

# HELSON MATRICES INDUCED BY MEASURES

SAMEER CHAVAN, CHAMAN KUMAR SAHU, AND KALYAN B. SINHA

ABSTRACT. We introduce a family of Helson matrices induced by the Laplace transform of a class of regular positive Borel measures  $\mu$ , not necessarily finite, on  $(0, \infty)$  and discuss their boundedness, Schatten-class properties and scattering theory. We also briefly discuss the class of Helson matrices induced by signed measures.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is motivated by the investigations in [4, 10, 11, 12] surrounding the notion of the multiplicative Hankel matrix, commonly known as the Helson matrix. The  $(m, n)$ -th entry of a Helson matrix depends only on the product  $mn$ . The purpose of this work is to discuss basic theory of Helson matrices induced by the Laplace transform of a class of positive measures.

The sets of positive integers and non-negative integers are denoted by  $\mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  respectively, the set  $\{j \in \mathbb{N} : j \geq 2\}$  by  $\mathbb{N}_2$ . Let  $\mathbb{R}$  stand for the set of real numbers. The function  $\ln : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  denotes the natural logarithm. Let  $\mu$  be a regular positive Borel measure on the positive real line  $(0, \infty)$ , and the Laplace transform  $\hat{\mu}$  of  $\mu$  be defined by

$$\hat{\mu}(s) = \int_0^\infty e^{-st} \mu(dt), \quad s \in (0, \infty),$$

whenever the integral converges. If  $\eta$  is Lebesgue measurable and  $\mu$  denotes the weighted Lebesgue measure with weight  $\eta$ , then we set  $\hat{\eta} := \hat{\mu}$ . We reserve the notation  $\text{Leb}$  for the Lebesgue measure on  $(0, \infty)$ . The Hilbert space of square-summable complex-valued sequences  $\{a_j\}_{j=2}^\infty$  is denoted by  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$ . Let  $\{e_n\}_{n=2}^\infty$  denote the standard orthonormal basis of  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$ .

Recall from [4] that the *multiplicative Hilbert matrix* is given by

$$\left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{mn} \ln(mn)} \right)_{m,n=2}^\infty.$$

Motivated by this and related examples (see [11]), we introduce the following family of Helson matrices induced by the Laplace transform of positive measures.

**Definition 1.1.** Let  $\mu$  be a regular positive Borel measure on  $(0, \infty)$  such that  $\int_0^\infty 2^{-t} \mu(dt) < \infty$ . The *Helson matrix*  $H_\mu$  induced by the measure  $\mu$ ,

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 47A55, 47B35; Secondary 44A10, 47A40.

*Key words and phrases.* Helson matrix, Laplace transform, scattering, absolutely continuous spectrum.

with respect to the standard basis  $\{e_n\}_{n=2}^\infty$  in  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$ , is given by

$$H_\mu = \left( \frac{\widehat{\mu}(\ln(mn))}{\sqrt{mn}} \right)_{m,n=2}^\infty. \quad (1.1)$$

**Remark 1.2.** It is worthwhile noting that by the virtue of condition on the measure  $\mu$  and by an application of Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, it follows easily that  $\widehat{\mu}(\ln n) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

The Helson matrix  $H_\mu$  is a densely defined, positive and self-adjoint operator in  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$ , which is not necessarily bounded (Lemma 2.3 and Theorem 2.1(i)). The reader is referred to [4, 10, 11, 12] for the spectral theory of Helson matrices.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, the proofs of the boundedness and compactness of Helson matrices (Theorem 2.1) are given, using the Schur-Holmgren-Carleman estimate, along with illustrations (Examples 2.8-2.11). In Section 3, some characterizations of trace-class and of other Schatten-class properties are discussed (Theorem 3.1). In this section, criteria are given for the densities of measures to lead to compact and trace class Helson matrices (Theorem 3.3). Finally, the Section 4 deals with the use of Scattering theory (of the trace-class perturbations) to make some spectral conclusions about a class of Helson matrices (Theorem 4.4).

## 2. BOUNDEDNESS, COMPACTNESS AND OPERATOR NORM BOUNDS OF $H_\mu$

The main result of this section provides growth conditions in terms of the Laplace transform  $\widehat{\mu}$  leading to the lower and upper bounds for the norm of the Helson matrix  $H_\mu$ .

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $\mu$  be a regular positive Borel measure on  $(0, \infty)$  such that  $\int_0^\infty 2^{-t} \mu(dt) < \infty$ . Then,*

- (i) *if  $\{(\ln n)\widehat{\mu}(\ln n)\}_{n=2}^\infty$  is an unbounded sequence, then  $H_\mu$  is a positive unbounded self-adjoint operator,*
- (ii) *if, for some  $D > 0$ ,*

$$\widehat{\mu}(\ln n) \leq \frac{D}{\ln n}, \quad n \geq 2, \quad (2.1)$$

*then  $\|H_\mu\| \leq D\pi$ ,*

- (iii) *if  $(\ln n)\widehat{\mu}(\ln n) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $H_\mu$  is compact,*
- (iv) *if alongwith (ii), one also has that*

$$\widehat{\mu}(\ln n) \geq \frac{C}{b + \ln n}, \quad n \geq 2 \quad (2.2)$$

*for some  $b \geq 0$  and  $C > 0$ , then  $H_\mu$  is a positive bounded operator on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$  with  $C\pi \leq \|H_\mu\| \leq D\pi$ .*

Note that parts (i) and (iii) of Theorem 2.1 are stated in [11, 12] without a proof. While the paper [4] may have elements of proof for (i), Theorem 2.1 collects these results as well as some other newer ones.

As a consequence of parts (i) and (ii) of Theorem 2.1, we obtain an analog of the equivalence (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (3) of [12, Theorem 5.1]:

**Corollary 2.2.**  *$H_\mu$  is bounded if and only if  $\{(\ln n)\widehat{\mu}(\ln n)\}_{n=2}^\infty$  is bounded.*

In order to understand  $H_\mu$ , we in the spirit of the proof of [11, Theorem 2.2], introduce the linear operator  $\mathcal{N}_\mu$  defined as:

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{N}_\mu) := \left\{ \{x_m\}_{m=2}^\infty \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2) : t \mapsto \sum_{m=2}^\infty x_m m^{-1/2-t} \in L^2((0, \infty), \mu) \right\}$$

and for  $x = \{x_m\}_{m=2}^\infty \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{N}_\mu)$ ,

$$(\mathcal{N}_\mu x)(t) = \sum_{m=2}^\infty x_m m^{-1/2-t}, \quad t > 0.$$

We need the following lemma in the proof of Theorem 2.1.

**Lemma 2.3.**  $\mathcal{N}_\mu$  defines a positive, closed, densely defined operator and the Helson matrix  $H_\mu$  is equal to  $\mathcal{N}_\mu^* \mathcal{N}_\mu$  and therefore a densely defined positive operator in  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$ .

*Proof.* Note that  $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{N}_\mu)$  contains  $\text{span}\{e_n : n \geq 2\}$ , where span stands for the linear span. This implies that  $\mathcal{N}_\mu$  is a densely defined linear operator. We next show that  $\mathcal{N}_\mu$  is closed. To see this, let  $\{f^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{N}_\mu)$  be a sequence such that  $f^{(n)} \rightarrow f$  in  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$  and  $\mathcal{N}_\mu f^{(n)} \rightarrow g$  in  $L^2((0, \infty), \mu)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\left| (\mathcal{N}_\mu f^{(n)})(t) - \sum_{m=2}^\infty f_m m^{-1/2-t} \right| \leq \|f^{(n)} - f\|_2 \sqrt{\zeta(1+2t) - 1}, \quad t > 0,$$

where  $f = \{f_m\}_{m=2}^\infty$  and  $\zeta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^\infty n^{-s}$  is the Riemann zeta function. This yields that  $\mathcal{N}_\mu f^{(n)} \rightarrow \sum_{m=2}^\infty f_m m^{-1/2-t}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  pointwise on  $(0, \infty)$ . Since a subsequence of  $\{\mathcal{N}_\mu f^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$  converges to  $g$  pointwise  $\mu$ -a.e., we get

$$g(t) = \sum_{m=2}^\infty f_m m^{-1/2-t}, \quad \mu\text{-a.e.},$$

and hence,  $f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{N}_\mu)$  and  $\mathcal{N}_\mu f = g$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{N}_\mu$  is a densely defined closed linear operator with domain  $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{N}_\mu)$ . By von Neumann's theorem (see [9, Theorem V.3.24]),

$$\mathcal{N}_\mu^* \mathcal{N}_\mu \text{ is a densely defined positive and self-adjoint operator.} \quad (2.3)$$

If  $H_{\mu, m, n}$  denotes the  $(m, n)$ -th entry of  $H_\mu$ , then for every  $x \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{N}_\mu^* \mathcal{N}_\mu) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{N}_\mu)$ , by Fubini's theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle H_\mu(x), e_n \rangle &= \sum_{m=2}^\infty x_m H_{\mu, m, n} = \int_0^\infty (\mathcal{N}_\mu x)(t) n^{-1/2-t} \mu(dt) \\ &= \langle \mathcal{N}_\mu x, \mathcal{N}_\mu e_n \rangle_{L^2(\mu)} \\ &= \langle \mathcal{N}_\mu^* \mathcal{N}_\mu(x), e_n \rangle, \quad n \geq 2. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that  $H_\mu = \mathcal{N}_\mu^* \mathcal{N}_\mu$  on  $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{N}_\mu^* \mathcal{N}_\mu)$  as the above matricial expression. This combined with (2.3) completes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 2.4.** (i) For  $c \in (0, \infty)$ , let  $\delta_c$  be the point mass measure at  $c$ . For any integer  $n \geq 2$ ,

$$\widehat{\delta}_c(\ln n) = \int_0^\infty n^{-t} \delta_c(dt) = \frac{1}{n^c}.$$

If  $a_c = \{n^{-(\frac{1}{2}+c)}\}_{n=2}^\infty$ , then  $a_c \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$  and  $H_{\delta_c}$  is a rank one positive self-adjoint operator on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$  given by  $x \mapsto \langle x, a_c \rangle a_c$ , and hence, is of trace-class also. Therefore,

$$\|H_{\delta_c}\| = \zeta(1+2c) - 1, \quad c > 0.$$

(ii) As in (i), if  $c = 0$ , then  $\widehat{\delta}_0(\ln n) = 1$  for all integers  $n \geq 2$ . Therefore, the matrix  $H_{\delta_0}$  is given by  $(\frac{1}{\sqrt{mn}})_{m,n=2}^\infty$ . For  $n \in \mathbb{N}_2$ , since

$$H_{\delta_0}e_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{m=2}^\infty \frac{e_m}{\sqrt{m}},$$

it follows that  $H_{\delta_0}e_n \notin \ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$ , and hence  $H_{\delta_0}$  does not even map  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$  into  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$ . Thus, in all our discussion in this article, the measures involved do not have mass at  $\{0\}$ .

The following recalls the Integral test, which is needed to prove Theorem 2.1.

*Integral estimate* [2, Theorem 9.2.6]: *Let  $f : [1, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  be a decreasing function. Then, for any  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ ,  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_2$  and  $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_2 \cup \{\infty\}$  with  $\alpha < \beta$ ,*

$$\int_\alpha^\beta f(t)dt \leq \sum_{k=\alpha}^\beta f(k) \leq \int_{\alpha-\epsilon}^\beta f(t)dt. \quad (2.4)$$

If  $\int_{\alpha-\epsilon}^\infty f(t)dt < \infty$ , then the series  $\sum_{k=\alpha}^\infty f(k)$  converges.

The next proposition gives the Schur-Holmgren-Carleman estimate, which is required to prove Theorem 2.1 (see [8, Theorem 5.2] and [9, Section 1.4.3]). Since we could not find any proof of this classical result in this particular form, its proof is included.

**Proposition 2.5.** *Let  $(a_{m,n})_{m,n=2}^\infty$  be an infinite matrix of complex numbers that defines a linear map in  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$ . Assume that for some sequence  $\{t_n\}_{n=2}^\infty$  of positive real numbers,*

$$M := \sup_{n \geq 2} \frac{1}{t_n} \sum_{m=2}^\infty |a_{n,m}|t_m < \infty \text{ and } \widetilde{M} := \sup_{m \geq 2} \frac{1}{t_m} \sum_{n=2}^\infty |a_{n,m}|t_n < \infty. \quad (2.5)$$

Then,  $(a_{m,n})_{m,n=2}^\infty$  defines a bounded linear operator on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$  and

$$\|(a_{m,n})_{m,n=2}^\infty\| \leq (M\widetilde{M})^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (2.6)$$

for every choice of such sequence.

*Proof.* For  $x = \{x_m\}_{m=2}^\infty \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$ , by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, an application of Fubini's theorem and using (2.5), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=2}^\infty \left| \sum_{m=2}^\infty a_{n,m}x_m \right|^2 &\leq \sum_{n=2}^\infty \left( \sum_{m=2}^\infty |a_{n,m}| |x_m| \right)^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{n=2}^\infty \left( \sum_{m=2}^\infty |a_{n,m}|t_m \right) \left( \sum_{m=2}^\infty \frac{|a_{n,m}| |x_m|^2}{t_m} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\leq M \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} t_n \left( \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \frac{|a_{n,m}| |x_m|^2}{t_m} \right) \\
 &= M \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} |x_m|^2 \left( \frac{1}{t_m} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} |a_{n,m}| t_n \right) \\
 &\leq M \widetilde{M} \|x\|_2^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

This proves the inequality (2.6).  $\square$

**Remark 2.6.** In case,  $(|a_{m,n}|)_{m,n=2}^{\infty}$  is a symmetric matrix, it is clear that  $M = \widetilde{M}$ . Therefore, the operator norm estimate in Proposition 2.5 yields  $\|(a_{m,n})_{m,n=2}^{\infty}\| \leq M$ .

We shall need the following standard result that is derived in [6, Section 9.5], by contour integration in complex analysis.

$$K_{\epsilon} := \int_0^{\infty} \frac{t^{-(\frac{1+\epsilon}{2})}}{1+t} dt = \frac{\pi}{\sin(\frac{\pi(1-\epsilon)}{2})}, \quad 0 < \epsilon < 1. \quad (2.7)$$

*Proof of Theorem 2.1.* (i) Assume that  $\{(\ln n)\widehat{\mu}(\ln n)\}_{n=2}^{\infty}$  is an unbounded sequence. We know by Lemma 2.3 that  $H_{\mu}$  is a positive densely defined self-adjoint operator, so we need to prove only unboundedness. After passing to a subsequence, if necessary, we may assume that for each  $C > 0$ , there exists a positive integer  $N \equiv N(C)$  such that

$$\widehat{\mu}(\ln m) > C(\ln m)^{-1} \text{ for all } m \geq N. \quad (2.8)$$

Now set for such  $N$ , a vector  $x^{(N)} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$  by

$$x_m^{(N)} = \begin{cases} (m \ln m)^{-\frac{1}{2}}, & N \leq m \leq N^4, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Next, for  $m \in \mathbb{N}_2$ ,

$$\langle H_{\mu} x^{(N)}, e_m \rangle = \sum_{n=N}^{N^4} \frac{\widehat{\mu}(\ln(mn)) x_n^{(N)}}{\sqrt{mn}} \stackrel{(2.8)}{>} \frac{C}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{n=N}^{N^4} \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\ln n \ln(mn)}}.$$

Thus, by using (2.4) and letting  $t = \sqrt{\ln x}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \langle x^{(N)}, H_{\mu} x^{(N)} \rangle &> C \sum_{m=N}^{N^4} \frac{1}{m \sqrt{\ln m}} \sum_{n=N}^{N^4} \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\ln n \ln(mn)}} \\
 &\geq C \sum_{m=N}^{N^4} \frac{1}{m \sqrt{\ln m}} \int_N^{N^4} \frac{1}{x \sqrt{\ln x \ln(mx)}} dx \\
 &= 2C \sum_{m=N}^{N^4} \frac{1}{m \sqrt{\ln m}} \int_{\sqrt{\ln N}}^{2\sqrt{\ln N}} \frac{1}{t^2 + \ln m} dt \\
 &= 2C \sum_{m=N}^{N^4} \frac{1}{m \ln m} \left( \tan^{-1} \left( 2\sqrt{\frac{\ln N}{\ln m}} \right) - \tan^{-1} \left( \sqrt{\frac{\ln N}{\ln m}} \right) \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

$$= 2C \sum_{m=N}^{N^4} \frac{1}{m \ln m} \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\frac{\ln N}{\ln m}}}{1 + 2\frac{\ln N}{\ln m}} \right).$$

Next, for any  $N \leq m \leq N^4$ , we have that  $\sqrt{\frac{\ln N}{\ln m}} \geq \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\frac{\ln N}{\ln m} \leq 1$ , and since  $\tan^{-1}(\cdot)$  is an increasing function,

$$\langle x^{(N)}, H_\mu x^{(N)} \rangle \geq 2C \left\{ \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{6} \right) \right\} \sum_{m=N}^{N^4} \frac{1}{m \ln m} = 2C \left\{ \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{6} \right) \right\} \|x^{(N)}\|_2^2.$$

Since  $C > 0$  is arbitrary,  $H_\mu$  is not bounded.

(ii) Let  $\{t_m\}_{m=2}^\infty$  be given by

$$t_m = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m \ln m}}, \quad m \geq 2.$$

Let  $(a_{m,n})_{m,n=2}^\infty$  be a matrix given by

$$a_{m,n} = \frac{\widehat{\mu}(\ln(mn))}{\sqrt{mn}}, \quad m, n \geq 2.$$

We may apply Proposition 2.5 to  $(a_{m,n})_{m,n=2}^\infty$  to conclude that  $H_\mu$  is bounded on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$  with  $\|H_\mu\| \leq D\pi$ . Indeed, by the integral test (see (2.4)),

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\ln n} \sum_{m=2}^\infty \frac{\widehat{\mu}(\ln(mn))}{m\sqrt{\ln m}} &\stackrel{(2.1)}{\leq} D \sum_{m=2}^\infty \frac{\sqrt{\ln n}}{m\sqrt{\ln m} \ln(mn)} \\ &\leq D \int_1^\infty \frac{\sqrt{\ln n}}{x\sqrt{\ln x} \ln(nx)} dx \quad (\text{letting } y = \ln x) \\ &= D \int_0^\infty \frac{\sqrt{\ln n}}{\sqrt{y}(y + \ln n)} dy \quad (\text{letting } z = \sqrt{y}) \\ &= D \int_0^\infty \frac{2\sqrt{\ln n}}{z^2 + \ln n} dz = D\pi. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\sup_{n \geq 2} \sqrt{\ln n} \sum_{m=2}^\infty \frac{\widehat{\mu}(\ln(mn))}{m\sqrt{\ln m}} \leq D\pi.$$

Since  $(a_{m,n})_{m,n=2}^\infty$  is symmetric, by Remark 2.6 and above estimate, it follows that  $H_\mu$  is bounded (in fact, positive) operator on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$  with  $\|H_\mu\| \leq D\pi$ .

(iii) For every  $N \in \mathbb{N}_2$ , define an infinite matrix  $H_\mu^{(N)}$  in  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$  as

$$H_{\mu,m,n}^{(N)} = \begin{cases} H_{\mu,m,n}, & 2 \leq m, n \leq N, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

so that  $H_\mu^{(N)}$  is  $N$ -truncation of  $H_\mu$ . Then,

$$H_{\mu,m,n} - H_{\mu,m,n}^{(N)} = \begin{cases} 0, & 2 \leq m, n \leq N, \\ H_{\mu,m,n}, & \text{if } m \text{ or } n \geq N + 1. \end{cases}$$

Since by hypothesis  $(\ln n)\widehat{\mu}(\ln n) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , it follows that  $\widehat{\mu}(\ln n) \leq D(\ln n)^{-1}$  for some  $D > 0$  and all integers  $n \geq 2$ , and hence  $H_\mu$  (and of course  $H_\mu^{(N)}$  as well) are bounded, by (ii).

As in part (ii) of this theorem, we apply Proposition 2.5 on  $H_\mu - H_\mu^{(N)}$ , using the same auxiliary function  $t_m = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m \ln m}}$  ( $m \geq 2$ ) and note that the hypothesis implies that for arbitrary  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\ln(mn)\widehat{\mu}(\ln mn) < \epsilon$  whenever  $mn > N_0$ . Thus, by Proposition 2.5 and Remark 2.6,

$$\begin{aligned} \|H_\mu - H_\mu^{(N_0)}\| &\leq \sup_{n \geq 2} \frac{1}{t_n} \sum_{\substack{m=2 \\ mn > N_0}}^{\infty} \frac{\widehat{\mu}(\ln(mn))}{\sqrt{mn}} t_m \\ &= \sup_{n \geq 2} \sqrt{\ln n} \sum_{\substack{m=2 \\ mn > N_0}}^{\infty} \frac{\widehat{\mu}(\ln(mn))}{m\sqrt{\ln m}} \\ &\leq \epsilon \sup_{n \geq 2} \sqrt{\ln n} \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m\sqrt{\ln m} \ln(mn)} \end{aligned}$$

(we used here the fact that  $H_{\mu, m, n} - H_{\mu, m, n}^{(N_0)} = 0$  whenever  $mn \leq N_0$ ). Therefore, by following the calculations in (2.9) of part (ii),

$$\|H_\mu - H_\mu^{(N)}\| \leq \|H_\mu - H_\mu^{(N_0)}\| \leq \pi\epsilon$$

for all  $N > N_0$ , which gives that  $\|H_\mu - H_\mu^{(N)}\| \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . On the other hand, it is clear that  $H_\mu^{(N)}$  is compact (in fact, finite rank) for every  $N \in \mathbb{N}_2$  and therefore  $H_\mu$  is compact.

(iv) By part (ii) of this theorem,  $H_\mu$  is bounded on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$  with  $\|H_\mu\| \leq D\pi$ . To see the lower estimate, for  $\epsilon > 0$ , let  $a_\epsilon = \{a_\epsilon(n)\}_{n=2}^\infty$  be a sequence defined by

$$a_\epsilon(n) = n^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\ln n)^{-\left(\frac{1+\epsilon}{2}\right)}, \quad n \geq 2.$$

Note that  $\|a_\epsilon\|_2^2 = \sum_{m=2}^\infty \frac{1}{m(\ln m)^{1+\epsilon}} < \infty$ , and furthermore by (2.4),

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon(\ln 2)^\epsilon} = \int_2^\infty \frac{dx}{x(\ln x)^{1+\epsilon}} \leq \|a_\epsilon\|_2^2 \leq \int_{3/2}^\infty \frac{dx}{x(\ln x)^{1+\epsilon}} = \frac{1}{\epsilon(\ln \frac{3}{2})^\epsilon}.$$

Thus, the lower estimate implies that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \|a_\epsilon\|_2 = +\infty. \quad (2.10)$$

Furthermore, by (2.4) and letting  $t = \frac{b+\ln x}{\ln n}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m=2}^\infty H_{\mu, n, m} a_\epsilon(m) &= \sum_{m=2}^\infty \frac{\widehat{\mu}(\ln(mn)) (\ln m)^{-\left(\frac{1+\epsilon}{2}\right)}}{m} \stackrel{(2.2)}{\geq} C \sum_{m=2}^\infty \frac{(\ln m)^{-\left(\frac{1+\epsilon}{2}\right)}}{m(b+\ln(mn))} \\ &\geq C \int_2^\infty \frac{(\ln x)^{-\left(\frac{1+\epsilon}{2}\right)}}{x(b+\ln(nx))} dx \geq C \int_2^\infty \frac{(b+\ln x)^{-\left(\frac{1+\epsilon}{2}\right)}}{x(b+\ln(nx))} dx \\ &= C(\ln n)^{-\left(\frac{1+\epsilon}{2}\right)} \int_{\frac{b+\ln 2}{\ln n}}^\infty \frac{t^{-\left(\frac{1+\epsilon}{2}\right)}}{t+1} dt, \end{aligned}$$

which together with (2.7) leads to

$$\sum_{m=2}^{\infty} H_{\mu,n,m} a_{\epsilon}(m) \geq C(\ln n)^{-\left(\frac{1+\epsilon}{2}\right)} \left( K_{\epsilon} - \int_0^{\frac{b+\ln 2}{\ln n}} \frac{t^{-\left(\frac{1+\epsilon}{2}\right)}}{1+t} dt \right).$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \left| \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} H_{\mu,n,m} a_{\epsilon}(m) \right|^2 \geq C^2 \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n(\ln n)^{1+\epsilon}} \left( K_{\epsilon} - \frac{2}{1-\epsilon} \left( \frac{b+\ln 2}{\ln n} \right)^{\frac{1-\epsilon}{2}} \right)^2,$$

where we used the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\frac{b+\ln 2}{\ln n}} \frac{t^{-\left(\frac{1+\epsilon}{2}\right)}}{1+t} dt &\leq \int_0^{\frac{b+\ln 2}{\ln n}} t^{-\left(\frac{1+\epsilon}{2}\right)} dt \\ &= \frac{2}{1-\epsilon} \left( \frac{b+\ln 2}{\ln n} \right)^{\frac{1-\epsilon}{2}} \text{ with } \epsilon \in (0, 1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \left| \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} H_{\mu,n,m} a_{\epsilon}(m) \right|^2 \\ &\geq C^2 \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n(\ln n)^{1+\epsilon}} \left( K_{\epsilon}^2 + \frac{4}{(1-\epsilon)^2} \left( \frac{b+\ln 2}{\ln n} \right)^{1-\epsilon} - \frac{4K_{\epsilon}}{(1-\epsilon)} \left( \frac{b+\ln 2}{\ln n} \right)^{\frac{1-\epsilon}{2}} \right) \\ &\geq C^2 \left( K_{\epsilon}^2 \|a_{\epsilon}\|_2^2 + \frac{4(b+\ln 2)^{1-\epsilon} M_1}{(1-\epsilon)^2} - \frac{4K_{\epsilon}(b+\ln 2)^{1-\epsilon} M_2}{(1-\epsilon)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $M_1 = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n(\ln n)^2} < \infty$  and  $M_2 = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n(\ln n)^{3/2}} < \infty$ . Therefore, for  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\frac{\|H_{\mu} a_{\epsilon}\|_2^2}{\|a_{\epsilon}\|_2^2} \geq C^2 \left( K_{\epsilon}^2 + \frac{4(b+\ln 2)^{1-\epsilon} M_1}{(1-\epsilon)^2 \|a_{\epsilon}\|_2^2} - \frac{4K_{\epsilon}(b+\ln 2)^{1-\epsilon} M_2}{(1-\epsilon) \|a_{\epsilon}\|_2^2} \right).$$

Finally, by (2.7) and (2.10), it follows that

$$\|H_{\mu}\|^2 \geq C^2 \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} K_{\epsilon}^2 \stackrel{(2.7)}{=} (C\pi)^2,$$

completing the proof.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.7.** *Let  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$  be two positive measures on  $(0, \infty)$  as in Definition 1.1. For  $r \in [0, 1]$ , let  $\nu_r$  be a convex combination of  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$ , i.e.,*

$$\nu_r(\Delta) = r\mu_1(\Delta) + (1-r)\mu_2(\Delta) \text{ for all Borel sets } \Delta \subseteq (0, \infty). \quad (2.11)$$

If for  $j = 1, 2$ , there exist  $b_j \geq 0$  and constants  $C_j, D_j > 0$  such that

$$\frac{C_j}{b_j + \ln n} \leq \hat{\mu}_j(\ln n) \leq \frac{D_j}{\ln n}, \quad n \geq 2, \quad (2.12)$$

then  $H_{\nu_r}$  is bounded on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$  with  $C\pi \leq \|H_{\nu_r}\| \leq D\pi$  for all  $r \in [0, 1]$ , where  $C = \min\{C_1, C_2\}$  and  $D = \max\{D_1, D_2\}$ .



*Proof.* Note that  $\int_0^\infty 2^{-t} \nu_r(dt) < \infty$  and  $\widehat{\nu}_r(t) = r\widehat{\mu}_1(t) + (1-r)\widehat{\mu}_2(t)$  for all  $t \geq \ln 2$ . If we set  $b = \max\{b_1, b_2\}$ , then by (2.12),

$$\frac{C}{b + \ln n} \leq \widehat{\nu}_r(\ln n) \leq \frac{D}{\ln n}, \quad n \geq 2.$$

This together with Theorem 2.1 completes the proof.  $\square$

An application of Corollary 2.7 provides the precise norm of Helson matrices induced by a convex combination of exponential measures.

**Example 2.8.** Let  $\mu_j(dt) = e^{-a_j t} dt$ , where  $a_j \geq 0$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ), and let  $\nu_r$  be given by (2.11). Then,

$$\frac{1}{\max\{a_1, a_2\} + \ln n} \leq \widehat{\nu}_r(\ln n) \leq \frac{1}{\ln n}, \quad n \geq 2,$$

and hence, by Corollary 2.7,  $H_{\nu_r}$  is bounded on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$  with  $\|H_{\nu_r}\| = \pi$ , independent of any value of  $r \in [0, 1]$ . As special sub-cases,

- (i) if  $\mu_a(dt) = e^{-at} dt$  with  $a \geq 0$ , then  $H_a \equiv H_{\mu_a}$  is bounded with  $\|H_a\| = \pi$  for all  $a > 0$ . However, it should be noted that while  $H_a$  here acts on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$ , a similar matrix

$$\widetilde{H}_a = \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{mn}(a + \ln(mn))} \right)_{m,n=1}^\infty$$

has been considered in [11]. There, it has been shown that  $\widetilde{H}_a$  is bounded on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$  with operator norm, can be greater than  $\pi$  unlike here  $\|H_a\| = \pi$  for all  $a > 0$ . To understand this apparent contradiction, let  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$  be embedded as a subspace of  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ , consider  $x = \{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  be such that  $x_1 \neq 0$  and  $x_n = 0$ ,  $n \geq 2$ . Then,

$$\langle \widetilde{H}_a x, x \rangle = \frac{|x_1|^2}{a} = \frac{\|x\|_2^2}{a},$$

which implies that  $\|\widetilde{H}_a\| \geq \frac{1}{a}$ . Therefore, if  $a \in (0, \pi^{-1})$ , then  $\|\widetilde{H}_a\| > \pi$ , giving that the operator norm is beyond  $\pi$  for certain values of  $a$ . However, for the matrix  $H_a$  (induced by  $e^{-at} dt$ ) in  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$ , the absolutely continuous spectrum is  $[0, \pi]$  and  $\|H_a\| = \pi$ , independent of any  $a > 0$ .

- (ii) if we consider  $\mu(dt) = e^{-at} \cosh(\omega t) dt$  with  $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$  satisfying  $a \geq |\omega|$ , then  $\mu$  may be rewritten as  $(e^{-(a-\omega)t} + e^{-(a+\omega)t}) dt / 2$ , and hence  $\|H_\mu\| = \pi$ .  $\diamond$

**Example 2.9.** (i) For  $\alpha \geq 0$ , let  $\eta_\alpha(t) = \frac{1}{(1+t)^\alpha}$ ,  $t > 0$  and let  $\mu_\alpha(dt) = \eta_\alpha(t) dt$ . Then,  $e^{-\alpha t} \leq \eta_\alpha(t) \leq 1$  on  $(0, \infty)$ , which implies that

$$\frac{1}{\alpha + \ln n} = \int_0^\infty n^{-t} e^{-\alpha t} dt \leq \widehat{\eta}_\alpha(\ln n) \leq \int_0^\infty n^{-t} dt = \frac{1}{\ln n}, \quad n \geq 2. \quad (2.13)$$

Hence,  $\|H_{\mu_\alpha}\| = \pi$  for every  $\alpha \geq 0$ , since  $C = D = 1$  in this example.

- (ii) For  $a, c, p \geq 0$ , consider  $\eta(t) = t^p + ce^{-at}$ ,  $t > 0$ . Then,

$$\widehat{\eta}(\ln n) = \int_0^\infty n^{-t} (t^p + ce^{-at}) dt = \frac{\Gamma(p+1)}{(\ln n)^{p+1}} + \frac{c}{a + \ln n}, \quad n \geq 2, \quad (2.14)$$

which implies that

$$\frac{c}{a + \ln n} \leq \widehat{\eta}(\ln n) \leq \left( \frac{\Gamma(1+p)}{(\ln 2)^p} + c \right) \frac{1}{\ln n}, \quad n \geq 2,$$

where  $\Gamma$  denotes the Gamma function. Hence, the corresponding  $H_\mu$  is bounded on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$  with  $c\pi \leq \|H_\mu\| \leq \left( \frac{\Gamma(1+p)}{(\ln 2)^p} + c \right) \pi$ .  $\diamond$

The following example is one for which the operator norm of  $H_\mu$  is strictly bigger than  $\pi$  unlike many examples discussed above.

**Example 2.10.** Let  $\mu$  be a positive measure such that  $H_\mu$  is bounded on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$ . An obvious lower bound of  $H_\mu$  is given by

$$\|H_\mu\| \geq \langle H_\mu e_2, e_2 \rangle = \frac{\widehat{\mu}(\ln 4)}{2}.$$

In particular, if  $\eta_p(t) = t^p$ ,  $t > 0$  for  $p > 0$ , then, by using (2.14),

$$\|H_{\mu_p}\| \geq \frac{\Gamma(p+1)}{2(\ln 4)^{p+1}}. \quad (2.15)$$

Let  $h(p) := \frac{\Gamma(p+1)}{2(\ln 4)^{p+1}}$ ,  $p > 0$ . Since  $h$  is an increasing function on  $\mathbb{N}_2$ , there exists a positive integer  $p_0$  such that

$$\frac{\Gamma(p+1)}{2(\ln 4)^{p+1}} > \pi, \quad \text{for all integers } p \geq p_0.$$

To obtain the least integer  $p_0$  satisfying this, observe that  $h(5) \approx 8.44$ , which is bigger than  $\pi$ . Also, since  $h(4) \approx 2.43 < \pi$ , the least value of  $p_0$  is exactly 5. This together with (2.15) yields

$$\|H_{\mu_p}\| > \pi \text{ for all integers } p \geq 5.$$

Moreover, since  $(\ln n)\widehat{\mu}_p(\ln n) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , by Theorem 2.1(iii),  $H_{\mu_p}$  is compact on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$ , and as we shall see later in Example 3.4(i) that it is in fact a trace-class operator.  $\diamond$

The next example yields a class of unbounded self-adjoint Helson matrices.

**Example 2.11.** For  $p \in (0, 1)$ , consider the weighted Lebesgue measure  $\mu_p$  with weight function  $\eta_p(t) = t^{-p}$ ,  $t > 0$ . Then,  $\widehat{\eta}_p(t) = \Gamma(1-p)t^{p-1}$  ( $t > 0$ ), which gives that  $(\ln n)\widehat{\eta}_p(\ln n) = \Gamma(1-p)(\ln n)^p \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence, by Theorem 2.1(i),  $H_{\mu_p}$  is an unbounded positive self-adjoint operator.  $\diamond$

For the later use, we show that  $H_\mu$  is a ‘‘superposition’’ of the Helson matrices  $H_{\delta_c}$ ,  $c > 0$  (see Remark 2.4(i)).

**Theorem 2.12.** Let  $\mu$  be a positive measure on  $(0, \infty)$  such that  $H_\mu$  defines a bounded operator on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$ . Then, for every  $x, y \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$ ,

$$\langle H_\mu x, y \rangle = \int_0^\infty \langle H_{\delta_t} x, y \rangle \mu(dt).$$

*Proof.* Note that for  $x = \{x_m\}_{m=2}^\infty$  and  $y = \{y_m\}_{m=2}^\infty$  in  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$ ,

$$\sum_{m,n=2}^\infty \frac{\widehat{\mu}(\ln(mn))}{\sqrt{mn}} |x_m| |y_n| = \langle H_\mu |x|, |y| \rangle \leq \|H_\mu\| \|x\| \|y\| < \infty,$$

where  $|z| = \{|z_m|\}_{m=2}^\infty$  for  $z = \{z_m\}_{m=2}^\infty$ . It now follows from Fubini's theorem that

$$\langle H_\mu x, y \rangle = \int_0^\infty \left( \sum_{m=2}^\infty x_m m^{-t-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \left( \sum_{n=2}^\infty n^{-t-\frac{1}{2}} \overline{y_n} \right) \mu(dt),$$

which is same as  $\int_0^\infty \langle H_{\delta_t} x, y \rangle \mu(dt)$  (see Remark 2.4(i)).  $\square$

**Remark 2.13.** Although, it is possible to realize the Helson matrices  $H_\mu$  as integral operators in the Hardy space of Dirichlet series, our methods use directly the (unitarily equivalent) matrix representation instead, mostly to study spectral properties. As we have seen in Lemma 2.3,  $H_\mu = \mathcal{N}_\mu^* \mathcal{N}_\mu$ , and by the proof of Theorem 2.12,

$$\langle H_\mu x, y \rangle = \int_0^\infty \langle H_{\delta_t} x, y \rangle \mu(dt) = \int_0^\infty \tilde{x}(t) \overline{\tilde{y}(t)} \mu(dt), \quad x, y \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2),$$

where  $\tilde{z}(t) = \sum_{m=2}^\infty z_m m^{-t-\frac{1}{2}}$  for  $z = \{z_m\}_{m=2}^\infty$ . On the other hand, if we look at its dual representation  $\tilde{H}_\mu \equiv \mathcal{N}_\mu \mathcal{N}_\mu^*$  (which as in [11], is unitarily equivalent to  $H_\mu$ , since  $\ker(\mathcal{N}_\mu) = \{0\}$ ), then for  $x, y \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$ ,

$$\langle \tilde{H}_\mu \tilde{x}, \tilde{y} \rangle = \langle \mathcal{N}_\mu^* \tilde{x}, \mathcal{N}_\mu^* \tilde{y} \rangle = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty (\zeta(s+t+1) - 1) \tilde{x}(s) \overline{\tilde{y}(t)} \mu(ds) \mu(dt).$$

### 3. SCHATTEN-CLASS PROPERTIES OF $H_\mu$

Here we study various Schatten  $p$ -class properties of Helson matrices of the type  $H_\mu$ . For definitions of Schatten  $p$ -classes as well as various spectra of a self-adjoint operator (e.g., essential spectrum  $\sigma_{ess}(\cdot)$ , absolutely continuous spectrum  $\sigma_{ac}(\cdot)$ ), the reader is referred to [15, 16].

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $\mu$  be a positive measure on  $(0, \infty)$  such that  $H_\mu$  defines a bounded operator on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$ . Then, the following statements are valid:*

(i)  $H_\mu$  is of trace-class if and only if

$$\sum_{m=2}^\infty \frac{\hat{\mu}(2 \ln m)}{m} < \infty, \quad (3.1)$$

(ii)  $H_\mu$  is of Hilbert-Schmidt class if and only if

$$\sum_{m,n=2}^\infty \left( \frac{\hat{\mu}(\ln(mn))}{\sqrt{mn}} \right)^2 < \infty,$$

(iii) if  $H_\mu$  belongs to the Schatten  $p$ -class for some  $2 < p < \infty$ , then

$$\sum_{n=2}^\infty \left( \sum_{m=2}^\infty \left( \frac{\hat{\mu}(\ln(mn))}{\sqrt{mn}} \right)^2 \right)^{p/2} < \infty, \quad (3.2)$$

(iv) if  $H_\mu$  belongs to the Schatten  $p$ -class for some  $p \in (1, \infty) \setminus \{2\}$ , then

$$\sum_{m=2}^\infty \left( \frac{\hat{\mu}(2 \ln m)}{m} \right)^p < \infty, \quad (3.3)$$

(v) for  $p \in (0, 2) \setminus \{1\}$ , if (3.2) holds or

$$\sum_{m,n=2}^{\infty} \left( \frac{\widehat{\mu}(\ln(mn))}{\sqrt{mn}} \right)^p < \infty, \quad (3.4)$$

then  $H_\mu$  belongs to the Schatten  $p$ -class.

*Proof.* (i) Note that

$$\langle H_\mu e_m, e_n \rangle = \frac{\widehat{\mu}(\ln(mn))}{\sqrt{mn}}, \quad m, n \geq 2, \quad (3.5)$$

and by Lemma 2.3,  $H_\mu$  is positive. Therefore, part (i) now follows from [7, Theorem 4.1].

(ii) For any integer  $m \geq 2$ ,

$$\|H_\mu e_m\|_2^2 = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \left( \frac{\widehat{\mu}(\ln(mn))}{\sqrt{mn}} \right)^2. \quad (3.6)$$

The required conclusion now follows from [7, Theorem 4.2].

(iii) Since any operator in the Schatten  $p$ -class is compact, by (3.6) and [7, Theorem A], we get that  $\{\|H_\mu e_m\|\}_{m=2}^{\infty} \in \ell^p(\mathbb{N}_2)$ , proving (3.2).

(iv) By (3.5), we have that

$$\langle H_\mu e_m, e_m \rangle = \frac{\widehat{\mu}(2 \ln m)}{m}, \quad m \geq 2,$$

which together with the assumption and [7, Theorem 2.7] yields (3.3).

(v) Note that the first assumption implies that  $\{\|H_\mu e_m\|\}_{m=2}^{\infty} \in \ell^p(\mathbb{N}_2)$ , which together with [7, Theorem B] gives the Schatten  $p$ -class of  $H_\mu$ . For the remaining part, note that (3.4) together with (3.5) gives that

$$\sum_{m,n=2}^{\infty} \langle H_\mu e_m, e_n \rangle^p < \infty.$$

Therefore, since  $H_\mu$  is self-adjoint, by [7, Theorem 3.3],  $H_\mu$  is in the Schatten  $p$ -class.  $\square$

**Remark 3.2.** The analytic symbol  $A_{n,\mathbf{a}}$  of  $\mathbf{a} = (a_{m,n})_{m,n=2}^{\infty}$  are the Dirichlet series given by

$$A_{n,\mathbf{a}}(s) = \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} a_{m,n} m^{-s-1/2}, \quad s \in \mathbb{H}_\rho, \quad n \geq 2,$$

(cf. [5]). It is easy to see that for any positive measure  $\mu$ ,  $\{\|A_{n,H_\mu}\|\}_{n=2}^{\infty} \in \ell^p(\mathbb{N}_2)$  if and only if (3.2) holds.

The next result is devoted to studying the Helson matrices induced by weighted Lebesgue measures.

**Theorem 3.3.** Let  $\mu$  be a weighted Lebesgue measure on  $(0, \infty)$  with a continuous positive weight function  $\eta$ . Suppose that either  $\eta(t)$  for  $t \in (0, \infty)$  decreases (or increases respectively) to the right limit  $\eta(0_+)$ .

- (i) Assume furthermore that there exist a positive measurable function  $g$  on  $(0, \infty)$  such that  $\int_0^\infty g(y)e^{-y}dy < \infty$  and that in either of the above mentioned cases,

$$\left| \eta\left(\frac{y}{x}\right) - \eta(0_+) \right| \leq g(y), \quad x \geq \ln 2, \quad y > 0. \quad (3.7)$$

Then,

$$\|H_\mu\| \leq \left( \eta(0_+) + \int_0^\infty g(y)e^{-y}dy \right) \pi.$$

Moreover,  $0 \leq x\hat{\eta}(x) - \eta(0_+) \rightarrow 0$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , (or  $0 \leq \eta(0_+) - x\hat{\eta}(x) \rightarrow 0$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$  respectively),  $H_\mu - \eta(0_+)H_{Leb}$  is compact and  $\sigma_{ess}(H_\mu) = [0, \eta(0_+)\pi]$ ,

- (ii) if in either case above, instead, for some  $p > 0$ , there exist  $D \equiv D(p) > 0$  and a positive measurable function  $g$  on  $(0, \infty)$  such that  $\int_0^\infty y^p g(y)e^{-y}dy < \infty$  and such that

$$\left| \eta\left(\frac{y}{x}\right) - \eta(0_+) \right| \leq D\left(\frac{y}{x}\right)^p g(y), \quad x \geq \ln 2, \quad y > 0, \quad (3.8)$$

then  $H_\mu - \eta(0_+)H_{Leb}$  (or  $\eta(0_+)H_{Leb} - H_\mu$  respectively) is positive and of trace-class.

*Proof.* For any  $x \geq \ln 2$ ,

$$x\hat{\eta}(x) = x \int_0^\infty e^{-tx} \eta(t) dt = \int_0^\infty \eta\left(\frac{y}{x}\right) e^{-y} dy$$

leading to

$$x\hat{\eta}(x) - \eta(0_+) = \int_0^\infty \left( \eta\left(\frac{y}{x}\right) - \eta(0_+) \right) e^{-y} dy, \quad (3.9)$$

where we used the fact that  $\int_0^\infty e^{-y} dy = 1$ . This combined with (3.7) implies that

$$x\hat{\eta}(x) \leq \eta(0_+) + \int_0^\infty g(y)e^{-y} dy, \quad x \geq \ln 2, \quad (3.10)$$

and hence by Theorem 2.1(ii),  $\|H_\mu\| \leq \left( \eta(0_+) + \int_0^\infty g(y)e^{-y} dy \right) \pi$ . In (3.9), choose  $L > 0$  large enough for a given  $\epsilon > 0$  such that

$$\left| \int_L^\infty \left( \eta\left(\frac{y}{x}\right) - \eta(0_+) \right) e^{-y} dy \right| \stackrel{(3.7)}{\leq} \int_L^\infty g(y)e^{-y} dy < \frac{\epsilon}{2}. \quad (3.11)$$

Next, for the compact set  $[0, L]$ , choose  $K_0 \equiv K_0(L, \epsilon)$  such that for  $x > K_0$  and for all  $y \in [0, L]$ ,

$$\left| \eta\left(\frac{y}{x}\right) - \eta(0_+) \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

This together with (3.9) gives that

$$|x\hat{\eta}(x) - \eta(0_+)| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \int_0^L e^{-y} dy + \int_L^\infty g(y)e^{-y} dy \stackrel{(3.11)}{<} \epsilon, \quad x > K_0,$$

implying that  $x(\hat{\eta}(x) - \eta(0_+)\widehat{Leb}(x)) \rightarrow 0$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$  (or  $x(\eta(0_+)\widehat{Leb}(x) - \hat{\eta}(x)) \rightarrow 0$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$  respectively), since  $\widehat{Leb}(x) = x^{-1}$ ,  $x > 0$ . If  $\eta(t) \geq$

$\eta(0_+)$  on  $(0, \infty)$ , then  $\widehat{\eta} - \eta(0_+)\widehat{\text{Leb}}$  is a positive function. Thus, by Theorem 2.1(iii),  $H_\mu - \eta(0_+)H_{\text{Leb}}$  (or  $\eta(0_+)H_{\text{Leb}} - H_\mu$  respectively) is compact, necessarily self-adjoint as well. Therefore, it follows from Weyl's theorem [9, Theorem IV.5.35] and [4, Theorem 1],

$$\sigma_{\text{ess}}(H_\mu) = \sigma_{\text{ess}}(\eta(0_+)H_{\text{Leb}}) = [0, \eta(0_+)\pi],$$

proving (i).

(ii) Note that by (3.9),

$$|x\widehat{\eta}(x) - \eta(0_+)| \stackrel{(3.8)}{\leq} D \int_0^\infty \left(\frac{y}{x}\right)^p g(y)e^{-y} dy = \widetilde{D}x^{-p}, \quad x \geq \ln 2,$$

where  $\widetilde{D} = \int_0^\infty y^p g(y)e^{-y} dy$ . Since  $x\widehat{\text{Leb}}(x) = 1$  for all  $x > 0$ , as in (i),

$$x(\widehat{\eta}(x) - \eta(0_+)\widehat{\text{Leb}}(x)) \leq \widetilde{D}x^{-p}, \quad p > 0, \quad x \geq \ln 2,$$

(or  $x(\eta(0_+)\widehat{\text{Leb}}(x) - \widehat{\eta}(x)) \leq \widetilde{D}x^{-p}$  respectively). If  $\eta(t) \geq \eta(0_+)$  on  $(0, \infty)$ , then  $\widehat{\eta} - \eta(0_+)\widehat{\text{Leb}}$  is a positive function, and

$$(\widehat{\eta} - \eta(0_+)\widehat{\text{Leb}})(\ln n) \leq \frac{\widetilde{D}}{(\ln n)^{p+1}}, \quad n \geq 2,$$

which implies that

$$\sum_{n=2}^\infty \frac{(\widehat{\eta} - \eta(0_+)\widehat{\text{Leb}})(2 \ln n)}{n} \leq \widetilde{D} \sum_{n=2}^\infty \frac{1}{n(2 \ln n)^{p+1}} < \infty.$$

Thus, by Theorem 3.1(i),  $H_\mu - \eta(0_+)H_{\text{Leb}}$  is positive and of trace-class (or  $\eta(0_+)H_{\text{Leb}} - H_\mu$  is positive and of trace-class respectively).  $\square$

Here are some special instances of Theorem 3.3.

**Example 3.4.** (i) For  $\eta(t) = t^p$ ,  $\eta(0_+) = 0$  and

$$\left| \eta\left(\frac{y}{x}\right) - \eta(0_+) \right| = \left(\frac{y}{x}\right)^p.$$

Applying Theorem 3.3 with  $g = 1$  gives that  $H_\mu$  is positive and of trace-class.

(ii) For  $\eta(t) = \ln(1+t)$ ,  $\eta(0_+) = 0$  and

$$\left| \eta\left(\frac{y}{x}\right) - \eta(0_+) \right| = \ln\left(1 + \frac{y}{x}\right) \leq \frac{y}{x}, \quad y, x > 0.$$

Therefore,  $H_\mu$  is positive and of trace-class.

(iii) For  $\eta(t) = e^{at^p}$  with  $a > 0$  and  $p \in (0, 1)$ , we have that  $\eta(0_+) = 1$  and

$$\eta\left(\frac{y}{x}\right) - 1 = a\left(\frac{y}{x}\right)^p \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{\left(a\left(\frac{y}{x}\right)^p\right)^k}{(k+1)!} \leq a\left(\frac{y}{x}\right)^p e^{a\left(\frac{y}{\ln 2}\right)^p}, \quad x \geq \ln 2,$$

and hence

$$\int_0^\infty y^p e^{a\left(\frac{y}{\ln 2}\right)^p} e^{-y} dy < \infty,$$

since  $p < 1$ , and thus by Theorem 3.3(ii),  $H_\mu - H_{\text{Leb}}$  is of trace-class.

(iv) For a non-negative continuous function  $h$  on  $(0, \infty)$ , let  $\mu$  be the positive measure given by  $\mu(dt) = e^{-h(t)}dt$ . Assume that  $h$  increases (or decreases respectively) to the right limit  $h(0_+)$ , and satisfies

$$h\left(\frac{y}{x}\right) - h(0_+) \leq D\left(\frac{y}{x}\right)^p \text{ for } p > 0$$

(or  $h(0_+) - h\left(\frac{y}{x}\right) \leq D\left(\frac{y}{x}\right)^p$  respectively). Then, the corresponding  $\eta$  decreases (or increases respectively), and

$$0 < \eta(0_+) - \eta\left(\frac{y}{x}\right) \leq h\left(\frac{y}{x}\right) - h(0_+) \leq D\left(\frac{y}{x}\right)^p.$$

Since  $\int_0^\infty y^p e^{-y} dy < \infty$ , by Theorem 3.3(ii), it follows that  $e^{-h(0_+)}H_{\text{Leb}} - H_\mu$  (or  $H_\mu - e^{-h(0_+)}H_{\text{Leb}}$ ) is positive and of trace-class. As a special case, one may take  $h(t) = at$  with  $a > 0$ , then  $H_{\text{Leb}} - H_\mu$  is positive and of trace-class.

(v) For  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\eta_m(t) = (1+t)^m$ . Then,  $\eta_m(0_+) = 1$  and for  $x \geq \ln 2$ ,

$$\eta_m\left(\frac{y}{x}\right) - 1 = \sum_{k=1}^m \binom{m}{k} \left(\frac{y}{x}\right)^k \leq (\ln 2)^{1-m} \left(\frac{y}{x}\right) \sum_{k=1}^m \binom{m}{k} y^{k-1}.$$

If  $g_m(y) = \sum_{k=1}^m \binom{m}{k} y^{k-1}$ , then  $\int_0^\infty y g_m(y) e^{-y} dy < \infty$ , and consequently,  $H_{\mu_m} - H_{\text{Leb}}$  is positive and of trace-class.  $\diamond$

We have so far looked at Helson matrices induced by positive measures via the Laplace transform as far as the trace-class property is concerned. Recall that two positive measures  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$  on  $(0, \infty)$  need not be necessarily comparable in the sense that neither  $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2$  nor  $\mu_2 \leq \mu_1$ . Therefore, we next study trace-class property of Helson matrices induced by signed measures on  $(0, \infty)$ .

For a Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}((0, \infty))$ , let  $\mu : \mathcal{B}((0, \infty)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a signed regular Borel measure. By the Hahn decomposition theorem (see [13, Section 17.2]),

$$\mu(\Delta) = \mu_+(\Delta) - \mu_-(\Delta), \quad \Delta \in \mathcal{B}((0, \infty)),$$

where  $\mu_+$  and  $\mu_-$  are the positive and negative parts of  $\mu$  having disjoint support. The *total variation*  $|\mu|(\cdot)$  of a measure  $\mu$  is given by

$$|\mu|(\Delta) = \mu_+(\Delta) + \mu_-(\Delta), \quad \Delta \in \mathcal{B}((0, \infty)).$$

In the rest of this section, we assume that  $\int_0^\infty 2^{-t} |\mu|(dt) < \infty$ . Then,  $|\widehat{\mu}(\ln n)| \leq \widehat{|\mu|}(\ln 2) < \infty$  for all integers  $n \geq 2$ .

**Theorem 3.5.** *Let  $\mu : \mathcal{B}((0, \infty)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a signed measure and assume that  $H_{|\mu|}$  is bounded on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$ . Then,  $H_\mu$  is a bounded self-adjoint operator such that  $H_\mu \leq H_{|\mu|}$ . If furthermore*

$$\sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \frac{\widehat{|\mu|}(2 \ln m)}{m} < \infty, \quad (3.12)$$

then  $H_\mu$  is of trace-class.

*Proof.* Since  $\widehat{|\mu|} = \widehat{\mu}_+ + \widehat{\mu}_-$ , we get  $H_{|\mu|} = H_{\mu_+} + H_{\mu_-}$ , and hence by the assumption,  $H_{\mu_\pm}$  are defined everywhere on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$ . Also, since  $H_{\mu_\pm}$  are positive (see Lemma 2.3) and  $\langle H_{\mu_\pm} x, x \rangle \leq \|H_{|\mu|}\|$  for all  $x \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$  with  $\|x\| = 1$ ,  $H_{\mu_\pm}$  are bounded, and hence  $H_\mu = H_{\mu_+} - H_{\mu_-}$  is a bounded

self-adjoint operator on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$ . Also, for  $x = \{x_m\}_{m=2}^\infty \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$ , by Theorem 2.12,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle H_\mu x, x \rangle &= \int_0^\infty \left| \sum_{m=2}^\infty x_m m^{-t-1/2} \right|^2 \mu(dt) \\ &\leq \int_0^\infty \left| \sum_{m=2}^\infty x_m m^{-t-1/2} \right|^2 d|\mu|(t) \\ &= \langle H_{|\mu|} x, x \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $H_\mu \leq H_{|\mu|}$ . To see the remaining part, recall from [16, Proposition 3.6.5] that if  $A$  is a bounded linear operator on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , then

$$\|A\|_1 = \sup \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^\infty \langle A f_n, h_n \rangle : \{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty, \{h_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \text{ are orthonormal sets in } \mathcal{H} \right\}.$$

Let  $\{f_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  and  $\{h_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  be orthonormal sets in  $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}_2)$ , and let  $a_t = \{m^{-1/2-t}\}_{m=2}^\infty$  for all  $t > 0$ . By Theorem 2.12, for any integer  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$\langle H_\mu f_n, h_n \rangle = \int_0^\infty \langle f_n, a_t \rangle \langle a_t, h_n \rangle \mu(dt),$$

so that by Fubini's theorem and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^\infty |\langle H_\mu f_n, h_n \rangle| &\leq \int_0^\infty \sum_{n=1}^\infty |\langle f_n, a_t \rangle \langle a_t, h_n \rangle| d|\mu|(t) \\ &\leq \int_0^\infty \|a_t\|_2^2 d|\mu|(t) \\ &= \int_0^\infty \left( \sum_{m=2}^\infty m^{-1-2t} \right) d|\mu|(t) \\ &= \sum_{m=2}^\infty \frac{\widehat{|\mu|}(2 \ln m)}{m}, \end{aligned}$$

which, by (3.12), is finite. This shows that  $\|H_\mu\|_1 < \infty$ , completing the proof.  $\square$

**Example 3.6.** For  $p > 0$ , let  $\eta(t) = t^p \sin(t)$ . Then,  $\mu$  is a non-positive infinite measure and  $\mu(dt) = \mu_+(dt) - \mu_-(dt)$ , where  $\mu_\pm$  are positive measures given by  $\mu_\pm(dt) = t^p \max\{\pm \sin(t), 0\}$ . Thus, it follows that  $|\mu|(dt) = \mu_+(dt) + \mu_-(dt) = t^p |\sin(t)| dt$ , and since  $|\sin t| \leq 1$  for all  $t > 0$ , by (2.14), we have that

$$\sum_{m=2}^\infty \frac{\widehat{|\mu|}(2 \ln m)}{m} \leq \sum_{m=2}^\infty \frac{t^p(2 \ln m)}{m} = \frac{\Gamma(p+1)}{2^{p+1}} \sum_{m=2}^\infty \frac{1}{m(\ln m)^{p+1}} < \infty.$$

Therefore by Theorem 3.5,  $H_\mu$  is of trace-class. Similarly, if  $\eta(t) = t^p \cos(t)$ , then the associated  $H_\mu$  is also of trace-class.  $\diamond$



## 4. SCATTERING BETWEEN TWO HELSON MATRICES

One of the aims here is to study some spectral properties of Helson matrices induced by a measure  $\mu$ . The scattering theory offers one possible avenue for doing so. For that purpose, the following two propositions collect a few results from scattering theory (e.g., [1], [9], [14, Propositions 1-3]).

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  be two (possibly unbounded) self-adjoint operators on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  and let  $P_{ac}(H_j)$  be the projections onto the absolutely continuous part of the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  with respect to  $H_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ .*

(i) *Set the wave operators,*

$$\Omega_{\pm}(H_2, H_1) = s\text{-}\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} e^{itH_2} e^{-itH_1} P_{ac}(H_1),$$

*if they exist. Then the operators  $\Omega_{\pm}(H_2, H_1)$  are partial isometries with initial space  $P_{ac}(H_1)\mathcal{H}$  and final ranges  $R(\Omega_{\pm}(H_2, H_1)) \subseteq P_{ac}(H_2)\mathcal{H}$ . Furthermore,  $\Omega_{\pm}(H_2, H_1)$  maps the domain  $\mathcal{D}(H_1)$  of  $H_1$  onto the domain  $\mathcal{D}(H_2)$  of  $H_2$  and*

$$H_2 \Omega_{\pm}(H_2, H_1) = \Omega_{\pm}(H_2, H_1) H_1 \quad \text{on } \mathcal{D}(H_1).$$

(ii) *(Chain rule) Let  $H_j$  ( $j = 1, 2, 3$ ) be three (possibly unbounded) self-adjoint operators and assume furthermore that the wave operators  $\Omega_{\pm}(H_3, H_2)$  and  $\Omega_{\pm}(H_2, H_1)$  exist. Then,  $\Omega_{\pm}(H_3, H_1)$  exist and*

$$\Omega_{\pm}(H_3, H_1) = \Omega_{\pm}(H_3, H_2) \Omega_{\pm}(H_2, H_1).$$

(iii) *(Completeness) The wave operators  $\Omega_{\pm}(H_2, H_1)$  are said to be complete if*

$$\text{Range}(\Omega_+(H_2, H_1)) = \text{Range}(\Omega_-(H_2, H_1)) = P_{ac}(H_2)\mathcal{H},$$

*and in such a case,  $H_{2,ac}$  is unitarily equivalent to  $H_{1,ac}$ . These wave operators are complete if and only if  $\Omega_{\pm}(H_1, H_2)$  exist and in such a case,  $\Omega_{\pm}(H_1, H_2) = \Omega_{\pm}(H_2, H_1)^*$ .*

The next set of propositions gives the trace-class criterion for ensuring the existence and completeness of a pair of self-adjoint operators due to Kato-Birman-Rosenblum (see [3], [9] and [14, Theorem XI.8]).

**Proposition 4.2.** (i) *Let  $H_j$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ) be two (possibly unbounded) self-adjoint operators such that  $H_2 - H_1$  is of trace class. Then,  $\Omega_{\pm}(H_2, H_1)$  exist and are complete. Furthermore,  $H_{2,ac}$  is unitarily equivalent to  $H_{1,ac}$ , and  $\sigma_{ac}(H_1) = \sigma_{ac}(H_2)$ .*

(ii) *Let  $H_j$  ( $j = 1, 2, 3$ ) be three (possibly unbounded) self-adjoint operators such that  $H_3 - H_2$  and  $H_2 - H_1$  both are of trace-class. Then, all the three wave operators  $\Omega_{\pm}(H_3, H_2)$ ,  $\Omega_{\pm}(H_2, H_1)$  and  $\Omega_{\pm}(H_3, H_1)$  exist and are complete, and furthermore,*

$$\Omega_{\pm}(H_3, H_1) = \Omega_{\pm}(H_3, H_2) \Omega_{\pm}(H_2, H_1),$$

*or, equivalently,  $\Omega_{\pm}(H_3, H_2) = \Omega_{\pm}(H_3, H_1) \Omega_{\pm}(H_2, H_1)^*$ . Also,  $H_{j,ac}$  ( $j = 1, 2, 3$ ) are mutually unitarily equivalent.*

**Remark 4.3.** Clearly, Proposition 4.2(ii) is a consequence of Proposition 4.1 and Proposition 4.2(i). It is obvious that if  $H_3 - H_2$  and  $H_2 - H_1$  both are of trace class, then  $H_3 - H_1$  is also of trace-class and by Proposition 4.2(i),

$\Omega_{\pm}(H_3, H_1)$  will exist and be complete. Its importance in our context lies in the facts that for Helson matrices, the condition for verifying the trace-class property would need the positivity of the difference operators (see Theorem 3.1(i)). However, in some situations, this issue can also be addressed directly (see Theorem 3.5).

The next theorem considers a class of Helson matrices where the above two propositions can be applied.

**Theorem 4.4.** (i) *Let  $\mu_j$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ) be two Borel measures on  $(0, \infty)$  with  $\text{Leb}$  denoting the Lebesgue measure. Furthermore, let  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$  be absolutely continuous with respect to  $\text{Leb}$  and with densities  $\eta_j$  satisfying the condition in Theorem 3.3(ii), and  $\eta_j(0_+) > 0$  for  $j = 1, 2$ . If we set  $H_j$  as the corresponding Helson matrix  $H_{\mu_j}$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ) and set  $H_0 = H_{\text{Leb}}$ , then  $H_1 - \eta_1(0_+)H_0$  and  $H_2 - \eta_2(0_+)H_0$  are of trace-class.*

(ii) *Both the wave operators  $\Omega_{\pm}(H_1, \eta_1(0_+)H_0)$  and  $\Omega_{\pm}(H_2, \eta_2(0_+)H_0)$  exist and are complete. If furthermore  $\eta_1(0_+) = \eta_2(0_+) = \gamma > 0$ , then  $\Omega_{\pm}(H_2, H_1)$  exist, are complete and*

$$\Omega_{\pm}(H_2, H_1) = \Omega_{\pm}(H_2, \gamma H_0)\Omega_{\pm}(H_1, \gamma H_0)^*.$$

Moreover,  $\sigma_{ac}(H_j) = [0, \gamma\pi]$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ .

*Proof.* For  $j = 1, 2$ , since

$$\left| \eta_j\left(\frac{y}{x}\right) - \eta_j(0_+) \right| \leq D(p)\left(\frac{y}{x}\right)^p g(y), \quad y > 0, \quad x > K > 0$$

with  $\int_0^{\infty} g(y)e^{-y} dy < \infty$ , part (i) follows from Theorem 3.3(ii). The first part of (ii) follows from Proposition 4.2(i), and since  $\eta_1(0_+) = \eta_2(0_+)$ , the second part follows from Proposition 4.2(ii). Finally, it also follows from Proposition 4.2(ii) that  $H_{j,ac}$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ) are unitarily equivalent to  $\gamma H_0$  implying that

$$\sigma_{ac}(H_j) = \sigma(\gamma H_0) = \gamma \sigma_{ac}(H_0) = [0, \gamma\pi], \quad j = 1, 2,$$

as by [11, Theorem 1.1],  $H_0$  is spectrally absolutely continuous.  $\square$

**Remark 4.5.** Since any densities  $\eta_j$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ) given in Example 3.4(iii)-(v) satisfy  $\eta_j(0_+) = 1$ , as a consequence of Theorem 4.4, we get that  $H_{\mu_j,ac}$  is unitarily equivalent to  $H_{\text{Leb}}$ . However, in Example 3.4(i)&(ii), if we consider  $\eta(t) = 1 + t^p$  or  $1 + \ln(1 + t)$ , then the corresponding  $H_{\mu,ac}$  will be unitarily equivalent to  $H_{\text{Leb}}$ .

Even when we do not have  $\mu_1 - \mu_2 \geq 0$  or  $\mu_2 - \mu_1 \geq 0$ , we see that  $H_{\text{Leb}}$  plays a central role in identifying the absolutely continuous spectra for certain choices of  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$ .

**Example 4.6.** For  $j = 1, 2$ , let  $\mu_j(dt) = (1 + t^{p_j})dt$  be such that  $p_j > 0$ . Note that neither  $\mu_1 - \mu_2 \geq 0$  nor  $\mu_2 - \mu_1 \geq 0$ . Since  $\mu_j(dt) - \text{Leb} = t^{p_j} dt$ , by Example 3.4(i),  $H_{\mu_j} - H_{\text{Leb}}$  is of trace-class. By Proposition 4.2(i),

$$\Omega_{\pm}(H_{\mu_j}, H_{\text{Leb}}) = \text{s-}\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} e^{iH_{\mu_j}t} e^{-iH_{\text{Leb}}t}, \quad j = 1, 2$$

exist and are complete. Therefore,  $H_{\mu_j,ac}$  is unitarily equivalent to  $H_{\text{Leb}}$ . Furthermore, by Proposition 4.1(ii), we get that

$$\Omega_{\pm}(H_{\mu_1}, H_{\mu_2}) = \Omega_{\pm}(H_{\mu_1}, H_{\text{Leb}})\Omega_{\pm}(H_{\mu_2}, H_{\text{Leb}})^*.$$

This happens though the measures  $\mu_1(dt) = (1 + t_1^p)dt$  and  $\mu_2(dt) = (1 + t_2^p)dt$ , which have no domination between each other. In fact, even if  $p_1 < p_2$ ,  $t_1^p$  will compare differently with  $t_2^p$  depending on if  $t < 1$  or  $t > 1$ .  $\diamond$

**Example 4.7.** Let  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$  be two positive measures on  $(0, \infty)$  such that  $\mu_1 - \mu_2$  is a positive measure. Suppose that there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $\mu_1|_{[0, \epsilon)} = \mu_2|_{[0, \epsilon)}$ . Then, for any integer  $m \geq 2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mu_1 - \mu_2}(2 \ln m) &= \int_{\epsilon}^{\infty} m^{-2t} d(\mu_1 - \mu_2)(t) \leq m^{-\epsilon} \int_{\epsilon}^{\infty} m^{-t} d(\mu_1 - \mu_2)(t) \\ &\leq m^{-\epsilon} \int_{\epsilon}^{\infty} 2^{-t} d(\mu_1 - \mu_2)(t), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that (3.1) is satisfied, and hence by Theorem 3.1(i),  $H_{\mu_1} - H_{\mu_2}$  is a trace-class operator. Therefore, by Proposition 4.2(i),  $\Omega_{\pm}(H_{\mu_1}, H_{\mu_2})$  exist, are complete and  $\sigma_{ac}(H_{\mu_1}) = \sigma_{ac}(H_{\mu_2})$ . As a special case, if  $\mu(dt) = \text{Leb}|_{[0,1)} + e^{-at}dt|_{[1, \infty)}$ , then  $\text{Leb} - \mu$  is positive and  $\text{Leb}|_{[0,1)} = \mu|_{[0,1)}$ , which implies that  $H_{\text{Leb}} - H_{\mu}$  is of trace class. Therefore,  $\sigma_{ac}(H_{\mu}) = [0, \pi]$  as  $\sigma_{ac}(H_{\text{Leb}}) = [0, \pi]$ .  $\diamond$

*Acknowledgment:* The second author (CKS) thanks both the Indian Statistical Institute, Bangalore and the Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay for having facilitated his visits to interact with the third author (KBS) to carry out this project. The third author acknowledges support from the Senior Scientist Scheme of the Indian National Science Academy.

## REFERENCES

- [1] W. Amrein, J. Jauch and K. B. Sinha, *Scattering theory in quantum mechanics. Physical principles and mathematical methods*. Lecture Notes and Supplements in Physics, No. 16. W. A. Benjamin, Inc., Reading, Mass.-London-Amsterdam, 1977. xxiii+691 pp.
- [2] R. G. Bartle and D. R. Sherbert, *Introduction to real analysis*, John Wiley and sons, New York, 2000.
- [3] M. S. Birman, A criterion for existence of wave operators, *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.* **27** (1963), 883–906.
- [4] O. F. Brevig, K.-M. Perfekt, K. Seip, A. G. Siskakis, and D. Vukotić, The multiplicative Hilbert matrix, *Adv. Math.* **302** (2016), 410-432.
- [5] S. Chavan and C. K. Sahu, Quasi-Invariance of the Dirichlet Series Kernels, Analytic Symbols and Homogeneous Operators, *J Geom Anal* **33** (2023), Paper No. 365, 29 pp.
- [6] P. Duren, *Invitation to classical analysis*, Pure and Applied Undergraduate Texts, 17. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012.
- [7] B. Hu, L. H. Khoi and K. Zhu, Frames and operators in Schatten classes, *Houston J. Math.* **41** (2015), 1191-1219.
- [8] P. R. Halmos and V. S. Sunder, *Bounded integral operators on  $L^2$  spaces*, Vol. 96. Springer Science & Business Media (2012).
- [9] T. Kato, *Perturbation theory for linear operators*, Reprint of the 1980 edition. Classics in Mathematics, xxii+619 pp. Springer, Berlin (1995).
- [10] N. Miheisi and A. Pushnitski, A Helson matrix with explicit eigenvalue asymptotics, *J. Funct. Anal.* **275** (2018), 967-987.
- [11] K.-M. Perfekt and A. Pushnitski, On the spectrum of the multiplicative Hilbert matrix, *Ark. Mat.* **56** (2018), 163-183.
- [12] K.-M. Perfekt and A. Pushnitski, On Helson matrices: moment problems, non-negativity, boundedness, and finite rank, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* **116** (2018), 101-134.
- [13] H. Royden and P. M. Fitzpatrick, *Real analysis*, China Machine Press, 2010.
- [14] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of modern mathematical physics. III. Scattering theory*. Academic Press, New York-London, 1979. xv+463 pp.

- [15] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of modern mathematical physics. I. Functional analysis*. Second edition. Academic Press, Inc., New York, 1980. xv+400 pp.
- [16] B. Simon, *Operator theory. A Comprehensive Course in Analysis, Part 4*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2015. xviii+749 pp.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
KANPUR, INDIA

*Email address:* `chavan@iitk.ac.in`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY BOMBAY, POWAI,  
MUMBAI, 400076, INDIA

*Email address:* `chamanks@math.iitb.ac.in`, `sahuchaman9@gmail.com`

J. N. CENTRE FOR ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH, JAKKUR, BANGALORE 560064,  
INDIA, AND INDIAN STATISTICAL INSTITUTE, INDIA

*Email address:* `kbs@jncasr.ac.in`