

POINTWISE LOWER BOUNDS IN GROWTH SPACES WITH LITTLE o CONDITIONS.

ŽELJKO ČUČKOVIĆ AND JARI TASKINEN

ABSTRACT. Pointwise lower bounds on the open unit disc \mathbb{D} for the sum of the moduli of two analytic functions f and g (or their derivatives) are known in several cases, like f, g belonging to the Bloch space \mathcal{B} , $BMOA$ or the weighted Hardy space H_ω^∞ . We find complementary results of Ramey-Ullrich and Abakumov-Doubtsov for functions with little o conditions.

1. INTRODUCTION

The motivation for this paper comes from the important paper by Ramey and Ullrich [7], where the authors proved the result about the growth of derivatives of functions in the Bloch space on the unit disk \mathbb{D} . Subsequently several authors continued this line of investigation, in particular, we mention the work by Lou [5] studying the α -Bloch spaces, Wulan and Zhu [8] studying an analogue of the Ramey-Ullrich result for the unit ball in \mathbb{C}^n and Abakumov and Doubtsov [1] who studied the weighted H^∞ spaces; see also [3] and [2] for higher dimensional generalizations. The goal of our paper is to obtain complementary lower bounds for growth spaces with little o condition. In particular, we are interested in the little Bloch space, $VMOA$ and weighted H^∞ spaces with o growth conditions.

We first introduce the relevant definitions. A function g is called a Bloch function if it is analytic on \mathbb{D} and it satisfies

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{D}} (1 - |z|^2) |g'(z)| < \infty.$$

The space of Bloch functions is denoted by \mathcal{B} . Similarly, the little Bloch space \mathcal{B}_0 consists of functions g analytic on \mathbb{D} such that

$$\lim_{|z| \rightarrow 1} (1 - |z|^2) |g'(z)| = 0.$$

Ramey and Ullrich proved the existence of two functions $f, g \in \mathcal{B}$ such that

$$(1.1) \quad |f'(z)| + |g'(z)| \geq \frac{1}{1 - |z|}$$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 30H10, 30H30.

The second named author was partially supported by the Väisälä Foundation of the Finnish Academy of Sciences and Letters and the EU-Horizon-MSCA project no. 101109510 LARGE BERGMAN..

for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$. It should be noted that just one analytic function cannot satisfy the inequality above. To prove their result, Ramey and Ullrich used functions that have a lacunary power series expansion in the form

$$f(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k z^{q^k}$$

where q is a positive integer. It is also known that the function f with such lacunary series belongs to the Bloch space \mathcal{B} if and only if $(a_k)_{k=0}^{\infty} \in \ell^{\infty}$. Similarly, $f \in \mathcal{B}_0$ if and only if $(a_k)_{k=0}^{\infty} \in c_0$ (see [4] or [6]).

Our Theorem 2.1 will give a growth condition for \mathcal{B}_0 that complements the Ramey-Ullrich result. In Proposition 2.2 we give an analogous growth result for *VMOA* functions.

Given a radial weight function $\omega : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$, a generalized formulation of the question related to (1.1) consists of finding two analytic functions f, g belonging to the weighted Hardy space H_{ω}^{∞} and satisfying a pointwise lower bound

$$(1.2) \quad |f(z)| + |g(z)| \geq \frac{1}{\omega(z)}.$$

A solution to this problem was found by Abakumov and Doubtsov in [1], where they proved that such functions can be found, if and only if the function $1/\omega$ is log-convex on the interval $[0, 1)$. Here, we will modify the proof of [1] so as to apply to functions f and g with the corresponding small o growth conditions. In that case one cannot expect to get the same lower bound as in (1.2), but we will show in Theorem 1.1 that if the right-hand side is multiplied by an arbitrary continuous, radial function $W : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ with $\lim_{|z| \rightarrow 1^-} W(z) = 0$, then the functions f and g can be found. We also observe that this is in a sense the best possible lower bound for f, g with small o growth conditions.

Here, by a radial weight ω we mean a continuous function on \mathbb{D} with positive values, such that $\omega(z) = \omega(|z|) < \omega(|w|) = \omega(w)$ for all $z, w \in \mathbb{D}$ with $|z| > |w|$ and, moreover, $\lim_{|z| \rightarrow 1^-} \omega(z) = 0$. Then, the weighted Hardy space, or the growth space, H_{ω}^{∞} is defined by

$$(1.3) \quad H_{\omega}^{\infty} = \left\{ f : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \text{ analytic} : \|f\|_{\omega} := \sup_{z \in \mathbb{D}} \omega(z) |f(z)| < \infty \right\},$$

and the corresponding space with o growth condition is

$$(1.4) \quad H_{\omega,0}^{\infty} = \left\{ f \in H_{\omega}^{\infty} : \lim_{|z| \rightarrow 1^-} \omega(z) |f(z)| = 0 \right\}.$$

As well known, both H_{ω}^{∞} and $H_{\omega,0}^{\infty}$ are Banach spaces. Note that $f \in H_{\omega}^{\infty}$, if and only if, for some constant $C_f > 0$

$$|f(z)| \leq \frac{C_f}{\omega(z)} \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

We say that two positive, radial functions v and w on \mathbb{D} are equivalent, if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $v(z)/C \leq w(z) \leq Cv(z)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$. We say that $1/\omega$ is log-convex, if the function $-\log \omega(r)$ is equivalent with a

convex function of $\log r$ for $r \in (0, 1)$. This holds in particular, if $-\log \omega(r)$ is a convex function of r , but there are other examples. (See Remark 6 in [1]. Note that in [1], weights are defined as $1/\omega$, where ω is a weight in the sense of our paper.)

Our modification of the main result in [1] reads as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that $1/\omega$ is equivalent to a log-convex function. Given any piecewise continuous, non-increasing function $W : [0, 1) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ with the property $\lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} W(r) = 0$, there exist functions $f, g \in H_{\omega, 0}^\infty$ such that*

$$(1.5) \quad |f(z)| + |g(z)| \geq \frac{W(|z|)}{\omega(z)} \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Note that if $f, g \in H_{\omega, 0}^\infty$, then the function $\widetilde{W}(z) : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$

$$\widetilde{W}(r) = \sup_{|w| \geq r} |f(w)|\omega(w) + \sup_{|w| \geq r} |g(w)|\omega(w)$$

is continuous, non-increasing and has the properties $\lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \widetilde{W}(r) = 0$ and

$$|f(z)| + |g(z)| \leq \widetilde{W}(|z|)/\omega(z) \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{D},$$

by (1.3), (1.4). Hence, given two functions $f, g \in H_{\omega, 0}^\infty$, there always exists a W such that the reverse inequality (1.5) holds. In this sense the result of Theorem 1.1 gives the largest possible lower bound for functions belonging to $H_{\omega, 0}^\infty$.

2. ON THE RAMEY-ULLRICH CONSTRUCTION

The result in Proposition 5.4. of [7] is of course contained in Theorem 1.2. of [1], nevertheless, we present in Theorem 2.1 a separate formulation of our result in that case, too. The reason is that the proof is substantially simpler than that of Theorem 1.1 and moreover, of its own interest, in view of the many applications of Proposition 5.4. of [7] appearing in the literature.

Our result reads as follows.

Theorem 2.1. *Given any continuous, non-increasing function $W : [0, 1) \rightarrow (0, 1)$ with the property $\lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} W(r) = 0$, there exist functions $f, g \in \mathcal{B}_0$ such that*

$$(2.1) \quad |f'(z)| + |g'(z)| \geq \frac{W(z)}{1 - |z|} \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Proof. The proof of Proposition 5.4. of [7] requires a number of modifications. We assume that the function W is given and, for simplicity, write $q = 100$, although any large enough q could be used in the same way as in the citation.

We define $f(z) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j z^{q^j}$, where the numbers a_j are defined inductively by

$$(2.2) \quad a_1 = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad a_j = \max \left\{ W(1 - q^{-j}), \frac{j-1}{j} a_{j-1} \right\} \quad \forall j \geq 2.$$

We first claim that

- (i) the sequence $(a_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ is non-increasing,
- (ii) $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_j = 0$, and
- (iii) there holds $a_j \geq 1/j$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

To see (i), we note that if $j \geq 2$ is arbitrary, then, $a_{j-1} \geq W(1 - q^{-(j-1)}) \geq W(1 - q^{-j})$, by observing the definition (2.2) for the coefficient a_{j-1} and the fact the W is non-increasing. We obtain that the right hand side of (2.2) is at most a_{j-1} . Thus, $a_j \leq a_{j-1}$, i.e., (i) holds.

Property (iii) follows from the relations $a_1 = 1$ and $a_j \geq (j-1)j^{-1}a_{j-1}$ by induction.

In order to prove (ii), we denote by $\mathbf{N} \subset \mathbb{N}$ the set of indices such that $a_j = W(1 - q^{-j})$, see (2.2). If \mathbf{N} is finite, there is some number $J \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the relation $a_j = \frac{j-1}{j}a_{j-1}$ holds for all $j \geq J$. By a repeated use of this relation we obtain for all $\ell > J$

$$(2.3) \quad a_\ell = \left(\prod_{j=J+1}^{\ell} \frac{j-1}{j} \right) a_J = \frac{J}{\ell} a_J \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \ell \rightarrow \infty.$$

If the set \mathbf{N} is infinite and $\varepsilon > 0$ is given, we choose $J \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $a_J = W(1 - q^{-J}) < \varepsilon$. (This is possible since $W(r)$ tends to 0 as $r \rightarrow 0$.) By property (i), we have $a_j \leq a_J < \varepsilon$ for all $j > J$, which proves the claim.

The rest of the proof follows that of the citation, with some more modifications. If $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is arbitrary, we first prove that

$$(2.4) \quad |f'(z)| \geq \frac{CW(z)}{1-|z|} \quad \text{for } z \text{ with } |z| \in I_k \subset [0, 1),$$

where we denote $I_k = [1 - q^{-k}, 1 - q^{-(k+1/2)}]$, and to this end we use the triangle inequality to write

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} |f'(z)| &\geq |a_k q^k z^{q^k}| - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} a_j q^j |z|^{q^j} - \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} a_j q^j |z|^{q^j} \\ &=: I(z) - II(z) - III(z) \end{aligned}$$

The estimate of the term I in [7] implies that

$$(2.6) \quad I(z) \geq \frac{a_k q^k}{3} \quad \text{for all } z \in I_k.$$

Also, since the sequence $(a_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ is non-increasing, we have

$$(2.7) \quad III(z) \leq a_{k+1} \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} q^j |z|^{q^j} \leq a_k \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} q^j |z|^{q^j}.$$

Now, in [7] it is shown that for $z \in I_k$ there holds

$$(2.8) \quad \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} q^j |z|^{q^j} \leq q^k \frac{q 2^{-q^{1/2}}}{1 - q 2^{-q^{3/2} + q^{1/2}}}.$$

Our choice $q = 100$ implies

$$(2.9) \quad q^{1/2} = 10 \Rightarrow q2^{-q^{1/2}} = 100 \cdot 2^{-10} \leq 2^{-3}$$

and

$$(2.10) \quad q^{3/2} = 1000 \Rightarrow 1 - q2^{-q^{3/2}+q^{1/2}} \geq 1 - 100 \cdot 2^{-990} \geq 1 - \delta$$

with $0 < \delta < 10^{-10}$. Hence, by (2.7), (2.8)

$$(2.11) \quad III(z) \leq \frac{a_k q^k}{8(1-\delta)} \quad \text{for all } z \in I_k.$$

To treat the term $II(z)$ we denote by ℓ the smallest integer not smaller than $k/2$ and write

$$(2.12) \quad II(z) \leq \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} a_j q^j = \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} a_j q^j + \sum_{j=\ell}^{k-1} a_j q^j \quad \text{for all } z \in I_k.$$

Since $0 < a_j < 1$ for all j , we can then estimate

$$(2.13) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} a_j q^j \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} q^j \leq \frac{q^\ell}{q-1}.$$

Since $\ell \leq k/2 + 1$, $q = 100$ and $a_k \geq 1/k$ (see (iii)), we obtain

$$(2.14) \quad q^{\ell-k} < q^{-k/2+1} < \frac{1}{100k} \leq \frac{a_k}{100},$$

and combining this with (2.13) yields

$$(2.15) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} a_j q^j \leq \frac{q^k q^{\ell-k}}{q-1} < \frac{a_k q^k}{100(q-1)}.$$

Finally, the second sum in (2.12) is estimated by

$$(2.16) \quad \sum_{j=\ell}^{k-1} a_j q^j \leq a_\ell \sum_{j=\ell}^{k-1} q^j \leq a_\ell \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} q^j \leq a_\ell \frac{q^k}{q-1}.$$

Here, the choice (2.2) implies

$$(2.17) \quad a_k \geq \left(\prod_{j=\ell+1}^k \frac{j-1}{j} \right) a_\ell = \frac{\ell}{k} a_\ell \geq \frac{a_\ell}{2}$$

which in combination with (2.15) gives us

$$(2.18) \quad \sum_{j=\ell}^{k-1} a_j q^j \leq a_k q^k \frac{2}{q-1}.$$

Altogether, (2.11), (2.12), (2.15), and (2.18) imply for $z \in I_k$ the bound

$$(2.19) \quad II(z) + III(z) \leq a_k q^k \left(\frac{3}{q-1} + \frac{1}{8(1-\delta)} \right) \leq \frac{a_k q^k}{7}.$$

By (2.5), (2.6),

$$(2.20) \quad |f'(z)| \geq I(z) - (II(z) + III(z)) \geq \frac{a_k q^k}{8} \quad \text{for all } z \in I_k.$$

Finally, since W is non-increasing, the maximum value of $W(z)$ on the interval I_k is $W(1 - q^{-k}) \leq a_k$ (see (2.4), (2.2)). Also, the maximum of the function $1/(1 - |z|)$ on the interval I_k equals q^k . Thus, we have for $z \in I_k$

$$(2.21) \quad \frac{W(z)}{1 - |z|} \leq a_k q^k$$

and (2.20) implies $|f'(z)| \geq W(z)/(8(1 - |z|))$ on I_k .

Note that above, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ was arbitrary. Now, as in [7] and analogously to the above proof, one can construct a function g such that

$$(2.22) \quad |g'(z)| \geq \frac{W(z)}{8(1 - |z|)}$$

for all z with $|z| \in [1 - q^{-(k+1/2)}, 1 - q^{-k-1}]$. This and a suitable multiplication of the functions f and g by a positive constant yields (2.1). \square

Recall that a function $f \in L^1(\partial\mathbb{D})$ belongs to the space BMO , if

$$(2.23) \quad \|f\|_* := \sup_I \frac{1}{|I|} \int_I |f(e^{i\theta}) - m_I(f)| d\theta < \infty, \quad \text{where}$$

$$m_I(f) = \frac{1}{|I|} \int_I |f(e^{i\theta})| d\theta.$$

Here, I denotes an arbitrary interval with positive length contained in $\partial\mathbb{D}$. The space VMO consists of functions $f \in BMO$ such that the expression $|I|^{-1} \int_I |f(e^{i\theta}) - m_I(f)| d\theta$ tends to 0 as $|I| \rightarrow 0$. The space $BMOA$ consists of such Poisson extensions of functions in BMO that are analytic in \mathbb{D} , and the space $VMOA$ is defined in the same way with the help of VMO instead of BMO . Endowed with the norm $\|f\|_{BMOA} = |f(0)| + \|f\|_*$, the space $BMOA$ is complete, and $VMOA$ is its closed subspace. See [4] or [9] for more details.

Proposition 2.2. *There exist functions $f, g \in VMOA$ such that*

$$(2.24) \quad |f'(z)| + |g'(z)| \geq \frac{1}{(1 - |z|) |\log(1 - |z|)|} \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Proof. We consider the function $W(r) = 1/|\log(1 - r)|$ in the proof of the previous theorem. Then, for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(2.25) \quad W(1 - q^j) = \frac{1}{|\log q^{-j}|} = \frac{1}{j \log 100} < \frac{1}{j}.$$

Thus, if we define $a_j = 1/j$ for all j , we see that the relations (2.2) hold for all j . As a consequence of the proof of Theorem 2.1 and the relation (2.1), the

functions

$$(2.26) \quad f(z) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{-1} z^{q^j}$$

and g , constructed following [7], satisfy the lower bound (2.24).

By Theorem 9.3 in [4], f and g belong to $VMOA$ (as well as H^2), since the Taylor coefficients of the lacunary series (2.26) belong to ℓ^2 . \square

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We modify the proof of Theorem 1.2 of [1]. Let us assume that we are given a weight ω such that $1/\omega$ is equivalent to a log-convex function. Our aim is to apply the considerations of Sections 2.3–2.5 of [1] to the weight $w = 1/\omega$. In Section 2.3 of the citation the authors construct monotonically increasing sequences $(x_k)_{k=0}^{\infty}$ and $(\beta_k)_{k=1}^{\infty}$ such that $x_k < 0$ and $\beta_k > 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x_k = 0$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \beta_k = \infty$, and denote

$$(3.1) \quad t_k = \exp(x_k) \in (0, 1) \quad \text{for all } k.$$

They also define, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, certain parameters $a_k > 0$ and linear functions $\ell_k : (-\infty, 0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$(3.2) \quad \ell_k(x) = \log a_k + \beta_k x, \quad \text{hence, } e^{\ell_k(x)} = a_k r^{\beta_k},$$

where $x \in (-\infty, 0)$, $r = e^x \in (0, 1)$. Note that in the construction, the numbers $x_0 < 0$ and $h > 0$ can be chosen arbitrarily, but after that all other parameters are uniquely determined; see Section 2.3. and the beginning of Section 2.5 of [1]. Here, we fix $h \geq 8$ for the rest of the proof (in the reference, the results hold for all $h \geq 2$). The number x_0 will be fixed later.

We do not need to present the details of the above mentioned construction, since it is enough for our purposes to quote a couple of the results in [1]. First, the inequality (2.2) in Lemma 2.1. of [1] says that

$$(3.3) \quad \ell_{k+1}(x) \geq \ell_k(x) + h \quad \text{for all } x \in [x_{k+1}, 0), \quad k \in \mathbb{N},$$

and the choice of the functions ℓ_k (see (ii) in the beginning of Section 2.3 and Fig.1 of [1]) implies that

$$(3.4) \quad \ell_{k+1}(x) \geq \ell_k(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in [x_k, x_{k+1}), \quad k \in \mathbb{N},$$

Second, Lemma 2.2 of [1] states that the following holds:

$$(I) \quad a_k r^{\beta_k} \leq 1/\omega(r), \quad r \in [t_0, 1),$$

$$(II) \quad e^{-h}/\omega(r) \leq a_k r^{\beta_k}, \quad r \in [t_{k-1}, t_k],$$

$$(III) \quad \sum_{\substack{m \geq 1, \\ |m-k| \geq 2}} a_m r^{\beta_m} \leq \frac{1}{2} a_k r^{\beta_k}, \quad r \in [t_{k-1}, t_k].$$

If necessary, we apply a simple scaling argument so that we can assume for the rest of the proof that $W(0) = 1$ and thus $W(|z|) \leq 1$ for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$. We define $\nu_1 = 1$ and

$$(3.5) \quad \nu_k = \max \left\{ W(t_k), \frac{k-1}{k} \nu_{k-1} \right\} \quad \forall k \geq 2.$$

Then, in the same way as after (2.2), one shows that the sequence $(\nu_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ is non-increasing and there holds $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \nu_k = 0$. Also, we have $\nu_k \geq 1/k$ for all k , and, moreover, if $m < k$, there holds, by a repeated use of (3.5),

$$(3.6) \quad \nu_m \leq \left(\prod_{j=m+1}^k \frac{j}{j-1} \right) \nu_k = \frac{k}{m} \nu_k.$$

Due to the properties of the numbers ν_k , the function $\widehat{W} : (0, 1) \rightarrow (0, 1)$,

$$(3.7) \quad \widehat{W}(r) = 1 \text{ for } r \in [0, t_0), \quad \widehat{W}(r) = \nu_k \text{ for } r \in [t_k, t_{k+1}), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

is non-increasing, piecewise continuous and has the limit 0 as $r \rightarrow 1^-$. Moreover, since \widehat{W} is not smaller than W , it suffices to prove the assertion of the theorem for this new function, which we still denote by W .

Our next task is to prove the following

Claim. There holds the following modification of (III): for arbitrary $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$(IV) \quad \sum_{\substack{m \geq 1, \\ |m-k| \geq 2}} \nu_m a_m r^{\beta_m} \leq \frac{1}{2} \nu_k a_k r^{\beta_k}, \quad r \in [t_{k-1}, t_k],$$

Now, the main difficulty is that if $m < k$, then the new coefficient ν_m , on the left hand side, is larger than ν_k (thus, the sequence $(\nu_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ must not decrease too fast). To prove the claim we first consider indices m smaller than k on the left-hand side of (IV). Indeed, (3.3) implies $\ell_{j+1}(x) - \ell_j(x) \geq h$ for all $j = m, m+1, \dots, k-2$ and $x \in [x_{k-1}, 0)$, hence, for these x ,

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \ell_m(x) + h(k-m-1) &\leq \ell_m(x) + \sum_{j=m}^{k-2} (\ell_{j+1}(x) - \ell_j(x)) \\ &= \ell_{k-1}(x) \leq \ell_k(x), \end{aligned}$$

see also (3.4). We obtain, by (3.2), (3.6) and (3.8), for all $m \leq k-2$ and $r = e^x \in [t_{k-1}, 1)$ (see (3.1)),

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{m}{k} e^{h(k-m-1)} \nu_m a_m r^{\beta_m} &= \nu_m \frac{m}{k} e^{\ell_m(x)} e^{h(k-m-1)} \leq \nu_k e^{\ell_m(x) + h(k-m-1)} \\ &\leq \nu_k e^{\ell_k(x)} = \nu_k a_k r^{\beta_k}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$(3.10) \quad \sum_{m=1}^{k-2} \nu_m a_m r^{\beta_m} \leq \nu_k a_k r^{\beta_k} \sum_{m=1}^{k-2} \frac{k}{m} e^{-h(k-m-1)}.$$

Here, assuming $k \geq 3$, $h \geq 8$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{m=1}^{k-2} \frac{k}{m} e^{-h(k-m-1)} \\
&= e^{-h(k-1)} \sum_{m=1}^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} \frac{k}{m} e^{hm} + e^{-h} \sum_{m=\lfloor k/2 \rfloor+1}^{k-2} \frac{k}{m} e^{-h(k-2-m)} \\
&\leq e^{-h(k-1)} k^2 e^{hk/2} + \frac{k}{k/2} e^{-h} \sum_{m=0}^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor-2} e^{-hm} \\
(3.11) \quad &\leq e^{-h(k/2-1)} k^2 + 2e^{-h} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} e^{-hm}.
\end{aligned}$$

The first term on the right is at most $e^{-4k+8} k^2$ (since $h \geq 8$), which is decreasing for $k \geq 3$ and thus at most $9e^{-4} < 1/5$. The second term is bounded by $3e^{-h} < \frac{1}{20}$. Hence, (3.10) yields

$$(3.12) \quad \sum_{m=1}^{k-2} \nu_m a_m r^{\beta_m} \leq \frac{1}{4} \nu_k a_k r^{\beta_k}$$

On the other hand, for $m > k$ we can use the estimate just before (2.3) of [1], namely,

$$(3.13) \quad a_m r^{\beta_m} \leq a_k r^{\beta_k} e^{-h(m-k-1)}, \quad r \in [t_{k-1}, t_k],$$

and since $\nu_k > \nu_m$ for $m > k$, this yields

$$(3.14) \quad \sum_{m=k+2}^{\infty} \nu_m a_m r^{\beta_m} < \nu_k \sum_{m=k+2}^{\infty} a_m r^{\beta_m} \leq \nu_k a_k r^{\beta_k} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} e^{-mh} \leq \frac{1}{4} \nu_k a_k r^{\beta_k}$$

for $r \in [t_{k-1}, t_k]$. Combining this with (3.12) proves (IV). \square

The rest of the proof follows the main reference with some necessary changes. Accordingly, we denote $n_k = \lfloor \beta_k \rfloor + 1 \geq \beta_k$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The arguments in the beginning of Section 2.5 in [1] include the choice of the number $x_0 < 0$ such that $t_0 = e^{x_0} > 9/10$, which then implies that $n_k < n_{k+1}$ and that

$$(3.15) \quad 1 < \frac{a_k r^{\beta_k}}{a_k r^{n_k}} \leq \frac{10}{9}$$

holds for all r close enough to 1, that is, at least for $r \in (\frac{9}{10}, 1)$. Thus, properties (I), (II), (IV) turn into

- (A) $a_k r^{n_k} \leq 1/\omega(r)$, $r \in [t_0, 1)$,
- (B) $\frac{9}{10} e^{-h}/\omega(r) \leq a_k r^{n_k}$, $r \in [t_{k-1}, t_k]$,

$$(C) \quad \sum_{\substack{m \geq 1, \\ |m-k| \geq 2}} \nu_m a_m r^{n_m} \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{10}{9} \nu_k a_k r^{n_k}, \quad r \in [t_{k-1}, t_k],$$

We define

$$(3.16) \quad f(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \nu_{2j+1} a_{2j+1} z^{n_{2j+1}}, \quad g(z) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \nu_{2j} a_{2j} z^{n_{2j}}$$

and claim first that both functions belong to $H_{\omega,0}^{\infty}$. Indeed for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and z with $r = |z| \in [t_{k-1}, t_k]$ we obtain

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{aligned} |f(z)| + |g(z)| &\leq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \nu_m a_m |z|^{n_m} \\ &= \sum_{m=k-1}^{k+1} \nu_m a_m r^{n_m} + \sum_{\substack{m \geq 1, \\ |m-k| \geq 2}} \nu_m a_m r^{n_m}. \end{aligned}$$

By (A) and (3.6), the first sum on the right-hand side can be estimated as

$$\sum_{m=k-1}^{k+1} \nu_m a_m r^{n_m} \leq \sum_{m=k-1}^{k+1} \frac{\nu_m}{\omega(r)} \leq 3 \frac{(k+1)\nu_{k+1}}{(k-1)\omega(r)} \leq \frac{6\nu_{k+1}}{\omega(r)}.$$

Since $r \in [t_{k-1}, t_k]$, we have $W(r) \geq \nu_{k-1} > \nu_{k+1}$ by (3.7), and the first sum in (3.17) thus has the upper bound $6W(r)/\omega(r)$. The second sum in (3.17) is also bounded by $CW(r)/\omega(r)$, since (C) and similar arguments yield

$$\sum_{\substack{m \geq 1, \\ |m-k| \geq 2}} \nu_m a_m r^{n_m} \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{10}{9} \nu_k a_k r^{n_k} \leq \frac{\nu_k}{\omega(r)} \leq \frac{W(r)}{\omega(r)}.$$

Hence, we obtain

$$|f(z)| + |g(z)| \leq \frac{CW(z)}{\omega(z)}$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$, since k was arbitrary. This proves the claim since $W(r) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow 1^-$.

To prove the lower bound (1.5) we consider first an odd $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq 3$, and $z \in \mathbb{D}$ with $|z| = r \in [t_{k-1}, t_k]$. Using (B), (C) and the bound $W(r) = \nu_{k-1} \leq k(k-1)^{-1}\nu_k$ (see (3.7), (3.6)) we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-h} \frac{W(r)}{\omega(r)} &\leq \frac{10k}{9(k-1)} \nu_k a_k r^{n_k} \leq 2\nu_k a_k r^{n_k} \\ &\leq 5 \left(\nu_k a_k r^{n_k} - \sum_{\substack{m \geq 1, \\ |m-k| \geq 2}} \nu_m a_m r^{n_m} \right) = 5 \left(|\nu_k a_k z^{n_k}| - \sum_{\substack{m \geq 1, \\ |m-k| \geq 2}} \nu_m a_m |z|^{n_m} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$(3.18) \leq 5 \left| \nu_k a_k z^{n_k} + \sum_{\substack{m \geq 1, \\ |m-k| \geq 2}} \nu_m a_m z^{n_m} \right| = 5|f(z)|.$$

If $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is even and $r \in [t_{k-1}, t_k]$, the same argument yields the lower bound $5g(r) \geq e^{-h}W(r)\omega(r)^{-1}$. By a simple redefinition of f and g , this proves (1.5) for all z belonging to the annulus $\mathbb{D} \setminus \overline{B(0, t_2)}$.

Condition (1.5) could still be violated in case the functions f and g have common zeros in $B(0, t_2)$. The common zero of f and g at the origin is treated by dividing f by z^{n_1} and redefining f accordingly. Then, the lower bound (1.5) can be obtained in the entire disc \mathbb{D} by choosing a suitable $\theta \in (0, 2\pi)$ so that changing the definition of g by the rotation $g(z) \mapsto g(e^{i\theta}z)$ removes the possible remaining, finitely many common zeros of f and g . For details, see the end of Section 2.5 of [1]. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Abakumov, E. Doubtsov, Moduli of holomorphic functions and logarithmically convex radial weights, *Bull. London Math. Soc.* 47 (2015), 519–532.
- [2] O. Blasco, M. Lindström, J. Taskinen, Bloch-to-BMOA compositions in several complex variables, *Complex Variables, Theory and Application: An International Journal*, 50 (2005), 1061–1080.
- [3] B.R. Choe, K.S. Rim, Fractional derivatives of Bloch functions, growth rate, and interpolation. *Acta Mathematica Hungarica*, 72(1996), 67–86.
- [4] D. Girela, Analytic functions of bounded mean oscillation. In: Rauno Aulaskari (ed.), *Complex function spaces Mekrijärvi 1999*, University of Joensuu, Department of Mathematics Report series No. 4, Joensuu 2001.
- [5] Z. Lou, Composition operators on Bloch type spaces, *Analysis* 23 (2003), 81–95.
- [6] Ch. Pommerenke, *Boundary behaviour of conformal maps*. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften vol. 299, Springer Verlag (1992).
- [7] W. Ramey, D. Ullrich, Bounded mean oscillation of Bloch pull-backs, *Math. Annalen* 291 (1991), 591–606.
- [8] H. Wulan, K. Zhu, Bloch and BMO functions in the unit ball, *Complex variables and elliptic equations* 53 (2008), 1009–1019.
- [9] K. Zhu, *Operator Theory in Function Spaces*, 2nd ed. Vol. 138, *Mathematical surveys and monographs*, American Mathematical Society, Providence RI, 2007.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO, TOLEDO, OH 43606, USA

UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, P.O.BOX 68, 00014 HELSINKI, FINLAND