

## Rank-one commutators on invariant subspaces of the Hardy space on the bidisk III

Kou Hei IZUCHI

(Received September 5, 2008; Revised December 26, 2008)

**Abstract.** We study a special type of invariant subspaces  $\mathcal{M}$  on the bidisk which are studied in the previous papers. We determine the rank of cross commutators on  $H^2 \ominus \mathcal{M}$ , and study when  $\mathcal{M}$  is generated by  $\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M})$  as an invariant subspace of  $H^2$ .

*Key words:* invariant subspaces, backward shift invariant subspaces, rank-one commutators.

### 1. Introduction

Let  $\mathbb{D}$  and  $\Gamma$  be the open unit disk and the unit circle in the complex plane  $\mathbb{C}$ , respectively. We denote by  $H^2 = H^2(\Gamma^2)$  the Hardy space over the torus  $\Gamma^2$ , and we denote two variables by  $z$  and  $w$ . For  $\psi \in L^\infty = L^\infty(\Gamma^2)$ , we define the Toeplitz operator on  $H^2$  by  $T_\psi f = P_{H^2} \psi f$ , where  $P_{H^2}$  is the orthogonal projection from  $L^2 = L^2(\Gamma^2)$  onto  $H^2$ . A closed subspace  $M$  of  $H^2$  with  $M \neq \{0\}$  and  $M \neq H^2$  is said to be invariant if  $M$  is invariant under  $T_z$  and  $T_w$ . In one variable case, Beurling [Beu] represented a well known theorem that an invariant subspace  $M$  has a form  $M = qH^2(\Gamma)$ , where  $q$  is an inner function. But in two variables case, the structure of invariant subspaces of  $H^2$  is very complicated; see [CG], [DY], [Rud], [Ya1], [Ya2], [Ya3].

For a fixed invariant subspace  $M$  of  $H^2$ , let  $R_z$  and  $R_w$  be the compression operators on  $M$  defined by  $R_z = P_M T_z|_M$  and  $R_w = P_M T_w|_M$ , respectively, where  $P_M$  is the orthogonal projection from  $L^2$  onto  $M$ . Write  $N = H^2 \ominus M$ . Then  $N$  is a backward shift invariant subspace, that is,  $T_z^* N \subset N$  and  $T_w^* N \subset N$ . Let  $S_z$  and  $S_w$  be the compression operators on  $N$  defined by  $S_z = P_N T_z|_N$  and  $S_w = P_N T_w|_N$ , respectively. We denote the cross commutators by  $[R_z, R_w^*] = R_z R_w^* - R_w^* R_z$  and  $[S_z, S_w^*] = S_z S_w^* - S_w^* S_z$ , where  $R_w^*$  and  $S_z^*$  are the adjoint operators

of  $R_w$  and  $S_z$  on  $M$  and  $N$ , respectively. We note that  $S_z^* = T_z^*|_N$  and  $T_z^*f = (f - f(0, w))/z$ .

In 1988, Mandrekar [Man] showed that an invariant subspace  $M$  has a form  $M = qH^2$ , where  $q$  is an inner function, if and only if  $[R_z, R_w^*] = 0$ . On the other hand, in [INS1] Izuchi, Nakazi, and Seto proved that  $[S_z, S_w^*] = 0$  if and only if  $M$  has one of the following forms:

$$M = q_1(z)H^2; \quad M = q_2(w)H^2; \quad M = q_1(z)H^2 + q_2(w)H^2$$

for some non-constant inner functions  $q_1(z)$  and  $q_2(w)$ . We write  $\text{rank}[R_z, R_w^*] = \dim[R_z, R_w^*]M$  and  $\text{rank}[S_z, S_w^*] = \dim[S_z, S_w^*]N$ .

In [II4], Izuchi and the author proved that  $\text{rank}[S_z, S_w^*] = 1$  if and only if  $M$  has one of the following forms:

- (i)  $M = \varphi H^2$ , where  $\varphi$  is a non-constant inner function and is not a one variable function,
- (ii)  $M = q_1(z)q_2(z)H^2 + q_2(z)q_3(w)H^2 + q_3(w)q_4(w)H^2$ , where  $q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4$  satisfy one of the following:
  - ( $\alpha$ )  $q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4$  are one variable non-constant inner functions,
  - ( $\beta$ )  $q_1 = 0$ , and  $q_2, q_3, q_4$  are one variable non-constant inner functions,
  - ( $\gamma$ )  $q_4 = 0$ , and  $q_1, q_2, q_3$  are one variable non-constant inner functions.

Since  $[R_z, R_w^*] = 0$  on  $wM$ , generally a cross commutator  $[R_z, R_w^*]$  is small. In [Ya3, Theorem 2.3], Yang showed that the operator  $[R_z, R_w^*]$  is Hilbert-Schmidt under a mild condition on  $M$ ; see also [Ya1]. In [II1], [II3], Izuchi and the author studied  $M$  under the condition that  $\text{rank}[R_z, R_w^*] = 1$ , and found an interesting example of  $M$  satisfying  $\text{rank}[R_z, R_w^*] = 1$ . We denote by  $\text{ball } H^\infty(\Gamma)$  the closed unit ball of  $H^\infty(\Gamma)$  with the supremum norm. [Gar], [Hof] are nice references for the study of  $H^\infty(\Gamma)$ . We denote by  $H^2(\Gamma_z)$  the Hardy space in variable  $z$ .

Let  $G(z), H(z) \in \text{ball } H^\infty(\Gamma_z)$  satisfying the following conditions:

- (a)  $G(z)$  is a non-extreme point in  $\text{ball } H^\infty(\Gamma_z)$ ,
- (b)  $|H(z)|^2 = 1 - |G(z)|^2$  a.e. on  $\Gamma_z$ ,
- (c)  $H_0(z)$  is an outer function with  $|H_0(z)|^2 = 1 - |G(z)|^2$  a.e. on  $\Gamma_z$ .
- (d)  $\varphi$  is an inner function with

$$\frac{\varphi H_0(z)}{w - G(z)} \in H^2.$$

It is known that  $f(z)$  is an extreme point in *ball*  $H^\infty(\Gamma_z)$  if and only if

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \log(1 - |f(e^{i\theta})|) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} = -\infty;$$

see [Hof, pp. 138–139]. In [II3], it is proved that

$$\varphi H^2 \perp \frac{\varphi H(z)}{w - G(z)} H^2(\Gamma_z).$$

We write

$$\mathcal{M} = \varphi H^2 \oplus \frac{\varphi H(z)}{w - G(z)} H^2(\Gamma_z). \quad (1.1)$$

It is also proved that  $\mathcal{M}$  is an invariant subspace with  $\text{rank}[R_z, R_w^*] = 1$ . In this paper, we study  $\mathcal{M}$  more exactly. In this moment, there are no complete descriptions of  $M$  satisfying  $\text{rank}[R_z, R_w^*] = 1$ . We write  $\mathcal{N} = H^2 \ominus \mathcal{M}$ .

Recently in [II5], Izuchi and the author showed that for invariant subspaces  $M$  of  $H^2$  with  $\text{rank}[R_w^*, R_w][R_z^*, R_z] < \infty$ ,

$$\text{rank}[R_z, R_w^*] - 1 \leq \text{rank}[S_z, S_w^*] \leq \text{rank}[R_z, R_w^*] + 1.$$

We will study  $\text{rank}[S_z, S_w^*]$  for  $\mathcal{M}$ .

About fifteen years ago, Hedenmalm [Hed] gave a very exciting theorem on the Bergman space  $L_a^2(\mathbb{D})$  over the unit disk  $\mathbb{D}$ . He proved that there is an invariant subspace  $I$  of  $L_a^2(\mathbb{D})$  satisfying  $\dim(I \ominus zI) = 2$ . In [ARS], Aleman, Richter, and Sundberg proved that  $[I \ominus zI] = I$  for every invariant subspace  $I$  of  $L_a^2(\mathbb{D})$ , where  $[I \ominus zI]$  is the invariant subspace of  $L_a^2(\mathbb{D})$  generated by  $I \ominus zI$ ; see also [DS], [HKZ].

In  $H^2$ , we can consider similar issues. Let  $M$  be an invariant subspace of  $H^2$ . The space  $M \ominus (zM + wM)$  is naturally considered as the corresponding space to  $I \ominus zI$ . The space  $M \ominus (zM + wM)$  is one of the most important spaces for studying the structure of  $M$ . For a subset  $E$  of  $H^2$ , let  $[E]$  denote the invariant subspace generated by all functions in  $E$ . In [Nak], Nakazi showed that for  $f \in H^2$   $\dim([f] \ominus (z[f] + w[f])) = 1$ , and posed a problem whether  $[f] = [[f] \ominus (z[f] + w[f])]$  holds or not. Here our question is; when does  $M = [M \ominus (zM + wM)]$  hold? We will answer this question for  $\mathcal{M}$ .

In Section 2, we treat the case that  $G(z)$  is a constant. It is proved

that if  $G(0) \neq 0$  and  $H(0) \neq 0$ , then  $\dim(\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M})) = 1$  and  $\mathcal{M} \neq [\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M})]$ .

In Section 3, we study the case that  $G(z)$  is non-constant. It is proved that if  $G(0) \neq 0$  and  $H(0) \neq 0$ , then  $\dim(\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M})) = 1$ , and  $\mathcal{M} = [\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M})]$  for some cases. In the first glance, one thinks that  $\mathcal{M}$  given by (1.1) is not a singly generated invariant subspace, but this is not true. We give an equivalent condition on  $G(z)$  and  $H(z)$  for which  $\mathcal{M} = [\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M})]$ .

## 2. The case that $G(z)$ is constant

Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be an invariant subspace given in (1.1) with conditions (a), (b), (c), and (d). In this section, we study the case that  $G(z)$  is a constant function. Let  $G(z) = a \in \mathbb{D}$ . Then

$$\mathcal{M} = \varphi H^2 \oplus \frac{\varphi H(z)}{w - a} H^2(\Gamma_z).$$

By (b), we can write  $H(z) = bI(z)$ , where  $b \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $|b|^2 = 1 - |a|^2$  and  $I(z)$  is inner. We note that

$$\varphi = \frac{w - a}{1 - \bar{a}w} \varphi_1$$

for some inner function  $\varphi_1$ . Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M} &= \varphi_1 \left( \frac{w - a}{1 - \bar{a}w} H^2 \oplus \frac{H(z)}{1 - \bar{a}w} H^2(\Gamma_z) \right) \\ &= \varphi_1 \left( \frac{w - a}{1 - \bar{a}w} H^2 + I(z) H^2 \right) \\ &= \varphi_1 \mathcal{M}_1, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{M}_1 = \frac{w - a}{1 - \bar{a}w} H^2 + I(z) H^2.$$

**Proposition 2.1** *Let*

$$\mathcal{M} = \varphi_1 \mathcal{M}_1 = \varphi_1 \left( \frac{w-a}{1-\bar{a}w} H^2 + I(z) H^2 \right)$$

for some inner function  $\varphi_1$ ,  $a \in \mathbb{D}$ , and one variable inner function  $I(z)$ . Then we have the following:

- (i) If  $\varphi_1$  is constant, then  $[S_z, S_w^*] = 0$ .
- (ii) Suppose that  $\varphi_1$  is non-constant and  $I(z)$  is constant. If  $\varphi_1$  is one variable, then  $[S_z, S_w^*] = 0$ . If  $\varphi_1$  is not one variable, then  $\text{rank}[S_z, S_w^*] = 1$ .
- (iii) Suppose that  $\varphi_1$  and  $I(z)$  are non-constant. If  $\varphi_1$  is one variable, then  $\text{rank}[S_z, S_w^*] = 1$ . If  $\varphi_1$  is not one variable, then  $\text{rank}[S_z, S_w^*] = 2$ .

To prove Proposition 2.1, we need the following lemma due to Yang [Ya4, p. 179].

**Lemma 2.2**  $\text{rank}[S_z, S_w^*] \leq \text{rank}[R_w^*, R_w][R_z^*, R_z]$ .

It is easy to see that

$$[R_w^*, R_w][R_z^*, R_z] = (I - R_w R_w^*)(I - R_z R_z^*) = P_{\mathcal{M} \ominus w\mathcal{M}} P_{\mathcal{M} \ominus z\mathcal{M}}.$$

*Proof of Proposition 2.1.* (i): By [INS1], we have that if  $\varphi_1$  is constant, then  $[S_z, S_w^*] = 0$ .

(ii): Suppose that  $\varphi_1$  is non-constant and  $I(z)$  is constant. Then  $\mathcal{M}_1 = H^2$  and  $\mathcal{M} = \varphi_1 H^2$ . By [INS1], we know that if  $\varphi_1$  is one variable inner, then  $[S_z, S_w^*] = 0$ . Yang [Ya4] pointed out that if  $\varphi_1$  is not one variable, then  $\text{rank}[S_z, S_w^*] = 1$ .

(iii): Suppose that  $\varphi_1$  and  $I(z)$  are non-constant inner functions. By [II4], if  $\varphi_1$  is one variable, then  $\text{rank}[S_z, S_w^*] = 1$ , and if  $\varphi_1$  is not one variable, then  $\text{rank}[S_z, S_w^*] \geq 2$ . We have

$$\mathcal{M} \ominus z\mathcal{M} = \varphi H^2(\Gamma_w) \oplus \mathbb{C} \cdot \frac{\varphi H(z)}{w-a}.$$

Hence

$$P_{\mathcal{M} \ominus w\mathcal{M}} P_{\mathcal{M} \ominus z\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{C} \cdot \varphi \oplus \mathbb{C} \cdot \frac{\varphi H(z)}{w-a}.$$

By Lemma 2.2, we have  $\text{rank}[S_z, S_w^*] \leq 2$ . So,  $\varphi_1$  is not one variable and  $\text{rank}[S_z, S_w^*] = 2$ .  $\square$

In the following theorem, we study  $[\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M})]$ . To study our problem, an inner factor  $\varphi_1$  is not essential, so we may assume that  $\varphi_1 = 1$ . If  $I(z)$  is constant, then  $\mathcal{M} = H^2$ . Hence  $\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M}) = \mathbb{C} \cdot 1$  and  $[\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M})] = \mathcal{M}$ . So, we assume that  $I(z)$  is non-constant.

**Theorem 2.3** *Let*

$$\mathcal{M} = \frac{w - a}{1 - \bar{a}w} H^2 + I(z) H^2$$

*for some  $a \in \mathbb{D}$  and a one variable non-constant inner function  $I(z)$ . Then we have the following:*

(i) *If  $a = 0$  and  $I(0) = 0$ , then*

$$\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M}) = \mathbb{C} \cdot w + \mathbb{C} \cdot I(z)$$

*and*

$$[\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M})] = \mathcal{M}.$$

(ii) *If  $a = 0$  and  $I(0) \neq 0$ , then*

$$\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M}) = \mathbb{C} \cdot I(z)$$

*and*

$$[\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M})] = I(z) H^2 \neq \mathcal{M}.$$

(iii) *If  $a \neq 0$  and  $I(0) = 0$ , then*

$$\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M}) = \mathbb{C} \cdot \frac{w - a}{1 - \bar{a}w}$$

*and*

$$[\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M})] = \frac{w - a}{1 - \bar{a}w} H^2 \neq \mathcal{M}.$$

(iv) If  $a \neq 0$  and  $I(0) \neq 0$ , then

$$\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M}) = \mathbb{C} \cdot \left( \frac{-\bar{a}(w-a)}{(1-|a|^2)(1-\bar{a}w)} + \frac{\overline{I(0)}I(z)}{1-\bar{a}w} \right)$$

and

$$[\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M})] \neq \mathcal{M}.$$

To describe  $\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M})$ , we use Guo and Yang's result given in [GY]. Let  $M$  be an invariant subspace of  $H^2$ , and  $K(\lambda, Z)$  be the reproducing kernel for  $M$ ,  $\lambda \in \Gamma^2$ , and  $Z = (z, w) \in \mathbb{D}^2$ . Associated with  $M$ , Guo and Yang defined the core operator  $C$  on  $M$  by

$$C(f)(Z) = \int_{\Gamma^2} (1 - \overline{\lambda_1}z)(1 - \overline{\lambda_2}w)K(\lambda, Z)f(\lambda) dm(\lambda), \quad (2.1)$$

where  $dm(\lambda)$  is the normarized Lebesgue measure on  $\Gamma^2$ , and they showed that

$$C = I - R_z R_z^* - R_w(1 - R_z R_z^*)R_w^*. \quad (2.2)$$

So,  $C$  is a bounded selfadjoint operator on  $M$ . Also they showed the following.

**Lemma 2.4** *Let  $f \in M$ . Then  $C(f) = f$  if and only if  $f \in M \ominus (zM + wM)$ .*

*Proof of Theorem 2.3.* It is not difficult to show (i), (ii), and (iii), so we shall show (iv). Write

$$q(w) = \frac{w-a}{1-\bar{a}w}.$$

By [Ya4, p. 176],

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - \overline{\lambda_1}z)(1 - \overline{\lambda_2}w)K(\lambda, Z) \\ &= \overline{I(\lambda_1)}I(z) + \overline{q(\lambda_2)}q(w) - \overline{I(\lambda_1)q(\lambda_2)}I(z)q(w). \end{aligned}$$

Hence by (2.1) and Lemma 2.4,

$$\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M}) \subset \mathbb{C} \cdot I(z) + \mathbb{C} \cdot q(w) + \mathbb{C} \cdot I(z)q(w).$$

Let  $F = aI(z) + bq(w) + cI(z)q(w)$  satisfying  $C(F) = F$ . It is not difficult to see that

$$\begin{aligned} C(F) &= (a + b\overline{I(0)}q(0) + cq(0))I(z) + (aI(0)\overline{q(0)} + b + cI(0))q(w) \\ &\quad - (a\overline{q(0)} + b\overline{I(0)} + c)I(z)q(w). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we get

$$b\overline{I(0)}q(0) + cq(0) = 0, \quad aI(0)\overline{q(0)} + cI(0) = 0, \quad -a\overline{q(0)} - b\overline{I(0)} = 2c.$$

Since  $q(0) \neq 0$  and  $I(0) \neq 0$ , we have

$$a = -\frac{1}{\overline{q(0)}}c \quad \text{and} \quad b = -\frac{1}{\overline{I(0)}}c.$$

By Lemma 2.4, we have

$$-\frac{1}{\overline{q(0)}}I(z) - \frac{1}{\overline{I(0)}}q(w) + I(z)q(w) \in \mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M}).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M}) \\ &= \mathbb{C} \cdot \left( -\overline{I(0)}I(z) + \frac{\overline{a}(w-a)}{1-\overline{a}w} - \overline{aI(0)}I(z)\frac{w-a}{1-\overline{a}w} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{C} \cdot \left( \frac{-\overline{a}(w-a)}{(1-|a|^2)(1-\overline{a}w)} + \frac{\overline{I(0)}I(z)}{1-\overline{a}w} \right). \end{aligned}$$

It remains to prove  $[\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M})] \neq \mathcal{M}$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}_1$  be the invariant subspace of  $H^2$  generated by the function

$$\frac{-\overline{a}(w-a)}{(1-|a|^2)(1-\overline{a}w)} + \frac{\overline{I(0)}I(z)}{1-\overline{a}w}.$$



We note that  $(1 - \bar{a}w)\mathcal{M}_1 = \mathcal{M}_1$ . Then  $\mathcal{M}_1$  is generated by

$$\frac{1 - \bar{a}w}{\overline{I(0)}} \left( \frac{-\bar{a}(w - a)}{(1 - |a|^2)(1 - \bar{a}w)} + \frac{\overline{I(0)}I(z)}{1 - \bar{a}w} \right) = \frac{-\bar{a}(w - a)}{\overline{I(0)}(1 - |a|^2)} + I(z).$$

Therefore it is enough to show that

$$\left[ \frac{-\bar{a}(w - a)}{\overline{I(0)}(1 - |a|^2)} + I(z) \right] \neq \frac{w - a}{1 - \bar{a}w} H^2 + I(z) H^2.$$

To prove this, we suppose that the equality holds. Since  $1 - \bar{a}w$  is an invertible function in  $H^\infty(\Gamma_w)$ , we have

$$\left[ \frac{-\bar{a}(w - a)}{\overline{I(0)}(1 - |a|^2)} + I(z) \right] = (w - a)H^2 + I(z)H^2.$$

Since  $I(z)$  is non-constant inner,  $I(\mathbb{D})$  is dense in  $\mathbb{D}$ . Since the range of the function

$$\frac{-\bar{a}(w - a)}{\overline{I(0)}(1 - |a|^2)}$$

contains small open disks with center 0, one sees that the common zero set in  $\mathbb{D}^2$  of

$$\left[ \frac{-\bar{a}(w - a)}{\overline{I(0)}(1 - |a|^2)} + I(z) \right]$$

has a nonempty connected component. On the other hand, the common zero set in  $\mathbb{D}^2$  of  $(w - a)H^2 + I(z)H^2$  is  $\{(\zeta, a) \in \mathbb{D}^2 | I(\zeta) = 0\}$  and this set is either empty or a discrete set. This is a contradiction. This completes the proof.  $\square$

### 3. The case that $G(z)$ is non-constant

Write

$$h_0 = \frac{\varphi H(z)}{w - G(z)} \in H^2. \quad (3.1)$$

Then  $\mathcal{M} = \varphi H^2 + h_0 H^2(\Gamma_z)$ . By (3.1),

$$h_0 = \varphi H(z) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \bar{w}^{(n+1)} G^n(z), \quad (3.2)$$

so for  $i \neq j$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle h_0 z^i, h_0 z^j \rangle &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \langle z^i H(z) G^n(z), z^j H(z) G^n(z) \rangle \\ &= \left\langle |H(z)|^2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |G(z)|^{2n}, z^{j-i} \right\rangle \\ &= \langle 1, z^{j-i} \rangle \quad \text{by condition (b)} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$h_0 z^i \perp h_0 z^j, \quad i \neq j, \quad (3.3)$$

so we have  $\mathcal{M} \subset H^2$ . By (3.2), for  $i, j, k \geq 0$

$$\langle \varphi z^i w^j, h_0 z^k \rangle = \left\langle z^i w^j, z^k H(z) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \bar{w}^{(n+1)} G^n(z) \right\rangle = 0.$$

Thus we have

$$\varphi H^2 \perp h_0 H^2(\Gamma_z),$$

so  $\mathcal{M} = \varphi H^2 \oplus h_0 H^2(\Gamma_z)$ . By condition (b) and (3.2), we have

$$\|h_0\|^2 = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|H(z) G^n(z)\|^2 = \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{|H(e^{i\theta})|^2}{1 - |G(e^{i\theta})|^2} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} = 1. \quad (3.4)$$

Since  $\mathcal{M} = \varphi H^2 \oplus h_0 H^2(\Gamma_z)$ , by (3.3) we have

$$\mathcal{M} \ominus z\mathcal{M} = \varphi H^2(\Gamma_w) \oplus \mathbb{C} \cdot h_0. \quad (3.5)$$

**Proposition 3.1** *If  $G(z)$  is non-constant, then  $\text{rank}[S_z, S_w^*] = 2$ .*

*Proof.* By (3.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} [R_w^*, R_w][R_z^*, R_z]\mathcal{M} &= P_{\mathcal{M} \ominus w\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{M} \ominus z\mathcal{M}) \\ &= P_{\mathcal{M} \ominus w\mathcal{M}}(\varphi H^2(\Gamma_w) \oplus \mathbb{C} \cdot h_0) \\ &= P_{\mathcal{M} \ominus w\mathcal{M}}(\mathbb{C} \cdot \varphi \oplus \mathbb{C} \cdot h_0). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore by Lemma 2.2,  $\text{rank}[S_z, S_w^*] \leq 2$ . By [INS1], we have  $[S_z, S_w^*] \neq 0$ . By [II4],  $\text{rank}[S_z, S_w^*] \neq 1$ . Thus we get  $\text{rank}[S_z, S_w^*] = 2$ .  $\square$

Next, we study  $[\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M})]$ . Recall that, by (2.2)

$$C = I - R_z R_z^* - R_w(I - R_z R_z^*)R_w^* = P_{\mathcal{M} \ominus z\mathcal{M}} - R_w P_{\mathcal{M} \ominus z\mathcal{M}} R_w^*.$$

Now it is easy to see that  $C = 0$  on  $w\varphi H^2$ . We have

$$\mathcal{M} \ominus w\varphi H^2 = \varphi H^2(\Gamma_z) \oplus h_0 H^2(\Gamma_z). \quad (3.6)$$

**Lemma 3.2** *For  $f(z) \in H^2(\Gamma_z)$ , we have the following:*

- (i)  $C(\varphi f(z)) = f(0)\varphi - \langle f(z), H(z) \rangle w h_0$ .
- (ii)  $C(h_0 f(z)) = f(0)h_0 - \langle f(z), G(z) \rangle w h_0$ .
- (iii)  $C(wh_0) = H(0)\varphi + G(0)h_0 - wh_0$ .
- (iv)  $C(\mathcal{M}) = \mathbb{C} \cdot \varphi + \mathbb{C} \cdot h_0 + \mathbb{C} \cdot wh_0$ .

*Proof.* (i): We have  $P_{\mathcal{M} \ominus z\mathcal{M}}\varphi f(z) = f(0)\varphi$ . Since  $R_w^*(\varphi f(z)) \perp \varphi H^2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_w P_{\mathcal{M} \ominus z\mathcal{M}} R_w^*(\varphi f(z)) &= w \langle R_w^* \varphi f(z), h_0 \rangle h_0 \quad \text{by (3.4) and (3.5)} \\ &= \langle \varphi f(z), wh_0 \rangle wh_0 \\ &= \left\langle f(z), \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \bar{w}^n G(z)^n H(z) \right\rangle wh_0 \\ &= \langle f(z), H(z) \rangle wh_0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we get (i).

(ii): We have  $P_{\mathcal{M} \ominus z\mathcal{M}}(h_0 f(z)) = f(0)h_0$ . Since  $R_w^*(h_0 f(z)) \perp \varphi H^2$ , we

have

$$\begin{aligned}
& R_w P_{\mathcal{M} \ominus z\mathcal{M}} R_w^* (h_0 f(z)) \\
&= \langle R_w^* h_0 f(z), h_0 \rangle w h_0 \\
&= \langle h_0 f(z), w h_0 \rangle w h_0 \\
&= \left\langle \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f(z) H(z) G(z)^n \bar{w}^{(n+1)}, \sum_{n=-1}^{\infty} H(z) G(z)^{n+1} \bar{w}^{(n+1)} \right\rangle w h_0 \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \langle f(z) H(z) G(z)^n, H(z) G(z)^{n+1} \rangle w h_0 \\
&= \left\langle f(z), \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |H(z)|^2 |G(z)|^{2n} G(z) \right\rangle w h_0 \\
&= \langle f(z), G(z) \rangle w h_0.
\end{aligned}$$

(iii): Since  $wh_0 = \varphi H(z) + h_0 G(z)$ , by (i) and (ii) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
C(wh_0) &= H(0)\varphi + G(0)h_0 - (\|H\|^2 + \|G\|^2)wh_0 \\
&= H(0)\varphi + G(0)h_0 - wh_0 \quad \text{by condition (b).}
\end{aligned}$$

(iv): This follows from (3.6), (i) and (ii).  $\square$

**Theorem 3.3** *Suppose that  $G(z)$  is non-constant. Then we have the following:*

(i) *If  $G(0) = H(0) = 0$ , then*

$$\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M}) = \mathbb{C} \cdot \varphi \oplus \mathbb{C} \cdot \frac{\varphi H(z)}{w - G(z)}$$

and

$$\mathcal{M} = [\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M})].$$

(ii) *If  $G(0) = 0$  and  $H(0) \neq 0$ , then*

$$\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M}) = \mathbb{C} \cdot \frac{\varphi H(z)}{w - G(z)},$$

and  $\mathcal{M} = [\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M})]$  if and only if  $H(z) = aH_0(z)$  for some  $a \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $|a| = 1$ .

(iii) If  $G(0) \neq 0$  and  $H(0) = 0$ , then

$$\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M}) = \mathbb{C} \cdot \varphi$$

and

$$\mathcal{M} \neq \varphi H^2(\Gamma^2) = [\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M})].$$

(iv) If  $G(0) \neq 0$  and  $H(0) \neq 0$ , then

$$\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M}) = \mathbb{C} \cdot \varphi \left( 1 - \frac{\overline{H(0)}H(z)}{G(0)(w - G(z))} \right),$$

and  $\mathcal{M} = [\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M})]$  if and only if

$$1 \leq \left| G(z) + \frac{\overline{H(0)}H(z)}{G(0)} \right|$$

for every  $z \in \mathbb{D}$ .

*Proof.* By (3.5),

$$\mathcal{M} \ominus z\mathcal{M} = \varphi H^2(\Gamma_w) \oplus \mathbb{C} \cdot h_0.$$

Then we can get easily

$$\{0\} \neq \mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M}) \subset \mathbb{C} \cdot \varphi \oplus \mathbb{C} \cdot h_0.$$

Let's start to prove Theorem 3.3.

(i): Since  $G(0) = H(0) = 0$ , by Lemmas 2.4 and 3.2 we have

$$\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M}) = \mathbb{C} \cdot \varphi \oplus \mathbb{C} \cdot h_0,$$

In this case, it is easy to see that  $\mathcal{M} = [\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M})]$ .

(ii): By Lemmas 2.4 and 3.2, we have  $\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M}) = \mathbb{C} \cdot h_0$ . We can write  $H(z) = I(z)H_0(z)$  for some inner function  $I(z)$ . Since  $H_0(z)$  is outer, by [Gar, p.85] there exists a sequence of polynomials  $\{p_n(z)\}_n$

such that  $|p_n(z)H_0(z)| \leq 1$  a.e. on  $\Gamma_z$  and  $p_n(z)H_0(z) \rightarrow 1$  a.e. on  $\Gamma_z$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Since  $(w - G(z))h_0 = \varphi H(z)$ , by the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem

$$p_n(z)(w - G(z))h_0 = p_n(z)H_0(z)\varphi I(z) \rightarrow \varphi I(z) \quad \text{in } H^2.$$

Hence we get  $\varphi I(z) \in [h_0]$ .

Now we prove that  $\mathcal{M} = [\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M})]$  if and only if  $H(z) = aH_0(z)$  for some  $a \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $|a| = 1$ .

( $\Leftarrow$ ) If  $I(z) = a$ , then we have  $\varphi \in [h_0]$  and  $\mathcal{M} = [\varphi, h_0] = [h_0]$ .

( $\Rightarrow$ ) To prove this by the contradiction, suppose that  $I(z)$  is non-constant. Then  $\varphi T_z^* I(z) \neq 0$  and  $\varphi T_z^* I(z) \in \mathcal{M}$ . For every non-negative integers  $i, j$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \varphi T_z^* I(z), z^i w^j h_0 \rangle &= \left\langle T_z^* I(z), z^i w^j I(z) H_0(z) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \overline{w}^{(k+1)} G^k(z) \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle 1, \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} z^{i+1} \overline{w}^{(k+1-j)} H_0(z) G^k(z) \right\rangle \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we get  $\varphi T_z^* I(z) \perp [h_0]$ , so that  $\mathcal{M} \neq [h_0]$ . Thus we get (ii).

(iii): By Lemmas 2.4 and 3.2, we have  $\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M}) = \mathbb{C} \cdot \varphi$ . Then we easily get (iii).

(iv): Let  $F = a\varphi + bh_0$  satisfying  $C(F) = F$ . By Lemma 3.2,

$$C(F) = a\varphi - a\overline{H(0)}wh_0 + bh_0 - b\overline{G(0)}wh_0.$$

Hence we get  $b = -\overline{H(0)}a/\overline{G(0)}$ . By Lemma 2.4,

$$\mathcal{M} \ominus (z\mathcal{M} + w\mathcal{M}) = \mathbb{C} \cdot (\varphi + \alpha h_0),$$

where  $\alpha = -\overline{H(0)}/\overline{G(0)}$ . By (3.1),

$$\varphi + \alpha h_0 = \varphi \left( 1 + \frac{\alpha H(z)}{w - G(z)} \right).$$

Since

$$\mathcal{M} = \varphi \left( H^2 \oplus \frac{H(z)}{w - G(z)} H^2(\Gamma_z) \right),$$

we have

$$\left[ 1 + \frac{\alpha H(z)}{w - G(z)} \right] \subset H^2 \oplus \frac{H(z)}{w - G(z)} H^2(\Gamma_z), \quad (3.7)$$

and it holds that

$$\mathcal{M} = \varphi \left[ 1 + \frac{\alpha H(z)}{w - G(z)} \right] \quad (3.8)$$

if and only if

$$\left[ 1 + \frac{\alpha H(z)}{w - G(z)} \right] = H^2 \oplus \frac{H(z)}{w - G(z)} H^2(\Gamma_z). \quad (3.9)$$

First suppose that  $1 \leq |G(z) - \alpha H(z)|$  for every  $z \in \mathbb{D}$ . Then by [IY, Corollary 2.7], we have

$$[w - (G(z) - \alpha H(z))] = H^2.$$

This shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left[ 1 + \frac{\alpha H(z)}{w - G(z)} \right] &\supset \overline{(w - G(z)) \left[ 1 + \frac{\alpha H(z)}{w - G(z)} \right]} \\ &= [w - (G(z) - \alpha H(z))] \\ &= H^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$1, \quad \frac{H(z)}{w - G(z)} \in \left[ 1 + \frac{\alpha H(z)}{w - G(z)} \right].$$

Therefore

$$H^2 \oplus \frac{H(z)}{w - G(z)} H^2(\Gamma_z) \subset \left[ 1 + \frac{\alpha H(z)}{w - G(z)} \right].$$

By (3.7), we have (3.9). So we get (3.8).

Finally we consider the case that  $|G(z_0) - \alpha H(z_0)| < 1$  for some  $z_0 \in D$ . By [IY, Corollary 2.7],

$$[w - (G(z) - \alpha H(z))] \neq H^2. \quad (3.10)$$

In this case, it is sufficient to prove that (3.9) does not hold. Suppose that (3.9) holds. Then we have

$$(w - G(z)) \left[ 1 + \frac{\alpha H(z)}{w - G(z)} \right] = (w - G(z))H^2 + H(z)H^2(\Gamma_z). \quad (3.11)$$

Since

$$(w - G(z)) \left[ 1 + \frac{\alpha H(z)}{w - G(z)} \right] \subset [w - (G(z) - \alpha H(z))],$$

by (3.11) we have

$$[w - G(z)] \subset [w - (G(z) - \alpha H(z))].$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \{0\} &\neq H^2 \ominus [w - (G(z) - \alpha H(z))] \quad \text{by (3.10)} \\ &\subset H^2 \ominus [w - G(z)]. \end{aligned}$$

By [IY, Theorem 2.5, Corollary 2.9 and its proof], we have

$$G(z) - \alpha H(z) = G(z).$$

This contradicts that  $H(z) \neq 0$ . Therefore (3.9) does not hold. This completes the proof.  $\square$

In the case (iv) in Theorem 3.1, by (3.7) we have

$$\varphi \left[ 1 + \frac{\alpha H(z)}{w - G(z)} \right] \subset \mathcal{M},$$

where  $\alpha = -\overline{H(0)}/\overline{G(0)}$ .



**Example 3.4** There are invariant subspaces  $\mathcal{M}$  such that

$$\varphi \left[ 1 + \frac{\alpha H(z)}{w - G(z)} \right] = \mathcal{M} \quad (3.12)$$

and

$$\varphi \left[ 1 + \frac{\alpha H(z)}{w - G(z)} \right] \subsetneq \mathcal{M}, \quad (3.13)$$

respectively.

Let  $G(z) = I(z)/2$  for some non-constant inner function  $I(z)$  with  $I(0) \neq 0$ . Then  $G(z)$  is a non-constant and non-extreme point in ball  $H^\infty(\Gamma_z)$  with  $G(0) \neq 0$ .

First we give an example of (3.12). Let  $H(z) = \sqrt{3}/2$ . Then  $|G(z)|^2 + |H(z)|^2 = 1$  a.e. on  $\Gamma_z$  and  $H(0) \neq 0$ . For each  $z \in \mathbb{D}$ , we have

$$|G(z) - \alpha H(z)| = \left| \frac{I(z)}{2} + \frac{3}{2\overline{I(0)}} \right| \geq \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{3}{|I(0)|} - 1 \right) > 1.$$

Thus by Theorem 3.3, we have (3.12).

Next we give an example of (3.13). Let  $H(z) = \sqrt{3}I(z)/2$ . Then we have  $|G(z)|^2 + |H(z)|^2 = 1$  a.e. on  $\Gamma_z$ ,  $H(0) \neq 0$  and  $G(z) - \alpha H(z) = 2I(z)$ . Since  $I(z)$  is non-constant inner, there exists  $z_0 \in \mathbb{D}$  such that  $|G(z_0) - \alpha H(z_0)| < 1$ . Thus by Theorem 3.3, we get (3.13).

When  $G(z)$  is contained in the disk algebra, the space of functions  $f(z) \in C(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$  which are analytic in  $\mathbb{D}$ , the existence of inner function  $\varphi$  satisfying

$$\varphi \left[ 1 + \frac{\alpha H(z)}{w - G(z)} \right] \subset H^2$$

is known, see [II3, Theorem 2.3].

## Acknowledgement

The author thanks the referee for his kind suggestions.

## References

- [ARS] Aleman A., Richter S. and Sundberg C., *Beurling's theorem for the Bergman space*. Acta Math. **117** (1996), 275–310.
- [Beu] Beurling A., *On two problems concerning linear transformations in Hilbert space*. Acta Math. **81** (1949), 239–255.
- [CG] Chen X. and Guo K., *Analytic Hilbert Modules*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2003.
- [DY] Douglas R. G. and Yang R., *Operator theory in the Hardy space over the bidisk* (I). Integral Eq. Op. Theory **38** (2000), 207–221.
- [DS] Duren P. and Schuster A., *Bergman spaces*. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, Vol. 100, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2004.
- [Gar] Garnett J. B., *Bounded Analytic Functions*. Academic Press, New York, 1981.
- [GY] Guo K. and Yang R., *The core function of submodules over the bidisk*. Indiana Univ. Math. J. **53** (2004), 205–222.
- [Hed] Hedenmalm H., *A factorization theorem for square area-integrable analytic functions*. J. Reine Angew. Math. **422** (1991), 45–68.
- [HKZ] Hedenmalm H., Korenblum B. and Zhu K., *Theory of Bergman Spaces*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.
- [Hof] Hoffman K., *Banach Spaces of Analytic Functions*. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1962.
- [II1] Izuchi K. J. and Izuchi K. H., *Rank-one commutators on invariant subspaces of the Hardy space on the bidisk*. J. Math. Anal. Appl. **316** (2006), 1–8.
- [II2] Izuchi K. J. and Izuchi K. H., *Cross commutators on backward shift invariant subspaces over the bidisk*. Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) **72** (2006), 251–270.
- [II3] Izuchi K. J. and Izuchi K. H., *Rank-one commutators on invariant subspaces of the Hardy space on the bidisk* II. J. Operator Theory, to appear.
- [II4] Izuchi K. J. and Izuchi K. H., *Rank-one cross commutators on backward shift invariant subspaces on the bidisk*. Preprint.
- [II5] Izuchi K. J. and Izuchi K. H., *Ranks of cross commutators on backward shift invariant subspaces over the bidisk*. Rocky Mountain J. Math., to appear.
- [INS1] Izuchi K. J., Nakazi T. and Seto M., *Backward shift invariant subspaces in the bidisc* II. J. Operator Theory **51** (2004), 361–376.
- [INS2] Izuchi K. J., Nakazi T. and Seto M., *Backward shift invariant subspaces in the bidisc* III. Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) **70** (2004), 727–749.
- [IY] Izuchi K. J. and Yang R., *Strictly contractive compression on backward*

- shift invariant subspaces over the torus*. Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) **70** (2004), 147–165.
- [Man] Mandrekar V., *The validity of Beurling theorems in polydiscs*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **103** (1988), 145–148.
- [Nak] Nakazi T., *An outer function and several important functions*. Arch. der Math. **66** (1996), 490–498.
- [Rud] Rudin W., *Function Theory in Polydiscs*. Benjamin, New York, 1969.
- [Sar] Sarason D., *Algebraic properties of truncated Toeplitz operators*. Preprint.
- [Ya1] Yang R., *The Berger-Shaw theorem in the Hardy module over the bidisk*. J. Operator Theory **42** (1999), 379–404.
- [Ya2] Yang R., *Operator theory in the Hardy space over the bidisk (II)*. Integral Eq. Op. Theory **42** (2002), 99–124.
- [Ya3] Yang R., *Operator theory in the Hardy space over the bidisk (III)*. J. Funct. Anal. **186** (2001), 521–545.
- [Ya4] Yang R., *Hilbert-Schmidt submodules and issues of unitary equivalence*. J. Operator Theory **53** (2005), 169–184.
- [Ya5] Yang, R., *The cor operator and congruent submodules*. J. Funct. Anal. **228** (2005), 469–489.

Department of Mathematics  
Korea University  
Seoul 136-701, Korea  
E-mail: kh.izuchi@gmail.com