



# Trajectories of semigroups of holomorphic functions and harmonic measure<sup>☆</sup>

Georgios Kelgiannis\*

*Department of Mathematics, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 54124, Thessaloniki, Greece*

---

## Abstract

We give an explicit relation between the slope of the trajectory of a semigroup of holomorphic functions and the harmonic measure of the associated planar domain  $\Omega$ . We use this to construct a semigroup whose slope is an arbitrary interval in  $[-\pi/2, \pi/2]$ . The same method is used for the slope of a backward trajectory approaching a super-repulsive fixed point.

*Keywords:* semigroups of holomorphic functions, harmonic measure, trajectories, slope

*2010 MSC:* 30C20, 30C85, 30D05

---

## 1. Semigroups of Holomorphic Functions

A one-parameter continuous semigroup of holomorphic self-mappings of the unit disk  $\mathbb{D}$  is a family  $(\phi_t)_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ , such that:

- (i)  $\phi_{t+s} = \phi_t \circ \phi_s$ , for all  $t, s \in [0, +\infty)$
- (ii)  $\phi_0(z) = z$
- (iii)  $\lim_{t \rightarrow s} \phi_t(z) = \phi_s(z)$ , for all  $s \in [0, +\infty)$ .

We will simply call  $(\phi_t)$  a semigroup. For general reference on semigroups we point to [1], [12] and [16].

A semigroup is called *elliptic* if it is not a group of hyperbolic rotations and it has an interior fixed point, which must be the same for all  $\phi_t$ ,  $t > 0$ . If  $(\phi_t)$  is a non-elliptic semigroup, then there exists a unique point  $\xi \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ , called the Denjoy-Wolff point of the semigroup [2], such that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \phi_t(z) = \xi, \quad \text{for every } z \in \mathbb{D}. \quad (1)$$

---

<sup>☆</sup>© 2019. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

\*Corresponding author

*Email address:* [gkelgian@math.auth.gr](mailto:gkelgian@math.auth.gr) (Georgios Kelgiannis)

*URL:* <https://users.auth.gr/gkelgian> (Georgios Kelgiannis)

A semigroup with no interior fixed point is called *non-elliptic*. From now on we will only deal with non-elliptic semigroups. An important tool in the study of non-elliptic semigroups is the corresponding Koenigs function, see [1], [12], [16] and the references therein. To every non-elliptic semigroup  $(\phi_t)$ , corresponds a conformal mapping  $h : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \Omega$  such that:

- (i)  $h(\mathbb{D}) = \Omega$ , and
- (ii)  $h(\phi_t(z)) = h(z) + t$ ,  $z \in \mathbb{D}$ ,  $t \geq 0$ .

The domain  $\Omega$  is called the associated planar domain of  $(\phi_t)$ . A domain  $\Omega$  is called convex in the positive direction when  $\{z + t : z \in \Omega\} \subset \Omega$ , for all  $t \in [0, \infty)$ . Obviously the associated planar domain of a semigroup is convex in the positive direction. The converse is also true; for every simply connected domain  $\Omega$  convex in the positive direction, define

$$\phi_t(z) = h^{-1}(h(z) + t),$$

where  $h$  is the Riemann map that maps  $\mathbb{D}$  onto  $\Omega$ . It is easy to verify that  $(\phi_t)$ , as defined above, is a semigroup.

We are interested in the boundary fixed points of  $\phi_t$ . These are defined using the notion of angular limit. When  $\phi(z) \rightarrow w'$  as  $z \rightarrow w$  through any sector at  $w$  we say that  $w'$  is the angular limit of  $\phi$  as  $z$  tends to  $w$ ; we write

$$\angle \lim_{z \rightarrow w} \phi(z) = w'.$$

A point  $w \in \partial\mathbb{D}$  is called a boundary fixed point of  $\phi$ , when  $\angle \lim_{z \rightarrow w} \phi(z) = w$ . For a boundary fixed point  $w$ , we define the angular derivative at  $w$  to be

$$\phi'(w) = \angle \lim_{z \rightarrow w} \frac{w - \phi(z)}{w - z}.$$

In the case when  $\phi(\mathbb{D}) \subset \mathbb{D}$ , we know [14, p.82] that  $\phi'(w)$  always exists and belongs to  $(0, +\infty) \cup \{\infty\}$ . Boundary fixed points in this case are divided into three categories; see [8] and references therein.

- (i) When  $\phi'(w) \in (0, 1]$ ,  $w$  is called an attractive point,
- (ii) when  $\phi'(w) \in (1, +\infty)$ ,  $w$  is called a repulsive point and
- (iii) when  $\phi'(w) = \infty$ ,  $w$  is called a super-repulsive point.

The Denjoy-Wolff Theorem guarantees that, in the context of semigroups, the Denjoy-Wolff point  $\xi$  in relation (1), is the unique attractive boundary fixed point of  $\phi_t$ , for all  $t > 0$ .

Non-elliptic semigroups can be categorized according to properties of the associated planar domain  $\Omega$ ; see e.g. [3]. Namely:

- (i) When  $\Omega$  is contained in a horizontal strip, the semigroup is called hyperbolic.

- (ii) When  $\Omega$  is not contained in a horizontal strip, but it is contained in a horizontal half-plane, the semigroup is called parabolic of positive hyperbolic step.
- (iii) When  $\Omega$  is not contained in any horizontal half-plane, the semigroup is called parabolic of zero hyperbolic step.

The trajectory of  $z \in \mathbb{D}$  of a semigroup  $(\phi_t)$  is defined as the curve

$$\gamma_z : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{D}, \quad \gamma_z(t) = \phi_t(z).$$

By utilizing the associated domain  $\Omega$ , every trajectory can be extended as follows. Let  $T$  be the infimum of  $\{t : h(z) + t \in \Omega\}$ . The extended trajectory of  $z$  is the curve defined by

$$\gamma_z : (T, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{D}, \quad \gamma_z(t) = h^{-1}(h(z) + t). \quad (2)$$

From now on  $\gamma_z$  will be used for the extended trajectory. In accordance with [8], we will define the  $\alpha$  and  $\omega$  limits of curves. For every curve  $\Gamma : (s_1, s_2) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ , if there exists a strictly increasing sequence  $t_n \rightarrow s_2$ , such that  $\Gamma(t_n) \rightarrow \xi$ , then  $\xi$  is called an  $\omega$ -limit point of  $\Gamma$ . The set of all  $\omega$ -limit points of  $\Gamma$  is called the  $\omega$ -limit set and denoted by  $\omega(\Gamma)$ . Replacing  $s_2$  with  $s_1$  and considering strictly decreasing sequences, we similarly define the  $\alpha$ -limit point and the  $\alpha$ -limit set  $\alpha(\Gamma)$ . From (1) it is obvious that for all  $z \in \mathbb{D}$  we have  $\omega(\gamma_z) = \{\xi\}$ , where  $\xi$  is the Denjoy-Wolff point. The set  $\alpha(\gamma_z)$  is also a single point which can be one of the following [8]:

- (i) The point in  $\partial\mathbb{D}$  that corresponds to  $h(z) + T \in \partial\Omega$ , when  $T > -\infty$ .
- (ii) A boundary fixed point of  $(\phi_t)$ , including the Denjoy-Wolff point  $\xi$ , when  $T = -\infty$ .

An interesting problem is the study of the slope of  $\gamma_z$  as it approaches the boundary of  $\mathbb{D}$ . For every  $\gamma_z$ , we consider the corresponding curve

$$t \in (T, +\infty) \rightarrow \arg(1 - \bar{\xi}\gamma_z(t)) \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}). \quad (3)$$

The  $\omega$ -limit set of the above curve will be the set of slopes of  $\gamma_z$  as it approaches the Denjoy-Wolff point  $\xi$  and it will be denoted by  $\text{Slope}^+(\gamma_z)$ . If  $\alpha(\gamma_z) = \{\chi\}$  then similarly consider the curve

$$t \in (T, +\infty) \rightarrow \arg(1 - \bar{\chi}\gamma_z(t)) \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}). \quad (4)$$

The  $\alpha$ -limit set of the above curve will be called the set of slopes of the backward trajectory  $\gamma_z$  as it approaches the boundary point  $\chi$  and it will be denoted by  $\text{Slope}^-(\gamma_z)$ . The following is already known about the  $\text{Slope}^+(\gamma_z)$ .

- (i) When a semigroup is hyperbolic,  $\text{Slope}^+(\gamma_z)$  is a singleton depending on  $z$ .
- (ii) When a semigroup is parabolic of positive hyperbolic step,  $\text{Slope}^+(\gamma_z)$  is either  $\{\pi/2\}$  or  $\{-\pi/2\}$  and it is independent of  $z$ .

When a semigroup is parabolic of zero hyperbolic step, it was conjectured that  $\text{Slope}^+(\gamma_z)$  is again a singleton. This was proven but only under some additional assumptions, see e.g. [10] and [11]. The existence of a semigroup with  $\text{Slope}^+(\gamma_z) = [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$  was first proven in [4] and [9]. In a more recent result, Bracci et al. [5] show that there exists a semigroup such that  $\text{Slope}^+(\gamma_z) \subset (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$  but it is not a singleton. Also in [6] we find an example with  $\text{Slope}^+(\gamma_z) = [-\pi/2, \alpha]$ , for some  $-\pi/2 < \alpha < \pi/2$ .

In [9] the authors posed the problem of constructing examples of one-parameter semigroups  $(\phi_t)$  with  $\text{Slope}^+(\gamma_z) = [\theta_1, \theta_2]$  for any given  $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$ ,  $\theta_1 < \theta_2$ . We will construct such a semigroup.

**Theorem 1.** *If  $\theta_1 < \theta_2$  are real numbers with  $|\theta_j| \leq \pi/2$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , then there exists a semigroup of holomorphic functions  $(\phi_t)$  such that*

$$\text{Slope}^+(\gamma_z) = [\theta_1, \theta_2]. \quad (5)$$

For the  $\text{Slope}^-(\gamma_z)$  similar results were only known for the following cases [8]:

- (i) When the  $\alpha$ -limit of  $\gamma_z$  is the Denjoy-Wolff point  $\xi$ ,  $\text{Slope}^-(\gamma_z)$  is a singleton, which is either  $\{\pi/2\}$  or  $\{-\pi/2\}$ .
- (ii) When the  $\alpha$ -limit of  $\gamma_z$  is a repulsive point,  $\text{Slope}^-(\gamma_z)$  is a single point, which belongs in  $(-\pi/2, \pi/2)$ .

We prove that, in the case of super-repulsive points, a semigroup can have a wildly oscillating trajectory, quite similar to the case of a parabolic semigroup of zero hyperbolic step.

**Theorem 2.** *If  $\theta_1 \leq \theta_2$  are real numbers with  $|\theta_j| \leq \pi/2$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , then there exists a semigroup of holomorphic functions  $(\phi_t)$  and a point  $z \in \mathbb{D}$ , such that the  $\alpha$ -limit of  $\gamma_z$  is a super-repulsive point and*

$$\text{Slope}^-(\gamma_z) = [\theta_1, \theta_2].$$

## 2. Harmonic measure

To prove the aforementioned results we need to establish a relationship between the slope of a trajectory  $\gamma_z$  and certain harmonic measures in the associated planar domain  $\Omega$  of a semigroup.

The harmonic measure is the solution  $u$  of the generalized Dirichlet problem for the Laplacian in a domain  $D$ , with boundary values equal to 1 on  $E \subset \partial\Omega$  and 0 on  $\partial\Omega \setminus E$ . We will be using the notation  $\omega(z, E, D)$ .

Two basic properties of the harmonic measure that we will use are conformal invariance and domain monotonicity. When  $\phi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \Omega$  is a conformal map, we know that, if  $A$  is the set of accessible points of  $\partial\Omega$ , we can extend  $\phi^{-1}$  to  $A$ . In that sense, when  $E \subset A$  we have [13, p.206]

$$\omega(z, \phi^{-1}(E), \mathbb{D}) = \omega(\phi(z), E, \Omega). \quad (6)$$

This implies that when an arc  $\widehat{ab} \subset \partial\mathbb{D}$  corresponds, through  $\phi$ , to a boundary set  $E \subset \partial\Omega$ , in the sense of Caratheodory boundary correspondence, then

$$\omega(z, \widehat{ab}, \mathbb{D}) = \omega(\phi(z), E, \Omega). \quad (7)$$

When for two domains  $D_1, D_2$  in  $\mathbb{C}_\infty$ , with  $D_1 \subset D_2$ , we have a set  $B \subset \partial D_1 \cap \partial D_2$ , then [15, p. 102]

$$\omega(z, B, D_1) \leq \omega(z, B, D_2). \quad (8)$$

We also know that [7, p.155], if  $\widehat{ab} \subset \partial\mathbb{D}$  is a circular arc, then the level set

$$L_k = \{\zeta \in \mathbb{D} : \omega(\zeta, \widehat{ab}, \mathbb{D}) = k\}, \quad 0 < k < 1, \quad (9)$$

is a circular arc with endpoints  $a$  and  $b$  that meets the unit circle with angle  $k\pi$ . We will also use the notation

$$\widehat{L}_k = \{\zeta \in \mathbb{D} : \omega(\zeta, \widehat{ab}, \mathbb{D}) > k\}. \quad (10)$$

In order to establish a relation between certain harmonic measures in the case when  $D$  contains, in a specific way, a rectangle, we introduce the following notation.

For any set  $B$  in the complex plane  $\mathbb{C}$ , let  $B^+ = B \cap \{z : \operatorname{Im} z > 0\}$  and  $B^- = B \cap \{z : \operatorname{Im} z < 0\}$ . Let

$$S_d = \{z : -d < \operatorname{Im} z < d\} \quad (11)$$

be a horizontal strip of width  $2d$ ,

$$S_{d,u} = \{z : -d < \operatorname{Im} z < d, \quad -u < \operatorname{Re} z < u\} \quad (12)$$

be a rectangle centered at the origin with width  $2d$  and length  $2u$ ,

$$B_{d,u} = \{z : \operatorname{Im} z = d, \quad -u < \operatorname{Re} z < u\} \quad (13)$$

be the upper side of  $S_{d,u}$  and  $B_{-d,u}$  be the lower side of  $S_{d,u}$ . Betsakos [4] has proven the following:

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a planar domain, convex in the positive direction. Assume that  $\mathbb{R} \subset \Omega$  and that  $(\partial\Omega)^+ \neq \emptyset$ ,  $(\partial\Omega)^- \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $d > 0$ . There exists a  $u_0 > 0$  with the property: If  $y \in (-d, d)$ ,  $S_{d,u_0} \subset \Omega$  and  $B_{d,u_0} \cup B_{-d,u_0} \subset \partial\Omega$ , then*

$$|\omega(iy, (\partial\Omega)^+, \Omega) - \omega(iy, (\partial S_d)^+, S_d)| < \epsilon. \quad (14)$$

In the original proof  $\Omega$  is fixed. However, a close inspection of the proof shows that  $u_0$  depends only on  $d$ , not on the set  $\Omega$  and that (14) holds for all  $u > u_0$ . We will use a variation of Lemma 1.

For  $w \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $d_1, d_2, u > 0$ , we consider the rectangles

$$A(w, d_1, d_2, u) = \{x + iy : |x - \operatorname{Re} w| < u/2, \quad \operatorname{Im} w - d_2 < y < \operatorname{Im} w + d_1\}.$$

Let also, for  $A = A(w, d_1, d_2, u)$ ,

$$\partial_h A = \{x + iy : |x - \operatorname{Re} w| < u/2, y = \operatorname{Im} w - d_2 \text{ or } y = \operatorname{Im} w + d_1\},$$

be the horizontal border of  $A$ . Finally for  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ , let

$$\partial_z^+ \Omega = \partial \Omega \cap \{\zeta : \operatorname{Im} \zeta > \operatorname{Im} z\} \quad (15)$$

be the part of the border of  $\Omega$  that lies above  $z$ . Note that when  $z \in \mathbb{R}$  we have  $\partial_z^+ \Omega = (\partial \Omega)^+$ . Note also that if the distances of  $iy$  from the upper and lower parts of a strip are respectively  $d_1$  and  $d_2$ , by applying standard conformal maps, one can see that

$$\omega(iy, (\partial S_d)^+, S_d) = \frac{d_2}{d_1 + d_2}. \quad (16)$$

By conformal invariance of the harmonic measure, Lemma 1 can be restated as follows.

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $d_1, d_2 > 0$ . Then for every  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a  $u_0 > 0$ , such that for every  $u > u_0$  and for all domains  $\Omega$ , convex in the positive direction, the following property holds: If  $A = A(w, d_1, d_2, u) \subset \Omega$  and  $\partial_h A \subset \partial \Omega$ , then*

$$\left| \omega(w, \partial_w^+ \Omega, \Omega) - \frac{d_2}{d_1 + d_2} \right| < \epsilon. \quad (17)$$

We will be working with domains convex in the positive direction but we point out that by a small modification of the proof found in [4], we can drop this requirement.

Let  $z \in \mathbb{D}$ . We will prove that the slope of the trajectory  $\gamma_z$  of a semigroup of holomorphic functions  $(\phi_t)$  is determined by certain harmonic measures. Consider the function

$$\omega_z(t) = \omega(h(z) + t, \partial_{h(z)}^+ \Omega, \Omega), \quad t \in (0, +\infty). \quad (18)$$

Betsakos [4] constructed a semigroup such that for every  $z \in \mathbb{D}$ ,  $\mathbf{Slope}^+(\gamma_z) = [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$ , by considering the behavior of  $\omega_0(t)$  as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$ . We will prove an explicit relation between the behavior of  $\omega_z(t)$  and the slopes of  $\gamma_z$ . We will then use it to construct a semigroup such that  $\mathbf{Slope}^+(\gamma_z) = [\theta_1, \theta_2]$  with  $-\pi/2 \leq \theta_1 < \theta_2 \leq \pi/2$ . The same principles will be extended to an analogous result for the  $\mathbf{Slope}^-(\gamma_z)$ .

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $(\phi_t)$  be a semigroup of holomorphic functions in  $\mathbb{D}$ . Denote by  $h$  the corresponding Koenigs function and by  $\Omega = h(\mathbb{D})$  the associated planar domain. For  $z \in \mathbb{D}$ , with  $\partial_{h(z)}^+ \Omega \neq \emptyset$  and  $\partial_{h(z)}^+ \Omega \neq \partial \Omega$ , let  $a_1 = \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \omega_z(t)$  and  $a_2 = \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \omega_z(t)$ . Then*

$$\mathbf{Slope}^+(\gamma_z) = [\pi(1/2 - a_1), \pi(1/2 - a_2)]. \quad (19)$$

*If, in addition, for that  $z$ , the trajectory  $\gamma_z$  is defined for all  $t \in (-\infty, 0]$  and we have  $b_1 = \limsup_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \omega_z(t)$  and  $b_2 = \liminf_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \omega_z(t)$ , then*

$$\mathbf{Slope}^-(\gamma_z) = [\pi(1/2 - b_1), \pi(1/2 - b_2)]. \quad (20)$$

Using the above theorem we can argue about the slopes of the trajectories of  $(\phi_t)$  by focusing on the image  $h(\mathbb{D})$  and looking at the behavior of the harmonic measure on the points of the half-line  $\{h(z) + t : t > 0\}$ , or on  $\{h(z) - t : t > 0\}$  for the backward trajectories.

### 3. Proofs

PROOF (THEOREM 3). We assume that the Denjoy-Wolff point of  $(\phi_t)$  is  $\xi$  and the  $\alpha$ -limit of  $\gamma_z$  is  $\chi$ . Let  $\widehat{\chi\xi}$  be the arc on  $\partial\mathbb{D}$  between  $\chi$  and  $\xi$ , corresponding through  $h(z)$  to  $\partial_{h(z)}^+\Omega$ . Note that  $\partial_{h(z)}^+\Omega \neq \emptyset$  and  $\partial_{h(z)}^+\Omega \neq \partial\Omega$  imply  $\chi \neq \xi$ . Also since  $h$  is conformal we have that  $\widehat{\chi\xi}$  is the arc that runs clockwise from  $\chi$  to  $\xi$ . We know that the level set

$$L_k = \{\zeta \in \mathbb{D} : \omega(\zeta, \widehat{\chi\xi}, \mathbb{D}) = k\}, \quad 0 < k < 1, \quad (21)$$

is a circular arc with endpoints  $\chi$  and  $\xi$  that meets the unit circle with angle  $k\pi$ . Let  $\widehat{L}_k = \{\zeta \in \mathbb{D} : \omega(\zeta, \widehat{\chi\xi}, \mathbb{D}) > k\}$  and  $\Gamma_k$  be the half-line emanating from  $\xi$  that is tangent to  $L_k$  at  $\xi$ . If  $\zeta$  lies on  $\Gamma_k$  then  $\arg(1 - \bar{\xi}\zeta) = \pi/2 - \pi k = \pi(1/2 - k)$ .

By conformal invariance of the harmonic measure (7),

$$\omega_z(t) = \omega(h(z) + t, \partial_{h(z)}^+\Omega, \Omega) = \omega(\phi_t(z), \widehat{\chi\xi}, \mathbb{D}). \quad (22)$$

Let  $a_1 = \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \omega_z(t)$  and  $\theta_1 = \pi(1/2 - a_1)$  the corresponding angle.

We will prove that  $\theta_1 = \min\{\text{Slope}^+(\gamma_z)\}$ .

**Claim 1.** If  $\theta \in \text{Slope}^+(\gamma_z)$  then  $\theta_1 \leq \theta$ .

If  $a_1 = 1$  then  $\theta_1 = -\pi/2$  and we are done. If not, since  $a_1 = \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \omega_z(t)$ , from (22) we must also have

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \omega(\phi_t(z), \widehat{\chi\xi}, \mathbb{D}) = a_1. \quad (23)$$

Assume that  $\theta \in \text{Slope}(\gamma_z)$  with  $\theta_1 > \theta = \pi(1/2 - a)$ . So there is an  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $a_1 < a_1 + \epsilon/2 < a_1 + \epsilon < a$ . Then there is a sequence  $t_n \rightarrow \infty$  such that all but finite of the points  $\phi_{t_n}(z)$  lie above  $\Gamma_{a_1 + \epsilon}$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$ . This means that  $\phi_{t_n}(z) \in \widehat{L}_{a_1 + \epsilon/2}$  for almost all  $n$ . This implies that  $\lim_{t_n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(\phi_{t_n}(z), \widehat{\chi\xi}, \mathbb{D}) \geq a_1 + \epsilon/2$ , a contradiction. So  $\theta_1 \leq \theta$ .

**Claim 2.**  $\theta_1 \in \text{Slope}^+(\gamma_z)$ .

Since there exists  $t_n$  with  $\omega(\phi_{t_n}(z), \widehat{\chi\xi}, \mathbb{D}) \rightarrow a_1$  we have that  $\arg(1 - \bar{\xi}\phi_{t_n}(z)) \rightarrow \theta_1$  and so  $\theta_1 \in \text{Slope}^+(\gamma_z)$ .

We have shown that  $\theta_1 = \min\{\text{Slope}^+(\gamma_z)\}$ . Using the same arguments we can show that if  $a_2 = \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \omega_z(t)$  and  $\theta_2 = \pi(1/2 - a_2)$  we have  $\theta_2 = \max\{\text{Slope}^+(\gamma_z)\}$ . This means that  $\text{Slope}^+(\gamma_z) = [\pi(1/2 - a_1), \pi(1/2 - a_2)]$ .

In the case when the  $\alpha$ -limit of  $\gamma_z$  is a super-repulsive point, replacing  $\infty$  with  $-\infty$  and  $\xi$  with  $\chi$ , using the same arguments, we obtain relation (20) for the  $\text{Slope}^-(\gamma_z)$ .

**Remark 1.** The only property of the set  $\partial_{h(z)}^+ \Omega$  that we use is that it corresponds, through  $h^{-1}$ , to an arc  $\widehat{\chi\xi}$  on  $\partial\mathbb{D}$  with  $\xi$  being the Denjoy-Wolff point, or  $\chi$  being the  $\alpha$ -limit of  $\gamma_z$ , and  $\chi \neq \xi$ . This means that even when  $\partial_{h(z)}^+ \Omega = \emptyset$  or  $\partial_{h(z)}^+ \Omega = \partial\Omega$  we can use the same approach by choosing a suitable subset of  $\partial\Omega$ .

PROOF (THEOREM 1). We will only prove the result for  $|\theta_1|, |\theta_2| < \pi/2$  for simplicity. Small variations of the proof can also account for the cases of  $\theta_1 = -\pi/2$  or  $\theta_2 = \pi/2$ . We will essentially present these variations in the proof of Theorem 2. We will modify the construction found in [4] and construct a set  $\Omega$  such that for the associated semigroup we have  $\text{Slope}^+(\gamma_0) = [\theta_1, \theta_2]$ . Let  $E[\zeta] = \{\zeta + t : t \leq 0\}$  be the half-line, parallel to the real axis, starting from  $\zeta$  and extending to the left. Let  $a_1 = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\theta_1}{\pi}$  and  $a_2 = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\theta_2}{\pi}$ , so that  $0 < a_2 < a_1 < 1$ . Let  $r_n, \rho_n$  be sequences such that

$$r_n = \frac{1 - a_1}{a_1} \rho_n \quad (24)$$

and

$$r_n = \frac{1 - a_2}{a_2} \rho_{n-1}, \quad n \geq 2. \quad (25)$$

Since  $a_1 > a_2$ , both  $r_n$  and  $\rho_n$  are increasing. Note that these depend only on the choice of  $a_1, a_2$  and  $r_1$ . For example  $a_1 = \frac{3}{4}$ ,  $a_2 = \frac{1}{3}$  and  $r_1 = 6$  gives

$$r_n = 6^n \text{ and } \rho_n = 3 \cdot 6^n.$$

It is easy to see that definitions (24) and (25) indeed give

$$\frac{\rho_n}{\rho_n + r_n} = a_1 \text{ and } \frac{\rho_{n-1}}{\rho_{n-1} + r_n} = a_2. \quad (26)$$

Note that for  $w = 0$  we have  $\partial_w^+ \Omega = (\partial\Omega)^+$  and choose an increasing sequence  $u'_n$  from Lemma 2, such that the following hold:

When  $n = 2k - 1$ , for all  $\Omega$  with  $A = A(w, r_k, \rho_k, u'_n) \subset \Omega$  and  $\partial A_h \subset \partial\Omega$ ,

$$|\omega(w, (\partial\Omega)^+, \Omega) - \frac{\rho_k}{\rho_k + r_k}| < \frac{1}{n} \quad (27)$$

and for all  $\Omega$  with  $A = A(x, r_{k+1}, \rho_k, u'_n) \subset \Omega$  and  $\partial A_h \subset \partial\Omega$ ,

$$|\omega(w, (\partial\Omega)^+, \Omega) - \frac{\rho_k}{\rho_k + r_{k+1}}| < \frac{1}{n}. \quad (28)$$

When  $n = 2k$ , for all  $\Omega$  with  $A = A(x, r_{k+1}, \rho_k, u'_n) \subset \Omega$  and  $\partial A_h \subset \partial\Omega$ ,

$$|\omega(w, (\partial\Omega)^+, \Omega) - \frac{\rho_k}{\rho_k + r_{k+1}}| < \frac{1}{n} \quad (29)$$



and for all  $\Omega$  with  $A = A(x, r_{k+1}, \rho_{k+1}, u'_n) \subset \Omega$  and  $\partial A_h \subset \partial \Omega$ ,

$$|\omega(w, (\partial \Omega)^+, \Omega) - \frac{\rho_{k+1}}{\rho_{k+1} + r_{k+1}}| < \frac{1}{n}. \quad (30)$$

Consider the partial sums  $u_n = \sum_{j=1}^n u'_j$  and set

$$\Omega = \mathbb{C} \setminus \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (E[u_{2k-1} + ir_k] \cup E[u_{2k} - i\rho_k]). \quad (31)$$

The way  $\Omega$  was constructed we have that  $\Omega$  is convex in the positive direction. We also have that, for  $n = 2k-1$ , for the rectangles  $A = A(x_n, r_k, \rho_k, u'_n)$  we have  $A \subset \Omega$  and  $\partial A_h \subset \partial \Omega$ , where  $x_n = (u_n + u_{n-1})/2$ . Obviously  $x_n \rightarrow \infty$ . For  $n = 2k$  the same holds for  $A = A(x_n, r_{k+1}, \rho_k, u'_n)$ .

So for  $n = 2k - 1$ , from relations (26) and (27), we have,

$$|\omega(x_n, (\partial \Omega)^+, \Omega) - a_1| < \frac{1}{n} \quad (32)$$


and for  $n = 2k$ , from relations (26) and (29),

$$|\omega(x_n, (\partial \Omega)^+, \Omega) - a_2| < \frac{1}{n}. \quad (33)$$

So we have found two sequences  $x_{2k-1} \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $x_{2k} \in \mathbb{R}$  with respective limits  $a_2$  and  $a_1$ . That means

$$[a_2, a_1] \subset [\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \omega_0(t), \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \omega_0(t)]. \quad (34)$$

We proceed to show the opposite inclusion. Consider a pair  $x_{2k-1}, x_{2k}$  on the real line. Note that the rectangles  $A(x_{2k-1}, r_k, \rho_k, u'_{2k-1})$  and  $A(x_{2k}, r_{k+1}, \rho_k, u'_{2k})$  are both contained in  $\Omega$ .



Consider the set  $\Omega_1 = \Omega \setminus E$ , where  $E = \{x + iy : y = r_k, u_{2k-1} < x \leq u_{2k}\}$ . In Figure 2,  $E$  is the dotted segment. Obviously  $\Omega_1 \subset \Omega$  and  $(\partial\Omega)^- = (\partial\Omega_1)^-$ . Also for all  $x \in [x_{2k-1}, x_{2k}]$ , since  $u'_n$  is increasing, we have that

$$A = A(x, r_k, \rho_k, u'_{2k-1}) \subset \Omega_1 \text{ and } \partial A_h \subset \partial\Omega_1. \quad (35)$$

Using the domain monotonicity of the harmonic measure and relation (27) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(x, (\partial\Omega)^+, \Omega) &= 1 - \omega(x, (\partial\Omega)^-, \Omega) \leq 1 - \omega(x, (\partial\Omega_1)^-, \Omega_1) \\ &= \omega(x, (\partial\Omega_1)^+, \Omega_1) < a_1 + \frac{1}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly consider  $\Omega_2 = \Omega \cup E[u_{2k-1} + ir_k]$ . Again for all  $x \in [x_{2k-1}, x_{2k}]$ , we have  $A = A(x, r_{k+1}, \rho_k, u'_{2k-1}) \subset \Omega_2$  and  $\partial A_h \subset \partial\Omega_2$ . Since  $\Omega \subset \Omega_2$ , considering (28),

$$\omega(x, (\partial\Omega)^+, \Omega) > \omega(x, (\partial\Omega_2)^+, \Omega_2) > a_2 - \frac{1}{n}.$$

We can likewise treat the case where  $x \in [x_{2k}, x_{2k+1}]$ . These inequalities show that if there exists a sequence  $t_k \rightarrow \infty$  with  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \omega_0(t_k) = a$  then  $a_2 \leq a \leq a_1$ .

We have shown that  $a_1 = \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \omega_0(t)$  and  $a_2 = \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \omega_0(t)$ . Considering the semigroup  $(\phi_t)$  that corresponds to the set  $\Omega$ , the desired result follows from Theorem 3.

PROOF (THEOREM 2). As in the above proof let  $b_1 = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\theta_1}{\pi}$ ,  $b_2 = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\theta_2}{\pi}$  and  $r_n, \rho_n$  be sequences such that

$$r_n = \frac{1 - b_2}{b_2} \rho_n,$$

and

$$r_n = \frac{1 - b_1}{b_1} \rho_{n-1}, \quad n \geq 2.$$

Since  $b_1 > b_2$  we have that both  $r_n$  and  $\rho_n$  are decreasing sequences. Note that these depend only on the choice of  $b_1, b_2$  and  $r_1$ . Similar to the above proof, if for example  $b_1 = \frac{3}{4}$ ,  $b_2 = \frac{1}{3}$  and  $r_1 = \frac{1}{3}$ , we get

$$r_n = \frac{1}{3} \cdot 6^{-(n-1)} \text{ and } \rho_n = 6^{-n}.$$

We define sequences  $u_n, u'_n$  in the exact same way as in the proof of Theorem 1. This means that we can use relations (27 - 30). Now  $\Omega$  can be defined as

$$\Omega = \mathbb{C} \setminus \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (E[-u_{2k-1} + ir_k] \cup E[-u_{2k} + i\rho_k]).$$

Obviously  $\Omega$  is convex in the positive direction and  $\gamma_0$  is defined for  $t \in (-\infty, +\infty)$ . Similarly with before we take  $x_n = -(u_n + u_{n-1})/2$ . We have that  $x_n$  goes to  $-\infty$  and for the subsequences  $x_{2k-1}$  and  $x_{2k}$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \omega(x_{2k-1}, (\partial\Omega)^+, \Omega) &= b_1 \text{ and} \\ \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \omega(x_{2k}, (\partial\Omega)^+, \Omega) &= b_2. \end{aligned}$$

We can show the opposite inclusion with the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 1. Again from Theorem 3 we get  $\text{Slope}^-(\gamma_0) = [\theta_1, \theta_2]$ .

We will now consider the case when  $b_2 = 0$ . We modify our sequences so that

$$r_n = (n + m)\rho_n,$$

and

$$r_n = \frac{1 - b_1}{b_1}, \quad n \geq 2,$$

where  $m$  is taken big enough, so that for all  $n$  we have  $n + m > \frac{1-b_2}{b_2}$ . We again have two decreasing sequences. The proof works out in the same way except that now, for  $n = 2k - 1$ , relation (27) becomes

$$\omega(x_n, (\partial\Omega)^+, \Omega) < \frac{1}{n + m + 1} + \frac{1}{n} < \frac{2}{n} \quad (36)$$

for all  $n$ . Obviously  $\omega(x_{2k-1}, (\partial\Omega)^+, \Omega) \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  and as before we have  $\omega(x_{2k}, (\partial\Omega)^+, \Omega) \rightarrow b_1$ . Similarly in the case when  $b_1 = 1$  we take

$$r_n = \frac{1 - b_2}{b_2}\rho_n,$$

and

$$r_n = \frac{1}{n + m}, \quad n \geq 2,$$

where  $m$  is taken big enough, so that for all  $n$  we have  $\frac{1}{n + m} < \frac{1 - b_2}{b_2}$ . As before, note that, for  $n = 2k$ , relation (29) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(x_n, \partial\Omega^+, \Omega) &> \frac{n + m}{n + m + 1} - \frac{1}{n} \\ &> \frac{n + m}{n + m + 1} - \frac{2}{n + m + 1} = 1 - \frac{3}{n + m + 1}, \end{aligned}$$

for all  $n > m + 1$ . Obviously  $\omega(x_{2k}, (\partial\Omega)^+, \Omega) \rightarrow 1$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , while  $\omega(x_{2k-1}, (\partial\Omega)^+, \Omega) \rightarrow b_2$ .

Combining the above we can also construct an example with  $\text{Slope}^-(\gamma_z) = [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$ . Note that in this case we can simply use

$$r_n = n\rho_n,$$

and

$$r_n = \frac{1}{n}\rho_{n-1}, \quad n \geq 2,$$

which coincides with what was used in [4].

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank professor D. Betsakos, my thesis advisor, for his help.

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Declarations of interest: none.

## References

- [1] Abate, M. (1989). *Iteration theory of holomorphic maps on taut manifolds*. Research and Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Complex Analysis and Geometry. Mediterranean Press, Rende.
- [2] Berkson, E., & Porta, H. (1978). Semigroups of analytic functions and composition operators. *Michigan Math. J.*, 25, 101–115. doi:10.1307/mmj/1029002009.
- [3] Betsakos, D. (2016). Geometric description of the classification of holomorphic semigroups. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 144, 1595–1604. doi:10.1090/proc/12814.
- [4] Betsakos, D. (2016). On the asymptotic behavior of the trajectories of semigroups of holomorphic functions. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 26, 557–569. doi:10.1007/s12220-015-9562-1.
- [5] Bracci, F., Contreras, M. D., Díaz-Madrigal, S., & Gaussier, H. (2018). Non-tangential limits and the slope of trajectories of holomorphic semigroups of the unit disc. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.05553v2*, .
- [6] Bracci, F., Contreras, M. D., Díaz-Madrigal, S., Gaussier, H., & Zimmer, A. (2018). Asymptotic behavior of orbits of holomorphic semigroups. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.07947*, .
- [7] Carathéodory, C. (1954). *Theory of functions of a complex variable. Vol. 1*. Chelsea Publishing Co., New York, N. Y. Translated by F. Steinhardt.
- [8] Contreras, M. D., & Díaz-Madrigal, S. (2005). Analytic flows on the unit disk: angular derivatives and boundary fixed points. *Pacific J. Math.*, 222, 253–286. doi:10.2140/pjm.2005.222.253.
- [9] Contreras, M. D., Díaz-Madrigal, S., & Gumenyuk, P. (2015). Slope problem for trajectories of holomorphic semigroups in the unit disk. *Comput. Methods Funct. Theory*, 15, 117–124. doi:10.1007/s40315-014-0092-9.
- [10] Elin, M., & Jacobzon, F. (2014). Parabolic type semigroups: asymptotics and order of contact. *Anal. Math. Phys.*, 4, 157–185. doi:10.1007/s13324-014-0084-y.
- [11] Elin, M., Khavinson, D., Reich, S., & Shoikhet, D. (2010). Linearization models for parabolic dynamical systems via Abel’s functional equation. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.*, 35, 439–472. doi:10.5186/aasfm.2010.3528.
- [12] Elin, M., & Shoikhet, D. (2010). *Linearization models for complex dynamical systems* volume 208 of *Operator Theory: Advances and Applications*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel. doi:10.1007/978-3-0346-0509-0.
- [13] Garnett, J. B., & Marshall, D. E. (2008). *Harmonic measure* volume 2 of *New Mathematical Monographs*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. Reprint of the 2005 original.
- [14] Pommerenke, C. (1992). *Boundary behaviour of conformal maps* volume 299 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-02770-7.
- [15] Ransford, T. (1995). *Potential theory in the complex plane* volume 28 of *London Mathematical Society Student Texts*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. doi:10.1017/CB09780511623776.
- [16] Shoikhet, D. (2001). *Semigroups in geometrical function theory*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht. doi:10.1007/978-94-015-9632-9.