

DIRICHLET TYPE SPACES IN THE UNIT BIDISC

MONOJIT BHATTACHARJEE, RAJEEV GUPTA, AND VIDHYA VENUGOPAL

ABSTRACT. In this article, we prove that an analytic 2-isometric left-inverse commuting pair on a Hilbert space always possess wandering subspace property. Along with this, we define Dirichlet-type space $\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ over the bidisc \mathbb{D}^2 for any measure $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{PM}_+(\mathbb{T}^2)$. We prove that the pair (M_{z_1}, M_{z_2}) of multiplication by the coordinate functions on $\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ is an analytic 2-isometric left-inverse commuting pair and satisfies $\langle z_1^m z_2^n, z_1^p z_2^q \rangle_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \langle z_1^m, z_1^p \rangle_{\mathcal{D}(\mu_1)} \langle z_2^n, z_2^q \rangle_{\mathcal{D}(\mu_2)}$, for any $m, n, p, q \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Furthermore, the unitary equivalent class of the commuting analytic 2-isometric pair (M_{z_1}, M_{z_2}) on $\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ is identified using left-inverse commutativity and the above property of inner product.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let \mathbb{N} and \mathbb{Z} denote the set of all positive integers and the set of all integers respectively. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ be the set of n -tuples of non-negative integers. We shall denote the unit circle and the open unit disc in the complex plane \mathbb{C} by \mathbb{T} and \mathbb{D} respectively. For any set X , the notation X^n shall be used to denote the n -times cartesian product of X with itself.

Let $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$ be an n -tuple of commuting bounded linear operators on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . A closed subspace $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ is said to be a *wandering subspace* of \mathbf{T} if

$$\mathcal{W} \perp T_1^{k_1} \dots T_n^{k_n} \mathcal{W} \quad \text{for all } (k_1, \dots, k_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$$

and, following Halmos [7], is said to be a *generating wandering subspace* for \mathbf{T} if in addition

$$\mathcal{H} = \overline{\text{span}}\{T_1^{k_1} \dots T_n^{k_n} \mathcal{W} : (k_1, \dots, k_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n\}.$$

We say an n -tuple of operators $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$ acting on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} has *wandering subspace property* provided \mathbf{T} has a generating wandering subspace in \mathcal{H} . We say that an n -tuple of operators $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$ acting on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is cyclic if there exists a vector $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $\mathcal{H} = \overline{\text{span}}\{T_1^{k_1} \dots T_n^{k_n} x_0 : (k_1, \dots, k_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n\}$.

One of the major motivation behind studying wandering subspaces is their natural connection with invariant subspaces. The existence of *wandering subspace property* for the restriction of multiplication by the coordinate function M_z to any invariant subspace of the Hardy space $H^2(\mathbb{D})$, the Bergman space $A^2(\mathbb{D})$ and the Dirichlet-type space $\mathcal{D}_\mu(\mathbb{D})$ for any finite positive Borel measure μ on the unit circle \mathbb{T} are shown by Beurling in [2], by Alemann,

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 46E20, 47B32, 47B38, Secondary 47A50, 31C25.

Key words and phrases. m -isometry, m -concave operators, wandering subspace property, Wold-type decomposition, Dirichlet-type spaces.

Richter and Sundberg in [1], and by Richter in [10], respectively. Later on, Shimorin proved the existence of this property for an abstract class of left-invertible operators (see [19]).

In multi-variable operator theory, characterization of invariant subspaces for n -tuples of operators is one of the interesting and demanding topic from the last few decades. In continuation with that, characterization of n -tuples of commuting bounded linear operators on a Hilbert space having *wandering subspace property* turns out to be one of the most important and interesting questions in this regard. In [17], Rudin shows that the existence of the *wandering subspace property* of general invariant subspace fails even for a pair of commuting isometries. In particular, he constructs an invariant subspace of Hardy space over bidisc \mathbb{D}^2 not having *wandering subspace property*. For analogous kind of examples on analytic functions over Euclidean unit ball, we refer the reader to [4]. Therefore, an immediate generalization of the single variable result is not possible. Meanwhile, the existence of *wandering subspace property* for several class of n -tuple of commuting bounded linear operators (T_1, \dots, T_n) acting on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} has been proven under the assumption of doubly commutativity, that is, $T_i^*T_j = T_jT_i^*$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq n$. For more details, we refer the reader to [8, 9, 13, 5] and references therein.

In this article, we have significantly extended the class of commuting pairs of bounded linear operators on a Hilbert space that possess the *wandering subspace property*. In particular, we prove a multi-variable generalization of Shimorin's result [19], which turns out to be a generalization of all aforesaid results in this regard. Along with this, we develop a natural bidisc \mathbb{D}^2 counter part of the existing theory of the Dirichlet space over \mathbb{D} introduced by Richter [10, 12] with an explicit description of the norm. We also show that it becomes a model space for a class of pair of cyclic analytic 2-isometries. With the help of the model theorem we establish a connection between the doubly commuting pairs of analytic 2-isometries and the class of analytic 2-isometries introduced in this article.

We now describe our main results more precisely. For a pair of commuting bounded linear operators $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, T_2)$ on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , we say \mathbf{T} is *analytic 2-isometry* if for each $i = 1, 2$, T_i is analytic 2-isometry. For the definition and basic properties of analyticity and 2-isometry, we refer the reader to [12].

Let $\mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T})$ denote the set of all positive finite Borel measures on the unit circle \mathbb{T} . Let $\mathcal{PM}_+(\mathbb{T}^2)$ denote the set of all measures $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ on \mathbb{T}^2 such that $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mu_1 \times \mu_2$, where μ_1 and μ_2 are positive finite Borel measures on \mathbb{T} , i.e.

$$\mathcal{PM}_+(\mathbb{T}^2) := \{\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mu_1 \times \mu_2 : \mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T})\}.$$

We define the Poisson kernel over \mathbb{D}^2 as a product of Poisson kernels over \mathbb{D} see also [17, Chapter 2]. More precisely, for any $z = (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{D}^2$ and $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2) \in \mathbb{T}^2$, $\mathbf{P}(z, \xi) := P(z_1, \xi_1) P(z_2, \xi_2)$, where

$$P(z_i, \xi_i) = \frac{(1 - |z_i|^2)}{|\xi_i - z_i|^2}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

For any $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{PM}_+(\mathbb{T}^2)$ and $(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{D}^2$, we define the *Poisson integral* $\mathbf{P}_\boldsymbol{\mu}(z_1, z_2) := P_{\mu_1}(z_1)P_{\mu_2}(z_2)$, where

$$P_{\mu_i}(z_i) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} P(z_i, e^{it}) d\mu_i(t), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Let $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ denote the set of all complex valued holomorphic functions on the unit bidisc \mathbb{D}^2 . For any $f \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ and for $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{PM}_+(\mathbb{T}^2)$, define

$$D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},1}^{(2)}(f) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{2\pi} \iint_{\mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{T}} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_1}(z_1, re^{it}) \right|^2 P_{\mu_1}(z_1) dA(z_1) dt, \quad (1)$$

$$D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},2}^{(2)}(f) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{2\pi} \iint_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{D}} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_2}(re^{it}, z_2) \right|^2 P_{\mu_2}(z_2) dA(z_2) dt, \quad (2)$$

and

$$D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},3}^{(2)}(f) := \iint_{\mathbb{D}^2} \left| \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial z_1 \partial z_2}(z_1, z_2) \right|^2 \mathbf{P}_\boldsymbol{\mu}(z_1, z_2) dA(z_1) dA(z_2), \quad (3)$$

where dA denotes the normalized Lebesgue area measure on the unit disc \mathbb{D} . Wherever needed, we shall use the short hand notations $\partial_1 f, \partial_2 f$ and $\partial_1 \partial_2 f$ in place of $\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_1}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_2}$ and $\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial z_1 \partial z_2}$ respectively. Whenever it is convenient, we shall denote $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, z_2)$ and $d\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{z}) = dA(z_1) dA(z_2)$. We define the Dirichlet-type integral over \mathbb{D}^2 as

$$D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{(2)}(f) := D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},1}^{(2)}(f) + D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},2}^{(2)}(f) + D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},3}^{(2)}(f).$$

We define the Dirichlet-type space on the unit bidisc with respect to the non-zero measure $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ to be the following space of analytic functions

$$\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu}) := \{f \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}^2) : D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{(2)}(f) < \infty\}.$$

For $\boldsymbol{\mu} = 0$, we set $\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)$, the Hardy space over the unit bidisc. The function $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{(2)}(\cdot)$ defines a semi-norm on $\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$. In Lemma 2.1, we prove that Dirichlet-type space over unit bidisc with respect to any product positive measure $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ on \mathbb{T}^2 is contained in the Hardy space over unit bidisc as a subset. With this information, we can convert the semi-norm $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{(2)}(\cdot)$ into a norm in a traditional way by adding the norm borrowed from $H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)$ to it. More precisely, for any $f \in \mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$, we define the norm $\|f\|_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ by setting

$$\|f\|_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^2 = \|f\|_{H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)}^2 + D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{(2)}(f).$$

It is observed in Theorem 2.2 that for any $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{PM}_+(\mathbb{T}^2)$, the space $(\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu}), \|\cdot\|_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})$ is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space. When $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{T}^2 , then we denote $\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ by \mathcal{D}^2 . The associated kernel function $K_{\mathcal{D}^2}$ turns out to be

$$K_{\mathcal{D}^2}((z_1, z_2), (w_1, w_2)) = K_{\mathcal{D}}(z_1, w_1) K_{\mathcal{D}}(z_2, w_2), \quad (z_1, z_2), (w_1, w_2) \in \mathbb{D}^2, \quad (4)$$

where $K_{\mathcal{D}}$ is the reproducing kernel for the classical Dirichlet space \mathcal{D} .

In a recent article [3], for any $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T})$ the Dirichlet-type space $\mathcal{D}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ over the bidisc is defined. In their formulation of $\mathcal{D}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$, they consider the semi-norm $\mathcal{D}_{\mu_1, \mu_2}(\cdot)$, which is determined solely by the terms specified in equations (1) and (2). The primary objective of their article was to analyze and propose a suitable model for toral 2-isometries.

By adopting their chosen norm, the authors in [3] achieve a squared norm for a function f in their version of the classical Dirichlet space over the bidisc given by $\sum_{m,n} |\hat{f}(m,n)|^2(n+m+1)$. This differs from that of $\mathcal{D} \otimes \mathcal{D}$, which might be a very natural choice for the classical Dirichlet space over the bidisc. Our motivation to introduce the quantity in equation (3) is to restore this property, as indicated in equation (4). Consequently, the class of commuting tuples (T_1, T_2) that we investigate in this article differs significantly from those studied in [3]. The specific class of commuting tuples we examine, which we term ‘left-inverse commuting pairs’, is defined as follows. Throughout this article, we occasionally refer to results obtained in [3] or incorporate some of their arguments. In such instances, we explicitly acknowledge the source.

Definition 1.1 (left-inverse commuting tuple). A tuple (T_1, \dots, T_n) of left invertible commuting operators is said to be a *left-inverse commuting tuple* if

$$L_i T_j = T_j L_i \quad \text{for } i \neq j, \quad (5)$$

where L_j denotes the left inverse of T_j with the property $\ker(L_j) = \ker T_j^*$.

The multiplication by coordinate functions z_1 and z_2 are bounded analytic 2-isometries on $\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$. These operators further satisfy (5). It turns out that the set of polynomials densely sits in the Hilbert space $(\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu}), \|\cdot\|_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})$. Moreover, we observe in Lemma 2.18 that

$$\langle z_1^m z_2^n, z_1^p z_2^q \rangle_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \langle z_1^m, z_1^p \rangle_{\mathcal{D}(\mu_1)} \langle z_2^n, z_2^q \rangle_{\mathcal{D}(\mu_2)},$$

for any $m, n, p, q \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Here $\mathcal{D}(\mu_j)$ denotes the Dirichlet-type space over the unit disc as defined by Richter in [12]. In Theorem 3.2, we prove that if (T_1, T_2) is a left-inverse commuting pair of analytic 2-isometries on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} then $\ker T_1^* \cap \ker T_2^*$ serves as a wandering subspace for the pair (T_1, T_2) . In [5, Corollary 2.2], authors have proved that if (T_1, T_2) is a doubly commuting pair of bounded analytic 2-isometries then $\ker T_1^* \cap \ker T_2^*$ serves as a wandering subspace for (T_1, T_2) . Note that if a pair (T_1, T_2) is doubly commuting then it necessarily satisfies (5). In this sense, Theorem 3.2 generalizes [5, Corollary 2.2]. In Example 4.3, we present an example of analytic 2-isometric left-inverse commuting pair (T_1, T_2) which is not doubly commuting. Furthermore, in Theorem 4.1, we prove that if (T_1, T_2) is a left-inverse commuting pair of analytic 2-isometries with

$$\langle T_1^m T_2^n x_0, T_1^p T_2^q x_0 \rangle = \langle T_1^m x_0, T_1^p x_0 \rangle \langle T_2^n x_0, T_2^q x_0 \rangle, \quad m, n, p, q \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0},$$

for some unit vector $x_0 \in \ker T_1^* \cap \ker T_2^*$, then the pair (T_1, T_2) is unitarily equivalent to (M_{z_1}, M_{z_2}) on $\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ for some $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{PM}_+(\mathbb{T}^2)$.

2. A FEW PROPERTIES OF $\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$

In what follows, it will be useful to set the following notations: for any $R, R_1, R_2 \in (0, 1)$, set

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},1}^{(2)}(f, R) &:= \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{2\pi} \iint_{R\mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{T}} |\partial_1 f(z_1, re^{it})|^2 P_{\mu_1}(z_1) dA(z_1) dt \\ D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},2}^{(2)}(f, R) &:= \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{2\pi} \iint_{\mathbb{T} \times R\mathbb{D}} |\partial_2 f(re^{it}, z_2)|^2 P_{\mu_2}(z_2) dA(z_2) dt \\ D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},3}^{(2)}(f, R_1, R_2) &:= \iint_{R_1\mathbb{D} \times R_2\mathbb{D}} |\partial_1 \partial_2 f(z_1, z_2)|^2 \mathbf{P}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(z_1, z_2) dA(z_1) dA(z_2). \end{aligned}$$

If $R_1 = R_2 = R$, then $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},3}^{(2)}(f, R_1, R_2)$ will simply be denoted by $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},3}^{(2)}(f, R)$.

The norm on $\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ satisfies the parallelogram identity, i.e., $\|f + g\|_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^2 + \|f - g\|_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^2 = 2(\|f\|_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^2 + \|g\|_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^2)$, and therefore $(\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu}), \|\cdot\|_{\boldsymbol{\mu}})$ is an inner product space. We shall denote the inner product of $\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$. Thus for $f, g \in \mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$, we set

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \langle f, g \rangle_{H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)} + \langle f, g \rangle_{\boldsymbol{\mu},1} + \langle f, g \rangle_{\boldsymbol{\mu},2} + \langle f, g \rangle_{\boldsymbol{\mu},3},$$

where we choose to denote

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f, g \rangle_{\boldsymbol{\mu},1} &:= \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{2\pi} \iint_{\mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{T}} \partial_1 f(z_1, re^{it}) \overline{\partial_1 g(z_1, re^{it})} P_{\mu_1}(z_1) dA(z_1) dt \\ \langle f, g \rangle_{\boldsymbol{\mu},2} &:= \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{2\pi} \iint_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{D}} \partial_2 f(re^{it}, z_2) \overline{\partial_2 g(re^{it}, z_2)} P_{\mu_2}(z_2) dA(z_2) dt \\ \langle f, g \rangle_{\boldsymbol{\mu},3} &:= \iint_{\mathbb{D}^2} \partial_1 \partial_2 f(z) \overline{\partial_1 \partial_2 g(z)} \mathbf{P}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(z) d\mathbf{A}(z). \end{aligned}$$

We start with the following important lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *For any $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in PM_+(\mathbb{T}^2)$, $\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \subseteq H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)$.*

Proof. Let $f(z_1, z_2) = \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} a_{m,n} z_1^m z_2^n \in \mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$. Using monotone convergence theorem, we get

$$D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},1}^{(2)}(f) \geq \lim_{R \rightarrow 1^-} \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{2\pi} \iint_{R\mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{T}} |\partial_1 f(z_1, re^{it})|^2 P_{\mu_1}(z_1) dt dA(z_1).$$

Since $P_{\mu_1}(z_1) \geq \frac{\mu_1(\mathbb{T})}{8\pi} (1 - |z_1|^2)$ (see [18, pg 236]), we get that,

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},1}^{(2)}(f) &\geq \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \lim_{R \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{2\pi} \iint_{R\mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{T}} \left| \sum_{m=1, n=0}^{\infty} m a_{m,n} z_1^{m-1} (re^{it})^n \right|^2 \frac{\mu_1(\mathbb{T})}{8\pi} (1 - |z_1|^2) dt dA(z_1) \\ &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \lim_{R \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{\mu_1(\mathbb{T})}{4\pi} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} m^2 |a_{m,n}|^2 r^{2n} R^{2m} \left\{ \frac{1}{2m} - \frac{R^2}{2m+2} \right\} \\ &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{\mu_1(\mathbb{T})}{8\pi} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |a_{m,n}|^2 \frac{m}{m+1} r^{2n}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\frac{m}{m+1} \geq \frac{1}{2}$, it follows that

$$D_{\mu,1}^{(2)}(f) \geq \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{\mu_1(\mathbb{T})}{16\pi} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |a_{m,n}|^2 r^{2n}. \quad (6)$$

Similarly we also get that,

$$D_{\mu,2}^{(2)}(f) \geq \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{\mu_2(\mathbb{T})}{16\pi} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |a_{m,n}|^2 r^{2m}. \quad (7)$$

Since $f \in \mathcal{D}^2(\mu)$, the left hand sides and consequently the right hand sides of (6) and (7) are finite. Now, it follows from the Dominated Convergence Theorem that f belongs to $H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)$. \square

In the following theorem, we note that it is, in fact, a reproducing kernel Hilbert space.

Theorem 2.2. *For any $\mu \in \mathcal{PM}_+(\mathbb{T}^2)$, the Dirichlet-type space $(\mathcal{D}^2(\mu), \|\cdot\|_{\mu})$ is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space.*

Proof. From Lemma 2.1, we have that $\mathcal{D}^2(\mu) \subseteq H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)$. This implies that $(\mathcal{D}^2(\mu), \|\cdot\|_{\mu})$ is contained contractively in $H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)$. Hence $\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)$ is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space provided $\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)$ is a Hilbert space with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{\mu}$. To prove the completeness of the space $(\mathcal{D}^2(\mu), \|\cdot\|_{\mu})$, let (f_n) be a Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)$. This in turn implies that (f_n) is a Cauchy sequence in $H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)$. Since $H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)$ is a Hilbert space, there exists an $f \in H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)$ such that $f_n \rightarrow f$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in $H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)$. Fix an $\epsilon > 0$. There exists an $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|f_n - f\|_{H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ for all $n \geq N_1$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\mu}^{(2)}(f_n - f) &= D_{\mu,1}^{(2)}(f_n - f) + D_{\mu,2}^{(2)}(f_n - f) + D_{\mu,3}^{(2)}(f_n - f) \\ &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \lim_{r_1 \rightarrow 1^-} \iint_{r_1 \mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{T}} |\partial_1(f_n - f)(z_1, re^{it})|^2 P_{\mu_1}(z_1) dt dA(z_1) + \\ &\quad \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \lim_{r_1 \rightarrow 1^-} \iint_{\mathbb{T} \times r_1 \mathbb{D}} |\partial_2(f_n - f)(re^{it}, z_2)|^2 P_{\mu_2}(z_2) dA(z_2) dt + \\ &\quad \lim_{r_1 \rightarrow 1^-} \iint_{(r_1 \mathbb{D})^2} |\partial_1 \partial_2(f_n - f)(z)|^2 P_{\mu}(z) dA(z). \end{aligned}$$

Since, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, f_n is an analytic map, therefore $f_n, \partial_1 f_n, \partial_2 f_n$, and $\partial_1 \partial_2 f_n$ will converge uniformly on any compact subset of bidisc \mathbb{D}^2 respectively to $f, \partial_1 f, \partial_2 f$, and $\partial_1 \partial_2 f$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $g_n(z_1, re^{it}) := \partial_1(f_n - f)(z_1, re^{it})$. Then we have,

$$\iint_{r_1 \mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{T}} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |g_n(z_1, re^{it})|^2 P_{\mu_1}(z_1) dt dA(z_1) = 0.$$

Therefore, by the Monotone Convergence theorem, there exists $N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \lim_{r_1 \rightarrow 1^-} \iint_{r_1 \mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{T}} |g_n(z_1, re^{it})|^2 P_{\mu_1}(z_1) dt dA(z_1) < \frac{\epsilon}{6}, \quad n \geq N_2.$$

Therefore, we get

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \iint_{\mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{T}} |\partial_1(f_n - f)(z_1, re^{it})|^2 P_{\mu_1}(z_1) dt dA(z_1) < \frac{\epsilon}{6}, \quad n \geq N_2.$$

Similarly, we get that for some $N_3, N_4 \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \iint_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{D}} |\partial_2(f_n - f)(re^{it}, z_2)|^2 P_{\mu_2}(z_2) dA(z_1) dt < \frac{\epsilon}{6}, \quad n \geq N_3,$$

and

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \iint_{(r_1 \mathbb{D})^2} |\partial_1 \partial_2(f_n - f)(z_1, z_2)|^2 \mathbf{P}_\mu(\mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{z}) < \frac{\epsilon}{6}, \quad n \geq N_4.$$

By choosing $N = \max\{N_1, N_2, N_3, N_4\}$, we observe that $D_\mu^{(2)}(f_n - f) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, for all $n \geq N$. Since (f_n) is Cauchy in $\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)$, it is a bounded sequence. That is, there exists a $K > 0$ such that, $D_\mu^{(2)}(f_n) < K$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Using the inequality $\|f\|_\mu \leq \|(f - f_N)\|_\mu + \|f_N\|_\mu$, we conclude that $f \in \mathcal{D}^2(\mu)$. Since, for all $n \geq N$, we have $D_\mu^{(2)}(f_n - f) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ and $\|f_n - f\|_{H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, it follows that Using this and the fact that $f_n \rightarrow f$ in $\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)$ it follows that, (f_n) converges to f in $\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)$. This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

When μ is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{T}^2 , then we denote $\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)$ by \mathcal{D}^2 and call it classical Dirichlet space over bidisc. We note that

$$\mathcal{D}^2 = \left\{ f(z_1, z_2) = \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} a_{m,n} z_1^m z_2^n : \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} (m+1)(n+1) |a_{m,n}|^2 < \infty \right\},$$

and consequently norm of any element $f \in \mathcal{D}^2$ with power series representation $\sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} a_{m,n} z_1^m z_2^n$, is given by

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{D}^2}^2 = \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} (m+1)(n+1) |a_{m,n}|^2.$$

The associated kernel function $K_{\mathcal{D}^2}$ at $(z_1, z_2), (w_1, w_2) \in \mathbb{D}^2$ therefore turns out to be

$$K_{\mathcal{D}^2}((z_1, z_2), (w_1, w_2)) = \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} \frac{z_1^m \bar{w}_1^m z_2^n \bar{w}_2^n}{(m+1)(n+1)} = K_{\mathcal{D}}(z_1, w_1) K_{\mathcal{D}}(z_2, w_2),$$

where $K_{\mathcal{D}}$ is the reproducing kernel for the classical Dirichlet space \mathcal{D} . For any $f \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ and fixed $(w_1, w_2) \in \mathbb{D}^2$, we define $f_{w_1}(z) := f(w_1, z)$ and $f_{w_2}(z) := f(z, w_2)$ for any $z \in \mathbb{D}$. We may refer f_{w_1} and f_{w_2} as w_1 -slice and w_2 -slice of f respectively. The next proposition tells us that for any $f \in \mathcal{D}^2$, its w_1 -slice as well as w_2 -slice belong to Dirichlet space \mathcal{D} .

Proposition 2.3. *Suppose $(w_1, w_2) \in \mathbb{D}^2$ and f is a function in \mathcal{D}^2 . Then f_{w_1} and f_{w_2} are in the classical Dirichlet space \mathcal{D} .*

Proof. Let $f(z_1, z_2)$ be represented by the power series $\sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} a_{m,n} z_1^m z_2^n$. Fix $(w_1, w_2) \in \mathbb{D}^2$. For each $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, define $b_m = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{m,n} w_2^n$. In these notations, we have

$$f_{w_2}(z) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} b_m z^m.$$

Note that

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (m+1) |b_m|^2 \leq \frac{1}{1-|w_2|^2} \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} (m+1) |a_{m,n}|^2 \leq \frac{1}{1-|w_2|^2} \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} (m+1)(n+1) |a_{m,n}|^2.$$

This shows that $f_{w_2} \in \mathcal{D}$. Similarly, one can show that $f_{w_1} \in \mathcal{D}$. \square

Proposition 2.3 is true for general $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{PM}_+(\mathbb{T}^2)$ when $(w_1, w_2) = 0$. We shall need this in what follows, e.g. in Lemma 2.11. Moreover, it says that $f(0, z_2)$ and $f(z_1, 0)$, when treated as functions on bidisc, belong to Dirichlet-type space $\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$.

Throughout the paper, we will consistently adhere to the following notations: for $m, p \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, define $m \wedge p := \min\{m, p\}$ and $m \vee p := \max\{m, p\}$. Also, we choose S to denote the open square $(0, 2\pi) \times (0, 2\pi)$.

Lemma 2.4. *For $f \in \mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$, the functions $f(0, z_2)$ and $f(z_1, 0) \in \mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$. Moreover, $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},j}^{(2)}(f) \geq D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},j}^{(2)}(f(0, z_2))$ and $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},j}^{(2)}(f) \geq D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},j}^{(2)}(f(z_1, 0))$, for $j = 1, 2, 3$.*

Proof. Consider $f(z_1, z_2) = \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} a_{m,n} z_1^m z_2^n$. If we let $z_1 = 0$, then the resulting function $f_2 = f(0, z_2)$ will be $f(0, z_2) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{0,n} z_2^n$. So it is enough to check $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},2}^{(2)}(f) < \infty$. The same computations as above show that

$$D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},2}^{(2)}(f_2, R) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{n,q=1}^{\infty} (n \wedge q) a_{0,n} \overline{a_{0,q}} \widehat{\mu}_2(q-n) R^{2(n \vee q)}.$$

Thus from (12), it can be seen that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},2}^{(2)}(f, R) &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n,q=1}^{\infty} (n \wedge q) a_{m,n} \overline{a_{m,q}} \widehat{\mu}_2(q-n) R^{2(n \vee q)} r^{2m} \\ &= D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},2}^{(2)}(f_2, R) + D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},2}^{(2)}\left(\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{m,n} z_1^m z_2^n, R\right). \end{aligned}$$

Taking limit R tending to 1, this implies that $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},2}^{(2)}(f) \geq D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},2}^{(2)}(f_2)$. As $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},1}^{(2)}(f_2) = 0 = D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},3}^{(2)}(f_2)$, the proof of the lemma is completed. \square

Now, we proceed towards proving that the functions z_1 and z_2 are multipliers of $\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$. To this end, few notations and a number of lemmas are in order.

For any $f \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ with power series representation $\sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} a_{m,n} z_1^m z_2^n$, define

$$(T_{k_1, k_2} f)(z_1, z_2) := \sum_{m=k_1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=k_2}^{\infty} a_{m,n} z_1^m z_2^n, \quad k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}.$$

Following Richter's paper [12, page 330], note that for any $R \in (0, 1)$, and $t \in [0, 2\pi]$,

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} e^{i(n-m)s} P(Re^{it}, e^{is}) ds = R^{|n-m|} e^{i(n-m)t}, \quad m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}. \quad (8)$$

In what follows, we shall be using the fact that for any $R \in [0, 1]$, $t, s \in [0, 2\pi]$, one gets $P(Re^{it}, e^{is}) = P(Re^{is}, e^{it})$.

Let ν be a finite positive Borel measure on the unit circle \mathbb{T} and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, the n^{th} -Fourier coefficient of ν is defined by,

$$\widehat{\nu}(n) := \int_0^{2\pi} e^{-int} d\nu(t).$$

At many occasions we shall be dealing with quantities of the form

$$\sum_{m,p=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (m \wedge p) a_{m,n} \bar{a}_{p,n} \widehat{\nu}(p-m) \text{ and } \sum_{n,q=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (n \wedge q) a_{m,n} \bar{a}_{m,q} \widehat{\nu}(q-n). \quad (9)$$

We shall find it convenient to adopt the following notation to denote the quantities in (9): For any measure $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T})$, define the matrix $M_\nu := ((j \wedge k) \widehat{\nu}(k-j))$. This is a matrix of size infinite and we shall denote it's (j, k) -th entry by $M_\nu(j, k)$. The quantity in (9) can be denoted as

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \langle M_\nu \mathbf{a}_n, \mathbf{a}_n \rangle \text{ and } \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \langle M_\nu \mathbf{a}_m, \mathbf{a}_m \rangle$$

respectively, where \mathbf{a}_n denotes the column $(a_{1n}, a_{2n}, \dots)^T$ and \mathbf{a}_m denotes the column $(a_{m1}, a_{m2}, \dots)^T$. Note that for any $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T})$, the matrix M_ν is formally positive definite. We shall use this fact in what follows, e.g. in Lemma 2.14.

We have the following lemmas which are analogous to the results of Richter in [12].

Lemma 2.5. *Let $0 < R < 1$. If f is analytic on \mathbb{D}^2 , then*

$$D_{\mu,1}^{(2)}(f, R) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \sum_{k_1=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \iint_S |(T_{k_1,0} f)(Re^{is}, re^{it})|^2 P_{\mu_1}(Re^{is}) ds dt.$$

Proof. For any $f(z_1, z_2) \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ with power series representation $\sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} a_{m,n} z_1^m z_2^n$ and $k_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Since $\int_0^{2\pi} e^{i(m-n)t} dt = \delta_{m,n}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\mu,1}^{(2)}(f, R) &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{2\pi} \iint_{R\mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{T}} |\partial_1 f(z_1, re^{it})|^2 P_{\mu_1}(z_1) dt dA(z_1) \\ &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{2\pi} \iint_{R\mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{T}} \left| \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} m a_{m,n} z_1^{m-1} (re^{it})^n \right|^2 P_{\mu_1}(z_1) dt dA(z_1) \\ &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{1}{\pi} \sum_{m,n,p=0}^{\infty} m p a_{m,n} \bar{a}_{p,n} \frac{R^{2(m \vee p)}}{2(m \vee p)} \widehat{\mu}_1(p-m) 2\pi r^{2n}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we get that

$$D_{\mu,1}^{(2)}(f, R) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{m,p=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} M_{\mu_1}(m, p) a_{m,n} \overline{a_{p,n}} r^{2n} R^{2(m \vee p)}. \quad (10)$$

On the other hand, using (8), note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \sum_{k_1=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \iint_S |(T_{k_1,0}f)(Re^{is_1}, re^{it})|^2 P_{\mu_1}(Re^{is_1}) ds_1 dt \\ &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \sum_{k_1=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \iint_S \left| \sum_{m=k_1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{m,n} (Re^{is_1})^m (re^{it})^n \right|^2 P_{\mu_1}(Re^{is_1}) ds_1 dt \\ &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \sum_{k_1=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \sum_{m,p=k_1}^{\infty} \sum_{n,q=0}^{\infty} a_{m,n} \overline{a_{p,q}} R^{2(m \vee p)} r^{n+q} e^{i(n-q)t} \widehat{\mu}_1(p-m) dt \\ &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \sum_{k_1=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{m,p=k_1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{m,n} \overline{a_{p,n}} R^{2(m \vee p)} r^{2n} \widehat{\mu}_1(p-m) \\ &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{m,p=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (m \wedge p) a_{m,n} \overline{a_{p,n}} r^{2n} R^{2(m \vee p)} \widehat{\mu}_1(p-m). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Equations (10) and (11) put together completes the proof of lemma. \square

We note down the following formula which is analogous to (10). In fact, we also have Lemma 2.6. We omit the proof of the formula as well as Lemma 2.6, since these are analogous to that of Lemma 2.5.

$$D_{\mu,2}^{(2)}(f, R) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n,q=1}^{\infty} M_{\mu_2}(n, q) a_{m,n} \overline{a_{m,q}} R^{2(n \vee q)} r^{2m}. \quad (12)$$

Lemma 2.6. *Let $0 < R < 1$. If f is analytic on \mathbb{D}^2 , then*

$$D_{\mu,2}^{(2)}(f, R) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \sum_{k_2=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \iint_S |(T_{0,k_2}f)(re^{it}, Re^{is})|^2 P_{\mu_2}(Re^{is}) ds dt.$$

The following lemma gives a relationship between $D_{\mu,1}^{(2)}(z_1 f, R)$ and $D_{\mu,1}^{(2)}(f, R)$. In particular, it proves that, for any $0 < R < 1$, $D_{\mu,1}^{(2)}(z_1 f, R) \geq R^2 D_{\mu,1}^{(2)}(f, R)$.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $0 < R < 1$. If f is analytic on \mathbb{D}^2 , then*

$$D_{\mu,1}^{(2)}(z_1 f, R) - R^2 D_{\mu,1}^{(2)}(f, R) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{R^2}{(2\pi)^2} \iint_S |f(Re^{is}, re^{it})|^2 P_{\mu_1}(Re^{is}) ds dt. \quad (13)$$

Proof. Applying (10) to $z_1 f$, we get

$$D_{\mu,1}^{(2)}(z_1 f, R) = R^2 \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{m,n,p=0}^{\infty} M_{\mu_1}(m+1, p+1) a_{m,n} \overline{a_{p,n}} R^{2(m \vee p)} r^{2n} \quad (14)$$

On the other hand, using (8), we observe that

$$R.H.S. \text{ of (13)} = \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{R^2}{2\pi} \sum_{m,n,p=0}^{\infty} a_{m,n} \overline{a_{p,n}} R^{2(m \vee p)} r^{2n} \widehat{\mu}_1(p-m). \quad (15)$$

Equations (10), (14), and (15) put together completes the proof of the lemma. \square

For any $f \in \mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$, taking limit R tends to 1 in (13), one gets

$$D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},1}^{(2)}(z_1 f) - D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},1}^{(2)}(f) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \iint_S \left| \tilde{f}(e^{is}, re^{it}) \right|^2 P_{\mu_1}(e^{is}) ds dt, \quad (16)$$

where \tilde{f} denotes the boundary value function corresponding to f .

Lemma 2.8. *There exists a constant $C = C(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ such that for every $f \in \mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ and $0 < R < 1$,*

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \iint_S |f(Re^{is}, re^{it})|^2 P_{\mu_1}(Re^{is}) ds dt \leq C \|f\|_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^2$$

Proof. Let $Q := \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \iint_S |f(Re^{is}, re^{it})|^2 P_{\mu_1}(Re^{is}) ds dt$. Note that

$$f(Re^{is}, re^{it}) = f(0,0) + (T_{1,0}f)(Re^{is}, re^{it}) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_{0,n}(re^{it})^n.$$

Therefore Lemmas 2.5 and 2.1 imply that

$$\begin{aligned} |f(Re^{is}, re^{it})|^2 &\leq 3 \left(|f(0,0)|^2 + |(T_{1,0}f)(Re^{is_1}, re^{it})|^2 + \left| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_{0,n}(re^{it})^n \right|^2 \right) \\ &\leq 3 \left(\|f\|_{H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)}^2 + \sum_{k_1=1}^{\infty} |(T_{k_1,0}f)(Re^{is_1}, re^{it})|^2 + \left| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_{0,n}(re^{it})^n \right|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 2.5, we deduce that

$$Q \leq \frac{3}{2\pi} \|f\|_{H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)}^2 \widehat{\mu}_1(0) + 3D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},1}^{(2)}(f, R) + \frac{3}{2\pi} \widehat{\mu}_1(0) \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |a_{m,n}|^2 r^{2n}.$$

Choosing $C = \max \left\{ \frac{3\widehat{\mu}_1(0)}{\pi}, 3 \right\}$ completes the proof of the lemma. \square

In this lemma, it is observed that the multiplication operator M_{z_1} behaves like an isometry with respect to semi-norm $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},2}^{(2)}(\cdot)$.

Lemma 2.9. *If $f \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ and $0 < R < 1$, then $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},2}^{(2)}(z_1 f, R) = D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},2}^{(2)}(f, R)$.*

Proof. Proof of this lemma easily follows from (12), hence we skip the details. \square

In the next two lemmas, we study the semi-norm $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},3}^{(2)}(\cdot)$. We observe that $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},3}^{(2)}(z_1 f, R) \geq D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},3}^{(2)}(f, R)$ for any $0 < R < 1$.

Lemma 2.10. *Let $0 < R < 1$. If f is analytic on \mathbb{D}^2 , then*

$$D_{\mu,3}^{(2)}(f, R) = \sum_{k_1=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k_2=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \iint_S |(T_{k_1, k_2} f)(Re^{is_1}, Re^{is_2})|^2 \mathbf{P}_{\mu}(Re^{is_1}, Re^{is_2}) ds_1 ds_2.$$

Proof. Let $f \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}^2)$. Using uniform convergence of $\partial_1 \partial_2 f$ on $R\mathbb{D}^2$ and a bit of computation, we get

$$D_{\mu,3}^{(2)}(f, R) = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \sum_{m,n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{p,q=1}^{\infty} M_{\mu_1}(m, p) M_{\mu_2}(n, q) a_{m,n} \overline{a_{p,q}} R^{2(m \vee p)} R^{2(n \vee q)}. \quad (17)$$

Now, using (8), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k_1, k_2=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \iint_S |(T_{k_1, k_2} f)(Re^{is_1}, Re^{is_2})|^2 \mathbf{P}_{\mu}(Re^{is_1}, Re^{is_2}) ds_1 ds_2 \\ &= \sum_{k_1, k_2=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \iint_S \left| \sum_{m=k_1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=k_2}^{\infty} a_{m,n} (Re^{is_1})^m (Re^{is_2})^n \right|^2 \mathbf{P}_{\mu}(Re^{is_1}, Re^{is_2}) ds_1 ds_2 \\ &= \sum_{k_1, k_2=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \iint_S \sum_{m=p=k_1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=q=k_2}^{\infty} a_{m,n} \overline{a_{p,q}} R^{2(m \vee p)} R^{2(n \vee q)} e^{i(m-p)\theta_1} e^{i(n-q)\theta_2} d\mu_1(\theta_1) d\mu_2(\theta_2) \\ &= \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} (m \wedge p)(n \wedge q) a_{m,n} \overline{a_{p,q}} R^{2(m \vee p)} R^{2(n \vee q)} \widehat{\mu}_1(p-m) \widehat{\mu}_2(q-n). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 2.11. *Let $0 < R < 1$. If f is in $\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)$, then there exists a constant $C = C(\mu)$ such that $D_{\mu,3}^{(2)}(z_1 f, R) \leq C \|f\|_{\mu}^2$.*

Proof. Since $T_{k_1, k_2} f = T_{k_1+1, k_2}(z_1 f)$ for all $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, it follows from Lemma 2.10 that

$$D_{\mu,3}^{(2)}(z_1 f, R) = \sum_{k_2=1}^{\infty} \frac{R^2}{(2\pi)^2} \iint_S |(T_{0, k_2} f)(Re^{is_1}, Re^{is_2})|^2 \mathbf{P}_{\mu}(Re^{is_1}, Re^{is_2}) ds_1 ds_2 + D_{\mu,3}^{(2)}(f, R)$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} |(T_{0, k_2} f)(Re^{is_1}, Re^{is_2})|^2 &= \left| \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n=k_2}^{\infty} a_{m,n} (Re^{is_1})^m (Re^{is_2})^n \right|^2 \\ &\leq 2 \left(\left| \sum_{n=k_2}^{\infty} a_{0,n} (Re^{is_2})^n \right|^2 + |(T_{1, k_2} f)(Re^{is_1}, Re^{is_2})|^2 \right) \\ &\leq 2 \left(\left| \sum_{n=k_2}^{\infty} a_{0,n} (Re^{is_2})^n \right|^2 + \sum_{k_1=1}^{\infty} |(T_{k_1, k_2} f)(Re^{is_1}, Re^{is_2})|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using Lemma 2.10, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k_2=1}^{\infty} \frac{R^2}{(2\pi)^2} \iint_S |(T_{0,k_2}f)(Re^{is_1}, Re^{is_2})|^2 \mathbf{P}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(Re^{is_1}, Re^{is_2}) ds_1 ds_2 \\ & \leq \sum_{k_2=1}^{\infty} \frac{2R^2}{(2\pi)^2} \iint_S \left| \sum_{n=k_2}^{\infty} a_{0,n}(Re^{is_2})^n \right|^2 \mathbf{P}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(Re^{is_1}, Re^{is_2}) ds_1 ds_2 + 2R^2 D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},3}^{(2)}(f, R) \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{RD}} |\partial_2 f(0, z_2)|^2 P_{\mu_2}(z_2) dA(z_2) dt &= \sum_{n,q=1}^{\infty} (m \wedge q) a_{0,n} \overline{a_{0,q}} \widehat{\mu}_2(q-n) R^{2(m \vee q)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\widehat{\mu}_1(0)} \sum_{k_2=1}^{\infty} \iint_S \left| \sum_{n=k_2}^{\infty} a_{0,n}(Re^{is_2})^n \right|^2 \mathbf{P}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(Re^{is_1}, Re^{is_2}) ds_1 ds_2. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality in (18) now gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k_2=1}^{\infty} \frac{R^2}{(2\pi)^2} \iint_S |(T_{0,k_2}f)(Re^{is_1}, Re^{is_2})|^2 \mathbf{P}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(Re^{is_1}, Re^{is_2}) ds_1 ds_2 \\ & \leq \frac{2R^2}{2\pi} \widehat{\mu}_1(0) D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},2}^{(2)} f(0, z_2) + 2R^2 D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},3}^{(2)}(f, R) \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.10, Lemma 2.4 and the above computation, we note that,

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{\mathbb{RD}^2} |\partial_1 \partial_2 z_1 f(\mathbf{z})|^2 \mathbf{P}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{z}) &\leq \frac{R^2}{\pi} \widehat{\mu}_1(0) D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},2}^{(2)}(f, R) + 2R^2 D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},3}^{(2)}(f, R) + D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},3}^{(2)}(f, R) \\ &\leq C \|f\|_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^2 \end{aligned}$$

where $C = \max \left\{ \frac{R^2}{\pi} \widehat{\mu}_1(0), 2R^2, 1 \right\}$. □

The proof of above lemma, in the limit $R \rightarrow 1$, implies that

$$D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},3}^{(2)}(z_1 f) \geq D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},3}^{(2)}(f). \quad (19)$$

Theorem 2.12. *Suppose $f \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}^2)$. Then the following statements are equivalent*

- (i) $f \in \mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$
- (ii) $z_1 f \in \mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$
- (iii) $z_2 f \in \mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$.

Moreover, in this case, $\|z_i f\|_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \geq \|f\|_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Proof. It is enough to prove the equivalence of (i) and (ii) only. Combining Lemma 2.7, Lemma 2.8, Lemma 2.9, and Lemma 2.11 proves that (i) implies (ii). For the other way implication we apply equation (16) with Lemma 2.9 and equation (19). □

For an infinite matrix $X : ((x_{mp}))$, define $\sigma^* X$ (see [19, page 151]) to be the matrix whose (m, p) -th entry is given by $x_{m+1, p+1}$.

Lemma 2.13. *For any polynomial $p \in \mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$, and $i = 1, 2$ we have the following relations;*

$$\|z_i^2 p\|_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^2 - 2\|z_i p\|_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^2 + \|p\|_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^2 = 0.$$

Proof. On computing the norm of $p, z_1 p, z_1^2 p$ for $p(z_1, z_2) = \sum_{m,n=0}^k a_{m,n} z_1^m z_2^n$ w.r.to the defined norm on $\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$, we have the following. Note that

$$\|p\|_{H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)}^2 = \|z_1 p\|_{H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)}^2 = \|z_1^2 p\|_{H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)}^2 = \sum_{m,n=0}^k |a_{m,n}|^2.$$

Therefore it is enough to check

$$D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{(2)}(z_i^2 p) - 2D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{(2)}(z_i p) + D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{(2)}(p) = 0.$$

Now, from (10), (12), (17), with $R = 1$, it follows that

$$D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},1}^{(2)}(p) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{n=0}^k \langle M_{\mu_1} \mathbf{a}_n, \mathbf{a}_n \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},2}^{(2)}(p) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{m=0}^k \langle M_{\mu_2} \mathbf{a}_m, \mathbf{a}_m \rangle.$$

In the same spirit, we also get the formulae:

$$D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},3}^{(2)}(p) = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \langle (M_{\mu_1} \otimes M_{\mu_2}) \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a} \rangle, \quad D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},1}^{(2)}(z_1 p) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{n=0}^k \langle \sigma^* M_{\mu_1} \mathbf{a}_n, \mathbf{a}_n \rangle,$$

$$D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},2}^{(2)}(z_1 p) = D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},2}^{(2)}(z_1^2 p) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{m=0}^k \langle M_{\mu_2} \mathbf{a}_m, \mathbf{a}_m \rangle,$$

$$D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},3}^{(2)}(z_1 p) = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \langle (\sigma^* M_{\mu_1} \otimes M_{\mu_2}) \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a} \rangle, \quad D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},1}^{(2)}(z_1^2 p) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{n=0}^k \langle (\sigma^*)^2 M_{\mu_1} \mathbf{a}_n, \mathbf{a}_n \rangle,$$

and

$$D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},3}^{(2)}(z_1^2 p) = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \langle ((\sigma^*)^2 M_{\mu_1} \otimes M_{\mu_2}) \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a} \rangle.$$

The above computations put together prove that $\|z_1^2 p\|_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^2 - 2\|z_1 p\|_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^2 + \|p\|_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^2 = 0$. Similarly, we can prove that $\|z_2^2 p\|_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^2 - 2\|z_2 p\|_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^2 + \|p\|_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^2 = 0$. \square

For any analytic function f in \mathbb{D}^2 and $0 < r < 1$, define $f_r(z_1, z_2) := f(rz_1, rz_2)$ for $(z_1, z_2) \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$.

Lemma 2.14. *For any $f \in \mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$, the relation $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{(2)}(f_r) \leq D_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^{(2)}(f)$ holds for any $0 < r < 1$.*

Proof. Let $f \in \mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ and $0 < r < 1$. We shall prove the relations $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},i}^{(2)}(f_r) \leq D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},i}^{(2)}(f)$, for $i = 1, 2, 3$. To this end, we claim that

$$D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},1}^{(2)}(f_r) \leq D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},1}^{(2)}(f). \quad (20)$$

We will first prove (20) for polynomials and then for any given $f \in \mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$. Let $P(z_1, z_2) = \sum_{m,n=0}^k a_{m,n} z_1^m z_2^n$ be a polynomial of degree at most $2k$. Then, from (10) with $R = 1$, we have

$$D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},1}^{(2)}(P) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{n=0}^k \langle M_{\mu_1} \mathbf{a}_n, \mathbf{a}_n \rangle.$$

Since $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},1}^{(2)}(z_1^2 P) - 2D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},1}^{(2)}(z_1 P) + D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},1}^{(2)}(P) = 0$, it then follows that $(\sigma^* - I)^2 M_{\mu_1} = 0$. Thus from [19, Theorem 3.11], we get that the matrix $\left((1 - r^{m+p}) M_{\mu_1}(m, p) \right)_{m,p \geq 0}$ is positive semidefinite. Now we have

$$\sum_{n=0}^k \langle ((\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{r}^* \mathbf{r}) \circ M_{\mu_1}) \mathbf{a}_n, \mathbf{a}_n \rangle \geq 0,$$

where \mathbf{r} denotes the row vector $(1, r, r^2, \dots, r^k)$, and $\mathbf{1}$ denotes the rank one matrix with all its entries equal to 1. Here $X \circ Y$ denotes the Schur product of matrices X and Y . Therefore, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},1}^{(2)}(P) - D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},1}^{(2)}(P_r) &= \sum_{m,n,p=0}^k (1 - r^{m+p+2n}) M_{\mu_1}(m, p) a_{m,n} \overline{a_{p,n}} \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^k \langle ((\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{r}^* \mathbf{r}) \circ M_{\mu_1}) \mathbf{a}_n, \mathbf{a}_n \rangle + \sum_{n=0}^k (1 - r^{2n}) \langle (\mathbf{r}^* \mathbf{r} \circ M_{\mu_1}) \mathbf{a}_n, \mathbf{a}_n \rangle \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows since the matrix $(r^{m+p})_{m,p \geq 0}$ is positive definite. This proves the claim (20). In a similar fashion, we can prove that $D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},2}^{(2)}(P_r) \leq D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},2}^{(2)}(P)$. Note that from (17) with $R = 1$, we have

$$D_{\boldsymbol{\mu},3}^{(2)}(P) = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \langle (M_{\mu_1}^T \otimes M_{\mu_2}^T) \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a} \rangle,$$

where \mathbf{a} denotes the 2-tensor $((a_{mn}))$. As $(\sigma^* - I)^2 M_{\mu_1} = 0$ and $(\sigma^* - I)^2 M_{\mu_2} = 0$, therefore $((\sigma^* - I)^2 M_{\mu_1}) \otimes M_{\mu_2} = 0$ and $M_{\mu_1} \otimes ((\sigma^* - I)^2 M_{\mu_2}) = 0$ hold true. By [19, Theorem 3.11], it turns out that for any $0 \leq r < 1$ the matrices $((\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{r}^* \mathbf{r}) \circ M_{\mu_1}) \otimes M_{\mu_2}$ and $M_{\mu_1} \otimes ((\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{r}^* \mathbf{r}) \circ M_{\mu_2})$ are positive semi-definite. This implies that

$$\sum_{m,n,p,q=0}^k (1 - r^{m+p}) M_{\mu_1}(m, p) M_{\mu_2}(n, q) a_{m,n} \overline{a_{p,q}} \geq 0 \quad (21)$$

$$\sum_{m,n,p,q=0}^k (1 - r^{n+q}) M_{\mu_1}(m, p) M_{\mu_2}(n, q) a_{m,n} \overline{a_{p,q}} \geq 0 \quad (22)$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{\mu,3}^{(2)}(P) - D_{\mu,3}^{(2)}(P_r) &= \sum_{m,n,p,q=0}^k (1 - r^{m+n+p+q})M_{\mu_1}(m,p)M_{\mu_2}(n,q)a_{m,n}\overline{a_{p,q}} \\
&= \sum_{m,n,p,q=0}^k (1 - r^{m+p} + r^{m+p} - r^{m+n+p+q})M_{\mu_1}(m,p)M_{\mu_2}(n,q)a_{m,n}\overline{a_{p,q}} \\
&= \sum_{m,n,p,q=0}^k (1 - r^{m+p})M_{\mu_1}(m,p)M_{\mu_2}(n,q)a_{m,n}\overline{a_{p,q}} + \\
&\quad \sum_{m,n,p,q=0}^k r^{m+p}(1 - r^{n+q})M_{\mu_1}(m,p)M_{\mu_2}(n,q)a_{m,n}\overline{a_{p,q}} \\
&\geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from (21), (22) and the fact that the matrix $((r^{m+p}))_{m,p=0}^{\infty}$ is positive semi-definite. To see that the matrix $((r^{m+p}))_{m,p=0}^{\infty}$ is positive semi-definite, note that $((r^{m+p})) = vv^T$, with v given by $v^T = [1 \ r \ r^2 \ r^3 \ \dots]$. This proves the lemma if f is a polynomial. Applying a standard uniform limit argument proves the lemma for any function f which is holomorphic in a neighborhood of $\overline{\mathbb{D}^2}$. Now for $f \in \mathcal{D}^2(\mu)$ and $0 < R < 1$ we have $f_R \in \mathcal{O}(\overline{\mathbb{D}^2})$. Therefore this readily implies that $D_{\mu}^{(2)}(f_R)_r \leq D_{\mu}^{(2)}(f_R)$, where r being any number in $(0, 1)$. Because $(f_R)_r = (f_r)_R$, we get that $D_{\mu}^{(2)}(f_r)_R \leq D_{\mu}^{(2)}(f_r)$. This is true for any $0 < R < 1$. Hence by taking limit $R \rightarrow 1$, we get that $D_{\mu}^{(2)}(f_r) \leq D_{\mu}^{(2)}(f)$. \square

We skip the proof of the following theorem as it is standard and follows from [3, Lemma 3.7] together with Fatou's theorem applied to $D_{\mu,3}^{(2)}(\cdot)$.

Lemma 2.15. *For any $f \in \mathcal{D}^2(\mu)$, $\|f_R - f\|_{\mu} \rightarrow 0$ as $R \rightarrow 1^-$.*

In the following theorem we prove that the set of all polynomials is dense in $\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)$.

Theorem 2.16. *The set of all polynomials is dense in $\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)$.*

Proof. Let $f \in \mathcal{D}^2(\mu)$ and $\epsilon > 0$. From Lemma 2.15, it follows that there exists an $0 < R < 1$ such that $\|f_R - f\|_{\mu} < \epsilon/2$. Let $f_R(z_1, z_2) = \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} b_{m,n}z_1^m z_2^n$, where the coefficient $b_{m,n}$ is a function of R . Consider the k -th partial sum $S_k f_R(z_1, z_2) = \sum_{m,n=0}^k b_{m,n}z_1^m z_2^n$ of $f_R(z_1, z_2)$. Note that $f_R(z_1, z_2)$ is holomorphic in any neighbourhood of $\overline{\mathbb{D}^2}$. Therefore the sequences $(S_k f_R)_{k=0}^{\infty}$, $(\partial_1(S_k f_R))_{k=0}^{\infty}$, $(\partial_2(S_k f_R))_{k=0}^{\infty}$, and $(\partial_1 \partial_2(S_k f_R))_{k=0}^{\infty}$ will converge uniformly on $\overline{\mathbb{D}^2}$ respectively to f_R , $\partial_1(f_R)$, $\partial_2(f_R)$, and $\partial_1 \partial_2(f_R)$. Thus it follows that there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|S_k f_R - f_R\|_{\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)}^2 \leq \epsilon/2$. We thus conclude that

$$\|f - S_k f_R\|_{\mu} \leq \|f - f_R\|_{\mu} + \|S_k f_R - f_R\|_{\mu} < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon.$$

This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

The results due to Lemma 2.13 and Theorem 2.16 yield the following theorem.

Theorem 2.17. *The multiplication by the coordinate functions M_{z_1} and M_{z_2} are 2-isometries on $\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$, i.e., for every $f \in \mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$, and $i = 1, 2$,*

$$\|z_i^2 f\|_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^2 - 2\|z_i f\|_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^2 + \|f\|_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^2 = 0.$$

Recall that for any $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T})$, one has

$$\langle z^m, z^n \rangle_{\mathcal{D}(\nu)} = \begin{cases} \frac{m \wedge n}{2\pi} \widehat{\nu}(n-m) & \text{if } m \neq n \\ 1 + \frac{m}{2\pi} \widehat{\nu}(0) & \text{if } m = n. \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

In the following lemma, we get a formula for inner product of monomials in the space $\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$, for any $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{PM}_+(\mathbb{T}^2)$.

Lemma 2.18. *For $m, n, p, q \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $\langle z_1^m z_2^n, z_1^p z_2^q \rangle_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \langle z_1^m, z_1^p \rangle_{\mathcal{D}(\mu_1)} \langle z_2^n, z_2^q \rangle_{\mathcal{D}(\mu_2)}$.*

Proof. Let $m, n, p, q \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $f(z_1, z_2) := z_1^m z_2^n$ and $g(z_1, z_2) := z_1^p z_2^q$. We divide the proof of the lemma into the following five cases:

Case 1: When either f or g is the constant function 1, i.e. $m = n = 0$ or $p = q = 0$.

Case 2: When f and g both are function of z_1 only (similarly of z_2 only).

Case 3: When f is a function of z_1 only and g is a function of z_2 only.

Case 4: When f is a function of z_1 only and g is a function of both z_1 and z_2 .

Case 5: When f and g both are functions of both variables z_1 and z_2 , i.e. $m, n, p, q \in \mathbb{N}$.

Case 1: Suppose f is the constant function 1, then

$$\langle 1, z_1^p z_2^q \rangle_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \langle 1, z_1^p z_2^q \rangle_{H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)} = \langle 1, z_1^p \rangle_{H^2(\mathbb{D})} \langle 1, z_2^q \rangle_{H^2(\mathbb{D})} = \langle 1, z_1^p \rangle_{\mathcal{D}(\mu_1)} \langle 1, z_2^q \rangle_{\mathcal{D}(\mu_2)}.$$

Case 2: From (8), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle z_1^m, z_1^p \rangle_{\mathcal{D}_{\mu,1}^2} &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{2\pi} \iint_{\mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{T}} m z_1^{m-1} p \bar{z}_1^{p-1} P_{\mu_1}(z_1) dA(z_1) dt \\ &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} m p r_1^{m+p-1} r_1^{|m-p|} e^{i(m-p)\theta_1} dr_1 dt d\mu_1(\theta_1) \\ &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{1}{\pi} m p \int_0^1 r_1^{m+p-1} r_1^{|m-p|} dr_1 \int_0^{2\pi} dt \int_0^{2\pi} e^{i(m-p)\theta_1} d\mu_1(\theta_1) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} (m \wedge p) \widehat{\mu}_1(p-m) \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand note that $\langle z_1^m, z_1^p \rangle_{H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)} = \delta_{mp}$ and $0 = \langle z_1^m, z_1^p \rangle_{\mathcal{D}_{\mu,2}^2} = \langle z_1^m, z_1^p \rangle_{\mathcal{D}_{\mu,3}^2}$. Therefore, we get

$$\langle z_1^m, z_1^p \rangle_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \delta_{mp} + \frac{1}{2\pi} (m \wedge p) \widehat{\mu}_1(p-m).$$

Now, using (23) completes the proof in this case.

Case 3: Using the definitions, it follows that

$$\langle z_1^m, z_2^q \rangle_{H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)} = \langle z_1^m, z_2^q \rangle_{\mathcal{D}_{\mu,1}^2} = 0 = \langle z_1^m, z_2^q \rangle_{\mathcal{D}_{\mu,2}^2} = \langle z_1^m, z_2^q \rangle_{\mathcal{D}_{\mu,3}^2}.$$

Thus, z_1^m and z_2^q are orthogonal in $\mathcal{D}^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$. For any $m, q \in \mathbb{N}$, it is trivial to verify that $\langle z_1^m, 1 \rangle_{\mathcal{D}(\mu_1)} \langle 1, z_2^q \rangle_{\mathcal{D}(\mu_2)} = 0$.

Case 4: From (8), note that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle z_1^m, z_1^p z_2^q \rangle_{\mathcal{D}_{\mu,1}^{(2)}} &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{2\pi} \iint_{\mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{T}} m z_1^{m-1} p \bar{z}_1^{p-1} \bar{z}_2^q P_{\mu_1}(z_1) dA(z_1) dt \\ &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{1}{\pi} m p \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} r_1^{m+p-1} r_1^{|m-p|} e^{i(m-p)\theta_1} r^q e^{-itq} d\mu_1(\theta_1) dt dr_1. \end{aligned}$$

Since $q \geq 1$, it easily follows that $\int_0^{2\pi} e^{-itq} dt = 0$. Therefore, we get that $\langle z_1^m, z_1^p z_2^q \rangle_{\mathcal{D}_{\mu,1}^{(2)}} = 0$.

On the other hand, using definitions, note that

$$\langle z_1^m, z_1^p z_2^q \rangle_{H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)} = 0 = \langle z_1^m, z_1^p z_2^q \rangle_{\mathcal{D}_{\mu,2}^{(2)}} = \langle z_1^m, z_1^p z_2^q \rangle_{\mathcal{D}_{\mu,3}^{(2)}}.$$

Using (23), we observe that $\langle 1, z_2^q \rangle_{\mathcal{D}(\mu_2)} = 0$. This establishes the equality in the lemma in this case.

Case 5: Once again from (8), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle z_1^m z_2^n, z_1^p z_2^q \rangle_{\mathcal{D}_{\mu,1}^{(2)}} &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{2\pi} \iint_{\mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{T}} m z_1^{m-1} z_2^n p \bar{z}_1^{p-1} \bar{z}_2^q P_{\mu_1}(z_1) dt dA(z_1) \\ &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{1}{\pi} m p \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} r_1^{m+p-1} r_1^{n+q} e^{i(n-q)t} r_1^{|m-p|} e^{i(m-p)\theta_1} d\mu_1(\theta_1) dt dr_1 \\ &= \delta_{nq} \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{1}{2\pi^2} m p \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} r_1^{m+p-1} r_1^{n+q} r_1^{|m-p|} e^{i(m-p)\theta_1} d\mu_1(\theta_1) dr_1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\langle z_1^m z_2^n, z_1^p z_2^q \rangle_{\mathcal{D}_{\mu,1}^{(2)}} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n \neq q \\ \frac{1}{2\pi} (m \wedge p) \widehat{\mu}_1(p - m) & \text{if } n = q. \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

Similarly, we can derive,

$$\langle z_1^m z_2^n, z_1^p z_2^q \rangle_{\mathcal{D}_{\mu,2}^{(2)}} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } m \neq p \\ \frac{1}{2\pi} (n \wedge q) \widehat{\mu}_2(q - n) & \text{if } m = p. \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

In the following, we use (8) twice to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle z_1^m z_2^n, z_1^p z_2^q \rangle_{\mathcal{D}_{\mu,3}^{(2)}} &= \iint_{\mathbb{D}^2} m n z_1^{m-1} z_2^{n-1} p q \bar{z}_1^{p-1} \bar{z}_2^{q-1} P_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(z_1, z_2) dA(z_1) dA(z_2) \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi^2} m n p q \frac{1}{2(m \vee p)} \frac{1}{2(n \vee q)} \widehat{\mu}_1(p - m) \widehat{\mu}_2(q - n) \\ &= \frac{1}{4\pi^2} (m \wedge p) (n \wedge q) \widehat{\mu}_1(p - m) \widehat{\mu}_2(q - n). \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Using (23), (24), (25), and (26), we get the result in this case. \square

We note down the case when $m = p$ and $n = q$ of above lemma into the following corollary.

Corollary 2.19. *For any $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $\|z_1^m z_2^n\|_{\mu} = \|z_1^m\|_{\mu} \|z_2^n\|_{\mu}$.*

Lemma 2.18 suggests that there should be a relationship between $\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)$ and $\mathcal{D}(\mu_1) \otimes \mathcal{D}(\mu_2)$. This is indeed the case, as shown in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.20. *For any $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T})$, the pair of commuting 2-isometries (M_{z_1}, M_{z_2}) is unitarily equivalent to the pair $(M_z \otimes I, I \otimes M_z)$ on $(\mathcal{D}(\mu_1) \otimes \mathcal{D}(\mu_2)) \oplus (\mathcal{D}(\mu_1) \otimes \mathcal{D}(\mu_2))$. In particular, the pair (M_{z_1}, M_{z_2}) is doubly commuting.*

Proof. Define $U : \mathcal{D}^2(\mu) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mu_1) \otimes \mathcal{D}(\mu_2)$ by the rule $U(z_1^m z_2^n) := z^m \otimes z^n$, for $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, and extend U linearly. Since the set of polynomials are dense in $\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)$, U extends to whole space $\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)$ linearly. Using Lemma 2.18, it follows that U is an isometry. On the other hand, since U has closed range and $\text{span}\{z^m \otimes z^n : m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\}$ is dense in $\mathcal{D}(\mu_1) \otimes \mathcal{D}(\mu_2)$, it follows that U is a unitary map. Also note that

$$UM_{z_1}(z_1^m z_2^n) = z^{m+1} \otimes z^n = (M_z \otimes I)U(z_1^m z_2^n)$$

and

$$UM_{z_2}(z_1^m z_2^n) = z^m \otimes z^{n+1} = (I \otimes M_z)U(z_1^m z_2^n).$$

This proves that the pair (M_{z_1}, M_{z_2}) is unitarily equivalent to the pair $(M_z \otimes I, I \otimes M_z)$. This, in particular, implies that M_{z_1} and M_{z_2} on $\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)$ is doubly commuting. \square

For the pair of commuting 2-isometries (M_{z_1}, M_{z_2}) on $\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)$, denote the closed subspace $(\mathcal{D}^2(\mu) \ominus z_1 \mathcal{D}^2(\mu)) \cap (\mathcal{D}^2(\mu) \ominus z_2 \mathcal{D}^2(\mu))$ by \mathcal{W} . The subspace \mathcal{W} plays a major role in this article. With a simple computation, it is also easy to see that $\mathcal{W} = \ker M_{z_1}^* \cap \ker M_{z_2}^*$. Below, we note down some of the important properties of the subspace \mathcal{W} .

Remark 2.21. The proof of Theorem 2.20 tells us that the kernel function K for $\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)$ is given by

$$K((z_1, z_2), (w_1, w_2)) = K^{\mu_1}(z_1, w_1)K^{\mu_2}(z_2, w_2), \quad (z_1, z_2), (w_1, w_2) \in \mathbb{D}^2,$$

where K^{μ_j} denotes the kernel function for $\mathcal{D}(\mu_j)$, $j = 1, 2$.

As corollaries of Theorem 2.20, we get the following results.

Corollary 2.22. *The closed subspace \mathcal{W} is a wandering subspace of (M_{z_1}, M_{z_2}) on $\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)$ and the dimension of \mathcal{W} is 1.*

Corollary 2.23. *The subspace $\ker M_{z_1}^* \subseteq \mathcal{D}^2(\mu)$ is a M_{z_2} -reducing subspace. Also, the subspace $\ker M_{z_2}^* \subseteq \mathcal{D}^2(\mu)$ is a M_{z_1} -reducing subspace.*

Before we proceed further, for any $f \in \mathcal{D}^2(\mu)$ and $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{D}$, we define the operators L_1 and L_2 by the rules

$$(L_1 f)(z_1, z_2) := \frac{f(z_1, z_2) - f(0, z_2)}{z_1} \quad \text{and} \quad (L_2 f)(z_1, z_2) := \frac{f(z_1, z_2) - f(z_1, 0)}{z_2}. \quad (27)$$

Using the definition of norm, Lemma 2.4, and Theorem 2.12, it turns out that L_1 and L_2 are indeed in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}^2(\mu))$. Here, we enlist some of the key properties of these operators.

Theorem 2.24. *The operators L_1 and L_2 are the left inverses of M_{z_1} and M_{z_2} respectively. Moreover, $L_1 M_{z_2} = M_{z_2} L_1$ and $L_2 M_{z_1} = M_{z_1} L_2$.*

Proof. By using the definition of the operators L_1 , defined above, we have

$$L_1 M_{z_1} f(z_1, z_2) = \frac{(z_1 f)(z_1, z_2) - (z_1 f)(0, z_2)}{z_1} = f(z_1, z_2)$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ and for all $(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{D}^2$. Similarly, we also have $L_2 M_{z_2} = M_{z_2} L_2$. On the other hand, for all $(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{D}^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (M_{z_2} L_1 f)(z_1, z_2) &= z_2 \left\{ \frac{f(z_1, z_2) - f(0, z_2)}{z_1} \right\} \\ &= z_2 \left\{ \sum_{m_1=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m_2=0}^{\infty} a_{m_1, m_2} z_1^{m_1-1} z_2^{m_2} \right\} \\ &= \sum_{m_1=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m_2=0}^{\infty} a_{m_1, m_2} z_1^{m_1-1} z_2^{m_2+1} \\ &= \frac{(z_2 f)(z_1, z_2) - (z_2 f)(0, z_2)}{z_1} \\ &= (L_1 M_{z_2} f)(z_1, z_2) \end{aligned}$$

Analogously, one can also derive $L_2 M_{z_1} = M_{z_1} L_2$. \square

Remark 2.25. Note that, by Theorem 2.12, the operators $M_{z_i} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu}))$ are bounded below for $i = 1, 2$, hence $(M_{z_i}^* M_{z_i})^{-1}$ exists as well as M_{z_i}' s are left invertible. Moreover, for $i = 1, 2$, $(M_{z_i}^* M_{z_i})^{-1} M_{z_i}^*$ and the above defined operators L_i are left-inverse of M_{z_i} with $\ker L_i = \ker (M_{z_i}^* M_{z_i})^{-1} M_{z_i}^* = \ker M_{z_i}^*$ and therefore $L_i = (M_{z_i}^* M_{z_i})^{-1} M_{z_i}^*$.

3. WANDERING SUBSPACE PROPERTY FOR A PAIR OF ANALYTIC 2-ISOMETRIES

In this section we deal with a commuting pair of left invertible operators acting on a Hilbert space and prove a multivariate version of S. Shimorin's result for a class of operators on a Hilbert space. We show that a class of commuting pair of 2-isometries on a Hilbert space always possess *wandering subspace property*.

Let $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, T_2)$ be a pair of commuting 2-isometries acting on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} and we consider the adjoint of the Cauchy-dual operators, that is, $L_i := (T_i^* T_i)^{-1} T_i^* \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ which is also a left-inverse of T_i for $i = 1, 2$.

In the following lemma, we prove that joint kernel of adjoint is non-trivial for any left-inverse commuting pair of analytic 2-isometries.

Lemma 3.1. *Let (T_1, T_2) be a left-inverse commuting pair of analytic 2-isometries on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Then,*

- (a) *the subspace $\ker T_1^* \cap \ker T_2^*$ is a non-trivial closed subspace of \mathcal{H} and*
- (b) *the operator $(I - T_1 L_1)(I - T_2 L_2)$ is a projection on $\ker T_1^* \cap \ker T_2^*$.*

Proof. (a) Let $x_0 \in \ker T_1^*$. From the definition of L_1 , it is easy to see that $\ker L_1 = \ker T_1^*$. So, we have $L_1 x_0 = 0$ and therefore $T_2 L_1 x_0 = 0$. Now, by using the hypothesis, we have $L_1 T_2 x_0 = 0$, that is, $T_2 x_0 \in \ker T_1^*$. So, $\ker T_1^*$ is invariant under T_2 . On the other hand, using the commutativity of T_1 and T_2 , it is straightforward to see that $\ker T_1^*$ is invariant under T_2^* . Hence, $\ker T_1^*$ is a T_2 -reducing subspace. Since $T_2|_{\ker T_1^*} : \ker T_1^* \rightarrow \ker T_1^*$ is an analytic operator, that is,

$$\bigcap_{n \geq 0} T_2^n|_{\ker T_1^*}(\ker T_1^*) = \{0\},$$

therefore, $T_2|_{\ker T_1^*}$ cannot be onto. Moreover, since $T_2|_{\ker T_1^*}$ is 2-isometry, it's range is closed. Therefore, the subspace $\ker(T_2^*|_{\ker T_1^*}) \subseteq \ker T_1^*$ is non-trivial. Hence, $\ker T_1^* \cap \ker T_2^* \neq \{0\}$.

(b) Using the definition of the operators L_1 and L_2 , defined above, it is easy to observe that the operators $I - T_1 L_1$ and $I - T_2 L_2$ are projections. To show that the product of these operators $(I - T_1 L_1)(I - T_2 L_2)$ is a projection, it is enough to show that

$$(I - T_1 L_1)(I - T_2 L_2) = (I - T_2 L_2)(I - T_1 L_1).$$

Therefore, we only need to show that $L_1 L_2 = L_2 L_1$. Since $\mathcal{H} = \bigvee_{n \geq 0} T_1^n(\ker T_1^*)$ and L_1 and L_2 are bounded linear operators, it is enough to check the identity $L_1 L_2 T_1^k y = L_2 L_1 T_1^k y$ for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $y \in \ker T_1^*$. Let $k \geq 1$ and $y \in \ker T_1^*$. Note that

$$L_1 L_2 T_1^k y = L_1 T_1^k L_2 y = T_1^{k-1} L_2 y = L_2 T_1^{k-1} y = L_2 L_1 T_1^k y.$$

Since $\ker T_1^*$ is a reducing subspace for T_2 , it follows that $L_2 y$ is in $\ker T_1^*$ also. Therefore, we have

$$L_2 L_1 y = 0 = L_1 L_2 y.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Now, we proceed to prove the existence of the *wandering subspace property* for the class of left-inverse commuting pair of analytic 2-isometries. This generalizes many existing results e.g. see [8, 9, 13, 5].

Theorem 3.2. *Let T_1 and T_2 be a pair of commuting, analytic 2-isometric operators on \mathcal{H} such that $L_1 T_2 = T_2 L_1$ and $L_2 T_1 = T_1 L_2$. Then there exists a wandering subspace $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ for the pair (T_1, T_2) . Moreover, $\mathcal{W} = \ker T_1^* \cap \ker T_2^*$ is a wandering subspace for the pair (T_1, T_2) on \mathcal{H} .*

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, we know the subspace $\ker T_1^* \cap \ker T_2^*$ is non-trivial. Also, for the subspace $\mathcal{W} = \ker T_1^* \cap \ker T_2^* \subseteq \mathcal{H}$, one sided inclusion is trivial, that is,

$$\bigvee_{n, m \geq 0} T_1^n T_2^m \mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathcal{H}.$$

To prove the other inclusion, denote $P_1 := (I - T_1 L_1)$ and $P_2 := (I - T_2 L_2)$. Recall from Lemma 3.1 that $P = P_1 P_2$ is a projection of \mathcal{H} onto \mathcal{W} . Using [10, pg. 209] and the

hypothesis that (T_1, T_2) is a left-inverse commuting pair, we observe that

$$(I - T_1^n L_1^n)(I - T_2^m L_2^m) = \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} T_1^i P_1 L_1^i \right) \left(\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} T_2^j P_2 L_2^j \right) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} T_1^i T_2^j P L_1^i L_2^j.$$

From the above computation, we conclude that for any $x \in \mathcal{H}$ and $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(I - T_1^n L_1^n - T_2^m L_2^m + T_1^n L_1^n T_2^m L_2^m)x \in \bigvee_{n, m \geq 0} T_1^n T_2^m \mathcal{W}.$$

To prove the claim, we first note that, by hypothesis, the operators T_1 and T_2 are 2-isometries. So, for any $x \in \mathcal{H}$, $i = 1, 2$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\|T_i^n x\|^2 - \|x\|^2 = n \|D_i x\|^2, \quad (28)$$

$$\|x\|^2 = \sum_{k=0}^n \|P_i L_i^k x\|^2 + \|L_i^{n+1} x\|^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} \|D_i L_i^k x\|^2, \quad (29)$$

where D_i denotes the positive square root of the operator $T_i^* T_i - I$ and (29) follows from [10, equation (9)]. Along with that, for each $i = 1, 2$, T_i is also analytic and therefore, following an analogous argument as in [10, Theorem 1], for each $x \in \mathcal{H}$ the sequence $\{T_i^{n_i} L_i^{n_i} x\}$ has a subsequence which converge to 0 weakly. Hence, it is enough to show that the double sequence $\{T_1^{n_1} L_1^{n_1} T_2^{n_2} L_2^{n_2} x\}$ has a subsequence which converges to 0 weakly. For more details we refer [10]. For fixed $n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, applying the above equations (28) and (29) for $T_2^{n_2} L_2^{n_2} x$ in place of x , we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n_1=1}^{m_1} \frac{1}{n_1} \inf_{1 \leq n_1 \leq m_1} (\|T_1^{n_1} L_1^{n_1} T_2^{n_2} L_2^{n_2} x\|^2 - \|L_1^{n_1} T_2^{n_2} L_2^{n_2} x\|^2) \\ & \leq \sum_{n_1=1}^{m_1} \frac{1}{n_1} (\|T_1^{n_1} L_1^{n_1} T_2^{n_2} L_2^{n_2} x\|^2 - \|L_1^{n_1} T_2^{n_2} L_2^{n_2} x\|^2) \\ & \leq \sum_{n_1=1}^{m_1} \|D_1 L_1^{n_1} T_2^{n_2} L_2^{n_2} x\|^2 \\ & \leq \|T_2^{n_2} L_2^{n_2} x\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we conclude that

$$\liminf_{n_1 \rightarrow \infty} \{ \|T_1^{n_1} L_1^{n_1} T_2^{n_2} L_2^{n_2} x\|^2 - \|L_1^{n_1} T_2^{n_2} L_2^{n_2} x\|^2 \} = 0.$$

From the equation (29) it is easy to observe that the sequence $\{\|L_1^{n_1} T_2^{n_2} L_2^{n_2} x\|^2\}$ is decreasing and combining all these we get

$$\liminf_{n_1 \rightarrow \infty} \|T_1^{n_1} L_1^{n_1} T_2^{n_2} L_2^{n_2} x\|^2 = \lim_{n_1 \rightarrow \infty} \|L_1^{n_1} T_2^{n_2} L_2^{n_2} x\|^2.$$

By hypothesis, we have $L_1 T_2 = T_2 L_1$ and by applying analogous argument on the sequence $\{T_2^{n_2} L_1^{n_1} L_2^{n_2} x\}$ we conclude

$$\liminf_{n_2 \rightarrow \infty} (\lim_{n_1 \rightarrow \infty} \|T_2^{n_2} L_2^{n_2} L_1^{n_1} x\|^2) = \lim_{n_2 \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n_1 \rightarrow \infty} \|L_2^{n_2} L_1^{n_1} x\|^2$$

and since the sequence $\{\|L_2^{n_2} L_1^{n_1} x\|^2\}$ is decreasing, follows from the equation (29), therefore we have

$$\liminf_{n_2 \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n_1 \rightarrow \infty} \|T_1^{n_1} L_1^{n_1} T_2^{n_2} L_2^{n_2} x\|^2 = \lim_{n_2 \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n_1 \rightarrow \infty} \|L_1^{n_1} L_2^{n_2} x\|^2.$$

Thus there exists a weakly convergent subsequence of $\{T_1^{n_1} L_1^{n_1} T_2^{n_2} L_2^{n_2} x\}$ which converges to y weakly. Also, since T_1 and T_2 are 2-isometries so, for each $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, the subspaces $T_i^{k_i} \mathcal{H}$, are weakly closed and $y \in T_i^{k_i} \mathcal{H}$ for each $i = 1, 2$. By using the analyticity of each operator T_i , we conclude that $y = 0$ and hence the theorem follows. \square

Remark 3.3. We would like to remark here that the statement of Theorem 3.2 along with it's proof can be adapted easily for it to work for any analytic 2-isometric left-inverse commuting tuple (T_1, \dots, T_n) .

4. MODEL FOR A CLASS OF PAIR OF CYCLIC ANALYTIC 2-ISOMETRIES

In this section, we prove the following model theorem which shows that the class of multiplication operators (M_{z_1}, M_{z_2}) on $\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ completely characterizes that of left-inverse commuting pair of analytic 2-isometries which satisfy certain splitting properties. With the help of this theorem, we give an example of a left-inverse commuting pair of analytic 2-isometries which is not a doubly commuting pair.

Theorem 4.1. *Let (T_1, T_2) be a pair of cyclic, analytic, 2-isometries on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with unit cyclic vector $x_0 \in \ker T_1^* \cap \ker T_2^*$. Then (T_1, T_2) on \mathcal{H} is unitarily equivalent with (M_{z_1}, M_{z_2}) on $\mathcal{D}^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ if and only if $L_1 T_2 = T_2 L_1$, $L_2 T_1 = T_1 L_2$ and for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$*

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T_1^m T_2^n x_0, T_1 T_2 x_0 \rangle &= \langle T_1^m x_0, T_1 x_0 \rangle \langle T_2^n x_0, T_2 x_0 \rangle, \\ \langle T_1^m T_2 x_0, T_1 T_2^n x_0 \rangle &= \langle T_1^m x_0, T_1 x_0 \rangle \langle T_2 x_0, T_2^n x_0 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since (T_1, T_2) is an analytic left-inverse commuting pair, it follows from Theorem 3.2 that $\ker T_1^* \cap \ker T_2^*$ is wandering subspace for (T_1, T_2) . Using the hypothesis that (T_1, T_2) is a cyclic pair, it follows that $\ker T_1^* \cap \ker T_2^* = \text{span}\{x_0\}$, for some unit vector x_0 . Consider the operator $S_1 := T_1|_{\ker T_2^*}$ and $S_2 := T_2|_{\ker T_1^*}$. From Lemma 3.1, it follows that S_1 and S_2 are bounded linear operators on $\ker T_2^*$ and $\ker T_1^*$ respectively. Now it follows that S_1 and S_2 are cyclic analytic 2-isometries with cyclic subspace $\ker T_1^* \cap \ker T_2^*$. Using [12, Theorem 5.1], we have $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T})$ and unitary maps $U_1 : \ker T_2^* \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mu_1)$ and $U_2 : \ker T_1^* \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mu_2)$ such that

$$U_i S_i = M_z U_i \quad \text{and} \quad U_i x_0 = 1.$$

Let $\boldsymbol{\mu} := \mu_1 \times \mu_2$ be the product measure and consider the corresponding Dirichlet-type spaces $\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$. We define a linear map $U : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$, which is defined by

$$U(p(T_1, T_2)x_0) = p(z_1, z_2),$$

where $p(T_1, T_2)x_0 = \sum_{k_1, k_2=0}^{n_1, n_2} a_{k_1 k_2} T_1^{k_1} T_2^{k_2} x_0$ for any polynomial $p(z_1, z_2) = \sum_{k_1, k_2=0}^{n_1, n_2} a_{k_1 k_2} z_1^{k_1} z_2^{k_2}$.

We claim that the map defines a unitary map from \mathcal{H} onto $\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$. So we need to show that $\|P(T_1, T_2)x_0\|^2 = \|P(z_1, z_2)\|_{\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})}^2$. Therefore, it is enough to verify that

$$\langle T_1^m T_2^n x_0, T_1^p T_2^q x_0 \rangle = \langle z_1^m z_2^n, z_1^p z_2^q \rangle_{\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})} \quad \text{for all } m, n, p, q \in \mathbb{N}.$$

First note that, in above, if $n, q = 0$ then for any $m, p \in \mathbb{N}$, considering the above unitary map U_1 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T_1^m x_0, T_1^p x_0 \rangle &= \langle U_1 T_1^m x_0, U_1 T_1^p x_0 \rangle_{\mathcal{D}(\mu_1)} \\ &= \langle M_z^m U_1 x_0, M_z^p U_1 x_0 \rangle_{\mathcal{D}(\mu_1)} \\ &= \langle z^m, z^p \rangle_{\mathcal{D}(\mu_1)} \\ &= \langle z_1^m, z_1^p \rangle_{\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we also have $\langle T_2^n x_0, T_2^q x_0 \rangle = \langle z_2^n, z_2^q \rangle_{\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)}$ for any $n, q \in \mathbb{N}$. On the other hand, by Lemma 3.1, we know that for any $i, j = 1, 2$ with $i \neq j$ the subspace $\text{Ker} T_j^*$ is T_i reducing. Without loss of generality, it is enough to prove for $i = 1$ and $j = 2$. By using this fact it is obvious that

$$\langle T_1^m x_0, T_1^p T_2^q x_0 \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for any } q \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \text{ and } m, p \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Now by combining the above equation and the Lemma 2.18 we conclude

$$\langle T_1^m x_0, T_1^p T_2^q x_0 \rangle = \langle z_1^m, z_1^p z_2^q \rangle_{\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)} = 0 \quad \text{for any } q \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \text{ and } m, p \in \mathbb{N}.$$

It remains to deal with the case where $m, n, p, q \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. Again, without loss of generality, it is enough to establish the equation for $m \geq p, n \geq q$ and $m \geq p, n \leq q$. First we consider the case $m \geq p, n \geq q$. Since T_1 is a 2-isometry therefore we deduce

$$\langle T_1^m T_2^n x_0, T_1^p T_2^q x_0 \rangle = (m \wedge p) \langle T_1^{m-p+1} T_2^n x_0, T_1 T_2^q x_0 \rangle.$$

Analogously, using the fact that T_2 is a 2-isometry, we reduce the above term further and it becomes

$$(m \wedge p) \langle T_1^{m-p+1} T_2^n x_0, T_1 T_2^q x_0 \rangle = (m \wedge p)(n \wedge q) \langle T_1^{m-p+1} T_2^{n-q+1} x_0, T_1 T_2 x_0 \rangle.$$

Combining all these we have

$$\langle T_1^m T_2^n x_0, T_1^p T_2^q x_0 \rangle = (m \wedge p)(n \wedge q) \langle T_1^{m-p+1} T_2^{n-q+1} x_0, T_1 T_2 x_0 \rangle.$$

By the given hypothesis, the above identities on T_1 and T_2 individually and the Lemma 2.18 we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T_1^m T_2^n x_0, T_1^p T_2^q x_0 \rangle &= (m \wedge p)(n \wedge q) \langle T_1^{m-p+1} T_2^{n-q+1} x_0, T_1 T_2 x_0 \rangle \\ &= (m \wedge p)(n \wedge q) \langle T_1^{m-p+1} x_0, T_1 x_0 \rangle \langle T_2^{n-q+1} x_0, T_2 x_0 \rangle \\ &= (m \wedge p)(n \wedge q) \langle z_1^{m-p+1}, z_1 \rangle_{\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)} \langle z_2^{n-q+1}, z_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)} \\ &= \langle z_1^m z_2^n, z_1^p z_2^q \rangle_{\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for the second case with $m \geq p, n \leq q$ by using the given hypothesis and the Lemma 2.18 we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T_1^m T_2^n x_0, T_1^p T_2^q x_0 \rangle &= (m \wedge p)(n \wedge q) \langle T_1^{m-p+1} T_2^n x_0, T_1 T_2^{q-n+1} x_0 \rangle \\ &= (m \wedge p)(n \wedge q) \langle T_1^{m-p+1} x_0, T_1 x_0 \rangle \langle T_2^n x_0, T_2^{q-n+1} x_0 \rangle \\ &= (m \wedge p)(n \wedge q) \langle z_1^{m-p+1}, z_1 \rangle_{\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)} \langle z_2^n, z_2^{q-n+1} \rangle_{\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)} \\ &= \langle z_1^m z_2^n, z_1^p z_2^q \rangle_{\mathcal{D}^2(\mu)}. \end{aligned}$$

The converse follows as an application of Lemma 2.18 and Proposition 2.24. \square

Remark 4.2. For any $\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\nu} \in \mathcal{PM}_+(\mathbb{T}^2)$, we content that (M_{z_1}, M_{z_2}) on $\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ is unitarily equivalent to (M_{z_1}, M_{z_2}) on $\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\nu})$ if and only if $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \boldsymbol{\nu}$. To prove this, note that M_{z_1} and M_{z_2} are analytic 2-isometries on $\mathcal{D}(\mu_j)$ and $\mathcal{D}(\nu_j)$ for each $j = 1, 2$. Therefore if U is the unitary (as in the proof of Theorem 4.1) intertwining pair (M_{z_1}, M_{z_2}) on $\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ and the pair (M_{z_1}, M_{z_2}) on $\mathcal{D}^2(\boldsymbol{\nu})$ then $M_{z_1}|_{\mathcal{D}(\mu_1)}$ and $M_{z_1}|_{\mathcal{D}(\nu_1)}$ is intertwined by the unitary map $U|_{\mathcal{D}(\mu_1)}$. Therefore, from [12, Theorem 5.2], it follows that $\mu_1 = \nu_1$. Similarly, one can prove $\mu_2 = \nu_2$.

We conclude this section with the following example which exhibits the importance of Theorem 3.2.

Example 4.3. Let $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{T})$. Consider the space $\mathcal{D}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ as introduced in [3]. We content that the pair (M_{z_1}, M_{z_2}) on $\mathcal{D}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ is a left-inverse commuting pair of analytic 2-isometries.

To see this, we first note that from [3, Corollary 3.8] the pair (M_{z_1}, M_{z_2}) is a toral 2-isometry and hence 2-isometric pair. Note that for any $f \in \mathcal{D}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$, the function $f(0, z_2)$ is in $\mathcal{D}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$, see Lemma 2.4.

Define $g(z_1, z_2) := f(z_1, z_2) - f(0, z_2)$. Note that $g \in \mathcal{D}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ and $\{(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{D}^2 : z_1 = 0\}$ is in the zero set of g . Now using [3, Theorem 2.2], we observe that g/z_1 (this is same as $L_1(f)$, see (27)) is in $\mathcal{D}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$. The operator L_1 serves as a left inverse of M_{z_1} on $\mathcal{D}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$. Rerunning the proof of Theorem 2.24 proves that (M_{z_1}, M_{z_2}) is a left-inverse commuting pair. By Theorem 3.2, the pair (M_{z_1}, M_{z_2}) on $\mathcal{D}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ possess wandering subspace property.

Now we assume that each of μ_1 and μ_2 is normalized Lebesgue measure σ on the circle \mathbb{T} . With the help of the fact that the set of monomials forms an orthogonal basis for $\mathcal{D}(\sigma, \sigma)$, it follows from a simple computation that for any $p \geq 1$ and $q \geq 0$

$$M_{z_1}^*(z_1^p z_2^q) = \frac{p+q+1}{p+q} z_1^{p-1} z_2^q.$$

It helps us to obtain that

$$M_{z_2} M_{z_1}^*(z_1^p z_2^q) = \frac{p+q+1}{p+q} z_1^{p-1} z_2^{q+1} \neq \frac{p+q+2}{p+q+1} z_1^{p-1} z_2^{q+1} = M_{z_1}^* M_{z_2}(z_1^p z_2^q).$$

Therefore, we can conclude that the pair (M_{z_1}, M_{z_2}) on $\mathcal{D}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$, where μ_1 and μ_2 are normalized Lebesgue measures on the circle \mathbb{T} , is not a doubly commuting pair.

Acknowledgements: The first and second named author's research are supported by the DST-INSPIRE Faculty Grant with Fellowship No. DST/INSPIRE/04/2020/001250 and DST/INSPIRE/04/2017/002367 respectively.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Aleman, S. Richter and C. Sundberg, *Beurling's theorem for the Bergman space*, Acta. Math. 177 (1996), 275–310.
- [2] A. Beurling, *On two problems concerning linear transformations in Hilbert space*, Acta. Math. 81 (1949), 239–255.

- [3] S. Bera, S. Chavan, and S. Ghara, *Dirichlet-type spaces of the unit bidisc and toral 2-isometries*, Canadian Journal of Mathematics, (2024), 1–23.
- [4] M. Bhattacharjee, J. Eschmeier, D. K. Keshari, J. Sarkar, *Dilations, wandering subspaces, and inner functions*, Linear Algebra Appl. **523** (2017), 263–280.
- [5] A. Chattopadhyay, B. K. Das, J. Sarkar, and S. Sarkar, *Wandering subspaces of the Bergman space and the Dirichlet space over \mathbb{D}^n* , Integral Equations Operator Theory, **79(4)**, (2014), 567–577.
- [6] O. El-Fallah, K. Kellay, J. Mashreghi, and T. Ransford, *A primer on the Dirichlet space*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (2014).
- [7] P. R. Halmos, *Shifts on Hilbert spaces*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 208 (1961) 102–112.
- [8] V. Mandrekar, *The validity of Beurling theorems in polydiscs*, Proc. Amer. Math.Soc. 103 (1988), 145–148.
- [9] D. Redett and J. Tung, *Invariant subspaces in Bergman space over the bidisc* Proc. Amer Math Soc, 138 (2010) , 2425–2430.
- [10] S. Richter, *Invariant subspaces of the Dirichlet shift*, J. Reine Angew. Math., **386** (1988), 205–220.
- [11] S. Richter, and A. Shields, *Bounded analytic functions in the Dirichlet space*, Math. Z., Mathematische Zeitschrift, **198**, (1988), 151–159.
- [12] S. Richter, *A representation theorem for cyclic analytic two-isometries*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc, **328** (1991), 325–349.
- [13] J. Sarkar, A. Sasane and B. Wick, *Doubly commuting submodules of the Hardy module over polydiscs*, Studia Math. 217 (2013), no 2, 179–192.
- [14] G. D. Taylor, *Multipliers on D_α* , Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, **123**, (1966), 229–240.
- [15] L. Carleson, *A representation formula for the Dirichlet integral*, Math. Z., Mathematische Zeitschrift, **73**, (1960), 190–196.
- [16] L. Brown, and A. Shields, *Cyclic vectors in the Dirichlet space*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, **285**, (1984), 269–303.
- [17] W. Rudin, *Function theory in polydiscs*, W. A. Benjamin, Inc., New York-Amsterdam, 1969, pages vii+188.
- [18] W. Rudin, *Real and Complex Analysis*, Tata McGraw-Hill Education, New York 2006.
- [19] S. Shimorin, *Wold-type decompositions and wandering subspaces for operators close to isometries*, J. Reine Angew. Math., **531**, (2001), 147–189.

(M. Bhattacharjee) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BIRLA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY AND SCIENCE
K K BIRLA GOA CAMPUS, INDIA

(R. Gupta) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
GOA, INDIA

(V. Venugopal) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BIRLA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY AND SCIENCE K
K BIRLA GOA CAMPUS, INDIA