

HYPERCYCLICITY OF TOEPLITZ OPERATORS WITH SMOOTH SYMBOLS

EMMANUEL FRICAIN, SOPHIE GRIVAUX, AND MAËVA OSTERMANN

ABSTRACT. This paper is devoted to the study of the dynamics of Toeplitz operators T_F with smooth symbols F on the Hardy spaces of the unit disk H^p , $p > 1$. Building on a model theory for Toeplitz operators on H^2 developed by Yakubovich in the 90's, we carry out an in-depth study of hypercyclicity properties of such operators. Under some rather general smoothness assumptions on the symbol, we provide some necessary/sufficient/necessary and sufficient conditions for T_F to be hypercyclic on H^p . In particular, we extend previous results on the subject by Baranov-Lishanskii and Abakumov-Baranov-Charpentier-Lishanskii. We also study some other dynamical properties for this class of operators.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction and main results	2
2. Model theory for Toeplitz operators on H^p spaces with smooth symbols	8
2.1. Some spectral theory	9
2.2. Eigenvectors	9
2.3. Interior and exterior boundary values	10
2.4. Boundary conditions in some Smirnov spaces	11
2.5. The main result of Yakubovich	11
2.6. The functional calculus	12
2.7. Spanning eigenvectors	12
3. Necessary conditions for hypercyclicity of Toeplitz operators	13
3.1. A condition on the winding number	13
3.2. Intersection with connected components of the interior of the spectrum	14
4. Proving the hypercyclicity of T_F : from a connected component to another	15
4.1. Example of two circles	17
4.2. From the interior to the exterior	19
4.3. From the exterior to the interior	20
4.4. A case where the two components have the same winding number	26
4.5. Applying Theorems 4.4 and 4.5	27
5. Applications and examples	27
5.1. The one-component case	28
5.2. When there are no adjacent components	29
5.3. A result involving maximal components	29
5.4. A case with a necessary and sufficient condition	32

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47B35, 47A16, 30H10, 30H15.

Key words and phrases. Toeplitz operators, hypercyclicity, linear dynamics, eigenvectors of Toeplitz operators, model theory for Toeplitz operators, Smirnov spaces.

The authors were supported in part by the Labex CEMPI (ANR-11-LABX-0007-01). The third author also acknowledges the support of the CNRS.

5.5. The case where $\max \text{wind}_F(\Omega) = 2$	36
6. An extension to a more general setting	37
6.1. Yakubovich's model theory for Toeplitz operators	38
6.2. A necessary condition for hypercyclicity	40
6.3. Sufficient conditions for hypercyclicity	40
6.4. An equivalence	45
7. Comparison with results of Abakumov, Baranov, Charpentier and Lishanskii	46
7.1. Link with the setting of [1]	46
7.2. The case where F is exactly N -valent	48
7.3. The Decreasing Valence Condition	49
7.4. About the Increasing Argument Condition	50
8. Some further results and open questions	52
8.1. Supercyclicity	52
8.2. Chaos, frequent hypercyclicity and ergodicity	53
8.3. From an exterior component to an interior component	55
8.4. Toeplitz operators and the Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion	59
8.5. Identical curves with different parametrizations	59
8.6. Boundary values of quotients of inner functions	61
Appendix A. Reminders	62
A.1. Reminders in complex analysis	62
A.2. Properties of the Riesz projection P_+	66
A.3. Carleson measures for H^p	68
A.4. Toeplitz operators	70
A.5. Smirnov spaces $E^p(\Omega)$	71
A.6. Linear dynamics	72
Appendix B. Proof of the H^p version of Yakubovich's model theory for Toeplitz operators	76
B.1. Some notations	77
B.2. Construction of eigenvectors	79
B.3. Another representation of the functions f_λ^+	81
B.4. Boundary relations for eigenvectors	86
B.5. The operators U and V	88
B.6. From Appendix B to Section 2	107
References	107

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

Our aim in this paper is to investigate Toeplitz operators on the Hardy space H^p of the open unit disk \mathbb{D} , where $1 < p < +\infty$, from the point of view of linear dynamics.

Given a function $F \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$, where \mathbb{T} denotes the unit circle in \mathbb{C} , the Toeplitz operator T_F on H^p is defined by

$$T_F u = P_+(F u) \quad \text{for every } u \in H^p.$$

Here P_+ denotes the canonical (Riesz) projection from $L^p(\mathbb{T})$ onto H^p , and it is well-known that it is bounded when $1 < p < +\infty$. Then the Toeplitz operator T_F is bounded on H^p , which we denote by $T_F \in \mathcal{B}(H^p)$. The class of Toeplitz operators plays a prominent role in operator theory, partly because of their numerous applications to various other domains

such as complex analysis, theory of orthogonal polynomials, probability theory, information and control theory, mathematical physics, etc. We refer the reader to one of the references [6, 10, 12, 22, 34, 39–41] for an in depth study of Toeplitz operators from various points of view. See also Appendix A for some useful reminders on Toeplitz operators and the Riesz projection P_+ .

Our focus here will be on the study of the hypercyclicity of Toeplitz operators on H^p spaces, as well as of related properties such as chaos, frequent hypercyclicity, ergodicity... Definitions as well as related concepts will be presented in the forthcoming sections and in Appendix A. Any unexplained terminology pertaining to linear dynamics can be found in one of the books [8] or [33], together with a thorough presentation of linear dynamical systems, both from the topological and from the measurable point of view. It may be useful to mention that the main difficulty when studying the dynamics of Toeplitz operators is that, in general, explicit formulas for the powers of the Toeplitz operator are not available, except when the symbol is analytic or anti-analytic.

Given a bounded operator T acting on a (real or complex) separable Banach space X , T is said to be *hypercyclic* on X if it admits a vector $x \in X$ with a dense orbit $\{T^n x; n \geq 0\}$. Such a vector x is called a hypercyclic vector for T . Hypercyclicity is clearly a reinforcement of the classical notion of cyclicity, where one requires the existence of a vector $x \in X$ such that the linear space of its orbit is dense in X . A hypercyclic operator $T \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ satisfies the following spectral properties: every connected component of its spectrum $\sigma(T)$ intersects the unit circle, and the point spectrum of its adjoint is empty. In particular, it easily follows that a Toeplitz operator with an analytic symbol is never hypercyclic. On the other hand, many operators can be shown to be hypercyclic, based on the study of their eigenvectors. Indeed, a well-known criterion due to Godefroy and Shapiro [30] states the following:

Suppose that the two spaces

$$(1.1) \quad H_-(T) = \overline{\text{span}}[\ker(T - \lambda); |\lambda| < 1] \quad \text{and} \quad H_+(T) = \overline{\text{span}}[\ker(T - \lambda); |\lambda| > 1]$$

are equal to X . Then T is hypercyclic on X .

This criterion will be used repeatedly in the paper to show that for large classes of symbols $F \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$, the associated Toeplitz operator T_F on H^p is hypercyclic.

The study of Toeplitz operators from the point of view of linear dynamics began in the seminal work of Godefroy and Shapiro [30], where they gave a necessary and sufficient condition for the adjoint of a multiplication operator on H^2 to be hypercyclic, thus characterizing hypercyclic Toeplitz operators with anti-analytic symbols: if $F \in H^\infty$ and F is not constant, then $T_{\overline{F}} \in \mathcal{B}(H^2)$ is hypercyclic if and only if $F(\mathbb{D}) \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$. The next step was done by Shkarin, who considered in [47] the case where

$$F(e^{i\theta}) = ae^{-i\theta} + b + ce^{i\theta} \quad \text{for every } e^{i\theta} \in \mathbb{T},$$

and proved that T_F is hypercyclic on H^2 if and only if $|a| > |c|$ and the bounded component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ intersects both \mathbb{D} and $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Baranov and Lishanskii investigated next in [4] the more general case where F has the form

$$F(e^{i\theta}) = P(e^{-i\theta}) + \varphi(e^{i\theta}) \quad \text{for a.e. } e^{i\theta} \in \mathbb{T},$$

where P is an analytic polynomial and φ belongs to H^∞ . They provided some necessary conditions (of a spectral kind) for T_F to be hypercyclic on H^2 , as well as some sufficient conditions, based on the study of the eigenvectors of T_F and on the Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion. The same line of approach was taken in the subsequent work [1] of Abakumov,

Baranov, Charpentier and Lishanskii, where the authors extended results of [4] to the case of more general symbols F of the form

$$F(e^{i\theta}) = R(e^{-i\theta}) + \varphi(e^{i\theta}) \quad \text{for a.e. } e^{i\theta} \in \mathbb{T},$$

where R is a rational function without poles in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and φ belongs to H^∞ . The novel feature of the approach taken in [1] is the use of deep results of Solomyak [48] providing necessary and sufficient conditions for finite sets of functions in H^2 to be cyclic for some analytic Toeplitz operators on H^2 . Taken in combination with the description of some eigenvectors of T_F , this yields substantial extensions of certain results from [4].

Our work is a further contribution to the study of hypercyclicity of Toeplitz operators. Our approach here is somewhat different from the ones taken in the previous works mentioned above, although we will use too properties of eigenvectors and the Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion in order to obtain sufficient conditions for T_F to be hypercyclic. So as to exhibit suitable families of spanning eigenvectors for T_F , we rely on deep constructions by Yakubovich of model operators for Toeplitz operators on H^2 with smooth symbol. It should be mentioned that the model theory for Toeplitz operators with smooth symbols has a rich history. See for instance [14–16, 19–21, 24, 43, 50]. In a series of papers culminating in the works [51] and [53] (see also [52]), Yakubovich showed that for a very large class of positively wound smooth symbols F on \mathbb{T} , the operator T_F is similar to a direct sum of multiplication operators by the independent variable z on certain closed subspaces of Smirnov spaces $E^2(\Omega)$, where the sets Ω are suitable unions of connected components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$. In the case where the symbol F is negatively wound, in an analogous way T_F is similar to the direct sum of the adjoints of these multiplication operators on these subspaces of the $E^2(\Omega)$'s. In particular, under these conditions, T_F admits an H^∞ functional calculus on the interior of the spectrum $\sigma(T_F)$ of T_F . Moreover, using this model, Yakubovich proved in [51] and [53] that whenever F is sufficiently smooth and negatively wound, T_F is cyclic on H^2 . The proof of this last property relies on the fact that the eigenvectors of T_F associated to eigenvalues $\lambda \in \sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ span a dense subspace of H^2 .

It is not difficult to see (see Proposition 3.1 below) that, for smooth symbols at least, a necessary condition for the hypercyclicity of T_F is that F be negatively wound. We will suppose that it is the case in the rest of this introduction.

Thus, in order to decide whether the Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion can be applied to T_F (proving then hypercyclicity), we need to find conditions on a subset A of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ implying that the vector space

$$\text{span} [\ker(T_F - \lambda); \lambda \in A]$$

is dense in H^p . In other words, given any $x \in H^q$ (where q is the conjugate exponent of p), we need to be able to decide whether $x = 0$ as soon as x vanishes on the eigenspaces $\ker(T_F - \lambda)$ for all $\lambda \in A$. An easy observation, based on the analyticity of the eigenvector fields and the Uniqueness Principle for analytic functions (see Proposition 2.5 for details), shows that if x vanishes on $\ker(T_F - \lambda)$ for all $\lambda \in A \cap \Omega$, then x vanishes on $\ker(T_F - \lambda)$ for all $\lambda \in \Omega$, where Ω is any connected component of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ such that $A \cap \Omega$ has an accumulation point in Ω . Recall that we do know (as mentioned above, it is a consequence of results from [51] and [53]) that if for every connected component Ω of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ and for every $\lambda \in \Omega$, x vanishes on $\ker(T_F - \lambda)$, then $x = 0$. So things boil down to the following kind of question, which we state here informally:

Question 1.1. *Let Ω be a connected component of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ and let $x \in H^q$ be such that*

$$x \text{ vanishes on } \ker(T_F - \lambda) \text{ for every } \lambda \in \Omega.$$

Let Ω' be another connected component of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$. Under which conditions on Ω and Ω' is it true that

$$x \text{ vanishes on } \ker(T_F - \lambda) \text{ for every } \lambda \in \Omega'?$$

We will investigate this question in some depth, finding rather general conditions on pairs (Ω, Ω') of connected components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ implying an affirmative answer to Question 1.1. This will allow us to derive necessary and sufficient geometrical conditions implying the hypercyclicity of T_F under fairly general conditions on the (negatively wound) symbol F . Moreover, this approach allows us to treat the case where T_F acts on H^p , $p > 1$ rather than the Hilbertian case $p = 2$ only.

Our conditions are stated essentially in terms of smoothness of the symbol F , which is at least required to belong to a class $C^{1+\varepsilon}$, for some suitable $\varepsilon > 0$ (see Appendix A.2 for the definition of $C^{1+\varepsilon}$) and of geometrical properties of the set of connected components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$. Rather than state here formally some of our results, which would require some preparation and notation, we prefer to present in an informal way some cases where we are able to characterize hypercyclicity of T_F , along with a picture of a situation where we are in the case considered and T_F is hypercyclic.

Let $p > 1$ and q its conjugate exponent, i.e. $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$. Consider the following conditions on the symbol F :

- (H1) F belongs to the class $C^{1+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{T})$ for some $\varepsilon > \max(1/p, 1/q)$, and its derivative F' does not vanish on \mathbb{T} ;
- (H2) the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$ self-intersects a finite number of times, i.e. the unit circle \mathbb{T} can be partitioned into a finite number of closed arcs $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$ such that
 - (a) F is injective on the interior of each arc α_j , $1 \leq j \leq m$;
 - (b) for every $i \neq j$, $1 \leq i, j \leq m$, the sets $F(\alpha_i)$ and $F(\alpha_j)$ have disjoint interiors;
- (H3) for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, $\text{wind}_F(\lambda) \leq 0$, where $\text{wind}_F(\lambda)$ denotes the winding number of the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$ around λ ;
- (H4) F admits an analytic extension to an open neighborhood of \mathbb{T} .

When condition (H2) is satisfied, denote by \mathcal{O} the set of all the extremities of the arcs α_j . The set of self-intersection points of the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$ is contained in \mathcal{O} , hence finite. By choosing the arcs α_j in a suitable manner, it is possible to ensure that \mathcal{O} is exactly the set of self-intersection points of $F(\mathbb{T})$; this is what we will assume in the forthcoming sections. Under assumption (H2), the function F admits an inverse F^{-1} defined on $F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$. Let us note that the results that we will obtain will depend only on the a.e. behaviour of the function F^{-1} on $F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$; in particular, they do not depend on the specific form of the set \mathcal{O} induced by the choice of the arcs α_j in assumption (H2).

The smoothness and injectivity conditions (H1) and (H2) are those from [51] in the case $p = 2$. A more general condition than (H2), allowing the sets $F(\alpha_i)$ and $F(\alpha_j)$ to coincide for some indices $i \neq j$, is provided in [53]. Some of our results also hold under this weaker assumption, but for simplicity's sake, we begin by restrict ourselves here to the case where (H2) holds, i.e. to the case where the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$ has only a finite number of auto-intersection points. The weaker assumptions of [53] will be considered in Section 6.

Let F satisfies the first three assumptions (H1), (H2) and (H3). Recall (see Lemma A.11) that in this case

$$\sigma(T_F) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T}); \text{wind}_F(\lambda) < 0\} \cup F(\mathbb{T}).$$

We denote by \mathcal{C} the set of all connected components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$. For every $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$, let $\text{wind}_F(\Omega)$ be the common value of $\text{wind}_F(\lambda)$, $\lambda \in \Omega$. We will prove (see Theorem 3.2) that a necessary condition for T_F , acting on H^p , to be hypercyclic, is that \mathbb{T} intersects every connected component of the interior of $\sigma(T_F)$. Here are now some examples of necessary/sufficient/necessary and sufficient conditions that we obtain for the hypercyclicity of T_F on H^p :

Case 1: If $\Omega \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$ for every $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$, then T_F is hypercyclic on H^p (Theorem 4.1).




FIGURE 1

Case 2: If \mathcal{C} has only one element, i.e. $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ is connected, then T_F is hypercyclic on H^p if and only if $\overset{\circ}{\sigma(T_F)} \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$ (Theorem 5.1).




FIGURE 2

Case 3: If $\overline{\Omega} \cap \overline{\Omega'}$ is finite for all distinct elements Ω, Ω' of \mathcal{C} , then T_F is hypercyclic on H^p if and only if $\Omega \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$ for every $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ (Theorem 5.5).




FIGURE 3

Case 4: Say that $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ is a maximal component of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ if the following holds: for every $\Omega' \in \mathcal{C}$ which is adjacent to Ω , $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega')| < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega)|$. If \mathbb{T} intersects all the maximal components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, then T_F is hypercyclic on H^p (Theorem 5.6).




FIGURE 4

Case 5: Suppose that F satisfies the additional assumption (H4) and that the following holds: for every pair (Ω, Ω') of adjacent connected components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ with $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega')|$, one of the following properties holds:

- (a) there exists a self intersection point λ_0 of the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$ and an open neighborhood V of λ_0 such that: $V \cap \partial\Omega' = V \cap \partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega'$, λ_0 belongs to $\partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega'$, and the restriction of the function ζ to $\partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega'$ cannot be extended continuously at the point λ_0 ;
- (b) $\partial\Omega'$ is a Jordan curve and the image of a single closed subarc of \mathbb{T} .

Then T_F is hypercyclic on H^p if and only if \mathbb{T} intersects every component of $\sigma(T_F)$ (Theorem 5.14).




FIGURE 5

Our results allow us to retrieve and generalize previous results from [47], [4] and [1] on hypercyclicity of Toeplitz operators on H^2 , up to one important point: while our results apply to general smooth functions F on \mathbb{T} , those of [1] apply to symbols of the form $F(e^{i\theta}) = R(e^{-i\theta}) + \varphi(e^{i\theta})$ where R is a rational function without poles in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and φ belongs to the disk algebra $A(\mathbb{D})$, the space of functions which are analytic on \mathbb{D} and admit a continuous extension to $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. While the restriction of R to \mathbb{T} is as smooth as we wish, that of φ is only continuous, so that the restriction of F to \mathbb{T} may be only continuous. See Section 7 for details.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we first present Yakubovich's results on models for Toeplitz operators with negatively wound symbols on H^2 , and state their

extension to the H^p setting that will be required in the sequel of the paper. In Section 3, we present some necessary conditions for the hypercyclicity of Toeplitz operators on H^p . Sections 4 and 5 are devoted to the proofs of our main results, providing sufficient as well as necessary and sufficient conditions for the hypercyclicity of these operators. The more general case where the symbol is not necessarily required to be injective on the circle minus a finite number of points (i.e. the setting of [53]) is discussed then in Section 6. In Section 7, we compare our results and approach to those taken by Abakumov, Baranov, Charpentier and Lishanskii in [1]. Section 8 contains some generalizations and further results, as well as some open questions arising from our study. In particular, we investigate in Section 8 other notions in linear dynamics such as supercyclicity, chaos, frequent hypercyclicity and ergodicity with respect to an invariant ergodic measure in the setting of Toeplitz operators.

The paper also contains two appendices: the first one, Appendix A, presents some reminders on topics and tools which are repeatedly used in the paper: basics on the Fredholm theory of Toeplitz operators, Carleson measure, Smirnov spaces, quasiconformal maps, Privalov's type theorems, and, lastly, linear dynamics. The second one, Appendix B, contains a full proof of the extension to the H^p case of the main results from [51] on Toeplitz operators. Our approach follows closely that of [51], and we do not make any claim for originality here. However, since these results are extremely beautiful, but not so easy to read in their original presentation, we thought it worthwhile to provide a detailed account of them, and of their extension to the H^p setting.

Acknowledgment. We are grateful to Dmitry Yakubovich for stimulating discussions on the topic of this paper, and to Dmitry Khavinson for providing us with useful references on Smirnov spaces.

2. MODEL THEORY FOR TOEPLITZ OPERATORS ON H^p SPACES WITH SMOOTH SYMBOLS

In this section we present the notation, setting and main results from [51] and [53] (in the H^2 -case) which are crucial to our approach to hypercyclicity properties of Toeplitz operators on H^p , $p > 1$. We'll restrict ourselves here to the bare essentials, see Appendix B for further details, explanations and proofs.

For $1 < p < +\infty$, let H^p denote the Hardy space of all analytic functions u on the open unit disk \mathbb{D} such that

$$\|u\|_{H^p} := \sup_{0 < r < 1} M_p(u, r) < +\infty \quad \text{where } M_p(u, r) = \left(\int_0^{2\pi} |u(re^{i\theta})|^p \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \right)^{1/p}.$$

A function $u \in H^p$ has non tangential boundary values u^* almost everywhere on \mathbb{T} . We will often still denote this boundary value as u . It is well-known that $\|u\|_{H^p} = \|u^*\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T})}$. The dual of H^p is canonically identified to H^q , where q is the conjugate exponent of p and the duality is given by the following formula:

$$(2.1) \quad \langle x | y \rangle_{p,q} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} x(e^{i\theta}) y(e^{-i\theta}) d\theta,$$

where $x \in H^p$ and $y \in H^q$. This duality bracket is linear on both sides; we keep this convention even when $p = 2$, so that in particular adjoints of operators on H^2 must be understood as Banach space adjoints, and not Hilbert space adjoints.

We denote by P_+ the Riesz projection from $L^p(\mathbb{T})$ into H^p defined by

$$P_+ u(z) = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{u(\tau)}{\tau - z} d\tau \quad \text{for } u \in L^p(\mathbb{T}) \text{ and } z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

2.1. Some spectral theory. Given $F \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$, the Toeplitz operator T_F on H^p defined by $T_F u = P_+(Fu)$, $u \in H^p$, is bounded on H^p . Suppose that F is continuous on \mathbb{T} . Then $T_F - \lambda$ is a Fredholm operator on H^p if and only if $\lambda \notin F(\mathbb{T})$; in this case, its Fredholm index is equal to $-\text{wind}_F(\lambda)$ and we can describe the spectrum of T_F as

$$\sigma(T_F) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T}); \text{wind}_F(\lambda) \neq 0\} \cup F(\mathbb{T}),$$

where $\text{wind}_F(\lambda)$ is the winding number of the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$ with respect to λ . See Lemma A.11. Note that, in all of this paper, F is, at least C^1 on \mathbb{T} , so the winding number is given by

$$\text{wind}_F(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{F'(\tau)}{F(\tau) - \lambda} d\tau = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{F'(e^{i\theta})}{F(e^{i\theta}) - \lambda} e^{i\theta} d\theta.$$

By continuity of the winding number, the function wind_F is constant on each connected component Ω of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$. We denote this common value by $\text{wind}_F(\Omega)$.

2.2. Eigenvectors. Suppose now that wind_F takes only non positive values on $\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, i.e. that assumption (H3) from the introduction is satisfied. It then follows from the H^p version of the Coburn Theorem (Theorem A.12) and Lemma A.11 that, for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$,

$$\ker(T_F^* - \lambda) = \{0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \dim \ker(T_F - \lambda) = -\text{wind}_F(\lambda).$$

Henceforward, we assume that F satisfies assumptions (H1), (H2) and (H3). In order to represent T_F as the adjoint of a multiplication operator by λ on a certain space of analytic functions, Yakubovich provided in [51] an explicit expression of a spanning family of elements of $\ker(T_F - \lambda)$, $\lambda \notin F(\mathbb{T})$. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, and consider the function ϕ_λ defined on \mathbb{T} by

$$\phi_\lambda(\tau) = \tau^{-\text{wind}_F(\lambda)} (F(\tau) - \lambda) \quad \text{for } \tau \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Since ϕ_λ is $C^{1+\varepsilon}$ and does not vanish on \mathbb{T} , and since $\text{wind}_{\phi_\lambda}(0) = 0$, one can define a logarithm $\log \phi_\lambda$ of ϕ_λ on \mathbb{T} that is $C^{1+\varepsilon}$ on \mathbb{T} , and set

$$(2.2) \quad F_\lambda^+ = \exp(P_+(\log \phi_\lambda)).$$

More details on the construction on F_λ^+ are contained in Appendix B. The functions F_λ^+ and $1/F_\lambda^+$ both belong to $A(\mathbb{D})$ and for every connected component Ω of $\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ and every $z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$, the map $\lambda \mapsto F_\lambda^+(z)$ is analytic on Ω and continuous on $\overline{\Omega}$ (see Lemma B.1 and Lemma B.9 for details).

Let $N = \max\{|\text{wind}_F(\lambda)|; \lambda \notin F(\mathbb{T})\}$ and for each $j = 0, \dots, N-1$, let

$$(2.3) \quad \Omega_j^+ = \{\lambda \notin F(\mathbb{T}); |\text{wind}_F(\lambda)| > j\}$$

be the set of points λ in $\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ where the (negative) winding number of F is strictly less than $-j$. We have

$$\Omega_{N-1}^+ \subseteq \Omega_{N-2}^+ \subseteq \dots \subseteq \Omega_1^+ \subseteq \Omega_0^+,$$

and $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ (which is the set of all λ 's in $\sigma(T_F)$ such that $T_F - \lambda$ is Fredholm) coincides with Ω_0^+ . Note also that

$$\partial\Omega_{N-1}^+ \subseteq \partial\Omega_{N-2}^+ \subseteq \dots \subseteq \partial\Omega_1^+ \subseteq \partial\Omega_0^+ = F(\mathbb{T}).$$

For every $j = 0, \dots, N-1$ and every $\lambda \in \Omega_j^+$, set

$$(2.4) \quad h_{\lambda,j}(z) = z^j \frac{F_\lambda^+(0)}{F_\lambda^+(z)} \quad \text{for any } z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

These functions belong to $A(\mathbb{D})$, hence to H^p , and it can be checked that $(T_F - \lambda)h_{\lambda,j} = 0$ for every $\lambda \in \Omega_j^+$. So, we have

$$\ker(T_F - \lambda) = \text{span} [h_{\lambda,j}; 0 \leq j < |\text{wind}_F(\lambda)|]$$

for every $\lambda \in \sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ (see Lemma B.4). Moreover, the map $\lambda \mapsto h_{\lambda,j}$ is analytic from Ω_j^+ into $A(\mathbb{D})$ and, for a fixed $z \in \mathbb{D}$, the function $\lambda \mapsto h_{\lambda,j}(z)$ belongs to the Smirnov space $E^q(\Omega_j^+)$, where q is the conjugate exponent of p (see Theorem B.15).

The reader may wonder why we normalize the eigenvectors in Equation (2.4) by the constant $F_\lambda^+(0)$. In fact, in the construction of the model, we would like that the isomorphism U which implements the model satisfies that $(U1)_0 \equiv 1$ (see Equation (2.7)) and, since $(U1)_0(\lambda) = h_{\lambda,0}(0)$, this imposes this constant. With this property for U , it turns out that one can obtain an explicit formulae for the inverse of U . See [51] for more explanations on this point.

2.3. Interior and exterior boundary values. Assumption (H2) implies that the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$ has only a finite number of points of self-intersection which is the set \mathcal{O} . Whenever γ is a subarc of $F(\mathbb{T})$ containing no point of \mathcal{O} , γ is included in the boundary of exactly two connected components Ω and Ω' of $\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, and we have

$$|\text{wind}_F(\Omega) - \text{wind}_F(\Omega')| = 1.$$

If $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| > |\text{wind}_F(\Omega')|$, we say that Ω is the *interior component* and Ω' is the *exterior component* (with respect to γ). Now, let u be continuous on $\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$. For $\lambda_0 \in F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$, let I_{λ_0} be a small subarc of $F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$ containing λ_0 . We define (when they exist) the following non-tangential limits, called respectively the interior and exterior boundary values of u at λ_0 :

$$u^{int}(\lambda_0) = \lim_{\substack{\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_0 \\ \lambda \in \Omega}} u(\lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad u^{ext}(\lambda_0) = \lim_{\substack{\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_0 \\ \lambda \in \Omega'}} u(\lambda),$$

where Ω and Ω' are respectively the interior and exterior connected components with respect to I_{λ_0} . Functions in a Smirnov space of a domain Ω of \mathbb{C} (with a rectifiable boundary $\Gamma = \partial\Omega$) admit non-tangential limits almost everywhere on Γ (see Appendix A.5). If Ω and Ω' are two adjacent domains along an arc γ , and if u belongs to some Smirnov space $E^r(\Omega \cup \Omega')$, then the interior and exterior boundary values u^{int} and u^{ext} exist almost everywhere on γ .




FIGURE 6

With these notations, suppose that F satisfies (H1), (H2) and (H3). Since F is invertible from $\mathbb{T} \setminus F^{-1}(\mathcal{O})$ onto $F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$, one can define the map $\zeta = 1/F^{-1}$ on $F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$. In particular, ζ is defined almost everywhere on $F(\mathbb{T})$. Then (see Corollary B.12) the eigenvectors $h_{\lambda,j}$ of T_F given by (2.4) satisfy the following relation:

$$(2.5) \quad h_{\lambda,j}^{int} - \zeta h_{\lambda,j+1}^{int} = h_{\lambda,j}^{ext} \quad \text{for almost all } \lambda \in \partial\Omega_{j+1}^+.$$

2.4. Boundary conditions in some Smirnov spaces. Let $r > 1$. On the direct sum $\bigoplus_{0 \leq j \leq N-1} E^r(\Omega_j^+)$, we consider the following norm:

$$\|(u_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1}\| = \left(\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \|u_j\|_{E^r(\Omega_j^+)}^r \right)^{1/r} \quad \text{for every } (u_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1} \in \bigoplus_{j=0}^{N-1} E^r(\Omega_j^+).$$

Note that for each connected component Ω of Ω_j^+ , the non-tangential limit of the function u_j exists almost everywhere on the boundary of Ω and that for every $0 \leq j \leq N-1$, the non tangential limits u_j^{int} , u_{j+1}^{int} and u_j^{ext} exist almost everywhere on $\partial\Omega_{j+1}^+$.

Let E_F^r be the closed subspace of $\bigoplus E^r(\Omega_j^+)$ formed by the N -tuples $(u_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1}$ in $\bigoplus E^r(\Omega_j^+)$ satisfying, for all $0 \leq j < N-1$,

$$(2.6) \quad u_j^{int} - \zeta u_{j+1}^{int} = u_j^{ext} \quad \text{a.e. on } \partial\Omega_{j+1}^+.$$

Note that Equation (2.5) implies that for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$, the N -tuple $(h_{\cdot,0}(z), \dots, h_{\cdot,N-1}(z))$ belongs to E_F^r . Note also that this subspace is an invariant subspace for the multiplication operator $M_\lambda : \bigoplus E^r(\Omega_j^+) \rightarrow \bigoplus E^r(\Omega_j^+)$ defined by

$$(M_\lambda u)_j = \lambda u_j(\lambda) \quad \text{for every } u = (u_i)_{0 \leq i \leq N-1} \in \bigoplus_{j=0}^{N-1} E^r(\Omega_j^+).$$

More generally let $v \in H^\infty(\sigma(\overset{\circ}{T}_F))$ be a bounded analytic function on the interior of the spectrum of T_F . Then the space E_F^r is invariant by the multiplication operator M_h on $\bigoplus E^r(\Omega_j^+)$ defined by $M_h(u_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1} = (hu_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1}$, where $u_j \in E^r(\Omega_j^+)$ for every $0 \leq j \leq N-1$. This means that $H^\infty(\sigma(\overset{\circ}{T}_F))$ is contained in the multiplier algebra of E_F^r .

2.5. The main result of Yakubovich. After all this preparation, we are now ready to define the operator U that gives M_λ as a model operator for T_F^* .

Let $p > 1$, and let q be the conjugate exponent of p (i.e. $1/p + 1/q = 1$). Suppose that the symbol F of the Toeplitz operator $T_F \in \mathcal{B}(H^p)$ satisfies (H1), (H2) and (H3). Let $h_{\lambda,j}$, $0 \leq j \leq N-1$, be given by (2.4). For every function $g \in H^q$, define $Ug = ((Ug)_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1}$ by setting

$$(2.7) \quad (Ug)_j(\lambda) = \langle h_{\lambda,j} | g \rangle_{p,q}, \quad \lambda \in \Omega_j^+.$$

Note that, since $h_{\lambda,j}$ is an eigenvector of T_F associated to the eigenvalue λ , we have for every $g \in H^q$ and every $0 \leq j \leq N-1$ that

$$\langle h_{\lambda,j} | T_F^* g \rangle_{p,q} = \langle T_F h_{\lambda,j} | g \rangle_{p,q} = \lambda \langle h_{\lambda,j} | g \rangle_{p,q} \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \Omega_j^+.$$

In other words,

$$U(T_F^* g) = M_\lambda U g \quad \text{for every } g \in H^q.$$

Since the functions $h_{\lambda,j}$, $0 \leq j \leq N-1$, form a basis of the eigenspace $\ker(T_F - \lambda)$, it follows that

Fact 2.1. *For any $g \in H^q$, g vanishes on $\ker(T_F - \lambda)$ if and only if $(Ug)_j(\lambda) = 0$ for every $0 \leq j < |\text{wind}_F(\lambda)|$.*

We are now ready to give the H^p version of the main result obtained by Yakubovich in [51].

Theorem 2.2. *The operator U defined above is a linear isomorphism from H^q onto E_F^q . Moreover, we have*

$$T_F^* = U^{-1}M_\lambda U.$$

In other words, the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^q & \xrightarrow{T_F^*} & H^q \\ U \downarrow & & \downarrow U \\ E_F^q & \xrightarrow{M_\lambda} & E_F^q \end{array}$$

This model is built from eigenvectors of T_F , and the relation $UT_F^* = M_\lambda U$ means nothing else than this. See the introductions of the papers [51, 52] for insightful comments on this construction. A detailed proof of Theorem 2.2 will be given in Appendix B.

We conclude this section with some important consequences of Theorem 2.2.

2.6. The functional calculus. Since $H^\infty(\sigma(\overset{\circ}{T}_F))$ is contained in the multiplier algebra of E_F^q , a first important consequence of Theorem 2.2 is the existence of an H^∞ functional calculus for T_F on the interior of the spectrum of T_F .

Corollary 2.3 (Yakubovich [51]). *Suppose that F satisfies (H1), (H2) and (H3). Then T_F admits an H^∞ functional calculus on $\sigma(\overset{\circ}{T}_F)$, i.e. there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|u(T_F)\| \leq C \sup\{|u(\lambda)|; \lambda \in \sigma(\overset{\circ}{T}_F)\}$$

for every function $u \in H^\infty(\sigma(\overset{\circ}{T}_F))$.

Indeed, let $u \in H^\infty(\sigma(\overset{\circ}{T}_F)) = H^\infty(\sigma(\overset{\circ}{T}_F^*))$. By Theorem 2.2, we can set $u(T_F^*) = U^{-1}M_{u(\lambda)}U$. This defines a functional calculus for T_F^* on $H^\infty(\sigma(\overset{\circ}{T}_F^*))$, and

$$\|u(T_F^*)\| \leq \|U\| \|U^{-1}\| \sup\{|u(\lambda)|; \lambda \in \sigma(\overset{\circ}{T}_F^*)\}.$$

See Theorem B.25. Set now $u(T_F) = u(T_F^*)^*$ for every $u \in H^\infty(\sigma(\overset{\circ}{T}_F))$; this defines an H^∞ functional calculus for T_F on the interior of $\sigma(T_F)$, and Corollary 2.3 follows.

2.7. Spanning eigenvectors. The second important consequence of Theorem 2.2 is that eigenvectors of T_F span a dense subset of H^p . Before we justify this statement, we set a notation which will be used repeatedly throughout this work.

Definition 2.4. Let \mathcal{C} denote the set of all connected components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$. For every $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$, set

$$(2.8) \quad H_\Omega(T_F) := \overline{\text{span}}[\ker(T_F - \lambda); \lambda \in \Omega].$$

Here is now a result which will be crucial in the sequel.

Proposition 2.5. *Let $p > 1$ and let F satisfy (H1), (H2) and (H3).*

(1) *Let $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$, and let A be a subset of \mathbb{C} . If $A \cap \Omega$ has an accumulation point in Ω , then*

$$\overline{\text{span}}[\ker(T_F - \lambda); \lambda \in A \cap \Omega] = \overline{\text{span}}[\ker(T_F - \lambda); \lambda \in \Omega].$$

(2) *We have*

$$\overline{\text{span}}[H_\Omega(T_F); \Omega \in \mathcal{C}] = H^p.$$

Proof. Given $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$, observe that the functions $\lambda \mapsto \langle h_{\lambda,j} | g \rangle_{p,q}$, $0 \leq j < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega)|$, are analytic on Ω (they belong to $E^p(\Omega)$) and span a dense subspace of $H_\Omega(T_F)$. Then the uniqueness principle for analytic functions yields (1). In order to prove (2), suppose that $g \in H^p$ vanishes on all eigenspaces $\ker(T_F - \lambda)$, $\lambda \in \Omega$, $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$. Then we have, for every $0 \leq j \leq N - 1$,

$$\langle h_{\lambda,j} | g \rangle_{p,q} = 0 \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \Omega_j^+.$$

This means exactly that $Ug = 0$, and since U is injective by Theorem 2.2, $g = 0$. \square

This consequence of Theorem 2.2 is used in [51] to derive the cyclicity of T_F under the assumptions (H1), (H2) and (H3). Indeed, since $\ker(T_F - \lambda)^* = \emptyset$ for every $\lambda \in \sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, it follows from Proposition 2.5 and Lemma A.21 that T_F is cyclic. In order to investigate the hypercyclicity of T_F , an important part of our work will be to refine Proposition 2.5, to as to be able to conclude (under suitable conditions on the symbol F), that

$$\begin{aligned} H_-(T_F) &= \overline{\text{span}}[\ker(T_F - \lambda); |\lambda| < 1] = H^p; \\ H_+(T_F) &= \overline{\text{span}}[\ker(T_F - \lambda); |\lambda| > 1] = H^p. \end{aligned}$$

These two properties will allow us to apply the Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion, and thus to deduce that T_F is hypercyclic on H^p . This will be the main goal of our Section 4. Applications will be presented in Section 5. Meanwhile, we present some necessary conditions (of a spectral nature) for the hypercyclicity of T_F .

3. NECESSARY CONDITIONS FOR HYPERCYCLICITY OF TOEPLITZ OPERATORS

3.1. A condition on the winding number. A first observation is that for a sufficiently smooth symbol F , F has to be negatively wound for T_F to have a chance of being hypercyclic.

Proposition 3.1. *Let F be continuous on \mathbb{T} and let $p > 1$. If there exists a point $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ with $\text{wind}_F(\lambda_0) > 0$, then T_F is not hypercyclic on H^p , $p > 1$.*

Proof. Recall (see Lemma A.11) that, since $\lambda_0 \notin F(\mathbb{T})$, $T_F - \lambda_0$ is a Fredholm operator, and its Fredholm index satisfies

$$j(T_F - \lambda_0) = \dim(\ker(T_F - \lambda_0)) - \dim(\ker(T_F^* - \lambda_0)) = -\text{wind}_F(\lambda_0).$$

Thus

$$\dim(\ker(T_F^* - \lambda_0)) = \text{wind}_F(\lambda_0) + \dim(\ker(T_F - \lambda_0)) \geq \text{wind}_F(\lambda_0) > 0.$$

Then λ_0 is an eigenvalue for T_F^* . But the adjoint of an hypercyclic operator must have empty point spectrum, and hence T_F cannot be hypercyclic. \square

Assumption (H3) is thus natural in our context.

3.2. Intersection with connected components of the interior of the spectrum.

It is also well-known (see Appendix A.6) that whenever T is a hypercyclic operator on a complex separable Banach space X , every connected component of the spectrum of T must intersect the unit circle \mathbb{T} . It turns out that, in our current setting, a stronger property must hold.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $p > 1$ and let F satisfy assumption (H1), (H2) and (H3). If T_F is hypercyclic on H^p , then every connected component of the interior of the spectrum of T_F must intersect \mathbb{T} .*

For instance, in the situation represented in Figure 7, Theorem 3.2 states that for T_F to be hypercyclic, the unit circle must intersect all the “petals” of the flower-like domain $\sigma(T_F)$ - which is much stronger than requiring that $\sigma(T_F)$, which is connected here, intersects \mathbb{T} .




FIGURE 7

Theorem 3.2 follows immediately from Proposition 3.3 below, which has some independent interest, and the fact that under assumptions (H1), (H2) and (H3), T_F has an $H^\infty(\sigma(T_F))$ -functional calculus (Corollary 2.3).

Proposition 3.3. *Let X be a complex separable Banach space, and let $T \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ be hypercyclic. Suppose that T admits an H^∞ -functional calculus on a certain open subset O of \mathbb{C} , and that all connected components of O intersect $\sigma(T)$. Then every connected component of O intersects \mathbb{T} .*

Proof. Let O_1 be a connected component of O , and let $O_2 = O \setminus O_1$. Define a function u_1 on O by setting $u_1(\lambda) = 1$ if $\lambda \in O_1$ and $u_1(\lambda) = 0$ if $\lambda \in O_2$. Set $u_2 = 1 - u_1$. Then u_1 and u_2 are elements of $H^\infty(O)$. Set $P_i = u_i(T)$, $i = 1, 2$. The P_i 's are well-defined bounded projections on X , with $P_1P_2 = P_2P_1 = 0$ and $P_1 + P_2 = I$. Denote by M_i the range of P_i , $i = 1, 2$. Then M_i is a closed T -invariant subspace of X and $X = M_1 \oplus M_2$. If O has at least two connected components, $\sigma(T)$ intersects both O_1 and O_2 , $\sigma(P_i) = \sigma(u_i(T)) = u_i(\sigma(T)) = \{0, 1\}$, and then P_i is a non-trivial projection. So $M_i \neq \{0\}$ and $M_i \neq X$. If O is connected, then $O_1 = O$ and $P_1 = I$. Denote by T_i the operator induced by T on M_i , $i = 1, 2$. Then

Fact 3.4. *We have $\sigma(T_1) = \overline{O_1} \cap \sigma(T)$.*

Proof of Fact 3.4. Since $\sigma(T) = \sigma(T_1) \cup \sigma(T_2)$, we clearly have $\sigma(T_1) \subseteq \sigma(T)$. If $\lambda \notin \overline{O_1}$, define a function f by setting $f(z) = \frac{1}{z-\lambda}u_1(z)$, $z \in O$. Then $f \in H^\infty(O)$, and the operator $S := f(T)$ leaves M_1 invariant and satisfies $S(T - \lambda)x_1 = (T - \lambda)Sx_1 = x_1$ for every $x_1 \in M_1$. So $T_1 - \lambda$ is invertible on M_1 , and $\lambda \notin \sigma(T_1)$. Thus $\sigma(T_1) \subseteq \overline{O_1} \cap \sigma(T)$.

Suppose now that $\lambda \in O_1 \cap \sigma(T)$. Then $\lambda \notin \overline{O_2}$ (because O_1 is open and $O_1 \cap O_2 = \emptyset$), and by the argument above $\lambda \notin \sigma(T_2)$. Since $\lambda \in \sigma(T)$, necessarily $\lambda \in \sigma(T_1)$, so that $O_1 \cap \sigma(T) \subseteq \sigma(T_1)$. Hence $\overline{O_1} \cap \sigma(T) \subseteq \sigma(T_1)$ and this shows that $\sigma(T_1) = \overline{O_1} \cap \sigma(T)$. \square

Moreover, since the operator T admits an $H^\infty(O)$ -functional calculus, T_1 admits an $H^\infty(O_1)$ -functional calculus. Let $u \in H^\infty(O_1)$. Then u can be extended into a function $\tilde{u} \in H^\infty(O)$ by setting $\tilde{u}(z) = 0$ for $z \in O_2$. For $x_1 \in M_1$, define

$$(3.1) \quad u(T_1)x_1 = \tilde{u}(T)x_1.$$

Then $u(T_1)$ is a bounded operator on M_1 and we have

$$\|u(T_1)\| \leq \|\tilde{u}(T)\| \leq C\|\tilde{u}\|_{\infty, O} = C\|u\|_{\infty, O_1}$$

for a positive constant C independent of u . Then we easily see that Equation (3.1) defines an $H^\infty(O_1)$ -functional calculus for T_1 . Since T is a hypercyclic operator on X , the operator T_1 is also hypercyclic on M_1 (see Lemma A.13).

Let us finally show that it is impossible to have $O_1 \subseteq \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ nor $O_1 \subseteq \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{D}$. If $O_1 \subseteq \overline{\mathbb{D}}$, then

$$\|T_1^n\| \leq C\|z^n\|_{\infty, O_1} \leq C \quad \text{for every } n \geq 0,$$

so that T_1 is a power-bounded operator on M_1 . This stands in contradiction with the hypercyclicity of T_1 . If now $O_1 \subseteq \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{D}$, then since $\sigma(T_1) = \overline{O_1} \cap \sigma(T_F)$, T_1 is invertible, and so T_1^{-1} is also hypercyclic (see Appendix A.6). Since $0 \notin O_i$, by the functional calculus again, we have that

$$\|T_1^{-n}\| \leq C\|z^{-n}\|_{\infty, O_1} \leq C \quad \text{for every } n \geq 0,$$

contradicting the hypercyclicity of T_1^{-1} . So $O_1 \cap (\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}) \neq \emptyset$ and $O_1 \cap \mathbb{D} \neq \emptyset$, i.e. $O_1 \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$. \square

4. PROVING THE HYPERCYCLICITY OF T_F : FROM A CONNECTED COMPONENT TO ANOTHER

We remind the reader that \mathcal{C} denotes the set of all connected components of $\sigma(T) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$; we also recall that the spaces $H_-(T)$ and $H_+(T)$ are defined in Equation (1.1), and the spaces $H_\Omega(T)$ for $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ in Equation (2.8). Let us begin with the easiest case where T_F can be shown to be hypercyclic.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $p > 1$ and let F satisfy (H1), (H2) and (H3). Suppose that*

$$(4.1) \quad \Omega \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset \quad \text{for every } \Omega \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Then T_F is hypercyclic on H^p .

Here is an example of a situation where $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ has two connected components and Theorem 4.1 applies:




FIGURE 8

Proof. Theorem 4.1 is an immediate consequence of Proposition 2.5. Indeed, since $\Omega \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$ for every $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$, $\Omega \cap \mathbb{D}$ and $\Omega \cap (\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}})$ both have accumulation points in Ω for every $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ and then, for every $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$\overline{\text{span}}[\ker(T_F - \lambda); \lambda \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{D}] = \overline{\text{span}}[\ker(T_F - \lambda); \lambda \in \Omega \cap (\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}})] = H_\Omega(T_F).$$

Hence $H_\Omega(T_F) \subseteq H_-(T_F)$ and $H_\Omega(T_F) \subseteq H_+(T_F)$ for every $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$. So by Proposition 2.5, we deduce that $H_+(T_F) = H_-(T_F) = H^p$, and the conclusion follows from the Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion. \square

What happens now if, in Figure 8, \mathbb{T} intersects only one of these two connected components Ω_1 and Ω_2 ? There are at least two kinds of situations which have to be considered.

Case a: the case where \mathbb{T} intersects the component $\Omega_2 = \{\lambda \notin F(\mathbb{T}); |\text{wind}_F(\lambda)| = 2\}$, but not the component $\Omega_1 = \{\lambda \notin F(\mathbb{T}); |\text{wind}_F(\lambda)| = 1\}$.




FIGURE 9

Case b: the case where \mathbb{T} intersects Ω_1 but not Ω_2 .




FIGURE 10

In the first case, since $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ has accumulation points in both Ω_1 and Ω_2 , according to Proposition 2.5, we have $H_+(T_F) = H^p$. However, we only know a priori, by Proposition 2.5 again, that $H_-(T_F)$ contains the subspace $H_{\Omega_2}(T_F)$, and in order to be able to conclude that $H_-(T_F) = H^p$, we would need to have also that

$$H_{\Omega_1}(T_F) \subseteq H_-(T_F).$$

This would obviously be true provided that

$$H_{\Omega_1}(T_F) \subseteq H_{\Omega_2}(T_F)$$

and then Proposition 2.5 would imply that $H_-(T_F) = H^p$.

In the second case, the easy fact is that $H_+(T_F) = H^p$ and it is true that $H_{\Omega_1}(T_F) \subseteq H_-(T_F)$. So what we would need in order to obtain that $H_-(T_F) = H^p$ is that

$$H_{\Omega_2}(T_F) \subseteq H_{\Omega_1}(T_F).$$

Observe that one can also have a mix of these two situations, where the unit circle is contained in the boundary of both Ω_1 and Ω_2 as in Figure 11.




FIGURE 11

Going back to our general situation, let us say that two connected components $\Omega, \Omega' \in \mathcal{C}$ are *adjacent* if there exists an arc γ with non-empty interior contained in $\partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega'$. In this case, the winding numbers $\text{wind}_F(\Omega)$ and $\text{wind}_F(\Omega')$ differ by 1 exactly. The main problem we are facing is the following:

Question 4.2. *Let Ω and Ω' be two adjacent components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$. When is it true that*

$$H_{\Omega'}(T_F) \subseteq H_{\Omega}(T_F) ?$$

As illustrated by the example in the next subsection, the difficulty of this question varies, depending on whether $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| > |\text{wind}_F(\Omega')|$ (meaning that Ω is the interior component and Ω' is the exterior component with respect to γ) or $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega')|$ (meaning that Ω' is the interior component and Ω is the exterior component with respect to γ).

In our study of Question 4.2, the boundary conditions in Equation (2.6) defining the subspace $E_F^q = \text{Im}(U)$ of $\bigoplus E^q(\Omega_j^+)$ (where U is the operator defined in Section 2) will play a crucial role. As a consequence, we will often use the following uniqueness property of functions belonging to Smirnov spaces (which is also recalled in Appendix A.5):

Fact 4.3. *Let Ω be a bounded simply connected domain and let $r \geq 1$. Let $f \in E^r(\Omega)$. Then f admits a non-tangential limit f^* almost everywhere on $\partial\Omega$. If $f^* = 0$ on a subset of $\partial\Omega$ of positive measure, then $f \equiv 0$ on Ω .*

4.1. **Example of two circles.** We consider here the following function:

$$F(e^{i\theta}) = \begin{cases} -1 + 2e^{-i3\theta/2} & \text{if } 0 \leq \theta < 4\pi/3 \\ e^{-3i\theta} & \text{if } 4\pi/3 \leq \theta < 2\pi. \end{cases}$$

The image of \mathbb{T} under F is represented in Figure 12.




FIGURE 12

Our aim here is to show, using the explicit expression of the function $\zeta = 1/F^{-1}$ on $\partial\Omega_2 \setminus \{1\}$ which is available in this case, that T_F is hypercyclic on H^p .

Observe that

$$F(e^{-i\theta}) = \begin{cases} -1 + 2e^{i3\theta/2} & \text{if } -4\pi/3 < \theta \leq 0 \\ e^{3i\theta} & \text{if } -2\pi < \theta \leq -4\pi/3, \end{cases}$$

which is equivalent to say that

$$F(e^{-i\theta}) = \begin{cases} -1 + 2e^{i3\theta/2} & \text{if } -4\pi/3 < \theta \leq 0 \\ e^{3i\theta} & \text{if } 0 < \theta \leq 2\pi/3. \end{cases}$$

Observe now that $\partial\Omega_2 \setminus \{1\} = \{F(e^{-i\theta}) : 0 < \theta < 2\pi/3\}$. Hence, for $\lambda \in \partial\Omega_2 \setminus \{1\}$, let $\theta(\lambda) \in (0, 2\pi/3)$ be such that $\zeta(\lambda) = e^{i\theta(\lambda)}$. We have $\lambda = e^{3i\theta(\lambda)}$, and since $3\theta(\lambda) \in (0, 2\pi)$, we get that $\theta(\lambda) = \frac{1}{3} \arg_{(0,2\pi)}(\lambda)$. So we deduce that

$$\zeta(\lambda) = \exp \left[\frac{i}{3} \arg_{(0,2\pi)}(\lambda) \right], \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \partial\Omega_2 \setminus \{1\}.$$

Let $g \in H^q$ and write $Ug \in E_F^q$ as $Ug = (u, v) \in E^q(\Omega_0^+) \oplus E^p(\Omega_1^+)$, where $\Omega_0^+ = \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2$ and $\Omega_1^+ = \Omega_2$. Then u and v satisfy $u^{int} - \zeta v^{int} = u^{ext}$ almost everywhere on $\partial\Omega_2$ (see Equation (2.6)). Note that, with respect to $\mathbb{T} = \partial\Omega_2$, Ω_1 is the exterior component and Ω_2 is the interior component.

- Suppose that g vanishes on $H_-(T_F)$. Since $\Omega_2 = \mathbb{D}$, we have

$$u(\lambda) = \langle h_{\lambda,0} | g \rangle_{p,q} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad v(\lambda) = \langle h_{\lambda,1} | g \rangle_{p,q} = 0 \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \Omega_2.$$

So $u^{int} = v^{int} = 0$ almost everywhere on $\partial\Omega_2$, and thus the boundary relation becomes

$$u^{ext} = 0 \quad \text{a.e. on } \partial\Omega_2.$$

Since $u|_{\Omega_1} \in E^q(\Omega_1)$ and its non-tangential limit is zero on a subset of $\partial\Omega_1$ with positive measure, we deduce that $u = 0$ on Ω_1 . This means that g vanishes on $H_{\Omega_1}(T_F)$. So g vanishes on $H_{\Omega_1}(T_F)$ and $H_{\Omega_2}(T_F)$, and by Proposition 2.5, we deduce that $g = 0$ and that $H_-(T_F) = H^p$.

- Suppose now that g vanishes on $H_+(T_F)$. Since $\Omega_1 \subseteq \mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}$, g vanishes on $H_{\Omega_1}(T_F)$, i.e.

$$u(\lambda) = \langle h_{\lambda,0} | g \rangle_{p,q} = 0 \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \Omega_1.$$

Then $u^{ext} = 0$ almost everywhere on $\partial\Omega_2$ and the boundary relation becomes

$$u^{int} - \zeta v^{int} = 0 \quad \text{a.e. on } \partial\Omega_2.$$

The function ζ admits an analytic extension to $\Omega_2 \setminus [0, 1]$, given by

$$(4.2) \quad \zeta(\lambda) = \exp \left[\frac{1}{3} \log_{(0,2\pi)}(\lambda) \right], \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \Omega_2 \setminus [0, 1],$$

where $\log_{(0,2\pi)}$ is an analytic branch of the logarithm with imaginary part in $(0, 2\pi)$. Note that this extension is such that

$$(4.3) \quad \lim_{\substack{y \rightarrow 0 \\ y > 0}} \zeta(x + iy) \neq \lim_{\substack{y \rightarrow 0 \\ y < 0}} \zeta(x + iy) \quad \text{for every } x \in]0, 1[.$$

Since ζ is analytic and bounded on $\Omega_2 \setminus [0, 1]$, the function ζv belongs to $E^q(\Omega_2 \setminus [0, 1])$, and since we have $u^{int} = \zeta v^{int}$ almost everywhere on $\partial\Omega_2$, which is a subset of $\partial(\Omega_2 \setminus [0, 1])$ of positive measure, we deduce that $u = \zeta v$ on $\Omega_2 \setminus [0, 1]$.

If we suppose now that v is not identically zero on Ω_2 , there exists a point $x_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that v does not vanish on a neighborhood of x . Thus

$$\lim_{\substack{y \rightarrow 0 \\ y > 0}} \zeta(x_0 + iy) = \lim_{\substack{y \rightarrow 0 \\ y > 0}} \frac{u(x_0 + y)}{v(x_0 + iy)} = \lim_{\substack{y \rightarrow 0 \\ y < 0}} \frac{u(x_0 + y)}{v(x_0 + iy)} = \lim_{\substack{y \rightarrow 0 \\ y < 0}} \zeta(x_0 + iy),$$

and this contradicts Equation (4.3). So $v = 0$ on Ω_2 and thus $u = 0$ on Ω_2 as well. This means that g vanishes on $H_{\Omega_2}(T_F)$, so $g = 0$ and thus $H_+(T_F) = H^p$.

Hence we have shown that $H_-(T_F) = H_+(T_F) = H^p$ and, by the Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion, the operator T_F is hypercyclic on H^p .

This example highlights the fact that when we need to go from a connected component to an adjacent one with a lower winding number, the situation is quite simple, whereas going to an adjacent component with a higher winding number becomes substantially more difficult.

4.2. From the interior to the exterior. The easiest case is the first one, when Ω is the exterior component of γ and Ω' is the interior one. In this case, Question 4.2 always admits an affirmative answer.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $p > 1$. Suppose that F satisfies (H1), (H2) and (H3) and let $\Omega, \Omega' \in \mathcal{C}$ be two adjacent components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ along an arc γ , such that $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| > |\text{wind}_F(\Omega')|$. Then $H_{\Omega'}(T_F) \subseteq H_{\Omega}(T_F)$.*

Proof. Suppose that $g \in H^q$ vanishes on $H_{\Omega}(T_F)$, i.e. that $\langle h_{\lambda,j} | g \rangle_{p,q} = 0$ for every $\lambda \in \Omega$ and every $0 \leq j < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega)|$. Set $j_0 = |\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| - 1 \geq 0$, so that $\Omega \subseteq \Omega_{j_0}^+$. Denoting by U the operator from Theorem 2.2 and setting $Ug = (u_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1}$ with $u_j \in E^q(\Omega_j^+)$ for $0 \leq j \leq N-1$, our assumption on g can be rewritten as $u_j = 0$ on Ω for every $0 \leq j \leq j_0$.

The assumption $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| > |\text{wind}_F(\Omega')|$ means that Ω is the interior component of γ and Ω' is the exterior one. It follows that

$$u_j^{int} = 0 \quad \text{a.e. on } \partial\Omega \text{ for every } 0 \leq j \leq j_0,$$

so that, for every $0 \leq j < j_0$, $u_j^{int} = 0$ and $u_{j+1}^{int} = 0$ almost everywhere on $\partial\Omega$.

The functions u_j satisfy the boundary relations

$$u_j^{int} - \zeta u_{j+1}^{int} = u_j^{ext} \quad \text{a.e. on } \partial\Omega_{j+1}^+ \text{ for every } 0 \leq j < N-1.$$

Since $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| > j_0 \geq j+1$ for every $0 \leq j < j_0$, it follows that $\Omega \subseteq \Omega_{j+1}^+$ and

$$u_j^{int} - \zeta u_{j+1}^{int} = u_j^{ext} \quad \text{a.e. on } \partial\Omega \text{ for every } 0 \leq j < j_0,$$

so that $u_j^{ext} = 0$ almost everywhere on $\gamma \subseteq \partial\Omega$. Now $\gamma \subseteq \partial\Omega'$ is a subset of positive measure of $\partial\Omega'$ and $u_j|_{\Omega'} \in E^q(\Omega')$ for every $0 \leq j < j_0$, so $u_j = 0$ on Ω' for every $0 \leq j < j_0$. Since $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega')| = |\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| - 1 = j_0$,

$$u_j(\lambda) = \langle h_{\lambda,j} | g \rangle_{p,q} = 0 \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \Omega' \text{ and every } 0 \leq j < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega')|,$$

i.e. g vanishes on all the eigenspaces $\ker(T_F - \lambda)$ with $\lambda \in \Omega'$. So g vanishes on $H_{\Omega'}(T_F)$, and Theorem 4.4 is proved. \square

4.3. From the exterior to the interior. Thus one can always “go up” from one component of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ to an adjacent one. We now need to “go down”, i.e. to deal with the case where $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega')|$. Here the situation is more intricate, and we are able to show that $H_{\Omega'}(T_F) \subseteq H_{\Omega}(T_F)$ only under stronger assumptions, concerning both the smoothness of the function F and a certain geometric property **(P)** of the boundaries of the domains Ω and Ω' .

Let $\Omega, \Omega' \in \mathcal{C}$ be two adjacent components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ along an arc γ such that $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega')|$. We say that the pair (Ω, Ω') satisfies the property **(P)** if the following holds:

(P) there exists a self intersection point λ_0 of the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$ and an open neighborhood V of λ_0 such that:

- $$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \bullet \lambda_0 \text{ belongs to } \partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega', \text{ and the restriction of the function } \zeta \text{ to } \partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega' \\ \text{cannot be extended continuously at the point } \lambda_0; \\ \bullet V \cap \partial\Omega' = V \cap \partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega'. \end{array} \right.$$

The meaning of the geometric assumption **(P)** may be somewhat difficult to grasp. Let us first explain how one can see whether an intersection point λ_0 on $\partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega'$ satisfies or not **(P)**. This property involves the behavior of ζ in the neighborhood of λ_0 . Recall that ζ is constructed from F (we have indeed $\zeta = 1/F^{-1}$ on $F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$), so in each direction of the curve near λ_0 , ζ admits a limit. For example, in the following figure, in two different directions, the limits are $1/\tau_1$, and in the other two directions, the limits are $1/\tau_2$.




FIGURE 13

For λ_0 to satisfy property **(P)**, we require that on $\partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega'$, it is possible to approach λ_0 from two different directions, and that the limits in these two directions are not the same. As a result, it will not be possible to extend ζ to $\partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega'$ in such a way that it is continuous at λ_0 . This means that we are not the situation in Figure 14A. We also require that there is a neighborhood V of λ_0 such that $V \cap \partial\Omega' = V \cap \partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega'$. It follows that Ω is the only adjacent component of Ω' in a neighborhood of λ_0 . So, if for example the intersection at the point λ_0 is simple, then we cannot be in the situation described in Figure 14B. If the intersection at the point λ_0 is not simple, then there is no component Ω'' inside Ω' which would also have λ_0 as a boundary point, i.e. we are not in the situation in Figure 14C.




FIGURE 14

An intersection point on $\partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega'$ which satisfies the assumptions in (P) is a point where we have this type of situation :




FIGURE 15

In some circumstances, we are able to handle situations where (P) does not hold. We will get back to this at the end of this section, and also provide some examples in Section 5.

Theorem 4.5. *Let $p > 1$. Suppose that F satisfies (H1), (H2), (H3) and (H4) and let $\Omega, \Omega' \in \mathcal{C}$ be two adjacent components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ along an arc γ , such that $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega')|$. Suppose additionally that the pair (Ω, Ω') satisfies the property (P). Then $H_{\Omega'}(T_F) \subseteq H_{\Omega}(T_F)$.*

Recall that assumption (H4) stipulates that F admits an analytic extension to a neighborhood of \mathbb{T} . As a direct consequence of Theorems 4.4 and 4.5, we have the following result.

Corollary 4.6. *Let $p > 1$. Suppose that F satisfies (H1), (H2), (H3) and (H4) and let $\Omega, \Omega' \in \mathcal{C}$ be two adjacent components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ along an arc γ . Suppose additionally that the pair (Ω, Ω') satisfies the property (P). Then $H_{\Omega'}(T_F) = H_{\Omega}(T_F)$.*

Proof. The beginning of the proof of Theorem 4.5 is the same as that of Theorem 4.4. Let $g \in H^q$ which vanishes on $H_{\Omega}(T_F)$. Set $j_0 = |\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| - 1$ and define $Ug = (u_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1}$ with $u_j \in E^q(\Omega_j^+)$, $0 \leq j \leq N-1$. We know that $u_j = 0$ on Ω for every $0 \leq j \leq j_0$. Now the assumption $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega')|$ means that Ω' is the interior component of γ and Ω is the exterior component of γ . Let $0 \leq j \leq j_0$. Since $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega')| = |\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| + 1 = j_0 + 2 > j_0 + 1$, $\Omega' \subseteq \Omega_{j+1}^+$, and we have $\partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega' \subseteq \partial\Omega_{j+1}^+$ for every $0 \leq j \leq j_0$. So, according to Equation (2.6), we have

$$u_j^{\text{int}} - \zeta u_{j+1}^{\text{int}} = u_j^{\text{ext}} \quad \text{a.e. on } \partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega' \text{ for every } 0 \leq j \leq j_0.$$

Now $u_j^{\text{ext}} = 0$ almost everywhere on $\partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega'$ for every $0 \leq j \leq j_0$, and hence

$$u_j^{\text{int}} - \zeta u_{j+1}^{\text{int}} = 0 \quad \text{a.e. on } \partial\Omega' \cap \partial\Omega \text{ for every } 0 \leq j \leq j_0.$$

We would like to be able to deduce from this relation that $u_j = 0$ on Ω' for every j with $0 \leq j \leq |\text{wind}_F(\Omega')| - 1 = j_0 + 1$. It is here that the assumptions (H4) and (P) come into play. We state separately as Proposition 4.7 the result we will need in order to conclude the proof.

Proposition 4.7. *Let $p > 1$. Suppose that F satisfies (H1), (H2), (H3) and (H4), and let $\zeta = 1/F^{-1}$ on $F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$. Fix $\Omega_0 \in \mathcal{C}$. Suppose that there exists $\lambda_0 \in \partial\Omega_0$ which is a point of self-intersection of the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$ such that for every sufficiently small open neighborhood V of λ_0 , the following property holds:*

there exists a connected component Σ of $V \cap \Omega_0$ such that the restriction of the function ζ to $\partial\Sigma$ cannot be extended continuously at the point λ_0 .

Let $r > 1$, and let $u, v \in E^r(\Omega_0)$. If $u - \zeta v = 0$ almost everywhere on $\partial\Omega_0 \cap V$, then $u = v = 0$.

Note that the condition on λ_0 in Proposition 4.7 means that for every neighborhood V of λ_0 , we can find a connected component Σ of $V \cap \Omega_0$ such that $\partial\Sigma \cap F(\mathbb{T})$ cannot be written as the image by F of exactly one arc in \mathbb{T} . Also note the following: if the assumptions of Theorem 4.5 are satisfied, if we set $\Omega_0 = \Omega'$ and if V is any sufficiently small neighborhood of the point λ_0 , then $V \cap \Omega_0$ is always a connected set, so that the assumptions of Proposition 4.7 are satisfied with $\Sigma = V \cap \Omega_0$.

Taking Proposition 4.7 for granted, let us explain how we conclude the proof of Theorem 4.5. For every $0 \leq j \leq j_0$, the functions u_j and u_{j+1} belong to $E^q(\Omega_j^+)$ and $E^q(\Omega_{j+1}^+)$ respectively. Since $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega')| > j_0 + 1 \geq j + 1$ for every $0 \leq j \leq j_0$, we have $\Omega' \subseteq \Omega_{j+1}^+ \subseteq \Omega_j^+$, and thus u_j and u_{j+1} both belong to $E^q(\Omega')$. We apply Proposition 4.7 to $\Omega_0 = \Omega'$, λ_0 and V given by the assumption (P), $\Sigma = \Omega_0 \cap V$, $u = u_j$ and $v = u_{j+1}$. We have $u - \zeta v = 0$ almost everywhere on $\partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega'$, hence $u - \zeta v = 0$ almost everywhere on $\partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega' \cap V$. Now by assumption (P), $\partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega' \cap V = \partial\Omega' \cap V$. So $u - \zeta v = 0$ almost everywhere on $\partial\Omega' \cap V$. Proposition 4.7 applies, and yields that $u = v = 0$ on Ω' .

We have proved that u_j and u_{j+1} vanish on Ω' for every $0 \leq j \leq j_0$, which is the conclusion we were looking for: g vanishes on $\ker(T_F - \lambda)$ for every $\lambda \in \Omega'$, and so $H_{\Omega'}(T_F) \subseteq H_{\Omega}(T_F)$. \square

It remains to prove Proposition 4.7.

Proof of Proposition 4.7. In agreement with assumption (H2), let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$ be m closed arcs of \mathbb{T} with disjoint interiors which cover the circle. Without loss of generality, we can write each arc α_j as

$$\alpha_j = \{e^{i\theta}; \theta_j \leq \theta \leq \theta_{j+1}\},$$

where $0 \leq \theta_1 < \theta_2 < \dots < \theta_{m+1}$ and $\theta_{m+1} = \theta_1 + 2\pi$. We set $\gamma_j = F(\alpha_j)$, so that

$$F(\mathbb{T}) = \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq m} \gamma_j.$$

The self-intersection points of the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$ are to be found among the points $e^{i\theta_j}$, $j = 1, \dots, m$. Whenever $\lambda \in F(\mathbb{T})$ is a self intersection point of the curve, we set

$$J_\lambda := \{j \in \{1, \dots, m\}, \lambda = F(e^{i\theta_j})\}.$$

Then J_λ contains at least two elements. If we enumerate J_λ as $J_\lambda = \{j_1, \dots, j_s\}$ for some $s > 1$, where $j_1 < \dots < j_s$, then for each $1 \leq k \leq s$, λ belongs to the arcs γ_{j_k} and $\gamma_{j_{k+1}}$, where $\gamma_{m+1} = \gamma_1$.




FIGURE 16

Let Ω_0 , λ_0 , V and Σ be given satisfying the assumptions of Proposition 4.7. We know that the restriction of the function ζ to $\partial\Sigma$ cannot be extended continuously at the point λ_0 . Reducing V if necessary, it follows that there exist two integers $1 \leq k \neq l \leq s$ and $\varepsilon_k, \varepsilon_l \in \{0, 1\}$ such that

$$(4.4) \quad \lim_{\substack{\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_0 \\ \lambda \in \gamma_{j_k + \varepsilon_k}}} \zeta(\lambda) = e^{i\theta_{j_k}} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\substack{\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_0 \\ \lambda \in \gamma_{j_l + \varepsilon_l}}} \zeta(\lambda) = e^{i\theta_{j_l}},$$

$$\partial\Sigma \cap V = (\gamma_{j_k + \varepsilon_k} \cup \gamma_{j_l + \varepsilon_l}) \cap V$$

and

$$(\gamma_{j_k + \varepsilon_k} \cap V) \cap (\gamma_{j_l + \varepsilon_l} \cap V) = \{\lambda_0\}.$$

What it means is best seen on a picture, with for example $k = 1, l = 3, \varepsilon_1 = 0$ and $\varepsilon_3 = 1$:




FIGURE 17

Since $u - \zeta v = 0$ almost everywhere on $\partial\Omega_0 \cap V$, $u - \zeta v = 0$ almost everywhere on $\partial\Sigma \cap V$. Our assumption (H4) now implies that the restrictions of ζ to the interiors of $\gamma_{j_k} \cup \gamma_{j_k+1}$ and $\gamma_{j_l} \cup \gamma_{j_l+1}$ respectively admit analytic extensions to a neighborhood $C_k \subseteq V$ of $\gamma_{j_k} \cup \gamma_{j_k+1}$ and to a neighborhood $C_l \subseteq V$ of $\gamma_{j_l} \cup \gamma_{j_l+1}$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that ζ is bounded on C_k and C_l .

Let Δ be a closed segment with non empty interior such that

- λ_0 is one of the extremities of Δ ;
- $\Delta \setminus \{\lambda_0\} \subseteq \Omega_0 \cap C_k \cap C_l$.




FIGURE 18

Making if necessary the sets C_k, C_l and the segment Δ smaller, we can suppose without loss of generality that Δ separates $\Sigma \cap C_k \cap C_l$ in two connected components. We denote by D_k the component containing the set $V \cap \gamma_{j_k + \varepsilon_k} \cap \Sigma$, and by D_l the component containing the set $V \cap \gamma_{j_l + \varepsilon_l} \cap \Sigma$. Since $u, v \in E^r(\Sigma)$ and ζ is bounded on C_k , $u - \zeta v \in E^r(D_k)$. Our assumption that $u - \zeta v = 0$ almost everywhere on $\partial\Sigma \cap V$ implies that $u - \zeta v = 0$ almost everywhere on $\gamma_{j_k + \varepsilon_k} \cap \overline{D_k}$, which is a subset of ∂D_k with positive measure. Hence $u - \zeta v = 0$ on D_k by the uniqueness property of Smirnov functions (see Fact 4.3). In the same way, $u - \zeta v = 0$ on D_l . Let now

$$E := \{z \in \Delta \setminus \{\lambda_0\}; \zeta \text{ cannot be analytically continued in a neighborhood of } z\}.$$

Fact 4.8. *E is non empty and has no isolated point.*

Proof. First, we claim that E is non-empty. Indeed, suppose that ζ admits a bounded analytic extension to a neighborhood W of $\Delta \setminus \{\lambda_0\}$. Since ζ is analytic and bounded on D_k and D_l , ζ admits an analytic and bounded extension to $D_k \cup W \cup D_l$. Now $D_k \cup W \cup D_l$ contains a domain of the form $D(\lambda_0, \rho) \cap \Sigma$, where $D(\lambda_0, \rho)$ is a disk of small radius $\rho > 0$ centered at λ_0 . Let $\Lambda = D(\lambda_0, \rho) \cap \Sigma$. Then

$$\partial\Lambda \cap D(\lambda_0, \rho) = ((\gamma_{j_k + \varepsilon_k} \cup \gamma_{j_l + \varepsilon_l}) \setminus \{\lambda_0\}) \cap D(\lambda_0, \rho)$$

and ζ admits a continuous extension to the set $\overline{\Lambda} \setminus \{\lambda_0\}$. By (4.4), this extension satisfies

$$(4.5) \quad \lim_{\substack{\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_0 \\ \lambda \in \gamma_{j_k + \varepsilon_k}}} \zeta(\lambda) = e^{i\theta_{j_k}} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\substack{\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_0 \\ \lambda \in \gamma_{j_l + \varepsilon_l}}} \zeta(\lambda) = e^{i\theta_{j_l}}.$$

Moreover, the boundary of Λ is a Jordan curve. By Theorem A.3, the two limits in (4.5) are necessarily equal. But $k \neq l$ so the two points $e^{i\theta_{j_k}}$ and $e^{i\theta_{j_l}}$ are distinct. We have reached a contradiction, and this proves that E is non-empty.

Now, note that E cannot have any isolated point in $\Delta \setminus \{\lambda_0\}$. Indeed, since ζ is bounded on $C_k \cup C_l$, and ζ cannot have any isolated singularity on $\Delta \setminus \{\lambda_0\}$. \square

We are now close to the conclusion of our proof. Suppose that v is not identically 0 on Σ and let $z_0 \in E$. If $v(z_0) = 0$, by the uniqueness principle for analytic functions, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for every $z \in D(z_0, \varepsilon) \setminus \{z_0\}$, $v(z) \neq 0$. But by Fact 4.8, $D(z_0, \varepsilon) \setminus \{z_0\} \cap E \neq \emptyset$. So, replacing z_0 if necessary by any point of $D(z_0, \varepsilon) \setminus \{z_0\} \cap E$, we can assume that $z_0 \in E$ and $v(z_0) = 0$. Since $u - \zeta v = 0$ on $D_k \cup D_l$, the function ζ admits an analytic extension $\tilde{\zeta}$ to a neighborhood of z_0 , defined by setting $\tilde{\zeta} = u/v$ on a neighborhood of z_0 where v does not vanish. So z_0 does not belong to E , which is a contradiction.

Thus $v = 0$ on Σ and $u = 0$ on Σ as well. So u and v vanish on a non-empty open subset of Ω_0 , and thus $u = v = 0$ on Ω_0 . Proposition 4.7 is proved. \square

We conclude this subsection with a modified version of Proposition 4.7 which is tailored to deal with the following configuration, where Theorem 4.5 cannot be applied.

In Figure 19, for any open neighborhood V of one of the two self intersection points λ_0 and λ_1 of the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$, $V \cap \partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega' \subsetneq V \cap \partial\Omega'$. When running through the proof of Theorem 4.5 for such an example, we arrive to the equation $u - \zeta v = 0$ almost everywhere on $\partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega' \cap V$. In order to be able to apply Proposition 4.7, we need to be able to ensure that $u - \zeta v = 0$ almost everywhere on $\partial\Omega' \cap V$, and since $V \cap \partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega' \neq V \cap \partial\Omega'$, it may not be necessarily the case.




FIGURE 19

However, the following consequence of Proposition 4.7 will allow us to conclude that $u - \zeta v = 0$ almost everywhere on $\partial\Omega' \cap V$.

Proposition 4.9. *Let $p > 1$. Suppose that F satisfies (H1), (H2), (H3) and (H4). Let $\Omega_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ be such that its boundary $\partial\Omega_0$ is a Jordan curve and the image by F of a single closed subarc of \mathbb{T} . Let $r > 1$, and let u and v belong to $E^r(\Omega_0)$.*

If $u - \zeta v = 0$ on a subset Z of $\partial\Omega_0$ of positive measure, then $u = v = 0$.

Proof. Let $\Gamma = \{e^{i\theta}; \alpha \leq \theta \leq \beta\}$, $\alpha < \beta < \alpha + 2\pi$, be such that $\partial\Omega_0 = F(\Gamma)$ and let $\lambda_0 = F(e^{i\alpha})$. For every open neighborhood V of λ_0 , $\Sigma = V \cap \Omega_0$ is connected and the restriction of ζ to $\partial\Sigma$ cannot be extended continuously at the point λ_0 .

Using assumption (H4) as in the proof of Proposition 4.7, we obtain an open neighborhood C of $\partial\Omega_0$ and a closed interval Δ with non empty interior having λ_0 as one of its extremities such that ζ has a bounded analytic extension to $C \setminus \Delta$. Without loss of generality, we can also suppose that $\partial(C \cap \Omega_0) \cap \Delta$ has exactly two points, which are the extremities of Δ (see Figure 20 below).




FIGURE 20

Replacing if necessary Z by a smaller subset of $\partial\Omega_0$ with positive measure, we can assume that there exists a simply connected domain U with $Z \subseteq U$ and $\bar{U} \subseteq (C \setminus \Delta)$. Since the functions u and ζv both belong to $E^r(U \cap \Omega_0)$, and have boundary limits which coincide on Z , which is a subset of $\partial(U \cap \Omega_0)$ of positive measure, $u - \zeta v = 0$ on $U \cap \Omega_0$. It follows that $u - \zeta v = 0$ on $(C \cap \Omega_0) \setminus \Delta$ and hence $u - \zeta v = 0$ almost everywhere on $\partial\Omega_0$. Thus the assumption of Proposition 4.7 is satisfied. Hence $u = v = 0$ and we are done. \square

Note that if there is another self-intersection point λ_1 on $\partial\Omega_0$, then ζ will have an analytic extension on $V_{\lambda_1} \cap \Omega_0$, where V_{λ_1} is some neighborhood of λ_1 . Then, we can

transfer on $\partial\Omega_0$ the fact that $u - \zeta v = 0$ from one side of λ_1 to the other side. This observation will be used in Section 4.4 and the key point of the proof of Theorem 4.12.

As a consequence, we obtain the following variation of Theorem 4.5:

Theorem 4.10. *Let $p > 1$. Suppose that F satisfy (H1), (H2), (H3) and (H4), and let $\Omega, \Omega' \in \mathcal{C}$ be two adjacent components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ such that $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega')|$. Suppose that $\partial\Omega'$ is a Jordan curve and the image by F of a single closed subarc of \mathbb{T} . Then $H_{\Omega'}(T_F) \subseteq H_{\Omega}(T_F)$.*

As a direct consequence of this theorem and Theorem 4.4, we have the following result.

Corollary 4.11. *Let $p > 1$. Suppose that F satisfy (H1), (H2), (H3) and (H4), and let $\Omega, \Omega' \in \mathcal{C}$ be two adjacent components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ such that $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega')|$. Suppose that $\partial\Omega'$ is a Jordan curve and the image by F of a single closed subarc of \mathbb{T} . Then $H_{\Omega'}(T_F) = H_{\Omega}(T_F)$.*

4.4. A case where the two components have the same winding number. Here is a last configuration that we are able to deal with. It is somewhat different from the preceding ones since the two connected components Ω and Ω' involved are not adjacent.

Theorem 4.12. *Let $p > 1$. Suppose that F satisfies (H1), (H2), (H3) and (H4), and let $\Omega, \Omega' \in \mathcal{C}$ be two connected components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ with $\text{wind}_F(\Omega) = \text{wind}_F(\Omega')$. Suppose that there exists a connected component Ω_0 with $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega_0)| > |\text{wind}_F(\Omega)|$ and a point $\lambda_0 \in \partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega_0 \cap \partial\Omega'$ such that*

- Ω and Ω' are both adjacent to Ω_0 and $\partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega_0$ and $\partial\Omega' \cap \partial\Omega_0$ both contain an arc with non empty interior having λ_0 as an extremity;
- the restriction of the function ζ to the boundary of Ω_0 admits a continuous extension at the point λ_0 .

Then

$$H_{\Omega}(T_F) = H_{\Omega'}(T_F).$$




FIGURE 21

Proof. Our assumption implies that there exists an open neighborhood V of λ_0 such that ζ admits a bounded analytic extension to V . Also, since Ω and Ω' are both adjacent to Ω_0 and $\partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega_0$ and $\partial\Omega' \cap \partial\Omega_0$ both contain an arc with non empty interior having λ_0 as an extremity, it follows that both $V \cap \partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega_0$ and $V \cap \partial\Omega' \cap \partial\Omega_0$ contain λ_0 and have positive measure. Suppose that $g \in H^q$ vanishes on $H_{\Omega}(T_F)$. Writing $Ug = (u_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1}$ with $u_j \in E^q(\Omega_j^+)$, we have $u_j = 0$ on Ω for every $0 \leq j < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega)|$. Since $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega_0)| > j + 1$, $\Omega_0 \subseteq \Omega_{j+1}^+$, and thus

$$u_j^{int} - \zeta u_{j+1}^{int} = u_j^{ext} \quad \text{a.e. on } \partial\Omega_0 \cap (\partial\Omega \cup \partial\Omega')$$

and $u_j^{ext} = 0$ almost everywhere on $\partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega_0$. So $u_j^{int} - \zeta u_{j+1}^{int} = 0$ almost everywhere on $\partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega_0$. Now, the function $u_j - \zeta u_{j+1}$ belongs to $E^q(\Omega_0 \cap V)$ and vanishes on $\partial\Omega_0 \cap \partial\Omega \cap V$, which is a subset of positive measure of the boundary of $\Omega_0 \cap V$. Hence $u_j - \zeta u_{j+1}$ is identically zero on $\Omega_0 \cap V$, and in particular $u_j^{int} - \zeta u_{j+1}^{int} = 0$ almost everywhere on $V \cap \partial\Omega_0 \cap \partial\Omega'$. Since $u_j^{int} - \zeta u_{j+1}^{int} = u_j^{ext}$ almost everywhere on $\partial\Omega_0 \cap \partial\Omega'$, this yields that $u_j^{ext} = 0$ almost everywhere on $V \cap \partial\Omega_0 \cap \partial\Omega'$, which is a subset of positive measure of $\partial\Omega'$, and so $u_j = 0$ on Ω' .

This being true for every $0 \leq j < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| = |\text{wind}_F(\Omega')|$, it follows that g vanishes on $H_{\Omega'}(T_F)$. Hence $H_{\Omega'}(T_F) \subseteq H_{\Omega}(T_F)$. In the same way, $H_{\Omega}(T_F) \subseteq H_{\Omega'}(T_F)$, and Theorem 4.12 is proved. \square

4.5. Applying Theorems 4.4 and 4.5. We conclude this section by outlining the kind of argument which will be used repeatedly in the proofs of our forthcoming results when applying our Theorems 4.4 and 4.5. Recall that $H_-(T_F) = \overline{\text{span}}[\ker(T_F - \lambda); |\lambda| < 1]$, that $H_+(T_F) = \overline{\text{span}}[\ker(T_F - \lambda); |\lambda| > 1]$, and that we have

$$(4.6) \quad \overline{\text{span}}[H_{\Omega}(T_F); \Omega \in \mathcal{C}] = H^p$$

by Proposition 2.5. Here is now the key argument which will be applied once we have managed to show, using either Theorem 4.4 or Theorem 4.5, that $H_{\Omega'}(T_F) \subseteq H_{\Omega}(T_F)$ for two adjacent component Ω and Ω' .

Proposition 4.13. *Let $\Omega, \Omega' \in \mathcal{C}$ be two adjacent components. Suppose that*

$$H_{\Omega'}(T_F) \subseteq H_{\Omega}(T_F).$$

(1) *If $\Omega \cap \mathbb{D} \neq \emptyset$, then $H_{\Omega'}(T_F) \subseteq H_{\Omega}(T_F) \subseteq H_-(T_F)$.*

(2) *If $\Omega \cap (\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}) \neq \emptyset$, then $H_{\Omega'}(T_F) \subseteq H_{\Omega}(T_F) \subseteq H_+(T_F)$.*

Proof. If $\Omega \cap \mathbb{D} \neq \emptyset$, then $\Omega \cap \mathbb{D}$ has an accumulation point in Ω . Thus, by Proposition 2.5,

$$\overline{\text{span}}[\ker(T_F - \lambda); \lambda \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{D}] = H_{\Omega}(T_F),$$

so that $H_{\Omega}(T_F) \subseteq H_-(T_F)$. This proves assertion (1). The proof of assertion (2) is exactly similar. \square

Suitable assumptions will ensure that we can apply Proposition 4.13 to pairs of components (Ω, Ω') , where Ω' varies of all of \mathcal{C} . By Equation (4.6), this will yield that $H_+(T_F) = H_-(T_F) = H^p$, and will enable us to apply the Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion.

5. APPLICATIONS AND EXAMPLES

We already gave in Section 3 a necessary condition for the hypercyclicity of T_F under assumptions (H1), (H2) and (H3) on the symbol F : the unit circle \mathbb{T} has to intersect every connected component of the interior of the spectrum of T_F (Theorem 3.2). Then, at the beginning of Section 4, we stated a condition implying, in a rather straightforward manner, that T_F is hypercyclic (Theorem 4.1): if $\Omega \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$ for every $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$, then T_F is hypercyclic on H^p . In this section, we explore more deeply sufficient conditions for hypercyclicity, the general philosophy being the following: if we only know that $\Omega \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$ for some $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$, can we deduce that T_F is hypercyclic?

5.1. The one-component case. By Theorems 3.2 and 4.1, if $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ is connected, we obtain immediately a necessary and sufficient condition for the hypercyclicity of T_F .

Theorem 5.1. *Let $p \geq 1$ and let F satisfy (H1), (H2) and (H3). Suppose that the set $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ is connected. Then, the following are equivalent:*

- (1) T_F is hypercyclic on H^p ;
- (2) $\sigma(T_F) \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$.




FIGURE 22

Theorem 5.1 allows us for instance to retrieve and extend to the H^p setting the pioneering result of Shkarin, who characterized in [47] the symbols F of the form $F(e^{i\theta}) = ae^{-i\theta} + b + ce^{i\theta}$, $a, b, c \in \mathbb{C}$, inducing a hypercyclic Toeplitz operator T_F on H^2 .

Theorem 5.2. *Let $F(e^{i\theta}) = ae^{-i\theta} + b + ce^{i\theta}$, $a, b, c \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|a| \neq |c|$, and let $p > 1$. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) T_F is hypercyclic on H^p
- (2) $|a| > |c|$ and $\mathcal{E} \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$, where \mathcal{E} is the interior of the (non-degenerate) elliptic curve $F(\mathbb{T})$.

Proof. Let us first show that (1) \implies (2). Since $|a| \neq |c|$, F satisfies (H1) and (H2), and the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$ is an ellipse with non-empty interior \mathcal{E} .

Fact 5.3. *We have $\text{wind}_F(\mathcal{E}) < 0$ when $|a| > |c|$ and $\text{wind}_F(\mathcal{E}) > 0$ when $|a| < |c|$.*

Proof. Let $a = |a|e^{i\alpha}$ and $c = |c|e^{i\gamma}$, and consider the map \tilde{F} defined by $\tilde{F}(e^{i\theta}) = |a|e^{-i\theta} + |c|e^{i\theta}$. Then

$$F(e^{i\theta}) = b + e^{i(\alpha+\gamma)/2} \tilde{F}(e^{i(\theta+(\gamma-\alpha)/2)}) \quad \text{for every } e^{i\theta} \in \mathbb{T}.$$

In particular $F(\mathbb{T})$ is the image of $\tilde{F}(\mathbb{T})$ by an affine transformation, and thus these two curves have the same orientation. It is now easy to see geometrically how the orientation of the elliptic curve $\tilde{F}(\mathbb{T})$ depends on $|a|$ and $|c|$: note that $\tilde{F}(1) = |a| + |c|$, $\tilde{F}(-1) = -(|a| + |c|)$ and $\tilde{F}(\mathbb{T})$ is negatively oriented if and only if $|c| - |a| = \text{Im}(\tilde{F}(i)) < 0$. Hence $F(\mathbb{T})$ is negatively oriented (which is equivalent to the property that $\text{wind}_F(\mathcal{E}) < 0$) if and only if $|a| > |c|$. \square

By Fact 5.3, Proposition 3.1 and Theorem 3.2, (2) is a necessary condition for the hypercyclicity of T_F on H^p . The converse implication is a direct consequence of Theorem 5.1. \square

Remark 5.4. When $|a| = |c|$, it was observed by Shkarin in [47] that T_F is a normal operator on H^2 , so that it cannot be hypercyclic on H^2 . Thus in the case where $p = 2$, the

assumption that $|a| \neq |c|$ can be dispensed with in Theorem 5.2. This observation extends to the case where $p > 2$. Indeed, if T_F were hypercyclic on H^p , then it would be hypercyclic on H^2 as well (see Remark 8.17 for details). We do not know what happens in the case $1 < p < 2$. Note that when $|a| = |c|$, the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$ is a segment and $\sigma(T_F) = F(\mathbb{T})$.

5.2. When there are no adjacent components. In this subsection, we obtain a characterization of the hypercyclicity of T_F when $F(\mathbb{T})$ has the following form:




FIGURE 23

Here the interior of $\sigma(T_F)$ consists of the three disjoint connected components Ω_1, Ω_2 and Ω_3 of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$. Such symbols are called “symbols with loops” by Clark, and studied for instance in [15, 17, 18]. In this kind of configuration, we have:

Theorem 5.5. *Let $p > 1$ and let F satisfy (H1), (H2) and (H3). Suppose that, for all pairs (Ω, Ω') of distinct connected component of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, the set $\bar{\Omega} \cap \bar{\Omega}'$ is finite. Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) T_F is hypercyclic on H^p ;
- (2) $\Omega \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$ for every connected component Ω of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$.

Proof. Our assumption implies that every $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ is a connected component of $\sigma(\overset{\circ}{T}_F)$, so the implication (1) \implies (2) is given by Theorem 3.2 and the implication (2) \implies (1) follows immediately from Theorem 4.1. □

5.3. A result involving maximal components. Let F satisfy (H1), (H2) and (H3). We say that $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ is a *maximal component* of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ if for every $\Omega' \in \mathcal{C}$ which is adjacent to Ω , $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega')| < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega)|$. In the picture below, the maximal components are Ω_2 and Ω_3 , and $\text{wind}_F(\Omega_2) = -2$ while $\text{wind}_F(\Omega_3) = -3$.




FIGURE 24

On the other hand, in Figure 23 above, the maximal components are $\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \Omega_3$ because there are no adjacent components to any of them. Using Theorem 4.4, it is possible to

weaken the assumptions of Theorem 4.1 by requiring only that every maximal component of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ intersects \mathbb{T} .

Theorem 5.6. *Let $p > 1$ and F satisfy (H1), (H2) and (H3). If $\Omega \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$ for every maximal component Ω of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, then T_F is hypercyclic on H^p .*

Proof. Let $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$. We claim:

Fact 5.7. *There exists a sequence $(\Omega_n)_{0 \leq n \leq r}$ of elements of \mathcal{C} such that:*

- $\Omega_0 = \Omega$;
- for each $0 \leq n < r$, Ω_n and Ω_{n+1} are adjacent and $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega_n)| < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega_{n+1})|$;
- Ω_r is a maximal component of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$.

Proof of Fact 5.7. Starting from $\Omega_0 = \Omega$, we choose, if possible, Ω_1 adjacent to Ω_0 such that $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega_1)| > |\text{wind}_F(\Omega_0)|$. If there is no such $\Omega_1 \in \mathcal{C}$, then Ω_0 is already a maximal component. In the opposite situation we choose, if possible, Ω_2 adjacent to Ω_1 such that $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega_2)| > |\text{wind}_F(\Omega_1)|$, etc. The process stops after finitely many steps, since $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ has a finite number of connected components. If the process stops after we have chosen Ω_r , i.e. if there is no $\Omega_{r+1} \in \mathcal{C}$ adjacent to Ω_r with $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega_{r+1})| > |\text{wind}_F(\Omega_r)|$, this means that Ω_r is a maximal component. \square

Starting from a given component $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$, let $(\Omega_n)_{0 \leq n \leq r}$ be given by Fact 5.7. Since Ω_n and Ω_{n+1} are adjacent and $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega_n)| < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega_{n+1})|$, Theorem 4.4 applies and

$$H_{\Omega_n}(T_F) \subseteq H_{\Omega_{n+1}}(T_F) \quad \text{for every } 0 \leq n < r.$$

In particular, $H_{\Omega}(T_F) \subseteq H_{\Omega_r}(T_F)$. Since Ω_r is a maximal component of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, by hypothesis, $\Omega_r \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$, and thus by Proposition 4.13, we have

$$H_{\Omega}(T_F) \subseteq H_{\Omega_r}(T_F) \subseteq H_+(T_F) \quad \text{and} \quad H_{\Omega}(T_F) \subseteq H_{\Omega_r}(T_F) \subseteq H_-(T_F).$$

This being true for *all* connected components $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$, it follows from Proposition 2.5 that $H_+(T_F) = H_-(T_F) = H^p$. By the Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion, T_F is hypercyclic on H^p . \square

When Ω_0 is connected to Ω_r by a chain of adjacent components $(\Omega_n)_{0 \leq n \leq r}$ satisfying $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega_n)| < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega_{n+1})|$ for every $0 \leq n < r$, we write

$$\Omega_0 \xrightarrow{I.W.} \Omega_r.$$

Note that when $\Omega_0 \xrightarrow{I.W.} \Omega_r$, then Theorem 4.4 implies that

$$(5.1) \quad H_{\Omega_0}(T_F) \subseteq H_{\Omega_r}(T_F).$$

In spirit, the proof of Theorem 5.6 can be summarized as follows: knowing that a certain function $u \in E_F^q$ vanishes on a certain maximal component $\Omega_r \in \mathcal{C}$, we need to deduce that u vanishes on another component Ω_0 with $\Omega_0 \xrightarrow{I.W.} \Omega_r$. Letting γ_n be an arc contained in the common boundaries of $\partial\Omega_n$ and $\partial\Omega_{n+1}$, $0 \leq n < r$, where $(\Omega_n)_{0 \leq n \leq r}$ is a chain of adjacent components connecting Ω_0 and Ω_r , we thus see that the proof of Theorem 4.4 shows exactly the following: using the boundaries relations in Equation (2.6) of E_F^q , the fact that u vanishes on Ω_r goes over from the interior component of γ_{r-1} (i.e. Ω_r) to its exterior component, Ω_{r-1} , then from the interior component of γ_{r-2} (i.e. Ω_{r-1}) to its exterior component Ω_{r-2} , etc. until we reach Ω_0 .

Example 5.8. For instance, here is what the proof of Theorem 4.4 tells us in the situation described in the picture below:




FIGURE 25

Note that $\Omega_0^+ = \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2 \cup \Omega_3 \cup \Omega_4 \cup \Omega_5$ and $\Omega_1^+ = \Omega_2 \cup \Omega_5$, and the maximal components are Ω_2 and Ω_5 . Starting from $u_0 \in E^q(\Omega_0^+)$ and $u_1 \in E^q(\Omega_1^+)$, and knowing that $u_0 = u_1 = 0$ on $\Omega_2 \cup \Omega_5$, we wish to deduce that u_0 is identically zero, using the boundary relation $u_0^{int} - \zeta u_1^{int} = u_0^{ext}$ almost everywhere on $\partial\Omega_1^+ = \partial\Omega_2 \cup \partial\Omega_5$. The proof of Theorem 4.4 goes as follows:

- i) since $u_0 = u_1 = 0$ on Ω_2 , $u_0 = 0$ on Ω_1 ;
- ii) since $u_0 = u_1 = 0$ on Ω_2 , $u_0 = 0$ on Ω_3 (alternatively, we could have used that since $u_0 = u_1 = 0$ on Ω_5 , $u_0 = 0$ on Ω_3);
- iii) since $u_0 = u_1 = 0$ on Ω_2 , $u_0 = 0$ on Ω_4 .

Hence $u_0 = 0$ on $\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_3 \cup \Omega_4$, and we are done.

The assumptions of Theorem 5.6 can be weakened to yield the following result, which is similar in spirit to [1, Th. 1.5]; see also the forthcoming Theorem 7.6.

Theorem 5.9. *Let $p > 1$, and let F satisfy assumptions (H1), (H2), (H3) and (H4). Suppose that \mathbb{T} intersects every maximal component $\Omega_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\text{wind}_F(\Omega_0) = -1$, and that for every non-maximal component $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$, there exist two maximal components Ω_+ and Ω_- in \mathcal{C} such that*

- $\Omega_- \cap \mathbb{D} \neq \emptyset$ and $\Omega \xrightarrow{I.W.} \Omega_-$;
- $\Omega_+ \cap (\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}) \neq \emptyset$ and $\Omega \xrightarrow{I.W.} \Omega_+$.

Then T_F is hypercyclic on H^p .

Note that when a maximal component $\Omega_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ satisfies $\text{wind}_F(\Omega_0) = -1$, it is a connected component of the interior of $\sigma(T_F)$, and so the condition $\Omega_0 \cap \mathbb{T}$ is necessary for the hypercyclicity of T_F by Theorem 3.2. Note also that, for a function F satisfying assumptions (H1), (H2), (H3) and (H4), the condition of Theorem 5.9 is weaker than the condition of Theorem 5.6. Indeed, in Theorem 5.6, we require that every maximal connected component meets \mathbb{T} , and thus intersects both \mathbb{D} and $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}$.

This is not the case in the situation described in Figure 26. On this figure, we see that the maximal connected components are Ω_- and Ω_+ and that $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega_+)| = |\text{wind}_F(\Omega_-)| = 3$. We have $\Omega_- \subseteq \mathbb{D}$ and $\Omega_+ \subseteq \mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Thus the hypothesis of Theorem 5.9 are satisfied, because we can go up from each one of the non-maximal connected components $\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \Omega_3$ to Ω_+ and Ω_- via adjacent components, that is $\Omega_k \xrightarrow{I.W.} \Omega_{\pm}$, $k = 1, 2, 3$.




FIGURE 26

Proof. Let $g \in H^q$ vanish on $H_-(T_F)$, and let Ω be a non-maximal component of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$. According to our hypothesis, there exists a maximal component Ω_- such that $\Omega_- \cap \mathbb{D} \neq \emptyset$ and $\Omega \xrightarrow{I.W.} \Omega_-$. Then, by Equation (5.1), $H_\Omega(T_F) \subseteq H_{\Omega_-}(T_F)$ and since $H_{\Omega_-}(T_F) \subseteq H_-(T_F)$ by Proposition 2.5,

$$H_\Omega(T_F) \subseteq H_-(T_F).$$

Thus g vanishes on $H_\Omega(T_F)$ for every non-maximal component $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$. Also, our hypothesis implies that g vanishes on $H_\Omega(T_F)$ for every maximal component $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\text{wind}_F(\Omega) = -1$.

Let $Ug = (u_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1}$, where U is the operator defined in Section 2 and $u_j \in E^q(\Omega_j^+)$ for every $0 \leq j \leq N-1$. This means that for every non-maximal $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $j < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega)|$, $u_j = 0$ on Ω , and moreover $u_0 = 0$ on Ω for any maximal component $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\text{wind}_F(\Omega) = -1$. It remains to prove that for every maximal component $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ with $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| \geq 2$ and for every $0 \leq j < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega)|$, we have $u_j = 0$ on Ω .

Let thus $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ be a maximal component with $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| \geq 2$. Then every adjacent component Ω' of Ω is non-maximal. So for every $0 \leq j < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| - 1$ and for every adjacent component Ω' of Ω , $u_j = 0$ on Ω' . The boundary conditions on the functions u_j applied on $\partial\Omega$ imply that for every $0 \leq j < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| - 1$, $u_j - \zeta u_{j+1} \in E^q(\Omega)$ enjoys the following property: for every adjacent component Ω' of Ω , $u_j - \zeta u_{j+1} = 0$ almost everywhere on $\partial\Omega' \cap \partial\Omega$. So $u_j - \zeta u_{j+1} = 0$ almost everywhere on $\partial\Omega$. By Proposition 4.7 applied to any self-intersection point $\lambda_0 \in \partial\Omega$ where ζ is discontinuous (such a point does exist since $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| \geq 2$), $u_j = u_{j+1} = 0$ on Ω . We have thus proved that g vanishes on $H_\Omega(T_F)$.

In conclusion, we have shown that g vanishes on $H_\Omega(T_F)$ for all $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$, and so $g = 0$ by Proposition 2.5. Hence $H_-(T_F) = H^p$. Similarly, we have $H_+(T_F) = H^p$, and thus, by the Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion, T_F is hypercyclic on H^p . \square

In the next subsection, we rely on Theorem 4.5 to present a general situation where it is possible to extend the nullity from the exterior component of a boundary arc to the interior component (which is harder than going from the interior component to the exterior component).

5.4. A case with a necessary and sufficient condition. Here is the main theorem of this section, which provides a necessary and sufficient condition for the hypercyclicity of T_F under fairly general assumptions on F . Recall that the function F admits an inverse F^{-1} , defined on $F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$, where we recall that \mathcal{O} denotes the set of auto-intersection points of the curve. We also remind that if Ω and Ω' are two adjacent connected components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ with $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega')|$, then we say that the pair (Ω, Ω') satisfies the property (P) if the following holds:

(P) there exists a self intersection point λ_0 of the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$ and an open neighborhood V of λ_0 such that:

- $$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \bullet \lambda_0 \text{ belongs to } \partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega', \text{ and the restriction of the function } \zeta \text{ to } \partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega' \\ \text{cannot be extended continuously at the point } \lambda_0; \\ \bullet V \cap \partial\Omega' = V \cap \partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega'. \end{array} \right.$$

Theorem 5.10. *Let F satisfy (H1), (H2), (H3) and (H4), let $\zeta = 1/F^{-1}$ on $F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$, and let $p > 1$. Suppose that every pair (Ω, Ω') of adjacent connected component of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ with $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega')|$ satisfies the property (P).*

Then the following assertions are equivalent:

- (1) T_F is hypercyclic on H^p ;
- (2) $\Theta \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$ for every connected component Θ of $\sigma(T_F)$.

Note that, apart from the regularity hypothesis on the function F , all the assumptions of this theorem are purely geometric. The following example illustrates how Theorem 5.10 can be applied in order to deduce the hypercyclicity (or non-hypercyclicity) of an operator whose symbol satisfies the assumption (P).

Example 5.11. Let F satisfy (H1), (H2), (H3) and (H4), and suppose that the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$ is represented as below.




FIGURE 27

Then this function F satisfies (P), and the intersection points that we use in (P) are λ_2 for the pair (Ω_1, Ω_2) , λ_3 for the pair (Ω_2, Ω_3) and λ_4 for the pair (Ω_1, Ω_4) . Since \mathbb{T} intersects Ω_1 , \mathbb{T} intersects $\sigma(T_F)$ which is connected in this case. So, by Theorem 5.10, T_F is hypercyclic on H^p for every $p > 1$.

Let us now get back to the proof of Theorem 5.10. As can be expected, the role of assumption (P) is to allow us to propagate a condition of the form “ $u = 0$ ” from Ω , which is the exterior component of a suitable arc $\gamma \subseteq \partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega'$, to its interior component Ω' , using the point λ_0 and Theorem 4.5.

Proof of Theorem 5.10. Thanks to Theorem 3.2, we only need to prove that (2) \implies (1). Let Θ be a connected component of $\sigma(T_F)$.

Our strategy of proof will be to connect any two components $\Omega, \Omega' \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\Omega, \Omega' \subseteq \Theta$ via a finite sequence of adjacent components of \mathcal{C} contained in Θ . Given $\Omega, \Omega' \in \mathcal{C}$, we write $\Omega \longleftrightarrow \Omega'$ if there exists a finite sequence $(\Omega_n)_{0 \leq n \leq r}$ of elements of \mathcal{C} with $\Omega_n \subseteq \Theta$, $0 \leq n \leq r$ such that $\Omega_0 = \Omega$, $\Omega_r = \Omega'$ and Ω_n is adjacent to Ω_{n+1} for each $0 \leq n < r$.

Lemma 5.12. *For any $\Omega, \Omega' \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\Omega, \Omega' \subseteq \Theta$, we have $\Omega \longleftrightarrow \Omega'$.*

Proof of Lemma 5.12. Choose $\lambda \in \Omega$ and $\lambda' \in \Omega'$. Since $\Theta \setminus \mathcal{O}$ is a connected open subset of $\sigma(T_F)$, it is path-wise connected (remind that \mathcal{O} is the finite set of auto-intersection points of $F(\mathbb{T})$). Let $\gamma : [0, 1] \mapsto \Theta \setminus \mathcal{O}$ be a continuous map such that $\gamma(0) = \lambda$ and $\gamma(1) = \lambda'$. Without loss of generality, we can suppose that the set

$$Z := \{t \in [0, 1]; \gamma(t) \in F(\mathbb{T})\}$$

consists of finitely many points $0 < t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_r < 1$, and that $\gamma(t_n) \in F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$ for every $0 \leq n \leq r < 1$. Set $t_{-1} = 0$ and $t_{r+1} = 1$. For every $0 \leq n \leq r$ and for $t_n < t < t_{n+1}$, the point $\gamma(t)$ remains in a given connected component of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, which we call Ω_n . Also $\Omega_0 = \Omega$, $\Omega_r = \Omega'$ and $\gamma(0) \in \Omega_0$, $\gamma(1) \in \Omega_r$. Since $\partial\Omega_n \cap \partial\Omega_{n+1}$ contains the point t_n , which is not a self-intersection point of the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$, Ω_n and Ω_{n+1} are adjacent for every $0 \leq n < r$. It follows that $\Omega \longleftrightarrow \Omega'$. \square

The next step in the proof of Theorem 5.10 is

Lemma 5.13. *If $\Omega, \Omega' \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\Omega, \Omega' \subseteq \Theta$, then $H_\Omega(T_F) = H_{\Omega'}(T_F)$.*

Proof of Lemma 5.13. By Lemma 5.12, we have $\Omega \longleftrightarrow \Omega'$, so let $(\Omega_n)_{0 \leq n \leq r}$ a finite sequence of adjacent components such that $\Omega_0 = \Omega$ and $\Omega_r = \Omega'$. For any $0 \leq n < r$, the pair (Ω_n, Ω_{n+1}) satisfies the property (P), so by Corollary 4.6 we deduce that $H_{\Omega_n}(T_F) = H_{\Omega_{n+1}}(T_F)$ and thus

$$H_\Omega(T_F) = H_{\Omega_0}(T_F) = \dots = H_{\Omega_r}(T_F) = H_{\Omega'}(T_F). \quad \square$$

Since $\Theta \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$, there exists $\Omega_0 \in \mathcal{C}$, $\Omega_0 \subseteq \Theta$, such that $\Omega_0 \cap (\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}) \neq \emptyset$. Then, according to Proposition 2.5, $H_{\Omega_0}(T_F) \subseteq H_+(T_F)$. By Lemma 5.13, for every $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$, $\Omega \subseteq \Theta$, we have $H_\Omega(T_F) = H_{\Omega_0}(T_F) \subseteq H_+(T_F)$ and thus

$$\overline{\text{span}} [H_\Omega(T_F), \Omega \in \mathcal{C}, \Omega \subseteq \Theta] \subseteq H_+(T_F).$$

Since this reasoning applies to all connected components Θ of $\sigma(T_F)$, it follows from Proposition 2.5 that $H_+(T_F) = H^p$. In the same way, connecting any $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\Omega \subseteq \Theta$ to a fixed component $\Omega_1 \subseteq \Theta$ such that $\Omega_1 \cap \mathbb{D} \neq \emptyset$, we obtain that $H_-(T_F) = H^p$. By the Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion, T_F is hypercyclic on H^p . \square

There are some natural situations where the hypothesis of Theorem 5.10 are not satisfied, and where we need other tools in order to be able to decide whether the operator T_F is hypercyclic or not. The drawing below represents an example of a curve for which assumption (P) of Theorem 4.5 is not satisfied:




FIGURE 28

Indeed, in the situation of Figure 28, we cannot find a neighborhood V of λ_0 such that $V \cap \partial\Omega' = V \cap \partial\Omega \cap \partial\Omega'$ (and similarly for λ_1). But actually, we have the following more general version of Theorem 5.10 which solves cases like the one above.

Theorem 5.14. *Let F satisfy (H1), (H2), (H3) and (H4), let $\zeta = 1/F^{-1}$ on $F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$, and let $p > 1$. Suppose that, for every pair (Ω, Ω') of adjacent connected components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ with $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega')|$, one of the following properties holds:*

- (a) *the pair (Ω, Ω') satisfies the condition (P).*
- (b) *$\partial\Omega'$ is a Jordan curve and the image of a single closed subarc of \mathbb{T} .*

Then the following assertions are equivalent:

- (1) *T_F is hypercyclic on H^p ;*
- (2) *$O \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$ for every connected component O of $\sigma(T_F)$.*

Proof. The proof is exactly the same as that of Theorem 5.10, except in the proof of Lemma 5.13. To show that $H_{\Omega_n}(T_F) = H_{\Omega_{n+1}}(T_F)$, we use either Corollary 4.6 if we are in case (a) or Corollary 4.11 if we are in case (b). □

Example 5.15. As an illustration, we describe on Figure 29 below the connections between adjacent components which allow us to apply Theorem 5.14 in this case, and to show that T_F is hypercyclic on H^p .




FIGURE 29

The pairs (Ω, Ω') of adjacent components with $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega')|$ are

- (Ω_1, Ω_2) , where (b) applies (but not (a));
- (Ω_3, Ω_2) , where (b) applies (but not (a));
- (Ω_3, Ω_4) , where (a) applies using the point $\lambda_0 = \lambda''$ (but the point λ''' does not satisfy assumption (a), and (b) does not apply either);
- (Ω_4, Ω_5) , where either (b) or (a) applies using the point $\lambda_0 = \lambda'''$.

Example 5.16. Still, there are examples where the philosophy of Theorem 5.14 applies although its assumptions are not satisfied. For instance, consider the following situation:




FIGURE 30

Because of the components Ω_2 and Ω_3 , a function F such that $F(\mathbb{T})$ has this representation does not satisfy the hypothesis of Theorem 5.14. Nonetheless, it is still true that T_F is hypercyclic on H^p if and only if \mathbb{T} intersects the interior of $\sigma(T_F)$.

Indeed, let $g \in H^q$ and suppose for instance that g vanishes on $H_{\Omega_1}(T_F)$. Since the restriction of ζ to $\partial\Omega_3$ has a continuous extension to the point λ_1 , we can apply Theorem 4.12 to deduce that g also vanishes on $H_{\Omega_4}(T_F)$. We can now apply Proposition 4.7 to Ω_2 and Ω_3 , using the point λ_0 . Indeed, let $U : H^q \rightarrow E^q(\Omega_0^+) \oplus E^q(\Omega_1^+) \oplus E^q(\Omega_2^+)$ be the operator defined in Section 2 where $\Omega_0^+ = \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2 \cup \Omega_3 \cup \Omega_4 \cup \Omega_5$, $\Omega_1^+ = \Omega_2 \cup \Omega_3 \cup \Omega_5$, and $\Omega_2^+ = \Omega_5$ and write $Ug = (u_0, u_1, u_2)$ with

$$u_j(\lambda) = \langle h_{\lambda,j} | g \rangle_{p,q} \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \Omega_j^+, j = 0, 1, 2.$$

Since g vanishes on $H_{\Omega_1}(T_F) \cup H_{\Omega_4}(T_F)$, we know that $u_0 = 0$ on $\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_4$. Then, according to the boundary relation in Equation (2.6), we get

$$\begin{aligned} u_0^{int} - \zeta u_1^{int} &= 0 \quad \text{a.e. on } \partial\Omega_3 \cap (\partial\Omega_1 \cup \partial\Omega_4); \\ u_0^{int} - \zeta u_1^{int} &= 0 \quad \text{a.e. on } \partial\Omega_2. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Proposition 4.7 to the point λ_0 yields that $u_0 = u_1 = 0$ on $\Omega_2 \cup \Omega_3$, and thus g vanishes on $H_{\Omega_2}(T_F) \cup H_{\Omega_3}(T_F)$. Finally, since $\partial\Omega_5$ is a Jordan curve and the image by F of a single closed subarc of \mathbb{T} , we can apply Theorem 4.10 and get that $H_{\Omega_5}(T_F) \subseteq H_{\Omega_3}(T_F)$. Thus g vanishes on $H_{\Omega_5}(T_F)$. Hence g vanishes on $H_{\Omega_i}(T_F)$ for every $1 \leq i \leq 5$, and Proposition 2.5 implies that $g = 0$.

If at the beginning, g vanishes on another space $H_{\Omega_j}(T_F)$, using similar arguments as well as Theorem 4.4, we can also conclude that $g = 0$. Therefore one can conclude from the Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion that T_F is hypercyclic on H^p as soon as \mathbb{T} intersects the interior of $\sigma(T_F)$, which is connected in this case.

5.5. The case where $\max |\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| = 2$. In the case where $\max\{|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)|; \Omega \in \mathcal{C}\} = 2$, some of our results above take a simpler form.

Theorem 5.17. *Let $p > 1$, and let F satisfy (H1), (H2), (H3) and (H4). Suppose that $\max\{|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)|; \Omega \in \mathcal{C}\} = 2$ and that for every $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ with $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| = 2$, $\partial\Omega$ is a Jordan arc which is the image by F of a single closed subarc of \mathbb{T} . Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) T_F is hypercyclic on H^p ;
- (2) $O \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$ for every connected component O of $\sigma(T_F)$.

Theorem 5.17 corresponds to the following kind of situation:




FIGURE 31

Theorem 5.17 also applies to the case considered in Section 4.1, where $F(\mathbb{T})$ consists of two tangent circles, the inner one being the unit circle (see Figure 12). We will get back to this example in Section 8. Note that Theorem 5.17 is an immediate consequence of Theorem 5.14 since any pair (Ω, Ω') of elements of \mathcal{C} with $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega')|$ is such that $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| = 1$ and $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega')| = 2$, and then by hypothesis, $\partial\Omega'$ is a Jordan curve which is the image by F of a single closed subarc of \mathbb{T} . Hence we are in case (b) of Theorem 5.14.

A situation where $\max\{|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)|; \Omega \in \mathcal{C}\} = 2$ but Theorem 5.17 does not apply is the following:




FIGURE 32

If \mathbb{T} does not intersect the component Ω_2 of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ with $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega_2)| = 2$, but intersects only one of the other components Ω with $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| = 1$, we are unable to conclude that T_F is hypercyclic. However if for instance $\mathbb{T} \cap \Omega_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathbb{T} \cap \Omega_4 \neq \emptyset$, then T_F is hypercyclic on H^p .




FIGURE 33

Indeed, let g vanish on $H_-(T_F)$. Then g vanishes on Ω_1 and Ω_4 . Let $Ug = (u_0, u_1)$ where U is the operator defined in Section 2. So $u_0 = 0$ on $\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_4$. Thanks to the boundary conditions given by Equation (2.6), we obtain that $u_0^{int} - \zeta u_1^{int} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega_2 \cap V$ (where V is a small neighborhood of λ_0 where $\partial\Omega_1 \cap \partial\Omega_4 = \{\lambda_0\}$), and we can apply Proposition 4.7 to conclude that $u_0 = u_1 = 0$ on Ω_2 . So T_F is hypercyclic on H^p .

6. AN EXTENSION TO A MORE GENERAL SETTING

In this section, we will extend some results of the previous sections, replacing (H2) by a more general assumption (H2') which allows the point $F(e^{i\theta})$ to travel several times along certain portions of the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$. This weaker assumption is introduced by Yakubovich

in the paper [53], and a model theory for Toeplitz operators on H^2 is developed here, under assumptions (H1), (H2') and (H3). We will not provide the full details of this approach here, and we will simply state the results from [53] that will be needed in order to generalize some of the theorems from the previous sections to this more general setting. In particular, we will consider only the case of Toeplitz operators acting on H^2 in this section (although it can reasonably be conjectured that the results can be extended to the H^p setting). We refer to the paper [53] for all the details of the construction.

6.1. Yakubovich's model theory for Toeplitz operators. Let $F : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a symbol satisfying the assumptions (H1), (H2') and (H3), where the condition (H2') runs as follows:

- (H2') Suppose that $\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ has a finite number of connected components, and that one can partition the unit circle \mathbb{T} into a finite number of closed arcs $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$ such that
- (a) the function F is injective on the interior of each arc α_j , $1 \leq j \leq m$;
 - (b) for every $i \neq j$, $1 \leq i, j \leq m$, either $F(\alpha_i) = F(\alpha_j)$ or the sets $F(\alpha_i)$ and $F(\alpha_j)$ have disjoint interiors.

Denote by $\mathcal{O} \subseteq F(\mathbb{T})$ the set of all the extremities of the arcs α_j . As in the previous sections, \mathcal{C} denotes the set of all connected components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$. As with the assumption (H2), the results that we will obtain under the assumption (H2') do not depend on the specific form of the set \mathcal{O} (which depends on the choice of the extremities of the arcs α_j), but only on the behaviour of certain functions almost everywhere on subarc of $F(\mathbb{T})$.

Here is a picture illustrating this assumption (H2'):




FIGURE 34

In order to develop a model theory for operators satisfying these weaker assumptions, it is required in [53] that “the point $F(e^{i\theta})$ does not travel too many times in one way along a portion of the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$ ”. In order to explain precisely what is meant by this assumption, we recall some definitions and notations concerning the interior and exterior components with respect to a subarc of $F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$.

Let γ be a subarc of $F(\mathbb{T})$ containing no point of \mathcal{O} . Suppose first that γ is included in the boundary of exactly two connected components Ω and Ω' of $\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$. If $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| > |\text{wind}_F(\Omega')|$, we say that Ω is the *interior component with respect to γ* and Ω' is the *exterior component*. If $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| = |\text{wind}_F(\Omega')|$, interior and exterior connected components can be chosen interchangeably. Recall that the interior and exterior boundary values of a function u at $\lambda_0 \in \gamma$, denoted by $u^{\text{int}}(\lambda_0)$ and $u^{\text{ext}}(\lambda_0)$, are the non-tangential limits of u

at λ_0 through the interior and exterior component when these limits exist, i.e.

$$u^{int}(\lambda_0) = \lim_{\substack{\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_0 \\ \lambda \in \Omega}} u(\lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad u^{ext}(\lambda_0) = \lim_{\substack{\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_0 \\ \lambda \in \Omega'}} u(\lambda),$$

where Ω and Ω' are respectively the interior and exterior connected components with respect to γ . When γ is included in the boundary of exactly one component Ω , then we say that Ω is both the interior and the exterior component. Now we need to define the interior and exterior boundary values at a point $\lambda_0 \in \gamma$ in this case: let V be a neighborhood of λ_0 such that $V \setminus \gamma \subseteq \Omega$ has exactly two connected components V_1 and V_2 . Then we note

$$u^{int}(\lambda_0) = \lim_{\substack{\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_0 \\ \lambda \in V_1}} u(\lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad u^{ext}(\lambda_0) = \lim_{\substack{\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_0 \\ \lambda \in V_2}} u(\lambda)$$

whenever these two non-tangential limits exist. The open sets V_1 and V_2 which are used to define $u^{int}(\lambda_0)$ and $u^{ext}(\lambda_0)$ can be chosen interchangeably.

For every point $\lambda \in F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$, let $\gamma \subseteq F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$ be a non-trivial curve such that $\lambda \in \gamma$. Let Ω and Ω' be respectively the interior and exterior components with respect to γ . Then set

$$w_i(\lambda) := \text{wind}_F(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad w_e(\lambda) := \text{wind}_F(\Omega').$$

The functions w_i and w_e are in fact respectively the interior and exterior limits of the function wind_F on the arc γ . As it is now allowed to travel the arc γ in both directions, let $n_i(\lambda)$ and $n_e(\lambda)$ denote the number of times that the point $F(e^{i\theta})$ travels along the arc γ in each one of the two directions, in such a way that $n_i(\lambda) \geq n_e(\lambda)$. Recall now the following geometrical interpretation of the winding number of a curve at a point. Adding 1 to the winding number can be interpreted as turning one more time around the point while keeping it on the left. In other words, saying that we travel $n_i(\lambda)$ times in one direction and $n_e(\lambda)$ times in the other direction on the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$ in the vicinity of the point λ is exactly equivalent to saying that we need to add $n_i(\lambda)$ and subtract $n_e(\lambda)$ to the winding number of one component (either interior or exterior) at the point λ in order to obtain the winding number of the other one; in other words,

$$(6.1) \quad n_i(\lambda) - n_e(\lambda) = |w_i(\lambda) - w_e(\lambda)| = |w_i(\lambda)| - |w_e(\lambda)|$$

or, equivalently,

$$(6.2) \quad |w_i(\lambda)| - n_i(\lambda) = |w_e(\lambda)| - n_e(\lambda).$$

We refer for instance to [54, p. 286] for this geometrical interpretation of the winding number of a curve at a point, which will be also used in the proof of Lemma B.8.

In this new situation it is also possible to define an operator U in much the same way as in Section 2, but this time, the boundary condition induced by Remark B.13 depends of $n_i(\lambda) + 1$ many functions $h_{\lambda,j}$ and $n_e(\lambda) + 1$ many functions $h_{\lambda,j}$. It turns out that the following additional assumption is needed [53, Lemma 4.1]:

$$|w_i(\lambda)| - n_i(\lambda) = |w_e(\lambda)| - n_e(\lambda) \geq 0 \quad \text{a.e. on } F(\mathbb{T}),$$

so that the $h_{\lambda,j}$'s involved in the boundary relation induced by Remark B.13 are eigenvectors of T_F . Under this additional assumption, Yakubovich is able to define in [53] a model operator similar to the one obtained under the assumption (H2) in [51] (see Theorem 2.2). We do not state this result in detail, but restrict ourselves to a rather informal statement of what is precisely needed for our purposes:

Theorem 6.1 (Yakubovich [53]). *Let F satisfy the assumptions (H1), (H2') and (H3), and suppose moreover that*

$$(6.3) \quad |w_i(\lambda)| - n_i(\lambda) = |w_e(\lambda)| - n_e(\lambda) \geq 0 \quad \text{a.e. on } F(\mathbb{T}).$$

Then the operator U of Theorem 2.2 can be replaced by a bounded operator \tilde{U} , defined on H^2 and taking values in a vector-valued (Hilbertian) Smirnov space of functions on the connected components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, satisfying similar properties to the ones of Theorem 2.2:

- *for every $\lambda \in \sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, we have $\tilde{U}T_F^*g(\lambda) = \lambda\tilde{U}g(\lambda)$. Also, $\tilde{U}g(\lambda) = 0$ if and only if g vanishes on $\ker(T_F - \lambda)$;*
- *the operator $\tilde{U} : H^2 \rightarrow \text{Ran}(\tilde{U})$ is invertible;*
- *the image $\text{Ran}(\tilde{U})$ of \tilde{U} is the subspace of the vector-valued Smirnov space of functions on the connected components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ satisfying the boundary conditions of [53, Eq. (2.1)].*

6.2. A necessary condition for hypercyclicity. Theorem 6.1 implies in particular that, in the same way as what happened under the stronger assumption (H2), the operator T_F still has an H^∞ functional calculus:

Corollary 6.2 (Yakubovich [53]). *Let F satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 6.1. Then T_F admits an H^∞ functional calculus on the interior of $\sigma(T_F)$, and there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|u(T_F)\| \leq C \sup \left\{ |u(\lambda)|; \lambda \in \overset{\circ}{\sigma}(T_F) \right\}$$

for every function $u \in H^\infty(\overset{\circ}{\sigma}(T_F))$.

Since Corollary 6.2 provides us with an H^∞ functional calculus in this more general situation, Theorem 3.2 can be extended to this context. We have:

Theorem 6.3. *Let F satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 6.1. If T_F is hypercyclic on H^2 , then every connected component of the interior of the spectrum of T_F must intersect \mathbb{T} .*

6.3. Sufficient conditions for hypercyclicity. In this subsection, we will not really work with the operator \tilde{U} but rather with the operator U constructed in Section 2.5, which satisfies similar properties to those proved when (H2) holds under the more general hypothesis (H2'). The main difference between the two settings concerns the range of this operator, which is more difficult to describe and to use in the general case where only (H2') is satisfied. Let us briefly recall the construction. In Section 2.5, we considered the operator U defined as

$$(Ug)_j(\lambda) = \langle h_{\lambda,j} | g \rangle_{p,q} \quad \text{for every } g \in H^q, \lambda \in \Omega_j^+, \text{ and } 0 \leq j < N,$$

where the functions $h_{\lambda,j}$ defined by $h_{\lambda,j}(z) = z^j F_\lambda^+(0)/F_\lambda^+(z)$, for $z \in \mathbb{D}$ and $0 \leq j < N$, form a basis of the eigenspace $\ker(T_F - \lambda)$. This construction remains valid when we replace (H2) by (H2'). In this case, the operator U satisfies similar properties to the ones that it enjoys under assumption (H2). More precisely, we have the following:

Theorem 6.4. *Let F satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 6.1. Then U is a bounded and injective operator from H^2 into $\bigoplus_{0 \leq j < N} E^2(\Omega_j^+)$.*

Proof. The proof of the boundedness of U under the hypothesis (H2') is carried out in Theorem B.15. The injectivity of U follows from the injectivity of \tilde{U} . Indeed, since the functions $h_{\lambda,j}$, $0 \leq j < |\text{wind}(\lambda)|$, form a basis of $\ker(T_F - \lambda)$ for every $\lambda \in \sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, we know that $g \perp \ker(T_F - \lambda)$ if and only if $(Ug)_j(\lambda) = 0$ for every $0 \leq j < |\text{wind}_F(\lambda)|$ (see Fact 2.1). According to Theorem 6.1, $g \perp \ker(T_F - \lambda)$ if and only if $\tilde{U}g(\lambda) = 0$. Hence if $Ug = 0$, we also have $\tilde{U}g = 0$, and then $g = 0$ by Theorem 6.1. \square

In particular, we have the following analogue of Proposition 2.5:

Proposition 6.5. *Let F satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 6.1.*

(1) *Let $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$, and let A be a subset of \mathbb{C} . If $A \cap \Omega$ has an accumulation point in Ω , then*

$$\overline{\text{span}}[\ker(T_F - \lambda); \lambda \in A \cap \Omega] = \overline{\text{span}}[\ker(T_F - \lambda); \lambda \in \Omega].$$

(2) *We have*

$$\overline{\text{span}}[H_\Omega(T_F); \Omega \in \mathcal{C}] = H^2.$$

In the rest of this section, we give a version, under the assumption (H2'), of some of the results of Sections 3 and 5 which are also true in this context.

First, since Proposition 2.5 generalizes here into Proposition 6.5, we can extend Theorem 4.1 (which was a direct consequence of Proposition 2.5) to the case where only (H2') is satisfied. This is the content of the next theorem:

Theorem 6.6. *Let F satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 6.1. Suppose that*

$$(6.4) \quad \Omega \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset \quad \text{for every } \Omega \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Then T_F is hypercyclic on H^2 .




FIGURE 35

As already said, the difficulty when working with assumption (H2') lies with the description of the range of U . In Remark B.13, we show that when (H2') holds, the eigenvectors $h_{\lambda,j}$ satisfy a boundary equation of the following form:

$$\sum_{p=0}^{n_i(\lambda)} a_p(\lambda) h_{\lambda,k+p}^{int} = \sum_{\ell=0}^{n_e(\lambda)} b_\ell(\lambda) h_{\lambda,k+\ell}^{ext} \quad \text{a.e. on } \partial\Omega_n^+,$$

for every $n \geq k + \max(n_i(\lambda), n_e(\lambda))$, where the quantities $a_p(\lambda)$ and $b_\ell(\lambda)$ are defined by Equations (B.21) and (B.22) respectively. Now, using the boundedness of the operator U

(which is still true under hypothesis (H2')), we see that if, given $g \in H^q$, we write Ug as $Ug = (u_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1}$, then the functions u_j satisfy the boundary relations

$$(6.5) \quad \sum_{p=0}^{n_i(\lambda)} a_p(\lambda) u_{k+p}^{int}(\lambda) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{n_e(\lambda)} b_\ell(\lambda) u_{k+\ell}^{ext}(\lambda) \quad \text{a.e. on } \partial\Omega_n^+$$

for every $n \geq k + \max(n_i(\lambda), n_e(\lambda))$.

A particular case of (H2') where the assumption (6.3) of Theorem 6.1 is satisfied is when $n_e = 0$ almost everywhere on $F(\mathbb{T})$, which means that the point $F(e^{i\theta})$ travels over every subarc of $F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$ in one direction only. Under this condition, Equation (6.5) implies that the range of U is contained in a subspace of $\bigoplus E^2(\Omega_j^+)$ consisting of N -tuples $(u_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1} \in \bigoplus_{0 \leq j \leq N-1} E^2(\Omega_j^+)$ satisfying a boundary relation of the type

$$u_j^{ext} = a_0(\lambda) u_j^{int} + \dots + a_{n_i(\lambda)}(\lambda) u_{j+n_i(\lambda)}^{int} \quad \text{a.e. on } \partial\Omega_{j+n_i(\lambda)}^+.$$

In particular, if $u = Ug$ vanishes on the interior component of an arc γ included in $F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$, then u vanishes also on the exterior component of γ , and so Theorem 4.4 can be extended when F satisfies (H1), (H2') and (H3) and $n_e = 0$ almost everywhere on $F(\mathbb{T})$. Thus Theorem 5.6 can be extended as follows:

Theorem 6.7. *Let F satisfy (H1), (H2') and (H3). Suppose moreover that $n_e = 0$ a.e. on $F(\mathbb{T})$. If $\Omega \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$ for every maximal component Ω of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, then T_F is hypercyclic on H^2 .*

Here is an example of a function F such that Theorem 6.7 applies but not Theorem 6.6.




FIGURE 36

Although going “from the interior component to the exterior component of a boundary arc” is still possible under assumption (H2') combined with the hypothesis that $n_e = 0$ almost everywhere on $F(\mathbb{T})$, we do not know of general conditions, possibly similar to those of Theorems 4.5 or 4.10, implying that one can go “from the exterior component to the interior component of a boundary arc”. Still, we are able to handle the following interesting example.

Example 6.8. One of the simplest situations where we would need to go from the exterior component of a boundary arc to the interior, in order to conclude that T_F is hypercyclic, is the one given by a curve of the following type:




FIGURE 37

It is similar to the curve considered in Section 4.1, but the inner circle is traveled twice. Set

$$F(e^{i\theta}) = \begin{cases} 3e^{-5i\theta/3} & \text{if } 0 \leq \theta < 6\pi/5 \\ 2 + e^{-5i\theta} & \text{if } 6\pi/5 \leq \theta < 2\pi. \end{cases}$$

In this case, the boundary relations allow us to prove directly that T_F is hypercyclic on H^2 . To this aim, we proceed in a similar fashion to what we did in Section 4.1: for every $\lambda \in \partial\Omega_2 \setminus \{3\}$, there exist $\theta_1(\lambda) \in (0, 2\pi/5)$ and $\theta_2(\lambda) \in (2\pi/5, 4\pi/5)$ such that

$$\lambda = F(e^{-i\theta_1(\lambda)}) = 2 + e^{5i\theta_1(\lambda)} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda = F(e^{-i\theta_2(\lambda)}) = 2 + e^{5i\theta_2(\lambda)}.$$

So let $\zeta_1(\lambda) = e^{i\theta_1(\lambda)}$ and $\zeta_2(\lambda) = e^{i\theta_2(\lambda)}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_1(\lambda) &= \exp\left(\frac{i}{5} \arg_{(0,2\pi)}(\lambda - 2)\right) \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \partial\Omega_2 \setminus \{3\}; \\ \zeta_2(\lambda) &= \exp\left(\frac{1}{5} \arg_{(2\pi,4\pi)}(\lambda - 2)\right) \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \partial\Omega_2 \setminus \{3\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $g \in H^2$. Then write $Ug = (u_0, u_1, u_2)$, where $u_0 \in E^2(\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2)$ and $u_1, u_2 \in E^2(\Omega_2)$ satisfy the following boundary relation:

$$(6.6) \quad u_0^{int} - (\zeta_1 + \zeta_2)u_1^{int} + \zeta_1\zeta_2u_2^{int} = u_0^{ext} \quad \text{a.e. on } \partial\Omega_2.$$

Indeed, in this example, the polynomials in Equations (B.21) and (B.22) become

$$\prod_{j \in N_{int}(\lambda)} (1 - d_j(\lambda)z) = (1 - \zeta_1(\lambda)z)(1 - \zeta_2(\lambda)z) = 1 - (\zeta_1(\lambda) + \zeta_2(\lambda))z + \zeta_1(\lambda)\zeta_2(\lambda)z^2;$$

$$\prod_{j \in N_{ext}(\lambda)} (1 - d_j(\lambda)z) = 1,$$

and then Equation (6.5) gives exactly Equation (6.6).

• Suppose that g is orthogonal to $H_-(T_F)$. Then, by Proposition 6.5, $g \perp H_{\Omega_1}(T_F)$, so that $u_0 = 0$ on Ω_1 . Hence $u_0^e = 0$ almost everywhere on $\partial\Omega_2$ and Equation (6.6) becomes

$$u_0^{int} - (\zeta_1 + \zeta_2)u_1^{int} + \zeta_1\zeta_2u_2^{int} = 0 \quad \text{a.e. on } \partial\Omega_2.$$

The functions ζ_1 and ζ_2 admit bounded analytic extensions to $\Omega_2 \setminus [2, 3]$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_1(\lambda) &= \exp\left(\frac{1}{5}\left[\log|\lambda-2| + i \arg_{(0,2\pi)}(\lambda-2)\right]\right) \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \Omega_2 \setminus [2, 3]; \\ \zeta_2(\lambda) &= \exp\left(\frac{1}{5}\left[\log|\lambda-2| + i \arg_{(2\pi,4\pi)}(\lambda-2)\right]\right) \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \Omega_2 \setminus [2, 3].\end{aligned}$$

which are such that for every $x \in [2, 3]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{\substack{y \rightarrow 0 \\ y > 0}} \zeta_1(x+iy) &= (x-2)^{1/5} \neq (x-2)^{1/5} e^{i\frac{2\pi}{5}} = \lim_{\substack{y \rightarrow 0 \\ y < 0}} \zeta_1(x+iy); \\ \lim_{\substack{y \rightarrow 0 \\ y > 0}} \zeta_2(x+iy) &= (x-2)^{1/5} e^{i\frac{2\pi}{5}} \neq (x-2)^{1/5} e^{i\frac{4\pi}{5}} = \lim_{\substack{y \rightarrow 0 \\ y < 0}} \zeta_2(x+iy).\end{aligned}$$

The functions u_0 , $(\zeta_1 + \zeta_2)u_1$, and $\zeta_1\zeta_2u_2$ belong to $E^2(\Omega_2 \setminus [2, 3])$ and since $u_0 - (\zeta_1 + \zeta_2)u_1 + \zeta_1\zeta_2u_2$ vanishes on a subset of positive measure of the boundary of $\Omega_2 \setminus [2, 3]$, we have $u_0 - (\zeta_1 + \zeta_2)u_1 + \zeta_1\zeta_2u_2 = 0$ on $\Omega_2 \setminus [2, 3]$.

If either u_1 or u_2 is identically zero on Ω_2 , the same argument as in Section 4.1 shows that $u_0 = 0$ on Ω_2 as well. So henceforward, we suppose that u_1 and u_2 are not identically zero on Ω_2 . For all $x \in [2, 3)$ except possibly countably many, we have $u_1(x) \neq 0$ and $u_2(x) \neq 0$. The function $u_0 = (\zeta_1 + \zeta_2)u_1 - \zeta_1\zeta_2u_2$ is continuous at the point x (because $u_0 \in E^2(\Omega_2)$), and taking limits of $u_0(x+iy)$ and $u_0(x-iy)$ as $y \rightarrow 0$, $y > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(x-2)^{1/5}\left(1 + e^{i\frac{2\pi}{5}}\right)u_1(x) - (x-2)^{2/5}e^{i\frac{2\pi}{5}}u_2(x) \\ = (x-2)^{1/5}\left(e^{i\frac{2\pi}{5}} + e^{i\frac{4\pi}{5}}\right)u_1(x) - (x-2)^{2/5}e^{i\frac{6\pi}{5}}u_2(x).\end{aligned}$$

Hence $u_1(x) - (x-2)^{1/5}e^{i\frac{2\pi}{5}}u_2(x) = e^{i\frac{4\pi}{5}}u_1(x) - (x-2)^{1/5}e^{i\frac{6\pi}{5}}u_2(x)$ so that

$$(6.7) \quad \left(1 - e^{i\frac{4\pi}{5}}\right)u_1(x) = (x-2)^{1/5}\left(e^{i\frac{2\pi}{5}} - e^{i\frac{6\pi}{5}}\right)u_2(x) \quad \text{for every } x \in [2, 3].$$

Set

$$w(\lambda) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{5}\left[\log|\lambda-2| + i \arg_{(-\pi,\pi)}(\lambda-2)\right]\right) \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \Omega_2 \setminus [1, 2]$$

and $v_1(\lambda) = \left(1 - e^{i\frac{4\pi}{5}}\right)u_1(\lambda)$, $v_2(\lambda) = \left(e^{i\frac{2\pi}{5}} - e^{i\frac{6\pi}{5}}\right)u_2(\lambda)$ for every $\lambda \in \Omega_2$. Then v_1 , v_2 , and w are analytic functions on $\Omega_2 \setminus [1, 2]$. Using the uniqueness principle and Equation (6.7), we deduce that $v_1 = w \cdot v_2$ on $\Omega_2 \setminus [1, 2]$. Now, since v_2 is not identically zero on Ω_2 , there exists $x \in (1, 2)$ with $v_2(x) \neq 0$, and so w admits an analytic extension to a neighborhood of x . But this contradicts the fact that

$$\lim_{\substack{y \rightarrow 0 \\ y > 0}} w(x+iy) = (x-2)^{1/5}e^{i\frac{\pi}{5}} \neq (x-2)^{1/5}e^{-i\frac{\pi}{5}} = \lim_{\substack{y \rightarrow 0 \\ y < 0}} w(x+iy).$$

So finally, we obtain that $u_1 = u_2 = 0$ on Ω_2 , so that $u_0 = 0$ on Ω_2 . This means that $g \perp H_{\Omega_2}(T_F)$, and so, by Proposition 6.5, $g = 0$. We finally deduce that $H_-(T_F) = H^2$.

• Suppose, lastly, that g is orthogonal to $H_+(T_F)$. Since $(\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}) \cap \Omega_1 \neq \emptyset$, and $(\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}) \cap \Omega_2 \neq \emptyset$, g is orthogonal to $H_{\Omega_1}(T_F)$ and $H_{\Omega_2}(T_F)$. So $g = 0$ and $H_+(T_F) = H^2$. So T_F is hypercyclic on H^2 .

6.4. An equivalence. When $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(T_F) = \overset{\circ}{\sigma(T_F)}$, Theorems 6.3 and 6.6 can be combined to provide a characterization of hypercyclicity. Observe that $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ coincides with the interior of $\sigma(T_F)$ if and only if the condition $F(\mathbb{T}) = \partial\sigma(T_F)$ is satisfied. We have the following theorem:

Theorem 6.9. *Let F satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 6.1. Suppose that $F(\mathbb{T}) = \partial\sigma(T_F)$. Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) T_F is hypercyclic on H^2 ;
- (2) $O \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$ for every connected component O of $\overset{\circ}{\sigma(T_F)}$.




FIGURE 38

Theorem 6.9 can be applied in particular when $F(\mathbb{T})$ is a Jordan curve on which the point $F(e^{i\theta})$ travels several times. We can also deal with the case where $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ is connected:

Theorem 6.10. *Let F satisfy assumptions (H1), (H2') and (H3). If $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ is connected, then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) T_F is hypercyclic on H^2 ;
- (2) $\overset{\circ}{\sigma(T_F)} \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$.




FIGURE 39

Proof. Let us begin by observing the following fact: set $\Omega = \sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$. If $\overset{\circ}{\sigma(T_F)} \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$, then $\overset{\circ}{\sigma(T_F)} \cap \mathbb{D} \neq \emptyset$. Since, in this case, $\Omega = \overset{\circ}{\sigma(T_F)} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, it follows that \mathbb{D} has to intersect also Ω . The same argument yields that $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ intersects Ω . Since Ω is connected, this implies that $\mathbb{T} \cap \Omega \neq \emptyset$. We deduce that, under the hypothesis that Ω is connected, the necessary condition for hypercyclicity in Theorem 6.3 and the sufficient condition in Theorem 6.6 are equivalent. We obtain thus the equivalence stated in Theorem 6.10. \square

7. COMPARISON WITH RESULTS OF ABAKUMOV, BARANOV, CHARPENTIER AND LISHANSKII

In [1], the authors study the hypercyclicity on H^2 of Toeplitz operators with symbols which are meromorphic on \mathbb{D} and continuous up to the boundary \mathbb{T} . Our aim in this section will be to apply our previous results to this class of symbols, and thus to recover and extend some of the results of [1]. More precisely, in this whole section, we consider symbols of the following form:

$$(7.1) \quad F(z) = R(1/z) + \phi(z),$$

where $\phi \in A(\mathbb{D})$ and R is a rational function without poles in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. In other words, the function R can be written as

$$R(z) = P(z) + \sum_{l=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^{k_l} \frac{\alpha_{l,j}}{(z - \eta_l)^j},$$

where P is a polynomial of degree N_1 and the poles $\eta_l \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}$, $l = 1, \dots, r$ of R are distinct with respective multiplicities k_l . We set $N_2 = \sum_{l=1}^r k_l$. Then setting $N = N_1 + N_2$, we have $\deg(R) = N$. In other words, F has exactly N poles in \mathbb{D} , counted with multiplicity. We denote by \mathcal{P} the set of these poles, which consists of the points $\eta_1^{-1}, \dots, \eta_r^{-1}$, plus the point 0 if the polynomial P is not constant.

7.1. Link with the setting of [1]. Since, for every $\lambda \notin F(\mathbb{T})$, the function $F - \lambda$ has no zero nor pole on \mathbb{T} , the argument principle implies that

$$(7.2) \quad \text{wind}_F(\lambda) = n_F(\lambda) - N \quad \text{for all } \lambda \notin F(\mathbb{T}),$$

where $n_F(\lambda)$ is defined for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ as the number of solutions of the equation $F(z) = \lambda$ in \mathbb{D} , counted with multiplicity. This equality provides a relation between the orientation of the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$ and the valence of F . Observe that there is no conflict with the notation employed in Section 2: if F is negatively wound, the integer N is indeed the maximal value of $|\text{wind}_F(\lambda)|$ when λ ranges over $\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$. If we consider the map F as taking values in the Riemann sphere $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$, then notice that for $|\lambda|$ sufficiently large (and for $\lambda = \infty$), we have $\text{wind}_F(\lambda) = 0$ and Equation (7.2) implies that the equation $F(z) = \lambda$ has exactly N solutions in \mathbb{D} (and also exactly N solutions in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ because $F(\mathbb{T})$ is compact and thus bounded). In the rest of this section, we will implicitly view F as taking values in $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$.

If Ω is a connected component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, we denote by $n_F(\Omega)$ the common value of the integers $n_F(\lambda)$, $\lambda \in \Omega$. We have $n_F(\Omega) = \text{wind}_F(\lambda) + N$. If Ω_∞ denotes the unbounded component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, then $n_F(\Omega_\infty) = N$.

Let now A be a subset of $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, and let K be a positive integer. We say that F is K -valent on A (resp. exactly K -valent on A) if for any $\lambda \in F(A)$, the equation $F(z) = \lambda$ has at most (resp. exactly) K solutions in A , counted with multiplicity. Note that, taking $A = \mathbb{D} \setminus \mathcal{P}$ (or $A = \mathbb{D}$), the K -valence of F on A (which means by definition that $n_F(\lambda) \leq K$ for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$) is equivalent to the property $n_F(\lambda) \leq K$ for every $\lambda \notin F(\mathbb{T})$, i.e. $\text{wind}_F(\lambda) \leq K - N$ for every $\lambda \notin F(\mathbb{T})$. Indeed, if $n_F(\lambda) \leq K$ for every $\lambda \notin F(\mathbb{T})$, then there is no point $\lambda_0 \in F(\mathbb{T})$ such that $n_F(\lambda_0) > K$: if it were the case, then by Rouché's Theorem there would exist $\lambda \notin F(\mathbb{T})$ such that $n_F(\lambda) > K$, a contradiction. So $n_F(\lambda) \leq K$ for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$.

Recall that Proposition 3.1 asserts that if a Toeplitz operator with a continuous symbol F is hypercyclic on H^p for some $p > 1$, then $F(\mathbb{T})$ is negatively wound, i.e. $\text{wind}_F \leq 0$ on

$\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$. When F is defined as in Equation (7.1), the relation between the winding number and the valence in Equation (7.2) together with Proposition 3.1 imply the following result:

Proposition 7.1. *Let F be given by Equation (7.1), and let $p > 1$. If T_F is hypercyclic on H^p , then F is N -valent on \mathbb{D} .*

We observe that if F is N -valent on \mathbb{D} , then Lemma A.11 and Equation (7.2) imply that

$$(7.3) \quad \sigma(T_F) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T}); n_F(\lambda) < N\} \cup F(\mathbb{T}).$$

We finish this subsection by spelling out the link between the eigenvectors $h_{\lambda,j}$ of T_F , for $|\text{wind}_F(\lambda)| = N$ and $0 \leq j \leq N-1$, and the eigenvectors used in [1].

For symbols F of the form (7.1), satisfying assumptions (H1), (H2), and (H3), and for $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\overline{\mathbb{D}}) = \mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{F(\mathbb{D})}$ (i.e λ belongs to a connected component $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| = N$), the eigenvectors $h_{\lambda,j}$, $0 \leq j \leq N-1$, can be written as

$$(7.4) \quad h_{\lambda,j}(z) = z^j \cdot \frac{c_\lambda}{z^{N_1} Q(z)(F(z) - \lambda)} \quad \text{for every } z \in \mathbb{D}$$

where

$$Q(z) = \prod_{l=1}^r (1 - \eta_l z)^{k_l}$$

and c_λ is a non-zero constant given by the value at 0 of the function $z \mapsto z^{N_1} Q(z)(F(z) - \lambda)$, which is analytic on \mathbb{D} . Indeed, write

$$\phi_\lambda(z) = z^N (F(z) - \lambda) = \frac{z^{N_2}}{Q(z)} [z^{N_1} Q(z)(F(z) - \lambda)] \quad \text{for every } z \in \mathbb{D},$$

and observe that the function $z \mapsto z^{N_1} Q(z)(F(z) - \lambda)$ belongs to $A(\mathbb{D})$ and does not vanish on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. In particular, one can define an analytic branch of its logarithm on \mathbb{D} , denoted by $\log(z^{N_1} Q(z)(F(z) - \lambda))$, which also belongs to $A(\mathbb{D})$. Moreover, since $N_2 = \sum_{l=1}^r k_l$, we have

$$\frac{z^{N_2}}{Q(z)} = \frac{1}{\prod_{l=1}^r \left(\frac{1}{z} - \eta_l\right)^{k_l}}.$$

Observe now that for every $1 \leq l \leq r$, the function $z \mapsto \log(z - \eta_l)$ (where we choose here a suitable determination of the logarithm) belongs to $A(\mathbb{D})$, and thus the function $z \mapsto \log\left(\frac{1}{z} - \eta_l\right)$ belongs to H_-^p , where $H_-^p = \{f \in H^p; \hat{f}(n) = 0 \text{ for every } n \geq 0\}$. Define now

$$U_\lambda(z) = - \sum_{l=1}^r k_l \log\left(\frac{1}{z} - \eta_l\right) + \log(z^{N_1} Q(z)(F(z) - \lambda)) \quad \text{for every } z \in \mathbb{T}.$$

We have

$$e^{U_\lambda(z)} = z^{N_1} Q(z)(F(z) - \lambda) \frac{z^{N_2}}{Q(z)} = \phi_\lambda(z) \quad \text{for every } z \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Hence, according to Equation (2.2), we see that $F_\lambda^+ = e^{P_+ U_\lambda}$. As the function $\log(z^{-1} - \eta_l)$ belongs to H_-^p for every $1 \leq l \leq r$, we have

$$P_+(\log(z^{-1} - \eta_l)) = 0.$$

Since $\log(z^{N_1} Q(z)(F(z) - \lambda))$ belongs to $A(\mathbb{D})$,

$$P_+\left(\log(z^{N_1} Q(z)(F(z) - \lambda))\right) = \log(z^{N_1} Q(z)(F(z) - \lambda)).$$

Finally,

$$F_\lambda^+(z) = e^{\log(z^{N_1}Q(z)(F(z)-\lambda))} = z^{N_1}Q(z)(F(z) - \lambda).$$

Taking Equation (2.4) into account eventually yields Equation (7.4) for the eigenvectors $h_{\lambda,j}$. For any $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ with $n_F(\Omega) = 0$, i.e. with $\text{wind}_F(\Omega) = -N$, let

$$(7.5) \quad h_\lambda = \frac{1}{F - \lambda} \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \Omega.$$

We have, for every $0 \leq j \leq N - 1$ and $\lambda \in \Omega$,

$$h_{\lambda,j}(z) = z^j \cdot \frac{c_\lambda}{z^{N_1}Q(z)} \cdot h_\lambda(z) \quad \text{for every } z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Therefore we recover the eigenvectors obtained in [1, Section 4.1].

7.2. The case where F is exactly N -valent. In this subsection, we consider a function F defined by Equation (7.1), satisfying (H1), and which is exactly N -valent on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. This means that for every $\lambda \in F(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$, the equation $F(z) = \lambda$ has exactly N solutions in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Moreover, for any $\lambda \notin F(\mathbb{T})$, $n_F(\lambda) \leq N$, and Equation (7.2) implies that F satisfies (H3). Note that the exact N -valence of F on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ (and not just on \mathbb{D}) implies the following fact:

Fact 7.2. *For every $\lambda \in F(\mathbb{T})$, the N solutions in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ of the equation $F(z) = \lambda$ belong to \mathbb{T} . Thus $F(\mathbb{T})$ is a Jordan curve on which the point $F(e^{i\theta})$ travels exactly N times, and $\partial\sigma(T_F) = F(\mathbb{T})$.*

Proof. Using Equation (6.1) which gives a link between the number of travels on the curve in both directions and the winding numbers of the exterior and interior components at a point of $F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$, we observe the following: for any point $\lambda_0 \in \partial\sigma(T_F)$ which belongs to the boundary of only two components of $\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ (so that in particular $\lambda_0 \in F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$), we have $n_i(\lambda_0) = N$ and $n_e(\lambda_0) = 0$. So the point $F(e^{i\theta})$ travels on each curve included in $\partial\sigma(T_F) \setminus \mathcal{O}$ exactly N times, and only in one direction. Suppose now that there exists a point $\lambda_0 \in \partial\sigma(T_F)$ which belongs to the boundary of at least three different components of $\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$.




FIGURE 40. An example with $N = 3$

Then such a point λ_0 belongs to \mathcal{O} , and the equation $F(z) = \lambda_0$ would necessarily have strictly more than N solutions in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$: indeed, the equation $F(z) = \lambda_0$ would have exactly N solutions in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ coming, by continuity, from the N solutions of the equation $F(z) = \lambda$, for $\lambda \in \partial\sigma(T_F) \setminus \mathcal{O}$, plus at least one other solution coming from another part of the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$ which meets the boundary $\partial\sigma(T_F)$ of the spectrum at the point λ_0 , as illustrated in Figure 40 with $N = 3$. This contradicts the exact N -valence of F on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. \square

These arguments allow for a more precise description of the spectrum of T_F in the following two cases : if F is exactly N -valent on \mathbb{D} , it follows from Equations (7.2) and (7.3) combined with the fact that for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, either $n_F(\lambda) = 0$ or $n_F(\lambda) = N$, that

$$\sigma(T_F) = (\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{D})) \cup F(\mathbb{T}).$$

If F is exactly N -valent on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, then $F(\mathbb{T}) \cap F(\mathbb{D}) = \emptyset$ by Fact 7.2, and thus

$$\sigma(T_F) = \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{D}).$$

As we have already seen, if F is exactly N -valent on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, then F satisfies (H3). Moreover, it follows from Fact 7.2 that F satisfies also (H2'). Finally, since by Fact 7.2, $F(\mathbb{T})$ is a Jordan curve and $\partial\sigma(T_F) = F(\mathbb{T})$, the Jordan curve Theorem implies that $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ is connected. Hence, applying Theorem 6.10, we deduce the following result:

Theorem 7.3. *Let F be defined by Equation (7.1) and satisfy (H1). Suppose that F is exactly N -valent on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Then the following assertions are equivalent*

- (1) T_F is hypercyclic on H^2 ;
- (2) $\sigma(\hat{T}_F) \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$.

The implication (2) \implies (1) in Theorem 7.3 is proved in [1, Th. 1.3] without the additional condition (H1) on the regularity on \mathbb{T} . Here we obtain, under assumption (H1), a characterization of the hypercyclicity of T_F on H^2 .

7.3. The Decreasing Valence Condition. In this subsection, we discuss some consequences of our Theorem 4.4 in the case where the symbol F is of the form (7.1) and satisfies the three assumptions (H1), (H2) and (H3). Recall that Theorem 4.4 asserts that if Ω, Ω' are two adjacent components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ such that $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| > |\text{wind}_F(\Omega')|$, then $H_{\Omega'}(T_F) \subseteq H_{\Omega}(T_F)$. When rewritten in terms of valence conditions, this statement becomes: let Ω and Ω' be two adjacent components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$. If $n_F(\Omega) < n_F(\Omega')$, then $H_{\Omega'}(T_F) \subseteq H_{\Omega}(T_F)$.

Given two components Ω and Ω' of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, we write $\Omega \xrightarrow{D.V.} \Omega'$ if there exists a sequence $(\Omega_j)_{0 \leq j \leq r}$ of adjacent components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ such that $\Omega_0 = \Omega$, $\Omega_r = \Omega'$, and $n_F(\Omega_j) > n_F(\Omega_{j+1})$ for every $0 \leq j < r$. With the notation of Section 5.3, this is equivalent to requiring that $\Omega \xrightarrow{I.W.} \Omega'$.

In the present context, a connected component Ω of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ satisfies $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| = N$ if and only if $n_F(\Omega) = 0$. Moreover, by definition, λ belongs to $F(\mathbb{D})$ if and only if $n_F(\lambda) \geq 1$. Hence the union of all connected components Ω of $\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ such that $n_F(\Omega) = 0$ is

$$(7.6) \quad \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T}); n_F(\lambda) = 0\} = (\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})) \setminus F(\mathbb{D}) = \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\overline{\mathbb{D}}).$$

Since $F : \overline{\mathbb{D}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ is continuous, $F(\overline{\mathbb{D}}) = \overline{F(\mathbb{D})}$, and so the right hand term in Equation (7.6) coincides with $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{F(\mathbb{D})}$. We have:

Theorem 7.4. *Let $p > 1$, and let F be of the form (7.1), satisfying the three assumptions (H1), (H2) and (H3). Suppose that for any connected component Ω of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, there exists a connected component Ω_0 of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ with $n_F(\Omega_0) = 0$ such that*

$$\Omega_0 \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega \xrightarrow{D.V.} \Omega_0.$$

Then T_F is hypercyclic on H^p .

Under the assumptions of Theorem 7.4, the maximal components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ are exactly the components of $\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{D})$, i.e. the components Ω of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ with $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| = N$. So Theorem 7.4 is a direct consequence of Theorem 5.6.

Remark 7.5. Remark that when $p = 2$, the assumption (H2) in Theorem 7.4 can be weakened into supposing that (H2') holds, and that $n_e = 0$ almost everywhere on $F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$. This follows directly from Theorem 6.7.

A result similar to Theorem 7.4 is implied by [1, Th. 1.5] under a weaker assumption, but under the additional condition (H4) that F has an analytic extension on a neighborhood of \mathbb{T} (see [1, Th. 1.5]). In order to fully retrieve [1, Th. 1.5], we have to impose also the condition (H4) on F . Recall that $N = \max\{|\text{wind}_F(\lambda)|; \lambda \notin F(\mathbb{T})\}$.

Theorem 7.6. *Let $p > 1$, and let F be of the form (7.1), satisfying the assumptions (H1), (H2), (H3) and (H4). Suppose that $N \geq 2$, and that for any connected component Ω of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ with $n_F(\Omega) > 0$, there exist two connected components Ω_+ and Ω_- of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ with $n_F(\Omega_+) = n_F(\Omega_-) = 0$ such that*

$$\Omega_- \cap \mathbb{D} \neq \emptyset, \quad \Omega_+ \cap (\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}) \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega \xrightarrow{D.V.} \Omega_{\pm}.$$

Then T_F is hypercyclic on H^p .

Note that our assumption in Theorem 7.6 on connected components Ω of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ corresponds to what is called the *Decreasing Valence Condition* (DVC) in [1]. Note also that, under the assumptions of Theorem 7.6, the maximal components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ are exactly the components of $\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$, i.e. the components Ω of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ with $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| = N$. So the assumption $N \geq 2$ implies that there is no maximal component with -1 as winding number and thus Theorem 7.6 is a direct consequence of Theorem 5.9. If $N = 1$, then $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T}) = \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ so there is no component Ω of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ with $n_F(\Omega) > 0$. In this situation, every component of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ is maximal and has -1 as winding number, so this case is solved by using Theorem 5.5.

7.4. About the Increasing Argument Condition. In [1], the authors consider symbols satisfying the so-called Increasing Argument Condition (IAC). Recall that the functions h_λ , $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ were defined in (7.5).

(IAC) There exists $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ such that

- the set $h_{\lambda_0}(\mathbb{T})$ is a finite union of C^2 Jordan arcs;
- some continuous branch of the function $\theta \mapsto \arg h_{\lambda_0}(e^{i\theta})$ is strictly increasing on $[0, 2\pi]$.

This condition was considered by Solomyak in [48], in a study of cyclicity for Toeplitz operators with analytic symbols. When rewritten in terms of the function F , the condition (IAC) becomes: there exists $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ such that

- the set $F(\mathbb{T})$ is a finite union of C^2 Jordan arcs;
- some continuous branch of the function $\theta \mapsto \arg(F(e^{i\theta}) - \lambda_0)$ is strictly decreasing on $[0, 2\pi]$.

Suppose more generally that F satisfies (H1), (H2), and

(DAC) there exists $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ with $|\text{wind}_F(\lambda_0)| = N$ for which some continuous branch of the function $\theta \mapsto \arg(F(e^{i\theta}) - \lambda_0)$ is strictly decreasing on $[0, 2\pi]$.

Here are some examples of curves satisfying (DAC):




FIGURE 41

Suppose that assumptions (H1), (H2) and (DAC) are satisfied. For each $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$, denote by Δ_θ the closed half-line having λ_0 as an extremity, and making an angle θ with the half-line $\lambda_0 + [0, \infty)$. For all θ except finitely many, the function $\lambda \mapsto \text{wind}_F(\lambda)$ is well-defined on $\Delta_\theta \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$; as λ goes to infinity along the line Δ_θ , it takes first the value $-N$, then the value $-(N - 1), \dots$, until it reaches the value -1 , then 0. All values $-k$, $0 \leq k \leq N$, are taken in decreasing order, and the jumps between two successive values take place when λ crosses the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$. There are N such crossings. As a consequence, we have

Fact 7.7. *Let F satisfy the conditions (H1), (H2), and (DAC). Then*

- (1) *the condition (H3) is automatically satisfied, i.e $\text{wind}_F(\lambda) \leq 0$ for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$;*
- (2) *there exists exactly one component $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ with $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| = N$;*
- (3) *for any $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ with $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| < N$, Ω is adjacent to a component $\Omega' \in \mathcal{C}$ with $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega')| > |\text{wind}_F(\Omega)|$.*

If we denote by Ω_0 the unique connected component of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ with $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega_0)| = N$, it follows that Ω_0 is the unique maximal component of \mathcal{C} . Applying Theorem 5.6, we thus obtain:

Theorem 7.8. *Let $p > 1$, and let F satisfy (H1) and (H2). Suppose moreover that there exists $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ such that some continuous branch of the argument*

$$\theta \mapsto \arg \left(F(e^{i\theta}) - \lambda_0 \right)$$

is strictly decreasing on $[0, 2\pi]$. If $\Omega_0 \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$, then T_F is hypercyclic on H^p .

This result is obtained in [1, Th. 1.4] in the case $p = 2$ and under the additional assumption that the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$ is piecewise C^2 -smooth.

Remark 7.9. When $p = 2$, the assumption (H2) in Theorem 7.8 can be weakened into supposing that (H2') holds. Indeed, the assumption that there exists $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ such that some continuous branch of the argument $\theta \mapsto \arg(F(e^{i\theta}) - \lambda_0)$ is strictly decreasing on $[0, 2\pi]$ implies that $n_e = 0$ almost everywhere on $F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$. Moreover, Fact 7.7 remains true, since for all $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$ except finitely many, the function $\lambda \mapsto \text{wind}_F(\lambda)$ takes first the value $-N$, then some value strictly larger than $-N, \dots$, until it reaches the value 0. The jumps between two successive values take place when λ crosses the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$. There are N such crossings, counted with multiplicities. It then suffices to apply Theorem 6.7 instead of Theorem 5.6.

8. SOME FURTHER RESULTS AND OPEN QUESTIONS

In this final section, we consider other important properties in linear dynamics in our context of Toeplitz operators. Since the results here follow, for the most part, in a straightforward manner from theorems already proved in the previous sections, we often skip the proofs. We refer to Appendix A.6 for all unexplained terminology.

8.1. Supercyclicity. Theorem A.15 in Appendix A allows us to immediately transpose our sufficient conditions for hypercyclicity into sufficient condition for supercyclicity of T_F . It suffices to replace the unit circle by a circle $r\mathbb{T}$ for some $r > 0$ in suitable places, and to keep otherwise the same assumptions. For instance Theorem 5.6 becomes:

Theorem 8.1. *Let $p > 1$, and suppose that F satisfy (H1), (H2) and (H3). If there exists $r > 0$ such that $\Omega \cap r\mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$ for every maximal component of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, then T_F is supercyclic on H^p .*

In the case where $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ is connected, T_F is always supercyclic on H^p . On the other hand, some work might be required in order to extend the necessary conditions of Section 3 to the supercyclicity setting. We still have:

Proposition 8.2. *Let F be continuous on \mathbb{T} . If there exists $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ such that $\text{wind}_F(\lambda_0) > 0$, then T_F is not supercyclic.*

Proof. The proof relies on the same kind of argument as that of Proposition 3.1: if $\text{wind}_F(\lambda_0) > 0$ for some $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, then $\text{wind}_F(\lambda) > 0$ for all $\lambda \in \Omega_0$, where Ω_0 is the unique element of \mathcal{C} containing λ_0 . According to Lemma A.11, for all $\lambda \in \Omega_0$, we should have $\dim(\ker(T_F^* - \lambda)) = \text{wind}_F(\lambda)$. Hence, every $\lambda \in \Omega_0$ is an eigenvalue of T_F^* . Since the point spectrum of the adjoint of a supercyclic operator can contain at most one element (see for instance [8, Prop 1.26]), T_F cannot be supercyclic. \square

An analogue of Theorem 3.2 still holds too.

Theorem 8.3. *Let F satisfy (H1), (H2) and (H3) and let $p > 1$. If T_F is supercyclic on H^p , then there exists $r > 0$ such that every connected component of the interior $\sigma(T_F)$ intersects $r\mathbb{T}$.*

Proof. Proceeding as in the proof of [8, Th. 1.24], consider the finite set \mathcal{G} of connected components of the interior of $\sigma(T_F)$. For each $O \in \mathcal{G}$, let $I_O = \{|z|; z \in O\}$: this is a non empty open interval in \mathbb{R}^+ . So we need to prove that when T_F is supercyclic, the intersection of all intervals I_O , $O \in \mathcal{G}$, is non-empty.

If this intersection is empty, then there exist $r > 0$ and two disjoint connected components $O_1, O_2 \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $O_1 \subseteq r\mathbb{D}$ and $O_2 \subseteq \mathbb{C} \setminus r\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Indeed, write each interval I_O as $I_O = (a_O, b_O)$, $a_O < b_O$. Then, if $\bigcap_{O \in \mathcal{G}} I_O = \emptyset$, we have $\min_{O \in \mathcal{G}} b_O \leq \max_{O \in \mathcal{G}} a_O$. It follows that there exist $O_1, O_2 \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $b_{O_1} \leq a_{O_2}$, and hence $I_{O_1} \cap I_{O_2} = \emptyset$. Taking for instance $r = b_{O_1}$, we have indeed $O_1 \subseteq r\mathbb{D}$ and $O_2 \subseteq \mathbb{C} \setminus r\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Observe that the fact that there are only finitely many components O to be considered here is crucial to the argument, compared to what is done in [8, Lemma 1.25].

Let then $O_3 = \overset{\circ}{\sigma}(T_F) \setminus (O_1 \cup O_2)$. So $\overset{\circ}{\sigma}(T_F) = O_1 \cup O_2 \cup O_3$ and $O_i \cap O_j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$, $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$. Using the fact that T admits an H^∞ functional calculus on the interior of $\sigma(T_F)$ (see Corollary 2.3), there exist three non-trivial closed T -invariant subspaces M_1, M_2 and M_3 of H^p such that H^p is the topological direct sum of M_1, M_2 and M_3 , i.e.

$H^p = M_1 \oplus M_2 \oplus M_3$, and such that if we denote by T_i the operator induced by T on M_i , then $\sigma(T_i) = \overset{\circ}{O}_i$, $i = 1, 2$ (see the proof of Proposition 3.3).

Since T admits an H^∞ functional calculus on $\sigma(T_F)$, the operator T_i admits an $H^\infty(O_i)$ -functional calculus, so that in particular there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $\|T_1^n\| \leq Cr^n$ and $\|T_2^{-n}\| \leq Cr^{-n}$ for every $n \geq 0$.

Suppose now by contradiction that T_F is supercyclic on H^p , and let $x = x_1 + x_2 + x_3$ be a supercyclic vector for T_F , with $x_i \in M_i$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. Then each operator T_i is supercyclic on M_i , with supercyclic vector x_i (see Lemma A.13). In particular, $x_i \neq 0$ for every $i = 1, 2, 3$. The fact that x is a supercyclic vector for T_F implies that there exist a sequence (λ_k) of complex numbers and a sequence (n_k) of positive integers such that

$$\lambda_k T^{n_k} x = \lambda_k T_1^{n_k} x_1 \oplus \lambda_k T_2^{n_k} x_2 \oplus \lambda_k T_3^{n_k} x_3 \longrightarrow x_1 \oplus 0 \oplus 0$$

as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. Then

$$\lambda_k r^{n_k} (r^{-n_k} T_1^{n_k} x_1) \longrightarrow x_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_k r^{n_k} (r^{-n_k} T_2^{n_k} x_2) \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Since $\|x_2\| \leq \|T_2^{-n_k}\| \|T_2^{n_k} x_2\| \leq C r^{-n_k} \|T_2^{n_k} x_2\|$ for every k , the sequence $(r^{-n_k} \|T_2^{n_k} x_2\|)_k$ is bounded away from 0 and hence $|\lambda_k| r^{n_k} \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. But since the sequence $(r^{-n_k} \|T_1^{n_k} x_1\|)_k$ is bounded, this implies that $x_1 = 0$, which is not the case. Hence T_F cannot be supercyclic on H^p . \square

We can hence extend our necessary and sufficient conditions for hypercyclicity to the context of supercyclicity. For instance, we have:

Theorem 8.4. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 5.14, the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) T_F is supercyclic on H^p ;
- (2) there exists $r > 0$ such that $O \cap r\mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$ for every connected component O of $\sigma(T_F)$.

We leave it to the reader to formulate the proper analogues of the other results of Section 5 for supercyclicity.

8.2. Chaos, frequent hypercyclicity and ergodicity. As explained in Appendix A.6, the notions of chaos, frequent hypercyclicity and ergodicity are most easily investigated via unimodular eigenvectors. And sometimes, the existence of suitably many unimodular eigenvectors is a prerequisite - this is the case for chaos, as well as for ergodicity with respect to a Gaussian measure with full support.

It follows from Theorem A.20 that many of our results can be extended to yield chaos, frequent hypercyclicity, and ergodicity. In the case considered in Theorem 5.2, where the symbol F has the form $F(e^{i\theta}) = ae^{-i\theta} + b + ce^{i\theta}$, with $a, b, c \in \mathbb{C}$, chaos and frequent hypercyclicity of the Toeplitz operator T_F acting on H^2 have already been investigated in [5].

Theorem 8.5. *Let F satisfy (H1), (H2) and (H3) and let $p > 1$. Suppose that either*

$$(i) \sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T}) \text{ is connected and } \sigma(T_F) \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset;$$

or

$$(ii) \Omega \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset \text{ for every maximal component } \Omega \text{ of } \sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T}).$$

Then the operator T_F acting on H^p is chaotic, frequently hypercyclic, and ergodic with respect to a Gaussian measure with full support.

The proof of Theorem 8.5 relies on the following consequence of Theorem A.20.

Proposition 8.6. *Let F satisfy (H1), (H2) and (H3), and let $p > 1$. Suppose that $\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_r$ are some connected components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ such that*

$$\overline{\text{span}} [H_{\Omega_i}(T_F); 1 \leq i \leq r] = H^p.$$

If $\Omega_i \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$ for every $1 \leq i \leq r$ then T_F is chaotic, frequently hypercyclic and ergodic with respect to a Gaussian measure with full support.

Proof. Let $U = \Omega_1 \cup \dots \cup \Omega_r$. For every $0 \leq j < N$ and every $1 \leq i \leq r$, define E_j on Ω_i by setting $E_j(\lambda) = h_{\lambda,j}$ for every $\lambda \in \Omega_i$ if $\Omega_i \subseteq \Omega_j^+$, and $E_j(\lambda) = 0$ for every $\lambda \in \Omega_i$ if $\Omega_i \not\subseteq \Omega_j^+$. This defines an analytic map $E_j : U \rightarrow H^p$. Moreover the closed linear span of the the vectors $E_j(\lambda)$, $\lambda \in U$, $0 \leq j < N$ contains the subspace $H_{\Omega_i}(T_F)$ for every $1 \leq i \leq r$. Hence

$$\overline{\text{span}} [E_j(\lambda); \lambda \in U, 0 \leq j < N] = H^p.$$

So the assumptions of Theorem A.20 are satisfied and Proposition 8.6 follows. \square

Proof of Theorem 8.5. Under assumption (i), Theorem 8.5 is an immediate consequence of Proposition 8.6 and of the fact that in this case, $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ has exactly one connected component Ω – the interior of $\sigma(T_F)$ – which satisfies $H_{\Omega}(T_F) = H^p$.

Under assumption (ii), we enumerate as $\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_r$ the set of all maximal connected components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$. The proof of Theorem 5.6 shows that $\overline{\text{span}} [H_{\Omega_i}(T_F); 1 \leq i \leq r] = H^p$, which concludes the proof in this case too. \square

Theorem 8.5 can be viewed as a generalization of Theorems 5.1, 5.5 and 5.6 to the notions of chaos, frequent hypercyclicity and ergodicity. We do not include Theorems 5.10, 5.14 and 5.17 in the list above. Indeed, consider the following example:

Example 8.7. Return to the example of two circles which is the object of Section 4.1, and consider the map $F : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined in the following way:

$$F(e^{it}) = \begin{cases} -1 + 2e^{-i3t/2} & \text{if } 0 \leq t < 4\pi/3 \\ e^{-3it} & \text{if } 4\pi/3 \leq t < 2\pi. \end{cases}$$

Here is a picture of the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$:




FIGURE 42

The assumptions of either Theorem 5.10, Theorem 5.14 or Theorem 5.17 are satisfied. Moreover, the interior of $\sigma(T_F)$ is the open disk centered at -1 of radius 2, which obviously intersects \mathbb{T} . So T_F is hypercyclic on H^p for every $p > 1$. However, since \mathbb{T} is wholly

contained in the boundary of $\partial\Omega_2$, $\mathbb{T} \cap \Omega_2 = \emptyset$ and $\mathbb{T} \cap \Omega_1 = \emptyset$ (but T_F satisfies the Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion; see Section 4.1 for details). So Theorem A.20 does not apply. It is not even clear that any $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$ is an eigenvalue of T_F , so it may quite possibly happen that T_F is hypercyclic, but not chaotic.

Question 8.8. *Let $p > 1$. Does the Toeplitz operator associated to the map F defined in Example 8.7 have any eigenvalue of modulus 1? Is T_F chaotic? frequently hypercyclic?*

If we knew that no $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$ is an eigenvalue of T_F , then T_F would provide the first known example of an operator satisfying the Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion, but having no unimodular eigenvalue. Such a situation would certainly be quite puzzling.

Going back to Theorems 5.14 and 5.17, we thus see that an additional assumption has to be required in order to obtain chaos, frequent hypercyclicity or ergodicity:

Theorem 8.9. *Suppose that the assumptions of either Theorem 5.14 or Theorem 5.17 are satisfied. Moreover, assume that for every connected component O of the interior of $\sigma(T_F)$, there exists a connected component Ω of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ with $\Omega \subseteq O$ such that $\Omega \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$. Then T_F acting on H^p is chaotic, frequently hypercyclic, and ergodic with respect to a Gaussian probability measure with full support.*

Proof. Denote by O_1, O_2, \dots, O_r the connected component of $\sigma(T_F)$. By assumption, for any $1 \leq i \leq r$, there exists a connected component Ω_i of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ with $\Omega_i \subseteq O_i$ and $\Omega_i \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$. Under the assumptions of either of Theorem 5.10 or Theorem 5.14, Lemma 5.13 shows that for every $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\Omega \subseteq O_i$, we have $H_\Omega(T_F) = H_{\Omega_i}(T_F)$. Hence

$$\overline{\text{span}} [H_{\Omega_i}(T_F); 1 \leq i \leq r] = \overline{\text{span}} [H_\Omega(T_F); \Omega \in \mathcal{C}],$$

and Proposition 2.5 implies that

$$\overline{\text{span}} [H_{\Omega_i}(T_F); 1 \leq i \leq r] = H^p.$$

We can now conclude using Proposition 8.6. □

8.3. From an exterior component to an interior component. One of the most obvious problems which arises from our work is the following: is it really necessary to add an assumption to be able to go from an exterior component to an interior component?

Question 8.10. *Suppose that F satisfies (H1), (H2) and (H3) and let $\Omega, \Omega' \in \mathcal{C}$ be two adjacent components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ such that $|\text{wind}_F(\Omega)| < |\text{wind}_F(\Omega')|$. Is it true that $H_{\Omega'}(T_F) \subseteq H_\Omega(T_F)$?*

If Question 8.10 had an affirmative answer, then Theorems 5.10, 5.14 and 5.17 would hold in much greater generality. In this regard, here are two examples which give food for thought. Remark that the approach in Example 8.11 (resp. in Example 8.12) is very similar to that of the example discussed in Section 4.1 (resp. to Example 6.8).

Example 8.11. Consider the map $F : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined in the following way:

$$F(e^{i\theta}) = \begin{cases} 3 + 3e^{-5i\theta/3} & \text{if } 0 \leq \theta < 6\pi/5 \\ \frac{9}{2} + \frac{3}{2}e^{-10i\theta/3} & \text{if } 6\pi/5 \leq \theta < 9\pi/5 \\ \frac{11}{2} + \frac{1}{2}e^{-10i\theta} & \text{if } 9\pi/5 \leq \theta < 2\pi. \end{cases}$$

Here is a picture of the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$:




FIGURE 43

The respective radii of the circles C_1, C_2 and C_3 are 3, $3/2$ and $1/2$. We have

$$\text{wind}_F(\Omega_1) = -1, \quad \text{wind}_F(\Omega_2) = -2 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{wind}_F(\Omega_3) = -3.$$

Among the connected components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, \mathbb{T} intersects only Ω_1 . In order to prove that T_F is hypercyclic (on H^p , $p > 1$), starting from $u_0 \in E^q(\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2 \cup \Omega_3)$, $u_1 \in E^q(\Omega_2 \cup \Omega_3)$ and $u_2 \in E^q(\Omega_3)$ with $u_0 = 0$ on Ω_1 and the properties

- (i) $u_0^{int} - \zeta u_1^{int} = 0$ almost everywhere on C_2 (since $u_0 = 0$ on Ω_1 , $u_0^{ext} = 0$ on C_2)
- (ii) $u_0^{int} - \zeta u_1^{int} = u_0^{ext}$ almost everywhere on C_3
- (iii) $u_1^{int} - \zeta u_2^{int} = u_1^{ext}$ almost everywhere on C_3 ,

we need to be able to deduce that u_0, u_1 and u_2 are identically zero. However, we can use neither Theorem 4.5 nor Theorem 4.10 to deduce that $u_0 = u_1 = 0$ on Ω_2 , as neither of their assumptions are satisfied. Indeed, $\partial\Omega_2 = C_2 \cup C_3$ is not a Jordan curve and there does not exist an open neighborhood V of $\lambda_0 = 6$ (which is the only point of self-intersection of $F(\mathbb{T})$) which satisfies $V \cap \partial\Omega_2 = V \cap \partial\Omega_1 \cap \partial\Omega_2$. Nonetheless, working directly with the explicit expression of ζ on C_2 , it is possible to infer what we want from (i), (ii) and (iii).

Let $\lambda \in \partial C_2 \setminus \{6\}$. In order to determine $\zeta(\lambda) = e^{i\theta(\lambda)}$, we need to solve the equation

$$\lambda = \frac{9}{2} + \frac{3}{2} e^{10i\theta(\lambda)/3}, \quad \text{with } \theta(\lambda) \in \left(-\frac{9\pi}{5}, -\frac{6\pi}{5}\right).$$

We obtain

$$\theta(\lambda) = \frac{3}{10} \arg_{(-6\pi, -4\pi)} \left(\frac{2\lambda - 9}{3} \right),$$

and thus

$$\zeta(\lambda) = \exp \left[\frac{3i}{10} \arg_{(-6\pi, -4\pi)} \left(\frac{2\lambda - 9}{3} \right) \right] \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \partial C_2 \setminus \{6\}.$$

So ζ admits an analytic continuation on $\mathbb{C} \setminus [9/2, \infty)$, hence in particular on $\Omega_2 \setminus [9/2, 5)$, given by

$$\zeta(\lambda) = e^{\frac{3}{10} \log_{(-6\pi, -4\pi)}\left(\frac{2\lambda-9}{3}\right)} \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \Omega_2 \setminus [9/2, 5),$$

where $\log_{(-6\pi, -4\pi)}$ is the analytic determination of the logarithm with imaginary part in $(-6\pi, -4\pi)$. Note that this extension is such that, for every $x \in (9/2, 5)$ we have

$$(8.1) \quad \lim_{\substack{y \rightarrow 0 \\ y > 0}} \zeta(x + iy) = \left| \frac{2x-9}{3} \right|^{3/10} e^{-9i\pi/5} \neq \left| \frac{2x-9}{3} \right|^{3/10} e^{-6i\pi/5} = \lim_{\substack{y \rightarrow 0 \\ y < 0}} \zeta(x + iy).$$

Since ζ is bounded on $\Omega_2 \setminus [9/2, 5)$, the function ζu_1 belongs to $E^q(\Omega_2 \setminus [9/2, 5))$, and so $u_0 - \zeta u_1 \in E^q(\Omega_2 \setminus [9/2, 5))$. Since $u_0^{int} - \zeta u_1^{int} = 0$ almost everywhere on C_2 , which is a subset of $\partial(\Omega_2 \setminus [9/2, 5))$ with positive measure, we deduce that $u_0 = \zeta u_1$ on $\Omega_2 \setminus [9/2, 5)$.

Suppose now that u_1 is not identically zero on Ω_2 . Then there exists $x \in (9/2, 5)$ such that $u_1(x) \neq 0$. Hence ζ admits an analytic extension to a neighborhood of x in Ω_2 , given by $\zeta(z) = u_0(z)/u_1(z)$ for $|z - x| < r$, where $r > 0$ is small enough. But this contradicts Equation (8.1). Hence $u_1 = 0$ on Ω_2 and $u_0 = 0$ on Ω_2 too. By the same argument (or by invoking either Theorem 4.5 or Theorem 4.10), we deduce from (ii) and (iii) that $u_1 = u_2 = u_3 = 0$ on Ω_3 . So T_F is indeed hypercyclic on H^p .

Observe that our argument here depends in a crucial way of the fact that ζ does not admit any continuous extension to the whole domain Ω_2 , which is ensured because the interval $[9/2, 6)$ is not contained in Ω_3 . But what happens if $[9/2, 6) \subseteq \Omega_3$? We consider this situation in the next example.

Example 8.12. Let $F : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be defined by

$$F(e^{i\theta}) = \begin{cases} 3 + 3e^{-11i\theta/6} & \text{if } 0 \leq \theta < 12\pi/11 \\ \frac{9}{2} + \frac{3}{2}e^{-11i\theta/3} & \text{if } 12\pi/11 \leq \theta < 18\pi/11 \\ 5 - e^{-11i\theta/2} & \text{if } 18\pi/11 \leq \theta < 2\pi. \end{cases}$$

Here the circle C_3 has radius 1, so that the picture of $F(\mathbb{T})$ looks like this:




FIGURE 44

Denoting by ζ_2 and ζ_3 the map $1/F^{-1}$ on $\partial C_2 \setminus \{6\}$ and $\partial C_3 \setminus \{6\}$ respectively, we have:

$$\zeta_2(\lambda) = \exp \left[\frac{3i}{11} \arg_{(-6\pi, -4\pi)} \left(\frac{2\lambda - 9}{3} \right) \right] \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \partial C_2 \setminus \{6\},$$

and

$$\zeta_3(\lambda) = \exp \left[\frac{2i}{11} \arg_{(-11\pi, -9\pi)}(5 - \lambda) \right] \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \partial C_3 \setminus \{6\}.$$

So ζ_2 and ζ_3 admits analytic extensions to $\mathbb{C} \setminus [9/2, \infty)$ and $\mathbb{C} \setminus [5, \infty)$ respectively, given by

$$\zeta_2(\lambda) = \exp \left[\frac{3i}{11} \log_{(-6\pi, -4\pi)} \left(\frac{2\lambda - 9}{3} \right) \right] \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [9/2, \infty),$$

and

$$\zeta_3(\lambda) = \exp \left[\frac{2i}{11} \log_{(-11\pi, -9\pi)}(5 - \lambda) \right] \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [5, \infty).$$

Moreover, for every $x \in (9/2, 6)$, the limits

$$\lim_{\substack{y \rightarrow 0 \\ y > 0}} \zeta_2(x + iy) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\substack{y \rightarrow 0 \\ y < 0}} \zeta_2(x + iy)$$

exist and are different, and similarly for every $x \in (5, 6)$, the limits

$$\lim_{\substack{y \rightarrow 0 \\ y > 0}} \zeta_3(x + iy) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\substack{y \rightarrow 0 \\ y < 0}} \zeta_3(x + iy)$$

exist and are different.

We proceed in the same way as in Example 8.11: starting from three analytic functions $u_0 \in E^q(\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2 \cup \Omega_3)$, $u_1 \in E^q(\Omega_2 \cup \Omega_3)$ and $u_2 \in E^q(\Omega_3)$ with $u_0 = 0$ on Ω_1 and

- (i) $u_0^{int} - \zeta_2 u_1^{int} = 0$ almost everywhere on C_2 (as $u_0^{ext} = 0$ on C_2)
- (ii) $u_0^{int} - \zeta_3 u_1^{int} = u_0^{ext}$ almost everywhere on C_3
- (iii) $u_1^{int} - \zeta_3 u_2^{int} = u_1^{ext}$ almost everywhere on C_3 ,

we wish to deduce that u_0 , u_1 and u_2 are identically zero.

In this example, contrary to what happens in Example 8.11, the relation (i) does not imply that $u_0 = u_1 = 0$ on Ω_2 , but only that $u_0 = \zeta_2 u_1$ on Ω_2 (since $u_0 - \zeta_2 u_1 \in E^q(\Omega_2)$, the fact that $u_0 - \zeta_2 u_1$ vanishes on a subset of positive measure of the boundary of Ω_2 implies that it vanishes on Ω_2). So we have $u_0^{ext} = \zeta_2 u_1^{ext}$ almost everywhere on C_3 . Using the relations (ii) and (iii), it follows that

$$u_0^{int} - \zeta_3 u_1^{int} = u_0^{ext} = \zeta_2 u_1^{ext} = \zeta_2 (u_1^{int} - \zeta_3 u_2^{int}) \quad \text{a.e. on } C_3,$$

and thus

$$u_0^{int} - (\zeta_2 + \zeta_3) u_1^{int} + \zeta_2 \zeta_3 u_2^{int} = 0 \quad \text{a.e. on } C_3.$$

Since ζ_2 and ζ_3 both admit analytic and bounded extensions to $\Omega_3 \setminus [9/2, 6)$, this yields

$$(iv) \quad u_0 - (\zeta_2 + \zeta_3) u_1 + \zeta_2 \zeta_3 u_2 = 0 \quad \text{on } \Omega_3 \setminus [9/2, 6).$$

Suppose that u_2 is not identically zero on Ω_3 . Then for all $x \in (9/2, 6)$ except countably many, $u_2(x) \neq 0$, and the function $u_0 \in E^q(\Omega_3)$ which satisfies $u_0 = (\zeta_2 + \zeta_3) u_1 - \zeta_2 \zeta_3 u_2$ is continuous at the point x . Choose such an x belonging to $(9/2, 5)$. Then ζ_3 is continuous

at the point x , but ζ_2 is not. Taking the limits of $u_0(x \pm iy)$ as $y \rightarrow 0, y > 0$, we obtain the equality

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\left(\frac{2x-9}{3} \right)^{3/11} e^{-18i\pi/11} + \zeta_3(x) \right) u_1(x) - \left(\frac{2x-9}{3} \right)^{3/11} e^{-18i\pi/11} \zeta_3(x) u_2(x) \\ &= \left(\left(\frac{2x-9}{3} \right)^{3/11} e^{-12i\pi/11} + \zeta_3(x) \right) u_1(x) - \left(\frac{2x-9}{3} \right)^{3/11} e^{-12i\pi/11} \zeta_3(x) u_2(x) \end{aligned}$$

which yields that

$$\left(e^{-18i\pi/11} - e^{-12i\pi/11} \right) u_1(x) = \left(e^{-18i\pi/11} - e^{-12i\pi/11} \right) \zeta_3(x) u_2(x).$$

Since $e^{-12i\pi/11} \neq e^{-18i\pi/11}$ (it is here that we use the fact that the limits of $\zeta_2(x + iy)$ and $\zeta_2(x - iy)$ as $y \rightarrow 0, y > 0$, are distinct), we get $u_1(x) = \zeta_3(x) u_2(x)$. This being true for almost every $x \in (9/2, 5)$, by uniqueness of the analytic extension this equality is true on $\Omega_3 \setminus [5, 6)$. It follows that u_1/u_2 is an analytic extension of ζ_3 on Ω_3 minus the set of zeroes of u_2 . In particular, ζ_3 admits an analytic extension to a neighborhood of some points $x \in (5, 6)$, and this is a contradiction. So $u_2 = 0$ on Ω_3 .

It then follows from equation (iv) and from a similar continuity argument that $u_0 = u_1 = 0$ on Ω_3 . Then we deduce as usual that u_0, u_1 and u_2 vanish identically, and T_F is hypercyclic on H^p .

These two examples might point towards a positive answer to Question 8.10. In any case, it would be interesting to try to include the arguments used in Examples 8.11 and 8.12 into a more general framework.

8.4. Toeplitz operators and the Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion. It is a rather intriguing fact that all the Toeplitz operators which are known to be hypercyclic are shown to be so thanks to the Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion. In this short section, we highlight the following question:

Question 8.13. *If T_F is a hypercyclic Toeplitz operator on H^p , $p > 1$, does T_F necessarily satisfy the Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion? Are there some hypercyclic Toeplitz operators which have no eigenvalue?*

8.5. Identical curves with different parametrizations. An intriguing fact is that some of our sufficient conditions for the hypercyclicity of T_F do not depend too precisely on the properties of the symbol F , but rather on the geometric properties of $F(\mathbb{T})$ (Theorems 5.5 and 5.6), while some others do (Theorems 5.10, 5.14 and 5.17). More precisely, if F and \tilde{F} satisfy (H1), (H2), (H3) and are such that $F(\mathbb{T}) = \tilde{F}(\mathbb{T})$, then the assumptions of Theorem 5.6, for instance, are satisfied for F if and only if they are satisfied for \tilde{F} . This is certainly not true for Theorems 5.10, 5.14 and 5.17. Let us illustrate this on the following example.

Example 8.14. Let F be such that the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$ looks like in Figure 45A. The order in which the point $F(e^{i\theta})$ travels the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$, as θ grows from 0 to 2π , is given by the numbers 1 to 9 in the picture. And let \tilde{F} be such that $\tilde{F}(\mathbb{T})$ is the same curve but with a different order for the travel of $\tilde{F}(e^{i\theta})$ on $\tilde{F}(\mathbb{T})$ as represented in Figure 45B.




FIGURE 45

Suppose that \mathbb{T} intersects $\sigma(\overset{\circ}{T}_F) = \sigma(\overset{\circ}{T}_{\tilde{F}})$, and that F and \tilde{F} both have an analytic extension to a neighborhood of \mathbb{T} . Then T_F is hypercyclic on H^p by Proposition 4.9 and Theorem 4.4, while our arguments do not allow us to conclude that $T_{\tilde{F}}$ is hypercyclic.

So we ask:

Question 8.15. *With the notation above, is it true that T_F and $T_{\tilde{F}}$ must be simultaneously hypercyclic or non-hypercyclic, on H^p ?*

A possible approach to this question would be via quasi-similarity. Indeed, if T_1 and T_2 are any two operators on a Banach space X for which there exists $A \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ with dense range such that $AT_1 = T_2A$, then T_2 is hypercyclic on X as soon as T_1 is. So in particular, quasi-similar operators are simultaneously hypercyclic or non-hypercyclic (recall that $T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ are quasi-similar if there exist $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ one-to-one with dense range such that $AT_1 = T_2A$ and $T_1B = BT_2$).

Similarity of Toeplitz operators was investigated by Clark in a series of papers [14, 15, 17], in the context of rational Toeplitz operators T_F such that $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ consists of a finite union of loops, intersecting at a finite number of points only. Quasi-similarity of operators in this class was studied again by Clark in [18]. Yakubovich also obtained in [51] a triangular representation for positively wound Toeplitz operators with smooth symbols, allowing him to show, in the case $p = 2$, that if F and \tilde{F} satisfy (H1), (H2) and (H3) and if there exists an orientation-preserving C^1 diffeomorphism τ of \mathbb{T} such that $\tilde{F} = F \circ \tau$ (which is stronger than merely assuming that $F(\mathbb{T}) = \tilde{F}(\mathbb{T})$), then there exists a bounded linear isomorphism L of H^2 and a finite rank operator K on H^2 such that

$$T_{\tilde{F}} = LT_FL^{-1} + K.$$

Unfortunately, we do not know if $K = 0$.

We conclude this subsection with this following observation: we have investigated dynamical properties of T_F acting on the spaces H^p , $p > 1$: our results depend on p only in a

very mild way - namely, the regularity assumption (H1) requires that F be of class $C^{1+\varepsilon}$, with $\varepsilon > \max(1/p, 1/q)$.

Question 8.16. *Under suitable smoothness assumptions on F , is it true that for any $p, r > 1$, the operator T_F is hypercyclic on H^p if and only if it is hypercyclic on H^r ?*

Remark 8.17. Observe that if $p > r > 1$, then T_F is hypercyclic on H^r as soon as T_F is hypercyclic on H^p . Indeed, we have $H^p \subseteq H^r$ and $\|\cdot\|_r \leq \|\cdot\|_p$. If $f \in H^p$ is a hypercyclic function for T_F seen as a bounded operator on H^p , then f belongs to H^r . Moreover, there exists, for any analytic polynomial q and any $\varepsilon > 0$, an integer n such that $\|T_F^n f - q\|_p < \varepsilon$. It follows that $\|T_F^n f - q\|_r < \varepsilon$. Since analytic polynomials are dense in H^r , it follows that f is a hypercyclic function for T_F acting on H^r . Our sufficient conditions for hypercyclicity thus carry over from H^2 to H^p , $1 < p < 2$, and our necessary conditions from H^2 to H^p , $p > 2$.

8.6. Boundary values of quotients of inner functions. One of the simplest case where Question 8.15 is open is when $F(\mathbb{T})$ consists of two tangent circles. So let F be a function satisfying (H1) such that $F(\mathbb{T})$ has the following representation: In particular, F




FIGURE 46

also satisfies (H2) and (H3).

In Section 4.1, we gave a parametrization \tilde{F} of this curve for which $T_{\tilde{F}}$ became a hypercyclic Toeplitz operator. So Question 8.15 above asks whether T_F is hypercyclic for *any* sufficiently smooth parametrization F of the curve above. Let $\zeta = 1/F^{-1}$. When trying to answer this question in this particular case, the natural thing to do is to study whether, given two functions $u, v \in E^q(\Omega_2)$, the boundary condition $u - \zeta v = 0$ almost everywhere on \mathbb{T} implies that $u = v = 0$. In this situation, note that $\Omega_2 = \mathbb{D}$ and so $E^q(\Omega_2) = H^q$. So let $u, v \in H^q$ be such that $u = \zeta v$ almost everywhere on \mathbb{T} . Since $|\zeta| = 1$ almost everywhere on \mathbb{T} , one can suppose without loss of generality that the functions u and v are inner. Observe also that the function $\tilde{\zeta} : \theta \mapsto \zeta(e^{i\theta})$ is $C^{1+\varepsilon}$ -smooth and injective on the interval $[0, 2\pi]$, with $\tilde{\zeta}(0) \neq \tilde{\zeta}(2\pi)$.

This leads us to the following question concerning the boundary values of quotients of inner functions on the unit disk:

Question 8.18. *Do there exist two inner functions u, v on the unit disk, and a function $\xi : [0, 2\pi] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ that is $C^{1+\varepsilon}$ -smooth, injective (in particular, such that $\xi(0) \neq \xi(2\pi)$) and such that*

$$\xi(\theta) = \frac{u(e^{i\theta})}{v(e^{i\theta})} \quad \text{for almost every } \theta \in (0, 2\pi)?$$

Quotients of inner functions have been investigated in depth, starting from the work [23] where it is shown that any unimodular function in $L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ can be uniformly approximated by quotients of inner functions. See for instance, among many others, the references [3, 11, 46].

Note that any answer to Question 8.18 would be interesting: if such functions do not exist, then, for every smooth parametrization F of the curve above, the operator T_F will satisfy the Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion, and thus be hypercyclic. This would also allow us for example to dispense with assumption (H4) in Theorem 4.10. In the case that the answer to Question 8.18 turns out to be negative, it would be interesting to investigate whether the answer remains negative when we require the function ξ to be only piecewise $C^{1+\varepsilon}$ -smooth on $[0, 2\pi]$.

On the other hand, suppose that the answer to Question 8.18 is affirmative, and that such functions u, v and ξ do exist. Then, starting from ξ , we can define a parametrization F of the curve above by setting $F(\xi(\lambda)) = \lambda$ for every $\lambda \in \partial\Omega_2 = \mathbb{T}$ when the orientation of the curve $\xi(\mathbb{T})$ is negative, and $F(1/\xi(\lambda)) = \lambda$ for every $\lambda \in \partial\Omega_2 = \mathbb{T}$ when the orientation of $\xi(\mathbb{T})$ is positive. This defines F on the subarc $\xi(\mathbb{T})$ (resp. $1/\xi(\mathbb{T})$) of \mathbb{T} . We then define F on the whole of \mathbb{T} in a $C^{1+\varepsilon}$ -smooth way, so that $F(e^{i\theta})$ travels once over each part of the two tangent circles (except at the point 1), and that the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$ is negatively wound. In this way, we will obtain an operator T_F that does not satisfy the Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion. Indeed, although $H_-(T_F)$ is easily seen to be equal to H^p , this is not the case for the subspace $H_+(T_F)$: supposing for instance that the orientation of ξ is negative, define $u_0 \in E^q(\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2)$ by setting $u_0 = 0$ on Ω_1 and $u_0 = u$ on Ω_2 , and $u_1 \in E^q(\Omega_2)$ by setting $u_1 = v$ on Ω_2 . The pair (u_0, u_1) belongs to the range of the operator U , and there exists $g \in H^q$ such that $Ug = (u_0, u_1)$. The function g is non-zero because $u_0 \neq 0$ (recall that u is inner).

Now, there are two possible situations: if T_F is hypercyclic, then T_F provides an example of a Toeplitz operator which is hypercyclic but does not satisfy the Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion, thus answering Question 8.13. If T_F is not hypercyclic, then this means that the answer of Question 8.15 is negative.

APPENDIX A. REMINDERS

The aim of this first appendix is to recall some definitions and results which are required at various stages in the paper, either for the proofs of our main theorems or for the detailed proof of Yakubovich's Theorem 2.2 which we provide in Appendix B. We begin with some reminders in complex analysis, then present some results due to Privalov concerning the regularity of the Riesz projection on spaces of smooth functions, as well as a few facts regarding the spectral theory of Toeplitz operators. A brief presentation of Smirnov spaces on bounded finitely connected domains follows. Lastly, we give a brief overview of some notions in linear dynamics that appear in our work.

A.1. Reminders in complex analysis.

A.1.1. *A consequence of Rouché's Theorem.* We first state a direct consequence of the Rouché Theorem, which is used in the proof of Lemma B.4. It is certainly well-known, but we provide a short proof for completeness' sake.

Lemma A.1. *Let W be an open subset of \mathbb{C} , let $g : W \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be an analytic map and let $\lambda_0 \in g(W)$. Assume that the equation $g(z) = \lambda_0$ has s solutions w_1, w_2, \dots, w_s in W , which are simple. Then there exist $\alpha > 0$ and one-to-one analytic maps $\tilde{d}_1, \tilde{d}_2, \dots, \tilde{d}_s$*

defined on the disk $D(\lambda_0, \alpha)$, such that for every $\lambda \in D(\lambda_0, \alpha)$, the equation $g(z) = \lambda$ has exactly s solutions in W which are the points $\tilde{d}_j(\lambda)$, $1 \leq j \leq s$.

Proof. For every $1 \leq j \leq s$, let W_j be a small disk centered at w_j such that $\overline{W_j} \subseteq W$ and for every $1 \leq j, k \leq s$ with $j \neq k$, $\overline{W_j} \cap \overline{W_k} = \emptyset$. Let $\alpha_j := \min_{z \in \partial W_j} |g(z) - \lambda_0| > 0$, and $\alpha := \min_{1 \leq j \leq s} \alpha_j$. Making α smaller if necessary, we may assume (using Rouché's Theorem) that for every $\lambda \in D(\lambda_0, \alpha)$, the set $\{z \in W; g(z) = \lambda\}$ has exactly s elements. Now, for every $\lambda \in D(\lambda_0, \alpha)$, every $1 \leq j \leq s$ and every $z \in \partial W_j$, we have

$$|\lambda - \lambda_0| < \alpha_j \leq |g(z) - \lambda_0|.$$

Thus Rouché's Theorem implies that the equation $g(z) = \lambda$ has exactly one solution in W_j , which we denote by $\tilde{d}_j(\lambda)$. Moreover, it follows from the Residue Theorem that

$$\tilde{d}_j(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\partial W_j} \frac{zg'(z)}{g(z) - \lambda} dz,$$

so that the function \tilde{d}_j is analytic on $D(\lambda_0, \alpha)$. □

A.1.2. Lindelöf's Theorem. We recall in this section the following classical result due to Lindelöf (see for instance [29, page 89] or [38]):

Theorem A.2. *Let $\eta > 0$, and $p > 1$. Let $f \in H^p(\mathbb{D} \cap \{|z - 1| < \eta\})$ (that is, $|f|^p$ has a harmonic majorant on $\mathbb{D} \cap \{|z - 1| < \eta\}$), and suppose that*

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0^+} f(e^{i\theta}) = \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0^-} f(e^{i\theta}) = \beta$$

do exists. Then $\alpha = \beta$ and

$$\lim_{\substack{z \in \mathbb{D} \\ z \rightarrow 1}} f(z) = \alpha.$$

This result applies in particular when $f \in H^\infty(\mathbb{D})$. We use several times in the proofs of our main results the following direct consequence of Lindelöf's Theorem:

Theorem A.3. *Let Ω be a bounded Jordan domain and let $\Gamma = \partial\Omega$. Let $\lambda_0 \in \Gamma$ and $f \in H^\infty(\Omega)$. Suppose that there exists a neighborhood V of λ_0 such that f has a continuous extension to $\overline{V \cap \Omega} \setminus \{\lambda_0\}$. Denote by Γ_0^+ and Γ_0^- two disjoint sub-arcs of the boundary Γ having λ_0 as an extremity.*

If the limit of $f(\lambda)$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_0$, $\lambda \in \Gamma_0^+$ exists as well as the limit of $f(\lambda)$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_0$, $\lambda \in \Gamma_0^-$, then these two limits coincide. Denoting by α their common value, we have

$$\lim_{\substack{\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_0 \\ \lambda \in \overline{V \cap \Omega} \setminus \{\lambda_0\}}} f(\lambda) = \alpha.$$

Proof. Let $u : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \Omega$ be a conformal map from \mathbb{D} onto Ω . Since Ω is a Jordan domain, the Carathéodory Theorem (see [45, Th. 14.19]) implies that u extends into a homeomorphism from $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ onto $\overline{\Omega}$. Theorem A.3 is then a direct consequence of Theorem A.2 applied to the function $f \circ u$. □

A.1.3. *Quasiconformal maps.* Quasiconformal functions appear naturally in the proof of Theorem 2.2 because of the following result of Dynkin (see [26, Th. 2] and [27, Sec. 1.3]):

Theorem A.4. *Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, and let $F \in C^{1+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{T})$. There exists a function $\tilde{F} \in C^1(\mathbb{C})$ such that the restriction of \tilde{F} to \mathbb{T} is equal to F , and*

$$(A.1) \quad |\partial_{\bar{z}}\tilde{F}(z)| \leq C\|F\|_{C^{1+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{T})} \operatorname{dist}(z, \mathbb{T})^\varepsilon \quad \text{for every } z \in \mathbb{C},$$

where C is a universal constant.

See Appendix A.2 for the definition of $C^{1+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{T})$. Such a function \tilde{F} which extends F and satisfies the estimate of Theorem A.4 is called a pseudoanalytic extension of F to \mathbb{C} .

We will apply Theorem A.4 to functions F such that $F' \neq 0$ on \mathbb{T} , where the derivative F' of F at a point z_0 of \mathbb{T} will be understood as the limit as $z \rightarrow z_0$, $z \in \mathbb{T}$, of the quotients $(F(z) - F(z_0))/(z - z_0)$. According to Equation (A.1), $\partial_{\bar{z}}\tilde{F}(z) = 0$ for every $z \in \mathbb{T}$. Moreover, since F' does not vanish on \mathbb{T} , $\partial_{\bar{z}}\tilde{F}$ does not vanish on \mathbb{T} . Since it is continuous on \mathbb{C} , there exists an open neighborhood U of \mathbb{T} such that

$$C\|F\|_{C^{1+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{T})} \operatorname{dist}(z, \mathbb{T})^\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}|\partial_{\bar{z}}\tilde{F}(z)|$$

for every $z \in U$. In particular,

$$(A.2) \quad |\partial_{\bar{z}}\tilde{F}(z)| \leq \frac{1}{2}|\partial_z\tilde{F}(z)| \quad \text{for every } z \in U.$$

Recall that the Jacobian satisfies

$$(A.3) \quad J_{\tilde{F}}(z) = |\partial_z\tilde{F}(z)|^2 - |\partial_{\bar{z}}\tilde{F}(z)|^2.$$

Then $J_{\tilde{F}}(z) > 0$ for every $z \in U$. So \tilde{F} is a local C^1 -diffeomorphism at every point of U , and there exists, for every $z \in U$, an open neighborhood U_z of z and two positive constants $c_{1,z}$ and $c_{2,z}$ such that

$$(A.4) \quad c_{1,z}|w - z| \leq |\tilde{F}(w) - \tilde{F}(z)| \leq c_{2,z}|w - z| \quad \text{for every } w \in U_z.$$

Moreover $\tilde{F} : U_z \rightarrow \tilde{F}(U_z)$ preserves the orientation since $J_{\tilde{F}}(z) > 0$. The inequality

$$(A.5) \quad |\partial_{\bar{z}}g| \leq k|\partial_zg|$$

where k is a constant with $0 < k < 1$, lies at the core of the theory of quasiconformal mappings. Indeed, if g is a C^1 -diffeomorphism between two domains G and G' of \mathbb{C} , the map g is quasiconformal if and only if it satisfies Equation (A.5) for some $0 < k < 1$.

The proper setting for the definition of quasiconformal mappings is that of orientation-preserving homeomorphisms. As we will briefly need it below, we recall one of the many equivalent definitions (see for instance [2, Ch. II, Def. B]). Let $g : G \rightarrow G'$ be an homeomorphism. Then g is said to be quasiconformal if g satisfies this two conditions:

- (a) g is Absolutely Continuous on Lines (ACL) on G ;
- (b) there exists $k \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$|\partial_{\bar{z}}g| \leq k|\partial_zg| \quad \text{a.e. on } G.$$

Absolute continuity on lines means that for any rectangle $R = \{x + iy; a < x < b, c < y < d\}$ with $\bar{R} \subseteq G$, the function $x \mapsto g(x + iy)$ is absolutely continuous (i.e. has bounded variation) on (a, b) for almost every $y \in (c, d)$, and the function $y \mapsto g(x + iy)$ is absolutely continuous on (c, d) for almost every $x \in (a, b)$. Whenever g is ACL on G , the partial derivatives ∂_xg and ∂_yg exist almost everywhere on G , so that (b) makes sense [37, Ch. III, Lemma 3.1]. Since g is an homeomorphism, it follows that g is differentiable

almost everywhere on G [37, Ch. III, Th. 3.1]. If (a) and (b) hold, it is even true that g is regular at almost every point z of G , i.e. g is differentiable at z and its Jacobian $J_g(z)$ does not vanish. See [37, Ch. IV, Th. 1.4] plus the explanation in [37, Ch. IV, Sec. 5.3] at the bottom of page 184. Since $|\partial_z g| \leq k|\partial_z g|$ almost everywhere on G with $0 < k < 1$, we have

$$J_g(z) = |\partial_z g(z)|^2 - |\partial_{\bar{z}} g(z)|^2 \geq (1 - k^2)|\partial_z g(z)|^2 \quad \text{a.e. on } G,$$

so that $J_g(z) \geq 0$ almost everywhere on G . Hence $J_g(z) > 0$ almost everywhere on G , and g is an orientation-preserving homeomorphism (see [37, Ch. I, Sec. 1.4-1.6] for details). If $g : G \mapsto G'$ is an homeomorphism which is besides of class C^1 , then g is clearly ACL, and thus g is quasiconformal if and only if (b) holds. Let us also mention here that if $g : G \mapsto G'$ is quasiconformal, then $g^{-1} : G' \mapsto G$ is also quasiconformal, and that the composition of two quasiconformal mappings is quasiconformal.

Getting back to our pseudo-analytic extension \tilde{F} of F to U , we see that it satisfies (a) and (b). It is tempting to deduce that it is quasiconformal, but since \tilde{F} has no reason to be an homeomorphism from U onto its image, it is only locally true: for every $z \in U$, the restriction of \tilde{F} to U_z is a quasiconformal mapping, where U_z is a neighborhood of z such that \tilde{F} satisfies Equation (A.4).

For reasons which will become clear later on in Appendix B, we will need to capture the global behavior of \tilde{F} on U , and for this we will need the notion of quasiconformal function. A function $f : G \mapsto \mathbb{C}$ is said to be a quasiconformal function if it can be written as $f = \varphi \circ g$, where g is a quasiconformal mapping (in particular an homeomorphism) from G onto a domain G' of \mathbb{C} and $\varphi : G' \mapsto \mathbb{C}$ is a non-constant analytic function. We refer to [2] and [37] for a full study on quasiconformal maps and to [37, Ch. VI] for an introduction of quasiconformal functions. It easily follows from the definition that locally, quasiconformal functions preserve the orientation. It is a particularly useful property which will be used several times in Appendix B.




FIGURE 47

Now here is how one identifies quasiconformal functions [37, Ch. VI, Th. 2.2.]. Let $f : G \mapsto \mathbb{C}$ be a non-constant function which is a generalized L^2 -solution on G of an equation of the form

$$(A.6) \quad \partial_{\bar{z}} f = \chi \partial_z f,$$

where χ is a measurable function on G with $\sup_{z \in G} |\chi(z)| < 1$. Then f is a quasiconformal function on G . That f is a generalized L^2 -solution of Equation (A.6) means that f is ACL on G (so that $\partial_x f$ and $\partial_y f$ exist almost everywhere on G) and that $|\partial_x f|^2$ and $|\partial_y f|^2$ are both integrable on any compact subset of G with respect to the area measure (and, of course, that Equation (A.6) is satisfied). Under these assumptions, $|\partial_{\bar{z}} f| \leq k|\partial_z f|$ almost everywhere on G , where $k = \sup_{z \in G} |\chi(z)| < 1$, i.e. Equation (A.5) is true.

Suppose now that $f : G \mapsto \mathbb{C}$ is a non-constant C^1 -smooth function satisfying Equation (A.5): then f is obviously ACL with partial derivatives which are measurable and square integrable on any compact subset of G . Suppose moreover that $J_f(z) \neq 0$ almost everywhere on G . Then Equation (A.6) is obviously satisfied with

$$\chi(z) = \frac{|\partial_{\bar{z}}f(z)|}{|\partial_zf(z)|} \quad \text{a.e. on } G.$$

Thus one deduces from [37, Ch. IV, Th. 2.2] the following statement: if $f : G \mapsto \mathbb{C}$ is a non-constant C^1 -smooth function such that $J_f(z) \neq 0$ almost everywhere on G and if $|\partial_{\bar{z}}f| \leq k|\partial_zf|$ almost everywhere on G , for some $k \in (0, 1)$, then f is a quasiconformal function on G .

Getting back to our pseudo-analytic extension \tilde{F} of F to U , we thus see, using Equations (A.2) and (A.3), that \tilde{F} is a quasiconformal function on U . So there exists a quasiconformal mapping g from U onto a domain V of \mathbb{C} and a non-constant analytic function $\varphi : V \mapsto \mathbb{C}$ such that $\tilde{F} = \varphi \circ g$ on U . Moreover, we have $J_{\tilde{F}}(z) > 0$ for every $z \in U$, and $\tilde{F} : U_z \mapsto \tilde{F}(U_z)$ is a C^1 -diffeomorphism, so that, in particular, \tilde{F} is injective on U_z . It follows that φ is injective on the domain $g(U_z)$, and $\varphi : g(U_z) \mapsto \varphi(g(U_z)) = \tilde{F}(U_z)$ is an analytic isomorphism. Hence, we can write g as $g = \varphi^{-1} \circ \tilde{F}$ on U_z , from which it follows that g is a C^1 -diffeomorphism from U_z onto $g(U_z)$. Since $g : U \rightarrow V$ is already known to be an homeomorphism, we eventually obtain that g is a C^1 -diffeomorphism from U onto V . We summarize our discussion in the following theorem, which we will use as such in Appendix B.

Theorem A.5. *Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, and let $F \in C^{1+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{T})$ be such that $F' \neq 0$ on \mathbb{T} . There exists an open neighborhood U of \mathbb{T} and a function $\tilde{F} \in C^1(U)$ such that:*

- (a) *the restriction of \tilde{F} to \mathbb{T} is equal to F ;*
- (b) *the function \tilde{F} can be written as $\tilde{F} = \varphi \circ g$, where g is a quasiconformal C^1 -diffeomorphism from U onto a domain V of \mathbb{C} , and φ is a non-constant analytic function on V . In particular, both g and g^{-1} are orientation preserving;*
- (c) *the Jacobian $J_{\tilde{F}}(z)$ is positive at every point $z \in U$; hence \tilde{F} is an orientation preserving local C^1 -diffeomorphism at every point of U , and there exist, for every $z \in U$, an open neighborhood U_z of z and two positive constants $c_{1,z}$ and $c_{2,z}$ such that*

$$c_{1,z}|w - z| \leq |\tilde{F}(w) - \tilde{F}(z)| \leq c_{2,z}|w - z| \quad \text{for every } w \in U_z.$$

A.2. Properties of the Riesz projection P_+ . Given $1 < p < \infty$, let q be its conjugate exponent, i.e. $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$. Then the duality between $L^p(\mathbb{T})$ and $L^q(\mathbb{T})$ is given by the following duality bracket

$$(A.7) \quad \langle x | y \rangle_{p,q} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} x(e^{i\theta})y(e^{-i\theta}) d\theta,$$

where $x \in L^p(\mathbb{T})$ and $y \in L^q(\mathbb{T})$. The Hardy space H^p is defined by

$$H^p = \{u \in L^p(\mathbb{T}); \forall n < 0, \hat{u}(n) = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad H^p_- = \{u \in L^p(\mathbb{T}); \forall n \geq 0, \hat{u}(n) = 0\}.$$

As usual, we may identify H^p with the space of analytic functions u on the open unit disc \mathbb{D} such that

$$\sup_{0 \leq r < 1} \|u_r\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T})} < \infty,$$

where $u_r(z) = u(rz)$, $z \in \mathbb{T}$. We also may identify the dual of H^p with H^q with respect to the duality bracket (A.7).

For every $z \in \mathbb{D}$, let k_z be the Cauchy kernel defined by $k_z(e^{i\theta}) = (1 - \bar{z}e^{i\theta})^{-1}$, $e^{i\theta} \in \mathbb{T}$. We have

$$\langle u | k_z \rangle_{p,q} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{u(e^{i\theta})}{1 - \bar{z}e^{-i\theta}} d\theta = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{e^{i\theta} u(e^{i\theta})}{e^{i\theta} - \bar{z}} d\theta \quad \text{for every } u \in H^p.$$

Hence by Cauchy's formula for H^p functions, we have

$$(A.8) \quad \langle u | k_z \rangle_{p,q} = u(\bar{z}) \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathbb{D} \text{ and all } u \in H^p.$$

The Riesz Theorem states that the Riesz projection $P_+ : L^p(\mathbb{T}) \rightarrow H^p$ defined by

$$P_+ f(z) = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{f(\tau)}{\tau - z} d\tau \quad \text{for every } z \in \mathbb{D}$$

is bounded whenever $1 < p < \infty$. Note that for every $\varphi \in L^p(\mathbb{T})$ and every $v \in H^q$, we have

$$(A.9) \quad \langle \varphi | v \rangle_{p,q} = \langle P_+ \varphi | v \rangle_{p,q}.$$

The Toeplitz operators that we consider are, as a general rule, associated to a $C^{1+\varepsilon}$ -smooth symbol. So let us begin by recalling what this means, and by giving some useful properties related to this space of functions.

Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and $n \geq 1$. Let Ω be a bounded subset of \mathbb{C}^n , endowed with the Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{C}^n}$, and let Y be a Banach space. A function $h : \Omega \rightarrow Y$ is said to be of class C^ε , or C^ε -smooth, or simply is a C^ε function, if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|h(z_1) - h(z_2)\|_Y \leq C \|z_1 - z_2\|_{\mathbb{C}^n}^\varepsilon \quad \text{for every } z_1, z_2 \in \Omega.$$

We denote by $C^\varepsilon(\Omega)$ the set of all such functions. When equipped with the norm

$$(A.10) \quad \|h\|_{C^\varepsilon(\Omega)} = \|h\|_\infty + \sup_{z_1 \neq z_2} \frac{\|h(z_1) - h(z_2)\|_Y}{\|z_1 - z_2\|_{\mathbb{C}^n}^\varepsilon},$$

the space $C^\varepsilon(\Omega)$ becomes a Banach space. Given an integer $k \geq 1$, we say that a function $h : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is of class $C^{k+\varepsilon}$ on Ω if $u^{(k)}$ is of class C^ε on Ω . Note that we have the following result:

Lemma A.6. *Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, and let Ω_1 and Ω_2 be bounded subsets of \mathbb{C}^n . Let the function $\phi : \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ belong to the space $C^\varepsilon(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)$. Write ε as $\varepsilon = \gamma + \beta$, where $\gamma, \beta > 0$. For every $a \in \Omega_1$ and $b \in \Omega_2$, denote by $\Phi_l(a)$ and $\Phi_r(b)$ the functions $\Phi_l(a) = \phi(a, \cdot)$ and $\Phi_r(b) = \phi(\cdot, b)$.*

Then Φ_l is a function of class C^γ from Ω_1 into $C^\beta(\Omega_2)$, and Φ_r is a function of class C^β from Ω_2 into $C^\gamma(\Omega_1)$.

If a and b are two functions on a subset Λ of \mathbb{C}^d taking non-negative values, we write $a \lesssim b$ if there exists a positive constant C such that $0 \leq a(w) \leq Cb(w)$ for every $w \in \Lambda$.

Proof. For $z_1, z_2 \in \Omega_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi_l(z_1) - \Phi_l(z_2)\|_{C^\beta(\Omega_2)} &= \|\Phi_l(z_1) - \Phi_l(z_2)\|_\infty \\ &+ \sup_{\substack{w_1, w_2 \in \Omega_2 \\ w_1 \neq w_2}} \frac{|\phi(z_1, w_1) - \phi(z_2, w_1) - \phi(z_1, w_2) + \phi(z_2, w_2)|}{\|w_1 - w_2\|_{\mathbb{C}^n}^\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that, since ϕ is C^ε , we have

$$\|\Phi_l(z_1) - \Phi_l(z_2)\|_\infty = \sup_{w \in \Omega_2} |\phi(z_1, w) - \phi(z_2, w)| \leq C \|z_1 - z_2\|_{\mathbb{C}^n}^\varepsilon,$$

and using the fact that Ω_1 is bounded, we get

$$\|\Phi_l(z_1) - \Phi_l(z_2)\|_\infty \lesssim \|z_1 - z_2\|_{\mathbb{C}^n}^\gamma.$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\phi(z_1, w_1) - \phi(z_2, w_1) - \phi(z_1, w_2) + \phi(z_2, w_2)| \\ & \leq |\phi(z_1, w_1) - \phi(z_2, w_1)| + |\phi(z_1, w_2) - \phi(z_2, w_2)| \leq 2C \|z_1 - z_2\|_{\mathbb{C}^n}^\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\phi(z_1, w_1) - \phi(z_2, w_1) - \phi(z_1, w_2) + \phi(z_2, w_2)| \\ & \leq |\phi(z_1, w_1) - \phi(z_1, w_2)| + |\phi(z_2, w_1) - \phi(z_2, w_2)| \leq 2C \|w_1 - w_2\|_{\mathbb{C}^n}^\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$|\phi(z_1, w_1) - \phi(z_2, w_1) - \phi(z_1, w_2) + \phi(z_2, w_2)| \leq 2C \min(\|z_1 - z_2\|_{\mathbb{C}^n}^\varepsilon, \|w_1 - w_2\|_{\mathbb{C}^n}^\varepsilon).$$

But $\min(a^\varepsilon, b^\varepsilon) \leq a^\gamma b^\beta$ for every $a, b \geq 0$, whence it follows that

$$|\phi(z_1, w_1) - \phi(z_2, w_1) - \phi(z_1, w_2) + \phi(z_2, w_2)| \leq 2C \|z_1 - z_2\|_{\mathbb{C}^n}^\gamma \|w_1 - w_2\|_{\mathbb{C}^n}^\beta.$$

Thus we obtain that

$$\|\Phi_l(z_1) - \Phi_l(z_2)\|_{C^\beta(\Omega_2)} \lesssim \|z_1 - z_2\|_{\mathbb{C}^n}^\gamma,$$

which proves that Φ_l is a C^γ function from Ω_1 into $C^\beta(\Omega_2)$. The proof is similar for Φ_r . \square

It is a well-known result that P_+ is a well-defined and bounded operator on $C^\varepsilon(\mathbb{T})$ and $C^{1+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{T})$:

Theorem A.7 (Privalov-Zygmund). *Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Then*

- (1) P_+ is a bounded map from $C^\varepsilon(\mathbb{T})$ into itself;
- (2) P_+ is a bounded map from $C^{1+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{T})$ into itself.

Assertion (1) is due to Privalov. See for instance [13, Th. 3.1.1]. Assertion (2) is due to Zygmund. See [13, Section 3.1, page 64] and [55].

A.3. Carleson measures for H^p . Recall that a positive finite Borel measure μ on \mathbb{D} is called a *Carleson measure* if there is a constant $A > 0$ such that

$$(A.11) \quad \mu(S(\tau, r)) \leq Ar \quad \text{for every } r > 0 \text{ and } \tau \in \mathbb{T},$$

where

$$S(\tau, r) = \{z \in \mathbb{D} : |z - \tau| < r\}.$$

Let $1 \leq p < \infty$. A famous theorem of Carleson [25, Thm 9.3] states that there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{D}} |f(z)|^p d\mu(z) \right)^{1/p} \leq c \|f\|_{H^p} \quad \text{for every } f \in H^p$$

if and only if μ is a Carleson measure. In other words, we can embed H^p continuously into $L^p(\mu)$ if and only if μ satisfies Equation (A.11). In the proof of the continuity of the

isomorphism involved in the construction of the model in Appendix B, the following result will be needed. It is probably well-known, but we give a proof for completeness' sake.

Proposition A.8. *Let γ be a curve included in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ which is the image of a C^1 bi-Lipschitz map u defined on $[0, 1]$. Then the injection $H^p \hookrightarrow L^p(\gamma)$ is continuous, that is, there exists a constant $c_{\gamma,p} > 0$ such that*

$$\int_{\gamma} |f(\lambda)|^p |d\lambda| \leq c_{\gamma,p} \|f\|_{H^p}^p \quad \text{for every } f \in H^p.$$

Proof. Let $f \in H^p$. We have

$$\int_{\gamma} |f(\lambda)|^p |d\lambda| = \int_{\gamma \cap \mathbb{D}} |f(\lambda)|^p |d\lambda| + \int_{\gamma \cap \mathbb{T}} |f(\lambda)|^p |d\lambda| \leq \int_{\gamma \cap \mathbb{D}} |f(\lambda)|^p |d\lambda| + \|f\|_{H^p}^p.$$

On the other hand, consider the Borel measure μ_{γ} defined by setting

$$\mu_{\gamma}(A) = |\gamma \cap A| = \int_{u^{-1}(\gamma \cap A)} |u'(t)| dt$$

for every Borel subset A of \mathbb{D} , i.e. $\mu_{\gamma}(A)$ is the length measure of the Borel subset $A \cap \gamma$ of γ . Then, for every Borel set $A \subset \mathbb{D}$, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{D}} \mathbb{1}_A(z) d\mu_{\gamma}(z) = \int_{\gamma} \mathbb{1}_{A \cap \gamma}(\lambda) |d\lambda|.$$

Then, by construction of the integral, for every positive measurable function g on \mathbb{D} with respect to μ_{γ} , we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{D}} g(z) d\mu_{\gamma}(z) = \int_{\gamma \cap \mathbb{D}} g(\lambda) |d\lambda|.$$

Thus it is sufficient to show that there exists a constant $c_{\gamma,p} > 0$ such that

$$(A.12) \quad \int_{\mathbb{D}} |f(z)|^p d\mu_{\gamma}(z) \leq c_{\gamma,p} \|f\|_{H^p}^p \quad \text{for every } f \in H^p.$$

According to Carleson's theorem, we need to check that μ_{γ} is a Carleson measure. The key point is the following fact.

Fact A.9. *There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that, for every $z, w \in \gamma$, we have $\ell_{\gamma}(z, w) \leq c|z - w|$, where $\ell_{\gamma}(z, w)$ is the length of the subarc of γ joining z to w .*

Proof. Since u is a C^1 bi-Lipschitz map u from $[0, 1]$ onto γ , there exist two constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that, for every $s, t \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$c_1|s - t| \leq |u(s) - u(t)| \leq c_2|s - t|.$$

Let $c_3 = \|u'\|_{\infty}$. Then, for $0 \leq s < t \leq 1$, we have

$$\ell_{\gamma}(u(s), u(t)) = \int_s^t |u'(x)| dx \leq c_3|t - s| \leq \frac{c_3}{c_1}|u(s) - u(t)|.$$

Hence for every $z, w \in \gamma$, we have $\ell_{\gamma}(z, w) \leq c|z - w|$ with $c = c_3/c_1$. \square

We now apply this fact to check that μ_{γ} is a Carleson measure. Let $\tau \in \mathbb{T}$ and $0 < r < 1$. If $S(\tau, r) \cap \gamma = \emptyset$, then of course $\mu_{\gamma}(S(\tau, r)) = 0$ and Equation (A.11) is satisfied. Otherwise let $s = \min\{x \in [0, 1] : u(x) \in S(\tau, r)\}$ and $t = \max\{x \in [0, 1] : u(x) \in \overline{S(\tau, r)}\}$. Then we have $S(\tau, r) \cap \gamma \subset \{u(x) : s \leq x \leq t\}$. Hence

$$\mu_{\gamma}(S(\tau, r)) = |S(\tau, r) \cap \gamma| \leq \ell_{\gamma}(u(s), u(t)) \leq c|u(s) - u(t)| \leq 2cr,$$

the last inequality following from the fact that $u(s)$ and $u(t)$ both belong to $\overline{S(\tau, r)}$. We conclude that μ_γ is a Carleson measure, which implies Equation (A.12) and then Proposition A.8. \square

A.4. Toeplitz operators. Given $F \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$, the Toeplitz operator T_F with symbol F is defined on the Hardy space H^p , $p > 1$, by the formula

$$T_F(u) = P_+(Fu) \quad \text{for every } u \in H^p.$$

It is a well-known fact that T_F is bounded from H^p into itself with

$$\|F\|_\infty \leq \|T_F\|_{\mathcal{L}(H^p)} \leq c_p \|F\|_\infty,$$

where c_p is the norm of the Riesz projection on $L^p(\mathbb{T})$. See [10, Th. 2.7]. It is easy to compute the adjoint of the operator T_F with respect to the duality bracket (A.7):

Lemma A.10. *For any $F \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$, define $f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ by setting $f(z) = F(1/z)$ for almost every $z \in \mathbb{T}$. Let $p > 1$. Then the adjoint of the operator T_F acting on H^p is the operator T_f acting on H^q .*

Proof. For every $u \in H^p$ and $v \in H^q$, using Equation (A.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u | T_F^* v \rangle_{p,q} &= \langle Fu | v \rangle_{p,q} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} F(e^{i\theta}) u(e^{i\theta}) v(e^{-i\theta}) d\theta \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(e^{-i\theta}) v(e^{-i\theta}) u(e^{i\theta}) d\theta \\ &= \langle u | v f \rangle_{p,q} = \langle u | T_f(v) \rangle_{p,q}, \end{aligned}$$

which yields that $T_F^*(v) = T_f(v)$. \square

The next lemma gathers some well-known results concerning spectral properties of Toeplitz operators with continuous symbols.

Lemma A.11. *Let F be a continuous function on \mathbb{T} . Consider the associated Toeplitz operator $T_F : H^p \rightarrow H^p$, $1 < p < \infty$.*

(i) *T_F is a Fredholm operator if and only if F does not vanish on \mathbb{T} , and in this case, its Fredholm index $j(T_F)$ satisfies*

$$j(T_F) = \dim(\ker T_F) - \dim(\ker T_F^*) = -\text{wind}_F(0).$$

(ii) *We have*

$$\sigma(T_F) = F(\mathbb{T}) \cup \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T}); \text{wind}_F(\lambda) \neq 0\}.$$

For a proof of Lemma A.11, see for instance [10, Th. 2.42]. It relies on a classical theorem due to Coburn (see [10, Th. 2.38]) which states the following:

Theorem A.12. *If $F \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ is not almost everywhere zero, then either $\ker T_F = \{0\}$ or $\ker T_F^* = \{0\}$.*

It should be noted that the duality pairing between H^p and H^q used in in [10] is given by the duality bracket

$$(A.13) \quad \langle f | g \rangle_{p,q} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(e^{i\theta}) \overline{g(e^{i\theta})} d\theta,$$

which is different from the one we use here. With respect to the duality bracket (A.13), the adjoint of T_F is $T_F^* = T_{\overline{F}}$. But since $\text{wind}_{\overline{F}}(0) = \text{wind}_f(0) = -\text{wind}_F(0)$, Theorems

2.42 and 2.38 from [10] remain valid when considering the pairing (2.1) rather than the pairing (A.13).

A.5. Smirnov spaces $E^p(\Omega)$. We briefly discuss in this section some standard properties of Smirnov spaces that we use in our paper. We refer to [25, 36, 44, 49] and the references therein for further details.

Let Ω be a bounded simply connected domain of \mathbb{C} with a boundary Γ which admits a piecewise C^1 parametrization $v : [0, 1] \rightarrow \Gamma$. We assume that v is positively oriented. Given $1 < p < \infty$, we say that an analytic function f on Ω belongs to the Smirnov space $E^p(\Omega)$ if there exists a sequence $(C_n)_{n \geq 1}$ of rectifiable Jordan curves included in Ω , tending to the boundary Γ (in the sense that C_n eventually surrounds each compact subdomain of Ω), and such that

$$(A.14) \quad \sup_{n \geq 1} \int_{C_n} |f(z)|^p |dz| < \infty.$$

With this definition, it is not clear that $E^p(\Omega)$ is a vector space. However, it can be proved (see [25, page 168-169]) that if φ is a conformal map from \mathbb{D} onto Ω , and if Γ_r is the image under φ of the circle $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = r\}$, $0 < r < 1$, then $f \in E^p(\Omega)$ if and only if

$$(A.15) \quad \sup_{0 < r < 1} \int_{\Gamma_r} |f(z)|^p |dz| < \infty.$$

Hence $E^p(\Omega)$ is a vector space and $f \in E^p(\Omega)$ if and only if $(f \circ \varphi) \cdot \varphi^{1/p} \in H^p(\mathbb{D})$ for some (all) conformal map φ from \mathbb{D} onto Ω .

Moreover, since Γ is a piecewise C^1 curve, each function $f \in E^p(\Omega)$ has a non-tangential limit at the point $v(t)$ for almost every $t \in [0, 1]$. Note that if the point $v(t)$ travels over a part of the curve $\partial\Omega$ in both directions (which is possible within the setting of assumption (H2')), the non-tangential limits of the function v are taken with respect to the domain which remains on the left while $v(t)$ travels over the curve (and these two limits can then be different). To simplify we still denote by f the non-tangential limit.




FIGURE 48

Note that the non-tangential limit cannot vanish on a set of positive measure unless $f(z) \equiv 0$ (see [25, Th. 10.3]). Furthermore, we have

$$\int_{\Gamma} |f(z)|^p |dz| = \int_0^1 |f(v(t))|^p |v'(t)| dt < \infty,$$

and we can equip $E^p(\Omega)$ with the following norm

$$\|f\|_{E^p(\Omega)} = \left(\int_{\Gamma} |f(z)|^p |dz| \right)^{1/p}$$

which turns $E^p(\Omega)$ into a Banach space. It is also known that each function $f \in E^1(\Omega)$ admits a Cauchy representation

$$f(z) = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma} \frac{f(\tau)}{\tau - z} d\tau \quad \text{for every } z \in \Omega,$$

and that the integral above vanishes for all $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \bar{\Omega}$ (see [25, Th. 10.4]).

If Ω is a simply connected domain, φ is a conformal map from \mathbb{D} onto Ω , and if $f \in E^p(\Omega)$, $f \not\equiv 0$ with $Z(f) = \{z \in \Omega : f(z) = 0\} = \{z_n : n \geq 1\}$, then we have

$$(A.16) \quad \sum_{n \geq 1} (1 - |\varphi^{-1}(z_n)|) < \infty.$$

Indeed, we have seen that if f belongs to $E^p(\Omega)$, then the function $F = (f \circ \varphi) \cdot \varphi^{1/p}$ belongs to $H^p(\mathbb{D})$. Moreover, $F(\varphi^{-1}(z_n)) = 0$ for every $n \geq 1$. Thus Equation (A.16) is nothing but the Blaschke condition on the sequence of zeroes of a non-zero function in $H^p(\mathbb{D})$.

When Ω is a bounded finitely connected domain with connected components $\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_N$ such that $\Gamma = \partial\Omega$ is piecewise C^1 , then an analytic function f on Ω is said to belong to $E^p(\Omega)$ if for every $1 \leq j \leq N$, the restriction $f|_{\Omega_j}$ of f to Ω_j belongs to $E^p(\Omega_j)$. It can be equipped with the norm

$$(A.17) \quad \|f\|_{E^p(\Omega)} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \|f|_{\Omega_j}\|_{E^p(\Omega_j)}^p \right)^{1/p} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \int_{\Gamma_j} |f|_{\Omega_j}(z)|^p |dz| \right)^{1/p}$$

where $\Gamma_j = \partial\Omega_j$, $1 \leq j \leq N$. Then $E^p(\Omega)$ becomes a Banach space.

We will also need to consider more general simply connected domains Ω within the extended complex plane $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$. Let Ω be such a simply connected domain with piecewise C^1 boundary such that $\infty \in \Omega$. An analytic function f on Ω is said to belong to $E_0^p(\Omega)$ if $f(\infty) = 0$, and there exists a sequence of rectifiable Jordan curves $(\gamma_n)_{n \geq 1}$ lying in Ω , tending to $\partial\Omega$, and such that

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \int_{\gamma_n} |f(z)|^p |dz| < \infty.$$

Fix $a \notin \Omega$ and define a function Θ by setting $\Theta(z) = \frac{1}{z-a}$, $z \in \Omega$. Then it is not difficult to prove that

$$g \in E^p(\Omega) \text{ if and only if } h = (g \circ \Theta^{-1}) \cdot ((\Theta^{-1})')^{1/p} \in E^p(\tilde{\Omega}),$$

where $\tilde{\Omega} = \Theta(\Omega)$. Then $\tilde{\Omega}$ is a bounded simply connected domain with rectifiable boundary. Using this, it can be proved that most of the previous properties of Smirnov spaces on bounded simply connected domain extend to the space $E_0^p(\Omega)$. When Ω is a finitely connected domain in $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$, we can define $E_0^p(\Omega)$ as in the bounded case: the norm defined by Equation (A.17) also turns it into a Banach space.

A.6. Linear dynamics. We briefly recall here the definitions of some important concepts in linear dynamics which are considered in this paper. The books [33] and [8] are excellent sources on linear dynamics.

A.6.1. *Topological setting.* Given a separable Banach space X over $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ or \mathbb{C} , a bounded operator on X is said to be *hypercyclic* if there exists a vector $x \in X$ whose orbit $\{T^n x; n \geq 0\}$ is dense in X . Related weaker notions are those of *supercyclicity* and *cyclicity*: T is *supercyclic* if there exists $x \in X$ whose projective orbit $\{\lambda T^n x; n \geq 0, \lambda \in \mathbb{K}\}$ is dense in X , and T is *cyclic* if there exists $x \in X$ such that the linear space $\text{span}[T^n x; n \geq 0]$ of the orbit of x under the action of T is dense in X . Clearly, hypercyclicity implies supercyclicity, which in its turn implies cyclicity. Observe also that whenever T is hypercyclic, rT is supercyclic for every scalar $r \in \mathbb{K} \setminus \{0\}$.

Obviously, a hypercyclic operator cannot be power bounded. More generally, hypercyclicity entails the following spectral restriction (see for instance [33, Th. 5.6]) : if T is a hypercyclic operator on a complex Banach space X , then every connected component of its spectrum $\sigma(T)$ meets the unit circle. Among straightforward necessary conditions for the hypercyclicity of $T \in \mathcal{B}(X)$, let us mention the fact that T^* cannot have any eigenvalue. See [33, Ch. 5] for more necessary conditions for hypercyclicity. For instance, normal operators on a Hilbert space are never hypercyclic. Similar results hold for supercyclicity: if $T \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ is supercyclic, then there exists $r \geq 0$ such that $r\mathbb{T}$ intersects each connected component of the spectrum of T (see [8, Th. 1.24]). Using the equivalence between hypercyclicity and topologically transitivity, it is not difficult to see that when T is invertible, then T is hypercyclic if and only if T^{-1} is hypercyclic (see [8, Cor. 1.3]).

We spell out the following simple fact as a Lemma.

Lemma A.13. *Let T be a bounded operator on a Banach space X , and suppose that X is decomposed as a topological direct sum $X = M_1 \oplus M_2$, where M_i is a non-trivial closed T -invariant subspace of X , $i = 1, 2$. Denote by T_i the operator induced by T on M_i . Let $x = x_1 + x_2$, $x_i \in M_i$, $i = 1, 2$. If x is a hypercyclic (resp. supercyclic) vector for T , then x_i is a hypercyclic (resp. supercyclic) vector for T_i , $i = 1, 2$.*

Proof. Suppose that x is hypercyclic. Then the set $\{T^n x_1 + T^n x_2; n \geq 0\}$ is dense in X . Denoting by P_i the bounded projection onto M_i , it follows that the set $\{P_i T^n x; n \geq 0\}$ is dense in M_i . But $P_i T^n x = T_i^n x_i$ for all $n \geq 0$, so that x_i is a hypercyclic vector for T_i . The case where x is supercyclic is similar. \square

One of the most useful tools for proving the hypercyclicity of some concrete classes of operators is the Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion, which requires the existence of a large supply of eigenvectors associated to eigenvalues of modulus smaller than 1 and larger than 1, respectively. It is a straightforward consequence of the so-called Hypercyclicity Criterion (see for instance [33, Ch. 3]).

Theorem A.14. *Let X be a complex separable Banach space and let $T \in \mathcal{B}(X)$. If the two subspaces*

$$H_-(T) = \overline{\text{span}}[\ker(T - \lambda); |\lambda| < 1] \quad \text{and} \quad H_+(T) = \overline{\text{span}}[\ker(T - \lambda); |\lambda| > 1]$$

are equal to X , then T is hypercyclic.

The next statement provides a necessary condition for supercyclicity in terms of eigenvectors.

Theorem A.15. *Let X be a complex separable Banach space and let $T \in \mathcal{B}(X)$. If for some $r > 0$, the two subspaces*

$$H_{r,-}(T) = \overline{\text{span}}[\ker(T - \lambda); |\lambda| < r] \quad \text{and} \quad H_{r,+}(T) = \overline{\text{span}}[\ker(T - \lambda); |\lambda| > r]$$

are equal to X , then T is supercyclic.

Theorem A.15 is a trivial consequence of Theorem A.14: under the assumption of Theorem A.15, the operator $\frac{1}{r}T$ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem A.14, so $\frac{1}{r}T$ is hypercyclic, and so T is supercyclic.

Another important notion in linear dynamics is that of chaos: a bounded operator $T \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ is said to be *chaotic* if T is hypercyclic and has a dense set of periodic points (a vector $x \in X$ is *periodic* for T if there exists an integer $n \geq 1$ such that $T^n x = x$). Again, there is a very useful version of the Godefroy-Shapiro Criterion for chaos [30]:

Theorem A.16. *Let X be a complex separable Banach space and let $T \in \mathcal{B}(X)$. If the three subspaces of X given by $H_+(T)$, $H_-(T)$ and*

$$H_0(T) = \overline{\text{span}}[\ker(T - \lambda); \lambda \text{ is an } n\text{-th root of unity, } n \geq 1]$$

are equal to X , then T is chaotic.

Since the set of periodic points for $T \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ is the linear vector space spanned by the eigenvectors of T associated to eigenvalues which are roots of unity, a necessary condition for the chaoticity of T is that $H_0(T) = X$.

A.6.2. *Measure-theoretic setting.* The few basic results on hypercyclicity that we have presented above already highlight the importance of eigenvectors in the study of linear dynamics from the topological point of view. Eigenvectors are even more important in the measure-theoretic setting. An excellent reference for the concepts recalled in this subsection is [8, Ch. 5].

Given a (complex) separable Banach space X and $T \in \mathcal{B}(X)$, the general aim of linear dynamics in the measure-theoretical setting is to endow X with a T -invariant Borel probability measure m , and to study the properties of the measure-preserving dynamical system $(X, \mathcal{B}, m; T)$. Here \mathcal{B} denotes the σ -algebra of Borel subsets of X . The measure m is *T -invariant* if $m(T^{-1}(A)) = m(A)$ for every $A \in \mathcal{B}$, and T is *ergodic with respect to m* if the only sets $A \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $T^{-1}A = A$ are those with $m(A) = 0$ or $m(A) = 1$. The study of the dynamics of T with respect to a probability measure m is especially interesting when m has *full (topological) support*, i.e. when $m(U) > 0$ for every non-empty open subset U of X .

Gaussian measures play a specific role in the study of the dynamics of bounded operators from a measure-theoretical point of view. A *Gaussian measure* m on X is a Borel probability measure such that every functional $x^* \in X^*$, when considered as a complex random variable on X , has symmetric complex Gaussian distribution.

In the Hilbertian setting, there is a very neat characterization of operators admitting an invariant ergodic measure with full support, given in terms of *unimodular eigenvectors* [7, 28]. Before we state this characterization as Theorem A.17, we recall that $T \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ has *perfectly spanning unimodular eigenvectors* if the following holds:

for any countable subset D of the unit circle \mathbb{T} ,

$$\overline{\text{span}}[\ker(T - \lambda); \lambda \in \mathbb{T} \setminus D] = X.$$

This property admits several equivalent formulations (see [32] for more details).

Theorem A.17. *Let H be a complex separable Hilbert space, and let $T \in \mathcal{B}(H)$. The following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) *T admits a T -invariant Gaussian probability measure with full support with respect to which T is ergodic;*
- (2) *T has perfectly spanning unimodular eigenvectors.*

Outside the Hilbertian setting, the implication (2) \implies (1) in Theorem A.17 remains true in full generality [9].

Theorem A.18. *Let X be a complex separable space, and let $T \in \mathcal{B}(X)$. If T has perfectly spanning unimodular eigenvectors, then T admits an invariant Gaussian probability measure with full support with respect to which T is ergodic.*

One of the interests of such results is that whenever T is ergodic with respect to an invariant probability-measure m with full support, T is *frequently hypercyclic*: there exists a vector $x \in X$ (a frequently hypercyclic vector for T) such that for every non empty open subset U of X , the set

$$N_T(x, U) = \{n \geq 0; T^n x \in U\}$$

has positive lower density, i.e.

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \text{card}\{0 \leq n < N; T^n x \in U\} > 0.$$

This follows from Birkhoff's Pointwise Ergodic Theorem. Actually, m -almost every vector $x \in X$ is frequently hypercyclic for T . Hence we have

Theorem A.19. *Let X be a complex separable Banach space, and let $T \in \mathcal{B}(X)$. If T has perfectly spanning unimodular eigenvectors, then T is frequently hypercyclic.*

We summarize some of the results presented above in a last statement, which provides us with a concrete criterion for proving chaos or ergodicity of large classes of operators.

Theorem A.20. *Let X be a complex separable Banach space, and let $T \in \mathcal{B}(X)$. Suppose that there exist a open subset U of \mathbb{C} and a finite or countable family $(E_i)_{i \in I}$ of analytic maps from U into X such that*

- (a) $TE_i(\lambda) = \lambda E_i(\lambda)$ for every $\lambda \in U$ and every $i \in I$;
- (b) $\overline{\text{span}}[E_i(\lambda); \lambda \in U, i \in I] = X$;
- (c) every connected component of U intersects the unit circle.

Then T has the following properties:

- (1) T admits an invariant Gaussian probability measure with full support with respect to which T is ergodic;
- (2) T is frequently hypercyclic, hence hypercyclic;
- (3) T is chaotic.

Proof. In order to prove assertions (1) and (2), it suffices by Theorem A.18 to show that T has perfectly spanning unimodular eigenvectors. So let D be a countable subset of \mathbb{T} . For each connected component O of U , let $\Gamma_O = \mathbb{T} \cap O$, which is a non-empty open subarc of \mathbb{T} by (c). Since $\Gamma_O \setminus D$ has accumulation points in O , the uniqueness principle for analytic functions implies that

$$\overline{\text{span}}[E_i(\lambda); \lambda \in \Gamma_O \setminus D, i \in I] = \overline{\text{span}}[E_i(\lambda); \lambda \in O, i \in I].$$

Hence the closed subspace

$$\overline{\text{span}}[E_i(\lambda); \lambda \in (\mathbb{T} \cap U) \setminus D, i \in I]$$

contains the linear span of all the subspaces $\overline{\text{span}}[E_i(\lambda); \lambda \in O, i \in I]$ where O varies over all connected components of U . It follows from (b) that

$$\overline{\text{span}}[E_i(\lambda); \lambda \in (\mathbb{T} \cap U) \setminus D, i \in I] = X,$$

and thus by (a),

$$\overline{\text{span}} [\ker(T - \lambda); \lambda \in \mathbb{T} \setminus D] = X.$$

Hence T has perfectly spanning unimodular eigenvectors.

The strategy to show assertion (3) is exactly the same, observing that if E denotes the set of all roots of unity in \mathbb{T} , $\Gamma_O \cap E$ has accumulation points in \mathbb{T} for every connected component O of U , so that

$$\overline{\text{span}} [E_i(\lambda); \lambda \in \Gamma_O \cap E, i \in I] = \overline{\text{span}} [E_i(\lambda); \lambda \in O, i \in I].$$

Hence $\overline{\text{span}} [\ker(T - \lambda); \lambda \in E] = X$, and T has a dense set of periodic points. Since we already know, by (2), that T is hypercyclic, this yields that T is chaotic. \square

We finish this section by recalling an important sufficient condition for the cyclicity of a bounded operator on a Banach space, which is crucial in the works [51], [52] and [53] to show the cyclicity of certain Toeplitz operators. This condition originates from [42]. The brief proof that we present here is inspired from [31]. For each polynomial $p \in \mathbb{C}[z] \setminus \{0\}$, we denote by $Z(p)$ the set of its roots.

Lemma A.21. *Let T be a bounded operator on a complex separable Banach space X , and let $\mathcal{D} = \{p \in \mathbb{C}[z] \setminus \{0\}; Z(p) \cap \sigma_p(T^*) = \emptyset\}$. Suppose that the vector space*

$$D := \bigcup_{p \in \mathcal{D}} \ker p(T)$$

is dense in X . Then T is cyclic.

In particular, if the linear span of the eigenspaces $\ker(T - \lambda)$, $\lambda \notin \sigma_p(T^)$, is dense in X , then T is cyclic.*

Proof. By the Baire Category Theorem, it suffices to show that for any non-empty open subsets U, V of X , there exists a polynomial $q \in \mathbb{C}[z]$ such that $q(T)(U) \cap V \neq \emptyset$. Let $u \in U \cap D$, and let $p \in \mathcal{D}$ be a non-zero polynomial such that $p(T)u = 0$. Since no root of p belongs to $\sigma_p(T^*)$, the operator $p(T)$ has dense range. Given $v \in V$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a vector $x \in X$ such that $\|p(T)x - v\| < \varepsilon$. Let now $\delta > 0$ be such that the open ball $B(u, \delta)$ is contained in U , and let $r > \frac{2}{\delta}\|x\|$. Then $\|\frac{x}{r}\| < \delta$. Let now $\tilde{u} := u + \frac{x}{r}$. Then $\tilde{u} \in U$, and if we set $q := rp$, we have

$$q(T)\tilde{u} = rp(T)\frac{x}{r} = p(T)x.$$

So $\|q(T)\tilde{u} - v\| < \varepsilon$, so that $q(T)\tilde{u} \in V$ if ε is sufficiently small. Hence $q(T)(U) \cap V \neq \emptyset$, which is the result we were looking for. \square

APPENDIX B. PROOF OF THE H^p VERSION OF YAKUBOVICH'S MODEL THEORY FOR TOEPLITZ OPERATORS

In this appendix, we give a complete proof of the main result of Yakubovich [51] in the H^p setting. We also prove some results which are true in the more general framework of [53].

Caution : In this Appendix B, the letter F will denote a **positively wound symbol**, while in the previous sections it was mainly denoting a negatively wound symbol. This choice, which is of course questionable, is motivated by the fact that we preferred to stick to the notation of [51], so as not to confuse the reader. We will explain in Appendix B.6 how to connect the notations and results from Appendix B to those of the rest of the paper.

Let $1 < p < \infty$ and let q be its conjugate exponent i.e. $1/p + 1/q = 1$. In the forthcoming appendix, we consider the Toeplitz operator T_F , with symbol F , defined on the Hardy space H^p . We recall here the assumptions on the symbol that will be used in the sequel (which are almost the same as in Section 1).

- (H1) F belongs to the class $C^{1+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{T})$ for some $\varepsilon > \max(1/p, 1/q)$, and its derivative F' does not vanish on \mathbb{T} ;
- (H2) there exists a partition \mathbb{T} into a finite number of closed arcs $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$ such that
 - (a) F is injective on the interior of each arc α_j , $1 \leq j \leq m$;
 - (b) for every $i \neq j$, $1 \leq i, j \leq m$, the sets $F(\alpha_i)$ and $F(\alpha_j)$ have disjoint interiors
- (H2') there exists a partition \mathbb{T} into a finite number of closed arcs $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$ such that
 - (a) F is injective on the interior of each arc α_j , $1 \leq j \leq m$;
 - (b) for every $i \neq j$, $1 \leq i, j \leq m$, $F(\alpha_i) = F(\alpha_j)$ or the sets $F(\alpha_i)$ and $F(\alpha_j)$ have disjoint interiors;
- (H3') for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, $\text{wind}_F(\lambda) \geq 0$, where $\text{wind}_F(\lambda)$ denotes the winding number of the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$ around λ .

Denote by $\mathcal{O} \subseteq F(\mathbb{T})$ the set of all the extremities of the arcs α_j .

The derivative F' of F at a point z_0 of \mathbb{T} will be understood as the limit as $z \rightarrow z_0$, $z \in \mathbb{T}$ of the quotients $(F(z) - F(z_0))/(z - z_0)$. Writing $z_0 = e^{i\theta_0}$, $\theta_0 \in [0, 2\pi)$, it could also be understood as the derivative at the point θ_0 of the function $\theta \mapsto F(e^{i\theta})$ defined on $[0, 2\pi)$ (the derivative of this last function is non-zero on $[0, 2\pi)$ if and only if F' is non-zero on \mathbb{T}).

B.1. Some notations. We now set an important piece of notation which will be involved in the statement of the boundary relations for eigenvectors of T_F^* . Let $N = \max\{\text{wind}_F(\lambda); \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})\}$. We set

$$\Omega_j^+ = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T}); \text{wind}_F(\lambda) > j\} \quad \text{for every } 0 \leq j \leq N - 1,$$

and

$$\Gamma_j^+ = \partial \overline{\Omega_j^+}$$

for every $0 \leq j \leq N - 1$. We also define $\Gamma_N^+ = \emptyset$ and $\Gamma = F(\mathbb{T})$. Observe that $\Gamma = \partial \Omega_0^+$.




FIGURE 49

A word of caution is in order here: the set Γ_j^+ is defined as the boundary of the closure of the set Ω_j^+ (and not as the boundary of Ω_j^+). Suppose that assumption (H2) is satisfied. A point $\lambda \in \Gamma \setminus \mathcal{O}$ belongs to Γ_j^+ if and only if its interior and exterior components Ω_{int} and

Ω_{ext} , defined in Section 6.1, are such that $\text{wind}_F(\Omega_{int}) = j+1$ and $\text{wind}_F(\Omega_{ext}) = j$. Hence Ω_{int} is a connected component of Ω_j^+ and Ω_{ext} is a connected component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus (F(\mathbb{T}) \cup \Omega_j^+)$. We have

$$\Gamma \cap \overline{\Omega_j^+} = \partial\Omega_j^+ = \bigcup_{k=j}^N \Gamma_k^+$$

for every $0 \leq j \leq N-1$. Two different sets Γ_j^+ can intersect in a finite set of points at most, and

$$\Gamma = \bigcup_{j=0}^{N-1} \Gamma_j^+.$$

In other words the family $\Gamma_j^+, 0 \leq j \leq N-1$, is a partition of Γ up to a finite set of points. We also define for $0 \leq j \leq N$

$$\Omega_j = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T}); \text{wind}_F(\lambda) = j\}.$$

Note that $\Omega_j^+ = \bigcup_{k \geq j+1} \Omega_k$.

Let $r > 1$ and $0 \leq j \leq N-1$. Recall that for $u \in E^r(\Omega)$ (where Ω satisfies the assumptions of Appendix A.5), we still denote by u its non-tangential limit on the boundary which exists almost everywhere (in the sense given in Appendix A.5). According to equation (A.17), for $u \in E^r(\Omega_j^+)$, we have

$$(B.1) \quad \|u\|_{E^r(\Omega_j^+)}^r = \sum_{k=j+1}^N \|u|_{\Omega_k}\|_{E^r(\Omega_k)}^r = \sum_{k=j+1}^N \|u|_{\Omega_k}\|_{L^r(\partial\Omega_k)}^r.$$

When F satisfies (H2), this expression can be simplified a bit. Note that when we travel along the curve Γ_{k-1}^+ endowed with the parametrization F , the set Ω_k is on the left side, and when we travel along the curve Γ_k^+ , it is on the right side. So in order to have a positive orientation for $\partial\Omega_k$, which is the union of Γ_{k-1}^+ and Γ_k^+ , we write $\partial\Omega_k = \Gamma_{k-1}^+ \cup (\tilde{\Gamma}_k^+)$, where $\tilde{\Gamma}_k^+$ is the same curve as Γ_k^+ , but with the opposite orientation.




FIGURE 50

On Γ_k^+ (still under hypothesis (H2)), recall that the interior and exterior boundary values, defined in Section 6.1, are such that, for almost every $\lambda \in \Gamma_k^+$,

$$(B.2) \quad u^{int}(\lambda) = \lim_{\substack{\mu \rightarrow \lambda \\ \mu \in \Omega_{k+1}}} u(\mu) \quad \text{and} \quad u^{ext}(\lambda) = \lim_{\substack{\mu \rightarrow \lambda \\ \mu \in \Omega_k}} u(\mu).$$

This means that u^{int} is the non-tangential limit on Γ_k^+ of $u|_{\Omega_{k+1}}$ and u^{ext} is the non-tangential limit on Γ_k^+ of $u|_{\Omega_k}$.

Thus, under assumption (H2), Equation (B.1) can be rewritten as

$$(B.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \|u\|_{E^r(\Omega_j^+)}^r &= \sum_{k=j+1}^N \|u|_{\Omega_k}\|_{L^r(\partial\Omega_k)}^r \\ &= \sum_{k=j+1}^N \|u^{int}\|_{L^r(\Gamma_{k-1}^+)}^r + \sum_{k=j+1}^N \|u^{ext}\|_{L^r(\Gamma_k^+)}^r. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, note that for every function $u \in E^1(\Omega_k)$, we have

$$(B.4) \quad \int_{\partial\Omega_k} u(\lambda) d\lambda = \int_{\Gamma_{k-1}^+} u^{int}(\lambda) d\lambda - \int_{\Gamma_k^+} u^{ext}(\lambda) d\lambda.$$

B.2. Construction of eigenvectors. Let us now assume that F satisfies the assumptions (H1) and (H3'). Since F is continuous, according to assertion (ii) of Lemma A.11, it follows that

$$\sigma(T_F) = F(\mathbb{T}) \cup \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T}) : \text{wind}_F(\lambda) > 0\}.$$

Now, according to assertion (i) of Lemma A.11, for every $\lambda \in \sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, we have

$$j(T_F) = \dim(\ker(T_F - \lambda)) - \dim(\ker(T_F^* - \lambda)) = -\text{wind}_F(\lambda),$$

and then, by Coburn's theorem,

$$\ker(T_F - \lambda) = \{0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \dim(\ker(T_F^* - \lambda)) = \text{wind}_F(\lambda).$$

In this section, we will construct a basis of eigenvectors for $T_F^* - \lambda = T_f - \lambda$, with $f(z) = F(1/z)$, $z \in \mathbb{T}$.

For $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ and $m = \text{wind}_f(\lambda)$, let

$$\varphi_\lambda(z) = z^{-m}(f(z) - \lambda) \quad \text{for every } z \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Note that $0 \notin \varphi_\lambda(\mathbb{T})$ and that $\text{wind}_{\varphi_\lambda}(0) = 0$. Consider now the function u_λ defined on \mathbb{T} by

$$u_\lambda(e^{is}) = \int_0^s i e^{it} \frac{\varphi'_\lambda(e^{it})}{\varphi_\lambda(e^{it})} dt \quad \text{for every } s \in [0, 2\pi).$$

For every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, the function $z \mapsto u_\lambda(z)$ is of class $C^{1+\varepsilon}$ on \mathbb{T} , and for every $s \in [0, 2\pi)$, the function $\lambda \mapsto u_\lambda(e^{is})$ is analytic on $\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$. Moreover, $\varphi_\lambda(e^{is}) = \varphi_\lambda(1)e^{u_\lambda(e^{is})}$ (and $u_\lambda + \log(\varphi_\lambda(1))$ is a continuous logarithm of φ_λ on \mathbb{T}). Define a function v_λ on \mathbb{T} by setting

$$(B.5) \quad v_\lambda(z) = (P_+ u_\lambda)(z) = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{u_\lambda(\tau)}{\tau - z} d\tau \quad \text{for every } z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Lemma B.1. *With the previous notation, we have*

- (1) for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, $v_\lambda \in A(\mathbb{D})$;
- (2) for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$, the map $\lambda \mapsto v_\lambda(z)$ is analytic on $\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$.

Proof. According to Theorem A.7, the projection P_+ maps $C^{1+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{T})$ into itself, whence v_λ belongs to $A(\mathbb{D})$. Assertion (2) follows immediately from Equation (B.5). \square

For every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, define the functions f_λ^+ and f_λ^- on \mathbb{D} and $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ respectively by setting

$$f_\lambda^+ = (f(1) - \lambda)e^{v_\lambda} \quad \text{and} \quad f_\lambda^- = e^{P_- u_\lambda},$$

where $P_- = I - P_+$. Note (this will be important later on) that the definition of f_λ^+ does not depend on the choice of the continuous branch of the logarithm of φ_λ that we make. The following equality holds on \mathbb{T} :

$$f_\lambda^+ f_\lambda^- = (f(1) - \lambda)e^{u_\lambda} = \varphi_\lambda = z^{-m}(f - \lambda).$$

Moreover, f_λ^+ belongs to $A(\mathbb{D})$ and $\lambda \mapsto f_\lambda^+(z)$ is analytic on $\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$. Observe also that $1/f_\lambda^+$ belongs to $A(\mathbb{D})$ (because f_λ^+ belongs to $A(\mathbb{D})$ and does not vanish on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$).

Lemma B.2. *Let $a \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$ and set $b(\tau) = a(1/\tau)$, $\tau \in \mathbb{T}$. Then for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$, we have $P_+ b(z) = \hat{a}(0) + P_- a(1/z)$.*

Proof. Set $a_n = \hat{a}(n)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, so that $a(\tau) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} a_n \tau^n$ on \mathbb{T} . Then $b(\tau) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} a_n \tau^{-n}$ and thus

$$P_+ b(z) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^0 a_n z^{-n} = a_0 + \sum_{n=-\infty}^{-1} a_n z^{-n} = \hat{a}(0) + P_- a(1/z) \quad \text{for every } z \in \mathbb{D}. \quad \square$$

Similarly, starting from the function ψ_λ defined on \mathbb{T} by $\psi_\lambda(z) = z^{-n}(F(z) - \lambda)$ with $n = \text{wind}_F(\lambda)$, we may construct functions U_λ and V_λ associated to F , and then F_λ^+ and F_λ^- , satisfying the following relations:

$$z^{-n}(F - \lambda) = (F(1) - \lambda)e^{U_\lambda}, \quad V_\lambda = P_+ U_\lambda,$$

and

$$(B.6) \quad F_\lambda^+ = (F(1) - \lambda)e^{V_\lambda}, \quad F_\lambda^- = e^{P_- U_\lambda}.$$

We thus obtain that

$$(B.7) \quad F - \lambda = z^n F_\lambda^+ F_\lambda^- \quad \text{on } \mathbb{T},$$

Recall that (see [12]), $T_{F_1 F_2} = T_{F_1} T_{F_2}$ if and only if $\overline{F_1}$ or F_2 belongs to H^∞ . In particular if $F_2 \in H^\infty$, we have $T_{F_1 F_2}(g) = T_{F_1}(F_2 g)$, for every $g \in H^p$. So Equation (B.7) gives, taking into account the fact that $F_\lambda^+ \in A(\mathbb{D})$ and $F_\lambda^- \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$, the equality

$$(B.8) \quad T_{F-\lambda}(g) = T_{F_\lambda^-}(z^n F_\lambda^+ g) \quad \text{for every } g \in H^p.$$

Lemma B.3. *For every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, we have*

$$F_\lambda^-(z) = \frac{f_\lambda^+(1/z)}{f_\lambda^+(0)} \quad \text{for every } z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}.$$

Proof. Note that $\text{wind}_f(\lambda) = -\text{wind}_F(\lambda)$ and $U_\lambda(e^{is}) = u_\lambda(e^{-is})$ for every $s \in [0, 2\pi)$. Then, according to Lemma B.2, for $z \in \mathbb{D}$ we have $P_+ u_\lambda(z) = \widehat{U}_\lambda(0) + P_- U_\lambda(1/z)$. Therefore, for every $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}$, we get

$$e^{P_- U_\lambda(z)} = \frac{e^{P_+ u_\lambda(1/z)}}{e^{\widehat{U}_\lambda(0)}}.$$

In other words, taking the definitions of F_λ^- and f_λ^+ into account, we have

$$F_\lambda^-(z) = \frac{f_\lambda^+(1/z)}{(f(1) - \lambda)e^{\widehat{U}_\lambda(0)}} \quad \text{for every } z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}.$$

Observe now that $\widehat{U}_\lambda(0) = \widehat{u}_\lambda(0) = P_+ u_\lambda(0)$, which gives

$$F_\lambda^-(z) = \frac{f_\lambda^+(1/z)}{f_\lambda^+(0)} \quad \text{for every } z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}. \quad \square$$

We have already mentioned the fact that f_λ^+ and F_λ^+ belong to $A(\mathbb{D})$. It follows immediately from Lemma B.3 that f_λ^- and F_λ^- belong to $A(\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}})$. Using this construction, we can now give an explicit description of the point spectra of both T_F and $T_F^* = T_f$. For all $\lambda \in \sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ and $0 \leq k < \text{wind}_F(\lambda)$, we introduce the functions $h_{\lambda,k}$ defined on \mathbb{D} by

$$(B.9) \quad h_{\lambda,k}(z) = z^k \frac{f_\lambda^+(0)}{f_\lambda^+(z)} \quad \text{for every } z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

These functions belong to H^q (indeed, they are in $A(\mathbb{D})$). Observe that this definition of $h_{\lambda,k}$ can be extended to any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ and any $k \geq 0$, but only the $h_{\lambda,k}$ with $\lambda \in \sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ and $0 \leq k < \text{wind}_F(\lambda)$ are eigenvectors of T_F^* .

Lemma B.4. *Suppose that F satisfies (H1) and (H3'), and let $p > 1$. Then, for every $\lambda \in \sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, we have*

$$\ker(T_F^* - \lambda) = \text{span} [h_{\lambda,k}, 0 \leq k < \text{wind}_F(\lambda)].$$

Proof. For $\lambda \in \sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, let $0 \leq k < n$, where $n = \text{wind}_F(\lambda) = -\text{wind}_f(\lambda)$. Since $f - \lambda = f_\lambda^+ z^{-n} f_\lambda^-$, and $z^{k-n} f_\lambda^- \in H_-^p = \ker(P_+)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} (T_F^* - \lambda)h_{\lambda,k} &= (T_f - \lambda)h_{\lambda,k} = P_+ [(f - \lambda)h_{\lambda,k}] \\ &= P_+ \left[f_\lambda^+ z^{-n} f_\lambda^- z^k \frac{f_\lambda^+(0)}{f_\lambda^+(z)} \right] = P_+ \left[f_\lambda^+(0) z^{k-n} f_\lambda^- \right] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have $h_{\lambda,k} \in \ker(T_F^* - \lambda)$ for every $0 \leq k < n$. Since $\dim(\ker(T_F^* - \lambda)) = \text{wind}_F(\lambda) = n$, this concludes the proof of Lemma B.4. \square

Our aim in the next section is to provide another representation of f_λ^+ (this is Lemma B.9 below), which will be crucial in order to obtain boundary relations for the eigenvectors of the operator T_F^* .

B.3. Another representation of the functions f_λ^+ . Assume that F satisfies (H1), (H2') and (H3'). By Theorem A.5, the function F can be extended to a C^1 -smooth function \tilde{F} on an open neighborhood \tilde{U} of \mathbb{T} , whose Jacobian $J_{\tilde{F}}(z)$ is positive at every point $z \in \tilde{U}$, and which can be written as $\tilde{F} = \varphi \circ g$, where g is a quasiconformal C^1 -diffeomorphism from \tilde{U} onto a domain V of \mathbb{C} , and φ is a non-constant analytic function on V . Let U be an open subset of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\mathbb{T} \subseteq U \subseteq \overline{U} \subseteq \tilde{U}$, and denote by W the open set $W = g(U)$. Note that $\overline{W} \subseteq V$ because g is an homeomorphism. Observe also that

$$(B.10) \quad \sup_{z \in \overline{U}} |J_{\tilde{F}}(z)| < \infty.$$

Fix $\lambda_0 \in F(\mathbb{T})$. The equation $\varphi(z) = \lambda_0$ has a finite number of solutions w_j , $1 \leq j \leq s$, in W . Moreover, the function \tilde{F} is locally a C^1 diffeomorphism on \tilde{U} , and thus is locally injective on \tilde{U} . It follows that $\varphi = \tilde{F} \circ g^{-1}$ is also locally injective on V , and thus the solutions w_j , $1 \leq j \leq s$, are simple. By Lemma A.1, there exist $\alpha > 0$ and one-to-one analytic maps $\tilde{d}_1, \tilde{d}_2, \dots, \tilde{d}_s$ on $D(\lambda_0, \alpha)$ such that for every $\lambda \in D(\lambda_0, \alpha)$, the solutions of the equation $\varphi(z) = \lambda$ in W are exactly the s points $\tilde{d}_j(\lambda)$, $1 \leq j \leq s$. Define $d_j = g^{-1} \circ \tilde{d}_j$, $1 \leq j \leq s$. For every $\lambda \in D(\lambda_0, \alpha)$ and every $1 \leq j \leq s$, we have then

$$\tilde{F}(d_j(\lambda)) = \lambda.$$

Notation B.5. For each $\lambda \in D(\lambda_0, \alpha)$, denote by $N(\lambda)$ the set $N(\lambda) = \{1 \leq j \leq s : |d_j(\lambda)| < 1\}$, and denote by $n(\lambda)$ its cardinal.

If $d_j(\lambda_0) \notin \mathbb{T}$, taking α smaller if necessary, we can assume that $d_j(D(\lambda_0, \alpha)) \cap \mathbb{T} = \emptyset$.

Moreover, for every $j \neq k$, $d_j(\lambda_0) \neq d_k(\lambda_0)$, so we can also assume that

$$(B.11) \quad \overline{d_j(D(\lambda_0, \alpha))} \cap \overline{d_k(D(\lambda_0, \alpha))} = \emptyset.$$

Denote by J the set of indices $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ such that $d_j(\lambda_0) \in \mathbb{T}$. Note that j belongs to J if and only if $d_j(D(\lambda_0, \alpha)) \cap \mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$.


Remark B.6. Let us point out the following consequence of these assumptions: suppose that $\lambda \in \mathcal{O}$ is an “essential” self-intersection point of the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$, in the sense that whatever the choice of the arcs α_j in assumption (H2) (or (H2’)), λ is the image by F of one of the extremities of one of the arcs α_j . If λ belongs to $D(\lambda_0, \alpha)$, then necessarily $\lambda = \lambda_0$. Indeed, if $\lambda \neq \lambda_0$, then the equation $F(z) = \lambda$ has strictly more solutions in \mathbb{T} than the equation $F(z) = \lambda_0$ (see the proof of Fact 7.2). Hence there exists an index j_0 such that $d_{j_0}(\lambda_0) \notin \mathbb{T}$ while $d_{j_0}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{T}$, which is not possible.

Notation B.7. We then define $D_{int}(\lambda_0)$ as the intersection of $D(\lambda_0, \alpha)$ with the interior connected component with respect to the arc $\Gamma_{\lambda_0} = D(\lambda_0, \alpha) \cap F(\mathbb{T})$ and $D_{ext}(\lambda_0)$ as the intersection of $D(\lambda_0, \alpha)$ with the exterior connected component with respect to Γ_{λ_0} (see Section 6.1 for the definition of the interior and exterior components). Note that if Γ_{λ_0} is included in the boundary of exactly one component Ω of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, this is both the interior and the exterior component. So, we denote by $D_{int}(\lambda_0)$ and $D_{ext}(\lambda_0)$ the two connected components of $\Omega \cap D(\lambda_0, \alpha)$. Let

$$N_{int}(\lambda_0) = \{j \in J : d_j(D_{int}(\lambda_0)) \subseteq \mathbb{D}\}, \quad N_{ext}(\lambda_0) = \{j \in J : d_j(D_{ext}(\lambda_0)) \subseteq \mathbb{D}\},$$

and set also $n_i(\lambda_0) = \text{card}(N_{int}(\lambda_0))$ and $n_e(\lambda_0) = \text{card}(N_{ext}(\lambda_0))$.

In other words, we partition the set $\{1, \dots, s\}$ as follows:



In particular, we have

$$(B.12) \quad N(\lambda) = N(\lambda_0) \cup N_{int}(\lambda_0) \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in D_{int}(\lambda_0)$$

and

$$(B.13) \quad N(\lambda) = N(\lambda_0) \cup N_{ext}(\lambda_0) \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in D_{ext}(\lambda_0).$$

Lemma B.8. *The definitions of $n_i(\lambda_0)$ and $n_e(\lambda_0)$ given in Notation B.7 coincide with the ones introduced in Section 6, and moreover we have*

$$(B.14) \quad w_i(\lambda_0) - n_i(\lambda_0) = w_e(\lambda_0) - n_e(\lambda_0) \quad \text{for every } \lambda_0 \in F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O},$$

where $w_i(\lambda_0)$ and $w_e(\lambda_0)$ denote the interior and exterior limits of wind_F at the point λ_0 . In particular, the function $\lambda \mapsto \text{wind}_F(\lambda) - n(\lambda)$ is constant on $D(\lambda_0, \alpha) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$.

Proof. Since the functions d_j are quasi-conformal, they preserve the orientation. Thus the integers $n_i(\lambda_0)$ and $n_e(\lambda_0)$ (as defined in Notation B.7) can be linked to the number of crossings at λ_0 in either direction along the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$. Indeed, since when traveling along the unit circle in the positive orientation, the disk is always located on the left side, it follows that if j belongs to $N_{int}(\lambda_0)$, then $D_{int}(\lambda_0)$ will remain on the left side of the portion $F(\gamma_j)$ of the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$, where γ_j is a small arc in \mathbb{T} centered at $d_j(\lambda_0)$. In other words, $n_i(\lambda_0)$ corresponds to the number of times we cross λ_0 while keeping the interior component on the left side (and the exterior component on the right side). Similarly, $n_e(\lambda_0)$ corresponds to the number of times we cross λ_0 while keeping the exterior component on the left side (and the interior component on the right side). Figure 51 below is an example where $n_i = 3$ and $n_e = 1$.




FIGURE 51. $n_i = 3, n_e = 1$

Recall the geometrical interpretation of the winding number (mentioned for instance in [54]) that we also used in Section 6.1: adding 1 to the winding number of a curve at a point can be interpreted as turning one more time around the point while keeping it on the left. So, we have

$$n_i - n_e = w_i - w_e \quad \text{on } F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}.$$

Since F satisfies (H3'), we have that $w_i \geq w_e \geq 0$ on $F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$, and thus, $n_i \geq n_e$, proving that the two definitions of Notation B.7 and Section 6 coincide.

Let us now prove the second assertion of Lemma B.8. Since wind_F is constant on connected components of $\sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ and since, according to Equations (B.12) and (B.13), $\lambda \mapsto n(\lambda)$ is constant on D_{int} as well as on D_{ext} , it is sufficient to prove that given $\lambda_i \in D_{int}$ and $\lambda_e \in D_{ext}$, we have

$$(B.15) \quad \text{wind}_F(\lambda_i) - n(\lambda_i) = \text{wind}_F(\lambda_e) - n(\lambda_e).$$

By Equations (B.12) and (B.13), we have

$$n_i(\lambda_0) = n(\lambda_i) - n(\lambda_0) \quad \text{and} \quad n_e(\lambda_0) = n(\lambda_e) - n(\lambda_0).$$

Equation (B.15) follows immediately by replacing $n_i(\lambda_0)$ and $n_e(\lambda_0)$ in Equation (B.14). \square

Let us now prove the key lemma of this section:

Lemma B.9. *Suppose that F satisfies (H1), (H2') and (H3'). Let $\lambda_0 \in F(\mathbb{T})$. With $\alpha = \alpha(\lambda_0)$ as above, there exists a function φ defined on $D(\lambda_0, \alpha) \times \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ such that*

- (i) *for every $\gamma, \beta > 0$ such that $\gamma + \beta = \varepsilon$, the functions $\varphi_l : \lambda \mapsto \varphi(\lambda, \cdot)$ and $1/\varphi_l$ are C^γ functions from $D(\lambda_0, \alpha)$ into $C^\beta(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$;*
- (ii) *if $\lambda \in D(\lambda_0, \alpha) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, then*

$$f_\lambda^+(z) = \varphi(\lambda, z) \prod_{j \in N(\lambda)} (z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1}) \quad \text{for every } z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}.$$

Proof. (i) Let $r_0 := \text{wind}_F(\lambda_1) + s - n(\lambda_1)$, where λ_1 is any element of $D(\lambda_0, \alpha) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$. Note that, by Lemma B.8, r_0 is well defined and does not depend of the point $\lambda_1 \in D(\lambda_0, \alpha) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$. Observe that for every $\lambda \in D(\lambda_0, \alpha)$ and every $1 \leq j \leq s$, we have $d_j(\lambda) \in U$. In particular, $d_j(\lambda) \neq 0$. Now, define a function ψ on $D(\lambda_0, \alpha) \times \mathbb{T}$ by setting, for every $(\lambda, z) \in D(\lambda_0, \alpha) \times \mathbb{T}$

$$\psi(\lambda, z) = z^{r_0} (f(z) - \lambda) \prod_{j=1}^s (z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1})^{-1} \quad \text{if } z \neq \frac{1}{d_j(\lambda)} \text{ for every } 1 \leq j \leq s$$

and

$$\psi(\lambda, z) = z^{r_0} f'(d_l(\lambda)^{-1}) \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq l}}^s (z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1})^{-1} \quad \text{if } z = \frac{1}{d_l(\lambda)} \text{ for some } 1 \leq l \leq s.$$

The function ψ does not vanish on $D(\lambda_0, \alpha) \times \mathbb{T}$. Since the functions d_j are of class C^1 on $D(\lambda_0, \alpha)$ and f is of class $C^{1+\varepsilon}$ on \mathbb{T} , it is not difficult to check that the function ψ is of class C^ε on $D(\lambda_0, \alpha) \times \mathbb{T}$. Observe also that $\text{wind}_{\psi(\lambda, \cdot)}(0) = 0$ for every $\lambda \in D(\lambda_0, \alpha)$.

Indeed, for every $\lambda \in D(\lambda_0, \alpha) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, none of the points $d_j(\lambda)^{-1}$, $1 \leq j \leq s$, belongs to \mathbb{T} (since $\tilde{F}(d_j(\lambda)) = \lambda$), and thus

$$\text{wind}_{\psi(\lambda, \cdot)}(0) = r_0 + \text{wind}_f(\lambda) + \sum_{j=1}^s \text{wind}_{(z-d_j(\lambda)^{-1})^{-1}}(0).$$

Now,

$$\text{wind}_{(z-d_j(\lambda)^{-1})^{-1}}(0) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |d_j(\lambda)| < 1 \\ -1 & \text{if } |d_j(\lambda)| > 1, \end{cases}$$

and hence

$$\text{wind}_{\psi(\lambda, \cdot)}(0) = r_0 + \text{wind}_f(\lambda) - (s - n(\lambda)).$$

Now, by Lemma B.8, $r_0 = \text{wind}_F(\lambda) + s - n(\lambda)$, and it follows that $\text{wind}_{\psi(\lambda, \cdot)}(0) = 0$. This equality being true for every $\lambda \in D(\lambda_0, \alpha) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, it remains true for $\lambda \in D(\lambda_0, \alpha) \cap F(\mathbb{T})$ by continuity. Using this, one can construct as above a determination of the logarithm of ψ , denoted by $\log \psi$, which is C^ε on $D(\lambda_0, \alpha) \times \mathbb{T}$. For every $\lambda \in D(\lambda_0, \alpha)$, set $v_\lambda = \log(\psi(\lambda, \cdot))$. According to Lemma A.6, $v_\lambda \in C^\beta(\mathbb{T})$, and $\|v_\lambda - v_\mu\|_{C^\beta(\mathbb{T})} \lesssim |\lambda - \mu|^\gamma$. Set

$$\varphi(\lambda, \cdot) = e^{P_+ v_\lambda}.$$

Recall that P_+ is a bounded map from $C^\beta(\mathbb{T})$ into itself (see Theorem A.7). For every $\lambda, \mu \in D(\lambda_0, \alpha)$, we have

$$\|P_+ v_\lambda - P_+ v_\mu\|_{C^\beta(\mathbb{T})} \lesssim \|v_\lambda - v_\mu\|_{C^\beta(\mathbb{T})} \lesssim |\lambda - \mu|^\gamma.$$

Therefore, we conclude that φ_l is of class C^γ from $D(\lambda_0, \alpha)$ into $C^\beta(\mathbb{T})$, and so into $C^\beta(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ by the Maximum Principle. Since φ does not vanish, the function $1/\varphi_l$ is also C^γ from $D(\lambda_0, \alpha)$ into $C^\beta(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$.

(ii) Let $\lambda \in D(\lambda_0, \alpha) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$. Then, for any $0 \leq j \leq s$, $d_j(\lambda) \notin \mathbb{T}$. So for every $z \in \mathbb{T}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} z^{-\text{wind}_f(\lambda)}(f(z) - \lambda) &= z^{\text{wind}_F(\lambda) - r_0} \psi(\lambda, z) \prod_{j=1}^s (z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1}) \\ &= z^{n(\lambda) - s} \psi(\lambda, z) \prod_{j=1}^s (z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1}) \\ &= z^{n(\lambda) - s} \psi(\lambda, z) \prod_{j \in N(\lambda)} (z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1}) \prod_{j \notin N(\lambda)} (z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1}) \\ &= \psi(\lambda, z) \prod_{j \in N(\lambda)} (z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1}) \prod_{j \notin N(\lambda)} (1 - z^{-1} d_j(\lambda)^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

For $\lambda \in D(\lambda_0, \alpha) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ and $z \in \mathbb{T}$, let

$$g_\lambda(z) = \log \psi(\lambda, z) + \sum_{j \in N(\lambda)} \log(z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1}) + \sum_{j \notin N(\lambda)} \log(1 - z^{-1} d_j(\lambda)^{-1}).$$

Then the function g_λ is continuous on \mathbb{T} and

$$e^{g_\lambda(z)} = z^{-\text{wind}_f(\lambda)}(f(z) - \lambda) \quad \text{for every } z \in \mathbb{T}.$$

This implies that $f_\lambda^+ = e^{P_+ g_\lambda}$ (as mentioned above, the definition of f_λ^+ as $f_\lambda^+ = e^{P_+ u_\lambda}$ does not depend of the continuous branch of the logarithm of $z^{-m}(f - \lambda)$ on \mathbb{T} that we consider). Observe that for every $j \in N(\lambda)$, $\log(z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1})$ belongs to H^p , whence it

follows that $P_+ \log(z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1}) = \log(z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1})$. On the other hand, for every $j \notin N(\lambda)$, $\log(1 - z^{-1}d_j(\lambda)^{-1})$ belongs to H_-^p , whence $P_+ \log(1 - z^{-1}d_j(\lambda)^{-1}) = 0$. Thus, for every $z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$,

$$(B.16) \quad f_\lambda^+(z) = e^{P_+ \log \psi(\lambda, z)} \exp \left(\sum_{j \in N(\lambda)} \log(z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1}) \right)$$

$$(B.17) \quad = \varphi(\lambda, z) \prod_{j \in N(\lambda)} (z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1}),$$

which proves (ii). \square

Remark B.10. It follows from Lemma B.9 that the function $(\lambda, z) \mapsto f_\lambda^+(z)$ is bounded on $D(\lambda_0, \alpha) \times \overline{\mathbb{D}}$.

B.4. Boundary relations for eigenvectors. Our aim here is to prove a boundary relation between the interior and exterior values of the eigenvectors. We start with the functions f_λ^+ . See Section 6.1 for the definitions of the interior and exterior boundary values.

Lemma B.11. *Let F be a symbol which satisfies (H1), (H2') and (H3'). For every $z \in \mathbb{D}$, the function $\lambda \mapsto f_\lambda^+(z)^{-1}$ admits interior and exterior boundary values almost everywhere on $F(\mathbb{T})$, satisfying the following relation:*

$$(B.18) \quad \left(\prod_{j \in N_{int}(\lambda)} (z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1}) \right) f_{\lambda, int}^+(z)^{-1} = \left(\prod_{j \in N_{ext}(\lambda)} (z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1}) \right) f_{\lambda, ext}^+(z)^{-1}.$$

In particular, if F satisfies (H2) rather than the more general assumption (H2'), we have

$$(B.19) \quad (z - \xi(\lambda)^{-1}) f_{\lambda, int}^+(z)^{-1} = f_{\lambda, ext}^+(z)^{-1} \quad \text{for almost every } \lambda \in F(\mathbb{T}),$$

where ξ is defined as $\xi = F^{-1}$ on $F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$.

In order to simplify the notation, we write $f_{\lambda, int}^+$ rather than $(f_\lambda^+)^{int}$ and $f_{\lambda, ext}^+$ rather than $(f_\lambda^+)^{ext}$.

Proof. Let $\lambda \in F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$. Since for $\lambda_i \in D_{int}(\lambda)$ and $\lambda_e \in D_{ext}(\lambda)$, we have $N(\lambda_i) = N(\lambda) \cup N_{int}(\lambda)$ and $N(\lambda_e) = N(\lambda) \cup N_{ext}(\lambda)$ (see Equations (B.12) and (B.13)), we can write

$$f_{\lambda_i}^+(z) = \varphi(\lambda_i, z) \prod_{j \in N(\lambda)} (z - d_j(\lambda_i)^{-1}) \prod_{j \in N_{int}(\lambda)} (z - d_j(\lambda_i)^{-1}) \quad \text{for every } z \in \mathbb{D},$$

and similarly for $f_{\lambda_e}^+$,

$$f_{\lambda_e}^+(z) = \varphi(\lambda_e, z) \prod_{j \in N(\lambda)} (z - d_j(\lambda_e)^{-1}) \prod_{j \in N_{ext}(\lambda)} ((z - d_j(\lambda_e)^{-1})) \quad \text{for every } z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

According to Lemma B.9, the function $\varphi(\cdot, z)$ is continuous on $D(\lambda_0, \alpha)$ as well as the functions d_j . Hence, letting λ_i and λ_e tend to λ in the equalities above gives that, for almost all $\lambda \in F(\mathbb{T})$ and all $z \in \mathbb{D}$, we have

$$f_{\lambda, int}^+(z) = \varphi(\lambda, z) \prod_{j \in N(\lambda)} (z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1}) \prod_{j \in N_{int}(\lambda)} (z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1})$$

and

$$f_{\lambda,ext}^+(z) = \varphi(\lambda, z) \prod_{j \in N(\lambda)} (z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1}) \prod_{j \in N_{ext}(\lambda)} (z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1}).$$

Comparing these two relations gives Equation (B.18).

Now assume that F satisfies (H2), and let $\lambda \in F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$. In this case the set J is reduced to one point, which we call j_0 , and $N_{int}(\lambda) = \{j_0\}$ while $N_{ext}(\lambda) = \emptyset$. Then $\xi(\lambda) = d_{j_0}(\lambda)$ and thus Equation (B.18) implies Equation (B.19). \square

Recalling that $N = \max\{\text{wind}_F(\lambda); \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})\}$, we set

$$\Omega_j^+ = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T}); \text{wind}_F(\lambda) > j\} \quad \text{for every } 0 \leq j \leq N-1.$$

As a direct consequence of Lemma B.11, we obtain:

Corollary B.12. *Let F satisfy (H1), (H2) and (H3'). Let $j \geq 0$. Then, for almost every $\lambda \in \overline{\Omega_{j+1}^+} \cap F(\mathbb{T}) = \partial\Omega_{j+1}^+$, we have*

$$(B.20) \quad h_{\lambda,j}^{int} - \xi(\lambda)h_{\lambda,j+1}^{int} = h_{\lambda,j}^{ext}.$$

Note that the definition of the $h_{\lambda,j}$ by $h_{\lambda,j}(z) = z^j f_{\lambda}^+(0)/f_{\lambda}^+(z)$ can be extended for every $j \geq 0$ and every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$. Then Equation (B.20) remains true for every $j \geq 0$ and almost every $\lambda \in F(\mathbb{T})$.

Proof. Using Equation (B.19), for $\lambda \in F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$ and $z \in \mathbb{D}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\lambda,j}^{ext}(z) &= z^j \frac{f_{\lambda,ext}^+(0)}{f_{\lambda,ext}^+(z)} = z^j \frac{f_{\lambda,int}^+(0)}{-\xi(\lambda)^{-1}} \frac{z - \xi(\lambda)^{-1}}{f_{\lambda,int}^+(z)} \\ &= z^j (1 - \xi(\lambda)z) \frac{f_{\lambda,int}^+(0)}{f_{\lambda,int}^+(z)} \\ &= z^j \frac{f_{\lambda,int}^+(0)}{f_{\lambda,int}^+(z)} - \xi(\lambda) z^{j+1} \frac{f_{\lambda,int}^+(0)}{f_{\lambda,int}^+(z)} \\ &= h_{\lambda,j}^{int}(z) - \xi(\lambda) h_{\lambda,j+1}^{int}(z). \end{aligned}$$

\square

Remark B.13. Under the hypothesis (H2'), the functions $h_{\lambda,j}$ also satisfy a boundary relation which can be written down rather explicitly. Indeed, we have as above

$$h_{\lambda,k}^{ext}(z) = z^k f_{\lambda,ext}^+(0) f_{\lambda,ext}^+(z)^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad h_{\lambda,k}^{int}(z) = z^k f_{\lambda,int}^+(0) f_{\lambda,int}^+(z)^{-1}$$

for almost every $\lambda \in F(\mathbb{T})$. But according to Equation (B.18), we have

$$\frac{\left(\prod_{j \in N_{int}(\lambda)} (z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1}) \right) f_{\lambda,int}^+(z)^{-1}}{\left(\prod_{j \in N_{int}(\lambda)} (-d_j(\lambda)^{-1}) \right) f_{\lambda,int}^+(0)^{-1}} = \frac{\left(\prod_{j \in N_{ext}(\lambda)} (z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1}) \right) f_{\lambda,ext}^+(z)^{-1}}{\left(\prod_{j \in N_{ext}(\lambda)} (-d_j(\lambda)^{-1}) \right) f_{\lambda,ext}^+(0)^{-1}},$$

from which it follows that for almost every $\lambda \in F(\mathbb{T})$ and every $z \in \mathbb{D}$

$$\left(\prod_{j \in N_{int}(\lambda)} (1 - d_j(\lambda)z) \right) h_{\lambda,k}^{int}(z) = \left(\prod_{j \in N_{ext}(\lambda)} (1 - d_j(\lambda)z) \right) h_{\lambda,k}^{ext}(z).$$

Let us now introduce coefficients $a_p(\lambda)$ and $b_\ell(\lambda)$ such that

$$(B.21) \quad \prod_{j \in N_{int}(\lambda)} (1 - d_j(\lambda)z) = \sum_{p=0}^{n_i(\lambda)} a_p(\lambda)z^p$$

and

$$(B.22) \quad \prod_{j \in N_{ext}(\lambda)} (1 - d_j(\lambda)z) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{n_e(\lambda)} b_\ell(\lambda)z^\ell.$$

Using the fact that $z^p h_{\lambda,k}^{int}(z) = h_{\lambda,k+p}^{int}(z)$ and $z^p h_{\lambda,k}^{ext}(z) = h_{\lambda,k+p}^{ext}(z)$ for every $k, p \geq 0$, we obtain a boundary relation of the form

$$(B.23) \quad \sum_{p=0}^{n_i(\lambda)} a_p(\lambda) h_{\lambda,k+p}^{int}(z) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{n_e(\lambda)} b_\ell(\lambda) h_{\lambda,k+\ell}^{ext}(z) \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathbb{D} \text{ and a.e. } \lambda \in F(\mathbb{T}).$$

Proceeding in a similar way, we can show that the functions F_λ^+ defined in Equation (B.6) satisfy the boundary relation

$$(B.24) \quad \prod_{j \in N_{ext}(\lambda)} (z - d_j(\lambda)) F_{\lambda,int}^+(z)^{-1} = \prod_{j \in N_{int}(\lambda)} (z - d_j(\lambda)) F_{\lambda,ext}^+(z)^{-1} \quad \text{a.e. on } F(\mathbb{T}).$$

In particular, when F satisfies (H2), we have for almost every $\lambda \in F(\mathbb{T})$ that

$$(B.25) \quad F_{\lambda,int}^+(z)^{-1} = (z - \xi(\lambda)) F_{\lambda,ext}^+(z)^{-1} \quad \text{for every } z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

B.5. The operators U and V .

B.5.1. *Definition and continuity of U .* Recall that $N = \max\{\text{wind}_F(\lambda); \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})\}$, and let $0 \leq j < N$. Given a function $g \in H^p$, denote by u_j the function defined on Ω_j^+ by

$$(B.26) \quad u_j(\lambda) = \langle g | h_{\lambda,j} \rangle_{p,q} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} g(e^{i\theta}) h_{\lambda,j}(e^{-i\theta}) d\theta \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \Omega_j^+,$$

and set

$$Ug = (u_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1}.$$

The main concern of this section is to show that the operator U is the isomorphism which implements the model for the operator T_F (Theorem B.25). We first state a few elementary properties of U .

Proposition B.14. *Let F satisfy (H1), (H2') and (H3'). Then the operator U defined above satisfies the following properties:*

- (1) for every $g \in H^p$, $0 \leq j \leq N-1$ and $\lambda \in \Omega_j^+$, we have $(UT_F g)_j(\lambda) = \lambda(Ug)_j(\lambda)$;
- (2) let $g \in H^p$ and $\lambda \in \sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$. Then g vanishes on $\ker(T_f - \lambda)$ if and only if $(Ug)_j(\lambda) = 0$ for every $0 \leq j < \text{wind}_F(\lambda)$;
- (3) let $g \in H^p$ and $0 \leq j \leq N-1$. Then the function $u_j = (Ug)_j$ is analytic on Ω_j^+ ;
- (4) let $z \in \mathbb{D}$, $0 \leq j \leq N-1$ and $\lambda \in \Omega_j^+$. Then $h_{\lambda,j}(z) = (Uk_z)_j(\lambda)$.

Proof. Let $u_j(\lambda) = (Ug)_j(\lambda) = \langle g|h_{\lambda,j} \rangle_{p,q}$. It follows from Lemma B.4 that for every $\lambda \in \Omega_j^+$, we have

$$(UT_Fg)_j(\lambda) = \langle T_Fg|h_{\lambda,j} \rangle_{p,q} = \langle g|T_F^*h_{\lambda,j} \rangle_{p,q} = \lambda \langle g|h_{\lambda,j} \rangle_{p,q} = \lambda u_j(\lambda),$$

which gives (1). Assertion (2) follows immediately from the fact that $\ker(T_F^* - \lambda) = \text{span}[h_{\lambda,k}; 0 \leq k < \text{wind}_F(\lambda)]$ (see Lemma B.4). Assertion (3) is a consequence of the fact that $\lambda \mapsto h_{\lambda,j}$ is analytic on Ω_j^+ and of the integral representation (B.26). Lastly, assertion (4) follows from (A.8). \square

A first consequence of Proposition B.14 is that the range of U is included in $\bigoplus \text{Hol}(\Omega_j^+)$ ($\text{Hol}(\Omega_j^+)$ being the set of analytic functions on Ω_j^+). Note that, by Lemma B.9, the function $\lambda \mapsto h_{\lambda,j}(z)$ belongs to $A(\Omega)$, for every connected component Ω of Ω_j^+ and every $z \in \mathbb{D}$ (recall that $A(\Omega)$ is the space of analytic functions on Ω with a continuous extension to $\bar{\Omega}$). In particular, for every $0 \leq j < N$, and every $z \in \mathbb{D}$, the function $\lambda \mapsto h_{\lambda,j}(z)$ belongs to $E^p(\Omega_j^+)$. This means that for every $z \in \mathbb{D}$, the N -tuple Uk_z lies in the space $\bigoplus E^p(\Omega_j^+)$. In the next theorem, we prove that all of the range of U is included in $\bigoplus E^p(\Omega_j^+)$, and that U is continuous from H^p into this space.

Theorem B.15. *Let F satisfy (H1), (H2') and (H3'), and let $p > 1$. Then the linear map U is well-defined and bounded from H^p into $\bigoplus_{0 \leq j \leq N-1} E^p(\Omega_j^+)$.*

The strategy of the proof is to show first that the range of U is included in $\bigoplus E^p(\Omega_j^+)$, and then the continuity of U will follow from the Closed Graph Theorem.

Proof. Let $g \in H^p$. We wish to show that for every $0 \leq j \leq N-1$, the function $u_j = (Ug)_j$ belongs to $E^p(\Omega_j^+)$. We know that it is analytic on Ω_j^+ . Going back to the definition of $E^p(\Omega_j^+)$, we see that we need to show that for every connected component Ω of $\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ contained in Ω_j^+ , there exists a sequence of rectifiable Jordan curves $(\gamma_n)_n$ contained in Ω_j^+ and tending to $\partial\Omega$ such that

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \int_{\gamma_n} |u_j(\lambda)|^p |d\lambda| < \infty.$$

Observe that

$$\int_{\gamma_n} |u_j(\lambda)|^p |d\lambda| = \int_{\gamma_n} |\langle g|z^j h_{\lambda,0} \rangle_{p,q}|^p |d\lambda| = \int_{\gamma_n} |\langle P_+(z^{-j}g)|h_{\lambda,0} \rangle_{p,q}|^p |d\lambda|.$$

Since $\Omega_j^+ \subseteq \Omega_0^+$, it is sufficient to check that whatever the choice of the function $g \in H^p$, the associated function u_0 belongs to $E^p(\Omega_0^+)$. Namely, we need to show that for every connected component Ω of $\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ contained in Ω_0^+ , there exists a sequence of rectifiable Jordan curves $(\gamma_n)_n$ contained in Ω_0^+ and tending to $\partial\Omega$ such that

$$(B.27) \quad \sup_{n \geq 1} \int_{\gamma_n} |u_0(\lambda)|^p |d\lambda| < \infty.$$

For every $\lambda \in F(\mathbb{T})$, there exists a real number $\alpha(\lambda) > 0$ such that Lemma B.9 is satisfied. Since $F(\mathbb{T})$ is compact, there exists a finite set of points $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_K$ of $F(\mathbb{T})$ and associated radii $\alpha_1 = \alpha(\lambda_1), \dots, \alpha_K = \alpha(\lambda_K) > 0$ such that $F(\mathbb{T}) \subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^K D(\lambda_k, \alpha_k)$. Remark that by Remark B.6, the ‘‘essential’’ self-intersection points in \mathcal{O} must all be

contained in the set $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_K\}$. Let Ω be a connected component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ contained in Ω_0^+ , and let $(\gamma_n)_n$ be a sequence of rectifiable Jordan curves in Ω_0^+ tending to $\partial\Omega$, with the property that $\gamma_n \subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^K D(\lambda_k, \alpha_k)$. For every $n \geq 1$ and $1 \leq k \leq K$, denote by $\gamma_{n,k}$ the set $\gamma_{n,k} = \gamma_n \cap D(\lambda_k, \alpha_k)$. In order to prove Equation (B.27), it is sufficient to check that for every $1 \leq k \leq K$, we have

$$(B.28) \quad \sup_{n \geq 1} \int_{\gamma_{n,k}} |u_0(\lambda)|^p |d\lambda| < \infty.$$

So fix $1 \leq k \leq K$ and let d_1, \dots, d_s be the functions defined in Appendix B.3 for the corresponding disk $D(\lambda_k, \alpha_k)$ (the reader should pay attention to the fact that the d_j 's depend on λ_k). Observe that the set $N(\lambda) = \{1 \leq j \leq s; |d_j(\lambda)| < 1\}$ is constant on $\Omega \cap D(\lambda_k, \alpha_k)$. We will denote by $N(\Omega)$ this set and by $n(\Omega)$ its cardinal. Using a partial fraction decomposition, for every $\lambda \in D(\lambda_k, \alpha_k)$, we can write

$$\prod_{j \in N(\Omega)} \frac{1}{z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1}} = \sum_{j \in N(\Omega)} \frac{c_j(\lambda)}{z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1}},$$

where

$$(B.29) \quad c_j(\lambda) = \prod_{\substack{\ell \neq j \\ \ell \in N(\Omega)}} \frac{1}{d_j(\lambda)^{-1} - d_\ell(\lambda)^{-1}}.$$

Recall that $h_{\lambda,0} = f_\lambda^+(0)/f_\lambda^+$. For every $\lambda \in \gamma_{n,k}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_0(\lambda) &= \langle g | f_\lambda^+(0)/f_\lambda^+ \rangle_{p,q} \\ &= f_\lambda^+(0) \sum_{j \in N(\Omega)} c_j(\lambda) \left\langle g \left| \varphi(\lambda, z)^{-1} (z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1})^{-1} \right. \right\rangle_{p,q}, \end{aligned}$$

where φ is the function given by Lemma B.9. Define a function η_j on $D(\lambda_k, \alpha_k) \times \mathbb{T}$ by setting

$$\eta_j(\lambda, z) = \frac{\varphi(\lambda, z)^{-1} - \varphi(\lambda, |d_j(\lambda)|d_j(\lambda)^{-1})^{-1}}{z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1}}, \quad \lambda \in D(\lambda_k, \alpha_k), z \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle g \left| \varphi(\lambda, z)^{-1} (z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1})^{-1} \right. \right\rangle_{p,q} &= \langle g | \eta_j(\lambda, \cdot) \rangle_{p,q} \\ &\quad + \left\langle g \left| \varphi(\lambda, |d_j(\lambda)|d_j(\lambda)^{-1})^{-1} (z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1})^{-1} \right. \right\rangle_{p,q} \\ &= \langle g | \eta_j(\lambda, \cdot) \rangle_{p,q} \\ &\quad + \varphi(\lambda, |d_j(\lambda)|d_j(\lambda)^{-1})^{-1} \left\langle g \left| (z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1})^{-1} \right. \right\rangle_{p,q} \\ &= \langle g | \eta_j(\lambda, \cdot) \rangle_{p,q} \\ &\quad - d_j(\lambda) \varphi(\lambda, |d_j(\lambda)|d_j(\lambda)^{-1})^{-1} g(d_j(\lambda)), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equation follows from Equation (A.8) and the fact that $d_j(\lambda) \in \mathbb{D}$ for every $j \in N(\Omega)$. Then

$$\left| \left\langle g \left| \varphi(\lambda, z)^{-1} (z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1})^{-1} \right. \right\rangle_{p,q} \right| \leq \|g\|_{H^p} \|\eta_j(\lambda, \cdot)\|_{L^q(\mathbb{T})} + |g(d_j(\lambda))| \sup_{D(\lambda_k, \alpha_k) \times \mathbb{T}} |1/\varphi|.$$

Note that, by Lemma B.9, the function $\lambda \mapsto f_\lambda^+(0)$ belongs to $A(\Omega \cap D(\lambda_k, \alpha_k))$ and $\sup_{D(\lambda_k, \alpha_k) \times \mathbb{T}} |1/\varphi|$ is finite. Moreover, by Equations (B.11) and (B.29), there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for every $\lambda \in D(\lambda_k, \alpha_k)$ and for every $1 \leq j \leq n_k$, we have $|c_j(\lambda)| \leq C$. Hence there exist two positive constants C_1 and C_2 such that, for every $\lambda \in \Omega \cap D(\lambda_k, \alpha_k)$,

$$(B.30) \quad |u_0(\lambda)| \leq C_1 \|g\|_{H^p} \sum_{j \in N(\Omega)} \|\eta_j(\lambda, \cdot)\|_{L^q(\mathbb{T})} + C_2 \sum_{j \in N(\Omega)} |g(d_j(\lambda))|.$$

We state separately the next estimate needed to conclude the proof. Let us point out that it is here where the condition $\varepsilon > 1/p$ comes into play. The condition $\varepsilon > 1/q$ will in its turn be needed in the proof of Theorem B.18.

Fact B.16. *There exists a constant $C_3 > 0$ such that $\|\eta_j(\lambda, \cdot)\|_{L^q(\mathbb{T})} \leq C_3$.*

Proof. Let β be such that $1/p < \beta < \varepsilon$, and set $\gamma = \varepsilon - \beta > 0$. According to Lemma B.9, the function $1/\varphi_l$ is of class C^γ from $D(\lambda_k, \alpha_k)$ into $C^\beta(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$. By Equation (A.10), there exists $M > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\lambda \in D(\lambda_k, \alpha_k)} \|1/\varphi(\lambda, \cdot)\|_{C^\beta(\overline{\mathbb{D}})} \leq M.$$

Hence we have, for every $\lambda \in D(\lambda_k, \alpha_k)$ and for every $z_1, z_2 \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$,

$$|\varphi(\lambda, z_1)^{-1} - \varphi(\lambda, z_2)^{-1}| \leq M|z_1 - z_2|^\beta.$$

Thus, for every $z \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$|\eta_j(\lambda, z)| \leq M \frac{|z - |d_j(\lambda)|d_j(\lambda)^{-1}|^\beta}{|z - d_j(\lambda)^{-1}|}.$$

It can be easily checked that for every $z \in \mathbb{T}$ and $w \in \mathbb{C}^*$, we have $\left|z - \frac{w}{|w|}\right| \leq 2|z - w|$, which gives

$$|\eta_j(\lambda, z)| \leq M2^\beta |d_j(\lambda)|^{1-\beta} \frac{1}{|1 - d_j(\lambda)z|^{1-\beta}} \leq 2M \frac{1}{|1 - d_j(\lambda)z|^{1-\beta}}.$$

Define now, for every $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, a function J_δ on \mathbb{D} by setting

$$J_\delta(z) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{|d\tau|}{|1 - \tau z|^{1+\delta}} \quad \text{for every } z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

By [35, Th. 1.7], J_δ is bounded on \mathbb{D} if $\delta < 0$. Take $\delta = q(1-\beta) - 1$; since $\beta > p^{-1} = 1 - q^{-1}$, we have $\delta < 0$. Thus we get

$$\|\eta_j(\lambda, \cdot)\|_{L^q(\mathbb{T})}^q \leq (2M)^q \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{1}{|1 - d_j(\lambda)\tau|^{q(1-\beta)}} |d\tau| = (2M)^q J_\delta(d_j(\lambda)) \leq C_3^q,$$

where $C_3 = (2M) (\sup_{z \in \mathbb{D}} |J_\delta(z)|)^{1/q} < +\infty$. This proves Fact B.16. \square

Getting back to our initial estimate of $|u_0(\lambda)|$, by combining Equation (B.30) and Fact B.16, we obtain that, for every $\lambda \in D(\lambda_k, \alpha_k)$,

$$|u_0(\lambda)| \leq C_1 C_3 n(\Omega) \|g\|_{H^p} + C_2 \sum_{j \in N(\Omega)} |g(d_j(\lambda))|.$$

Since

$$\int_{\gamma_n} |d\lambda| \longrightarrow \int_{\partial\Omega} |d\lambda| < \infty \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty,$$

in order to prove Equation (B.28) (and hence Equation (B.27)), it remains to show that

$$(B.31) \quad \sup_{n \geq 1} \int_{\gamma_{n,k}} |g(d_j(\lambda))|^p |d\lambda| < \infty.$$

Write $\gamma'_{n,k} = d_j(\gamma_{n,k})$. Using the change of variable $w = d_j(\lambda)$, or $\tilde{F}(w) = \lambda$, (remind that \tilde{F} is a C^1 diffeomorphism from $D(\lambda_k, \alpha_k)$ onto its image), we have

$$\int_{\gamma_{n,k}} |g(d_j(\lambda))|^p |d\lambda| = \int_{\gamma'_{n,k}} |g(w)|^p |J_{\tilde{F}}(w)| |dw|.$$

It follows then from Equation (B.10), that $C_4 = \sup_{n \geq 1} \sup_{w \in \gamma'_{n,k}} |J_{\tilde{F}}(w)|$ is finite, whence we get

$$\int_{\gamma_{n,k}} |g(d_j(\lambda))|^p |d\lambda| \leq C_4 \int_{\gamma'_{n,k}} |g(w)|^p |dw|.$$

Now, since $\gamma'_{n,k}$ tends to $d_j(\partial\Omega \cap D(\lambda_k, \alpha_k)) \subseteq \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ with respect to the Hausdorff measure on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, we get that, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\int_{\gamma'_{n,k}} |g(w)|^p |dw| \longrightarrow \int_{d_j(\partial\Omega \cap D(\lambda_k, \alpha_k))} |g(w)|^p |dw|.$$

Hence the proof of Equation (B.31) and thus Equation (B.27) will follow if we can prove that for every $j \in N(\Omega)$ there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for every $g \in H^p$, we have

$$(B.32) \quad \int_{d_j(\partial\Omega \cap D(\lambda_k, \alpha_k))} |g(w)|^p |dw| \leq c \|g\|_{H^p}.$$

Let Δ be a connected component of $\partial\Omega \cap D(\lambda_k, \alpha_k) \setminus \{\lambda_k\}$. There exists a closed arc $\alpha = \{e^{i\theta}; \theta_1 \leq \theta \leq \theta_2\}$ of \mathbb{T} such that F is injective on α and $\overline{\Delta} = F(\alpha)$. Then it follows that $\overline{d_j(\Delta)}$ is the image of $[0, 1]$ by the map

$$u : t \longmapsto u(t) = d_j \left(F \left(e^{it\theta_2 + (1-t)\theta_1} \right) \right).$$

Since F is a C^1 diffeomorphism from α to $\overline{\Delta}$ and d_j is a C^1 diffeomorphism from $\overline{\Delta}$ to $\overline{d_j(\Delta)}$, it follows that u is a C^1 diffeomorphism from $[0, 1]$ to $\overline{d_j(\Delta)}$ and, in particular, u is a C^1 bi-Lipschitz map from $[0, 1]$ to $\overline{d_j(\Delta)}$. Hence by Proposition A.8, there exists a constant $c_{\Delta,p} > 0$ such that

$$\int_{d_j(\Delta)} |g(w)|^p |dw| \leq c_{\Delta,p} \|g\|_{H^p}^p.$$

If we now consider all the connected components $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_m$ of $\partial\Omega \cap D(\lambda_k, \alpha_k) \setminus \{\lambda_k\}$, we get

$$\int_{d_j(\partial\Omega \cap D(\lambda_k, \alpha_k))} |g(w)|^p |dw| \leq c \|g\|_{H^p}^p,$$

where $c = \sum_{i=1}^m c_{\Delta_i,p} < +\infty$, and this proves Equation (B.32).

Finally, we can conclude that the function u_j belongs to $E^p(\Omega_j^+)$ for every $0 \leq j \leq N-1$, and thus the N -tuple $Ug = (u_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1}$ belongs to $\bigoplus E^p(\Omega_j^+)$ for every $g \in H^p$.

It remains to prove that U is a bounded operator from H^p into $\bigoplus E^p(\Omega_j^+)$. This is a consequence of the Closed Graph Theorem. Suppose that $(g_n)_n$ is a sequence of functions

in H^p such that $g_n \rightarrow 0$ in H^p and $Ug_n \rightarrow u = (u_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1}$ in $\bigoplus E^p(\Omega_j^+)$. Since convergence in $E^p(\Omega_j^+)$ implies pointwise convergence on Ω_j^+ , we have

$$\langle g_n | h_{\lambda,j} \rangle_{p,q} \rightarrow u_j(\lambda) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty \text{ for every } 0 \leq j \leq N-1 \text{ and every } \lambda \in \Omega_j^+.$$

But since $g_n \rightarrow 0$ in H^p , we also have that $\langle g_n | h_{\lambda,j} \rangle_{p,q} \rightarrow 0$, and thus $u_j(\lambda) = 0$ for every $0 \leq j \leq N-1$ and every $\lambda \in \Omega_j^+$. In other words, $u_j = 0$ for every $0 \leq j \leq N-1$, ie. $u = 0$. By the Closed Graph Theorem, this proves that U is bounded. \square

Recall that $h_{\lambda,j}(z) = (Uk_{\bar{z}})_j(\lambda)$ for every $z \in \mathbb{D}$ and every $\lambda \in \Omega_j^+$, $0 \leq j \leq N-1$. Moreover, for every $z \in \mathbb{D}$, the map $\lambda \mapsto h_{\lambda,j}(z)$ is in $E^p(\Omega_j^+)$. When assumption **(H2)** holds, the functions $h_{\lambda,j}$ satisfy the boundary relation of Equation **(B.20)**. Using the density of the linear span of the Cauchy kernels k_z , $z \in \mathbb{D}$, and the continuity of U , we will now prove that the range of U is contained in the subspace \mathcal{E}_F^p consisting of N -tuples $u = (u_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1}$ in $\bigoplus E^p(\Omega_j^+)$ satisfying the following boundary relations: for every $0 \leq j < N-1$, we have

$$(B.33) \quad u_j^{int} - \xi u_{j+1}^{int} = u_j^{ext} \quad \text{a.e. on } \partial\Omega_{j+1}^+ = \Gamma \cap \overline{\Omega_{j+1}^+} = \bigcup_{k=j+1}^N \Gamma_k^+,$$

where $\Gamma = F(\mathbb{T})$ and $\Gamma_k^+ = \partial\overline{\Omega_k^+}$ for every $0 \leq k \leq N-1$ (see Appendix **B.1**).

Lemma B.17. *Let F satisfy **(H1)**, **(H2)** and **(H3')**. Then*

- (1) \mathcal{E}_F^p is a closed subspace of $\bigoplus_{0 \leq j \leq N-1} E^p(\Omega_j^+)$;
- (2) $UH^p \subseteq \mathcal{E}_F^p$.

Proof. (1) In order to prove that \mathcal{E}_F^p is closed in $\bigoplus_{0 \leq j \leq N-1} E^p(\Omega_j^+)$, consider a sequence $u_n = (u_{n,j})_{0 \leq j \leq N-1}$ of elements of \mathcal{E}_F^p which tends to $u = (u_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1}$ in $\bigoplus E^p(\Omega_j^+)$. Then, for every $0 \leq j \leq N-1$, we have $u_{n,j} \rightarrow u_j$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, in $E^p(\Omega_j^+)$.

According to Equation **(B.3)**, recall that, for every $v \in E^p(\Omega_j^+)$, we have

$$\|v\|_{E^p(\Omega_j^+)}^p = \sum_{k=j+1}^N \|v^{int}\|_{L^p(\Gamma_{k-1}^+)}^p + \sum_{k=j+1}^N \|v^{ext}\|_{L^p(\Gamma_k^+)}^p.$$

In particular, for every $k \geq j+1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u_{n,j}^{int} - \xi u_{n,j+1}^{int} - u_{n,j}^{ext} - (u_j^{int} - \xi u_{j+1}^{int} - u_j^{ext})\|_{L^p(\Gamma_k^+)} \\ & \leq \|u_{n,j}^{int} - u_j^{int}\|_{L^p(\Gamma_k^+)} + \|\xi(u_{n,j+1}^{int} - u_{j+1}^{int})\|_{L^p(\Gamma_k^+)} + \|u_{n,j}^{ext} - u_j^{ext}\|_{L^p(\Gamma_k^+)} \\ & \lesssim 2\|u_{n,j} - u_j\|_{E^p(\Omega_j^+)} + \|u_{n,j+1} - u_{j+1}\|_{E^p(\Omega_{j+1}^+)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the sequence $(u_{n,j}^{int} - \xi u_{n,j+1}^{int} - u_{n,j}^{ext})_n$ tends to $u_j^{int} - \xi u_{j+1}^{int} - u_j^{ext}$ in $L^p(\Gamma_k^+)$. In particular, taking a sub-sequence if necessary, we may assume that

$$u_{n,j}^{int} - \xi u_{n,j+1}^{int} - u_{n,j}^{ext} \rightarrow u_j^{int} - \xi u_{j+1}^{int} - u_j^{ext} \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow +\infty, \text{ a.e. on } \Gamma_k^+.$$

But since $(u_{n,j})_{0 \leq j \leq N-1}$ belongs to \mathcal{E}_F^p , it follows that

$$u_j^{int} - \xi u_{j+1}^{int} - u_j^{ext} = 0 \quad \text{a.e. on } \Gamma_k^+,$$

which implies that u belongs to \mathcal{E}_F^p .

(2) Let $z \in \mathbb{D}$. Then, according to Proposition B.14, $Uk_{\bar{z}} = (u_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1}$ with

$$u_j(\lambda) = h_{\lambda,j}(z) \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \Omega_j^+.$$

By Corollary B.12, we have

$$h_{\lambda,j}^{int} - \xi(\lambda)h_{\lambda,j+1}^{int} = h_{\lambda,j}^{ext} \quad \text{for a.e. } \lambda \in \Gamma \cap \overline{\Omega_{j+1}^+},$$

which means that

$$u_j^{int} - \xi u_{j+1}^{int} = u_j^{ext} \quad \text{a.e. on } \Gamma \cap \overline{\Omega_{j+1}^+}.$$

In other words, $Uk_{\bar{z}}$ belongs to \mathcal{E}_F^p . The fact that $UH^p \subseteq \mathcal{E}_F^p$ follows now from the continuity of U and the density in H^p of the linear span of the functions k_z , $z \in \mathbb{D}$. \square

The aim of the remaining sections is to show that under the hypothesis (H2), the operator U is an isomorphism from H^p onto \mathcal{E}_F^p . We start by introducing another operator V which will be useful to construct the inverse of U . We will prove that this operator is also bounded under the more general hypothesis (H2'). Let us mention here that in the case where (H2') holds, it is possible, using Equation (B.23), to show that the range of U is also included in some subspace of $\bigoplus E^p(\Omega_j^+)$ defined by some boundary relations.

B.5.2. Definition and continuity of V . For every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ and every integer $m \geq n = \text{wind}_F(\lambda)$, let us define

$$(B.34) \quad G_{\lambda,m}(z) = -z^{m-n} F_{\lambda}^+(z)^{-1} \quad \text{for every } z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Recall that $N = \max\{\text{wind}_F(\lambda); \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})\}$. For every $g \in H^q$ and every $0 \leq j \leq N-1$, denote by v_j the function defined on $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus (F(\mathbb{T}) \cup \Omega_j^+)$ by

$$v_j(\lambda) = \langle G_{\lambda,j} | g \rangle_{p,q} \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus (F(\mathbb{T}) \cup \Omega_j^+),$$

and by Vg the N -tuple

$$Vg = (v_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1}.$$

It follows from Equation (B.25) that when F satisfies (H2), we have

$$(B.35) \quad G_{\lambda,j+1}^{ext} - \xi(\lambda)G_{\lambda,j}^{ext} = G_{\lambda,j+1}^{int} \quad \text{a.e. on } F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \partial\Omega_{j+1}^+ = \bigcup_{k=0}^j \Gamma_k^+,$$

for every $0 \leq j \leq N-1$. Indeed, for every $z \in \mathbb{D}$, $0 \leq k \leq j$, and for almost every $\lambda \in \Gamma_k^+$, we have

$$G_{\lambda,j}^{ext}(z) = \lim_{\substack{\mu \rightarrow \lambda \\ \mu \in \Omega_k}} G_{\mu,j}(z) = \lim_{\substack{\mu \rightarrow \lambda \\ \mu \in \Omega_k}} \left(-z^{j-k} F_{\mu}^+(z)^{-1} \right) = -z^{j-k} F_{\lambda,ext}^+(z)^{-1},$$

and

$$G_{\lambda,j+1}^{int}(z) = \lim_{\substack{\mu \rightarrow \lambda \\ \mu \in \Omega_{k+1}}} G_{\mu,j+1}(z) = \lim_{\substack{\mu \rightarrow \lambda \\ \mu \in \Omega_{k+1}}} \left(-z^{j-k} F_{\mu}^+(z)^{-1} \right) = -z^{j-k} F_{\lambda,int}^+(z)^{-1}.$$

Recall now that equation (B.25) gives

$$F_{\lambda,int}^+(z)^{-1} = (z - \xi(\lambda))F_{\lambda,ext}^+(z)^{-1} \quad \text{for every } z \in \mathbb{D},$$

from which it follows that, for every $0 \leq k \leq j$ and for almost every $\lambda \in \Gamma_k^+$

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\lambda, j+1}^{int}(z) &= -z^{j-k}(z - \xi(\lambda))F_{\lambda, ext}^+(z)^{-1} \\ &= (z - \xi(\lambda))G_{\lambda, j}^{ext}(z) \\ &= G_{\lambda, j+1}^{ext}(z) - \xi(\lambda)G_{\lambda, j}^{ext}(z), \end{aligned}$$

which proves Equation (B.35).

Theorem B.18. *Let F satisfy (H1), (H2') and (H3'). The linear map V is well-defined and bounded from H^q into the space $\bigoplus_{0 \leq j \leq N-1} E_0^q(\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus (F(\mathbb{T}) \cup \Omega_j^+))$.*

Proof. The proof is quite similar to that of Theorem B.15. The assumption $\varepsilon > 1/q$ is necessary in the present proof for exactly the same reason as the assumption $\varepsilon > 1/p$ was needed in the proof of Fact B.16. We leave the details to the reader. The only point which requires an additional explanation is the following: when showing that each function v_j belongs to $E_0^q(\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus (F(\mathbb{T}) \cup \Omega_j^+))$, we need to check that $v_j(\lambda) \rightarrow 0$ as $|\lambda| \rightarrow \infty$. So let λ be such that $|\lambda| \geq 2\|F\|_\infty$. In particular, $\text{wind}_F(\lambda) = 0$. Then for every $0 \leq j \leq N-1$, we have

$$v_j(\lambda) = \langle G_{\lambda, j} | g \rangle_{p, q} = -\langle z^j F_\lambda^+(z)^{-1} | g \rangle_{p, q}.$$

So $|v_j(\lambda)| \leq \|z^j F_\lambda^+(z)^{-1}\|_p \|g\|_q$, and we need to bound the quantities $\|z^j F_\lambda^+(z)^{-1}\|_p$ for $|\lambda| \geq 2\|F\|_\infty$ in a suitable way.

We have $F_\lambda^+(z)^{-1} = \frac{1}{F(1)-\lambda} e^{-V_\lambda(z)}$, where

$$V_\lambda(z) = P_+ U_\lambda(z) = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{U_\lambda(\tau)}{\tau - z} d\tau \quad \text{for every } z \in \mathbb{D}$$

and

$$U_\lambda(e^{is}) = \int_0^s i e^{it} \frac{\psi'_\lambda(e^{it})}{\psi_\lambda(e^{it})} dt \quad \text{for every } s \in [0, 2\pi).$$

Since we have here $\psi_\lambda(z) = F(z) - \lambda$, $z \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$U_\lambda(e^{is}) = \int_0^s i e^{it} \frac{F'(e^{it})}{F(e^{it}) - \lambda} dt \quad \text{for every } s \in [0, 2\pi).$$

Hence for $|\lambda| \geq 2\|F\|_\infty$ and $s, \theta \in [0, 2\pi)$, we have

$$(B.36) \quad |U_\lambda(e^{is}) - U_\lambda(e^{i\theta})| = \left| \int_\theta^s i e^{it} \frac{F'(e^{it})}{F(e^{it}) - \lambda} dt \right| \leq \frac{\|F'\|_\infty}{\|F\|_\infty} |s - \theta| \leq C_1 |e^{i\theta} - e^{it}|,$$

where the constant C_1 does not depend of λ .

Now, for $t \in [0, 2\pi)$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, denote by $v_{\lambda, t}(x) = V_\lambda(xe^{it})$, $x \in [0, 1)$. Then, for every $0 < r < 1$ and $t \in [0, 2\pi)$, we have

$$V_\lambda(re^{it}) = V_\lambda(0) + \int_0^r v'_{\lambda, t}(x) dx$$

with

$$v'_{\lambda, t}(x) = \frac{e^{it}}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{e^{i\theta} U_\lambda(e^{i\theta})}{(e^{i\theta} - xe^{it})^2} d\theta.$$

Since

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{e^{i\theta}}{(e^{i\theta} - xe^{it})^2} d\theta = 0 \quad \text{for every } x \in (0, 1),$$

we deduce that

$$v'_{\lambda,t}(x) = \frac{e^{it}}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{e^{i\theta}(U_\lambda(e^{i\theta}) - U_\lambda(e^{it}))}{(e^{i\theta} - xe^{it})^2} d\theta,$$

and thus, by Equation (B.36), we have

$$|v'_{\lambda,t}(x)| \leq \frac{C_1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{|e^{i\theta} - e^{it}|}{|e^{i\theta} - xe^{it}|^2} d\theta.$$

Now, the estimate $|1 - e^{i(t-\theta)}| \leq 2|1 - xe^{i(t-\theta)}|$ yields that

$$(B.37) \quad |v'_{\lambda,t}(x)| \leq \frac{C_1}{\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1}{|1 - xe^{i(t-\theta)}|} d\theta.$$

In order to estimate the integral on the right-hand side, we consider separately the cases $0 < x \leq 1/2$ and $1/2 < x \leq 1$. For $0 < x \leq 1/2$, we have $|1 - xe^{i(t-\theta)}| \geq 1 - x \geq 1/2$, whence

$$(B.38) \quad |v'_{\lambda,t}(x)| \leq 4C_1.$$

On the other hand, according to [13, Lemma 1.12.3], there exists a constant C_2 independent of $x \in (1/2, 1)$ such that

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1}{|1 - xe^{i(t-\theta)}|} d\theta \leq -C_2 \log(1-x) \quad \text{for every } t \in [0, 2\pi) \text{ and } x \in (1/2, 1),$$

whence it follows that

$$(B.39) \quad |v'_{\lambda,t}(x)| \leq -C_3 \log(1-x) \quad \text{for every } x \in (1/2, 1).$$

Therefore, putting together the estimates Equations (B.38) and (B.39), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |V_\lambda(re^{it})| &\leq |V_\lambda(0)| + \int_0^r |v'_{\lambda,t}(x)| dx \\ &\leq |V_\lambda(0)| + \int_0^{1/2} |v'_{\lambda,t}(x)| dx + \int_{1/2}^1 |v'_{\lambda,t}(x)| dx \\ &\leq |V_\lambda(0)| + 2C_1 - C_2 \int_{1/2}^1 \log(1-x) dx \\ &= |V_\lambda(0)| + 2C_1 - C_2 \int_0^{1/2} \log(x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

We are now close to our goal. Observe that

$$|U_\lambda(e^{is})| \leq \int_0^s \frac{|F'(e^{it})|}{|F(e^{it}) - \lambda|} dt \leq \frac{\|F'\|_\infty}{\|F\|_\infty} 2\pi =: C_3,$$

and it follows from this estimate that

$$|V_\lambda(0)| = |\widehat{U}_\lambda(0)| \leq \|U_\lambda\|_\infty \leq C_3.$$

Finally, if we take $C_4 = C_3 + 2C_1 - C_2 \int_0^{1/2} \log(x) dx < \infty$, we see that for every $z \in \mathbb{D}$, and every $|\lambda| \geq 2\|F\|_\infty$, we have

$$|V_\lambda(z)| \leq C_4.$$

Therefore

$$|F_\lambda^+(z)^{-1}| = \frac{1}{|F(1) - \lambda|} e^{-\operatorname{Re}(V_\lambda(z))} \leq \frac{1}{|F(1) - \lambda|} e^{|V_\lambda(z)|} \leq \frac{e^{C_4}}{|F(1) - \lambda|},$$

where the constant C_4 is independent of λ . We thus get

$$|v_j(\lambda)| \leq \|z^j F_\lambda^+(z)^{-1}\|_p \|g\|_q \leq \frac{e^{C_4}}{|F(1) - \lambda|} \|g\|_q,$$

from which we conclude that $v_j(\lambda) \rightarrow 0$ as $|\lambda| \rightarrow \infty$. This terminates the proof of the boundedness of V . \square

B.5.3. Left invertibility of U . From now on, we will assume that F satisfies (H1), (H2) and (H3').

In order to show that U is left-invertible as an operator from H^p into \mathcal{E}_F^p , we will embed the range of U into the space $L^p(\Gamma)$ and the range of V into the space $L^q(\Gamma)$, where

$$\Gamma = F(\mathbb{T}) = \bigcup_{j=0}^{N-1} \Gamma_j^+.$$

Given $u = (u_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1} \in \bigoplus_{0 \leq j \leq N-1} E^p(\Omega_j^+)$, we define a function $\pi_{int}(u)$ on Γ by setting

$$\pi_{int}(u)(\lambda) = u_j^{int}(\lambda) \quad \text{for a.e. } \lambda \in \Gamma_j^+, \quad 0 \leq j \leq N-1,$$

and similarly for $v = (v_j)_{j \geq N} \in \bigoplus_{0 \leq j \leq N-1} E_0^q(\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus (F(\mathbb{T}) \cup \Omega_j^+))$, we define a function $\pi_{ext}(v)$ on Γ by setting

$$\pi_{ext}(v)(\lambda) = v_j^{ext}(\lambda) \quad \text{for a.e. } \lambda \in \Gamma_j^+, \quad 0 \leq j \leq N-1.$$

The duality between $L^p(\Gamma)$ and $L^q(\Gamma)$ is given by

$$[\tilde{u}|\tilde{v}]_{p,q} = \int_{\Gamma} \tilde{u}(\lambda) \tilde{v}(\lambda) d\lambda \quad \text{for every } \tilde{u} \in L^p(\Gamma), \tilde{v} \in L^q(\Gamma).$$

Lemma B.19. *Let $\Gamma = F(\mathbb{T})$. The operator π_{int} is bounded from $\bigoplus_{0 \leq j \leq N-1} E^p(\Omega_j^+)$ into $L^p(\Gamma)$ and the operator π_{ext} is bounded from $\bigoplus_{0 \leq j \leq N-1} E_0^q(\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus (F(\mathbb{T}) \cup \Omega_j^+))$ into $L^q(\Gamma)$. Moreover, we have*

$$(B.40) \quad [\pi_{int}u|\pi_{ext}v]_{p,q} = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \int_{\Gamma_j^+} u_j^{int}(\lambda) v_j^{ext}(\lambda) d\lambda.$$

for every $u \in \bigoplus_{0 \leq j \leq N-1} E^p(\Omega_j^+)$ and every $v \in \bigoplus_{0 \leq j \leq N-1} E_0^q(\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus (F(\mathbb{T}) \cup \Omega_j^+))$.

Proof. Let $u = (u_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1} \in \bigoplus_{0 \leq j \leq N-1} E^p(\Omega_j^+)$. Note that according to Equation (B.3), we have

$$\|u_j^{int}\|_{L^p(\Gamma_j^+)}^p \leq \|u_j\|_{E^p(\Omega_j^+)}^p.$$

Thus we get

$$\|\pi_{int}u\|_{L^p(\Gamma)}^p = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \|u_j^{int}\|_{L^p(\Gamma_j^+)}^p \leq \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \|u_j\|_{E^p(\Omega_j^+)}^p = \|u\|^p,$$

where the norm of u is taken in the space $\bigoplus_{0 \leq j \leq N-1} E^p(\Omega_j^+)$. This shows that the operator π_{int} is bounded. A similar argument shows that π_{ext} is bounded too.

Now, since $\bigcup_{j=0}^{N-1} \Gamma_j^+$ is a partition of Γ (up to a finite set of points) we have

$$\begin{aligned} [\pi_{int}u | \pi_{ext}v]_{p,q} &= \frac{1}{2i\pi} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \int_{\Gamma_j^+} \pi_{int}(u)(\lambda) \pi_{ext}(v)(\lambda) d\lambda \\ &= \frac{1}{2i\pi} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \int_{\Gamma_j^+} u_j^{int}(\lambda) v_j^{ext}(\lambda) d\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

which gives Equation (B.40) and ends the proof of the lemma. \square

Now we can prove that U is left-invertible on H^p .

Theorem B.20. *Let F satisfy (H1), (H2) and (H3'). For every $g_1 \in H^p$ and every $g_2 \in H^q$, we have*

$$(B.41) \quad [\pi_{int}Ug_1 | \pi_{ext}Vg_2]_{p,q} = \langle g_1 | g_2 \rangle_{p,q}.$$

In particular, we have

$$(\pi_{ext}V)^* \pi_{int}U = I_{H^p}.$$

Proof. Since π_{int} , π_{ext} , U and V are bounded operators on their respective domains by Lemma B.19 and Theorems B.15 and B.18 respectively, it is sufficient to check Equation (B.41) for two Cauchy kernels g_1 and g_2 (remember that the linear span of Cauchy kernels k_z , $z \in \mathbb{D}$, is dense both in H^p and in H^q). So let $g_1 = k_{z_1}$ and $g_2 = k_{z_2}$, where $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{D}$. By Equation (A.8), we have $Uk_{z_1} = (u_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1}$ with

$$u_j(\lambda) = \langle k_{z_1} | h_{\lambda,j} \rangle_{p,q} = h_{\lambda,j}(z_1) \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \Omega_j^+, 0 \leq j \leq N-1$$

and $Vk_{z_2} = (v_j)_{j \geq N}$ with

$$v_j(\lambda) = \langle G_{\lambda,j} | k_{z_2} \rangle_{p,q} = G_{\lambda,j}(z_2) \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus (F(\mathbb{T}) \cap \Omega_j^+), 0 \leq j \leq N-1.$$

As already noted in Appendix B.1, the interior component at a point $\lambda \in \Gamma_j^+$ is a connected component of Ω_j^+ , and the exterior component is a connected component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus (F(\mathbb{T}) \cup \Omega_j^+)$. Thus we have $u_j^{int}(\lambda) = h_{\lambda,j}^{int}(z_1)$ and $v_j^{ext}(\lambda) = G_{\lambda,j}^{ext}(z_2)$. By Equation (B.40), we have

$$(B.42) \quad [\pi_{int}Uk_{z_1} | \pi_{ext}Vk_{z_2}]_{p,q} = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \int_{\Gamma_j^+} h_{\lambda,j}^{int}(z_1) G_{\lambda,j}^{ext}(z_2) d\lambda.$$

Recalling that the functions $h_{\lambda,j}$ are defined for $\lambda \in \Omega_j^+$ as $h_{\lambda,j}(z) = z^j f_\lambda^+(0) / f_\lambda^+(z)$, $z \in \mathbb{D}$, we observe that this definition can in fact be extended to any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ (although the resulting functions are not eigenvectors of T_F^* anymore) and they also satisfies the boundary relation Equation (B.20) almost everywhere also on Γ .

Recall now, that for $0 \leq j \leq N$, we denote by Ω_j the set

$$\Omega_j = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T}); \text{wind}_F(\lambda) = j\}.$$

Since wind_F is locally constant on $\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, the sets Ω_j are open sets and they form a partition of $\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$. We can now define an analytic function on $\mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$ by setting

$$\Phi(\lambda) = h_{\lambda,j}(z_1) G_{\lambda,j}(z_2) \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \Omega_j, 0 \leq j \leq N.$$

For $0 \leq j \leq N-1$ and $\lambda \in \Gamma_j^+$, according to Equation (B.2), we have

$$\Phi^{int}(\lambda) = \lim_{\substack{\mu \rightarrow \lambda \\ \mu \in \Omega_{j+1}}} \Phi(\mu) = \lim_{\substack{\mu \rightarrow \lambda \\ \mu \in \Omega_{j+1}}} h_{\mu,j+1}(z_1) G_{\mu,j+1}(z_2) = h_{\lambda,j+1}^{int}(z_1) G_{\lambda,j+1}^{int}(z_2),$$

and similarly

$$\Phi^{ext}(\lambda) = \lim_{\substack{\mu \rightarrow \lambda \\ \mu \in \Omega_j}} \Phi(\mu) = \lim_{\substack{\mu \rightarrow \lambda \\ \mu \in \Omega_j}} h_{\mu,j}(z_1)G_{\mu,j}(z_2) = h_{\lambda,j}^{ext}(z_1)G_{\lambda,j}^{ext}(z_2).$$

Observe that, for almost every $\lambda \in \Gamma_j^+$, we have

$$h_{\lambda,j}^{int}(z_1)(1 - z_1\xi(\lambda)) = h_{\lambda,j}^{ext}(z_1),$$

whence

$$h_{\lambda,j+1}^{int}(z_1) = \frac{z_1}{1 - z_1\xi(\lambda)} h_{\lambda,j}^{ext}(z_1).$$

On the other hand, Equation (B.35) gives that for almost every $\lambda \in \Gamma_j^+$, we also have

$$G_{\lambda,j+1}^{int}(z_2) = (z_2 - \xi(\lambda))G_{\lambda,j}^{ext}(z_2).$$

Thus

$$\Phi^{int}(\lambda) = \frac{z_1(z_2 - \xi(\lambda))}{1 - z_1\xi(\lambda)} h_{\lambda,j}^{ext}(z_1) \cdot G_{\lambda,j}^{ext}(z_2),$$

and we obtain that

$$(B.43) \quad \Phi^{int}(\lambda_0) = \frac{z_1(z_2 - \xi(\lambda_0))}{1 - z_1\xi(\lambda_0)} \Phi^{ext}(\lambda_0) \quad \text{for a.e. } \lambda_0 \in \Gamma.$$

For $0 \leq j \leq N-1$, let now $(K_n)_n$ be a sequence of compact sets contained in Ω_{j+1} such that K_n converges to Ω_{j+1} . Let $\gamma_n = \partial K_n$, and consider the positive orientation on γ_n ; that is, when we travel along the curve γ_n , the compact set K_n remains on the left side.

By Cauchy's Theorem, since Φ is analytic on Ω_{j+1} , we have

$$\frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\gamma_n} \Phi(\lambda) d\lambda = 0.$$

Moreover, using Equation (B.4) as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\gamma_n} \Phi(\lambda) d\lambda \longrightarrow \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_j^+} \Phi^{int}(\lambda) d\lambda - \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_{j+1}^+} \Phi^{ext}(\lambda) d\lambda,$$

whence

$$(B.44) \quad \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_{j+1}^+} \Phi^{ext}(\lambda) d\lambda - \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_j^+} \Phi^{int}(\lambda) d\lambda = 0,$$

where the integral over Γ_{j+1}^+ should be replaced by 0 when $j = N-1$ (recall that $\Gamma_N^+ = \emptyset$).

Plugging Equation (B.43) into Equation (B.44), we get that for every $0 \leq j \leq N-1$,

$$\frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_{j+1}^+} \Phi^{ext}(\lambda) d\lambda - \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_j^+} \frac{z_1(z_2 - \xi(\lambda))}{1 - z_1\xi(\lambda)} \Phi^{ext}(\lambda) d\lambda = 0.$$

Remarking that $\frac{z_1(z_2 - \xi(\lambda))}{1 - z_1\xi(\lambda)} = \frac{z_1z_2 - 1}{1 - z_1\xi(\lambda)} + 1$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_{j+1}^+} \Phi^{ext}(\lambda) d\lambda - \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_j^+} \Phi^{ext}(\lambda) d\lambda = \frac{z_1z_2 - 1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_j^+} \frac{\Phi^{ext}(\lambda)}{1 - z_1\xi(\lambda)} d\lambda.$$

Summing over $0 \leq j \leq N-1$ yields

$$(B.45) \quad \frac{1 - z_1z_2}{2i\pi} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \int_{\Gamma_j^+} \frac{\Phi^{ext}(\lambda)}{1 - z_1\xi(\lambda)} d\lambda = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_0^+} \Phi^{ext}(\lambda) d\lambda.$$

Let us now compute the right-hand side integral in Equation (B.45). Since the winding number of the curve Γ_0^+ at the point ∞ is equal to -1 , the Residue Theorem implies that

$$\frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_0^+} \Phi^{ext}(\lambda) d\lambda = -\text{Res}_\infty(\Phi),$$

where $\text{Res}_\infty(\Phi)$ is the residue of Φ at infinity. Let us now check that $\text{Res}_\infty(\Phi) = -1$.

Going back to the definitions of the functions $h_{\lambda,j}$ and $G_{\lambda,j}$, we see that $\Phi(\lambda)$ can also be written as

$$\Phi(\lambda) = -z_1^{\text{wind}_F(\lambda)} f_\lambda^+(0) f_\lambda^+(z_1)^{-1} F_\lambda^+(z_2)^{-1}.$$

Now, for $|\lambda|$ sufficient large, using the definitions of f_λ^+ and F_λ^+ , we have

$$\Phi(\lambda) = -\frac{1}{F(1) - \lambda} \exp\left(-\frac{z_1}{2i\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{u_\lambda(\tau)}{\tau(\tau - z_1)} d\tau - \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{U_\lambda(\tau)}{\tau - z_2} d\tau\right).$$

Hence we deduce that for $|\lambda|$ sufficiently small,

$$(B.46) \quad -\frac{1}{\lambda^2} \Phi\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{1}{\lambda F(1) - 1} \exp\left(-\frac{z_1}{2i\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{u_{\frac{1}{\lambda}}(\tau)}{\tau(\tau - z_1)} d\tau - \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{U_{\frac{1}{\lambda}}(\tau)}{\tau - z_2} d\tau\right).$$

Note now that

$$u_{\frac{1}{\lambda}}(e^{is}) = \int_0^s ie^{it} \frac{f'(e^{it})}{f(e^{it}) - \frac{1}{\lambda}} dt = \lambda \int_0^s \frac{ie^{it} f'(e^{it})}{\lambda f(e^{it}) - 1} dt,$$

and that we have a similar formula for $U_{\frac{1}{\lambda}}(e^{is})$. Hence the function

$$\lambda \mapsto -\frac{z_1}{2i\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{u_{\frac{1}{\lambda}}(\tau)}{\tau(\tau - z_1)} d\tau - \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{U_{\frac{1}{\lambda}}(\tau)}{\tau - z_2} d\tau$$

is analytic in a neighborhood of zero and vanishes at zero. Therefore it follows from Equation (B.46) that

$$\text{Res}_\infty(\Phi) = \text{Res}_0\left(-\frac{1}{\lambda^2} \Phi\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)\right) = -1.$$

Thus Equation (B.45) reads now as

$$(B.47) \quad \frac{1 - z_1 z_2}{2i\pi} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \int_{\Gamma_j^+} \frac{\Phi^{ext}(\lambda)}{1 - z_1 \xi(\lambda)} d\lambda = 1.$$

As already noted, for almost every $\lambda \in \Gamma_j^+$, we have $\Phi^{ext}(\lambda) = h_{\lambda,j}^{ext}(z_1) G_{\lambda,j}^{ext}(z_2)$. On the other hand, according to Corollary B.12, we have $(1 - \xi(\lambda)z) h_{\lambda,j}^{int}(z) = h_{\lambda,j}^{ext}(z)$, whence it follows that

$$\frac{\Phi^{ext}(\lambda)}{1 - z_1 \xi(\lambda)} = (1 - z_1 \xi(\lambda))^{-1} h_{\lambda,j}^{ext}(z_1) G_{\lambda,j}^{ext}(z_2) = h_{\lambda,j}^{int}(z_1) G_{\lambda,j}^{ext}(z_2).$$

Thus

$$\frac{1 - z_1 z_2}{2i\pi} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \int_{\Gamma_j^+} h_{\lambda,j}^{int}(\lambda)(z_1) G_{\lambda,j}^{ext}(z_2) d\lambda = 1$$

by Equation (B.47). Combining this with Equations (A.8) and (B.42), we can conclude that

$$[\pi_{int} U k_{z_1} | \pi_{ext} V k_{z_2}]_{p,q} = \frac{1}{1 - z_1 z_2} = \langle k_{z_1} | k_{z_2} \rangle_{p,q},$$

which proves the result we were looking for. \square

Theorem B.20 implies that when F satisfies assumptions (H1), (H2) and (H3'), the operator U is an isomorphism onto its range.

B.5.4. Right invertibility of U . Recall that $\text{Ran}(U) \subseteq \mathcal{E}_F^p$ and that we proved in the previous subsection that U is one to one from H^p into \mathcal{E}_F^p . Our goal here is to prove that $\text{Ran}(U) = \mathcal{E}_F^p$, i.e. that the operator U is surjective from H^p to \mathcal{E}_F^p . To prove this, we will check that the left-inverse of U obtained in the previous subsection is also the right-inverse of U . This statement is given by the following theorem.

Theorem B.21. *Assume that F satisfies (H1), (H2) and (H3'). Then for every $u \in \mathcal{E}_F^p$, we have $U(\pi_{\text{ext}}V)^*\pi_{\text{int}}(u) = u$.*

In order to prove this theorem, the first step is to describe explicitly $(\pi_{\text{ext}}V)^*\pi_{\text{int}}$, which is done in the next result.

Lemma B.22. *For every $u = (u_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1} \in \bigoplus_{j=0}^{N-1} E^p(\Omega_j^+)$ and every $z \in \mathbb{D}$, we have*

$$((\pi_{\text{ext}}V)^*\pi_{\text{int}}u)(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_j^+} u_j^{\text{int}}(\lambda) G_{\lambda,j}^{\text{ext}}(z) d\lambda.$$

Proof. Fix $z \in \mathbb{D}$. According to Equation (A.8), we have

$$((\pi_{\text{ext}}V)^*\pi_{\text{int}}u)(z) = \langle k_{\bar{z}} | (\pi_{\text{ext}}V)^*\pi_{\text{int}}u \rangle_{p,q} = [\pi_{\text{ext}}V k_{\bar{z}} | \pi_{\text{int}}u]_{p,q}.$$

As we already observed in the proof of Theorem B.20, we have

$$(\pi_{\text{ext}}V k_{\bar{z}})(\lambda) = G_{\lambda,j}^{\text{ext}}(z) \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \Gamma_j^+.$$

Hence

$$((\pi_{\text{ext}}V)^*\pi_{\text{int}}u)(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_j^+} u_j^{\text{int}}(\lambda) G_{\lambda,j}^{\text{ext}}(z) d\lambda. \quad \square$$

In order to check that for every $u \in \mathcal{E}_F^p$, we have $U(\pi_{\text{ext}}V)^*\pi_{\text{int}}(u) = u$, we need to introduce a family of polynomials orthogonal to eigenvectors of T_F^* .

For every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \Gamma$, and every integer $m \geq 0$, define

$$(B.48) \quad \rho_{\lambda,m} = P_+(z^m F_\lambda^-),$$

where we recall that F_λ^{-1} is the function defined in Equation (B.6). By Equations (B.8) and (B.34), we have for every $m \geq \text{wind}_F(\lambda) = n$

$$(B.49) \quad \begin{aligned} (\lambda - T_F)G_{\lambda,m} &= (T_F - \lambda)(z^{m-n}(F_\lambda^+)^{-1}) = T_{F_\lambda^-}(F_\lambda^+ z^n z^{m-n}(F_\lambda^+)^{-1}) \\ &= P_+(z^m F_\lambda^-) = \rho_{\lambda,m}. \end{aligned}$$

Fix $m \geq 0$. By Lemma B.3, we have

$$(B.50) \quad \rho_{\lambda,m} = P_+ \left(z^m \frac{f_\lambda^+(1/z)}{f_\lambda^+(0)} \right) = P_+(z^m h_{\lambda,0}(z^{-1})^{-1}),$$

where we still denote by $h_{\lambda,0}$ the function $h_{\lambda,0}(z) = f_\lambda^+(0)/f_\lambda^+(z)$, $z \in \mathbb{D}$, even if $\text{wind}_F(\lambda) = 0$. Since $h_{\lambda,0}^{-1}$ belongs to $A(\mathbb{D})$, we can expand $h_{\lambda,0}^{-1}$ as a series

$$h_{\lambda,0}(z)^{-1} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} p_j(\lambda) z^j,$$

where the sequence $(p_j(\lambda))_{j \geq 0}$ belongs to $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$. Then

$$(B.51) \quad \rho_{\lambda,m}(z) = P_+ \left(z^m \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} p_j(\lambda) z^{-j} \right) = \sum_{\ell=0}^m p_{m-\ell}(\lambda) z^\ell.$$

In particular, we see that for fixed $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \Gamma$ and $m \geq 0$, the function $z \mapsto \rho_{\lambda,m}(z)$ is a polynomial of degree m (observe that $p_0(\lambda) = h_{\lambda,0}(0)^{-1} = 1$).

Lemma B.23. *For every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \Gamma$, every $m \geq 0$ and every $j \geq 0$, we have*

$$\langle z^j h_{\lambda,0} | \rho_{\lambda,m} \rangle_{p,q} = \delta_{j,m},$$

where $\delta_{j,m} = 1$ if $j = m$ and $\delta_{j,m} = 0$ if $j \neq m$.

Proof. According to Equation (B.50), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle z^j h_{\lambda,0} | \rho_{\lambda,m} \rangle_{p,q} &= \langle z^j h_{\lambda,0} | P_+(z^m h_{\lambda,0}(z^{-1})^{-1}) \rangle_{p,q} \\ &= \langle z^j h_{\lambda,0} | z^m h_{\lambda,0}(z^{-1})^{-1} \rangle_{p,q} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} e^{ij\theta} h_{\lambda,0}(e^{i\theta}) e^{-im\theta} h_{\lambda,0}(e^{i\theta})^{-1} d\theta \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} e^{i(j-m)\theta} d\theta = \delta_{j,m}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Observe that, according to Lemma B.1, for a fixed $z \in \mathbb{D}$, the function $\lambda \mapsto \rho_{\lambda,m}(z)$ is analytic on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Gamma$. Moreover, since

$$(B.52) \quad p_j(\lambda) = \langle h_{\lambda,0}(z)^{-1} | z^j \rangle_{p,q} = \left\langle \frac{f_\lambda^+}{f_\lambda^+(0)} \middle| z^j \right\rangle_{p,q},$$

using Remark B.10 and Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, we see that for each component Ω of $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \Gamma$, the functions p_j admit continuous extensions to $\partial\Omega$.

According to Corollary B.12 (recall that F satisfies (H2)), we have

$$h_{\lambda,0}^{ext}(z)^{-1} (1 - z\xi(\lambda)) = h_{\lambda,0}^{int}(z)^{-1} \quad \text{a.e. on } \Gamma.$$

Remark that this is exactly the boundary relation of Corollary B.12 written for $j = 0$, except for the fact that in Corollary B.12 it is valid on $\partial\Omega_1^+$ only. But extending $h_{\lambda,0}$ to $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Gamma$ as we did above, we see that it is actually valid almost everywhere on Γ .

Hence by Equation (B.52), we have for every $0 \leq j \leq N-1$ that

$$p_{j+1}^{ext} - \xi p_j^{ext} = p_{j+1}^{int} \quad \text{a.e. on } \Gamma.$$

Plugging this equality into Equation (B.51), we get

$$(B.53) \quad \rho_{\lambda,j+1}^{ext}(z) - \xi(\lambda) \rho_{\lambda,j}^{ext}(z) = \rho_{\lambda,j+1}^{int}(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{D} \quad \text{for a.e. } \lambda \in \Gamma.$$

Moreover, since p_l belongs to $A(\Omega)$ for every connected component Ω of $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \Gamma$, Equation (B.51) implies that for a fixed $z \in \mathbb{D}$, the function $\lambda \mapsto \rho_{\lambda,j}(z)$ lies in $E^q(\Omega_0^+)$ for every $j \geq 0$.

Since $\rho_{\lambda,0}(z) = p_0(\lambda) = h_{\lambda,0}(0)^{-1} = 1$ for every $z \in \mathbb{D}$, we also have have

$$(B.54) \quad \rho_{\lambda,0}^{int} = \rho_{\lambda,0}^{ext}.$$

Lemma B.24. *Let F satisfy (H1), (H2) and (H3'). Let $u \in \mathcal{E}_F^p$ and $z \in \mathbb{D}$. Fix also $0 \leq n \leq N-1$ and a point $\mu \in \Omega_{n+1}$. Then*

$$\sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_m^+} \frac{u_m^{int}(\lambda) \rho_{\lambda,m}^{ext}(z)}{\lambda - \mu} d\lambda = \sum_{j=0}^n u_j(\mu) \rho_{\mu,j}(z).$$

Proof. Fix $z \in \mathbb{D}$ and $\mu \in \Omega_{n+1}$. In order to simplify the notation, we write $\tilde{v}_j(\lambda) = \rho_{\lambda,j}(z)$ and (although these formula do not necessarily correspond to boundary values of functions in a Smirnov space)

$$v_j^{ext}(\lambda) = \frac{\tilde{v}_j^{ext}(\lambda)}{\lambda - \mu}, \quad v_j^{int}(\lambda) = \frac{\tilde{v}_j^{int}(\lambda)}{\lambda - \mu}, \quad w_j^{int} = u_j^{int} v_j^{int} \quad \text{and} \quad w_j^{ext} = u_j^{ext} v_j^{ext}.$$

Since $u \in \mathcal{E}_F^p$, we have for every $0 \leq j \leq N-1$,

$$u_j^{int} = u_j^{ext} + \xi u_{j+1}^{int} \quad \text{a.e. on } \Gamma \cap \overline{\Omega_{j+1}^+} = \bigcup_{k=j+1}^N \Gamma_k^+,$$

and, according to Equation (B.53),

$$v_{j+1}^{ext} - v_{j+1}^{int} = \xi v_j^{ext} \quad \text{a.e. on } \Gamma.$$

Hence we have almost everywhere on $\Gamma \cap \overline{\Omega_{j+1}^+}$

$$u_j^{int} v_j^{ext} = u_j^{ext} v_j^{ext} + \xi v_j^{ext} u_{j+1}^{int} = u_j^{ext} v_j^{ext} + (v_{j+1}^{ext} - v_{j+1}^{int}) u_{j+1}^{int},$$

which gives

$$u_j^{int} v_j^{ext} - u_{j+1}^{int} v_{j+1}^{ext} + w_{j+1}^{int} = w_j^{ext} \quad \text{a.e. on } \Gamma \cap \overline{\Omega_{j+1}^+}.$$

Let $0 \leq m \leq N-1$. Summing these equalities for $0 \leq j \leq m-1$, and remembering that $\Omega_m^+ \subseteq \Omega_j^+$, we obtain

$$u_0^{int} v_0^{ext} - u_m^{int} v_m^{ext} + \sum_{j=1}^m w_j^{int} = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} w_j^{ext} \quad \text{a.e. on } \Gamma \cap \overline{\Omega_m^+},$$

that is

$$u_m^{int} v_m^{ext} = u_0^{int} v_0^{ext} + \sum_{j=1}^m w_j^{int} - \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} w_j^{ext} \quad \text{a.e. on } \Gamma \cap \overline{\Omega_m^+}.$$

Denote by I the integral

$$I = \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_m^+} \frac{u_m^{int}(\lambda) \rho_{m,\lambda}^{ext}(z)}{\lambda - \mu} d\lambda.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
I &= \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_m^+} u_0^{int}(\lambda) v_0^{ext}(\lambda) d\lambda + \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2i\pi} \sum_{j=1}^m \int_{\Gamma_m^+} w_j^{int}(\lambda) d\lambda \\
&\quad - \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2i\pi} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \int_{\Gamma_m^+} w_j^{ext}(\lambda) d\lambda \\
&= \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_m^+} u_0^{int}(\lambda) v_0^{ext}(\lambda) d\lambda + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \sum_{m=j}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_m^+} w_j^{int}(\lambda) d\lambda \\
&\quad - \sum_{j=0}^{N-2} \sum_{m=j+1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_m^+} w_j^{ext}(\lambda) d\lambda.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{N-2} \sum_{m=j+1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_m^+} w_j^{ext}(\lambda) d\lambda = \sum_{j=0}^{N-2} \sum_{m=j}^{N-2} \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_{m+1}^+} w_j^{ext}(\lambda) d\lambda.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
I &= \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_m^+} (u_0^{int}(\lambda) v_0^{ext}(\lambda) - w_0^{int}(\lambda)) d\lambda \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=j}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_m^+} w_j^{int}(\lambda) d\lambda - \sum_{j=0}^{N-2} \sum_{m=j}^{N-2} \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_{m+1}^+} w_j^{ext}(\lambda) d\lambda.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\Gamma_N^+ = \emptyset$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=j}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_m^+} w_j^{int}(\lambda) d\lambda - \sum_{j=0}^{N-2} \sum_{m=j}^{N-2} \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_{m+1}^+} w_j^{ext}(\lambda) d\lambda \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=j}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2i\pi} \left(\int_{\Gamma_m^+} w_j^{int}(\lambda) d\lambda - \int_{\Gamma_{m+1}^+} w_j^{ext}(\lambda) d\lambda \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Observe now that $u_j \tilde{v}_j \in E^1(\Omega_m^+)$ for $m \geq j$. Then by Cauchy's formula for functions in $E^1(\Omega_m^+)$ (see [25, Th. 10.4]), we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2i\pi} \left(\int_{\Gamma_m^+} w_j^{int}(\lambda) d\lambda - \int_{\Gamma_{m+1}^+} w_j^{ext}(\lambda) d\lambda \right) &= \frac{1}{2i\pi} \left(\int_{\Gamma_m^+} \frac{u_j^{int}(\lambda) \tilde{v}_j^{int}(\lambda)}{\lambda - \mu} d\lambda \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \int_{\Gamma_{m+1}^+} \frac{u_j^{ext}(\lambda) \tilde{v}_j^{ext}(\lambda)}{\lambda - \mu} d\lambda \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\partial\Omega_{m+1}} \frac{u_j(\lambda) \tilde{v}_j(\lambda)}{\lambda - \mu} d\lambda \\
&= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } m \neq n \\ u_j(\mu) \tilde{v}_j(\mu) & \text{if } m = n. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=j}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_m^+} w_j^{int}(\lambda) d\lambda - \sum_{j=0}^{N-2} \sum_{m=j}^{N-2} \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\Gamma_{m+1}^+} w_j^{ext}(\lambda) d\lambda = \sum_{j=0}^n u_j(\mu) \tilde{v}_j(\mu).$$

Now it remains to observe that $v_0^{ext} = v_0^{int}$ a.e. (according to equation (B.54)), whence it follows that $u_0^{int} v_0^{ext} - w_0^{int} = u_0^{int} v_0^{ext} - u_0^{int} v_0^{int} = 0$ a.e.. Therefore, we conclude that

$$I = \sum_{j=0}^n u_j(\mu) \tilde{v}_j(\mu),$$

which is the equality we wanted to prove. \square

We will now check the right invertibility of U .

Proof of Theorem B.21. Observe that, according to Lemma B.4, for every $\mu \in \sigma(T_F) \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus F(\mathbb{T})$, and every $0 \leq m < \text{wind}_F(\mu)$, we have

$$T_{F-\lambda}^* h_{\mu,m} = (\mu - \lambda) h_{\mu,m}.$$

Hence, for $0 \leq m < \text{wind}_F(\mu)$, $\ell \geq \text{wind}_F(\lambda)$ and $\lambda \neq \mu$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle G_{\lambda,\ell} | h_{\mu,m} \rangle_{p,q} &= \frac{1}{\mu - \lambda} \langle G_{\lambda,\ell} | T_{F-\lambda}^* h_{\mu,m} \rangle_{p,q} \\ &= \frac{1}{\mu - \lambda} \langle T_{F-\lambda} G_{\lambda,\ell} | h_{\mu,m} \rangle_{p,q} \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda - \mu} \langle \rho_{\lambda,\ell} | h_{\mu,m} \rangle_{p,q}, \end{aligned}$$

the last equality following from Equation (B.49).

Let now $u = (u_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1}$ be an element of \mathcal{E}_F^p . Write $U((\pi_{ext} V)^* \pi_{int} u) = (r_j)$, with $r_j \in E^p(\Omega_j^+)$ for every $0 \leq j \leq N-1$. By the definition of U , we have

$$r_j(\mu) = \langle (\pi_{ext} V)^* \pi_{int} u | h_{\mu,j} \rangle_{p,q} = [\pi_{int} u | \pi_{ext} V h_{\mu,j}]_{p,q} \quad \text{for every } \mu \in \Omega_j^+.$$

Now, observe that if we write $V h_{\mu,j} = (v_\ell)_{0 \leq \ell \leq N-1}$, we have, by the definition of V ,

$$v_\ell(\lambda) = \langle G_{\lambda,\ell} | h_{\mu,j} \rangle_{p,q} = \frac{1}{\lambda - \mu} \langle \rho_{\lambda,\ell} | h_{\mu,m} \rangle_{p,q} \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus (F(\mathbb{T}) \cup \Omega_\ell^+).$$

Thus, for almost all $\lambda \in \Gamma_\ell^+$, we have

$$\pi_{ext}(V h_{\mu,j})(\lambda) = v_\ell^{ext}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda - \mu} \langle \rho_{\lambda,\ell}^{ext} | h_{\mu,m} \rangle_{p,q},$$

which yields, by Lemma B.22, that

$$r_j(\mu) = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} \int_{\Gamma_\ell^+} \frac{u_\ell^{int}(\lambda)}{\lambda - \mu} \langle \rho_{\lambda,\ell}^{ext} | h_{\mu,j} \rangle_{p,q} d\lambda.$$

Observe that the function

$$z \longmapsto \int_{\Gamma_\ell^+} \frac{u_\ell^{int}(\lambda) \rho_{\lambda,\ell}^{ext}(z)}{\lambda - \mu} d\lambda$$

belongs to H^p (because it is actually a polynomial). Thus, by continuity of the bilinear form $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{p,q}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} r_j(\mu) &= \frac{1}{2i\pi} \sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} \int_{\Gamma_\ell^+} \frac{u_\ell^{int}(\lambda)}{\lambda - \mu} \langle \rho_{\lambda,\ell}^{ext} | h_{\mu,j} \rangle_{p,q} d\lambda \\ &= \left\langle \sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} \int_{\Gamma_\ell^+} \frac{u_\ell^{int}(\lambda) \rho_{\lambda,\ell}^{ext}}{\lambda - \mu} d\lambda \middle| h_{\mu,j} \right\rangle_{p,q}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, it follows from Lemma B.24 that, for every $z \in \mathbb{D}$ and every $\mu \in \Omega_k$, with $k \geq j+1$, we have

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} \int_{\Gamma_\ell^+} \frac{u_\ell^{int}(\lambda) \rho_{\lambda,\ell}^{ext}(z)}{\lambda - \mu} d\lambda = \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} u_\ell(\mu) \rho_{\mu,\ell}(z).$$

Hence

$$r_j(\mu) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} u_\ell(\mu) \langle \rho_{\mu,\ell} | h_{\mu,j} \rangle_{p,q}.$$

Finally, Lemma B.23 implies that

$$r_j(\mu) = u_j(\mu) \quad \text{for every } \mu \in \Omega_k, k \geq j+1.$$

In other words, $r_j(\mu) = u_j(\mu)$ for every $\mu \in \Omega_j^+$, which means that $r_j = u_j$, and we have shown that $U(\pi_{ext}V)^*\pi_{int}(u) = u$. \square

We now have everything we need to prove the main result of [51].

B.5.5. Summary. We denote by M_λ the multiplication by the independent variable on \mathcal{E}_F^p , that is, if $u = (u_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1} \in \mathcal{E}_F^p$, then

$$M_\lambda u = (v_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1}, \quad \text{with } v_j(\lambda) = \lambda u_j(\lambda) \quad \text{for every } \lambda \in \Omega_j^+.$$

It is not difficult to see that M_λ is a bounded operator on \mathcal{E}_F^p . More generally, if φ is a bounded analytic function on the interior $\sigma(\overset{\circ}{T}_F)$ of the spectrum of T_F , then the multiplication by φ is a bounded operator on \mathcal{E}_F^p satisfying $\|M_\varphi\| \leq \|\varphi\|_\infty$. Indeed, if $u = (u_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1} \in \mathcal{E}_F^p$, then we obviously have $\varphi u_j \in E^p(\Omega_j^+)$ and $\|\varphi u_j\|_{E^p(\Omega_j^+)} \leq \|\varphi\|_\infty \|u_j\|_{E^p(\Omega_j^+)}$. Moreover, since $(\Gamma \cap \overline{\Omega_{j+1}^+}) \setminus \mathcal{O} \subset \sigma(\overset{\circ}{T}_F)$, we get immediately that $\varphi^{int} = \varphi^{ext}$ almost everywhere on $\Gamma \cap \overline{\Omega_{j+1}^+}$, $0 \leq j \leq N-1$, and it is clear that φu_j satisfies the boundary conditions in Equation (B.33). Thus we deduce that $\varphi u \in \mathcal{E}_F^p$ and

$$\|\varphi u\|_{\mathcal{E}_F^p}^p = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \|\varphi u_j\|_{E^p(\Omega_j^+)}^p \leq \|\varphi\|_\infty^p \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \|u_j\|_{E^p(\Omega_j^+)}^p = \|\varphi\|_\infty^p \|u\|_{\mathcal{E}_F^p}^p,$$

meaning that M_φ is bounded on \mathcal{E}_F^p with $\|M_\varphi\| \leq \|\varphi\|_\infty$.

Theorem B.25. *Let F satisfy (H1), (H2) and (H3'), and let $p > 1$. Then*

- (1) *The operator U is an isomorphism from H^p onto \mathcal{E}_F^p .*
- (2) *We have*

$$UT_F = M_\lambda U.$$

(3) T_F admits an $H^\infty(\sigma(\overset{\circ}{T}_F))$ functional calculus, and there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|\varphi(T_F)\| \leq C\|\varphi\|_\infty \quad \text{for every } \varphi \in H^\infty(\sigma(\overset{\circ}{T}_F)).$$

Proof. The fact that U is an isomorphism from H^p onto \mathcal{E}_F^p follows immediately from Theorems B.20 and B.21. The fact (2) has already been proved in Proposition B.14 (1).

Now, given a bounded analytic function φ on $\Omega = \sigma(\overset{\circ}{T}_F)$, we can define $\varphi(T_F) = U^{-1}M_\varphi U$. Then $\varphi(T_F)$ is well-defined on H^p , and we have

$$\|\varphi(T_F)\| \leq \|U\| \|U^{-1}\| \|M_\varphi\| \leq \|U\| \|U^{-1}\| \|\varphi\|_\infty.$$

It is then not difficult to check that $\varphi \mapsto \varphi(T_F)$ defines an $H^\infty(\Omega)$ functional calculus. \square

B.6. From Appendix B to Section 2. In this very last section, we explain the change of notation which allows us to go from the setting of Appendix B to the setting of Section 2.

Let F be a symbol satisfying assumptions (H1), (H2) and (H3) - in particular, F is **negatively wound**; these are the standing assumptions in the first sections of the paper. Let $f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ be defined as $f(z) = F(1/z)$, $z \in \mathbb{T}$. Then f satisfies assumptions (H1), (H2) and (H3'). If T_F is seen as acting on H^p , $p > 1$, then $T_f = T_F^*$ acts on H^q . Theorem B.25 applies to f , allowing us to define the operator U from H^q into \mathcal{E}_f^q , where \mathcal{E}_f^q is the set of N -tuples of functions $(u_j)_{0 \leq j \leq N-1}$ with $u_j \in E^q(\Omega_j^+)$ satisfying the boundary relations

$$u_j^{int} - \zeta u_{j+1}^{int} = u_j^{ext} \quad \text{a.e. on } \partial\Omega_{j+1}^+,$$

where $\zeta = f^{-1}$ on $f(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$, \mathcal{O} denoting the set of self-intersection points of the curve $f(\mathbb{T})$ (which is the same as the set of self-intersection points of the curve $F(\mathbb{T})$). Since $f(\zeta(\lambda)) = \lambda$ for every $\lambda \in F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$, $F(1/\zeta(\lambda)) = \lambda$, i.e. $\zeta = 1/F^{-1}$ on $F(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \mathcal{O}$ (cf. the definition of ζ at the end of Section 2.3). The space \mathcal{E}_f^q is denoted by E_F^q in Section 2.

We have then $UT_f = M_\lambda U$, where M_λ is the multiplication operator by λ on \mathcal{E}_f^q , i.e. $UT_F^* = M_\lambda U$: this is exactly the relation $T_F^* = U^{-1}M_\lambda U$ given in Theorem 2.2.

The eigenvectors $h_{\lambda,j}$ of T_F defined by Equation (2.4) are exactly those given by Equation (B.9), since the fonction F from Section 2 plays the role of the function f from Appendix B.

The same correspondence is in force when the symbol F from Section 6 is supposed to satisfy assumption (H2') rather than (H2) (besides assumptions (H1) and (H3), of course).

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Abakumov, A. Baranov, S. Charpentier, and A. Lishanskii, *New classes of hypercyclic Toeplitz operators*, Bull. Sci. Math. **168** (2021), Paper No. 102971, 13. MR4237429
- [2] L. V. Ahlfors, *Lectures on quasiconformal mappings*, Second, University Lecture Series, vol. 38, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2006. With supplemental chapters by C. J. Earle, I. Kra, M. Shishikura and J. H. Hubbard. MR2241787
- [3] S. Axler, *Factorization of L^∞ functions*, Ann. of Math. (2) **106** (1977), no. 3, 567–572. MR461142
- [4] A. Baranov and A. Lishanskii, *Hypercyclic Toeplitz operators*, Results Math. **70** (2016), no. 3-4, 337–347. MR3544864
- [5] S. Bartoll, R.R. Jiménez-Munguía, R.A. Martínez-Avenidaño, and A. Peris, *Chaos for the dynamics of toeplitz operators*, Mathematics **10** (2022), no. 425.

- [6] E. L. Basor and I. Gohberg (eds.), *Toeplitz operators and related topics*, Operator Theory: Advances and Applications, vol. 71, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1994. The Harold Widom Anniversary volume, Papers from the Workshop on Toeplitz and Wiener-Hopf Operators held in Santa Cruz, California, September 20–22, 1992. MR1300205
- [7] F. Bayart and S. Grivaux, *Frequently hypercyclic operators*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **358** (2006), no. 11, 5083–5117. MR2231886
- [8] F. Bayart and É. Matheron, *Dynamics of linear operators*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 179, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2009. MR2533318
- [9] F. Bayart and É. Matheron, *Mixing operators and small subsets of the circle*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **715** (2016), 75–123. MR3507920
- [10] A. Böttcher and B. Silbermann, *Analysis of Toeplitz operators*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990. MR1071374
- [11] J. Bourgain, *A problem of Douglas and Rudin on factorization*, Pacific J. Math. **121** (1986), no. 1, 47–50. MR815031
- [12] A. Brown and P. R. Halmos, *Algebraic properties of Toeplitz operators*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **213** (1963/64), 89–102. MR160136
- [13] J. A. Cima, A. L. Matheson, and W. T. Ross, *The Cauchy transform*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 125, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2006. MR2215991
- [14] D. N. Clark, *On a similarity theory for rational Toeplitz operators*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **320** (1980), 6–31. MR592139
- [15] ———, *On Toeplitz operators with loops*, J. Operator Theory **4** (1980), no. 1, 37–54. MR587367
- [16] ———, *On the structure of rational Toeplitz operators*, Contributions to analysis and geometry (Baltimore, Md., 1980), 1981, pp. 63–72. MR648455
- [17] ———, *On Toeplitz operators with loops. II*, J. Operator Theory **7** (1982), no. 1, 109–123. MR650196
- [18] ———, *Quasimilarity of rational Toeplitz operators*, Toeplitz centennial (Tel Aviv, 1981), 1982, pp. 175–186. MR6669906
- [19] ———, *On Toeplitz operators with unimodular symbols*, Operators in indefinite metric spaces, scattering theory and other topics (Bucharest, 1985), 1987, pp. 59–68. MR903064
- [20] ———, *Perturbation and similarity of Toeplitz operators*, Topics in operator theory: Ernst D. Hellinger memorial volume, 1990, pp. 235–243. MR1207399
- [21] D. N. Clark and J. H. Morrel, *On Toeplitz operators and similarity*, Amer. J. Math. **100** (1978), no. 5, 973–986. MR517140
- [22] R. G. Douglas, *Banach algebra techniques in operator theory*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 49, Academic Press, New York-London, 1972. MR361893
- [23] R. G. Douglas and W. Rudin, *Approximation by inner functions*, Pacific J. Math. **31** (1969), 313–320. MR254606
- [24] P. L. Duren, *Extension of a result of Beurling on invariant subspaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **99** (1961), 320–324. MR119085
- [25] ———, *Theory of H^p spaces*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 38, Academic Press, New York-London, 1970. MR268655
- [26] E. M. Dyn'kin, *Pseudoanalytic continuation of smooth functions. Uniform scale*, Mathematical programming and related questions (Proc. Seventh Winter School, Drogobych, 1974), Theory of functions and functional analysis (Russian), 1976, pp. 40–73. MR587795
- [27] ———, *The pseudoanalytic extension*, J. Anal. Math. **60** (1993), 45–70. MR1253229
- [28] E. Flytzanis, *Unimodular eigenvalues and linear chaos in Hilbert spaces*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **5** (1995), no. 1, 1–13. MR1312018
- [29] J. B. Garnett, *Bounded analytic functions*, first, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 236, Springer, New York, 2007. MR2261424
- [30] G. Godefroy and J. H. Shapiro, *Operators with dense, invariant, cyclic vector manifolds*, J. Funct. Anal. **98** (1991), no. 2, 229–269. MR1111569
- [31] S. Grivaux, *Hypercyclic operators, mixing operators, and the bounded steps problem*, J. Operator Theory **54** (2005), no. 1, 147–168. MR2168865
- [32] ———, *A new class of frequently hypercyclic operators*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **60** (2011), no. 4, 1177–1201. MR2975340
- [33] K.-G. Grosse-Erdmann and A. Peris Manguillot, *Linear chaos*, Universitext, Springer, London, 2011. MR2919812

- [34] A. Hartmann and M. Mitkovski, *Kernels of Toeplitz operators*, Recent progress on operator theory and approximation in spaces of analytic functions, 2016, pp. 147–177. MR3589674
- [35] H. Hedenmalm, B. Korenblum, and K. Zhu, *Theory of Bergman spaces*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 199, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000. MR1758653
- [36] S.Ya. Khavinson, *Two papers in extremal problems in complex analysis*, first, American Mathematical Society translations- Series 2, vol. 129, AMS, 1986.
- [37] O. Lehto and K. I. Virtanen, *Quasiconformal mappings in the plane*, Second, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 126, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1973. Translated from the German by K. W. Lucas. MR344463
- [38] E. Lindelöf, *Sur un principe général de l'analyse et ces applications à la théorie de la représentation conforme*, Acta Soc. Sci. Fenn. **46** (1915), no. 4.
- [39] 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. MR1864396
- [40] ———, *Operators, functions, and systems: an easy reading. Vol. 2*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 93, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002. Model operators and systems, Translated from the French by Andreas Hartmann and revised by the author. MR1892647
- [41] ———, *Toeplitz matrices and operators*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 182, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2020. Translated from the French edition by Danièle Gibbons and Greg Gibbons. MR4319036
- [42] N. K. Nikolskii, *Multicyclicity phenomenon. I. An introduction and maxi-formulas*, Toeplitz operators and spectral function theory, 1989, pp. 9–57. MR1030049
- [43] V. V. Peller, *Spectrum, similarity, and invariant subspaces of Toeplitz operators*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. **50** (1986), no. 4, 776–787, 878. MR864176
- [44] I. I. Priwalow, *Randeigenschaften analytischer Funktionen*, Hochschulbücher für Mathematik [University Books for Mathematics], Band 25, VEB Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, Berlin, 1956. Zweite, unter Redaktion von A. I. Markushevitch überarbeitete und ergänzte Auflage. MR83565
- [45] W. Rudin, *Real and complex analysis*, Third, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1987. MR924157
- [46] D. Sarason, *Generalized interpolation in H^∞* , Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **127** (1967), 179–203. MR208383
- [47] S. Shkarin, *Orbits of coanalytic Toeplitz operators and weak hypercyclicity*, 2012.
- [48] B. M. Solomyak, *Cyclic sets for analytic Toeplitz operators*, Zapiski Nauchnykh Seminarov POMI **157** (1987), 88–102.
- [49] G. C. Tumarkin and S. Ja. Havinson, *Classes of analytic functions on multiply connected domains*, French transl.: In "fonctions d'une variable complexe. problèmes contemporains", pp. 37–71; Gauthiers-Villars, Paris, 1962, 1960, pp. 45–77. MR118847
- [50] D. M. Wang, *Similarity of smooth Toeplitz operators*, J. Operator Theory **12** (1984), no. 2, 319–329. MR757437
- [51] D. V. Yakubovich, *On the spectral theory of Toeplitz operators with a smooth symbol*, Algebra i Analiz **3** (1991), no. 4, 208–226. MR1152611
- [52] ———, *Spectral multiplicity of Toeplitz operators with smooth symbols*, Amer. J. Math. **115** (1993), no. 6, 1335–1346. MR1254736
- [53] ———, *Dual piecewise analytic bundle shift models of linear operators*, J. Funct. Anal. **136** (1996), no. 2, 294–330. MR1380657
- [54] A. Yger, *Analyse Complexe et Distributions*, Ellipses, 2001.
- [55] A. Zygmund, *Trigonometric series. Vol. I, II*, Third, Cambridge Mathematical Library, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002. With a foreword by Robert A. Fefferman. MR1963498

UNIV. LILLE, CNRS, UMR 8524 - LABORATOIRE PAUL PAINLEVÉ, F-59000 LILLE, FRANCE
 Email address: emmanuel.fricain@univ-lille.fr

UNIV. LILLE, CNRS, UMR 8524 - LABORATOIRE PAUL PAINLEVÉ, F-59000 LILLE, FRANCE
 Email address: sophie.grivaux@univ-lille.fr

UNIV. LILLE, CNRS, UMR 8524 - LABORATOIRE PAUL PAINLEVÉ, F-59000 LILLE, FRANCE
 Email address: maeva.ostermann@univ-lille.fr