

ON TOEPLITZ OPERATORS ON  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ 

CARLO BELLAVITA AND MARCO M. PELOSO

ABSTRACT. In this paper we consider Toeplitz operators with anti-analytic symbols on  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ . It is well known that there are no bounded Toeplitz operators  $T_{\bar{\Theta}}: H^1(\mathbb{C}^+) \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ , where  $\Theta \in H^\infty(\mathbb{C}^+)$ . We consider the subspace  $H_{\bar{\Theta}}^1 = \{f \in H^1(\mathbb{C}^+): \int_{\mathbb{R}} f \bar{\Theta} = 0\}$  and show that it is natural to study the boundedness of  $T_{\bar{\Theta}}: H_{\bar{\Theta}}^1 \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ . We provide several different conditions equivalent to such boundedness. We prove that when  $\Theta = e^{i\tau(\cdot)}$ , with  $\tau > 0$ ,  $T_{\bar{\Theta}}: H_{\bar{\Theta}}^1 \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$  is bounded. Finally, we discuss a number of related open questions.

## INTRODUCTION

Let  $\mathbb{D}$  be the unit disk and  $\mathbb{C}^+$  the upper half-plane in  $\mathbb{C}$ . For  $p \in (0, \infty]$ , let  $H^p(\mathbb{D})$  and  $H^p(\mathbb{C}^+)$  denote the Hardy spaces on  $\mathbb{D}$  and  $\mathbb{C}^+$ , resp. We write  $H^p$  to denote either the space on  $\mathbb{D}$  or  $\mathbb{C}^+$ . Functions in  $H^p$  admits non-tangential boundary values on  $\mathbb{T}$  or on  $\mathbb{R}$ , whichever is appropriate. Given a function  $f \in H^p$ , as customary, we denote by  $f$  also its boundary-value function. The mappings  $H^p(\mathbb{D}) \ni f \mapsto f \in L^p(\mathbb{T})$ , and  $H^p(\mathbb{C}^+) \ni f \mapsto f \in L^p(\mathbb{R})$  are isometries, where the measure on  $\mathbb{T}$  is the normalized Lebesgue measure. Thus, functions in  $H^p$  can be identified with their boundary value functions. We also consider the spaces of anti-analytic functions  $\overline{H^p}$ , both in  $\mathbb{D}$  and  $\mathbb{C}^+$ . Notice that  $H^p(\mathbb{C}^+) \cap \overline{H^p}(\mathbb{C}^+) = \{0\}$ , while  $H^p(\mathbb{D}) \cap \overline{H^p}(\mathbb{D}) = \text{span}\{1\}$ .

When  $p = 2$ ,  $H^2$  is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space, and also a closed subspace of  $L^2(\mathbb{T})$  and  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ , resp. We denote by  $P_+$  the orthogonal projection from  $L^2$  onto  $H^2$ , and by  $P_-$  the orthogonal projection from  $L^2$  onto  $\overline{H^2}$ , in both the cases of  $\mathbb{D}$  and  $\mathbb{C}^+$ .

The *Toeplitz operator* with symbol  $\varphi$  is defined as

$$T_\varphi: H^2 \ni f \mapsto P_+(\varphi f) \in H^2,$$

whenever it is well defined, while the *Hankel operator* with symbol  $\varphi$  is defined as

$$H_\varphi: H^2 \ni f \mapsto P_-(\varphi f) \in \overline{H^2}.$$

---

*Date:* March 11, 2025.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 47B35, 30H10.

*Key words and phrases.* Toeplitz operator, Hardy space,  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ , half-plane.

The authors are members of Gruppo Nazionale per l'Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e le loro Applicazioni (GNAMPA) of Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (INdAM). The first author was partially supported by PID2021-123405NB-I00 by the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación. He wishes to thank for the support provided. The second author was partially supported by the 2022 INdAM-GNAMPA project Holomorphic Functions in One and Several Complex Variables (CUP E55F22000270001). He wishes to thank GNAMPA for the support provided.

It is well known that  $T_\varphi: H^2 \rightarrow H^2$  is bounded if and only if  $\varphi \in L^\infty$ , while  $H_\varphi: H^2 \rightarrow \overline{H^2}$  is bounded if and only if  $\varphi \in \text{BMO}$ , see e.g. [16, Part B] for these results, and also Section 1 for the definition of BMO. The above mentioned results extend to the case of  $H^p$ , for  $p \in (1, \infty)$ , see [11]. In the case  $p = 1$  on the unit disk, S. Janson, J. Peetre and S. Semmes in [11] showed that the Toeplitz operator  $T_\varphi: H^1(\mathbb{D}) \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{D})$  is bounded if and only if  $\varphi$  belongs to  $L^\infty(\mathbb{T}) \cap \text{LMO}(\mathbb{T})$ , where  $\text{LMO}(\mathbb{T})$  is a log-BMO type space, see Section 2. In the same article Janson, Peetre and Semmes pointed out that in the case of  $\mathbb{C}^+$  there are no bounded Toeplitz operator  $T_{\overline{\Theta}}: H^1(\mathbb{C}^+) \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ , when  $\Theta \in H^\infty$ .

In this paper we consider the problem of the boundedness of Toeplitz operators on  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ . We show that the correct question is to consider the Toeplitz operators defined only on a (closed) subspace of  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ , defined in the terms of the symbol of the Toeplitz operator. Then, we restrict our attention to anti-analytic symbols  $\overline{\Theta}$ , where  $\Theta \in H^\infty(\mathbb{C}^+)$  and we denote by  $H_{\overline{\Theta}}^1$  the closed subspace of  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ , given by  $H_{\overline{\Theta}}^1 = \{f \in H^1(\mathbb{C}^+): \int f \overline{\Theta} = 0\}$ , to which we restrict the Toeplitz operator  $T_{\overline{\Theta}}$ . We provide some conditions that are equivalent to the boundedness of  $T_{\overline{\Theta}}: H_{\overline{\Theta}}^1 \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ , Theorem 1.3. The final main result is Theorem 1.4 in which we prove that  $T_{\overline{\Theta}}: H_{\overline{\Theta}}^1 \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$  is bounded when  $\Theta = e^{i\tau(\cdot)}$ , with  $\tau > 0$ .

## 1. BASIC FACTS AND STATEMENT OF THE MAIN RESULTS

For  $0 < p \leq \infty$ , the Hardy space  $H^p(\mathbb{C}^+)$  of the upper half-plane  $\mathbb{C}^+$  consists of the analytic functions  $f$  on  $\mathbb{C}^+$  such that, when  $0 < p < \infty$ ,

$$\|f\|_{H^p}^p = \sup_{y>0} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(x+iy)|^p dx < \infty$$

and, when  $p = \infty$ ,

$$\|f\|_{H^\infty} = \sup_{z \in \mathbb{C}^+} |f(z)| < \infty.$$

If  $1 \leq p < \infty$ ,  $H^p(\mathbb{C}^+)$  is a Banach space, while if  $0 < p < 1$ ,  $H^p(\mathbb{C}^+)$  is only a quasi-Banach space.

Elements of  $H^p(\mathbb{C}^+)$  possess non-tangential boundary limits almost everywhere on the real line  $\mathbb{R}$ , and the space of their boundary values can be identified with a closed subspace of  $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ . More precisely, for  $1 < p < \infty$ , the following decomposition holds

$$L^p(\mathbb{R}) = H^p(\mathbb{C}^+)|_{\mathbb{R}} \oplus \overline{H^p(\mathbb{C}^+)|_{\mathbb{R}}},$$

where  $H^p(\mathbb{C}^+)|_{\mathbb{R}}$  denotes the boundary values of  $H^p(\mathbb{C}^+)$  and  $\overline{H^p(\mathbb{C}^+)|_{\mathbb{R}}}$  denotes its complex conjugate.

The case  $p = 1$  is more delicate. The *real variable* Hardy space on  $\mathbb{R}$  is defined as

$$H^1(\mathbb{R}) = \{f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}): Hf \in L^1(\mathbb{R})\},$$

where  $H$  denotes the Hilbert transform, with norm  $\|f\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} = \|f\|_{L^1} + \|Hf\|_{L^1}$ . It turns out that

$$H^1(\mathbb{R}) = H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)|_{\mathbb{R}} \oplus \overline{H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)|_{\mathbb{R}}},$$

where  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)|_{\mathbb{R}}, \overline{H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)|_{\mathbb{R}}}$  isomorphically embed into  $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ . The space  $H^1(\mathbb{R})$  admits an atomic decomposition. Precisely, every  $f \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$  can be written as  $\sum_j \lambda_j a_j$ , where  $\lambda_j \in \mathbb{C}$

with  $\sum_j |\lambda_j| < \infty$  and  $a_j$ 's are  $H^1$ -atoms, that is, they are  $L^1$ -functions which satisfy the following three conditions:

- there exists an interval  $I_j$  such that  $\text{supp}(a_j) \subseteq I_j$ ;
- $\int_{I_j} a(x) dx = 0$ ;
- $|a_j(x)| \leq 1/|I_j|$ , where  $|E|$  denotes the Lebesgue measure of a measurable set  $E$ .

Notably, every function  $f \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$  satisfies

$$(1.1) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) dx = 0.$$

Let  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{S}'$  denote the space of Schwartz functions and the space of tempered distributions on the real line  $\mathbb{R}$  respectively. For  $f \in \mathcal{S}'$  we equivalently denote by  $\widehat{f}$  or  $\mathcal{F}f$  its Fourier transform, which, for  $f \in \mathcal{S}$ , is given by

$$\mathcal{F}f(\xi) = \widehat{f}(\xi) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) e^{-ix\xi} dx.$$

The Fourier transform  $\mathcal{F}$  is an isomorphism of  $\mathcal{S}$  onto itself with inverse given by

$$\mathcal{F}^{-1}g(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(\xi) e^{ix\xi} d\xi.$$

The Hardy spaces can also be characterized using the Cauchy-Szegö projection, If  $f \in \mathcal{S}$ , the orthogonal projections  $P_{\pm}$  of  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$  onto  $H^2(\mathbb{C}^+)$ ,  $\overline{H^2(\mathbb{C}^+)}$ , resp., are given by

$$P_+ f(x) = \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{f(t)}{t - x - iy} dt$$

and

$$P_- f(x) = \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{f(t)}{x - iy - t} dt.$$

Note that  $P_+ + P_- = \text{Id}$ . By Riesz' theorem, for  $p \in (1, \infty)$ , the projections  $P_{\pm}$  extend to bounded linear operators of  $L^p(\mathbb{R})$  into itself. The Hilbert transform  $H: L^2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R})$  is defined by the identity

$$(1.2) \quad H = -i(P_+ - P_-).$$

By the boundedness of  $P_{\pm}$ , the Hilbert transform  $H: L^p(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^p(\mathbb{R})$  is also bounded when  $p \in (1, \infty)$ .

It is important to recall that, while  $P_{\pm}$  fail to be bounded on  $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $P_{\pm}: H^1(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{C}^{\pm})$  are bounded, and that

$$P_{\pm}(H^1(\mathbb{R})) = H^1(\mathbb{C}^{\pm}),$$

see [25, Chapter 9]. Here and in what follows, we use the natural identification of  $\overline{H^2(\mathbb{C}^+)}$  with  $H^2(\mathbb{C}^-)$ .

By  $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R})$ , or simply  $\text{BMO}$ , we denote the quotient space of functions of bounded mean oscillation modulo constants:

$$\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}) = \left\{ \varphi \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}) : \|\varphi\|_{\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R})} := \sup_{I \subset \mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{|I|} \int_I |\varphi - \varphi_I| dm < \infty \right\},$$

where  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$  is any bounded interval,  $\varphi_I = \frac{1}{|I|} \int_I \varphi$  is the average of  $\varphi$  over  $I$ . We emphasize that  $\varphi \in \text{BMO}$  represents an equivalence class and  $\varphi = \psi$  if and only if  $\varphi - \psi$  is constant. Every function  $f \in \text{BMO}$  is Poisson integrable and, therefore, also belongs to  $\mathcal{S}'$ . We define the space of analytic BMO

$$\text{BMOA} = \{ \varphi \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}) : \text{supp}(\widehat{\varphi}) \subseteq [0, \infty) \}.$$

It is well known that  $\text{BMO}(\mathbb{R})$  is isomorphic to the dual of  $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ : for every bounded linear functional  $\Lambda$  on  $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ , there exists a unique function  $\psi \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R})$  such that

$$\Lambda(f) = \langle f, \psi \rangle := \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) \overline{\psi(x)} dx,$$

for every  $f \in \mathcal{S}$ , [10, Chapter VI]. Analogously,  $\text{BMOA}$  represents the dual of  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)_{\mathbb{R}}$ . In this article, we endow  $\text{BMO}$  and  $\text{BMOA}$  with the dual norm.

This article is devoted to the study of the Toeplitz operators on  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$  having bounded anti-analytic symbol. As pointed out by Janson, Peetre and Semmes in [11, Remark 4.1], the Toeplitz operator  $T_{\overline{\Theta}}$  is never bounded on  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ .

**Proposition 1.1** (Janson, Peetre and Semmes, Remark 4.1 [11]). *Let  $\Theta \in H^\infty(\mathbb{C}^+)$  be non-constant. The Toeplitz operator  $T_{\overline{\Theta}}$  is unbounded on  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ .*

While it is not difficult to check that the calculation indicated in [11] proves Proposition 1.1, we are going to provide a different argument. Indeed, in (2.4), we observe that the formal adjoint of  $T_{\overline{\Theta}}$  on  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$  is the multiplication operator  $M_\Theta$  acting on  $\text{BMOA}$ . Thus, it becomes apparent that  $M_\Theta$  is not even well-defined as an operator from  $\text{BMOA}$  into itself, as, in particular it fails to map the equivalence class of 0 into itself.

Therefore, we propose that the appropriate space for studying the Toeplitz operator  $T_{\overline{\Theta}}$  is the pre-dual of  $\text{BMOA} / \text{span}\{\Theta\}$ . In this setting,  $M_\Theta$  is well-defined as a map from  $\text{BMOA}$  to  $\text{BMOA} / \text{span}\{\Theta\}$ .

**Definition 1.2.** Let  $\Theta \in H^\infty(\mathbb{C}^+)$ . The space  $H^1_{\Theta}$  is defined as the kernel of the linear functional induced by  $\Theta$  on  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ , that is,

$$H^1_{\Theta} := \{ f \in H^1(\mathbb{C}^+) : \langle f, \Theta \rangle = 0 \}.$$

Note that  $H^1_{\Theta}$  is a closed subspace of  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ , so we endow  $H^1_{\Theta}$  with its norm,

$$\|f\|_{H^1_{\Theta}} = \|f\|_{H^1}.$$

It is clear that the dual of  $H^1_{\Theta}$  is isomorphic to the quotient space  $\text{BMOA} / \text{span}\{\Theta\}$ , see [22, Chapter 4]. We note that when  $\Theta$  is constant, then  $H^1_{\Theta} = H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ , because of (1.1).

In order to avoid trivialities, from now on we *always* assume that the function  $\Theta \in H^\infty$  we consider is *non-constant*.

An  $H^\infty(\mathbb{C}^+)$ -function  $\Theta$  is called an *inner function* if  $|\Theta| = 1$  a.e. on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Given an inner function  $\Theta$ , and  $p \in [1, \infty)$ , we consider the *Beurling subspace*

$$(1.3) \quad \Theta H^p := \{f \in H^p(\mathbb{C}^+) : (\overline{\Theta}f)|_{\mathbb{R}} \in H^p(\mathbb{C}^+)|_{\mathbb{R}}\},$$

and the *backward-shift invariant subspace*

$$(1.4) \quad K_{\Theta}^p := \left\{f \in H^p(\mathbb{C}^+) : (\overline{\Theta}f)|_{\mathbb{R}} \in \overline{H^p(\mathbb{C}^+)|_{\mathbb{R}}}\right\}.$$

The first main result provides some equivalent conditions to the boundedness of  $T_{\overline{\Theta}}$  on  $H_{\Theta}^1$ .

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $\Theta \in H^\infty(\mathbb{C}^+)$ . Then, the following conditions are equivalent.*

- (a) *The Toeplitz operator  $T_{\overline{\Theta}}: H_{\Theta}^1 \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$  is bounded;*
- (b) *the Hankel operator  $H_{\overline{\Theta}}: H_{\Theta}^1 \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{C}^-)$  is bounded;*
- (c) *the multiplication operator  $M_{\Theta}: \text{BMOA} \rightarrow \text{BMOA} / \text{span}\{\Theta\}$  is bounded.*

*If in addition  $\Theta$  is an inner function, then (a) – (c) are also equivalent to:*

- (d) *we have the equality  $H_{\Theta}^1 = K_{\Theta}^1 \oplus \Theta H^1$ .*

We point out that, if  $p \in (1, \infty)$ , it holds that  $H^p(\mathbb{C}^+) = K_{\Theta}^p \oplus \Theta H^p$ , see e.g. [17] for the case of the unit disk; the simple argument works also in the case of  $\mathbb{C}^+$ . In Lemma 2.5 we show that, when  $p = 1$ ,  $K_{\Theta}^1 \oplus \Theta H^1$  is a closed subspace of  $H_{\Theta}^1$ , which of course, since we are assuming throughout the paper that  $\Theta$  is non-constant, is properly contained in  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ .

Particularly important inner functions are the meromorphic inner functions, see [13, Chapter VII]. The second main result of this article shows that the Toeplitz operator associated to the meromorphic inner function  $\Theta = e^{i\tau(\cdot)}$ ,  $\tau > 0$ , is bounded.

**Theorem 1.4.** *The Toeplitz operator  $T_{e^{-i\tau(\cdot)}}: H_{e^{i\tau(\cdot)}}^1 \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$  is bounded.*

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we discuss some general properties of the Toeplitz operators on  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$  with anti-analytic symbol, we describe some properties of the subspace  $H_{\Theta}^1$ , and we conclude with proving Theorem 1.3. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.4. We conclude in Section 4 with some final remarks and open questions.

Our interest in the Toeplitz operators stems from our work in [4], where we characterized the dual of the 1-Bernstein spaces (also called Paley–Wiener 1-spaces). Precisely, we have used Theorem 1.4 in [4, Theorem 1] to provide an explicit description of the dual of 1-Bernstein spaces in terms of BMO entire functions. We refer the reader to [14, Lectures 20-21], [20, 21], e.g., for the properties of the Bernstein spaces. Further results can be found in [15].

The 1-Bernstein spaces are particular examples of 1-de Branges spaces. See [2] and [3] for some properties of the 1-de Branges spaces. In the upcoming paper [5], we apply this circle of ideas to provide a characterization of the dual of the 1-de Branges spaces.

In [1] A. B. Aleksandrov characterized the backward-shift invariant subspaces of  $H^1(\mathbb{D})$ , we refer to the monograph [8] for a detailed proof. We also point out that some descriptions and properties of the dual of the 1-backward-shift invariant subspaces in the unit disk, which are strictly related to the 1-de Branges spaces, have been provided in [18], [6] and [9].

2. TOEPLITZ OPERATORS ON  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$  WITH ANTI-ANALYTIC SYMBOL

In this section we present the Toeplitz operators of  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$  and we focus our attention on those with anti-analytic symbol. However, before proceeding with the case of the upper half-plane, we briefly recall the situation in the case of the unit disk.

Let  $\mathcal{P}$  denote the space of trigonometric polynomials on  $\mathbb{T}$ , and  $\mathcal{P}'$  its dual. Then,  $\mathcal{P}'$  is the space of formal Fourier series. For every  $f \in \mathcal{P}$ , we consider the multiplication operator

$$M_b: \mathcal{P} \ni f \mapsto bf \in \mathcal{P}'.$$

Since the action of the Szegő projection  $P_+$  is well defined on  $\mathcal{P}'$ , we define  $T_b := P_+M_b$ , and observe that

$$(2.1) \quad T_b: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}'$$

is well defined. We now introduce the log-BMO space, that we denote by LMO. An  $L^1(\mathbb{T})$  function  $f$  belongs to LMO if

$$\sup_{I \subseteq \mathbb{T}} \frac{\log(1/|I|)}{|I|} \int_I |f(e^{i\theta}) - f_I| \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} < \infty,$$

where  $I$  ranges over all subarcs of  $\mathbb{T}$ . D. Stegenga initially characterized bounded Toeplitz operators on  $H^1(\mathbb{T})$  under certain additional assumptions on the symbol  $b$ . Subsequently, Janson, Peetre, and Semmes provided a complete characterization.

**Theorem 2.1** (Stegenga, Theorem 1.1 [23] & Janson, Peetre and Semmes, Theorem 2.i [11]). *Let*

$$b(e^{i\theta}) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \hat{b}(n) e^{in\theta} \in \mathcal{P}'.$$

*Then, the Toeplitz operator  $T_b$  defined as in (2.1) admits a bounded extension as an operator  $T_b: H^1(\mathbb{T}) \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{T})$  if and only if  $b \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T}) \cap \text{LMO}$ .*

Next, if  $\varphi \in H^\infty$ , it is easy to see that the adjoint of  $T_{\bar{\varphi}}: H^2(\mathbb{T}) \rightarrow H^2(\mathbb{T})$  is the multiplication operator  $M_\varphi$ . Therefore, the boundedness of  $T_{\bar{\varphi}}$  on  $H^1(\mathbb{T})$  implies the boundedness of  $M_\varphi$  on  $\text{BMOA}(\mathbb{D})$ . Actually, the reverse implication is true as well.

**Theorem 2.2** (Stegenga, Theorems 1.2 and 3.8 [23]). *The linear operator  $M_\varphi$  is a bounded multiplier of  $\text{BMOA}(\mathbb{D})$  if and only if  $\varphi \in H^\infty$  and its boundary values belong to LMO. In particular, if  $\Theta$  is an inner function,  $T_{\bar{\Theta}}$  is bounded if and only if  $\Theta$  is a finite Blaschke product.*

We now turn to the case of the upper half-plane. Our first step is to identify the class of allowable symbols of the Toeplitz operators. Notice that, in the case of the unit circle,  $P_+: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ , so that we could consider symbols in  $\mathcal{P}'$ . In the case of the real line,  $P_+: \mathcal{S} \not\rightarrow \mathcal{S}$  and the situation is a bit more involved.

Let  $\varphi \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$  be a moderate increasing function, that is, at most of polynomial growth. For every  $f \in \mathcal{S}$ , we consider the multiplication operator

$$M_\varphi: \mathcal{S} \ni f \mapsto \varphi f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}).$$

Next, we observe that the space

$$\mathcal{S}_+ = \{f = P_+\phi: \phi \in \mathcal{S}, \text{supp}(\widehat{\phi}) \subseteq [0, \infty)\}$$

is contained and dense in  $H^p(\mathbb{C}^+)$ , for all  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . Notice in particular that  $\mathcal{S}_+$  is a space of holomorphic functions in  $\mathbb{C}^+$ , given by the Cauchy–Szegő integral of Schwartz functions whose Fourier transform is supported on the half-line  $[0, \infty)$ . Therefore, if  $f = P_+\phi$ , then  $f|_{\mathbb{R}} = \phi$ .

For  $\varphi$  in  $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$  at most of moderate growth, we define

$$(2.2) \quad T_\varphi := P_+M_\varphi: \mathcal{S}_+ \rightarrow \text{Hol}(\mathbb{C}^+).$$

Analogously, we consider the *Hankel operator with symbol  $\varphi$*

$$(2.3) \quad H_\varphi := P_-M_\varphi: \mathcal{S}_+ \rightarrow \text{Hol}(\mathbb{C}^-).$$

We are interested in studying under which conditions on the symbol of the Toeplitz operator,  $T_\varphi$  extends to a bounded linear operator  $T_\varphi: H^1(\mathbb{C}^+) \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ .

Clearly, if  $\varphi = u \in H^\infty(\mathbb{C}^+)$ , then  $T_u$  is bounded on  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ . On the other hand, by Proposition 1.1 we know that if  $\varphi$  is an anti-analytic symbol,  $\varphi = \overline{\Theta}$ , with  $\Theta \in H^\infty(\mathbb{C}^+)$ , then  $T_{\overline{\Theta}}$  is unbounded. However, this fact can be also observed directly. Indeed, if  $T_{\overline{\Theta}}: H^1(\mathbb{C}^+) \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$  were bounded, then  $T_{\overline{\Theta}}^*: \text{BMOA} \rightarrow \text{BMOA}$  would also be bounded. However, it is simple to see that  $T_{\overline{\Theta}}^* = M_\Theta$ . Indeed, if  $f, g \in \mathcal{S}_+$ , we have that

$$(2.4) \quad \langle T_{\overline{\Theta}}f, g \rangle = \langle \overline{\Theta}f, g \rangle = \langle f, M_\Theta g \rangle.$$

However, the multiplication by  $\Theta$  is not a well-defined operator on  $\text{BMOA}(\mathbb{C}^+)$ . Recall that elements of  $\text{BMOA}(\mathbb{C}^+)$  are equivalent classes of functions modulo constants. Then,  $M_\Theta$  maps elements of  $\text{BMOA}(\mathbb{C}^+)$  into functions modulo multiples of  $\Theta$ . Therefore, the natural question is for which  $\Theta \in H^\infty$ , or more generally even  $\Theta \in \text{BMOA}$ ,

$$M_\Theta: \text{BMOA} \rightarrow \text{BMOA} / \text{span}\{\Theta\}$$

is bounded. Note that  $\text{BMOA} / \text{span}\{\Theta\}$  is the dual of the annihilator of  $\Theta$  in  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ , that is the space  $H^1_\Theta$ , see Definition 1.2. Note also that this situation does not occur in the case of  $\mathbb{D}$ . Indeed,  $\text{BMO}$  is *not* a quotient space, and the multiplication operator on  $\text{BMO}$  produces a well defined function.

The above discussion is the motivation for the next definition. First a lemma.

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $\Theta \in H^\infty$ . Then,  $H^1_\Theta \cap \mathcal{S}_+$  is dense in  $H^1_\Theta$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $f \in H^1_\Theta$ , and let  $\{h_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_+$  be such that  $h_n \rightarrow f$  in  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ . Then,  $\langle h_n, \Theta \rangle \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Let  $h_0 \in \mathcal{S}_+$  be such that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} h_0 \overline{\Theta} = 1$ . Then,  $g_n := h_n - \langle h_n, \Theta \rangle h_0 \in \mathcal{S}_+ \cap H^1_\Theta$ , and  $g_n \rightarrow f$  in  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . This proves the lemma.  $\square$

**Definition 2.4.** Let  $\Theta \in H^\infty$ . Then we define the domain of the Toeplitz operator  $T_{\overline{\Theta}}$  as  $H^1_\Theta \cap \mathcal{S}_+$ .

In other words, given an inner function  $\Theta$ , we always think of the Toeplitz operator  $T_{\overline{\Theta}}$  as initially defined on  $H^1_\Theta \cap \mathcal{S}_+$  which is a dense subspace of  $H^1_\Theta$ , where the latter is endowed with its topology as closed subspace of  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ . We wish to determine for which  $\Theta \in H^\infty$ ,  $T_{\overline{\Theta}}$

extends to a bounded linear operator  $T_{\bar{\Theta}}: H_{\bar{\Theta}}^1 \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ . With Theorem 1.4 that we prove below, we show that the answer is in the positive when  $\Theta = e^{i\tau(\cdot)}$ . Analogously, we think of the Hankel operator  $H_{\bar{\Theta}}$  as defined on the dense subspace of  $H_{\bar{\Theta}}^1$ ,  $H_{\bar{\Theta}}^1 \cap \mathcal{S}_+$ .

We provide some conditions equivalent to the boundedness of  $T_{\bar{\Theta}}$ , when  $\Theta$  is an inner function. Recall that the subspaces  $\Theta H^1$  and  $K_{\Theta}^1$  are defined in (1.3) and (1.4), resp.

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $\Theta$  be an inner function. Then, we have*

- (a)  $K_{\Theta}^1 \oplus \Theta H^1$  is a closed subspace of  $H_{\Theta}^1$ ;
- (b)  $K_{\Theta}^1 \subseteq \ker(T_{\bar{\Theta}})$ .

*Proof.* It is well known, and immediate to check, that  $\Theta H^1$  and  $K_{\Theta}^1$  are closed subspaces of  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ . If  $f \in K_{\Theta}^1 \cap \Theta H^1$ , then there exists  $g, h \in H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$  such that  $f|_{\mathbb{R}} = (\Theta \bar{g})|_{\mathbb{R}}$  and  $f|_{\mathbb{R}} = (\Theta h)|_{\mathbb{R}}$ . This implies that  $\bar{g}|_{\mathbb{R}} = h|_{\mathbb{R}}$ , whence  $g = h = 0$ . Therefore,  $K_{\Theta}^1 \oplus \Theta H^1$  is a direct sum of closed subspaces of  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ . However, if  $f \in K_{\Theta}^1$ ,  $f|_{\mathbb{R}} = (\Theta \bar{g})|_{\mathbb{R}}$  for a  $g \in H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ , then

$$\langle f, \Theta \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f \bar{\Theta} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{g} = 0,$$

so that  $f \in H_{\Theta}^1$ . Analogously, if  $f \in \Theta H^1$ , and  $f|_{\mathbb{R}} = (\Theta h)|_{\mathbb{R}}$ , with  $h \in H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ , then

$$\langle f, \Theta \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} h = 0.$$

Thus,  $K_{\Theta}^1 \oplus \Theta H^1$  is a closed subspace of  $H_{\Theta}^1$ , and (a) follows.

(b) Notice that Lemma 2.3 guarantees that  $T_{\bar{\Theta}}$  is defined on a dense subspace of  $H_{\bar{\Theta}}^1$ . Let  $f \in K_{\Theta}^1$ , so that  $f|_{\mathbb{R}} = (\Theta \bar{g})|_{\mathbb{R}}$  for some  $g \in H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ . Then,

$$T_{\bar{\Theta}} f = P_+(\bar{g}) = 0.$$

This proves the lemma. □

*Proof of Theorem 1.3.* In order to prove that (a) and (b) are equivalent, note that

$$\|T_{\bar{\Theta}} f\|_{H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)} = \|(\text{Id} - P_-)(\bar{\Theta} f)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)} \leq \|\Theta\|_{H^\infty} \|f\|_{H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)} + \|H_{\bar{\Theta}}(f)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{C}^-)}.$$

Hence (b) implies (a). For the reverse implication, note that  $P_- = \text{Id} - P_+$ , so that

$$\|H_{\bar{\Theta}} f\|_{H^1(\mathbb{C}^-)} = \|(\text{Id} - P_+)(\bar{\Theta} f)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{C}^-)} \leq \|\Theta\|_{H^\infty} \|f\|_{H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)} + \|T_{\bar{\Theta}}(f)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)}.$$

Next we prove that (a) and (c) are equivalent. If  $T_{\bar{\Theta}}$  is bounded, then  $M_{\Theta}$  is bounded and  $\|M_{\Theta}\| = \|T_{\bar{\Theta}}\|$ . Conversely, assume that  $M_{\Theta}$  is bounded. Consider,  $g \in H_{\bar{\Theta}}^1$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_{\bar{\Theta}}(g)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)} &= \sup_{v \in \text{VMOA}, \|v\|=1} |\langle v, T_{\bar{\Theta}}(g) \rangle| \\ &= \sup_{v \in \text{VMOA}, \|v\|=1} |\langle \Theta v, g \rangle| \leq \|M_{\Theta}\| \|g\|_{H_{\bar{\Theta}}^1}, \end{aligned}$$

where VMOA is the pre-dual of  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ . Therefore,  $T_{\bar{\Theta}}$  is bounded and, by the first part of the proof,  $\|T_{\bar{\Theta}}\| = \|M_{\Theta}\|$ . Hence, (a) and (c) are equivalent.



Suppose now that  $\Theta$  is an inner function and that (d) holds. Let  $f \in H_{\Theta}^1$ ,  $f = f_1 + f_2 \in K_{\Theta}^1 \oplus \Theta H^1$ , where  $f_1 \in K_{\Theta}^1$ ,  $f_2 \in \Theta H^1$  and  $f_2 = \Theta g$ , with  $g \in H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ . By Lemma 2.5 (b), we have that

$$T_{\overline{\Theta}}f = T_{\overline{\Theta}}f_2 = g \in H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$$

and

$$\|T_{\overline{\Theta}}f\|_{H^1} = \|g\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} = \|\overline{\Theta}f_2\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} = \|f_2\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} = \|f_2\|_{H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)} \leq \|f\|_{H_{\Theta}^1}.$$

Hence, (d) implies (a). Finally, suppose (a) holds. Consider  $f \in H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ . We have that  $\overline{\Theta}f \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$ . Indeed, clearly  $\overline{\Theta}f \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ , while

$$H(\overline{\Theta}f) = -i(2P_+ - \text{Id})(\overline{\Theta}f) = -2iT_{\Theta}f + i\overline{\Theta}f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}),$$

since (a) holds. Since  $\overline{\Theta}f \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$ , it follows that

$$(2.5) \quad \overline{\Theta}f = P_-(\overline{\Theta}f) + P_+(\overline{\Theta}f),$$

that is,

$$f = \Theta P_-(\overline{\Theta}f) + \Theta P_+(\overline{\Theta}f) =: f_1 + f_2,$$

where  $f_2 = \Theta T_{\overline{\Theta}}f \in \Theta H^1 \subseteq H^1$ . Therefore,

$$\|f_2\|_{H^1} \leq \|T_{\overline{\Theta}}f\|_{H^1} \leq C\|f\|_{H^1}.$$

Moreover, since  $f_1 = f - f_2$ ,  $f_1 \in H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ ,

$$f_1 = \Theta P_-(\overline{\Theta}f) \in K_{\Theta}^1$$

and, we also have

$$\|f_1\|_{H^1} \leq (1 + C)\|f\|_{H^1}.$$

This shows that the maps  $H_{\Theta}^1 \ni f \mapsto f_1 \in K_{\Theta}^1$  and  $H_{\Theta}^1 \ni f \mapsto f_2 \in \Theta H^1$  are bounded, and that  $H_{\Theta}^1 = K_{\Theta}^1 + \Theta H^1$ . The conclusion now follows from Lemma 2.5 (a). Notice however that, since  $\ker(T_{\overline{\Theta}}) \cap \Theta H^1 = \{0\}$ , while  $K_{\Theta}^1 \subseteq \ker(T_{\overline{\Theta}})$ , we also have that

$$K_{\Theta}^1 = \ker(T_{\overline{\Theta}}).$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

### 3. BOUNDEDNESS OF $T_{e^{-i\tau(\cdot)}}$ ON $H_{e^{i\tau(\cdot)}}^1$

Before proving Theorem 1.4, we need some preliminary considerations. If  $J$  is a subset of  $[0, \infty)$ , we denote by  $H_J^1$  the subspace of  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$  of functions whose Fourier transform of its boundary values vanishes on  $J$ . Observe that if  $J$  is a singleton,  $J = \{\tau\}$ , with  $\tau > 0$ , then  $H_{\{\tau\}}^1 = H_{e^{i\tau(\cdot)}}^1$ . Therefore, from now on, we use the former notation.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let*

$$\mathcal{S}_{0,\tau} := \{\varphi \in \mathcal{S} : \text{supp}(\widehat{\varphi}) \subseteq [0, \infty), \int \varphi(x)x^k dx = \int \varphi(x)x^j e^{-i\tau x} dx = 0 \ \forall j, k \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

*Then,  $\mathcal{S}_{0,\tau}$  is dense in  $H_{\{\tau\}}^1$ .*

*Proof.* In order to prove the lemma, we begin by showing that the subspace

$$H_{00}^1 = \{\phi \in L^1: \widehat{\phi} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}), \text{dist}(\text{supp}(\widehat{\phi}), \{0\}) > 0\}$$

is dense in  $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ . This is [24, Corollary pag. 230]. The proof is based on the fact that a function in  $L_0^1 = \{g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}): \widehat{g}(0) = 0\}$  can be approximated by  $L^1$ -functions whose Fourier transform is compactly supported, with support having positive distance from the origin. We repeat the proof here for the reader's convenience, and since we use a similar argument in the second step of the proof.

As customary, for  $r > 0$  and a function  $g$ , we denote by  $g_r$  and  $g^r$  the functions defined by

$$g_r(\xi) = \frac{1}{r}g(\xi/r) \text{ and } g^r(\xi) = g(r\xi).$$

Recall that  $\widehat{g_r} = \widehat{g}^r$ . Let  $\eta \in C_c^\infty$ ,  $\eta(\xi) = 1$  if  $|\xi| \leq 1$  and  $\eta(\xi) = 0$  if  $|\xi| \geq 2$ . For  $r > 0$  we define the operator  $T_r f = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\eta^{1/r}) * f$ . Notice that

$$\|T_r f\|_{L^1} \leq \|(\mathcal{F}^{-1}\eta)_{1/r}\|_{L^1} \|f\|_{L^1} = \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\eta\|_{L^1} \|f\|_{L^1}.$$

Hence, the operators  $T_r$  have uniformly bounded norm on  $L^1$ . An elementary argument shows that, if  $f \in L_0^1$ ,  $T_\epsilon f \rightarrow 0$  as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Therefore, if  $f \in L_0^1$ ,

$$T_R(\text{Id} - T_\epsilon)f \rightarrow f \quad \text{as } R \rightarrow \infty, \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Moreover,

$$\mathcal{F}(T_R(\text{Id} - T_\epsilon)f) = \eta^{1/R}(1 - \eta^{1/\epsilon})\widehat{f}$$

has support contained in  $\{\xi: \epsilon \leq |\xi| \leq 2R\}$ . Let  $\widetilde{\eta}$  be another smooth cut-off function, having support contained in  $\{|\xi| \leq \epsilon'\}$ . Then, the functions

$$f_{R,\epsilon} := T_R(\text{Id} - T_\epsilon)f \in L_0^1$$

and for  $0 < \epsilon' < \epsilon$ ,  $\widetilde{\eta}_{\epsilon'} * \widehat{f_{R,\epsilon}} \in C_c^\infty$  with support contained in

$$\{\xi: (\epsilon - \epsilon') \leq |\xi| \leq 2R + \epsilon'\}.$$

Then,  $H_{00}^1$  is dense in  $L_0^1$ . However,  $H_{00}^1$  is dense also in  $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ . For, given any function  $g \in H_{00}^1$ , let  $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $\chi = -i \text{sign}$  on  $\text{supp}(\widehat{g})$ . Then,

$$Hg = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\chi\widehat{g}) \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$$

(recall,  $H$  denotes the Hilbert transform).

Now, given  $f \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$ , let  $f_n := \widetilde{\eta}_{2/n} * f_{n,1/n}$ , with the above notation. Then,  $f_n \rightarrow f$ , and  $Hf_n = \widetilde{\eta}_{2/n} * T_n(\text{Id} - T_{1/n})Hf \rightarrow Hf$  in  $L^1$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . (This is the argument taken from [24].)

For  $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ , consider

$$H_{\tau 0}^1 = \{\phi \in L^1: \widehat{\phi} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}), \text{dist}(\text{supp}(\widehat{\phi}), \{\tau\}) > 0\}.$$

Notice that  $H_{\tau 0}^1 = e^{i\tau(\cdot)} H_{00}^1$ . Also we set  $H_{\{0,\tau\},0}^1 := H_{00}^1 * H_{\tau 0}^1$ . Then,

$$H_{\{0,\tau\},0}^1 = \{\phi \in L^1: \widehat{\phi} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}), \text{dist}(\text{supp}(\widehat{\phi}), \{0, \tau\}) > 0\}.$$

Indeed, it is clear that  $H_{00}^1 * H_{\tau 0}^1 \subseteq \{\phi \in L^1: \widehat{\phi} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}), \text{dist}(\text{supp}(\widehat{\phi}), \{0, \tau\}) > 0\}$ . On the other hand, if  $\eta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ , and  $\text{dist}(\text{supp}(\eta), \{0, \tau\}) > 0$ , then we can find  $v_1, v_2 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $v_1, v_2 = 1$  on  $\text{supp}(\eta)$  and  $v_1$  identically 0 in a neighborhood of the origin, and  $v_2$  identically 0 in a neighborhood of  $\tau$ . Then,  $\eta = v_1(v_2\eta)$ , Moreover,  $\mathcal{F}^{-1}v_1 \in H_{00}^1$ ,  $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(v_2\eta) \in H_{\tau 0}^1$ . and  $\mathcal{F}^{-1}\eta = (\mathcal{F}^{-1}v_1) * (\mathcal{F}^{-1}(v_2\eta))$ .

Finally, in order to prove the lemma, it suffices to show that  $H_{\{0, \tau\}, 0}^1$  is dense in  $H_{\{\tau\}}^1$ . Let  $f \in H_{\{\tau\}}^1$ . In particular,  $f, e^{-i\tau(\cdot)}f \in L_0^1$  so that

$$T_n(\text{Id} - T_{1/n})f \rightarrow f, \quad e^{i\tau(\cdot)}T_n(\text{Id} - T_{1/n})(e^{-i\tau(\cdot)}f) \rightarrow f$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , which imply that

$$T_n(\text{Id} - T_{1/n})[e^{i\tau(\cdot)}T_n(\text{Id} - T_{1/n})(e^{-i\tau(\cdot)}f)] \rightarrow f.$$

Once suitable regularized with  $\tilde{\eta}$  as before, the functions on the left hand side above are in  $H_{\{0, \tau\}, 0}^1$  and the conclusion follows by the same argument as before. This proves the lemma.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.2.** *It holds that*

$$(3.1) \quad H_{\{\tau\}}^1 = H_{[\tau, \infty)}^1 \oplus H_{[0, \tau]}^1,$$

where, if  $H_{\{\tau\}}^1 \ni f = f_1 + f_2 \in H_{[\tau, \infty)}^1 \oplus H_{[0, \tau]}^1$ , then

$$\|f\|_{H^1} = \|f\|_{H_{\{\tau\}}^1} \asymp \|f_1\|_{H^1} + \|f_2\|_{H^1}.$$

*Proof.* Clearly,  $H_{[\tau, \infty)}^1$  and  $H_{[0, \tau]}^1$  are closed subspaces of  $H_{\{\tau\}}^1$  and they have trivial intersection. Thus, the sum in (3.1) is a direct sum and it is a closed subspace of  $H_{\{\tau\}}^1$ . If it is a proper subspace, there exists  $f \in H_{\{\tau\}}^1 \setminus (H_{[\tau, \infty)}^1 \oplus H_{[0, \tau]}^1)$ . Then, there exists  $b \in \text{BMOA}$  such that  $b|_{H_{[\tau, \infty)}^1 \oplus H_{[0, \tau]}^1} = 0$  and  $\langle f, b \rangle \neq 0$ .

Let  $\{g_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{0, 2\pi}$ ,  $g_n \rightarrow f_0$  in  $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ . Then, according to Lemma 3.1,  $\widehat{g}_n = \psi_{n,1} + \psi_{n,2}$ , where  $\psi_{n,1}, \psi_{n,2} \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $\text{supp}(\psi_{n,1}) \subseteq [0, \tau]$ , and  $\text{supp}(\psi_{n,2}) \subseteq [\tau, \infty)$ . For  $j = 1, 2$ , we define

$$F_{n,j}(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^\infty e^{iz\xi} \psi_{n,j}(\xi) d\xi$$

and  $F_n = F_{n,1} + F_{n,2}$ , so that  $F_{n,j} \in H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ ,  $F_{n,1} \in H_{[\tau, \infty)}^1$ ,  $F_{n,2} \in H_{[0, \tau]}^1$ , and  $F_n \rightarrow f$  in  $H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ . Therefore,

$$\langle f, b \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle F_{n,1} + F_{n,2}, b \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle F_{n,1}, b \rangle + \langle F_{n,2}, b \rangle = 0,$$

a contradiction. The equivalence of the two norms follows from the open mapping theorem.  $\square$

The proof of Theorem 1.4 is now immediate.

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* Since, if  $\Theta = e^{i\tau(\cdot)}$ ,

$$K_\Theta^1 = H_{[\tau, \infty)}^1 \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta H^1 = H_{[0, \tau]}^1,$$

the conclusion follows from Theorem 1.3 and Proposition 3.2.  $\square$

## 4. OPEN QUESTIONS

**Question 1.** Clearly, the first question we are interested in is whether there are inner functions  $\Theta$ , other than the meromorphic inner functions  $e^{i\tau(\cdot)}$ , such that the associated Toeplitz operator  $T_{\overline{\Theta}}: H_{\Theta}^1 \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$  is bounded, or equivalently, for which inner functions  $\Theta$  the equality

$$H_{\Theta}^1 = K_{\Theta}^1 \oplus \Theta H^1$$

holds. Moreover, from Theorem 1.3 we know that, if  $\Theta$  is an inner function,  $T_{\overline{\Theta}}: H_{\Theta}^1 \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$  is unbounded if and only if

$$K_{\Theta}^1 \oplus \Theta H^1 \subsetneq H_{\Theta}^1,$$

that is, if and only if the quotient  $H_{\Theta}^1/(K_{\Theta}^1 \oplus \Theta H^1)$  is non-trivial. When non-trivial, it would be interesting to describe it.

**Question 2.** The second question delves deeper into the subject and it is related to another interesting problem. In analogy with the holomorphic case, we introduce a subspace of the real variable Hardy space  $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ . For  $b \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R})$  we consider the pre-annihilator of  $\{b\}$ , that is,

$$(4.1) \quad H_b^1(\mathbb{R}) := \{\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \text{ such that } \langle \phi, b \rangle = 0\}.$$

Observe that, if  $b = \Theta \in H^\infty(\mathbb{C}^+)$

$$H_{\Theta}^1(\mathbb{R}) = \overline{H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)}_{|\mathbb{R}} \oplus (H_{\Theta}^1)_{|\mathbb{R}}.$$

Following the ideas in Theorem 1.3, we reformulate the boundedness of  $T_{\overline{\Theta}}$  in terms of  $[\overline{\Theta}, H]$ .

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $\Theta$  be an inner function. Then, the following are equivalent:*

- (a) *the Toeplitz operator  $T_{\overline{\Theta}}: H_{\Theta}^1 \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$  is bounded;*
- (b) *the commutator  $[\overline{\Theta}, H]: H_{\Theta}^1(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^1(\mathbb{R})$  is bounded.*
- (c) *the multiplication operator  $M_{\overline{\Theta}}: H_{\Theta}^1(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{R})$  is bounded.*

*Proof.* We note that for every  $H_{\Theta}^1(\mathbb{R}) \ni f = f_1 + f_2$ , with  $f_1 \in \overline{H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)}_{|\mathbb{R}}$  and  $f_2 \in H_{\Theta}^1$ , by using (1.2) we have that

$$[\overline{\Theta}, H](f_1) = \overline{\Theta}H(f_1) - H(\overline{\Theta}f_1) = \overline{\Theta}(-if_1) + i\overline{\Theta}f_1 = 0.$$

Moreover,

$$[\overline{\Theta}, H](f_2) = \overline{\Theta}H(f_2) - H(\overline{\Theta}f_2) = -i\overline{\Theta}f_2 + iP_+(\overline{\Theta}f_2) - iP_-(\overline{\Theta}f_2) = -2iH_{\overline{\Theta}}(f_2).$$

Consequently,  $[\overline{\Theta}, H]$  is bounded if and only if the Hankel operator  $H_{\overline{\Theta}}$  is bounded from  $H_{\Theta}^1$  to  $\overline{H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)}_{|\mathbb{R}}$ , which is equivalent to the boundedness of  $T_{\overline{\Theta}}: H_{\Theta}^1 \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ , by Theorem 1.3. Thus, (a) and (b) are equivalent.

Next, suppose (a) holds. Then we have that if  $f \in H_{\Theta}^1$ , then  $(\overline{\Theta}f)_{|\mathbb{R}} \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$ . Indeed, we wish to show that  $(\overline{\Theta}f)_{|\mathbb{R}}$  and  $H((\overline{\Theta}f)_{|\mathbb{R}}) \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ . Clearly  $\overline{\Theta}f \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ , and

$$H(\overline{\Theta}f) = -i(2P_+ - \text{Id})(\overline{\Theta}f) = -2iT_{\Theta}f + i\overline{\Theta}f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}),$$

since (a) holds. Therefore,  $(\overline{\Theta}f)_{|\mathbb{R}} \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$ , and

$$\|\overline{\Theta}f\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq 2\|T_{\Theta}f\|_{H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)} + \|f\|_{H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)} \leq C\|f\|_{H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)},$$

that is, (c) holds. The fact that (c) implies (a) follows from the fact that  $P_+ : H^1(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{C}^+)$ , and the lemma follows.  $\square$

From the above Lemma, the following question arises:

For which inner function  $\Theta$  is the commutator  $[\overline{\Theta}, H] : H_{\Theta}^1(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^1(\mathbb{R})$  bounded?

**Question 3.** In the real-variable theory of Hardy spaces, it is natural to extend Question 2 to more general symbols. If  $b \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R})$ , then it has been known that the commutator  $[b, H]$  is not bounded from  $H^1(\mathbb{R})$  to  $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ . It was then natural to ask on which subspace of  $H^1(\mathbb{R})$  the commutator  $[b, T]$  is bounded, where  $T$  denotes a general Caldéron–Zygmund operator. In [19], C. Perez gave the following definition.

**Definition 4.2.** Let  $b \in \text{BMO}$  be given. A function  $a$  is called a  $b$ -atom if it is an atom of  $H^1(\mathbb{R})$  (see Section 1) with the additional property that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} a \bar{b} = \langle a, b \rangle = 0$ . The space  $H_{b,\text{at}}^1$  is defined to be the space of  $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ -functions  $f$  which can be written as

$$f = \sum_j \lambda_j a_j,$$

where the  $a_j$ 's are  $b$ -atoms,  $\sum_j |\lambda_j| < \infty$ , and we set

$$\|f\|_{H_{b,\text{at}}^1} := \inf \left\{ \sum_j |\lambda_j| : f = \sum_j \lambda_j a_j, a_j \text{ } b\text{-atoms, } \sum_j |\lambda_j| < \infty \right\}.$$

Since a  $b$ -atom is in particular a standard atom, if  $f = \sum_j \lambda_j a_j \in H_{b,\text{at}}^1$ ,  $\|f\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq \sum_j |\lambda_j|$ , which implies that  $\|f\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq \|f\|_{H_{b,\text{at}}^1}$ . Moreover, we have  $\langle f, b \rangle = 0$  for all  $f \in H_{b,\text{at}}^1$ , that is,  $H_{b,\text{at}}^1 \subseteq \ker(b)$ . Thus, if  $f \in H_{b,\text{at}}^1$  we have  $\|f\|_{H_b^1} \leq \|f\|_{H_{b,\text{at}}^1}$ . In [19] Perez established the bound

$$\sup \{ \| [b, H](a) \|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} : a \text{ is a } b\text{-atom} \} < \infty,$$

which, in light of the result in [7], is not sufficient to imply that  $[b, H] : H_{b,\text{at}}^1 \rightarrow L^1(\mathbb{R})$  is bounded. L. Ky in [12] defined another space, that here we denote by  $\mathcal{H}_{b,\text{at}}^1$  as

$$\mathcal{H}_{b,\text{at}}^1 = \{ f \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) : [b, \mathfrak{M}]f \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \},$$

where  $\mathfrak{M}$  is the so-called *grand maximal function*. Ky proved that  $[b, T] : \mathcal{H}_{b,\text{at}}^1 \rightarrow L^1(\mathbb{R})$  is bounded, that is  $H_{b,\text{at}}^1 \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{b,\text{at}}^1$  and that  $\mathcal{H}_{b,\text{at}}^1$  is the largest subspace of  $H^1(\mathbb{R})$  on which  $[b, T]$  is bounded. Again,  $T$  denotes a general Caldéron–Zygmund operator.

In our opinion, very natural questions to address are the following:

For which  $b \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R})$ , we have  $H_{b,\text{at}}^1 = H_b^1$ ? For which  $b \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $[b, H] : H_b^1 \rightarrow L^1(\mathbb{R})$ ?

## REFERENCES

- [1] A.B. Aleksandrov, *Invariant subspaces of shift operators. An axiomatic approach*, Zap. Nauchn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (LOMI) **113** (1981), 7–26, 264, Investigations on linear operators and the theory of functions, XI. MR 629832
- [2] A. Baranov, *On  $L^1$ -norms of meromorphic functions with fixed poles*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **134** (2006), no. 10, 3003 – 3013.

- [3] C. Bellavita, *Continuous embedding between  $p$ -de Branges spaces*, Concrete Operators **8** (2021), no. 1, 125 – 134.
- [4] C. Bellavita and M.M. Peloso, *Duality, BMO and Hankel operators on Bernstein spaces*, Journal of Functional Analysis **288** (2025), no. 2, Paper No. 110708, 31. MR 4815899
- [5] ———, *On bounded mean oscillations in de Branges spaces*, in preparation (2025).
- [6] R.V. Bessonov, *Duality theorems for coinvariant subspaces of  $H^1$* , Advances in Mathematics **271** (2015), 62–90.
- [7] M. Bownik, *Boundedness of operators on Hardy spaces via atomic decompositions*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **133** (2005), no. 12, 3535 – 3542. MR 2163588
- [8] J.A. Cima and W.T. Ross, *The backward shift on the Hardy space*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 79, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000. MR 1761913
- [9] K.M. Dyakonov, *Interpolation and duality in spaces of pseudocontinuable functions*, Mathematische Zeitschrift **302** (2022), no. 3, 1477 – 1488.
- [10] J. Garnett, *Bounded analytic functions*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer New York, 2006.
- [11] S. Janson, J. Peetre, and S. Semmes, *On the action of Hankel and Toeplitz operators on some function spaces*, Duke Mathematical Journal **51** (1984), no. 4, 937 – 958.
- [12] L.D. Ky, *Bilinear decompositions and commutators of singular integral operators*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **365** (2013), no. 6, 2931 – 2958.
- [13] B.Y. Levin, *Distribution of zeros of entire functions*, Translations of mathematical monographs, American Mathematical Society, 1964.
- [14] ———, *Lectures on entire functions*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, vol. 150, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996, In collaboration with and with a preface by Yu. Lyubarskii, M. Sodin and V. Tkachenko, Translated from the Russian manuscript by Tkachenko. MR 1400006
- [15] A. Monguzzi, M.M. Peloso, and M. Salvatori, *Fractional Paley-Wiener and Bernstein spaces*, Collectanea Mathematica **72** (2021), no. 3, 615 – 643. MR 4297147
- [16] N.K. Nikolski, *Operators, functions, and systems: an easy reading. Vol. 1*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 92, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002, Hardy, Hankel, and Toeplitz, Translated from the French by Andreas Hartmann. MR 1864396
- [17] M. Nowak and A. Sołtysiak, *Toeplitz operators on backward shift invariant subspaces of  $H^p$* , J. Math. Anal. Appl. **481** (2020), no. 1, 123461, 10. MR 4008548
- [18] R. O’Loughlin, *Symbols of compact truncated Toeplitz operators*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications **507** (2022), no. 2, 125819.
- [19] C. Perez, *Endpoint estimates for commutators of singular integral operators*, Journal of Functional Analysis **128** (1995), no. 1, 163 – 185.
- [20] M. Plancherel and G. Pólya, *Fonctions entières et intégrales de Fourier multiples*, Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici **9** (1936), no. 1, 224 – 248. MR 1509557
- [21] ———, *Fonctions entières et intégrales de fourier multiples*, Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici **10** (1937), no. 1, 110 – 163. MR 1509570
- [22] W. Rudin, *Functional analysis*, International series in pure and applied mathematics, McGraw-Hill, 1991.
- [23] D.A. Stegenga, *Bounded Toeplitz operators on  $H^1$  and applications of the duality between  $H^1$  and the functions of bounded mean oscillation*, American Journal of Mathematics **98** (1976), no. 3, 573.
- [24] E.M. Stein, *Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions*, Princeton Mathematical Series, Princeton University Press, 1970.
- [25] K. Zhu, *Operator theory in function spaces*, Mathematical surveys and monographs, American Mathematical Society, 2007.

DEPARTAMENT DE MATEMÀTIQUES I INFORMÀTICA, UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA, GRAN VIA 585, 08007  
BARCELONA, SPAIN

*Email address:* `carlobellavita@ub.edu`

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA F. ENRIQUES, DIPARTIMENTO DI ECCELLENZA MUR 2023-2027, UNIVERSITÀ  
DEGLI STUDI DI MILANO, VIA C. SALDINI 50, I-20133 MILANO

*Email address:* `marco.peloso@unimi.it`