



Szegő's theorem on Parreau–Widom sets

Jacob S. Christiansen¹

Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Universitetsparken 5, 2100 Copenhagen, Denmark

Received 2 March 2011; accepted 12 September 2011

Available online 28 October 2011

Communicated by Charles Fefferman

Abstract

In this paper, we generalize Szegő's theorem for orthogonal polynomials on the real line to infinite gap sets of Parreau–Widom type. This notion includes Cantor sets of positive measure. The Szegő condition involves the equilibrium measure which in turn is absolutely continuous. Our approach builds on a canonical factorization of the M -function and the covering space formalism of Sodin–Yuditskii.

© 2011 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

MSC: primary 42C05, 47B36; secondary 30Jxx, 31Axx

Keywords: Szegő integral; Eigenvalue sums; Parreau–Widom sets

1. Introduction

Let $d\nu = w(\theta)\frac{d\theta}{2\pi} + d\nu_s$ be a finite positive measure on the unit circle $\partial\mathbb{D}$, with $d\nu_s$ singular to $d\theta$. A classical result of Szegő [44] reads

$$\inf_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \left\{ \int |1 - p|^2 d\nu \right\} = \exp \left\{ \int_0^{2\pi} \log w(\theta) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \right\}, \quad (1.1)$$

where \mathbb{P} is the set of polynomials vanishing at zero. So the infimum on the left-hand side is > 0 if and only if the integral on the right-hand side, also known as the *Szegő integral*, is convergent

E-mail address: stordal@math.ku.dk.

¹ The author was supported by a Steno Research Grant (09-064947) from the Danish Research Council for Nature and Universe.

(i.e., $> -\infty$). Strictly speaking, Szegő only considered absolutely continuous measures but one can allow for a singular part too.

There are many equivalent forms of Szegő’s theorem, see, e.g., [39, Chap. 2], and it is bound up with asymptotics of Toeplitz determinants. From the point of view of orthogonal polynomials, perhaps the most suitable formulation is due to Verblunsky [46]. It replaces the left-hand side in (1.1) by

$$\prod_{n=0}^{\infty} (1 - |\alpha_n|^2),$$

where $\{\alpha_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ are the recurrence coefficients of the associated monic orthogonal polynomials. Without any problems, one can carry over the result of Szegő to measures supported on an interval of the real line. Let $d\mu = f(t) dt + d\mu_s$ be a probability measure supported on $[-2, 2]$ and let $\{a_n, b_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be the recurrence coefficients of the associated orthonormal polynomials. Then

$$\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (a_1 \cdots a_n) > 0 \iff \int_{-2}^2 \frac{\log f(t)}{\sqrt{4-t^2}} dt > -\infty. \tag{1.2}$$

It is possible to allow for point masses of $d\mu_s$ outside $[-2, 2]$ as long as the mass points $\{x_k\}$ satisfy the condition

$$\sum_k \sqrt{(x_k + 2)(x_k - 2)} < \infty,$$

see [28,41] for details. If infinite in number, the x_k ’s thus have to accumulate sufficiently fast at the endpoints ± 2 .

The aim of this paper is to establish a version of Szegő’s theorem on sets in \mathbb{R} much more general than an interval, namely what we shall call Parreau–Widom sets. The notion of such sets will be introduced in Section 2 and we shall only give a brief description here. Among all regular compact subsets of \mathbb{R} , the Parreau–Widom condition (2.6) singles out those for which the values of the Green’s function at critical points are summable. In particular, it allows for a great number of sets with infinitely many components.

Our main result, Theorem 2 (in Section 5), goes beyond the recent monograph [40] of Simon as to generalizing the Szegő–Shohat–Nevai theorem, using the language of [40]. The situation of ‘finite gap sets’ was studied in [5,6], inspired by Widom’s famous paper [47] and the landmark paper [29] of Peherstorfer and Yuditskii. For a finite gap set ϵ , the product in (1.2) has to be replaced by

$$\frac{a_1 \cdots a_n}{\text{Cap}(\epsilon)^n}, \tag{1.3}$$

where $\text{Cap}(\epsilon)$ is the logarithmic capacity of ϵ . Moreover, the Szegő condition takes the form

$$\int_{\epsilon} \log f(t) d\mu_{\epsilon}(t) > -\infty, \tag{1.4}$$

where $d\mu_\epsilon$ is the equilibrium measure of ϵ . For comparison, $d\theta/2\pi$ is the equilibrium measure of $\partial\mathbb{D}$ and $d\mu_{[a,b]}$ is a scaled arcsine distribution. While [47] uses multiple-valued functions, [29] makes heavy use of the covering space formalism introduced by Sodin and Yuditskii [42]. The present paper also builds on [42], as do [5,6], and we give some background on uniformization theory in Section 2.

The core of [29,30] is to establish Szegő asymptotics of orthogonal polynomials on the so-called homogeneous sets in \mathbb{R} . This is done under the Szegő condition and a Blaschke condition (similar to (1.5)) by comparing the solutions of two extremal problems. As a by-product, the implication ‘ \Leftarrow ’ of (1.2) (or rather (1.6) below) is obtained. In contrast, the main tool of the present paper is a step-by-step sum rule obtained from a canonical factorization of the M -function. This technique was developed by Killip and Simon [19] and is applied repeatedly in the monograph [40]. We shall establish the desired factorization in Section 3 and arrive at the step-by-step sum rule in (3.32)–(3.33). As pointed out in Section 4, the Szegő integral is a relative entropy (up to some constant), and known properties of relative entropy combined with uniform upper bounds on certain eigenvalue sums allow us to iterate the step-by-step sum rule and pass to the limit. With all preparations in place, the proof of Theorem 2 presented in Section 5 is merely half a page.

Every now and then we shall use the language of Jacobi matrices rather than the one of measures. As is well known, there is a one–one correspondence between compactly supported (nontrivial) probability measures on \mathbb{R} and bounded Jacobi matrices. Given $d\mu$, the associated Jacobi matrix is given by

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} b_1 & a_1 & & & \\ a_1 & b_2 & a_2 & & \\ & a_2 & b_3 & a_3 & \\ & & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\{a_n, b_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \in (0, \infty)^\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}^\mathbb{N}$ are the recurrence coefficients of the orthonormal polynomials $P_n(x, d\mu)$. When $\text{supp}(d\mu)$ is compact, these coefficients are bounded. The spectrum of J , viewed as an operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$, coincides with $\text{supp}(d\mu)$ and we shall often refer to $d\mu$ as the spectral measure of J . In the language of Jacobi matrices (and with g the Green’s function for $\overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E$), the main result of the paper reads:

Theorem. *Let $J = \{a_n, b_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a Jacobi matrix with spectral measure $d\mu = f(t) dt + d\mu_s$ and let $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a Parreau–Widom set. Assume that $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(J) = E$ and denote by $\{x_k\}$ the eigenvalues of J outside E , if any. On condition that*

$$\sum_k g(x_k) < \infty, \tag{1.5}$$

we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_1 \cdots a_n}{\text{Cap}(E)^n} > 0 \iff \int_E \log f(t) d\mu_E(t) > -\infty. \tag{1.6}$$

Moreover, if one and hence both of the equivalent conditions in (1.6) hold true, then

$$0 < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_1 \cdots a_n}{\text{Cap}(\mathbf{E})^n} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_1 \cdots a_n}{\text{Cap}(\mathbf{E})^n} < \infty.$$

While the Szegő integral relates to relative entropy and allows for defining an outer function (see Section 3), the product $a_1 \cdots a_n$ is the reciprocal of the leading coefficient in $P_n(x, d\mu)$. So if \mathbf{E} is rescaled to have capacity 1, the leading coefficients in the orthonormal polynomials are bounded above and below.

With (1.1) as a starting point, Hayashi [16] set out to generalize Szegő’s theorem to Riemann surfaces. Naturally, such a generalization may not be as clean and explicit as (1.2) or (1.6). Interestingly, the results of [16] simplify when the Riemann surface \mathcal{R} is of Parreau–Widom type. Let $d\omega_\tau$ be the harmonic measure on $\partial\mathcal{R}$ for a point $\tau \in \mathcal{R}$. When $h \geq 0$ belongs to $L^1(\partial\mathcal{R}, d\omega_\tau)$, Hayashi proves that

$$\inf_{f \in H_\tau^\infty(\mathcal{R})} \left\{ \int |1 - f|^p h d\omega_\tau \right\} \leq C \exp \left\{ \int_{\partial\mathcal{R}} \log h d\omega_\tau \right\}, \tag{1.7}$$

where $H_\tau^\infty(\mathcal{R})$ is the set of bounded analytic functions on \mathcal{R} vanishing at τ , and $C > 0$ is some constant depending on τ . Provided that $\partial\mathcal{R} \subset \mathbb{R}$, and if the infimum on the left-hand side can be related to $a_1 \cdots a_n / \text{Cap}(\partial\mathcal{R})^n$, this inequality may prove the implication ‘ \Rightarrow ’ of (1.6) when $d\mu_s = 0$. In order to be able to include a singular part of the measure, [16] needs an extra assumption on \mathcal{R} which is equivalent to the Direct Cauchy Theorem. We shall not discuss this issue here but refer the reader to [15] and the recent paper [49].

2. Parreau–Widom sets and uniformization theory

In this section we start by introducing the notion of a Parreau–Widom set on the real line. This notion covers a large class of compact subsets of \mathbb{R} and allows for a set to have infinitely many ‘gaps’, yet no isolated points. The precise definition will be given below. It relies on potential theory and key roles will be played by the Green’s function and the equilibrium measure. We refer the reader to [10,12,20,26,43,45] for background and more details on potential theory.

In the second part of the section, we give a brief account on uniformization theory. The universal covering map will be brought into play and we relate the Green’s function to Blaschke products of the underlying Fuchsian group. See, e.g., [1,25] or [40, Chap. 9] for further details.

2.1. Parreau–Widom sets

Let $\mathbf{E} \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a compact set. We shall always assume that the logarithmic capacity of \mathbf{E} , denoted $\text{Cap}(\mathbf{E})$, is positive so that the domain $\Omega = \bar{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \mathbf{E}$ has a *Green’s function*. For fixed $y \in \Omega$, we let $g_\Omega(\cdot, y)$ be the Green’s function for Ω with pole at y . Recall that this function is positive and harmonic on $\Omega \setminus \{y\}$. Moreover,

$$g_\Omega(\cdot, y) + \log |\cdot - y| \tag{2.1}$$

is harmonic at y . The special case $y = \infty$ will be of particular interest to us and we write g instead of $g_{\Omega}(\cdot, \infty)$. Not only is $g(\cdot) - \log|\cdot|$ harmonic at ∞ , but we also have the expansion

$$g(x) = \log|x| + \gamma(E) + o(1), \tag{2.2}$$

where $\gamma(E) = -\log(\text{Cap}(E))$ is the so-called Robin’s constant for E .

There is a unique probability measure on E of minimal logarithmic energy. This measure is called the *equilibrium measure* of E and will be denoted $d\mu_E$. It minimizes the integral

$$I(d\mu) = \iint \log \frac{1}{|s-t|} d\mu(t) d\mu(s)$$

among all probability measures $d\mu$ on E and the minimal energy is given by $I(d\mu_E) = \gamma(E)$. The logarithmic potential of $d\mu_E$ brings us back to the Green’s function through the relation

$$g(x) = \gamma(E) - \int \log \frac{1}{|t-x|} d\mu_E(t). \tag{2.3}$$

Besides E having positive logarithmic capacity, we will assume that each point of E is a regular point for Ω , that is,

$$\lim_{\Omega \ni x \rightarrow t} g(x) = 0 \quad \text{for all } t \in E. \tag{2.4}$$

This in particular means that E has no isolated points (as such points are irregular for Ω). In short we say that E is regular when (2.4) holds. Equivalent to this is the Green’s function being continuous on all of \mathbb{C} .

It will often be useful to write E in the form

$$E = [\alpha, \beta] \setminus \bigcup_j (\alpha_j, \beta_j), \tag{2.5}$$

where \bigcup_j is a countable union of disjoint open subintervals of $[\alpha, \beta]$ and $\alpha < \alpha_i \neq \beta_j < \beta$ for all i, j . We shall refer to (α_j, β_j) as a ‘gap’ in E and to (2.5) as the infinite (or finite) gap representation of E . While the Green’s function vanishes on E and in particular at the endpoints α_i and β_j , it is strictly concave on each of the gaps. Since g cannot be constant on any interval in $\mathbb{R} \setminus E$, this follows from (2.3) and the fact that \log is concave. Hence there is a unique point $c_j \in (\alpha_j, \beta_j)$ at which g attains its maximum on (α_j, β_j) . The c_j ’s are the *critical points* of g since $g'(c_j) = 0$ for each j and g' never vanishes outside $[\alpha, \beta]$.

Definition. Suppose $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a compact set of $\text{Cap}(E) > 0$ and suppose E is regular. We call E a *Parreau–Widom set* if

$$\sum_j g(c_j) < \infty, \tag{2.6}$$

where g is the Green’s function for $\overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E$ with pole at ∞ and $\{c_j\}$ are the critical points of g .

Remark. Note that the definition is independent of which $y \in \Omega$ is taken as pole of the Green’s function. If the values of $g_\Omega(\cdot, y)$ at critical points are small enough to be summable for one y , the same applies to all y . The choice of $y = \infty$ is made for convenience.

The above terminology is inspired by the monograph [15] of Hasumi. In comparison, we say that $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a Parreau–Widom set if the domain $\Omega = \mathbb{C} \setminus E$ is a Riemann surface of Parreau–Widom type in the language of [15, Chap. 5]. While originally introduced by Parreau in [27], Widom [48] showed that such surfaces have sufficiently many analytic functions. See, e.g., [15] for more details.

One can show that a Parreau–Widom set automatically has positive Lebesgue measure (cf. Proposition 2 below). Following Levin [21–23], it is possible to give a clear geometrical interpretation of the condition (2.6) using conformal mappings. By a *comb-like domain* we understand a semi-strip $S = \{z: a < \operatorname{Re} z < b, \operatorname{Im} z > 0\}$ with countably many cuts of the form $H_j = \{t_j + iy \mid 0 < y \leq h_j\}$, where $a < t_j < b$ and $h_j > 0$. Since E is regular, there is a conformal map ψ of the upper half-plane \mathbb{C}_+ onto a comb-like domain $S \setminus \bigcup_j H_j$ such that

$$\psi((-\infty, \alpha)) = \{a + iy \mid y > 0\}, \quad \psi(E) = [a, b], \quad \psi((\beta, \infty)) = \{b + iy \mid y > 0\},$$

and such that each (α_j, β_j) is mapped onto H_j in a two-to-one fashion (except at c_j). We can fix ψ uniquely by taking $a = 0$ and $b = \pi$. Then a simple argument shows that $\operatorname{Im} \psi$ coincides with the Green’s function in the upper half-plane (see, e.g., [7] or [8] for details). Hence the Parreau–Widom condition (2.6) is equivalent to $\sum_j h_j < \infty$, that is, finite total length of the ‘teeth’ in the corresponding comb-like domain $S \setminus \bigcup_j H_j$.

Clearly, any finite gap set (cf. [4–6]) is a Parreau–Widom set. But the notion goes way beyond. Jones and Marshall [18, Sect. 3] proved that it includes infinite gap sets E which are *homogeneous* in the sense of Carleson [3]. By definition, this means there is an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\frac{|(t - \delta, t + \delta) \cap E|}{\delta} \geq \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } t \in E \text{ and all } \delta < \operatorname{diam}(E). \tag{2.7}$$

Carleson introduced this geometric condition to avoid the possibility of certain parts of E to be very thin, compared to Lebesgue measure. See [9,50] for further results on homogeneous sets.

Example. Remove the middle 1/4 from the interval $[0, 1]$ and continue to remove subintervals of length $1/4^n$ from the middle of each of the 2^{n-1} remaining intervals. Let E be the set of what is left in $[0, 1]$; this is a fat Cantor set of $|E| = 1/2$. One can show that $|(t - \delta, t + \delta) \cap E| \geq \delta/4$ for all $t \in E$ and all $\delta < 1$.

2.2. Uniformization theory

When E has at least one gap, the domain $\Omega = \mathbb{C} \setminus E$ is not simply connected. So only in the trivial case of E being an interval, Ω is conformally equivalent to the unit disk. For general Parreau–Widom sets, we shall employ uniformization theory as in the seminal paper [42] of Sodin and Yuditskii. There is a map $\mathbf{x} : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \Omega$, which is onto but only locally one-to-one, and a Fuchsian group Γ of Möbius transformations on \mathbb{D} so that

$$\mathbf{x}(z) = \mathbf{x}(w) \iff \exists \gamma \in \Gamma: z = \gamma(w). \tag{2.8}$$

This map is called the *universal covering map* and we fix it uniquely by requiring

$$\mathbf{x}(0) = \infty, \quad x_\infty := \lim_{z \rightarrow 0} z\mathbf{x}(z) > 0. \tag{2.9}$$

Note that Γ is isomorphic to the fundamental group $\pi_1(\Omega)$ and hence a free group on as many generators as the number of gaps in E .

Since $\text{Cap}(E) > 0$, it follows from a theorem of Myrberg (see, e.g., [45, Chap. XI]) that Γ is of convergent type. This means

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} (1 - |\gamma(w)|) < \infty \quad \text{for all } w \in \mathbb{D},$$

and hence the Blaschke products defined by

$$B(z, w) = \prod_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \frac{|\gamma(w)|}{\gamma(w)} \frac{\gamma(w) - z}{1 - \overline{\gamma(w)}z} \tag{2.10}$$

are convergent for $z, w \in \mathbb{D}$. By convention, a factor in (2.10) reduces to z if $\gamma(w) = 0$. Note that $B(\cdot, w)$ is analytic on \mathbb{D} with simple zeros at $\{\gamma(w)\}_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$. The link back to potential theory is given by

$$|B(z, w)| = \exp\{-g_\Omega(\mathbf{x}(z), \mathbf{x}(w))\} \quad \text{for } z, w \in \mathbb{D}. \tag{2.11}$$

In particular, the Green’s function can be written as

$$g(\mathbf{x}(z)) = -\log|B(z)|, \tag{2.12}$$

where B is shorthand notation for $B(\cdot, 0)$. We point out that

$$B(z) = \frac{\text{Cap}(E)}{x_\infty} z + \mathcal{O}(z^2) \tag{2.13}$$

near $z = 0$. Since $B'(0) = \prod_{\gamma \neq \text{id}} |\gamma(0)| > 0$ and $\mathbf{x}(z) = x_\infty/z + \mathcal{O}(1)$ around $z = 0$, this follows from (2.2) and (2.12).

3. A canonical factorization of the M -function

Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a Parreau–Widom set and consider a Jacobi matrix $J = \{a_n, b_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ with $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(J) = E$. The spectrum of J thus contains E and besides it consists only of isolated eigenvalues. We denote these eigenvalues, if any, by $\{x_k\}$. Should there be infinitely many of them, the x_k ’s accumulate nowhere but at some (or all) of the endpoints of E , viz., α, β and α_j, β_j in the representation (2.5).

Let $d\mu = f(t) dt + d\mu_s$ be the spectral measure of J and introduce the m -function (or Stieltjes transform of $d\mu$) by

$$m(x) := m_\mu(x) = \int \frac{d\mu(t)}{t - x}, \quad x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \text{supp}(d\mu). \tag{3.1}$$

It is well known that m is a Nevanlinna–Pick function (i.e., m is analytic in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ and $\text{Im } m(x) \geq 0$ for $\text{Im } x \geq 0$). Since $d\mu$ is compactly supported, we readily see that

$$m(x) = -1/x + \mathcal{O}(x^{-2}) \tag{3.2}$$

near ∞ . In fact, one can write down the Laurent expansion of m_μ around ∞ in terms of the moments of $d\mu$. More importantly, the boundary values $m(t + i0) := \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} m(t + i\varepsilon)$ exist for a.e. $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and

$$\frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im } m_\mu(t + i\varepsilon) dt \xrightarrow{w} d\mu \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \downarrow 0. \tag{3.3}$$

To be even more specific, we have $f(t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im } m_\mu(t + i0)$ a.e. and

$$\mu_s(\{t\}) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \text{Im } m_\mu(t + i\varepsilon) \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{3.4}$$

The m -function remains analytic in the gaps of E and also below α and above β , except at the eigenvalues $\{x_k\}$ where it has simple poles. Moreover, m is real-valued and strictly increasing on any interval in $\mathbb{R} \setminus \sigma(J)$ as its derivative is > 0 there. So the poles and zeros of m interlace on each of the intervals in $\mathbb{R} \setminus E$ and the same applies to $m(x) - a$ for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$.

A major role in what follows will be played by the function

$$M(z) := -m(\mathbf{x}(z)), \quad z \in \mathbb{D}. \tag{3.5}$$

Here \mathbf{x} is the covering map defined in (2.8)–(2.9). Compared to m , the function M has the advantage of being meromorphic on \mathbb{D} rather than $\mathbb{C} \setminus E$. It follows immediately from (2.9) and (3.2) that

$$M(z) = \frac{z}{x_\infty} + \mathcal{O}(z^2) \tag{3.6}$$

near $z = 0$. As a direct consequence of (2.8), M is *automorphic* with respect to Γ (i.e., $M(\gamma(z)) = M(z)$ for every $z \in \mathbb{D}$ and all $\gamma \in \Gamma$). The poles of M are situated at the points $p \in \mathbb{D}$ for which $\mathbf{x}(p) \in \{x_k\}$. To better keep track of this set, we introduce a fundamental set for Γ as follows. Consider first the open set

$$F := \{z \in \mathbb{D} : |\gamma'(z)| < 1 \text{ for all } \gamma \neq \text{id}\} \tag{3.7}$$

which is known as the Ford fundamental region. Geometrically, F is the unit disk with a number of orthocircles (and their interior) removed. More precisely, one has to remove two orthocircles for each generator γ_j of Γ (or one for γ_j and one for γ_j^{-1}) since the action of γ_j can be described as inversion in some orthocircle C_j in the upper half-plane following complex conjugation, and γ_j^{-1} acts similarly with respect to the conjugate circle in the lower half-plane. Besides being symmetric in the real line, the set F has the important properties that

- 1) no two of its points are equivalent under Γ (i.e., if $z \in F$ then $\gamma(z) \notin F$),
- 2) $\bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \text{cl}(\gamma(F)) = \mathbb{D}$, where ‘cl’ refers to closure within \mathbb{D} .

We can preserve these two properties and even get a disjoint union in 2) without taking closure by considering

$$\mathbb{F} := F \cup \left(\bigcup_j C_j \cap \mathbb{D} \right). \tag{3.8}$$

This is a fundamental set for Γ as it contains one and only one point of each Γ -orbit.

Returning to the poles of M , let p_k be the unique point in \mathbb{F} such that $\mathbf{x}(p_k) = x_k$. Then we can write the collection of poles as $\{\gamma(p_k)\}_{k, \gamma \in \Gamma}$. Note that p_k either belongs to $(-1, 1) \setminus \{0\}$ or lies in one of the C_j 's, depending on whether x_k is situated outside $[\alpha, \beta]$ or contained in (α_j, β_j) for some j . The minus sign on the right-hand side in (3.5) ensures that $\text{Im } M(z) \geq 0$ when $z \in F$ and $\text{Im } z \geq 0$.

We now aim at establishing an all-important result about M , namely that it is a function of bounded characteristic on \mathbb{D} with no singular inner part (under a certain condition on the poles $\{x_k\}$, also known as the Blaschke condition). This result can also be found in [42, Sect. 5] but we include a complete proof of the statement here, partly due to its importance and partly to make the present paper more self-contained.

Proposition 1. *Let J and E be given as above. In addition, assume that the eigenvalues $\{x_k\}$ satisfy the condition*

$$\sum_k g(x_k) < \infty, \tag{3.9}$$

where g is the Green's function for $\bar{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E$ with pole at ∞ . Then the function M defined in (3.5) has bounded characteristic.

Remark. The condition (3.9) is equivalent to

$$\sum_k g_\Omega(x_k, y) < \infty \quad \text{for all } y \in \bar{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \sigma(J). \tag{3.10}$$

For by (2.12), it implies

$$\prod_{k, \gamma \in \Gamma} |\gamma(p_k)| = \prod_k |B(p_k)| > 0,$$

so that $\prod_k B(z, p_k)$ converges to an analytic function on \mathbb{D} with simple zeros at $\{\gamma(p_k)\}_{k, \gamma \in \Gamma}$. As none of these zeros belong to $\mathbb{F} \setminus \{p_k\}$, the product $\prod_k |B(p_k, z)|$ is > 0 there. Hence (3.10) follows from (2.11).

Since every compact set $K \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus \sigma(J)$ is the image (under \mathbf{x}) of a compact subset of $\mathbb{F} \setminus \{p_k\}$, we also have a uniform bound of the form

$$\sum_k g_\Omega(x_k, y) \leq C \quad \text{for all } y \in K. \tag{3.11}$$

Before the proof, let us briefly recall the notion of *bounded characteristic* (see, e.g., [17] or [26]). For a meromorphic function h , one defines the proximity function by

$$m(r, h) = \int_0^{2\pi} \log^+ |h(re^{i\theta})| \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}$$

and the counting function by

$$N(r, h) = \int_0^r \frac{n(t, h)}{t} dt,$$

where $n(t, h)$ is the number of poles of h in $|z| < t$ (counted with multiplicity). If these poles are denoted $\{p_k\}$, the above integral can also be written as

$$N(r, h) = \sum_k \log \frac{r}{|p_k|}. \tag{3.12}$$

The sum

$$T(r) := T(r, h) = m(r, h) + N(r, h) \tag{3.13}$$

is called the characteristic function of h and if $\lim_{r \uparrow 1} T(r) < \infty$, we say that h has bounded characteristic in $|z| < 1$.

When $z = 0$ is not a pole of h , the Cartan identity states that

$$T(r) = \int_0^{2\pi} N\left(r, \frac{1}{h - e^{i\theta}}\right) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} + \log^+ |h(0)|.$$

This formula, obtained by applying Jensen’s formula to $h(z) - e^{i\theta}$ and integrating over the unit circle, becomes very useful when the solutions to $h(z) = e^{i\theta}$ are under control for all θ . In a similar way and by use of potential theory, Frostman [11] established the more general estimate

$$T(r) = \int_K N(r, 1/(h - a)) d\mu_K(a) + \mathcal{O}(1) \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 1, \tag{3.14}$$

valid for any set $K \subset \mathbb{C}$ of $\text{Cap}(K) > 0$ and where $d\mu_K$ is the equilibrium measure of K (see [26, Chap. 6]). This estimate in particular tells us that if $N(r, \frac{1}{h-a}) \leq C$ for $r < 1$ and all a in a set of positive logarithmic capacity, then $T(r)$ is bounded.

Proof of Proposition 1. The plan is to show that $N(1, \frac{1}{M-a}) \leq C$ for all a in some interval of the real line. Given $a \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\{p_k(a)\}$ be the unique points in \mathbb{F} such that $\{\mathbf{x}(p_k(a))\}$ are the a -points of m in $\overline{\mathbb{R}} \setminus E$ (i.e., the solutions of $m(x) = a$). Clearly, the points $x_k(a) := \mathbf{x}(p_k(a))$

interlace with the poles of m and the collection $\{\gamma(p_k(a))\}_{k,\gamma \in \Gamma}$ accounts for all the a -points of $-M$ in \mathbb{D} . Recalling (3.12) and (2.12), we have

$$N\left(1, \frac{1}{M+a}\right) = \sum_{k,\gamma \in \Gamma} \log \frac{1}{|\gamma(p_k(a))|} = - \sum_k \log |B(p_k(a))| = \sum_k g(x_k(a)).$$

Hence the task is reduced to dealing with values of the Green’s function. Due to interlacing, we immediately see that

$$\sum_{k: x_k(a) \in (\alpha_j, \beta_j)} g(x_k(a)) \leq g(c_j) + \sum_{k: x_k \in (\alpha_j, \beta_j)} g(x_k). \tag{3.15}$$

So the a -points in gaps of E do not present any problems. Outside $[\alpha, \beta]$, most of the a -points interlace with poles too. But for $a > 0$, there may be an a -point ($x_{\min}(a)$, say) of m below the smallest eigenvalue of J and for $a < 0$, there may be an a -point above the largest eigenvalue. However that may be, we always have a pointwise (in $a \neq 0$) estimate of the form

$$\sum_{k: x_k(a) \in \mathbb{R} \setminus [\alpha, \beta]} g(x_k(a)) \leq C(a) + \sum_{k: x_k \in \mathbb{R} \setminus [\alpha, \beta]} g(x_k) \tag{3.16}$$

for some constant $C := C(a)$ depending on a . For the choice of $C = g(x_{\min}(1))$, the estimate holds uniformly for $a \geq 1$. Combining (3.15) and (3.16), we thus arrive at

$$N\left(1, \frac{1}{M+a}\right) \leq \sum_j g(c_j) + \sum_k g(x_k) + C,$$

valid for $a \in [1, 2]$, say. This completes the proof. \square

As a function of bounded characteristic, M has angular boundary values $M(e^{i\theta})$ a.e. on the unit circle and admits a factorization of the form

$$M(z) = \frac{\pi_1(z)}{\pi_2(z)} \exp \left\{ \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{e^{i\theta} + z}{e^{i\theta} - z} \log |M(e^{i\theta})| \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} + \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{e^{i\theta} + z}{e^{i\theta} - z} d\rho(\theta) \right\}, \tag{3.17}$$

where π_1, π_2 are Blaschke products corresponding to zeros and poles of M , and $d\rho$ is a singular measure on $\partial\mathbb{D}$. In particular, $\log |M(e^{i\theta})|$ belongs to $L^1(\partial\mathbb{D})$. Naturally, $M(e^{i\theta})$ coincides a.e. with $m(t + i0)$ for suitable $t \in E$. As $e^{i\theta}$ runs through $\partial\mathbb{F} := \overline{\mathbb{F}} \cap \partial\mathbb{D}$, the corresponding values of t cover E precisely twice and the same applies when $e^{i\theta}$ traverses $\gamma(\overline{\mathbb{F}}) \cap \partial\mathbb{D}$ for arbitrary $\gamma \in \Gamma$. With reference to Pommerenke [33], see also [37], we have $\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} |\gamma(\overline{\mathbb{F}}) \cap \partial\mathbb{D}| = 2\pi$ (since E is a Parreau–Widom set) and

$$\int_0^{2\pi} h(\mathbf{x}(e^{i\theta})) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} = \int_{\partial\mathbb{F}} h(\mathbf{x}(e^{i\theta})) \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} |\gamma'(e^{i\theta})| \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}$$

whenever $h \circ \mathbf{x}$ is integrable on $\partial\mathbb{D}$. Moreover, by preservation of the equilibrium measure under the covering map (see, e.g., [15, Chap. 3] or [10, Chap. 2]),

$$\int_E h(t) d\mu_E(t) = \int_0^{2\pi} h(\mathbf{x}(e^{i\theta})) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \tag{3.18}$$

for every $h \in L^1(E, d\mu_E)$.

The exponential of the integral in (3.17) that involves $\log |M(e^{i\theta})|$ is called the *outer part* of M while \exp of the second integral is referred to as the *singular inner part* of M . The following result will be crucial to us.

Theorem 1. *In the setting of Proposition 1, the function M has no singular inner part. In other words, it can be factorized as*

$$M(z) = B(z) \prod_k \frac{B(z, z_k)}{B(z, p_k)} \exp \left\{ \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{e^{i\theta} + z}{e^{i\theta} - z} \log |M(e^{i\theta})| \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \right\}, \tag{3.19}$$

where z_k and p_k belong to the fundamental set \mathbb{F} and are chosen in such a way that $\{\mathbf{x}(z_k)\}$ and $\{\mathbf{x}(p_k)\}$ are the zeros and poles of m in $\mathbb{R} \setminus E$.

Proof. We start by showing that $M - \varepsilon$ has no singular inner part for $\varepsilon > 0$. The result will then follow taking $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, write $m_\varepsilon := m + \varepsilon$ in the form

$$m_\varepsilon(x) = |m_\varepsilon(i)| \exp \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{1}{t-x} - \frac{t}{t^2+1} \right) \xi(t) dt \right\},$$

where ξ is defined a.e. on \mathbb{R} by $\xi(t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \text{Arg } m_\varepsilon(t + i0)$. The trick is to split the integral into two parts, namely i) \int_E and ii) $\int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus E}$. We consider each of the two parts separately:

i)
$$m_1(x) = \exp \left\{ \int_E \left(\frac{1}{t-x} - \frac{t}{t^2+1} \right) \xi(t) dt \right\}.$$

Since E is compact, the behaviour of m_1 is controlled by the function

$$\varphi(x) := \int_E \frac{\xi(t)}{t-x} dt.$$

As a Stieltjes transform, φ is holomorphic in $\mathbb{C} \setminus E$ and vanishes at ∞ . Hence $\varphi \circ \mathbf{x}$ is analytic on \mathbb{D} and in order to show that $\exp\{\varphi \circ \mathbf{x}\}$ has no singular inner part, it suffices to prove that $\varphi \circ \mathbf{x}$

belongs to the Hardy space H^1 . For every $f \in H^1$ has a complex Poisson representation of the form

$$f(z) = i \operatorname{Im} f(0) + \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{e^{i\theta} + z}{e^{i\theta} - z} \operatorname{Re} f(e^{i\theta}) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

A simple computation shows that

$$|\operatorname{Im} \varphi(x)| \leq |\operatorname{Im} x| \int_E \frac{\xi(t)}{|x - t|^2} dt \leq |\operatorname{Im} x| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{dt}{|x - t|^2} \leq \pi$$

since $0 \leq \xi(t) \leq 1$. So the imaginary part of $\varphi \circ \mathbf{x}$ is bounded and by M. Riesz’ theorem on conjugate functions (see, e.g., [36, Chap. 17]), this implies that $\varphi \circ \mathbf{x} \in H^p$ for all $p < \infty$.

ii)
$$m_2(x) = \exp \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus E} \left(\frac{1}{t - x} - \frac{t}{t^2 + 1} \right) \xi(t) dt \right\}.$$

Since m_ε is real-valued (on \mathbb{R}) away from $\sigma(J)$, the function ξ only takes the values 0 and 1 in $\mathbb{R} \setminus E$ (except at poles and zeros where it is not defined). More precisely, $\xi = 1$ on every interval of the form (x_k, y_k) , where x_k is a pole and y_k the following zero or some β_j , whichever comes first. Furthermore, if $\lim_{t \downarrow \alpha_i} m_\varepsilon(t) < 0$ for some i , then $\xi = 1$ on the interval (α_i, y) , where y is the first zero after α_i (or some β_j). Otherwise $\xi = 0$, and this in particular means that ξ vanishes below x_- (= the minimum of α and the smallest pole) and above y_+ (= the maximum of β and the largest zero). Hence it suffices to consider the function

$$\psi(x) := \exp \left\{ \int_{I \setminus E} \frac{\xi(t)}{t - x} dt \right\}, \quad I := [x_-, y_+]. \tag{3.20}$$

Let $P := \{x_k\}$ denote the set of poles of m . In case these poles accumulate at all endpoints of E , we can write ψ as

$$\psi(x) = \prod_k \frac{x - y_k}{x - x_k}, \tag{3.21}$$

where y_k by definition is the first zero to the right of x_k . The behaviour of m at ∞ ensures that

- 1) no zero can come before the smallest pole in $(-\infty, \alpha)$,
- 2) there will always be a zero after the largest pole in (β, ∞) .

The representation in (3.21) remains valid in general if we abuse notation and allow for certain x_k ’s and y_k ’s to coincide with suitable α_i ’s or β_j ’s. In all circumstances, the interval (x_k, y_k) is either contained in a gap of E or in $\mathbb{R} \setminus [\alpha, \beta]$. So each factor in (3.21) – and hence the full

product – is positive on E , except perhaps at certain endpoints where it vanishes or is not defined. Naturally, the x_k 's can be ordered and we set

$$\psi_n(x) = \prod_{k \leq n} \frac{x - y_k}{x - x_k}. \tag{3.22}$$

Since $\sum_k (y_k - x_k) \leq y_+ - x_-$, the finite product in (3.22) converges uniformly to $\psi(x)$ on compact subsets of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \bar{P}$.

The strategy for showing that $m_2 \circ \mathbf{x}$ has no singular inner part is as follows. We know that $\psi \circ \mathbf{x}$ admits a factorization of the form (3.17), involving a ratio of Blaschke products and a singular measure $d\rho$. Move the Blaschke products to the left-hand side, take the logarithm and compare the real parts. Because of (2.11), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \log |\psi(\mathbf{x}(z))| + \sum_k (g_\Omega(\mathbf{x}(z), y_k) - g_\Omega(\mathbf{x}(z), x_k)) \\ &= \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1 - |z|^2}{|e^{i\theta} - z|^2} \log |\psi(\mathbf{x}(e^{i\theta}))| \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} + \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1 - |z|^2}{|e^{i\theta} - z|^2} d\rho(\theta), \quad z \in \mathbb{D}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

The goal is to show that the harmonic function on the left-hand side is the Poisson integral of its boundary values (i.e., the first integral on the right-hand side since $g_\Omega(\cdot, y)$ vanishes on E for all $y \in \Omega$). This clearly implies $d\rho$ to be the trivial measure. As it seems hard to tell whether the harmonic function in question is the real part of an H^p -function for suitable $p > 1$, we proceed by approximation.

For $0 < \delta_1, \delta_2 < 1$, consider the function

$$\phi_{n;\delta_1,\delta_2}(x) = \log \left| \frac{\delta_1 + \psi_n(x)}{1 + \delta_2 \psi_n(x)} \right| + \sum_{k \leq n} (g_\Omega(x, y_k(\delta_1, n)) - g_\Omega(x, y_k(1/\delta_2, n))), \tag{3.24}$$

where $\{y_k(\delta, n)\}$ are the zeros of $\delta + \psi_n(\cdot)$. It is clear that $y_k(\delta, n) \in (x_k, y_k)$ for all k , and $y_k(\delta_1, n) \nearrow y_k$ as $\delta_1 \downarrow 0$ while $y_k(1/\delta_2, n) \searrow x_k$ as $\delta_2 \downarrow 0$. Since

$$\frac{\delta_1 + \psi_n(x)}{1 + \delta_2 \psi_n(x)} = \frac{1 + \delta_1}{1 + \delta_2} \prod_{k \leq n} \frac{x - y_k(\delta_1, n)}{x - y_k(1/\delta_2, n)},$$

we see from (2.1) that $\phi_{n;\delta_1,\delta_2}$ is harmonic on Ω and continuous throughout $\bar{\mathbb{C}}$. Hence its maximum and minimum is assumed on E (= the boundary of Ω). The Möbius transformation $z \mapsto (\delta_1 + z)/(1 + \delta_2 z)$ maps \mathbb{R}_+ onto the interval $(\delta_1, 1/\delta_2)$ and since $g_\Omega(\cdot, y_k(\delta, n))$ vanishes on E , we therefore have

$$\log(\delta_1) \leq \phi_{n;\delta_1,\delta_2}(x) \leq \log(1/\delta_2), \quad x \in \Omega. \tag{3.25}$$

The uniform convergence of ψ_n implies (by Hurwitz’s theorem) that $y_k(\delta, n) \rightarrow y_k(\delta)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $\{y_k(\delta)\}$ are the zeros of $\delta + \psi(\cdot)$. We claim that $\phi_{n;\delta_1,\delta_2}$ converges locally uniformly on Ω to

$$\phi_{\delta_1,\delta_2}(x) = \log \left| \frac{\delta_1 + \psi(x)}{1 + \delta_2 \psi(x)} \right| + \sum_k (g_\Omega(x, y_k(\delta_1)) - g_\Omega(x, y_k(1/\delta_2))). \tag{3.26}$$

It suffices to consider compact sets $K \subset \Omega$ for which the intersection $K \cap (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{E})$ is a closed interval, say $L = [a, b]$. There are only finitely many $y_k(\delta)$ ’s in this interval and if none of them are endpoints of L (i.e., $= a$ or b), we have precisely the same number of $y_k(\delta, n)$ ’s in L for n large enough (again, by Hurwitz’s theorem). Clearly,

$$\sum_{k: y_k(\delta,n) \in L} (g_\Omega(x, y_k(\delta, n)) + \log|x - y_k(\delta, n)|) \tag{3.27}$$

is bounded on K , uniformly in n , and the claim will follow by dominated convergence if we can find $C > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{k: y_k(\delta,n) \notin L} g_\Omega(x, y_k(\delta, n)) \leq C$$

for all $x \in K$ and n sufficiently large. By concavity of the Green’s function and with $\{c_{x,j}\}$ the critical points of $g_\Omega(\cdot, x)$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k: y_k(\delta,n) \notin L} g_\Omega(x, y_k(\delta, n)) &\leq g_\Omega(a - \eta, x) + g_\Omega(b + \eta, x) \\ &+ \sum_{k: x_k \notin L} g_\Omega(x_k, x) + \sum_{j: c_j \notin L} g_\Omega(c_{x,j}, x) \end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

for $\eta > 0$ small and n sufficiently large. We thus get the desired C on the lines of the remark after Proposition 1.

The estimate (3.25) continues to hold in the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ so that $\phi_{\delta_1,\delta_2} \circ \mathbf{x}$ is a bounded harmonic function on \mathbb{D} . Hence it can be written as the Poisson integral of its boundary values, that is,

$$\phi_{\delta_1,\delta_2}(\mathbf{x}(z)) = \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1 - |z|^2}{|e^{i\theta} - z|^2} \log \left| \frac{\delta_1 + \psi(\mathbf{x}(e^{i\theta}))}{1 + \delta_2 \psi(\mathbf{x}(e^{i\theta}))} \right| \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}. \tag{3.29}$$

All that remains is now to let $\delta_2 \downarrow 0$ and then $\delta_1 \downarrow 0$ in (3.29) and (3.26). Recalling that $\psi \geq 0$ a.e. on \mathbb{E} , we get by monotone convergence that

$$\lim_{\delta_1 \downarrow 0} \lim_{\delta_2 \downarrow 0} \phi_{\delta_1,\delta_2}(\mathbf{x}(z)) = \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1 - |z|^2}{|e^{i\theta} - z|^2} \log|\psi(\mathbf{x}(e^{i\theta}))| \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Since $y_k(\delta)$ converges to y_k as $\delta \downarrow 0$ and to x_k as $\delta \uparrow \infty$, it follows from (3.26) that

$$\lim_{\delta_1 \downarrow 0} \lim_{\delta_2 \downarrow 0} \phi_{\delta_1, \delta_2}(x) = \log|\psi(x)| + \sum_k (g_\Omega(x, y_k) - g_\Omega(x, x_k)), \quad x \in \Omega$$

if we use dominated convergence as above. In conclusion, $\psi \circ \mathbf{x}$ has no singular inner part.

For $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, the largest zero of m_ε lies to the right of β and when $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, it converges to ∞ . We therefore get the extra factor $B(z)$ in (3.19). \square

Along the lines of [19,38] we shall now rewrite (3.19) to a nonlocal step-by-step sum rule and introduce first some notation. Let J_n be the n times stripped Jacobi matrix (i.e., the matrix obtained from J by removing the first n rows and columns) and denote by $d\mu_n = f_n(t) dt + d\mu_{n,s}$ its spectral measure. In particular, $J_1 = \{a_{n+1}, b_{n+1}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ and we let m_1 be the associated m -function. More generally, m_n denotes the m -function for J_n (or Stieltjes transform of $d\mu_n$) and M_n is short for $-m_n \circ \mathbf{x}$. Furthermore, we use $\{x_{n,k}\}$ to denote the eigenvalues of J_n (or poles of m_n) in $\mathbb{R} \setminus E$ and write $p_{n,k}$ for the points in \mathbb{F} for which $\mathbf{x}(p_{n,k}) = x_{n,k}$.

Related to coefficient stripping is the Stieltjes expansion

$$m(x) = \frac{1}{-x + b_1 - a_1^2 m_1(x)} \tag{3.30}$$

which by iteration leads to a continued fraction representation of m . As a direct consequence of (3.30), we see that the zeros of m coincide with the poles of m_1 . Moreover, taking boundary values of the imaginary parts and recalling that $m(t + i0) \neq 0$ a.e., we get that

$$\frac{\text{Im} m(t + i0)}{|m(t + i0)|^2} = a_1^2 \text{Im} m_1(t + i0) \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Pulled back to $\partial\mathbb{D}$, this means

$$a_1^2 |M(e^{i\theta})|^2 = \frac{\text{Im} M(e^{i\theta})}{\text{Im} M_1(e^{i\theta})} \quad \text{for a.e. } \theta,$$

provided that $\text{Im} M_1(e^{i\theta}) \neq 0$ a.e. or, equivalently, $\text{Im} M(e^{i\theta}) \neq 0$ a.e. on $\partial\mathbb{D}$. When the set $\{\theta: \text{Im} M(e^{i\theta}) \neq 0\}$ has full measure (i.e., $f(t) > 0$ for a.e. $t \in E$), we can therefore write (3.19) in the form

$$a_1 M(z) = B(z) \prod_k \frac{B(z, p_{1,k})}{B(z, p_k)} \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{e^{i\theta} + z}{e^{i\theta} - z} \log \left(\frac{\text{Im} M(e^{i\theta})}{\text{Im} M_1(e^{i\theta})} \right) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \right\}. \tag{3.31}$$

This representation, relating M and M_1 , provides us with step-by-step sum rules. For our purpose it suffices to compare the constant terms.

If we divide by $B(z)$ in (3.31) and let $z \rightarrow 0$, the left-hand side reduces by (3.6) and (2.13) to $a_1 / \text{Cap}(E)$. According to (2.12), the logarithm of the Blaschke product (over k) on the right-hand

side simplifies to $\sum_k (g(x_k) - g(x_{1,k}))$ and the integral becomes $\int_E \log(f/f_1) d\mu_E$, using (3.18). So we end up with

$$\log\left(\frac{a_1}{\text{Cap}(E)}\right) = \sum_k (g(x_k) - g(x_{1,k})) + \frac{1}{2} \int_E \log\left(\frac{f(t)}{f_1(t)}\right) d\mu_E(t). \tag{3.32}$$

Iteration now leads to

$$\log\left(\frac{a_1 \cdots a_n}{\text{Cap}(E)^n}\right) = \sum_k (g(x_k) - g(x_{n,k})) + \frac{1}{2} \int_E \log\left(\frac{f(t)}{f_n(t)}\right) d\mu_E(t), \tag{3.33}$$

provided that either $\log f$ or $\log f_n$ is integrable with respect to $d\mu_E$. The underlying assumption (3.9) automatically implies that $\sum_k g(x_{n,k}) < \infty$ for all n (cf. Proposition 3).

4. Preparatory results

In this section we present the last results needed to prove our main theorem. Throughout, E will denote a Parreau–Widom set. As is crucial for the Szegő condition, the equilibrium measure of E has no singular part.

Proposition 2. *The equilibrium measure $d\mu_E$ is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure.*

This result – a proof of which is included in Appendix A – immediately shows that $|E| > 0$. But it also enables us to relate the Szegő integral to relative entropies. For we can write $d\mu_E = f_E(t) dt$ and it follows from (3.18) and the fact that $d\mu_E$ is reflectionless on E (cf. Lemma 2 in Appendix A) that

$$\int_E \log f_E(t) d\mu_E(t) = \int_0^{2\pi} \log |M_E(e^{i\theta})| \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} - \log \pi > -\infty. \tag{4.1}$$

Hence the Szegő integral (i.e., $\int_E \log f d\mu_E$) is a relative entropy up to some additive constant, specifically

$$S(d\mu_E | d\mu) := - \int_E \log\left(\frac{f_E(t)}{f(t)}\right) d\mu_E(t) = \int_E \log f(t) d\mu_E(t) - \int_E \log f_E(t) d\mu_E(t). \tag{4.2}$$

Returning to the end of the previous section, if either $\log f$ or $\log f_n$ belongs to $L^1(E, d\mu_E)$ then we can write the integral in (3.33) as

$$\int_E \log\left(\frac{f(t)}{f_n(t)}\right) d\mu_E(t) = S(d\mu) - S(d\mu_n), \tag{4.3}$$

where $S(\cdot)$ is short notation for the relative entropy $S(d\mu_E | \cdot)$.

Then there is a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\sum_k g(x_{n,k}), \sum_k g(x_k^{(n)}), \sum_k g(\tilde{x}_k^{(n)}) \leq C \tag{4.6}$$

for all $n \geq 1$.

Proof. For the first two series, the choice of

$$C = 2 \sum_k g(x_k) + \sum_j g(c_j) < \infty$$

works. This follows immediately from the above lemma. To estimate the third, consider first $J^{(n)} \oplus \tilde{J}$ (i.e., set $a_n = 0$ in $\tilde{J}^{(n)}$). Since \tilde{J} has no eigenvalues, this direct sum has the same eigenvalues as $J^{(n)}$. The rank two perturbation coming from $a_n > 0$ can be written as

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & a_n \\ a_n & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{a_n}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \frac{a_n}{2} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Near the right end of a gap, the negative rank one perturbation $\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$ interlaces the eigenvalues and the positive rank one perturbation $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ then moves the eigenvalues to the right. Near the left end of a gap, a similar argument applies. Hence,

$$\sum_k g(\tilde{x}_k^{(n)}) \leq \sum_k g(x_k^{(n)}) + 2 \sum_j g(c_j)$$

and the result follows. \square

In the next section, we take \tilde{J} to be the Jacobi matrix corresponding to the equilibrium measure of E .

5. Szegő’s theorem

We are now ready to prove the main result of the paper.

Theorem 2. Let $J = \{a_n, b_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a Jacobi matrix with spectral measure $d\mu = f(t)dt + d\mu_s$ and let $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a Parreau–Widom set. Assume that $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(J) = E$ and denote by $\{x_k\}$ the eigenvalues of J outside E , if any. On condition that $\sum_k g(x_k) < \infty$, we have

$$\int_E \log f(t) d\mu_E(t) > -\infty \tag{5.1}$$

if and only if

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_1 \cdots a_n}{\text{Cap}(E)^n} > 0. \tag{5.2}$$

In particular, (5.1) is equivalent to $a_1 \cdots a_n / \text{Cap}(E)^n \not\rightarrow 0$ for measures $d\mu$ supported on E .

Proof. Assume first that the Szegő condition (5.1) holds. Then $S(d\mu) > -\infty$ and by (3.33) together with (4.3), we have

$$\log\left(\frac{a_1 \cdots a_n}{\text{Cap}(\mathbb{E})^n}\right) = \sum_k (g(x_k) - g(x_{n,k})) + \frac{1}{2}(S(d\mu) - S(d\mu_n)). \tag{5.3}$$

According to Proposition 3, the eigenvalue sum $\sum_k g(x_{n,k})$ is bounded above, uniformly in n , and the relative entropy $S(d\mu_n)$ is ≤ 0 for all n . Hence the right-hand side of (5.3) is bounded below and thus

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_1 \cdots a_n}{\text{Cap}(\mathbb{E})^n} > 0. \tag{5.4}$$

So much the more, (5.2) is true.

To prove that $\limsup > 0$ implies the Szegő condition, let J_E be the Jacobi matrix of $d\mu_E$ and set $\tilde{J} = J_E$ in (4.4). Then $\tilde{J}^{(n)}$ reduces to J_E if we coefficient strip n times. By Proposition 3 and because $\log f_E$ is integrable with respect to $d\mu_E$, cf. (4.1), the iterated step-by-step sum rule (3.33) applies to $\tilde{J}^{(n)}$. Since $d\mu_E$ has no eigenvalues and $S(d\mu_E) = 0$, we arrive at

$$\log\left(\frac{a_1 \cdots a_n}{\text{Cap}(\mathbb{E})^n}\right) = \sum_k g(\tilde{x}_k^{(n)}) + \frac{1}{2}S(d\tilde{\mu}_n), \tag{5.5}$$

where $d\tilde{\mu}_n$ is the spectral measure of $\tilde{J}^{(n)}$. Clearly, $\tilde{J}^{(n)}$ converges strongly to J as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and thus $d\tilde{\mu}_n \xrightarrow{w} d\mu$. As relative entropy is weakly upper semi-continuous, we therefore have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} S(d\tilde{\mu}_n) \leq S(d\mu).$$

Hence,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_1 \cdots a_n}{\text{Cap}(\mathbb{E})^n} \leq C' \exp\left\{\frac{1}{2}S(d\mu)\right\}, \tag{5.6}$$

where C' is exp of the constant in (4.6). In this way, (5.2) implies (5.1). \square

Corollary. *In the setting of Theorem 2, if one and hence both of the equivalent conditions (5.1)–(5.2) hold true, then*

$$0 < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_1 \cdots a_n}{\text{Cap}(\mathbb{E})^n} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_1 \cdots a_n}{\text{Cap}(\mathbb{E})^n} < \infty.$$

Proof. The statement follows immediately from (5.4) and (5.6). \square

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Alexandru Aleman, Katsuhiko Matsuzaki, Barry Simon, Mikhail Sodin, Peter Yuditskii, and Maxim Zinchenko for useful discussions and comments while preparing the paper. Also thanks to the anonymous referee for pointing out the papers [21–23] of Levin on conformal mappings onto comb-like domains.

Appendix A

In this appendix we give a direct proof of the following result stated in Section 4.

Proposition. *When E is a Parreau–Widom set, the equilibrium measure $d\mu_E$ is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure.*

Remark. If \bigcup_j in (2.5) is a finite union, then the result is well known (see, e.g., [40, Chap. 5]). For homogeneous E , the result is contained in [3] (see also [18]).

Our proof relies on two lemmas, inspired by [13,24]. While the first applies to any probability measure on \mathbb{R} , the second is more specific to equilibrium measure. Alternatively, one can deduce the result by considering the conformal map ψ introduced in Section 2.1.

Lemma 1. *Let $d\rho = w(t) dt + d\rho_s$ be a probability measure on \mathbb{R} and let*

$$m_\rho(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{d\rho(t)}{t - x}, \quad x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \text{supp}(d\rho)$$

be its Stieltjes transform. If $m_\rho(t + i0)/(t + i)$ belongs to $L^1(\mathbb{R})$, then $d\rho$ is absolutely continuous (i.e., $d\rho_s = 0$).

Proof. Recall that the boundary values $m_\rho(t + i0)$ exist for a.e. $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and that $w(t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im } m_\rho(t + i0)$ a.e. on \mathbb{R} . Our goal is thus to prove that

$$m_\rho(x) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\text{Im } m_\rho(t + i0)}{t - x} dt, \quad x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}.$$

By the assumption on $m_\rho(t + i0)/(t + i)$, the integral

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{m_\rho(t + i0)}{t - x} dt =: f(x)$$

defines a holomorphic function in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$. We readily see that

$$f(a + ib) - f(a - ib) = \frac{b}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{m_\rho(t + i0)}{(t - a)^2 + b^2} dt$$

and since the right-hand side has the same boundary values as $m_\rho(a + ib)$ for $b \downarrow 0$ (see, e.g., [35, Thm. 5.30]), it follows that

$$f(x) - f(\bar{x}) = m_\rho(x)$$

for $x \in \mathbb{C}_+$. Hence $f(\bar{x})$ is holomorphic on \mathbb{C}_+ , but so is $\overline{f(\bar{x})}$, and therefore $f(\bar{x})$ must be constant on \mathbb{C}_+ . Indeed, $f(\bar{x}) = 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{C}_+$ since $f(-ib) \rightarrow 0$ as $b \rightarrow \infty$. So we conclude that

$$f(a + ib) = \begin{cases} m_\rho(a + ib) & \text{for } b > 0, \\ 0 & \text{for } b < 0, \end{cases}$$

and the goal is now easily achieved noting that

$$\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\text{Im } m_\rho(t + i0)}{t - x} dt = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{m_\rho(t + i0) - \overline{m_\rho(t + i0)}}{t - x} dt = f(x) + \overline{f(\bar{x})} = m_\rho(x)$$

for $x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$. \square

Lemma 2. *Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a regular compact set and denote by m_K the Stieltjes transform of the equilibrium measure $d\mu_K$. Then the boundary values $m_K(t + i0)$ are purely imaginary for a.e. $t \in K$.*

Remark. Needless to say, the conclusion is empty unless $|E| > 0$. In the language of [13,14,31, 32,34], the lemma says that $d\mu_K$ (or m_K) is *reflectionless* on K . The statement is consistent with the fact that the equilibrium potential is constant a.e. on K .

Proof of Lemma 2. Write

$$K_n = [\alpha, \beta] \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^n (\alpha_j, \beta_j), \quad K := K_\infty.$$

It is known that m_{K_n} has the desired property for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (see, e.g., [40, Chap. 5]). By passing to a subsequence, if necessary, we can assume that $d\mu_{K_n} \xrightarrow{w} d\mu_K$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence $m_{K_n} \rightarrow m_K$, locally uniformly on $\mathbb{C} \setminus K$.

The trick is now to consider the exponential representation of the m -function. We have

$$\frac{m_{K_n}(x)}{|m_{K_n}(i)|} = \exp \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{1}{t-x} - \frac{t}{t^2+1} \right) \xi_n(t) dt \right\}, \tag{A.1}$$

where $\xi_n(t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \text{Arg } m_{K_n}(t + i0)$ a.e. on \mathbb{R} . Obviously, $\xi_n(t) = 0$ for $t < \alpha$ and $\xi_n(t) = 1$ for $t > \beta$. So the right-hand side in (A.1) reduces to

$$\frac{\sqrt{1 + \beta^2}}{\beta - x} \exp \left\{ \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} \left(\frac{1}{t-x} - \frac{t}{t^2+1} \right) \xi_n(t) dt \right\}.$$

But more importantly, we have $\xi_n(t) = 1/2$ for all $t \in K_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The uniform convergence of m_{K_n} implies that $\int_{\alpha}^{\beta} \xi_n(t) dt$ converges uniformly for γ in $[\alpha, \beta]$ (see, e.g., [2, Sect. 2]). Equivalently, $\xi_n(t) dt \xrightarrow{w} \xi(t) dt$ as measures on $[\alpha, \beta]$ (where ξ is short for ξ_∞). Since the

Green’s function for $\bar{\mathbb{C}} \setminus K_n$ converges locally uniformly to the Green’s function for $\Omega := \bar{\mathbb{C}} \setminus K$, the critical points converge too. Therefore,

$$\xi_n(t) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\text{pointwise}} \begin{cases} 1/2 & \text{for } t \in K, \\ 1 & \text{for } t \in (\alpha_j, c_j), \\ 0 & \text{for } t \in (c_j, \beta_j), \end{cases}$$

where $\{c_j\}$ are the critical points of g_Ω . We conclude that $\xi(t) = 1/2$ for a.e. $t \in K$ and the result follows. \square

Proof of Proposition. By Lemma 1, it suffices to show that $m_E(t + i0)/(t + i)$ is integrable on \mathbb{R} . We split the integral into 3 parts, namely i) \int_E , ii) $\int_{\cup_j(\alpha_j, \beta_j)}$, and iii) $\int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus [\alpha, \beta]}$.

i) According to Lemma 2, $m_E(t + i0)$ is purely imaginary a.e. on E . When restricted to E , $|m_E(t + i0)|$ is therefore the absolutely continuous part of a finite measure. Hence,

$$\int_E \left| \frac{m_E(t + i0)}{t + i} \right| dt < \infty.$$

ii) By (2.3), we can relate m_E to the derivative of g in the gaps of E and get the estimate

$$\int_{\cup_j(\alpha_j, \beta_j)} \left| \frac{m_E(t + i0)}{t + i} \right| dt \leq 2 \sum_j g(c_j).$$

Since E is a Parreau–Widom set, the sum on the right-hand side is $< \infty$.

iii) Recall from (3.2) that m_E decays like $-1/t$ at ∞ . Therefore,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus [\alpha, \beta]} \left| \frac{m_E(t + i0)}{t + i} \right| dt < \infty.$$

This completes the proof. \square

References

[1] B.N. Apanasov, Discrete Groups in Space and Uniformization Problems, Math. Appl. (Soviet Ser.), vol. 40, Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1991. Translated and revised from the 1983 Russian original.
 [2] N. Aronszajn, W.F. Donoghue Jr., On exponential representations of analytic functions in the upper half-plane with positive imaginary part, J. Anal. Math. 5 (1956/1957) 321–388.
 [3] L. Carleson, On H^∞ in multiply connected domains, in: Conference on Harmonic Analysis in Honor of Antoni Zygmund, vols. I, II, Chicago, IL, 1981, in: Wadsworth Math. Ser., Wadsworth, Belmont, CA, 1983, pp. 349–372.
 [4] J.S. Christiansen, B. Simon, M. Zinchenko, Finite gap Jacobi matrices: an announcement, J. Comput. Appl. Math. 233 (3) (2009) 652–662.
 [5] J.S. Christiansen, B. Simon, M. Zinchenko, Finite gap Jacobi matrices, I. The isospectral torus, Constr. Approx. 32 (1) (2010) 1–65.
 [6] J.S. Christiansen, B. Simon, M. Zinchenko, Finite gap Jacobi matrices, II. The Szegő class, Constr. Approx. 33 (3) (2011) 365–403.
 [7] M. Embree, L.N. Trefethen, Green’s functions for multiply connected domains via conformal mapping, SIAM Rev. 41 (4) (1999) 745–761 (electronic).
 [8] A. Eremenko, P. Yuditskii, Comb functions, arXiv:1109.1464v1, 2011.

- [9] J.L. Fernández, Domains with strong barrier, *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana* 5 (1–2) (1989) 47–65.
- [10] S.D. Fisher, *Function Theory on Planar Domains. A Second Course in Complex Analysis*, Pure Appl. Math. (N. Y.), John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1983. Wiley–Interscience Publication.
- [11] O. Frostman, Potentiel d'équilibre et capacité des ensembles avec quelques applications à la théorie des fonctions, *Medd. Lunds Univ. Math. Sem.* 3 (1935).
- [12] J.B. Garnett, D.E. Marshall, *Harmonic Measure*, New Math. Monogr., vol. 2, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005.
- [13] F. Gesztesy, P. Yuditskii, Spectral properties of a class of reflectionless Schrödinger operators, *J. Funct. Anal.* 241 (2) (2006) 486–527.
- [14] F. Gesztesy, M. Zinchenko, Local spectral properties of reflectionless Jacobi, CMV, and Schrödinger operators, *J. Differential Equations* 246 (1) (2009) 78–107.
- [15] M. Hasumi, *Hardy Classes on Infinitely Connected Riemann Surfaces*, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1027, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983.
- [16] M. Hayashi, Szegő's theorem on Riemann surfaces, *Hokkaido Math. J.* 10 (Special Issue) (1981) 242–254.
- [17] W.K. Hayman, *Meromorphic Functions*, Oxford Math. Monogr., Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1964.
- [18] P.W. Jones, D.E. Marshall, Critical points of Green's function, harmonic measure, and the corona problem, *Ark. Mat.* 23 (2) (1985) 281–314.
- [19] R. Killip, B. Simon, Sum rules for Jacobi matrices and their applications to spectral theory, *Ann. of Math.* (2) 158 (1) (2003) 253–321.
- [20] N.S. Landkof, *Foundations of Modern Potential Theory*, Grundlehren Math. Wiss., vol. 180, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1972. Translated from Russian by A.P. Doohovskoy.
- [21] B.Ya. Levin, Majorants in classes of subharmonic functions, *J. Soviet Math.* 52 (6) (1990) 3441–3451.
- [22] B.Ya. Levin, The relation between majorants and conformal mappings. II, *J. Soviet Math.* 52 (5) (1990) 3351–3364.
- [23] B.Ya. Levin, The classification of the closed sets on \mathbf{R} and the representation of the majorants. III, *J. Soviet Math.* 52 (5) (1990) 3364–3372.
- [24] F. Nazarov, A. Volberg, P. Yuditskii, Reflectionless measures with a point mass and singular continuous component, arXiv:0711.0948v1, 2007.
- [25] R. Nevanlinna, *Uniformisierung*, Zweite Auflage, Grundlehren Math. Wiss., band 64, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1967.
- [26] R. Nevanlinna, *Analytic Functions*, Grundlehren Math. Wiss., vol. 162, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1970. Translated from the second German edition by Phillip Emig.
- [27] M. Parreau, Théorème de Fatou et problème de Dirichlet pour les lignes de Green de certaines surfaces de Riemann, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I* 250/25 (1958) 8.
- [28] F. Peherstorfer, P. Yuditskii, Asymptotics of orthonormal polynomials in the presence of a denumerable set of mass points, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 129 (11) (2001) 3213–3220 (electronic).
- [29] F. Peherstorfer, P. Yuditskii, Asymptotic behavior of polynomials orthonormal on a homogeneous set, *J. Anal. Math.* 89 (2003) 113–154.
- [30] F. Peherstorfer, P. Yuditskii, Remark on the paper “Asymptotic behavior of polynomials orthonormal on a homogeneous set”, arXiv:math.SP/0611856, 2006.
- [31] A. Poltoratski, C. Remling, Reflectionless Herglotz functions and Jacobi matrices, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 288 (3) (2009) 1007–1021.
- [32] A. Poltoratski, B. Simon, M. Zinchenko, The Hilbert transform of a measure, *J. Anal. Math.* 111 (2010) 247–265.
- [33] Ch. Pommerenke, On the Green's function of Fuchsian groups, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math.* 2 (1976) 409–427.
- [34] C. Remling, The absolutely continuous spectrum of Jacobi matrices, *Ann. of Math.* (2) 174 (2011) 125–171.
- [35] M. Rosenblum, J. Rovnyak, *Topics in Hardy Classes and Univalent Functions*, Birkhäuser Adv. Texts: Basler Lehrbücher (Birkhäuser Adv. Texts: Basel Textbooks), Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1994.
- [36] W. Rudin, *Real and Complex Analysis*, third edition, McGraw–Hill Book Co., New York, 1987.
- [37] M.V. Samokhin, Some classical problems in the theory of analytic functions in domains of Parreau–Widom type, *Mat. Sb.* 182 (6) (1991) 892–910.
- [38] B. Simon, A canonical factorization for meromorphic Herglotz functions on the unit disk and sum rules for Jacobi matrices, *J. Funct. Anal.* 214 (2) (2004) 396–409.
- [39] B. Simon, *Orthogonal Polynomials on the Unit Circle. Part 1. Classical Theory*, Amer. Math. Soc. Colloq. Publ., vol. 54, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2005.
- [40] B. Simon, Szegő's Theorem and Its Descendants. *Spectral Theory for L^2 Perturbations of Orthogonal Polynomials*, M.B. Porter Lectures, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2011.
- [41] B. Simon, A. Zlatoš, Sum rules and the Szegő condition for orthogonal polynomials on the real line, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 242 (3) (2003) 393–423.

- [42] M. Sodin, P. Yuditskii, Almost periodic Jacobi matrices with homogeneous spectrum, infinite-dimensional Jacobi inversion, and Hardy spaces of character-automorphic functions, *J. Geom. Anal.* 7 (3) (1997) 387–435.
- [43] H. Stahl, V. Totik, *General Orthogonal Polynomials*, *Encyclopedia Math. Appl.*, vol. 43, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992.
- [44] G. Szegő, Beiträge zur Theorie der Toeplitzschen Formen, *Math. Z.* 6 (1920) 167–202.
- [45] M. Tsuji, *Potential Theory in Modern Function Theory*, Chelsea Publishing Co., New York, 1975. Reprinting of the 1959 original.
- [46] S. Verblunsky, On positive harmonic functions (second paper), *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (2) 40 (1936) 290–320.
- [47] H. Widom, Extremal polynomials associated with a system of curves in the complex plane, *Adv. Math.* 3 (1969) 127–232.
- [48] H. Widom, \mathcal{H}_p sections of vector bundles over Riemann surfaces, *Ann. of Math.* (2) 94 (1971) 304–324.
- [49] P. Yuditskii, On the direct Cauchy theorem in Widom domains: Positive and negative examples, *Comput. Methods Funct. Theory* 11 (2) (2011) 395–414.
- [50] M. Zinsmeister, Espaces de Hardy et domaines de Denjoy, *Ark. Mat.* 27 (2) (1989) 363–378.