# **ON SUBORDINATION OF SUBHARMONIC FUNCTIONS**

By Shōji Kobayashi and Nobuyuki Suita

**Introduction.** In the present paper we are concerned with analytic maps from a Riemann surface into another which preserve the least harmonic majorant of a subharmonic function.

Let R denote an open Riemann surface. Let S(R) be the class of all functions subharmonic on R which admit harmonic majorants on R and  $S^+(R) = \{f \in S(R): f \text{ is bounded below on } R\}$ . We denote by  $\hat{f}$  the least harmonic majorant of f for any  $f \in S(R)$ . Let  $R_j$  (j=1, 2) be open Riemann surfaces and  $\phi$  be an analytic map from  $R_1$  into  $R_2$ . Littlewood's subordination theorem (see [3, p. 10]) shows that  $f \circ \phi \in S(R_1)$  and

(1) 
$$\hat{f} \cdot \phi \ge \hat{f} \cdot \phi$$

on  $R_1$  for any  $f \in S(R_2)$ . In this paper we deal with the problem when equality holds in (1).

In the case where  $R \in O_G$ , it is well known that there exist no positive superharmonic functions but the constants on R (see for example [1, p. 204]). Therefore we easily see that  $\hat{f} - f \equiv 0$  for any  $f \in S(R)$ , which means that S(R)reduces to the harmonic functions. It is easily verified that if  $R_1 \in O_G$  and  $R_2 \notin O_G$  there exist no nonconstant analytic maps from  $R_1$  into  $R_2$ . Hence, if one of  $R_j$  (j=1, 2) is of class  $O_G$ , equality always holds in (1) for any  $f \in S(R_2)$ .

From now on we assume that  $R_j \notin O_G$  for j=1, 2. Let  $G_j(z, t)$  denote the Green's function of  $R_j$  with pole at t. Following Heins [4], we say that  $\phi$  is of type B1 when  $G_2(\phi(z), t)$  majorates no positive bounded harmonic functions for some  $t \in R_2$ , or equivalently for every  $t \in R_2$  (see Theorem 4.1 of [4, p. 446]), and we say that  $\phi$  is of type B1 when  $G_2(\phi(z), t)$  majorates no positive harmonic functions for every  $t \in R_2$ . Let U denote the open unit disc and  $\pi_j$  be a universal covering map of  $R_j$ . By applying the monodromy theorem, we can define an analytic function  $\phi$  in U which is bounded by 1 such that

$$\phi \circ \pi_1 = \pi_2 \circ \phi \,.$$

An inner function is any function  $\psi$  analytic in U with the properties  $|\psi(z)| \leq 1$  in U and  $|\psi^*(e^{i\theta})|=1$  a.e. on  $\partial U$ , where  $\psi^*$  denotes the Fatou's boundary function of  $\psi$ .

Received May 28, 1979

## 1. Main results. First of all we state our results.

THEOREM 1. Let  $\phi$  be an analytic map from  $R_1$  into  $R_2$ , then the following statements are equivalent:

(a)  $\hat{f} \circ \phi = \hat{f} \circ \phi$  for every  $f \in S^+(R_2)$ .

- (b)  $\hat{f} \circ \phi = f \circ \phi$  for some  $f \in S(R_2)$  which is not harmonic on whole  $R_2$ .
- (c) There exists an inner function  $\psi$  such that  $\phi \circ \pi_1 = \pi_2 \circ \psi$ .
- (d)  $\phi$  is of type B1.

*Remark.* Theorem 1 is a generalization of a theorem of Ryff (Theorem 3 of [7, p. 351]) which states the invariance of  $H_p$  norm of an analytic function in U under composition by any inner function  $\phi$  with  $\phi(0)=0$ .

THEOREM 2. Let  $\phi$  be as in Theorem 1, then the following statements are equivalent:

- (a)  $\hat{f} \circ \phi = \hat{f} \circ \phi$  for every  $f \in S(R_2)$ .
- (b) There exists an inner function  $\psi$  such that  $(\psi(z)-\alpha)/(1-\bar{\alpha}\psi(z))$  is a Blaschke product for every  $\alpha \in U$  and such that  $\phi \circ \pi_1 = \pi_2 \circ \psi$ .
- (c)  $\phi$  is of type  $B1_1$ .

#### 2. Proof of the theorems. First we need a lemma.

LEMMA 1. Let  $R \notin O_G$  and  $\pi$  be a universal covering map of R, then  $\hat{f} \circ \pi = \hat{f} \circ \pi$  holds for any  $f \in S(R)$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\hat{f} \circ \pi$  is a harmonic majorant of  $f \circ \pi$ , we easily see that  $\hat{f} \circ \pi \geq \hat{f} \circ \pi$ . We must show the inverse inequality. Let  $\Gamma$  be the cover transformation group under which  $\pi$  is invariant. Since  $\hat{f} \circ \pi \circ T$  is a harmonic majorant of  $f \circ \pi \circ T = f \circ \pi$  for every  $T \in \Gamma$ , we see that  $\hat{f} \circ \pi \geq \hat{f} \circ \pi \circ T$ . By composing  $T^{-1}$  from right, we obtain the inverse inequality  $\hat{f} \circ \pi \geq \hat{f} \circ \pi \circ T$ . Thus we see that  $\hat{f} \circ \pi$  is invariant under  $\Gamma$ . Therefore we can define a single-valued harmonic function on R by  $\hat{f} \circ \pi \circ \pi^{-1}$ , which is a harmonic majorant of f. Then we see that  $\hat{f} \circ \pi \geq \hat{f} \circ \pi \circ \pi^{-1} \geq \hat{f}$ , and hence  $\hat{f} \circ \pi \geq \hat{f} \circ \pi$  as desired.

Remark. Lemma 1 was essentially proved by Rudin [5, p. 48].

### Proof of Theorem 1.

1. (a) implies (d). Suppose that (d) does not hold. Then there exists a positive bounded harmonic function u which is majorated by  $G_2(\phi(z), t)$  on  $R_1$  for some  $t \in R_2$ . Let  $g(z) = -\min\{G_2(z, t), M\}$ , where  $M = \sup\{u(z): z \in R_1\}$ , then  $g \in S^+(R_2)$  and  $g \circ \phi \leq -u$ . On the other hand, we see by (a) that  $g \circ \phi = \hat{g} \circ \phi \equiv 0$ , since  $\hat{g} \geq -\hat{G}_2 \equiv 0$ . This is a contradiction.

316

2. (d) implies (b). For example, let  $f = -\min\{G_2(z, t), 1\}$  for some  $t \in R_2$ , then we see by (d) that  $\widehat{f \circ \phi} \equiv 0 \equiv \widehat{f \circ \phi}$ .

3. (b) implies (c). Suppose that (c) does not hold, then every analytic function  $\psi$  in U bounded by 1 such that  $\phi \circ \pi_1 = \pi_2 \circ \psi$  is not inner. Therefore the set  $E = \{e^{i\theta} : |\psi^*(e^{i\theta})| \leq 1-2\delta\}$  is of positive measure for a sufficiently small positive number  $\delta$ . By Egorov's theorem we can find a compact subset F of E of positive measure on which  $\psi(re^{i\theta})$  converges uniformly to  $\psi^*(e^{i\theta})$  as  $r \to 1$ . Then, we have  $|\psi(re^{i\theta})| \leq 1-\delta$  for every  $e^{i\theta} \in F$  and every  $r \geq r_0$  for some  $r_0$  with  $0 < r_0 < 1$ . Let f be as in (b), then we see that  $\hat{f} > f$  on  $R_2$ , since f is not harmonic on  $R_2$ . Let  $\varepsilon = \inf\{\hat{f}(\zeta) - f(\zeta) : \zeta \in \pi_2(\{|z| \leq 1-\delta\})\} > 0$ , then we see that

(3) 
$$(\hat{f} \circ \pi_2 \circ \psi)(re^{i\theta}) \ge (f \circ \pi_2 \circ \psi)(re^{i\theta}) + \varepsilon$$

if  $r \ge r_0$  and  $e^{i\theta} \in F$ . Then, by (3), we see for  $r \ge r_0$ 

(4) 
$$(\hat{f} \circ \phi \circ \pi_1)(0) = (\hat{f} \circ \pi_2 \circ \phi)(0)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{0}^{2\pi} (\hat{f} \circ \pi_{2} \circ \phi)(re^{i\theta}) d\theta$$
  
$$= \frac{1}{2\pi} \left( \int_{F} + \int_{F^{c}} (\hat{f} \circ \pi_{2} \circ \phi)(re^{i\theta}) d\theta \right)$$
  
$$\ge \frac{1}{2\pi} \left( \int_{F} (f \circ \pi_{2} \circ \phi)(re^{i\theta}) + \varepsilon \right) d\theta$$
  
$$+ \int_{F^{c}} (f \circ \pi_{2} \circ \phi)(re^{i\theta}) d\theta$$
  
$$= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{0}^{2\pi} (f \circ \pi_{2} \circ \phi)(re^{i\theta}) d\theta + \varepsilon m(F) ,$$

where *m* denotes the normalized Lebesgue measure. Letting  $r \to 1$ , we see  $(\hat{f} \circ \phi \circ \pi_1)(0) > (\widehat{f} \circ \pi_2 \circ \phi)(0)$ . Then, using Lemma 1, we obtain  $\hat{f} \circ \phi > \widehat{f} \circ \phi$ , as desired. 4. (c) implies (a). Let  $f \in S^+(R_2)$  and we assume that (c) holds. Without loss of generality, we may assume that *f* is nonnegative on  $R_2$ . Let  $\rho$  be fixed with  $0 < \rho < 1$  and let  $M_\rho = \sup\{(f \circ \pi_2)(z) : |z| \le \rho\}$ . By Egorov's theorem, for

every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists an open subset O of the unit circle such that

(5) 
$$m(O) < \varepsilon / M_{\rho}$$

and that  $\phi(re^{i\theta})$  converges uniformly to  $\phi^*(e^{i\theta})$  on  $O^c$ . Therefore there exists r with 0 < r < 1 such that

$$(6) \qquad \qquad |\psi(re^{i\theta})| > \rho$$

for  $e^{i\theta} \in O$ , since  $|\psi^*(e^{i\theta})|=1$  a.e. on  $\partial U$ . Let  $u_{\rho}$  be the least harmonic majorant of  $f \circ \pi_2$  in  $\Delta_{\rho} = \{z : |z| < \rho\}$ . Let  $D_{\rho} = \psi^{-1}(\Delta_{\rho})$  and  $\Omega_{\rho}$  be the connected component of  $D_{\rho} \cap \Delta_r$  containing 0. Then, by (6), we see that SHŌJI KOBAYASHI AND NOBUYUKI SUITA

(7) 
$$\partial \Omega_{\rho} \cap \Gamma_r \subset rO \equiv \{re^{i\theta} : e^{i\theta} \in O\}$$

Let  $\omega$  be the harmonic measure of rO in  $\Delta_r$ , then by (5)

(8) 
$$w(0) \leq \varepsilon / M_{\rho}$$

Let  $h_{\rho} = \widehat{f \circ \pi_2 \circ \phi} - u_{\rho} \circ \phi$ , then we easily see that

(9) 
$$h_{\rho} \ge 0$$
 on  $\partial \Omega_{\rho} - \partial \Delta_r$ ,

(10) 
$$h_{\rho} \ge -M_{\rho} \text{ on } \partial \Omega_{\rho} \cap \partial \Delta_r.$$

Therefore, by the maximum principle, we obtain

(11) 
$$h_{\rho} \ge -M_{\rho} \omega$$
 in  $\Omega_{\rho}$ 

and hence  $h_{\rho}(0) \ge -\varepsilon$ . Since  $\varepsilon$  is arbitrary, we see that  $h_{\rho}(0) \ge 0$ . Letting  $\rho \to 1$ , we obtain

(12) 
$$\widehat{f \circ \pi_2 \circ \psi} \cong \widehat{f \circ \pi_2 \circ \psi}$$

since  $\lim_{\rho \to 1} u_{\rho} = \widehat{f \circ \pi_2}$ . Using Lemma 1, we obtain  $\widehat{f \circ \phi} \ge \widehat{f} \circ \phi$ , as desired.

Proof of Theorem 2.

1. (a) implies (b). Suppose that (b) does not hold, then there exists  $\alpha \in U$  such that  $(\phi(z) - \alpha)/(1 - \bar{\alpha}\phi(z))$  is not a Blaschke product. Let S denote its singular part, then S is represented as

(13) 
$$S(z) = \exp\left(-\int_{0}^{2\pi} \frac{e^{i\theta} + z}{e^{i\theta} - z} d\mu(\theta)\right),$$

where  $\mu$  is a positive singular measure on  $\partial U$  (see [3, p. 24]). Let  $f(z) = -G_2(z, \pi_2(\alpha))$ , then  $f \in S(R_2)$  and

(14) 
$$(f \circ \pi_2)(z) = \sum_{T \in \Gamma} \log \left| \frac{T(z) - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha} T(z)} \right|$$

by Myrberg's theorem (see [8, p. 522]). Therefore

(15) 
$$(f \circ \phi \circ \pi_{1})(z) = (f \circ \pi_{2} \circ \phi)(z)$$
$$= \sum_{T \in \Gamma} \log \left| \frac{(T \circ \phi)(z) - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}(T\phi)(z)} \right|$$
$$= \log \left| \frac{\phi(z) - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}\phi(z)} \right| + \sum_{\substack{T \in \Gamma \\ T \neq id}} \log \left| \frac{(T \circ \phi)(z) - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha}(T \circ \phi)(z)} \right|$$
$$\leq \log |S(z)|$$
$$= -\int_{0}^{2\pi} \operatorname{Re} \frac{e^{i\theta} + z}{e^{i\theta} - z} d\mu(\theta) ,$$

318

and hence

(16) 
$$f \circ \phi \circ \pi_1 \leq -P[\mu] < 0,$$

where  $P[\mu]$  denotes the Poisson integral of  $\mu$ . Using Lemma 1, we have  $\widehat{f \circ \phi} < \widehat{f \circ \phi}$  from which we see that (a) does not hold.

2. (b) implies (c). The following lemma is well known, for the proof, for example see [6, p. 335].

LEMMA 2. Let B be a Blaschke product, then

(17) 
$$\lim_{r \to 1} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log |B(re^{i\theta})| d\theta = 0.$$

Remark. (17) means

(18) 
$$\widehat{\log |B|} \equiv 0$$

in our language, since the left-hand side of (17) is the value at 0 of the least harmonic majorant of  $\log |B|$ .

Let  $f(z) = -G_2(z, t)$  for arbitrarily fixed  $t \in R_2$ . Then, by Myrberg's theorem,

(19) 
$$(f \circ \pi_2)(z) = \sum_{T \in \Gamma} \log \left| \frac{T(z) - \alpha}{1 - \bar{\alpha} T(z)} \right|,$$

where  $\alpha$  is a point in U with  $\pi_2(\alpha) = t$ . Therefore we see

(20)  

$$(f \circ \phi \circ \pi_{1})(z) = (f \circ \pi_{2} \circ \psi)(z)$$

$$= \sum_{T \in \Gamma} \log \left| \frac{(T \circ \psi)(z) - \alpha}{1 - \overline{\alpha}(T \circ \psi)(z)} \right|$$

$$= \sum_{T \in \Gamma} \log |B_{T}(z)|$$

$$= \log |B(z)|,$$

where  $B_T = (T \circ \psi - \alpha)/(1 - \bar{\alpha}T \circ \psi)$ , which is a Blaschke product by (b) for every  $T \in \Gamma$ , and  $B = \prod_{T \in \Gamma} B_T$ . Using Lemma 2, we obtain

(21) 
$$\widehat{f \circ \phi \circ \pi_1} = \widehat{\log |B|} \equiv 0.$$

Then, by Lemma 1, we see that  $\widehat{f \circ \phi} \equiv 0$ , which means that  $\phi$  is of type  $B1_1$ , as desired.

3. (c) implies (a). Any superharmonic function s on a Riemann surface  $R \notin O_G$  which is represented as

(22) 
$$s(z) = \int_{R} G(z, t) d\mu(t),$$

where G is the Green's function of R and  $\mu$  is a nonnegative measure on R, is called a (Green's) potential. By Riesz's theorem (Satz 4.6 and Folgesatz 4.6 of

[2, pp. 41-42]), a nonnegative superharmonic function is a potential if and only if its greatest harmonic minorant is 0. Let  $f \in S(R_2)$ , then  $\hat{f} - f$  is a potential on  $R_2$ , i.e.

(23) 
$$\hat{f}(w) - f(w) = \int_{R_2} G_2(w, \zeta) dm(\zeta) ,$$

where *m* is a nonnegative measure on  $R_2$ . By (c)  $G_2(\phi(z), t)$  is a potential on  $R_1$  for any  $t \in R_2$ , i.e.

(24) 
$$G_{2}(\phi(z), t) = \int_{R_{1}} G_{1}(z, \tau) d\nu_{t}(\tau) ,$$

where  $\nu_t$  is a nonnegative measure on  $R_1$  for every  $t \in R_2$ . It is known that  $\nu_t$  is the sum of the point masses at points s such that  $\phi(s)=t$  counting with multiplicity (see [4, p. 440]). Therefore we can easily see that for any compact  $K \subset R_1$ ,  $\nu_t(K)$  is upper semi-continuous as a function of t. Define a nonnegative measure  $\nu$  on  $R_2$  by

(25) 
$$\nu(K) = \int_{R_2} \nu_t(K) dm(t) ,$$

for any compact  $K \subseteq R_1$ . From (23), (24) and (25) we obtain

(26) 
$$(\hat{f} \circ \phi)(z) - (f \circ \phi)(z) = \int_{R_1} G_1(z, \tau) d\nu(\tau) ,$$

which means that  $\hat{f} \circ \phi - f \circ \phi$  is a potential on  $R_1$ , and hence its greatest harmonic minorant is 0 by Riesz's theorem cited above (cf. [4, pp. 449-451]). Therefore we obtain  $\hat{f} \circ \phi = \widehat{f \circ \phi}$ , as desired.

#### References

- [1] AHLFORS, L.V. AND L. SARIO, Riemann surfaces, Princeton university press, 1960.
- [2] CONSTANTINESCU, C. AND A. CORNEA, Ideale Ränder Riemannscher Flächen, Springer-Verlag, 1963.
- [3] DUREN, P.L. Theory of  $H^p$  spaces, Academic Press, New York, 1970.
- [4] HEINS, M. On the Lindelöf principle, Ann. of Math. 61 (1955), 440-473.
- [5] RUDIN, W. Analytic functions of class H<sub>p</sub>, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 78 (1955), 46-66.
- [6] RUDIN, W. Real and complex analysis, MacGraw-Hill, New York, 1974.
- [7] RYFF, J.V. Subordinate  $H^p$  functions, Duke Math. J. 33 (1966), 347-354.
- [8] TSUJI, M. Potential theory in modern function theory, Maruzen, Tokyo, 1959.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, Tokyo Institute of Technology.