

# ORBITS OF NON-ELLIPTIC DISC AUTOMORPHISMS ON $H^p$

EVA A. GALLARDO-GUTIÉRREZ, PAMELA GORKIN, AND DANIEL SUÁREZ

ABSTRACT. Motivated by the *Invariant Subspace Problem*, we describe explicitly the closed subspace  $H^2$  generated by the limit points in the  $H^2$  norm of the orbit of a thin Blaschke product  $B$  under composition operators  $C_\varphi$  induced by non-elliptic automorphisms. This description exhibits a surprising connection to model spaces. Finally, we give a constructive characterization of the  $C_\varphi$ -eigenfunctions in  $H^p$  for  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARIES

Given a bounded linear operator  $T$  on a separable Banach space  $\mathcal{B}$ , the fact that an operator has invariant subspaces may not tell you much about the operator. On the other hand, knowing that an operator has a large number of invariant closed subspaces, and, in particular, a structured family, may make it possible to obtain a lot of information about the action of the operator on  $\mathcal{B}$ . In this context, it is helpful to focus on the behavior of the cyclic subspaces generated by the elements of  $\mathcal{B}$  under  $T$ ; in other words, focusing on the subspace

$$K_x = \overline{\text{span}\{T^n x : n \geq 0\}}^{\mathcal{B}},$$

where  $x \in \mathcal{B}$ . Here  $T^0$  denotes the identity operator  $I$  and  $T^n = T \circ \overset{n \text{ times}}{\cdots} \circ T$ .

It turns out that knowing the cyclic subspaces of concrete operators on an infinite dimensional separable Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  (operators that are *universal*) would solve the long-standing open question known as the Invariant Subspace Problem. Recall that an operator  $U$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  is called universal, in the sense of Rota [14], if for any bounded linear  $T$  on  $\mathcal{H}$ , there exists a complex constant  $\lambda \neq 0$  and a closed invariant subspace  $\mathcal{M}$  of  $U$  such that  $U|_{\mathcal{M}}$  is similar to  $\lambda T$ .

Note that every bounded linear operator on an infinite dimensional separable Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  would have a non-trivial (closed) invariant subspace  $\mathcal{M}$ , that is,  $\mathcal{M} \neq \{0\}$  and  $\mathcal{M} \neq \mathcal{H}$ , if and only if the minimal invariant subspaces of a universal operator  $U$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  are just one dimensional. In the eighties, Nordgren, Rosenthal and Wintrobe [13] proved that if  $\varphi$  is a hyperbolic automorphism of the unit disc and  $\lambda$  is in the interior of the spectrum of the composition operator  $C_\varphi$  acting on the classical Hardy space  $H^2$ , then  $C_\varphi - \lambda I$  is a universal operator on  $H^2$  (see also [12]). Of

---

*Date:* March 2011, Revised version: October 2011.

*1991 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 47B38.

*Key words and phrases.* Blaschke products, Invariant subspaces, Eigenfunctions of composition operators.

course, the lattice of the closed invariant subspaces of  $C_\varphi - \lambda I$  coincides with that of  $C_\varphi$ . Thus, it is important to study the closed invariant subspaces of  $C_\varphi$  in  $H^2$  and, in particular, the cyclic subspaces generated by  $H^2$  functions.

Our discussion turns naturally to the factorization of  $f \in H^p$  into its inner and outer factor. The inner factor can be factored further, into a piece carrying all of its zeros (the Blaschke factor) and one with no zeros (the singular inner factor). If the zero sequence of the Blaschke product is an interpolating sequence, the Blaschke product is said to be interpolating. An important subclass of the interpolating Blaschke products is the set of thin Blaschke products; recall that a Blaschke product  $B$  with zeros  $\{z_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  is said to be thin if

$$\prod_{n \neq k} \rho(z_n, z_k) \rightarrow 1$$

as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\rho$  denotes the pseudo-hyperbolic distance in the open unit disc  $\mathbb{D}$ . When this holds,  $\{z_n\}$  is called a thin sequence. Thin Blaschke products have the closest behavior to finite Blaschke products that we can expect from infinite ones.

When  $\varphi$  is a non-elliptic automorphism, in [8] the first two authors exhibited Blaschke products that are cyclic for  $C_\varphi$  by showing that the closed linear span of the limit points of their orbits is the whole space  $H^2$ . Clearly, this forces such Blaschke products to be infinite, since the limit points of orbits of finite Blaschke products are constant functions of modulus 1. Here, we consider an arbitrary thin Blaschke product and characterize the closed linear span of limit points of its orbit, which is trivially invariant for  $C_\varphi$ . Concretely, we prove the following (see Theorem 2.4): Let  $L_\varphi(B)$  denote the set of limit points, in the  $H^2$  norm, of the orbit of a thin Blaschke product  $B$  under the composition operator  $C_\varphi$  where  $\varphi$  is a non-elliptic automorphism. Then the  $H^2$ -closure of the linear span of  $L_\varphi(B)$  is either

$$H^2 \quad \text{or} \quad (zbH^2)^\perp,$$

where  $b$  is a Blaschke product with simple (or no) zeros that satisfies  $b \circ \varphi = \gamma b$  for some  $\gamma \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ . We then proceed to show that the same result holds for the Hardy spaces  $H^p$  when  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . We find the appearance of model spaces surprising, and we also see from this result that a natural question follows: What are the eigenfunctions of  $C_\varphi$ ? It is easy to see that  $f$  is an eigenfunction if and only if the same is true for its Blaschke, singular and outer factors.

In [4] Cowen studied eigenfunctions for composition operators. Later, Matache [10] characterized the singular inner eigenfunctions of  $C_\varphi$  in terms of the behavior of pull-back measures (see also [11] for discrete singular inner functions). Our approach provides separate characterizations for Blaschke products, singular inner functions and outer functions in  $H^p$  that are eigenfunctions. The basic idea is the same in each of the three cases, but some of the technicalities are different.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is devoted to studying the orbit of thin Blaschke products. In Section 3 we characterize the eigenfunctions of composition operators induced by non-elliptic disc automorphisms. Finally, and for the sake of completeness, we end this preliminary section by recalling some basic results and notation.

**1.1. Notation and basic results.** Throughout this paper the open unit disc of the complex plane will be denoted by  $\mathbb{D}$  and  $\partial\mathbb{D}$  will stand for its boundary. We will denote the space of holomorphic functions on  $\mathbb{D}$  endowed with the topology of uniform convergence on compacta by  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{D})$ .

Recall that the Hardy space  $H^p$ ,  $1 \leq p < \infty$ , consists of holomorphic functions  $f$  on  $\mathbb{D}$  for which the norm

$$\|f\|_p = \left( \sup_{0 \leq r < 1} \int_0^{2\pi} |f(re^{i\theta})|^p \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \right)^{1/p}$$

is finite. The space consisting of bounded analytic functions on  $\mathbb{D}$  endowed with the sup norm will be denoted by  $H^\infty$ . A classical result due to Fatou states that every Hardy function  $f$  has non-tangential limit at  $e^{i\theta} \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ , except possibly on a set Lebesgue measure zero (see [6], for instance). Throughout this work,  $f(e^{i\theta})$  will denote the non-tangential limit of  $f$  at  $e^{i\theta}$ .

Recall that an automorphism  $\varphi$  of  $\mathbb{D}$  can be expressed in the form

$$\varphi(z) = e^{i\theta} \frac{p - z}{1 - \bar{p}z} \quad (z \in \mathbb{D}),$$

where  $p \in \mathbb{D}$  and  $-\pi < \theta \leq \pi$ . Recall that  $\varphi$  is called *hyperbolic* if  $|p| > \cos(\theta/2)$  (thus,  $\varphi$  fixes two points on  $\partial\mathbb{D}$ ); *parabolic* if  $|p| = \cos(\theta/2)$  (so,  $\varphi$  fixes just one point, located on  $\partial\mathbb{D}$ ) and *elliptic* if  $|p| < \cos(\theta/2)$  (therefore,  $\varphi$  fixes two points in the Riemann sphere, one in  $\mathbb{D}$  and the other outside  $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ , see [1], for example).

Throughout this paper, the involution that interchanges 0 and  $w$  will be denoted by

$$\varphi_w(z) = \frac{w - z}{1 - \bar{w}z},$$

where  $z \in \mathbb{D}$ . For  $w \in \mathbb{D}$ , we shall always denote this automorphism by  $\varphi_w$ . The pseudo-hyperbolic and hyperbolic metrics for  $z, w \in \mathbb{D}$  are given, respectively, by

$$\rho(z, w) = |\varphi_w(z)| \quad \text{and} \quad \beta(z, w) = \log \frac{1 + \rho(z, w)}{1 - \rho(z, w)},$$

and we will denote by  $D_\rho(z, r)$  and  $D_\beta(z, R)$  the respective closed balls of center  $z$  and radius  $r$ , with  $0 \leq r < 1$  and  $R \geq 0$ .




Fig. 1

If  $\varphi$  is a non-elliptic automorphism and  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  (an integer), we denote by  $\varphi^{(n)}$  the  $|n|$ -th iterate of  $\varphi$  if  $n > 0$ , of  $\varphi^{-1}$  if  $n < 0$ , and the identity map if  $n = 0$ . The action on  $\mathbb{D}$  of the group  $\mathcal{G}_\varphi = \{\varphi^{(n)} : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  leads naturally to the consideration of the quotient space  $\mathbb{D}/\mathcal{G}_\varphi$ , where we are identifying points  $z, w \in \mathbb{D}$  such that  $\varphi^{(n)}(z) = w$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

Since the class of  $z \in \mathbb{D}$  in  $\mathbb{D}/\mathcal{G}_\varphi$  is the bilateral orbit  $o_\varphi(z) = \{\varphi^{(n)}(z) : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ , we can represent  $\mathbb{D}/\mathcal{G}_\varphi$  by any subset  $D_\varphi \subset \mathbb{D}$  such that  $o_\varphi(z) \cap D_\varphi$  is a singleton for every  $z \in \mathbb{D}$ . Figures 1 and 2 show reasonable choices of  $D_\varphi$  when  $\varphi$  is hyperbolic and parabolic, respectively. We can transfer the quotient topology of  $\mathbb{D}/\mathcal{G}_\varphi$  to  $D_\varphi$ , so that the one-to-one correspondence becomes a homeomorphism.

This identification allows us to think of the quotient map  $P : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}/\mathcal{G}_\varphi \simeq D_\varphi$  as a map onto  $D_\varphi$ ; that is,  $P(z) = o_\varphi(z) \cap D_\varphi$ , defines a continuous map from  $\mathbb{D}$  onto  $D_\varphi$ , where  $D_\varphi$  has the quotient topology. So,  $D_\varphi$  can be identified with a subset of  $\mathbb{D}$ , but endowed with the topology where a base of neighborhoods of a point  $z \in D_\varphi$  is given by  $\{w \in D_\varphi : \inf_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |w - \varphi^{(n)}(z)| < \varepsilon\}$ , for  $\varepsilon > 0$ . From Figures 1 and 2 it is not difficult to see that in both cases  $D_\varphi$  is homeomorphic to a two-sided truncated cylinder without the upper and lower boundaries.

## 2. ORBITS OF THIN BLASCHKE PRODUCTS

We study the orbit of thin Blaschke products under composition operators induced by non-elliptic automorphisms, characterizing the closed set of its limit points (in the  $H^2$  norm).




Fig. 2

If  $\varphi$  is a self-map of  $\mathbb{D}$  and  $f$  is analytic in  $\mathbb{D}$ , that is,  $f \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{D})$ , the orbit of  $f$  is defined by  $O_\varphi(f) = \{f \circ \varphi^{(n)} : n \geq 0\}$ . When  $f$  is a bounded analytic function, that is,  $f \in H^\infty$ , the orbit  $O_\varphi(f)$  is precompact in the compact-open topology of  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{D})$ , so it makes sense to define the limit set

$$L_\varphi(f) = \{g \in H^\infty : f \circ \varphi^{(n_k)} \rightarrow g \text{ in } \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{D}) \text{ for some subsequence } \{n_k\}\}.$$

By the Corollary that follows Proposition 2 in [2], any sup-norm bounded sequence that converges in  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{D})$  also converges weakly in  $H^p$  for  $1 < p < \infty$ . Thus the points in  $L_\varphi(f)$  belong to the  $H^p$ -closure of the convex hull of  $O_\varphi(f)$ . As we will show later, more can be said in case  $f$  is a thin Blaschke product. We proceed with a technical lemma that will be needed for our description of  $L_\varphi(B)$  when  $B$  is a thin Blaschke product.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $\{z_n\}$  in  $\mathbb{D}$  be a sequence such that  $|z_n| \rightarrow 1$ ,  $0 \leq r_k < 1$  be any sequence and  $0 < \delta_k < 1$  be a sequence that tends to 1. Then there is a subsequence  $\{z_{n_k}\}$  of  $\{z_n\}$  such that any sequence of points  $\xi_k \in D_\rho(z_{n_k}, r_k)$  satisfies*

$$\prod_{j \neq k} \rho(\xi_j, \xi_k) > \delta_k.$$

*In particular,  $\{\xi_k\}$  is thin.*

*Proof.* Let  $x_j \in (0, 1)$  be a thin sequence such that  $\prod_{j \neq k} \rho(x_j, x_k) > \delta_k$ . It will be enough to choose the points  $z_{n_k}$  so that  $\rho(D_\rho(z_{n_k}, r_k), D_\rho(z_{n_j}, r_j)) \geq \rho(x_k, x_j) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha_{k,j}$  for all  $k \neq j$  or, equivalently,

$$\beta(D_\beta(z_{n_k}, R_k), D_\beta(z_{n_j}, R_j)) \geq \beta_{k,j} \quad \text{for } j < k,$$

where

$$R_k = \log \frac{1+r_k}{1-r_k} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_{k,j} = \log \frac{1+\alpha_{k,j}}{1-\alpha_{k,j}}.$$

This is quite easy to do inductively. Once  $z_{n_1}, \dots, z_{n_{k-1}}$  are chosen, simply take  $z_{n_k}$  such that  $\beta(z_{n_k}, \{z_{n_1}, \dots, z_{n_{k-1}}\}) > R_k + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (R_j + \beta_{k,j})$ .  $\square$

The preceding lemma resembles that of Wolff and Sundberg [15, Lemma 5.4], though we do not need to control the pseudo-hyperbolic distance from our given sequence as they do. Instead, we pass to a subsequence to obtain the properties we need. Our next result provides a description of all the sets in  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{D})$  of the form  $L_\varphi(B)$ , where  $B$  is a thin Blaschke product. The description contains some undetermined constants that will be irrelevant later when we take linear combinations (in the proof of Theorem 2.4).

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $\varphi$  be a non-elliptic automorphism. If  $B$  is a thin Blaschke product, then there exists a nonempty set  $V \subseteq \partial\mathbb{D}$  such that*

$$(2.1) \quad L_\varphi(B) = \{\lambda\varphi_w : w \in E, \text{ for some } \lambda \in \partial\mathbb{D}\} \cup V,$$

where  $E \subset \mathbb{D}$  is closed in  $\mathbb{D}$  with  $\varphi(E) = E$ . Conversely, given any such set  $E$ , there is a thin product  $B$  and a set  $V$  such that  $L_\varphi(B)$  is given by (2.1). Also, given  $B$ ,

$$E = \{w \in \mathbb{D} : \exists z_j \in Z(B) \text{ and integers } m_j \rightarrow +\infty \text{ such that } \varphi^{(-m_j)}(z_j) \rightarrow w\}.$$

*Proof.* Observe in advance that for  $B$  thin, every  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{D})$ -convergent subsequence of  $\{B \circ \varphi^{(n)}\}$  tends either to  $\lambda\varphi_w$  or  $\lambda$ , for some  $\lambda \in \partial\mathbb{D}$  and  $w \in \mathbb{D}$ . This is because if  $B \circ \varphi^{(n_k)} \rightarrow f$  in  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{D})$ , there are three possible situations: in the first one,  $|f(0)| = 1$  and consequently  $B \circ \varphi^{(n_k)} \rightarrow \lambda \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ . If  $f(0) = 0$ , then the definition of thin Blaschke product along with Schwarz's lemma shows that there exists  $\lambda \in \partial\mathbb{D}$  such that  $f(z) = \lambda z$  (see [9, Proposition 2.3], for instance). Finally, if  $\xi = f(0) \neq 0$  and  $|\xi| < 1$ , then a computation shows that  $\varphi_\xi \circ B$  is thin and  $\varphi_\xi \circ B \circ \varphi^{(n_k)} \rightarrow \gamma z$  for some  $\gamma \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ . Thus,  $B \circ \varphi^{(n_k)} \rightarrow \varphi_\xi(\gamma z) = \lambda\varphi_w(z)$ , for some  $\lambda \in \partial\mathbb{D}$  and  $w \in \mathbb{D}$ .

First we show that if  $B$  is a thin product, there is some  $\lambda \in \partial\mathbb{D}$  that is a limit point of  $\{B \circ \varphi^{(n)}\}$ . Otherwise, the maximum modulus principle implies that  $\sup_{n \geq 0} |B(\varphi^{(n)}(0))| < \alpha$  for some  $\alpha < 1$ . Thus, there exists  $R > 0$  such that

$$\varphi^{(n)}(0) \in \{z : |B(z)| < \alpha\} \subset \bigcup_{v \in Z(B)} D_\beta(v, R)$$

for all  $n \geq 0$ . This is true because a thin product  $B$  satisfies  $|B(z)| \rightarrow 1$  as  $\beta(z, Z(B)) \rightarrow \infty$  (see [7, Ch. X, Lemma 1.4]). Since  $\{\varphi^{(n)}(0)\}$  is an interpolating sequence (see Section 3), the number of points contained in each of these balls,  $D_\beta(v, R)$ , must be bounded independently of the ball, say by  $m$ . Consider only the zeros  $v_k$  of  $B$  such that  $D_\beta(v_k, R)$  contains some point  $\varphi^{(n_k)}(0)$ . Thus,

at least one of the points  $\varphi^{(n_k)}(0), \varphi^{(n_k+1)}(0), \dots, \varphi^{(n_k+m)}(0)$  must be contained in a different ball,  $D_\beta(v_j, R)$ , with  $j \neq k$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(v_k, v_j) &\leq \beta(v_k, \varphi^{(n_k)}(0)) + \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} \beta(\varphi^{(n_k+l)}(0), \varphi^{(n_k+l+1)}(0)) + R \\ &\leq R + \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} \beta(\varphi^{(0)}(0), \varphi^{(1)}(0)) + R \\ &= 2R + m\beta(0, \varphi(0)), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality holds because  $\beta$  is  $\varphi$ -invariant, and this happens for every  $k$ . On the other hand, since  $\{v_k\}$  is a thin sequence,  $\beta(v_k, \{v_j : j \neq k\}) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , a contradiction.

Now suppose that  $w \in E = \{w \in \mathbb{D} : \lambda\varphi_w \in L_\varphi(B) \text{ for some } \lambda \in \partial\mathbb{D}\}$ . Then there is a sequence  $\{n_k\}$  such that  $B \circ \varphi^{(n_k)} \rightarrow \lambda\varphi_w$ . So, for any  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $B \circ \varphi^{(n_k+m)} \rightarrow \lambda(\varphi_w \circ \varphi^{(m)})$ . Now,  $\varphi_w \circ \varphi^{(m)}$  vanishes at  $\varphi^{(-m)}(w)$ , so taking  $m = -1, 1$  we see that  $\varphi^{(1)}(w), \varphi^{(-1)}(w) \in E$ . Thus,  $\varphi(E) = E$ . The fact that  $E$  is closed in  $\mathbb{D}$  follows from a diagonal argument: indeed, if  $w_s \in E$  is a sequence that tends to  $w \in \mathbb{D}$ , then for each  $s$  there exists a sequence  $\{n_k(s)\}$  such that  $B \circ \varphi^{(n_k(s))} \rightarrow \lambda_s \varphi_{w_s}$  for some  $\lambda_s \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ , when  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . We may assume that the sequence  $\lambda_s$  converges to some  $\lambda_0 \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ , and then we can extract a sequence from  $B \circ \varphi^{(n_k(s))}$  that tends to  $\lambda_0 \varphi_w$ , so  $w \in E$ .

To prove the converse, first consider the case in which  $E = \emptyset$ . Since  $\varphi^{(n)}(0) \rightarrow \gamma \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ , the attractive fixed point of  $\varphi$ , for every Blaschke product  $B$  with zeros that do not accumulate at  $\gamma$  we have  $B \circ \varphi^{(n)} \rightarrow B(\gamma) \in \partial\mathbb{D}$  in  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{D})$ .

If  $E \neq \emptyset$ , choose a sequence  $\{\alpha_j\}$  that is dense in  $E$  and change it to  $\{w_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ , given by

$$\alpha_1, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_1, \dots,$$

so that, as sets  $\{w_k\}_{k \geq 1} = \{\alpha_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ , and the set of limit points in  $\mathbb{D}$  of the sequence  $\{w_k\}$  is  $E$ . Write  $\varphi^{(n)} = \lambda_n \varphi_{z_n}$ , where  $|\lambda_n| = 1$  and  $z_n \in \mathbb{D}$  (every automorphism can be written in this form), and observe that  $|z_n| \rightarrow 1$ . Now use Lemma 2.1 to choose a subsequence  $\{z_{-n_k}\}$  of  $\{z_{-n}\}_{n \geq 0}$  such that any sequence with one point in each  $D_\rho(z_{-n_k}, |w_k|)$  is thin. Consider

$$B(z) = \prod_{k \geq 1} \gamma_k (\varphi_{w_k} \circ \varphi^{(-n_k)})(z) = \prod_{k \geq 1} \gamma_k \varphi_{w_k} (\lambda_{-n_k} \varphi_{z_{-n_k}}(z)),$$

where  $\gamma_k \in \partial\mathbb{D}$  are chosen so that either each factor is positive at the origin or it is  $z$ . The zeros of  $B$  are  $\varphi_{z_{-n_k}}(\bar{\lambda}_{-n_k} w_k) \in D_\rho(z_{-n_k}, |w_k|)$ . If  $w \in E$ , there is a subsequence  $w_{k_j} \rightarrow w$ , and

$$B \circ \varphi^{(n_{k_j})} = \varphi_{w_{k_j}} \gamma_{k_j} \prod_{k \neq k_j} \gamma_k (\varphi_{w_k} \circ \varphi^{(-n_k + n_{k_j})}).$$

Since every  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{D})$ -convergent subsequence of  $\{B \circ \varphi^{(n_{k_j})}\}$  tends either to  $\lambda\varphi_{z_*}$  or  $\lambda$ , for some  $\lambda \in \partial\mathbb{D}$  and  $z_* \in \mathbb{D}$ , and in our case  $\varphi_{w_{k_j}} \rightarrow \varphi_w$ , it follows that the convergent subsequences of  $\{B \circ \varphi^{(n_{k_j})}\}$  tend to automorphisms of the form  $\lambda\varphi_w$ , for some  $\lambda \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ . On the other hand, if there is  $\lambda \in \partial\mathbb{D}$  such that  $\lambda\varphi_w \in L_\varphi(B)$ , we will show that  $w \in E$ . For any integer  $m$ :

$$Z(B \circ \varphi^{(m)}) = \varphi^{(-m)}(Z(B)) = \{\varphi^{(-m+n_k)}(w_k) : k \geq 1\} \subset E,$$

where the last inclusion holds because  $\{w_k\}_{k \geq 1} \subset E$  and  $\varphi(E) = E$ . If  $\lambda\varphi_w \in L_\varphi(B)$  for some  $\lambda \in \partial\mathbb{D}$  then  $0 = \inf_{m \geq 0} \rho(w, Z(B \circ \varphi^{(m)})) \geq \rho(w, E)$ , and consequently  $w \in E$  because  $E$  is closed.

For the last assertion of the proposition, suppose that  $B$  is a thin product with associated set  $E$ . Then  $w \in E$  if and only if there exists a sequence  $m_j \rightarrow +\infty$  such that  $B \circ \varphi^{(m_j)} \rightarrow \lambda\varphi_w$  for some  $\lambda \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ . This means that  $B(\varphi^{(m_j)}(w)) \rightarrow 0$ , and since  $B$  is an interpolating Blaschke product, this holds if and only if  $\rho(\varphi^{(m_j)}(w), Z(B)) \rightarrow 0$  (see [7, p. 395]). That is, there is a sequence  $\{z_j\}$  in  $Z(B)$  such that  $\rho(\varphi^{(m_j)}(w), z_j) = \rho(w, \varphi^{(-m_j)}(z_j)) \rightarrow 0$ , or equivalently,  $w = \lim \varphi^{(-m_j)}(z_j)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $B$  be a thin Blaschke product. Then the  $H^2$ -limit points of  $O_\varphi(B)$  are precisely the functions in  $L_\varphi(B)$ .*

*Proof.* If  $g$  is an  $H^2$ -limit point of  $O_\varphi(B)$ , there is a sequence  $B \circ \varphi^{(n_k)} \rightarrow g$  in  $H^2$ . It is clear that  $g \in H^\infty$  and bearing in mind that norm convergence in  $H^2$  implies uniform convergence on compacta, it follows that  $g \in L_\varphi(B)$ .

Conversely, if  $g \in L_\varphi(B)$ , there is a sequence  $B \circ \varphi^{(n_k)} \rightarrow g$  uniformly on compacta. This, plus the fact that  $\|B \circ \varphi^{(n_k)}\|_2 = 1$ , implies that  $B \circ \varphi^{(n_k)} \rightarrow g$  weakly in  $H^2$ . By Proposition 2.2, we have that either  $g = \lambda\varphi_w$  or  $g = \lambda$ , for some  $\lambda \in \partial\mathbb{D}$  and  $w \in \mathbb{D}$ . Hence,

$$(2.2) \quad \|B \circ \varphi^{(n_k)} - g\|_2^2 = 2 - 2\operatorname{Re} \langle B \circ \varphi^{(n_k)}, g \rangle \rightarrow 2(1 - \|g\|^2) = 0$$

as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , and the lemma follows.  $\square$

Now, we are in position to state the main result of this section. If  $N \subset H^2$  is a closed subspace, we denote its orthogonal complement by  $N^\perp$ .

**Theorem 2.4.** *Let  $\varphi$  be a non-elliptic automorphism and  $B$  be a thin product. Write  $\mathcal{H} = \overline{\operatorname{span}} L_\varphi(B)$  for the closure in  $H^2$  of the linear span of  $L_\varphi(B)$ . Then*

$$\mathcal{H} = H^2 \quad \text{or} \quad \mathcal{H} = (zbH^2)^\perp,$$

where  $b$  is a Blaschke product with simple (or no) zeros that satisfies  $b \circ \varphi = \gamma b$  for some  $\gamma \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ . Conversely, if  $\mathcal{H}$  is either of the above spaces, there is a thin product  $B$  such that  $\overline{\operatorname{span}} L_\varphi(B) = \mathcal{H}$ .



*Proof.* Since Proposition 2.2 says that  $L_\varphi(B)$  contains a non-null constant and for  $w \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$ ,

$$(2.3) \quad \overline{w}\varphi_w(z) = \overline{w} \frac{w-z}{1-\overline{w}z} = 1 - \frac{1-|w|^2}{1-\overline{w}z},$$

the same proposition tells us that a subspace  $\mathcal{H} \subset H^2$  has the form  $\mathcal{H} = \overline{\text{span}} L_\varphi(B)$  for  $B$  thin if and only if there is a relatively closed set  $E \subset \mathbb{D}$ , with  $\varphi(E) = E$ , such that

$$\mathcal{H} = \overline{\text{span}}_{H^2} \left[ \{1\} \cup \left\{ \frac{1}{1-\overline{w}z} : w \in E \right\} \cup \{z : \text{if } 0 \in E\} \right].$$

We recall that the function  $K_w(z) = (1-\overline{w}z)^{-1}$  is the reproducing kernel in  $H^2$  for  $w \in \mathbb{D}$ , meaning that  $\langle f, K_w \rangle = f(w)$  for all  $f \in H^2$ . So, a function  $f$  is orthogonal to  $\mathcal{H}$  if and only if  $f(0) = 0$ ,  $f(w) = 0$  for all  $w \in E$ , and  $f'(0) = 0$  when  $0 \in E$ . That is,

$$\mathcal{H}^\perp = \{f \in H^2 : f \in zH^2, f \equiv 0 \text{ on } E \text{ and } f \in z^2H^2 \text{ if } 0 \in E\}.$$

There are four possibilities:  $E = \emptyset$ ,  $E \neq \emptyset$  is not a Blaschke sequence, or  $E$  is a Blaschke sequence, in which case we distinguish temporarily between the cases  $0 \notin E$  and  $0 \in E$ . If  $E = \emptyset$ , then  $\mathcal{H}^\perp = zH^2$ . Since the zeros of a non-null function in  $H^2$  form a Blaschke sequence, when  $E$  is not such sequence we have  $\mathcal{H}^\perp = \{0\}$ . If  $E$  is a Blaschke sequence, let  $b$  and  $b_0$  be Blaschke products that satisfy  $Z(b) = E$  and  $Z(b_0) = E \setminus \{0\}$ . If  $0 \notin E$ , we get  $\mathcal{H}^\perp = zH^2 \cap bH^2 = zbH^2$ . On the other hand, if  $0 \in E$  we get  $\mathcal{H}^\perp = b_0H^2 \cap z^2H^2 = z^2b_0H^2 = zbH^2$ . Summing up,

1.  $\mathcal{H} = H^2 \Leftrightarrow E$  is not a Blaschke sequence.
2.  $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C} \Leftrightarrow E = \emptyset$ .
3.  $\mathcal{H} = (zbH^2)^\perp$ , with  $Z(b) = E \Leftrightarrow E$  is a Blaschke sequence, whether  $0 \in E$  or not.

Finally, in the last case we have  $Z(b \circ \varphi) = \varphi^{-1}(Z(b)) = \varphi^{-1}(E) = E = Z(b)$ . Therefore  $b \circ \varphi$  and  $b$  are Blaschke products with the same zeros, which means that  $b \circ \varphi = \gamma b$  for some unimodular constant  $\gamma$ .  $\square$

By Theorem 2.4, the equality is attained in the inclusion  $\overline{\text{span}} L_\varphi(B) \subseteq \overline{\text{span}} O_\varphi(B)$  if and only if  $\overline{\text{span}} L_\varphi(B) = H^2$  or  $\overline{\text{span}} L_\varphi(B) = (zbH^2)^\perp$ , where  $b$  is a non-constant Blaschke product as in the theorem, and  $B \in (zbH^2)^\perp$ . This means that  $\overline{z}bB = \overline{z}v$ , where  $v \in H^2$  is inner, or equivalently, that  $B$  divides  $b$ . Our next example shows that  $\overline{\text{span}} L_\varphi(B)$  can be much smaller than  $\overline{\text{span}} O_\varphi(B)$ .

**Example 2.5.** *There exist thin Blaschke products  $B$  such that*

$$\overline{\text{span}} O_\varphi(B) = H^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\text{span}} L_\varphi(B) = \mathbb{C}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\{w_k\}$  be a sequence in  $D_\varphi$  such that  $|w_k| \rightarrow 1$  and whose set of non-tangential accumulation points has positive measure. We show the existence of such a sequence as follows: take

any maximal sequence in  $\mathbb{D}$  that satisfies  $\beta(w_j, w_k) \geq \delta > 0$  if  $k \neq j$ . Since the sequence is hyperbolically separated, it does not accumulate on  $\mathbb{D}$ . We claim that it accumulates non-tangentially at every point of  $\partial\mathbb{D}$ .

Otherwise, for every angle  $0 < \alpha < \pi/2$ , there is a point  $\xi \in \partial\mathbb{D}$  such that some non-tangential sector with vertex  $\xi$  and half opening  $\alpha$  does not contain any point  $w_k$ . If  $\alpha$  is big enough we have that the hyperbolic distance of  $r\xi$  to the sequence is larger than  $\delta$  when  $r < 1$  is close to 1. This contradicts the maximality of the sequence. Hence, the intersection of this sequence with  $D_\varphi$  satisfies the desired condition.

As we did in the proof of Proposition 2.2, we can use Lemma 2.1 to pick  $n_k \rightarrow +\infty$  so that the Blaschke product

$$B(z) = \prod_{k \geq 1} \gamma_k(\varphi_{w_k} \circ \varphi^{(-n_k)})(z)$$

with zeros  $\varphi^{(n_k)}(w_k)$  is thin. Moreover, by Lemma 2.1 we can choose  $n_k \rightarrow \infty$  so fast that  $B$  is as ‘thin’ as we wish, meaning that if  $j \geq 1$  and  $B_j := \prod_{k \neq j} \gamma_k(\varphi_{w_k} \circ \varphi^{(-n_k)})$ , then  $|B_j(\varphi^{(n_j)}(w_j))|$  is so close to 1 as we predefine (by choosing  $\delta_j \rightarrow 1$  fast enough in Lemma 2.1). Furthermore, since for every  $h \in H^\infty$ , with  $\|h\|_\infty \leq 1$ , and  $w \in \mathbb{D}$ , the Schwarz-Pick inequality easily yields  $\rho(|h(w)|, |w|) \leq |h(0)|$  (see [7, Ch. I, Cor. 1.3]), taking  $h = B_j \circ \varphi^{(n_j)}$  and  $w = w_j$ , we can ensure that the right hand side of

$$\rho(|B_j \circ \varphi^{(n_j)}(w_j)|, |w_j|) \leq |B_j \circ \varphi^{(n_j)}(0)|$$

is as close to 1 as desired. In particular, we can impose the condition

$$(2.4) \quad \frac{(1 - |B_j \circ \varphi^{(n_j)}(0)|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{1 - |w_j|^2} \rightarrow 0.$$

We will check that  $\overline{\text{span}} O_\varphi(B) = H^2$ . Suppose that  $f \in H^2$  is orthogonal to  $O_\varphi(B)$ . By Proposition 2.2,  $f \perp \mathbb{C}$ . So, using (2.3),  $f \perp (B \circ \varphi^{(n_k)})$ ,  $f \perp \mathbb{C}$  and

$$B \circ \varphi^{(n_k)} = (B_k \circ \varphi^{(n_k)}) \gamma_k \varphi_{w_k}, \quad (k \geq 1),$$

successively in the following chain of equalities, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\gamma_k B_k(\varphi^{(n_k)}(0))} f(w_k) &= \frac{1}{1 - |w_k|^2} \left\langle f, (1 - \overline{w_k} \varphi_{w_k}) \gamma_k (B_k \circ \varphi^{(n_k)})(0) \right\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{1 - |w_k|^2} \left\langle f, \overline{w_k} (B \circ \varphi^{(n_k)}) + (1 - \overline{w_k} \varphi_{w_k}) \gamma_k (B_k \circ \varphi^{(n_k)})(0) \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle f, \frac{\overline{w_k}}{1 - |w_k|^2} (B \circ \varphi^{(n_k)}) - \frac{\gamma_k \overline{w_k}}{1 - |w_k|^2} \varphi_{w_k} (B_k \circ \varphi^{(n_k)})(0) \right\rangle \\ &= \frac{w_k}{1 - |w_k|^2} \left\langle f, \gamma_k \varphi_{w_k} [(B_k \circ \varphi^{(n_k)}) - (B_k \circ \varphi^{(n_k)})(0)] \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} |B_k(\varphi^{(n_k)}(0))| |f(w_k)| &\leq \frac{|w_k|}{1-|w_k|^2} \|f\|_2 \|(B_k \circ \varphi^{(n_k)}) - (B_k \circ \varphi^{(n_k)})(0)\|_2 \\ &= \frac{|w_k|}{1-|w_k|^2} \|f\|_2 (1 - |(B_k \circ \varphi^{(n_k)})(0)|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

by (2.4); that is,  $f(w_k) \rightarrow 0$ . Since the sequence  $\{w_k\}$  accumulates non-tangentially on a set of positive measure in  $\partial\mathbb{D}$ , the non-tangential limits of  $f$  must vanish on a set of positive measure, implying that  $f = 0$ . This proves our claim.

The equality  $\overline{\text{span}} L_\varphi(B) = \mathbb{C}$  will follow from the last assertion of Proposition 2.2 if we show that the set  $E$  associated with  $B$  is empty. So, suppose that  $w \in E$ . Since the zeros of  $B$  are  $\varphi^{(n_k)}(w_k)$ , the proposition says that there are integers  $m_j, k_j \rightarrow +\infty$  such that  $\varphi^{(-m_j)}(\varphi^{(n_{k_j})}(w_{k_j})) \rightarrow w$ . Applying the quotient map  $P : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow D_\varphi$ , we obtain

$$\lim w_{k_j} = \lim P(\varphi^{(-m_j+n_{k_j})}(w_{k_j})) = P(w) \in D_\varphi,$$

where the limit is taken in the  $D_\varphi$  topology. This is not possible, because  $|w_{k_j}| \rightarrow 1$ .  $\square$

**2.1. Generalization to Hardy spaces.** The proof of Theorem 2.4 is more natural and transparent in the context of the Hilbert space  $H^2$ , but with very minor modifications we can see that both Lemma 2.3 and Theorem 2.4 are valid for  $H^p$  when  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . We recall that the composition operator  $C_\varphi$  is bounded on  $H^p$  for  $p \geq 1$  (see [5, p. 121]). To see that the lemma holds simply replace (2.2) by

$$\|B \circ \varphi^{(n_k)} - g\|_p^p \leq \|B \circ \varphi^{(n_k)} - g\|_{2(p-1)}^{p-1} \|B \circ \varphi^{(n_k)} - g\|_2 \leq 2^{p-1} \|B \circ \varphi^{(n_k)} - g\|_2,$$

which by (2.2) tends to 0 as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , where the first inequality is the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the second holds because  $|B \circ \varphi^{(n_k)} - g| \leq 2$ .

Let  $1 < p < \infty$  and  $N \subset H^p$  be a subspace. The annihilator of  $N$  is

$$N^\perp = \{f \in H^q : \langle h, f \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } h \in N\},$$

where  $1/p + 1/q = 1$ . Mimicking the proof of Theorem 2.4 we see that if  $\varphi$  is a non-elliptic automorphism and  $B$  is a thin product, a space  $\mathcal{H} \subset H^p$  has the form  $\mathcal{H} = \overline{\text{span}}_{H^p} L_\varphi(B)$  if and only if it is closed and  $\mathcal{H}^\perp = \{0\} \subset H^q$  or  $\mathcal{H}^\perp = zbH^q$ , where  $b$  is a Blaschke product as in Theorem 2.4. This is the same as saying that

$$\mathcal{H} = H^p \quad \text{or} \quad \mathcal{H} = (zbH^q)^\perp = H^p \cap b\overline{H}^p,$$

where the bar means complex conjugation. This is the  $H^p$  version of Theorem 2.4 for  $1 < p < \infty$ . The result for  $H^1$  requires a different argument. Since the first of the following spaces

$$\text{span } L_\varphi(B) \subset \overline{\text{span}}_{H^2} L_\varphi(B) \subset \overline{\text{span}}_{H^1} L_\varphi(B) := \mathcal{H}$$

is dense in the latter, so is the one in middle, which by Theorem 2.4, is either  $H^2$  or  $H^2 \cap b\overline{H}^2$ , with both cases occurring. In the first case  $\mathcal{H} = H^1$  and in the second,  $\mathcal{H}$  is the  $H^1$ -norm closure of  $H^2 \cap b\overline{H}^2$ , which by Lemma 5.8.14 of [3] is  $H^1 \cap b\overline{H}^1$ . This gives Theorem 2.4 for  $H^1$ .

### 3. A CONSTRUCTIVE CHARACTERIZATION OF EIGENVECTORS

While our work in this section is related to those in [4, Section 4], our approach to the problem is quite different. The function  $h(z) = i\frac{1+z}{1-z}$  maps  $\mathbb{D}$  onto  $\mathbb{C}_+ = \{v \in \mathbb{C} : \text{Im } v > 0\}$ , with  $h^{-1}(v) = \frac{v-i}{v+i}$ . If  $\varphi$  is a hyperbolic automorphism of  $\mathbb{D}$ , by conjugating  $C_\varphi$  with an invertible operator, we can assume that its fixed points are  $-1$  and  $1$ , where  $1$  is the attractive point. Thus,  $\varphi = h^{-1} \circ \tilde{\varphi} \circ h$ , where  $\tilde{\varphi} : \mathbb{C}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_+$  is  $\tilde{\varphi}(w) = \alpha w$ , with  $\alpha > 1$  (see [1], for instance). A straightforward calculation shows that

$$(3.5) \quad \varphi(z) = -\varphi_{\frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}}(z) \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi^{(n)}(z) = -\varphi_{\frac{1-\alpha^n}{1+\alpha^n}}(z) \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

The same argument with  $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  parabolic, where we now assume that its fixed point is  $1$ , and therefore  $\tilde{\varphi}(w) = w + t$ , with  $t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ , shows that

$$(3.6) \quad \varphi(z) = \left(\frac{t-2i}{t+2i}\right) \varphi_{\frac{t}{t-2i}}(z) \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi^{(n)}(z) = \left(\frac{nt-2i}{nt+2i}\right) \varphi_{\frac{nt}{nt-2i}}(z) \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

We can further assume that  $t > 0$ , since otherwise the treatment is analogous.

From the above expressions for  $\tilde{\varphi}$ , it is easy to see in both cases that if  $w_0 \in \mathbb{C}_+$  then  $\{\tilde{\varphi}^{(n)}(w_0) : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  is an interpolating sequence for  $H^\infty(\mathbb{C}_+)$  (see [7, Ch. VII]), so  $\{\varphi^{(n)}(z_0) : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  is an interpolating sequence for  $H^\infty(\mathbb{D})$  for any fixed  $z_0 \in \mathbb{D}$ .

**3.1. Blaschke product eigenvectors.** It is clear that a Blaschke product  $b$  satisfies  $b \circ \varphi = \gamma b$  for some  $\gamma \in \partial\mathbb{D}$  if and only if  $b$  and  $b \circ \varphi$  have the same zeros. This means that for every zero  $w$  of  $b$ ,  $\{\varphi^{(n)}(w) : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  are zeros of  $b$ , each one with the same multiplicity as  $w$ . Hence,  $b$  is solely determined by the sequence of its zeros in  $D_\varphi$ . So, a characterization of the Blaschke products that are eigenvectors is tantamount to a characterization of the Blaschke sequences  $\{z_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  in  $D_\varphi$  such that  $\{\varphi^{(n)}(z_k) : k \geq 1, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  is also a Blaschke sequence. We have to distinguish between the hyperbolic and the parabolic case.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $\{z_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  be Blaschke sequence in  $D_\varphi$ . Then  $\{\varphi^{(n)}(z_k) : k \geq 1, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  is a Blaschke sequence*

- (1) *always when  $\varphi$  is hyperbolic.*
- (2) *if and only if  $\{z_k\}$  stays outside of some horocycle tangent to  $\partial\mathbb{D}$  at the fixed point of  $\varphi$ , when  $\varphi$  is parabolic.*

*Proof.* Geometrically, it will be more convenient to look at things in the upper half-plane  $\mathbb{C}_+ = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Im} z > 0\}$ . Hence, the Blaschke condition for the sequence  $z_k = x_k + iy_k$  is  $\sum \frac{y_k}{1+|z_k|^2} < \infty$ . To prove (1) we can assume that  $\varphi$  is a hyperbolic automorphism that fixes 0 and  $\infty$ , and therefore has the form  $\varphi(w) = \alpha w$  with  $1 \neq \alpha > 0$ . We can also assume that  $\alpha > 1$ , since the proof is the same in both cases. In this case, we can take  $D_\varphi = \{z \in \mathbb{C}_+ : 1 \leq |z| < \alpha\}$ , and we must show that if  $\{z_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  in  $D_\varphi$  is a Blaschke sequence then so is  $\{\alpha^n z_k : k \geq 1, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \geq 1, n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{\alpha^n y_k}{1 + |\alpha^n z_k|^2} &\leq \sum_{n \geq 0} \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{\alpha^n y_k}{\alpha^{2n} |z_k|^2} + \sum_{n < 0} \sum_{k \geq 1} \alpha^n y_k \\ &\leq \left[ \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{1}{\alpha^n} + \sum_{n < 0} \alpha^n \right] \sum_{k \geq 1} y_k \quad (\text{since } |z_k| \geq 1) \\ &\leq \left[ \frac{\alpha + 1}{\alpha - 1} \right] \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{y_k (1 + \alpha^2)}{1 + |z_k|^2} < \infty \quad (\text{since } |z_k| < \alpha). \end{aligned}$$

To prove (2) we can assume that  $\varphi$  is a parabolic automorphism that fixes  $\infty$ , and therefore has the form  $\varphi(w) = w + t$ , where  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , and we can also assume that  $t > 0$ , since the proof is the same in both cases.

In the case at hand, we take  $D_\varphi = \{z \in \mathbb{C}_+ : 0 \leq \operatorname{Re} z < t\}$ , and show that given a Blaschke sequence  $\{z_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  in  $D_\varphi$ ,  $\{z_k + nt : k \geq 1, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  is a Blaschke sequence if and only if the sequence  $\{y_k\}$  is bounded.

First suppose that there is some constant  $C > 0$  such that  $y_k \leq C$  for all  $k \geq 1$ . Since  $|x_k + nt| \geq |n|t - x_k \geq (|n| - 1)t$ , we have that  $(x_k + nt)^2 \geq (|n| - 1)^2 t^2$  for all  $n \neq 0$ . Consequently, if  $n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ ,

$$\frac{1 + |z_k|^2}{1 + |z_k + nt|^2} \leq \frac{1 + t^2 + C^2}{1 + (|n| - 1)^2 t^2},$$

leading to

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \geq 1, n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{y_k}{1 + |z_k + nt|^2} &= \sum_{k \geq 1, n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{y_k}{1 + |z_k|^2} \frac{1 + |z_k|^2}{1 + |z_k + nt|^2} \\ &\leq \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{y_k}{1 + |z_k|^2} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1 + t^2 + C^2}{1 + (|n| - 1)^2 t^2}, \end{aligned}$$

which is convergent. Obviously, the sum is also bounded for  $n = 0$ .

If the sequence  $\{y_k\}$  is not bounded, fix an arbitrary  $y_k \geq t + 1$  and consider all the values of  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $-\frac{y_k}{t} \leq -\left[\frac{y_k}{t}\right] \leq n \leq \left[\frac{y_k}{t}\right] \leq \frac{y_k}{t}$ , where  $[a]$  denotes the largest integer  $\leq a$ . Since  $0 \leq x_k < t$ , we have

$$-y_k \leq x_k - y_k \leq x_k + nt \leq x_k + y_k \leq t + y_k \leq 2y_k,$$

and consequently  $(x_k + nt)^2 \leq (2y_k)^2$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{-\lceil \frac{y_k}{t} \rceil \leq n \leq \lceil \frac{y_k}{t} \rceil} \frac{y_k}{1 + |z_k + nt|^2} &\geq \frac{1}{y_k} \sum_{-\lceil \frac{y_k}{t} \rceil \leq n \leq \lceil \frac{y_k}{t} \rceil} \frac{y_k^2}{1 + 5y_k^2} \\
&\stackrel{(y_k \geq 1)}{\geq} \frac{1}{y_k} \sum_{-\lceil \frac{y_k}{t} \rceil \leq n \leq \lceil \frac{y_k}{t} \rceil} \frac{1}{6} \\
&= \frac{1}{6y_k} \left( 2 \left\lceil \frac{y_k}{t} \right\rceil + 1 \right) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{6y_k} \left( \frac{y_k}{t} \right) = \frac{1}{6t}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\sum_{k \geq 1, n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{y_k}{1 + |z_k + nt|^2} \geq \sum_{y_k \geq t+1} \sum_{-\lceil \frac{y_k}{t} \rceil \leq n \leq \lceil \frac{y_k}{t} \rceil} \frac{y_k}{1 + |z_k + nt|^2} \geq \sum_{y_k \geq t+1} \frac{1}{6t},$$

which is infinite if there are infinitely many  $y_k \geq t+1$ .  $\square$

**3.2. Outer eigenfunctions.** If  $\varphi$  is given by (3.5) (the hyperbolic case) consider the circular intervals  $J = (\varphi(i), i] \cup [-i, \varphi(-i))$  of  $\partial\mathbb{D}$ , and if  $\varphi$  is given by (3.6) (the parabolic case) consider  $J = [-1, \varphi(-1))$  (see Figures 1 and 2).

**Lemma 3.2.** *If  $\varphi$  is given by (3.5) then*

$$(3.7) \quad \frac{1}{4} \alpha^{-|n|} \leq |\varphi^{(n)'}(w)| \leq (\alpha + 1)^2 \alpha^{-|n|} \quad \forall w \in J, \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

*If  $\varphi$  is given by (3.6) then there is a constant  $c(t) > 0$  such that*

$$(3.8) \quad \frac{1}{n^2 t^2 + 4} \leq |\varphi^{(n)'}(w)| \leq \frac{c(t)}{n^2 t^2 + 4} \quad \forall w \in J, \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

*Proof.* If  $\varphi$  comes from (3.5),

$$|\varphi^{(n)'}(w)| = \frac{1 - \left| \frac{1 - \alpha^n}{1 + \alpha^n} \right|^2}{\left| 1 - \frac{1 - \alpha^n}{1 + \alpha^n} w \right|^2} = \frac{\frac{4\alpha^n}{(1 + \alpha^n)^2}}{\left| 1 - \frac{1 - \alpha^n}{1 + \alpha^n} w \right|^2}.$$

When  $w \in J$  and  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\frac{1 - \alpha^n}{1 + \alpha^n} w$  remains in the angular sector  $\{re^{i\theta} : 0 \leq r \leq 1, \arg \varphi(i) < \theta < \arg \varphi(-i)\}$ . Since  $\mathbb{D} \cap \partial D_\varphi$  is orthogonal to  $\partial\mathbb{D}$  (see Figure 1), it follows that

$$\frac{2^2}{(\alpha + 1)^2} = |1 - \varphi(0)|^2 \leq \left| 1 - \frac{1 - \alpha^n}{1 + \alpha^n} w \right|^2 \leq 2^2.$$

For  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$\alpha^{-|n|} \leq \frac{4\alpha^n}{(1 + \alpha^n)^2} \leq 4\alpha^{-|n|},$$

so combining the above inequalities we obtain the desired result. If  $\varphi$  comes from (3.6),

$$|\varphi^{(n)'}(w)| = \frac{1 - \left| \frac{nt}{nt-2i} \right|^2}{\left| 1 - \frac{nt}{nt-2i} w \right|^2} = \frac{\frac{4}{n^2 t^2 + 4}}{\left| 1 - \frac{nt}{nt-2i} w \right|^2}.$$

When  $w \in [-1, \varphi(-1))$ , Figure 2 shows that

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \geq \left| \bar{w} - \frac{nt}{nt-2i} \right| &\geq |\varphi(-1) - 1| - \left| 1 - \frac{nt}{nt-2i} \right| \\ &= 2 \left[ \frac{1}{(t^2+1)^{1/2}} - \frac{1}{(n^2 t^2 + 4)^{1/2}} \right] \\ &\stackrel{\text{if } n \neq 0}{\geq} 2 \left[ \frac{1}{(t^2+1)^{1/2}} - \frac{1}{(t^2+4)^{1/2}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The claim follows for  $n \neq 0$  by inserting the above inequalities in the expression of  $|\varphi^{(n)'}(w)|$ . Since  $|\varphi^{(0)'}(w)| = 1$ , it also follows for  $n = 0$  by taking  $c(t) > 4$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$  and  $\varphi$  be a non-elliptic automorphism. If  $f_0 \geq 0$  belongs to  $L^p(J)$  and  $\log f_0 \in L^1(J)$  with respect to the linear Lebesgue measure  $|dz|$ , then for  $\lambda > 0$ ,*

$$f(z) := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \chi_{\varphi^{(n)}(J)}(z) \lambda^n f_0(\varphi^{(-n)}(z))$$

is in  $L^p(\partial\mathbb{D})$  and  $\log f \in L^1(\partial\mathbb{D})$  if and only if

- (1)  $\frac{1}{\sqrt[p]{\alpha}} < \lambda < \sqrt[p]{\alpha}$  in the hyperbolic case (i.e.: when  $\varphi$  is given by (3.5)),
- (2)  $\lambda = 1$  in the parabolic case (i.e.: when  $\varphi$  is given by (3.6)).

Furthermore,  $f \circ \varphi = \lambda f$  on  $\partial\mathbb{D}$  in both cases.

*Proof.* Clearly  $f$  is defined almost everywhere on  $\partial\mathbb{D}$  so that  $f|_J = f_0$  and  $(f \circ \varphi^{(n)})(z) = \lambda^n f(z)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  (see Figures 1 and 2). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\varphi^{(n)}(J)} f(z)^p |dz| &= \int_J f(\varphi^{(n)}(w))^p |\varphi^{(n)'}(w)| |dw| \\ (3.9) \qquad &= \int_J \lambda^{pn} f(w)^p |\varphi^{(n)'}(w)| |dw|. \end{aligned}$$

In the hyperbolic case we insert the inequalities (3.7) in the above expression to obtain a constant  $C(\alpha) > 0$  such that

$$\frac{1}{4} \frac{\lambda^{pn}}{\alpha^{|n|}} \int_J f(w)^p |dw| \leq \int_{\varphi^{(n)}(J)} f(z)^p |dz| \leq C(\alpha) \frac{\lambda^{pn}}{\alpha^{|n|}} \int_J f(w)^p |dw|.$$

Summing over  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$\frac{1}{4} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{\lambda^{pn}}{\alpha^{|n|}} \int_J f^p \leq \int_{\partial\mathbb{D}} f^p \leq C(\alpha) \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{\lambda^{pn}}{\alpha^{|n|}} \int_J f^p.$$

For the convergence of the sum it is necessary and sufficient that  $\lambda^p/\alpha < 1$  and  $\lambda^p\alpha > 1$ ; that is,  $\frac{1}{\sqrt[p]{\alpha}} < \lambda < \sqrt[p]{\alpha}$ . The same idea, with  $f^p$  replaced by  $\log f$ , gives

$$\frac{1}{4} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{\alpha^{|n|}} \int_J (\log f + n \log \lambda) \leq \int_{\partial \mathbb{D}} \log f \leq C(\alpha) \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{\alpha^{|n|}} \int_J (\log f + n \log \lambda),$$

which converges because  $\alpha > 1$ .

In the parabolic case we insert the inequalities (3.8) in (3.9) to obtain a constant  $c(t) > 0$  such that

$$\frac{\lambda^{pn}}{n^2 t^2 + 4} \int_J f(w)^p |dw| \leq \int_{\varphi^{(n)}(J)} f(z)^p |dz| \leq c(t) \frac{\lambda^{pn}}{n^2 t^2 + 4} \int_J f(w)^p |dw|.$$

Summing over  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{\lambda^{pn}}{n^2 t^2 + 4} \int_J f^p \leq \int_{\partial \mathbb{D}} f^p \leq c(t) \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{\lambda^{pn}}{n^2 t^2 + 4} \int_J f^p.$$

The sum converges if and only if  $\lambda = 1$ . Finally, observing that for  $\lambda = 1$  we have  $\log(f \circ \varphi) = \log f$ , the same proof, with  $f^p$  replaced by  $\log f$ , gives

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{n^2 t^2 + 4} \int_J \log f \leq \int_{\partial \mathbb{D}} \log f \leq c(t) \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{n^2 t^2 + 4} \int_J \log f,$$

which converges. □

**Theorem 3.4.** *Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$  and  $\varphi$  be a non-elliptic automorphism. There is an outer function*

$$F(z) = \exp \left( \int \frac{e^{i\theta} + z}{e^{i\theta} - z} \log f(e^{i\theta}) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \right) \in H^p$$

*such that  $F \circ \varphi = \gamma \lambda F$  for  $\lambda > 0$  and some  $\gamma \in \partial \mathbb{D}$  if and only if*

- (1)  $\frac{1}{\sqrt[p]{\alpha}} < \lambda < \sqrt[p]{\alpha}$  in the hyperbolic case (where  $\varphi$  is given by (3.5)),
- (2)  $\lambda = 1$  in the parabolic case,

*and  $f$  is given by Lemma 3.3. Moreover,  $\gamma$  depends on  $\varphi$  and  $f_0$  but it is independent of  $\lambda$  in both cases.*

*Proof.* Since  $|F(\xi)| = f(\xi)$  for almost every  $\xi \in \partial \mathbb{D}$ , we also have  $|F(\varphi(\xi))| = f(\varphi(\xi)) = \lambda f(\xi)$ , where the last equality comes from the lemma. That means that the outer functions  $F \circ \varphi$  and  $\lambda F$  have the same modulus on  $\partial \mathbb{D}$ , and consequently they differ by a multiplicative constant of modulus one (see [7, Ch. II, Thm. 4.6]). To complete the proof, notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma \lambda = \frac{F(\varphi(0))}{F(0)} &= \exp \left( \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left[ \frac{e^{i\theta} + \varphi(0)}{e^{i\theta} - \varphi(0)} - 1 \right] \log f(e^{i\theta}) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \right) \\ &= \exp \left( \int_{\partial \mathbb{D}} \frac{2\varphi(0)}{e^{i\theta} - \varphi(0)} \log f(e^{i\theta}) \frac{|d(e^{i\theta})|}{2\pi} \right). \end{aligned}$$



So, if we partition  $\partial\mathbb{D} = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi^{(n)}(J)$  and change variables (as in (3.9)), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &= \exp \left( i \int_{\partial\mathbb{D}} \operatorname{Im} \frac{2\varphi(0)}{e^{i\theta} - \varphi(0)} \log f(e^{i\theta}) \frac{|d(e^{i\theta})|}{2\pi} \right) \\ &= \exp \left( i2\varphi(0) \int_J \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \operatorname{Im} \frac{|\varphi^{(n)'}(e^{i\theta})|}{\varphi^{(n)}(e^{i\theta}) - \varphi(0)} [\log f_0(e^{i\theta}) + n \log \lambda] \frac{|d(e^{i\theta})|}{2\pi} \right) \\ &= \exp \left( i2\varphi(0) \int_J \log f_0(e^{i\theta}) \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \operatorname{Im} \frac{|\varphi^{(n)'}(e^{i\theta})|}{\varphi^{(n)}(e^{i\theta}) - \varphi(0)} \frac{|d(e^{i\theta})|}{2\pi} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds in the hyperbolic case because  $J$  is symmetric with respect to the real axis,  $\varphi(0) \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\varphi^{(n)}(e^{-i\theta}) = \overline{\varphi^{(n)}(e^{i\theta})}$ , and in the parabolic case because  $\lambda = 1$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.5.** The case  $p = \infty$  is easier. If a bounded function is an eigenvector corresponding to an eigenvalue  $a$ , then  $|a| = 1$ . On the other hand, if  $f_0 \in L^\infty(J)$ ,  $\log f_0 \in L^1(J)$  and  $\lambda = 1$  in Lemma 3.3, it is clear that the function  $f$  of the lemma is bounded and the same proof shows that  $\log f \in L^1(\partial\mathbb{D})$ . Thus, Theorem 3.4 holds for  $p = \infty$  with  $\lambda = 1$  in both the hyperbolic and parabolic case.

**3.3. Singular inner eigenvectors.** For  $\mu$  a positive, finite, singular measure on  $\partial\mathbb{D}$ , its associated singular inner function is

$$S_\mu(z) = \exp \left( - \int \frac{e^{i\theta} + z}{e^{i\theta} - z} d\mu(e^{i\theta}) \right).$$

The following lemma was proved by Matache in [10] as a means to characterize the singular inner eigenfunctions in terms of pull-back measures. We give a different proof.

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $\varphi$  be any automorphism and  $\nu$  be a (finite positive) singular measure on  $\partial\mathbb{D}$ . Then there exists a unique singular measure  $\mu$  that satisfies  $|S_\nu(\varphi^{-1}(z))| = |S_\mu(z)|$  for  $z \in \mathbb{D}$ , and it is given by*

$$(3.10) \quad \mu(E) = \int_{\varphi^{-1}(E)} |\varphi'| d\nu$$

for Borel sets  $E \subset \partial\mathbb{D}$ .

*Proof.* The existence holds because  $S_\nu(\varphi^{-1}(z))$  is a singular inner function, so there must exist a singular measure  $\mu$  and  $\lambda \in \partial\mathbb{D}$  such that  $S_\nu(\varphi^{-1}(z)) = \lambda S_\mu(z)$ . The uniqueness follows because two singular inner functions with the same modulus have the same associated measure (see [7, p. 70]). To prove the last statement consider first the case  $\nu = \delta_\xi$ , the Dirac measure concentrated at a point  $\xi \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ . If  $\mu_\xi$  is the measure that satisfies  $|S_{\delta_\xi}(\varphi^{-1}(z))| = |S_{\mu_\xi}(z)|$ , the first function

extends continuously to  $\partial\mathbb{D} \setminus \{\varphi(\xi)\}$  as the constant 1, and thus the same holds for  $|S_{\mu_\xi}(z)|$ , which means that  $\mu_\xi = c\delta_{\varphi(\xi)}$  for some constant  $c > 0$ . Moreover,

$$c = \mu_\xi(\mathbb{D}) = -\log |S_{\mu_\xi}(0)| = -\log |S_{\delta_\xi}(\varphi^{-1}(0))| = \frac{1 - |\varphi^{-1}(0)|^2}{|\xi - \varphi^{-1}(0)|^2} = |\varphi'(\xi)|.$$

So,  $\mu_\xi = |\varphi'(\xi)|\delta_{\varphi(\xi)}$ , which is the measure defined by (3.10) for  $\nu = \delta_\xi$ . For an arbitrary singular measure  $\nu$ , write  $\nu = \int \delta_\xi d\nu(\xi)$  and consider the singular measure  $\mu := \int \mu_\xi d\nu(\xi)$ , where the integrals converge weak-\* in the space of finite Borel measures. Since  $\mu_\xi$  is the measure that satisfies (3.10) for  $\delta_\xi$ , then  $\mu$  is the measure that satisfies (3.10) for  $\nu$ . Moreover, since the map  $\sigma \mapsto P_z(\sigma) = -\log |S_\sigma(z)|$  (the Poisson integral of  $\sigma$ ) is linear,

$$-\log |S_\nu(\varphi^{-1}(z))| = P_{\varphi^{-1}(z)}(\nu) = \int P_{\varphi^{-1}(z)}(\delta_\xi) d\nu(\xi) = \int P_z(\mu_\xi) d\nu(\xi) = P_z(\mu) = -\log |S_\mu(z)|,$$

where we can take the integral of measures outside of the Poisson integral because the kernel of  $P_w$  is continuous on  $\partial\mathbb{D}$  for every  $w \in \mathbb{D}$ , and the equality in the middle is proved above.  $\square$

In order to present a statement that is as clear as possible, we allow the possibility of  $\nu \equiv 0$  as a singular measure in the next corollary, and we interpret this to mean that  $S_\nu \equiv 1$ .

**Corollary 3.7.** *Let  $\varphi$  be a non-elliptic automorphism and  $\nu$  be a non-negative measure supported on the fixed points of  $\varphi$ . Then  $|S_\nu(\varphi^{-1}(z))| = |S_\nu(z)|$  for  $z \in \mathbb{D}$  if and only if*

- (1)  $\nu \equiv 0$  in the hyperbolic case,
- (2)  $\nu = a\delta_1$  in the parabolic case, where  $\delta_1$  is the Dirac measure at 1 and  $a \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* By (3.10),  $|S_\nu(\varphi^{-1}(z))| = |S_\nu(z)|$  if and only if  $\nu(\{\xi\}) = |\varphi'(\xi)|\nu(\{\xi\})$  for any fixed point  $\xi$  of  $\varphi$ . So,  $\xi \in \{-1, 1\}$  when  $\varphi$  is hyperbolic, and since  $|\varphi'(1)| = \alpha^{-1}$  and  $|\varphi'(-1)| = \alpha$ , where  $\alpha \neq 1$ , then  $\nu(\{\xi\}) = 0$ . If  $\varphi$  is parabolic, we have that  $\xi = 1$  and  $|\varphi'(1)| = 1$ , which means that  $\nu(\{1\})$  can be any non-negative number.  $\square$

Now we are in position to state the result concerning singular inner functions.

**Theorem 3.8.** *Let  $\varphi$  be a non-elliptic automorphism and  $J \subset \partial\mathbb{D}$  be the set associated with  $\varphi$  by the paragraph that precedes Lemma 3.2. If  $\nu_0$  is a singular measure on  $\partial\mathbb{D}$  with mass concentrated in  $J$ , write*

$$(3.11) \quad d\nu := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} d\nu_n, \quad \text{where} \quad \nu_n(G) = \int_{\varphi^{(-n)}(G)} |\varphi^{(n)'}(e^{i\theta})| d\nu_0(e^{i\theta}).$$

*Then  $S_\nu$  is a singular inner function that satisfies  $S_\nu(\varphi(z)) = \gamma S_\nu(z)$  for some  $\gamma \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ . If  $\varphi$  is parabolic, the same holds for  $S_{\nu+a\delta_1}$  for any  $a \geq 0$ . Conversely, every singular inner eigenvector  $S_\mu$  has this form, with  $\nu_0 = \chi_J \mu$  and, if  $\varphi$  is parabolic,  $a = \mu(\{1\})$ .*

*Proof.* First we prove that  $\nu$  is a finite measure. Observe that the whole mass of  $\nu_n$  is concentrated in  $\varphi^{(n)}(J)$  and that these sets are pairwise disjoint. Hence,

$$\nu(\partial\mathbb{D}) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \nu_n(\partial\mathbb{D}) = \int_{\partial\mathbb{D}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |\varphi^{(n)'}(e^{i\theta})| d\nu_0(e^{i\theta}) = \int_J \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |\varphi^{(n)'}(e^{i\theta})| d\nu_0(e^{i\theta}).$$

It follows from Lemma 3.2 that the above quantity is finite.

By (3.10),  $|S_{\nu_0}(\varphi^{(-n)}(z))| = |S_{\nu_n}(z)|$ , and consequently,

$$|S_{\nu_{n-1}}(z)| = |S_{\nu_0}(\varphi^{(-[n-1])}(z))| = |S_{\nu_0}(\varphi^{(-n)}(\varphi(z)))| = |S_{\nu_n}(\varphi(z))|.$$

Therefore

$$\log |S_\nu(z)| = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \log |S_{\nu_{n-1}}(z)| = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \log |S_{\nu_n}(\varphi(z))| = \log |S_\nu(\varphi(z))|,$$

which means that  $S_\nu(\varphi(z))/S_\nu(z)$  is some constant of modulus 1. Corollary 3.7 says that we can add to  $\nu$  an atom at 1 when  $\varphi$  is parabolic.

To prove the converse, suppose that  $S_\mu$  is a singular inner eigenvector and write  $\nu_n = \chi_{\varphi^{(n)}(J)}\mu$ . If we fix  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , for any Borel set  $G \subset \varphi^{(n)}(J)$ , the equality  $|S_\mu(\varphi^{(-n)}(z))| = |S_\mu(z)|$  together with (3.10) yields

$$\nu_n(G) = \mu(G) = \int_{\varphi^{(-n)}(G)} |\varphi^{(n)'}(e^{i\theta})| d\mu(e^{i\theta}) = \int_{\varphi^{(-n)}(G)} |\varphi^{(n)'}(e^{i\theta})| d\nu_0(e^{i\theta}).$$

Thus,  $\mu = \nu + \mu_\infty$ , where  $\nu$  is given by (3.11), with  $\nu_0 = \chi_J\mu$  and  $\mu_\infty$  supported on the fixed points of  $\varphi$ . But since  $S_\nu$  and  $S_\mu$  are both eigenvectors, the same holds for  $S_{\mu_\infty}$ . The theorem now follows from Corollary 3.7.  $\square$

We can summarize this discussion by saying that if  $1 \leq p < \infty$ , and  $h = FBS \in H^p$ , where  $F$  is outer,  $B$  is a Blaschke product and  $S$  is a singular inner function, then  $h$  is an eigenvector of  $C_\varphi$  if and only if  $F$ ,  $B$  and  $S$  are respectively given by Theorems 3.4, 3.1 and 3.8. The same holds for  $p = \infty$ , with  $F$  given by Remark 3.5.

**Acknowledgements:** We thank the referee for carefully reading the paper and for suggestions that have helped us to improve the exposition of the paper. The first author is partially supported by the grant MTM2010-16679 and the Gobierno de Aragón research group *Análisis Matemático y Aplicaciones*, ref. DGA E-64. The third author is partially supported by the Ramón y Cajal program and the grants 2009SGR00420 and MTM2008-00145 (Spain), and BID-PICT2009-0082 (Argentina). Part of this work was done while the second author was visiting the University of Zaragoza with a grant of the research institute IUMA.

## REFERENCES

1. L. V. Ahlfors, *Complex Analysis*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1979.
2. L. Brown and A. L. Shields, *Cyclic vector in the Dirichlet space*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 285 (1984), n. 1, 269–304.
3. J. A. Cima and W. T. Ross, *The Backward Shift on the Hardy Space*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 2000.
4. C. C. Cowen, *Iteration and the solution of functional equations for functions analytic in the unit disk*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 265 (1981), 69–95.
5. C. C. Cowen and B. D. MacCluer, *Composition Operators on Spaces of Analytic Functions*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 1995.
6. P. Duren, *Theory of  $H^p$  spaces*, Academic Press, New York (1970).
7. J. B. Garnett, *Bounded analytic functions*, Revised first edition. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 236. Springer, New York, 2007.
8. E. A. Gallardo-Gutiérrez and P. Gorkin, *Cyclic Blaschke products for composition operators*, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana 25 (2009), n. 2, 447–470.
9. H. Hedenmalm, *Thin interpolating sequences and three algebras of bounded functions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 99 (1987), n. 3, 489–495.
10. V. Matache, *The eigenfunctions of a certain composition operator*, Contemp. Math. 213 (1998), 121–136.
11. R. Mortini, *Cyclic subspaces and eigenvectors of the hyperbolic composition operator*, Travaux mathématiques, Fasc. VII, 69–79, Sémin. Math. Luxembourg, Centre Univ. Luxembourg, Luxembourg, 1995.
12. E. A. Nordgren, P. Rosenthal and F. S. Wintrobe, *Composition operators and the invariant subspace problem*, C. R. Mat. Rep. Acad. Sci. Canada, 6, (1984), 279–282.
13. E. A. Nordgren, P. Rosenthal and F. S. Wintrobe *Invertible composition operators on  $H^p$* , J. Functional Analysis, 73 (1987), 324–344.
14. G. C. Rota, *On models for linear operators*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 13 (1960) 469–472.
15. C. Sundberg and T. H. Wolff, *Interpolating sequences for  $QA_B$* , Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 276 (1983), 551–581.

DEPARTAMENTO DE ANÁLISIS MATEMÁTICO, FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE DE MADRID E IUMA, PLAZA DE CIENCIAS 3, 28040 MADRID, SPAIN.

*E-mail address:* `eva.gallardo@mat.ucm.es`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY, PA 17837, LEWISBURG, U.S.A.

*E-mail address:* `pgorkin@bucknell.edu`

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, FCEyN, UNIVERSIDAD DE BUENOS AIRES, (1428) NÚÑEZ, CAP. FED., ARGENTINA.

*E-mail address:* `dsuarez@dm.uba.ar`