrow H^\Psi \text{ compact} \iff \lim_{h \searrow 0} \frac{\Psi^{-1}(1/h)}{\Psi^{-1}(1/\rho_\varphi(h))} = 0.$$

For the sequel, we shall set:

$$(4.4) \quad \Delta(h) = \frac{\Psi^{-1}(1/h)}{\Psi^{-1}(1/\rho_\varphi(h))}.$$

Our strategy will be to elaborate on the previous example to produce a (nearly) surjective φ such that $\rho_\varphi(h)$ is very small (depending on Ψ) for small h . The tool will be the notion of harmonic measure for certain open sets of the extended plane $\hat{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$, called *hyperbolic* (see [2], Definition 19.9.3); for example, every conformal image of \mathbb{D} is hyperbolic (see [2], Proposition 19.9.2 (d) and Theorem 19.9.7). If G is a hyperbolic domain and $a \in G$, the *harmonic measure* of G at a is the probability measure $\omega_G(a, \cdot)$ supported by ∂G (here, and throughout the rest of this section, boundaries and closures will be taken in $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$) such that:

$$u(a) = \int_{\partial G} u(z) d\omega_G(a, z)$$

for each bounded and continuous function u on \overline{G} , which is harmonic in G (see [2], Definition 21.1.3). The harmonic measure at a of a Borel set $A \subseteq \partial G$ will be denoted by $\omega_G(a, A)$. Clearly,

$$\omega_{\mathbb{D}}(0, \cdot) = m,$$

the Haar measure (*i.e.* normalized Lebesgue measure) of $\partial\mathbb{D}$.

R. Nevanlinna (see [2], Proposition 21.1.6) showed that harmonic measures share a *conformal invariance property*. Namely, assume that G is a simply connected domain, in which the Dirichlet problem can be solved (a *Dirichlet domain*), and $\tau: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \overline{G}$ is a continuous function which maps conformally \mathbb{D} onto G ; then τ maps $\partial\mathbb{D}$ onto ∂G , and, if $\tau(0) = a$:

$$(4.5) \quad \omega_G(a, A) = m(\tau^{-1}(A))$$

for every Borel set $A \subseteq \partial G$. This explains why harmonic measures enter the matter when we consider composition operators C_φ : such an operator induces a map $H^\Psi \rightarrow L^\Psi(m_\varphi)$, where $m_\varphi = \varphi^*(m)$ appears as an image measure of m , as it happens for the harmonic measure of G at a in (4.5).

A useful alternative way of defining the harmonic measure, due to S. Kakutani, and completed by J. Doob (see [19], page 454, and [6], Appendix F, page 477) is the following: Let $(B_t)_{t>0}$ be the 2-dimensional Brownian motion starting at $a \in G$ (*i.e.* $B_0 = a$), and τ be the stopping time defined by:

$$(4.6) \quad \tau = \inf\{t > 0; B_t \notin G\};$$

we have:

$$(4.7) \quad \omega_G(a, A) = \mathbb{P}_a(B_\tau \in A),$$

i.e. the harmonic measure of A at a is the probability that the Brownian motion starting at a exits from G through the Borel set $A \subseteq \partial G$. The following lemma will be basic for the construction of our example. We shall provide two proofs, the second one being more illuminating.

Lemma 4.2 (Hole principle) *Let G_0 and G_1 be two hyperbolic open sets and $H \subseteq \partial G_0$ a Borel set such that*

$$G_0 \subseteq G_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \partial G_0 \subseteq \partial G_1 \cup H.$$

Then, for every $a \in G_0$, we have the following inequality:

$$(4.8) \quad \omega_{G_1}(a, \partial G_1 \setminus \partial G_0) \leq \omega_{G_0}(a, H).$$

Proof 1. From [2], Corollary 21.1.14, with $\Delta = \partial G_0 \cap \partial G_1$, one has $\omega_{G_0}(a, \Delta) \leq \omega_{G_1}(a, \Delta)$. But $\partial G_1 \setminus \Delta = \partial G_1 \setminus \partial G_0$, and hence, since harmonic measures are probability measures,

$$\omega_{G_1}(a, \partial G_1 \setminus \partial G_0) = \omega_{G_1}(a, \partial G_1 \setminus \Delta) = 1 - \omega_{G_1}(a, \Delta) \leq 1 - \omega_{G_0}(a, \Delta);$$

we get the result since $\partial G_0 = H \cup \Delta$, which implies $1 \leq \omega_{G_0}(a, H) + \omega_{G_0}(a, \Delta)$.
□

Proof 2. Let us define

$$(4.9) \quad \tau_0 = \inf\{t > 0; B_t \notin G_0\}, \quad \tau_1 = \inf\{t > 0; B_t \notin G_1\}$$

and

$$(4.10) \quad E = \{B_{\tau_1} \in \partial G_1 \setminus \partial G_0\}, \quad F = \{B_{\tau_0} \in H\}.$$

Inequality (4.8) amounts to proving that $\mathbb{P}_a(E) \leq \mathbb{P}_a(F)$, which will follow from the inclusion $E \subseteq F$. Suppose that the event E holds. Since $G_0 \subseteq G_1$, one has $\tau_0 \leq \tau_1$. The Brownian path $(B_s)_{0 \leq s \leq \tau_1}$ being continuous with $B_0 = a \in G_0$, one has $B_{\tau_0} \in \partial G_0 \subseteq \partial G_1 \cup H$. If we had $B_{\tau_0} \in \partial G_1$, we should have $B_{\tau_0} \notin G_1$, since G_1 is open, and hence $\tau_0 = \tau_1$, since we know that $\tau_0 \leq \tau_1$. But then $B_{\tau_1} = B_{\tau_0} \in \partial G_0$, contrary to the definition of E . Therefore, $B_{\tau_0} \in H$ and F holds. \square

We also shall need the following result (see [2], Proposition 21.1.17).

Proposition 4.3 (Continuity principle) *If G is a hyperbolic open set and $a \in G$, then the harmonic measure $\omega_G(a, \cdot)$ is atomless.*

Proof of Theorem 4.1. It will be enough to construct a 2-valent mapping $\varphi: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ such that $\varphi(\mathbb{D}) = \mathbb{D}^*$ and $C_\varphi: H^\Psi \rightarrow H^\Psi$ is compact. We can then modify φ by the same trick as the one used by B. McCluer and J. Shapiro. Note that every point in \mathbb{D}^* is the image by e^{-z} of two distinct points of R , except those which are the image of points of the hyperbola $y = (1/x) + 2\pi$, which have only one pre-image.

For a positive integer n , set:

$$(4.11) \quad b_n = \frac{1}{4n\pi},$$

and let $\varepsilon_n > 0$ such that:

$$(4.12) \quad \frac{\Psi^{-1}(2/b_{n+1})}{\Psi^{-1}(1/\varepsilon_n)} \leq \frac{1}{n}.$$


We now modify the domain R , including “barriers” in it (not in the sense of potential theory, nor of Perron!) in the following way.

Let, for every $n \geq 1$, M_n be the intersection point of the horizontal line $y = 4\pi n$ and of the hyperbola $y = (1/x) + 2\pi$, that is $M_n = \frac{1}{4\pi n - 2\pi} + 4\pi n i$.

Define inductively closed sets P_n^+ and P_n^- , which are like small points of swords (two segments and a piece of hyperbola), in the following way:

- The lower part of P_n^+ and P_n^- are horizontal segments of altitude $4n\pi$.
- Those two horizontal segments are separated by a small open horizontal segment H_n whose middle is M_n .
- The upper part of P_n^+ is a slant segment whose upper extremity c_n^+ lies on the hyperbola $y = 1/x$.
- The upper part of P_n^- is a slant segment whose upper extremity c_n^- lies on the hyperbola $y = (1/x) + 4\pi$.

- The curvilinear part of P_n^+ is supported by the hyperbola $y = 1/x$.
- The curvilinear part of P_n^- is supported by the hyperbola $y = (1/x) + 4\pi$.
- One has $4(n+1)\pi - \Im c_n^\pm > 2\pi$.



The size of the small horizontal holes will be determined inductively in the following way. Fix once and for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\Im a < 4\pi$. Suppose that H_1, H_2, \dots, H_{n-1} have already been determined. Set:

$$(4.13) \quad \Omega_n = \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \bigcup_{j < n} (P_j^+ \cup P_j^-); \Im z < 4n\pi \right\}.$$

We can adjust H_n so small that:

$$(4.14) \quad \omega_{\Omega_n}(a, H_n) \leq \varepsilon_n.$$

Indeed, Ω_n is bounded above by the horizontal segment $[b_n + 4in\pi, b_{n-1} + 4in\pi]$, where the point M_n lies. If $H_n = [M_n - \delta, M_n + \delta]$, we see that H_n decreases to the singleton $\{M_n\}$ as δ decreases to zero. Therefore, by Proposition 4.3, we can adjust δ so as to realize (4.14).

We now define our modified open set Ω by the formula

$$(4.15) \quad \Omega = \mathbb{R} \setminus \bigcup_{n \geq 1} (P_n^+ \cup P_n^-) = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \Omega_n.$$

It is useful to observe that:

$$(4.16) \quad \inf_{w \in \partial\Omega_n} \Re w = b_n.$$

This is obvious by the way we defined the upper part of $\partial\Omega_n$.

Now, we can easily finish the proof. Fix $h \leq b_1/2$ and let n be the integer such that:

$$(4.17) \quad b_{n+1} < 2h \leq b_n.$$

Let $g: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \Omega$ be a conformal mapping such that $g(0) = a$. Since $\partial_\infty \Omega$ is connected, Caratheodory's Theorem (see [15]) ensures that g can be continuously extended from $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ onto $\overline{\Omega}$. More explicitly, using the Moebius transformation $T(z) = 1/z$, we see that there exists an automorphism of the extended complex plane such that $\overline{\Omega}$ is sended onto a compact subset of \mathbb{C} ; so, we can apply to Ω many results stated for bounded domains. For instance, the boundary of Ω is a continuous path in the extended plane; so, by [2], Theorem 14.5.5, g can be extended to a continuous function (for the extended plane topology) $g: \overline{\mathbb{D}} \rightarrow \overline{\Omega}$. In particular, g has boundary values g^* .

We define $\varphi = e^{-g}$.

As in the proof of B. McCluer and J. Shapiro ([14]), we have that φ is 2-valent (see the remark made at the beginning of this proof), and we still have $\varphi(\mathbb{D}) = \mathbb{D}^*$, since, in the process for constructing Ω from R , for every point of \mathbb{D}^* , at least one of the preimages by e^{-z} in R has not been removed. Observe that, in particular, we did not remove any point in the hyperbola $y = (1/x) + 2\pi$, thanks to the choice of M_n .

Moreover, Ω is a Dirichlet domain (because each component of $\partial\Omega$ has more than one point: see the comment after Definition 19.7.1 in [2]), so we can use the conformal invariance. Then by (4.5), (4.14), (4.16) and by the hole principle, we see that, if $A = \{\Re e g^*(e^{it}) < 2h\}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.18) \quad \rho_\varphi(h) &\leq m_\varphi(\{|z| > 1 - h\}) = m(\{e^{-\Re e g^*(e^{it})} > 1 - h\}) \\
&= m(\{\Re e g^*(e^{it}) < \log(1/(1-h))\}) \\
&\leq m(\{\Re e g^*(e^{it}) < 2h\}) = \omega_{\mathbb{D}}(0, A) \\
&= \omega_{g(\mathbb{D})}(g(0), g(A)) = \omega_\Omega(a, \{\Re e w < 2h\}) \\
&\leq \omega_\Omega(a, \{\Re e w \leq b_n\}) \\
&\leq \omega_\Omega(a, \partial\Omega \setminus \partial\Omega_n) \leq \omega_{\Omega_n}(a, H_n) \leq \varepsilon_n.
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to observe that:

$$\Delta(h) = \frac{\Psi^{-1}(1/h)}{\Psi^{-1}(1/\rho_\varphi(h))} \leq \frac{\Psi^{-1}(2/b_{n+1})}{\Psi^{-1}(1/\varepsilon_n)} \leq \frac{1}{n} \leq Ch,$$

in view of (4.12) and of the choice of n , C being a numerical constant. We should point out the fact that we applied the hole principle to the domains $G_0 = \Omega_n$ and $G_1 = \Omega$ and that this was licit because the assumptions of the hole principle (in particular the inclusion $\partial\Omega_n \subseteq \partial\Omega \cup H_n$) are satisfied. We have therefore proved that:

$$\lim_{h \searrow 0} \Delta(h) = 0,$$

and this ends, as we already explained, the first part of the proof of Theorem 4.1.

To prove the last part, let us remark that in (4.12) we may take ε_n arbitrarily small. If one takes $\varepsilon_n \leq e^{-n}$, one has, for some constant $c > 0$, $\rho_\varphi(h) \leq e^{-c/h}$, by using (4.17) and (4.18). In particular, $\rho_\varphi(h) \leq Ch^\alpha$ for every $\alpha > 1$. By Luecking's criterion, that implies that $C_\varphi \in S_p(\mathbb{H}^2)$ for every $p > 0$ (see [9], Corollary 3.2). \square

Remark. Let us note that our result is stronger than McCluer-Shapiro's, since our C_φ is in all the Schatten classes $S_p(H^2)$, $p > 0$. Though our construction follows McCluer-Shapiro's, it is the introduction of the "barriers" P_n^+ and P_n^- which allows to get this improvement.

5 Composition operators with closed range

In [1], J. Cima, J. Thomson and W. Wogen gave a characterization of composition operators $C_\varphi: H^p \rightarrow H^p$ with closed range. This characterization involves the Radon-Nikodym derivative of the restriction to $\partial\mathbb{D}$ of m_φ . They found it not satisfactory, and asked a characterization with the range of φ itself. N. Zorboska ([20]) gave such a characterization, but her statement is somewhat complicated. We shall give here more explicit characterizations, either in terms of the Nevanlinna counting function N_φ , or in terms of the Carleson measure m_φ .

Theorem 5.1 *Let $\varphi: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ be a non-constant analytic self map. Then the composition operator $C_\varphi: H^p \rightarrow H^p$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, has a closed range if and only if there is a constant $c > 0$ such that, for $0 < h < 1$,*

$$(5.1) \quad \frac{1}{A(S(\xi, h))} \int_{S(\xi, h)} N_\varphi(z) dA(z) \geq ch, \quad \forall \xi \in \partial\mathbb{D}.$$

Theorem 5.1 will follow immediately from the next theorem, applied to $\mu = m_\varphi$, and from [11], Theorem 4.2.

Theorem 5.2 *Let μ be a finite positive measure on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Assume that the canonical map $J: H^p \rightarrow L^p(\mu)$ is continuous, $1 \leq p < \infty$. Then J is one-to-one and has a closed range if and only if there is a constant $c > 0$ such that, for $0 < h < 1$,*

$$(5.2) \quad \mu[W(\xi, h)] \geq ch, \quad \forall \xi \in \partial\mathbb{D}.$$

Proof. 1) Assume that J has a closed range. By making a rotation on the variable z , we only have to find a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$(5.3) \quad \mu(S_h) \geq ch,$$

for $h > 0$ small enough, where $S_h = S(1, h)$.

Since J is one-to-one, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that:

$$(5.4) \quad \|f\|_{L^p(\mu)}^p \geq C^p \|f\|_p^p, \quad \forall f \in H^p.$$

We are going to test (5.4) on

$$(5.5) \quad f_N(z) = \left(\frac{1+z}{2} \right)^N.$$

It is classical that there is a constant $c_p > 0$ such that:

$$(5.6) \quad \|f_N\|_p^p = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left| \cos \frac{t}{2} \right|^{pN} dt \geq \frac{c_p}{\sqrt{N}}.$$

Now, since $|z+1|^2 + |z-1|^2 = 2(|z|^2 + 1) \leq 4$ for every $z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$, one has:

$$|f_N(z)| \leq \left(1 - \frac{|z-1|^2}{4} \right)^{N/2} \leq e^{-\frac{N}{8}|z-1|^2}.$$

Hence, using $|f_N(z)| \leq 1$ when $|z-1| \leq h$, one has:

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_N\|_{L^p(\mu)}^p &\leq \mu(S_h) + \int_{|z-1|>h} e^{-p\frac{N}{8}|z-1|^2} d\mu \\ &= \mu(S_h) + \int_0^{e^{-pNh^2/8}} \mu(\{e^{-p\frac{N}{8}|z-1|^2} > u\}) du, \end{aligned}$$

that is, making the change of variable $u = e^{-p\frac{N}{8}x^2}$,

$$\|f_N\|_{L^p(\mu)}^p \leq \mu(S_h) + \int_h^\infty \mu(\{|z-1| \leq x\}) \frac{pN}{4} x e^{-p\frac{N}{8}x^2} dx.$$

Now, the continuity of J means, by Carleson's Theorem see [4], Theorem 9.3), that there is a constant $K > 0$ such that:

$$(5.7) \quad \sup_{|\xi|=1} \mu(S(\xi, x)) \leq Kx, \quad 0 \leq x < 1.$$

We get hence:

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_N\|_{L^p(\mu)}^p &\leq \mu(S_h) + \int_h^\infty Kx \frac{pN}{4} x e^{-p\frac{N}{8}x^2} dx \\ &= \mu(S_h) + \frac{K\sqrt{8}}{\sqrt{p}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_{h\sqrt{\frac{pN}{8}}}^\infty y^2 e^{-y^2} dy. \end{aligned}$$

We take now for N the smaller integer $> 1/h^2$, multiplied by some constant integer a_p , large enough to have:

$$\frac{K\sqrt{8}}{\sqrt{p}} \int_{\sqrt{\frac{p a_p}{8}}}^\infty y^2 e^{-y^2} dy \leq \frac{c_p C^p}{2}.$$

We get then, from (5.4) and (5.6):

$$\mu(S_h) \geq \frac{C^p c_p}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}},$$

which gives (5.3).

2) Conversely, assume that (5.2) holds. Since the disk algebra $A(\mathbb{D})$ is dense in H^p , it suffices to show that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $\|f\|_{L^p(\mu)} \geq C \|f\|_p$ for every $f \in A(\mathbb{D})$.

Let $f \in A(\mathbb{D})$ such that $\|f\|_p = 1$. Choose an integer N such that:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N |f(e^{2\pi in/N})|^p \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial\mathbb{D}} |f(\xi)|^p dm(\xi) = \frac{1}{2},$$

and such that, due to the uniform continuity of f ,

$$z, z' \in \overline{\mathbb{D}} \quad \text{and} \quad |z - z'| \leq \frac{2\pi}{N} \quad \implies \quad |f(z) - f(z')| \leq \frac{1}{2^{(p+1)/p}}.$$

Then, setting $W_n = W(e^{2\pi in/N}, \pi/N)$, $1 \leq n \leq N$, one has:

$$\|f\|_{L^p(\mu)}^p = \int_{\mathbb{D}} |f|^p d\mu \geq \sum_{n=1}^N \int_{W_n} |f|^p d\mu.$$

If we choose $z_n \in W_n$ such that $|f(z_n)| = \min_{z \in W_n} |f(z)|$, we get, using (5.2):

$$\|f\|_{L^p(\mu)}^p \geq \sum_{n=1}^N |f(z_n)|^p \mu(W_n) \geq \frac{c\pi}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N |f(z_n)|^p.$$

Since $A^p \leq 2^{p-1}[(A-B)^p + B^p]$, by Hölder's inequality, one has:

$$|f(z_n)|^p \geq \frac{1}{2^{p-1}} |f(e^{2\pi in/N})|^p - |f(z_n) - f(e^{2\pi in/N})|^p$$

and hence:

$$\|f\|_{L^p(\mu)}^p \geq \frac{c\pi}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \left[\frac{1}{2^{p-1}} |f(e^{2\pi in/N})|^p - |f(z_n) - f(e^{2\pi in/N})|^p \right].$$

Now, since $z_n \in W_n$, one has:

$$|z_n - e^{2\pi in/N}| \leq \left| z_n - \frac{z_n}{|z_n|} \right| + \left| \frac{z_n}{|z_n|} - e^{2\pi in/N} \right| \leq \frac{\pi}{N} + \frac{\pi}{N} = \frac{2\pi}{N};$$

therefore $|f(z_n) - f(e^{2\pi in/N})| \leq 1/2^{p+1}$ and we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{L^p(\mu)}^p &\geq c\pi \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{1}{2^{p-1}} |f(e^{2\pi in/N})|^p - \frac{1}{2^{p+1}} \right] \\ &\geq c\pi \left(\frac{1}{2^{p-1}} \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^{p+1}} \right) = \frac{c\pi}{2^{p+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

That ends the proof of Theorem 5.2. □

Remark. To make the link with Cima-Thomson-Wogen's criterion, we shall see that condition 5.2 implies that the restriction of μ to the boundary $\mathbb{T} = \partial\mathbb{D}$ of the disk dominates the Lebesgue measure m . In fact, let I be an arc of \mathbb{T} . If $m(I) = h$, we can write:

$$I = \bigcap_{n \geq 1} \bigcup_{j=1}^n W(\xi_{n,j}, h/2n),$$

with disjoint windows $W(\xi_{n,1}, h/2n), \dots, W(\xi_{n,n}, h/2n)$; hence:

$$\mu(I) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^n \mu[W(\xi_{n,j}, h/2n)] \geq c \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{h}{2n} = \frac{c}{2} h.$$

6 Composition operators in Schatten classes

In [12], D. Luecking characterized composition operators $C_\varphi: H^2 \rightarrow H^2$ which are in the Schatten classes, by using, essentially, the m_φ -measure of Carleson windows. Five years later, D. Luecking and K. Zhu ([13]) characterized them by using the Nevanlinna counting function of φ . We shall see in this section how the result of [11] makes these two characterizations directly equivalent.

It will be convenient here to work with *modified* Carleson windows, namely:

$$W_{n,j} = \left\{ z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}; 1 - 2^{-n} \leq |z| \leq 1 \text{ and } \frac{(2j-1)\pi}{2^n} \leq \arg z < \frac{(2j+1)\pi}{2^n} \right\}$$

($j = 0, 1, \dots, 2^n - 1$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$). We shall say that $W_{n,j}$ is the Carleson window centered at $e^{2\pi i j / 2^n}$ with size 2^{-n} .

Theorem 6.1 *For $p > 0$ the two following conditions are equivalent:*

- a) $\frac{N_\varphi(z)}{\log(1/|z|)} \in L^{p/2}(\lambda)$, where $d\lambda(z) = (1 - |z|)^{-2} dA(z)$ and A is the normalized area measure on \mathbb{D} ;
- b) $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{2^n-1} [2^n m_\varphi(W_{n,j})]^{p/2} < \infty$.

Condition *b*) in the last theorem yields that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_j 2^n m_\varphi(W_{n,j}) = 0$, and it is not difficult to see that this implies that $m_\varphi(\partial\mathbb{D}) = 0$, or equivalently, that $|\varphi^*| < 1$ almost everywhere on $\partial\mathbb{D}$. In this situation we know ([9], Proposition 3.3) that *b*) in Theorem 6.1 is equivalent to Luecking's condition in [12]. In fact the characterization of belonging to a Schatten class in [12] includes the requirement $m_\varphi(\partial\mathbb{D}) = 0$.

Proof. We may, and do, assume that $\varphi(0) = 0$.

1) Assume first that condition *b*) is satisfied. Let:

$$R_{n,j} = \left\{ z \in \mathbb{D}; 1 - 2^{-n} \leq |z| < 1 - 2^{-n-1} \text{ and } \frac{(2j-1)\pi}{2^n} \leq \arg z < \frac{(2j+1)\pi}{2^n} \right\}$$

be the (disjoint) Luecking windows ($0 \leq j \leq 2^n - 1$, $n \geq 0$). One has $R_{n,j} \subseteq W_{n,j}$.

By [11], Theorem 3.1, there are a constant $C > 0$ and an integer K such that $N_\varphi(z) \leq C m_\varphi(\widetilde{W}_{n,j})$, for every $z \in R_{n,j}$, where $\widetilde{W}_{n,j}$ is the window centered at $e^{2\pi i j/2^n}$, as $W_{n,j}$, but with size 2^{K-n} . The windows $W_{n-K,j}$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, 2^{n-K} - 1$, have the same size as the windows $\widetilde{W}_{n,j}$, but may have a different center; nevertheless, each $\widetilde{W}_{n,j}$ can be covered with two windows $W_{n-K,l}$: for $n > K$, $\widetilde{W}_{n,j} \subseteq W_{n-K,l} \cup W_{n-K,l+1}$, for some $l = 1, 2, \dots, 2^{n-K}$ (where $l+1$ is understood as 0 if $l = 2^{n-K} - 1$), we get (we shall use \lesssim to mean \leq up to a constant):

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{D}} \frac{(N_\varphi(z))^{p/2}}{(1-|z|)^{\frac{p}{2}+2}} dA(z) &\leq \sum_{n,j} \int_{R_{n,j}} (2^n)^{\frac{p}{2}+2} (N_\varphi(z))^{p/2} dA(z) \\ &\lesssim \sum_{n,j} \int_{R_{n,j}} (2^n)^{\frac{p}{2}+2} (m_\varphi(\widetilde{W}_{n,j}))^{p/2} dA(z) \\ &\lesssim \sum_{n,j} (2^n)^{p/2} (m_\varphi(\widetilde{W}_{n,j}))^{p/2} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{\nu,l} (2^\nu)^{p/2} (m_\varphi(W_{\nu,l}))^{p/2} < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

and a) holds.

2) Conversely, assume that a) is satisfied. We shall use the following inequality, whose proof will be postponed (for $p \geq 2$, (6.1) follows directly from [11], Theorem 4.2, and Hölder's inequality):

$$(6.1) \quad [m_\varphi(W_{n,j})]^{p/2} \lesssim \frac{1}{A(\widetilde{W}_{n,j})} \int_{\widetilde{W}_{n,j}} [N_\varphi(z)]^{p/2} dA(z),$$

where $\widetilde{W}_{n,j}$ is a window with the same center as $W_{n,j}$ but with a bigger proportional size; say of size 2^{-n+L} . We get:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n,j} [2^n m_\varphi(W_{n,j})]^{p/2} &\lesssim \sum_{n,j} 2^{np/2} 2^{2n} \int_{\widetilde{W}_{n,j}} [N_\varphi(z)]^{p/2} dA(z) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{D}} \left(\sum_n 2^{n(2+\frac{p}{2})} \left[\sum_j \mathbf{1}_{\widetilde{W}_{n,j}}(z) \right] \right) [N_\varphi(z)]^{p/2} dA(z). \end{aligned}$$

Let $k = 0, 1, \dots$ such that $1 - 2^{-k+1} < |z| \leq 1 - 2^{-k}$. One has $z \in \widetilde{W}_{n,j}$ only if $n \leq k + L$, and then, for each such n , z is at most in 2^L windows $\widetilde{W}_{n,j}$. It follows that:

$$\sum_n 2^{n(2+\frac{p}{2})} \sum_j \mathbf{1}_{\widetilde{W}_{n,j}}(z) \leq 2^{(k+L+1)(2+\frac{p}{2})} \times 2^L.$$

But $|z| \geq 1 - 2^{-k+1}$ implies $2^{(k+L+1)(2+\frac{p}{2})} \leq C_p/(1-|z|)^{2+\frac{p}{2}}$; hence:

$$\sum_{n,j} [2^n m_\varphi(W_{n,j})]^{p/2} \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{D}} \frac{[N_\varphi(z)]^{p/2}}{(1-|z|)^{\frac{p}{2}+2}} dA(z) < \infty,$$

and b) holds.

It remains to show (6.1).

By [11], Theorem 4.1, we can find a window W with the same center as $W_{n,j}$, but with greater size ch ($h = 2^{-n}$ is the size of the window $W_{n,j}$), such that:

$$m_\varphi(W_{n,j}) \lesssim \sup_{w \in W} N_\varphi(w).$$

There is hence some $w_0 \in W$ such that:

$$m_\varphi(W_{n,j}) \lesssim N_\varphi(w_0).$$

Take $R = |w_0| + ch$ (one has $R \geq 1$ since $w_0 \in W$ and W has size ch) and set $\varphi_0(z) = \varphi(z)/R$. One has $N_{\varphi_0}(z) = N_\varphi(Rz)$ for $|z| < 1/R$ and $N_{\varphi_0}(z) = 0$ if $|z| \geq 1/R$.

Let now u be the upper subharmonic regularization of N_{φ_0} ([13], Lemma 1, and its proof page 1140): u is a subharmonic function on $\mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $u \geq N_{\varphi_0}$ and $u = N_{\varphi_0}$ almost everywhere, with respect to dA .

A result of C. Fefferman and E. M. Stein ([5], Lemma 2), generously attributed by them to Hardy and Littlewood, asserts that for any $q > 0$, there exists a constant $C = C(q)$ such that

$$(6.2) \quad [u(a)]^q \leq \frac{C}{A(D(a,r))} \int_{D(a,r)} [u(z)]^q dA(z)$$

for every nonnegative subharmonic function u on a domain G and every disk $D(a,r) \subseteq G$ (see also [13], Lemma 3).

If Δ is the disk centered at w_0/R and of radius $1 - |w_0|/R$ (which is contained in $\mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$ since $R > |w_0|$), one has, by (6.2):

$$\begin{aligned} [N_\varphi(w_0)]^{p/2} &= [N_{\varphi_0}(w_0/R)]^{p/2} \leq [u(w_0/R)]^{p/2} \\ &\leq \frac{C}{A(\Delta)} \int_{\Delta} [u(z)]^{p/2} dA(z) \\ &= \frac{C}{A(\Delta)} \int_{\Delta} [N_{\varphi_0}(z)]^{p/2} dA(z) \\ &= \frac{C}{A(\Delta)} \int_{\Delta \cap D(0,1/R)} [N_\varphi(Rz)]^{p/2} dA(z) \\ &= \frac{C}{A(\tilde{\Delta})} \int_{\tilde{\Delta} \cap \mathbb{D}} [N_\varphi(w)]^{p/2} dA(w), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\Delta} = D(w_0, R - |w_0|) = D(w_0, ch)$.

Since the center w_0 of $\tilde{\Delta}$ is in \mathbb{D} , $\tilde{\Delta} \cap \mathbb{D}$ contains more than a quarter of $\tilde{\Delta}$ (at least for $ch \leq 1$), and hence $A(\tilde{\Delta} \cap \mathbb{D}) \geq A(\tilde{\Delta})/4 = c^2 h^2 / 4\pi$. Now, let $\tilde{W}_{n,j}$ be the window with the same center as $W_{n,j}$ and of size $2ch$. Since $2ch \geq ch + (1 - |w_0|)$, $\tilde{W}_{n,j}$ contains $\tilde{\Delta} \cap \mathbb{D}$ and $A(\tilde{W}_{n,j}) \approx h^2 \approx A(\tilde{\Delta})$ (\approx meaning that the ratio is between two absolute constants). We therefore get:

$$[N_\varphi(w_0)]^{p/2} \lesssim \frac{1}{A(\tilde{W}_{n,j})} \int_{\tilde{W}_{n,j}} [N_\varphi(w)]^{p/2} dA(w),$$

proving (6.1). □

References

- [1] J. Cima, J. Thomson and W. Wogen, On some properties of composition operators, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 24 (3) (1974), 215–220.
- [2] J. B. Conway, *Functions of One Complex Variable II*, Graduate Texts in Math. 159, Springer-Verlag (1995).
- [3] C. C. Cowen and B. D. McCluer, *Composition operators on spaces of analytic functions*, Studies in Advanced Mathematics, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL (1995).
- [4] P. L. Duren, *Theory of H^p spaces*, Second edition, Dover Publications (2000).
- [5] C. Fefferman and E. M. Stein, H^p spaces of several variables, *Acta Math.* 129 (1972), 137–193.
- [6] J. B. Garnett and D. E. Marshall, *Harmonic measure*, New Mathematical Monographs 2, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2005).
- [7] P. Lefèvre, D. Li, H. Queffélec, and L. Rodríguez-Piazza, Opérateurs de composition sur les espaces de Hardy-Orlicz, *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 344 (2007), no. 1, 5–10.
- [8] P. Lefèvre, D. Li, H. Queffélec, and L. Rodríguez-Piazza, Composition operators on Hardy-Orlicz spaces, *preprint*, math.FA/0610905, to appear in *Memoirs Amer. Math. Soc.*
- [9] P. Lefèvre, D. Li, H. Queffélec and L. Rodríguez-Piazza, Some examples of compact composition operators on H^2 , *J. Funct. Anal.* 255, No. 11 (2008), 3098–3124.
- [10] P. Lefèvre, D. Li, H. Queffélec and L. Rodríguez-Piazza, Compact composition operators on H^2 and Hardy-Orlicz spaces, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 354 (2009), no. 1, 360–371.

- [11] P. Lefèvre, D. Li, H. Queffélec and L. Rodríguez-Piazza, Nevanlinna counting function and Carleson function of analytic maps, *preprint*, arXiv : 0904.2496.
- [12] D. H. Luecking, Trace ideal criteria for Toeplitz operators, *J. Funct. Anal.* 73 (1987), 345–368.
- [13] D. H. Luecking and K. Zhu, Composition operators belonging to the Schatten ideals, *Amer. J. Math.* 114 (1992), 878–906.
- [14] B. McCluer and J. Shapiro, Angular derivatives and compact composition operators on the Hardy and Bergman spaces, *Canad. J. Math.* 38, no. 4 (1986), 878–906.
- [15] C. Pommerenke, Boundary behaviour of conformal maps, *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften* 299, Springer-Verlag (1992).
- [16] H. Queffélec, Carleson measures and composition operators, *Proceed. 2008 OT Conference in Timisoara*, *to appear*.
- [17] H. J. Schwartz, Composition operators on H^p , Thesis, University of Toledo (1969).
- [18] J. H. Shapiro, *Composition Operators and Classical Function Theory*, Universitext, Tracts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York (1993).
- [19] D. W. Stroock, *Probability Theory, An Analytic View*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1994).
- [20] N. Zorboska, Composition operators with closed range, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 334 (2) (1994), 791–801.

Pascal Lefèvre, *Univ Lille Nord de France F-59 000 LILLE, FRANCE*
UArtois, Laboratoire de Mathématiques de Lens EA 2462,
Fédération CNRS Nord-Pas-de-Calais FR 2956,
F-62 300 LENS, FRANCE
pascal.lefevre@euler.univ-artois.fr

Daniel Li, *Univ Lille Nord de France F-59 000 LILLE, FRANCE*
UArtois, Laboratoire de Mathématiques de Lens EA 2462,
Fédération CNRS Nord-Pas-de-Calais FR 2956,
Faculté des Sciences Jean Perrin,
Rue Jean Souvraz, S.P. 18,
F-62 300 LENS, FRANCE
daniel.li@euler.univ-artois.fr

Hervé Queffélec, *Univ Lille Nord de France F-59 000 LILLE, FRANCE*
USTL, Laboratoire Paul Painlevé U.M.R. CNRS 8524,
F-59 655 VILLENEUVE D'ASCQ Cedex, FRANCE
queff@math.univ-lille1.fr

Luis Rodríguez-Piazza, *Universidad de Sevilla,*
Facultad de Matemáticas, Departamento de Análisis Matemático,
Apartado de Correos 1160,
41 080 SEVILLA, SPAIN
piazza@us.es