Electronic Journal: Southwest Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics
Internet: http://rattler.cameron.edu/swjpam.html
ISBN 1083-0464
Issue 2 December 1998, pp. 49 – 55
Submitted: April 30, 1998. Published: February1, 1999

ON FAMILIES OF CAUCHY TRANSFORMS

Yusuf Abu Muhanna and El-Bachir Yallaoui

Abstract

In this paper we prove a number of results on Cauchy transforms of generalized type given by Borel measures supported on the class of analytic functions mapping the unit disc into the unit disk.

1991 A.M.S. Subject Classification Codes. 30E20, 30D99.
Key Words and Phrases: Cauchy Transform.

1. Introduction

Let $\Delta = \{z \in C : |z| < 1\}$, $\Gamma = \partial\Delta$ and let B (equipped with the topology of uniform convergence on compact subsets) denote the set of functions ϕ that are analytic in Δ such that $|\phi(z)| < 1$ and $\phi(0) = 0$. Let $\mathcal{M}$,$\mathcal{N}$ denote the sets of complex–valued Borel measures on Γ and B respectively. Here, $\mathcal{M}$ is equivalent to the subset of $\mathcal{N}$ consisting of all those measures supported on the set $\{xz : |x| = 1\}$.

For $z \in \Delta$ and $\alpha \geq 0$, let A_α denote the family of functions f for which there exists a measure $\mu \in \mathcal{N}$ such that

$$f(z) = \begin{cases} \displaystyle\int_B \frac{1}{(1-\phi(z))^\alpha}\, d\mu(\phi) & \text{for } \alpha > 0 \\ \displaystyle\int_B \log\frac{1}{1-\phi(z)}\, d\mu(\phi) + f(0) & \text{for } \alpha = 0 \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
Sultan Qaboos University
Muscat, Sultanate of Oman
E-mail: yusufa@squ.edu.om
E-mail: bachiry@squ.edu.om

Copyright ©1998 by Cameron University

The classes F_α consisting of those functions g for which there exists a measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ such that,

$$g(z) = \begin{cases} \displaystyle\int_B \frac{1}{(1-\overline{x}z)^\alpha}\, d\mu(x) & \text{for } \alpha > 0 \\ \displaystyle\int_B \log \frac{1}{1-\overline{x}z}\, d\mu(x) + f(0) & \text{for } \alpha = 0 \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

have been well studied [3], [4], [9] and [10]. The classes F_α are subsets of A_α when the measures μ in (1.1) are in $\mathcal{M}$.

The class A_α is a Banach space with respect to the norm

$$\|f\|_{A_\alpha} = \begin{cases} \inf \|\mu\|, & \text{for } \alpha > 0 \\ \inf \|\mu\| + |f(0)|, & \text{for } \alpha = 0 \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

where μ varies over all measures in $\mathcal{N}$ for which (1.1) holds and where $\|\mu\|$ denotes the total variation norm of μ .

Clearly, for $f \in F_\alpha$, $\|f\|_{F_\alpha} \geq \|f\|_{A_\alpha}$. It is also known from [1] that for $\alpha \geq 1$, $F_\alpha = A_\alpha$.

We will show in this paper that for $0 \leq \alpha < \beta$,

$$A_\alpha \subset A_\beta \quad \text{and} \quad \|f\|_{A_\beta} \leq \|f\|_{A_\alpha} \tag{1.4}$$

This generalizes similar results for F_α in [6] and [7].

We will also show that $A_0 = BMOA$ and that the norm $\|.\|_{A_0}$ is equivalent to well known BMO norms. Furthermore we will show that, for all $n \geq 1$ and $\alpha \geq 0$

$$\|z^n\|_{A_\alpha} \leq k$$

where the constant k is independent of n or α.

2. The Classes A_α

In this section we will establish for $0 \leq \alpha < \beta$ the relationship between A_α and A_β as well as their respective norms.

Theorem 1. *If $0 \leq \alpha < \beta$, then $A_\alpha \subset A_\beta$ and $\|f\|_{A_\beta} \leq \|f\|_{A_\alpha}$*

Proof. Note that since $A_\alpha = F_\alpha$ for $\alpha \geq 1$ [1], and for $0 < \alpha < \beta$,$F_\alpha \subset F_\beta$ and $\|f\|_{F_\beta} \leq \|f\|_{F_\alpha}$ [7], then all we have to prove is the case $0 \leq \alpha < \beta < 1$.

(i) Let $f \in A_\alpha$ where $0 < \alpha < \beta$, then we can write

$$f(z) = \int_B \frac{1}{(1-\psi(z))^\alpha} d\mu(\psi), \tag{2.1}$$

Since $\dfrac{1}{(1-z)^\alpha} \in F_\alpha \subset F_\beta$, we can write

$$\frac{1}{(1-z)^\alpha} = \int_\Gamma \frac{1}{(1-\overline{x}z)^\beta}\, d\nu(x) \tag{2.2}$$

and

$$\left\| \frac{1}{(1-z)^\alpha} \right\|_{F_\beta} \leq \left\| \frac{1}{(1-z)^\alpha} \right\|_{F_\alpha} = 1 \tag{2.3}$$

Now by replacing z in (2.2) by $\psi(z)$ and putting the result in (2.1) we get

$$f(z) = \int_B \int_\Gamma \frac{1}{(1-\overline{x}\psi(z))^\beta} d\nu(x) d\mu(\psi). \tag{2.4}$$

Suppose, without loss of generality that ν is a positive measure and let

$$g_n(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{\nu_k}{(1-\overline{x}z)^\beta}.$$

Then by (2.2),

$$\int_B g_n(\psi)\ d\mu(\psi)$$

converges locally uniformly to

$$f(z) = \int_B \int_\Gamma \frac{1}{(1-\overline{x}\psi(z))^\beta} d\nu(x) d\mu(\psi).$$

Let $\eta_n(\psi) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \nu_k \mu(\psi)$ then,

$$\int_B g_n(\psi)\ d\mu(\psi) = \int_B \frac{1}{(1-\psi)^\beta} d\eta_n(\psi),$$

where $\|\eta_n\| \leq \|\nu\|\|\mu\|$ for all n. Hence by compactness, there exists a measure σ, such that,

$$f(z) = \int_B \frac{1}{(1-\psi(z))^\beta} d\sigma(\psi) \tag{2.5}$$

which shows that $f \in A_\beta$. Furthermore, $\|\sigma\| \leq \|\nu\|\|\mu\|$. Consequently,

$$\|f\|_{A_\beta} \leq \|\sigma\| \leq \|\mu\|\|\nu\| \quad \text{for all } \mu$$

however since μ and ν are arbitrary measures that give (2.1) and (2.2) then,

$$\|f\|_{A_\beta} \leq \inf\{\|\mu\|\} \inf\{\|\nu\|\}$$

Hence by (2.3)

$$\|f\|_{A_\beta} \leq \|f\|_{A_\alpha}$$

(ii) Now let $f \in A_0$. We want to show that $f \in A_\alpha$ for any $\alpha > 0$. By definition,

$$f(z) = \int_B \log \frac{1}{1-\phi(z)}\, d\mu(\phi) + f(0) \tag{2.6}$$

Since $\log \dfrac{1}{1-z} \in F_0 \subset F_\alpha$ see [5], then

$$\log \frac{1}{1-z} = \int_\Gamma \frac{1}{(1-\overline{x}z)^\alpha}\, d\nu(x)$$

where ν depends only on α. Hence (2.6) becomes

$$f(z) = \int_B \int_\Gamma \frac{1}{(1-\overline{x}\phi(z))^\alpha} d\nu(x)\ d\mu(\phi) + f(0) \tag{2.7}$$

where the integral in (2.7) looks exactly like the one in (2.3) with α replacing β and hence using an argument similar to the one in (i) we will get that

$$f(z) = \int_B \int_\Gamma \frac{1}{(1-\psi(z))^\alpha}\, d\sigma(\psi) + f(0) \tag{2.8}$$

which shows that $f \in A_\alpha$. Furthermore $\|\sigma\| \leq \|\nu\|\|\mu\|$, and hence

$$\|f\|_{A_\alpha} \leq \inf\{\|\mu\|\} + |f(0)| = \|f\|_{A_0} \tag{2.9}$$

□

3. CHARACTERIZATION OF A_0

It is known from ([2], p248) that a function $\phi \in$ BMO if and only if there exists functions ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 in L^∞ such that

$$\phi = \phi_1 + \widetilde{\phi_2} + \alpha$$

where both $\|\phi_1\|_\infty$ and $\|\phi_2\|_\infty$ are less than $C\|\phi\|_\star$, C is a constant and $\|\ \|_\star$ is the classical BMO norm ([2], p248).

Consequently $f \in$ BMOA if and only if there are analytic functions f_1 and f_2 such that

$$f = f_1 + f_2 + \alpha \tag{3.1}$$

where $\|\mathrm{Re} f_1\|_\infty \leq C$ and $\|\mathrm{Im}\ f_2\|_\infty \leq C$.

If we define on BMOA the norm

$$\|f\|^\star = \inf\{\ \|\mathrm{Re} f_1\|_\infty + \|\mathrm{Im} f_2\|_\infty : f = f_1 + f_2 + \alpha\ \} \tag{3.2}$$

then by ([2], p248), the norms $\|f\|^\star$ and $\|f\|_\star$ are equivalent.

Now we have the following proposition which establishes a set equality between A_0 and BMOA.

Theorem 2. *$A_0 = BMOA$*

Proof. Suppose that $f \in A_0$, then according to (1.1) and (1.2) there exists a measure $\mu \in \mathcal{N}$ such that,

$$f(z) = \int_B \log \frac{1}{1-\phi(z)}\, d\mu(\phi) + f(0) \tag{3.3}$$

Assume without loss of generality, that μ is a probability measure. Then f is subordinate to $\log \dfrac{1}{1-z} + f(0)$ and consequently by (3.1), $f \in$ BMOA. The proof of the other inclusion follows from (3.1) and subordination.

Theorem 3. *The norms $\|.\|_\star$ and $\|.\|_{A_0}$ are equivalent, namely there exists positive constants c_1 and c_2 such that*

$$c_1\|f\|_\star \leq \|f\|_{A_0} \leq c_2\|f\|_\star \tag{3.4}$$

Proof. Suppose $f \in$ BMOA, then f can be decomposed as in (3.1). Let d_1 denote $\|\mathrm{Re} f_1\|_\infty$ and d_2 denote $\|\mathrm{Im}\ f_2\|_\infty$. Then

$$\left|\frac{\pi}{2d_1}\mathrm{Im} i f_1(z)\right| \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \tag{3.5}$$

and

$$\left|\frac{\pi}{2d_2}\mathrm{Im} f_2(z)\right| \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \tag{3.6}$$

for all $z \in \Delta$. Consequently, by subordination

$$if_1(z) = \frac{2d_1}{\pi}\left(\log\frac{1}{1-\phi(z)} - \log\frac{1}{1+\phi(z)}\right) + if_1(0) \tag{3.7}$$

$$f_2(z) = \frac{2d_2}{\pi}\left(\log\frac{1}{1-\psi(z)} - \log\frac{1}{1+\psi(z)}\right) + f_2(0) \tag{3.8}$$

for all $z \in \Delta$ and where $\phi, \psi \in B$. Therefore

$$\|f\|_{A_0} \leq \frac{4}{\pi}(d_1 + d_2), \tag{3.9}$$

and hence

$$\|f\|_{A_0} \leq \frac{4}{\pi}\|f\|^\star \leq c_2\|f\|_\star \tag{3.10}$$

which gives the right inequality in (3.3).

Next, we show the left inequality. Let us write f as in (1.2) and assume without loss of generality that μ is a positive measure. Then,

$$|\mathrm{Im} f(z)| \leq c\|\mu\| \tag{3.11}$$

where $c > 1$. Thus

$$|\mathrm{Im} f(z)| \leq c\|f\|_{A_0} \tag{3.12}$$

and since

$$\|\mathrm{Im} f\|_\infty \geq \|\mathrm{Im} f\|_\star \tag{3.13}$$

we have

$$\|f\|_\star \leq k_1\|\mathrm{Im} f\|_\star \leq k_2\|f\|_{A_0} = \frac{1}{c_1}\|f\|_{A_0}. \tag{3.14}$$

where $c_1 = \dfrac{1}{k_2}$ and the left inequality in (3.13) follows by ([2], p235) and this concludes the proof. □

Theorem 4. *$\|z^n\|_{A_\alpha} \leq k$ for $n \geq 1$*

Proof. It is enough to show that $\|z^n\|_{A_0} \leq k$ for $n \geq 1$. Since we showed that $\|\ .\ \|_\star$ and $\|\ .\ \|_{A_0}$ are equivalent, let us approximate $\|z^n\|_\star$. It is known from ([2], p240)that,

$$\|g\|_\star^2 \approx \sup_\psi \iint_\Delta |\bigtriangledown g|^2(1-|z|^2)|\psi'(z)|dA, \tag{3.15}$$

where $\psi(z) = \dfrac{z+z_0}{1+\overline{z_0}z}$ is a mobius transformation.
Replace g in (3.15) by z^n and $|z|$ by r to get,

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \iint_\Delta |\bigtriangledown(z^n)|^2 (1-r^2)|\psi'(z)|\, dA \\ &\leq \iint_\Delta n^2 r^{2n-2}(1-r^2)|\psi'(z)|dA \\ &\leq \int_0^{2\pi}\int_0^1 n^2 r^{2n-2}(1-r^2)|\psi'(z)|drd\theta \\ &\leq 2\pi n^2 \int_0^1 r^{2n-2}(1-r)\, dr, \text{ because} \int_0^{2\pi}|\psi'(z)|d\theta \leq 2\pi \\ &\leq 2\pi n^2 \int_0^1 (r^{2n-2}-r^{2n})\, dr = \frac{4\pi n^2}{(4n^2-1)} \leq \frac{4\pi}{3} \end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

which gives us the desired result and completes the proof. □

The following theorem is a direct consequence of Proposition 4.

Theorem 5. *If* $f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n$ *is analytic and if* $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |a_n| < \infty$ *then* $f \in A_\alpha$ *for all* $\alpha \geq 0$.

Proof. It is sufficient to prove that $f \in A_0$ since $A_0 \subset A_\alpha$. To show that $f \in A_0$ all we have to show is that the norm $\|f(z)\|_{A_0}$ is bounded.

$$\|f(z)\|_{A_0} = \left\|\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n\right\|_{A_0} \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |a_n|\, \|z^n\|_{A_0} \leq \frac{4\pi}{3} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |a_n| < \infty. \quad \square$$

References

[1] D. A. Brannan, J. G. Clunie and W. E. Kirwan, *On the coefficient problem for functions of bounded boundary rotation*, Ann. Acad. Sci. Finn. Ser. AI Math., 523 (1973).

[2] J.Garnett, Bounded Analytic Functions, Acadimic Press, New York 1980.

[3] D.J. Hallenbeck, T.H. MacGregor and K. Samotij, Fractional Cauchy transforms, inner functions and multipliers, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) 72 (1996) 157-187.

[4] D.J. Hallenbeck and K. Samotij, On Cauchy integrals of logarithmic potentials and their multipliers, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 174 (1993), 614-634.

[5] R.A. Hibschweiler and T.H. MacGregor, Closure properties of families of Cauchy-Stieltjes transforms, Prceed. Amer. Math. Soc. Vol. 105, No. 3 (1989), 615-621.

[6] R.A. Hibschweiler and T.H. MacGregor, Multipliers of families of Cauchy-Stieltjes transforms, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 331 (1992), 377-394.

[7] R.A. Hibschweiler and E. Nordgren, Cauchy transforms of measures and weighted shift operators on the disk algebra, Rocky Mount. J. Math. Vol. 26, No. 2 (1996), 627-653.

[8] T. H. Macgregor, Analytic and univalent functions with integral representations involving complex measure, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 36 (1987) 109-130.

[9] S.V. Hruscev and S.A. Vinogradov, Inner functions and multipliers of Cauchy type integrals, Arkiv Mat. 19(1981), 23-42.

[10] S.A. Vinogradov, Properties of multipliers of Cauchy-Stieltjes intergrals and some factorization problems for analytic functions, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. (2) 115 (1980), 1-32.