

Miroslav Pavlović

On harmonic conjugates with exponential mean growth

Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, Vol. 49 (1999), No. 4, 733–742

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/127524>

Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 1999

Institute of Mathematics of the Czech Academy of Sciences provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This document has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://dml.cz>

ON HARMONIC CONJUGATES WITH EXPONENTIAL
MEAN GROWTH

MIROSLAV PAVLOVIĆ, Belgrade

(Received September 13, 1996)

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $h_p(\varphi)$ denote the class of (complex-valued) functions harmonic in the unit disc Δ for which $M_p(u, r) = O(\varphi(r))$, $r \rightarrow 1^-$, where φ is a positive, continuous function defined on some interval $[r_0, 1)$, $r_0 < 1$, and

$$M_p(u, r) = \left\{ \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} |u(re^{i\theta})|^p d\theta \right\}^{1/p}.$$

Following [8] we say that $h_p(\varphi)$ is *self-conjugate* if the Riesz projection maps $h_p(\varphi)$ into itself or, equivalently, if $f \in h_p(\varphi)$ whenever f is an analytic function such that $\operatorname{Re} f$ (= real part of f) is in $h_p(\varphi)$.

It follows from the Riesz projection theorem that $h_p(\varphi)$ is self-conjugate whenever $1 < p < \infty$, without additional restrictions on φ . That $h_p((1-r)^{-a})$ is self-conjugate for all $p > 0$, $a > 0$, was established by Hardy and Littlewood [3]. Shields and Williams [8, 9] were the first who studied the case where $\varphi(r)$ is different from $(1-r)^{-a}$. They proved that $h_p(\varphi)$ is self-conjugate provided

$$(U) \quad (1-r)^\beta \varphi(r) \downarrow 0, \quad r \rightarrow 1^-, \quad \text{for some } \beta < \infty$$

and

$$(L) \quad (1-r)^\alpha \varphi(r) \uparrow \infty, \quad r \rightarrow 1^-, \quad \text{for some } \alpha > 0.$$

(For the case $p < 1$ see [4, 6].)

The typical example of functions satisfying (U) + (L) is

$$\varphi(r) = (1-r)^{-a} \left(\log \frac{1}{1-r} \right)^b,$$

where $a > 0$. It was also proved in [9] that if $(1-r)^\beta \varphi(r) \downarrow 0$ ($r \rightarrow 1^-$) for all $\beta > 0$, then $h_\infty(\varphi)$ is not self-conjugate, which is true, e.g., if

$$\varphi(r) = \left(\log \frac{1}{1-r} \right)^b, \quad b > 0.$$

We are however interested in the case where $\varphi(r)$ grows *faster* than any positive power of $1/(1-r)$ and especially when

$$(1.1) \quad \varphi(r) = (1-r)^{-a} \left(\log \frac{1}{1-r} \right)^b \exp \frac{c}{1-r}$$

($c > 0$). We believe that condition (L) is sufficient for $h_p(\varphi)$ to be self-conjugate but we can prove it only under additional restrictions on the regularity of growth of φ . As a special case of our main result (Theorem 2.1) we have that $h_p(\varphi)$ is self-conjugate in the case of (1.1) ($c > 0$ or $c = 0, a > 0$).

Our proofs are surprisingly easy and are independent of any deeper fact from the theory of harmonic functions. The key is the inequality

$$(1.2) \quad |u(0)|^p \leq C_p \int_{\Delta} |u|^p dA,$$

where u is harmonic in Δ , and dA is the normalized planar measure on Δ . If $p \geq 1$, then one can take $C_p = 1$ because of the subharmonicity of $|u|^p$. In the case of $p < 1$, in which $|u|^p$ need not be subharmonic, (1.2) is contained implicitly in another theorem of Hardy and Littlewood on harmonic conjugates [3], Theorem 5:

$$(1.3) \quad \int_{\Delta} |f|^p dA \leq C_p \int_{\Delta} |\operatorname{Re} f|^p dA,$$

where f is analytic and $\operatorname{Im} f(0) = 0$. Indeed, (1.2) follows from (1.3) and the subharmonicity of $|f|^p$. However, Hardy and Littlewood proved their theorems without mentioning the inequality (1.2) and this was the main reason for which their proofs were rather difficult and long.

A proof of (1.2) can be found in [2]. In order that the paper be self-contained we reproduce a very short and simple proof given in [7]. See Lemma 2.1.

2. MAIN RESULT

A real function F is said to be *almost increasing* (almost decreasing) if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $F(x) \leq CF(y)$ ($F(y) \leq CF(x)$) whenever $x < y$. For a C^1 -function F we say that it is *almost convex* if its derivative is almost increasing. An application of Lagrange's theorem shows that F is almost convex if and only if there is a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$(2.1) \quad F'(x)/C \leq \frac{F(y) - F(x)}{y - x} \leq CF'(y), \quad x < y.$$

By the term *majorant* we mean a function φ defined, positive and continuous on some interval $(r_0, 1)$, $0 < r_0 < 1$, and such that $\varphi(r) \rightarrow \infty$ as $r \rightarrow 1$. We say that a majorant φ satisfies condition (L^+) if it is C^1 and

$$(L^+) \quad \varphi^{-m} \text{ is almost convex on } (r_0, 1) \text{ for some } m > 0, r_0 < 1.$$

This is equivalent to the requirement that $\varphi'(r)/\varphi(r)^{m+1}$ is almost decreasing near 1, which implies that $\varphi' > 0$ near 1. Moreover, applying (2.1) to $F = \varphi^{-m}$ we obtain

$$-(m/C)\varphi'(r)\varphi(r)^{-m-1}(\varrho - r) \leq \varphi(\varrho)^{-m} - \varphi(r)^{-m}$$

for $r < \varrho < 1$, whence by letting ϱ tend to 1,

$$(2.2) \quad \varphi'(r) \geq \alpha(1 - r)^{-1}\varphi(r) \quad (r_0 < r < 1),$$

where $\alpha = C/m$. In particular, $\varphi'(r) \rightarrow \infty$ ($r \rightarrow 1$). Thus if φ satisfies (L^+) , then φ' is a majorant and φ satisfies (L) . Further remarks are in Section 3.

Theorem 2.1. *Let φ be a majorant satisfying (L^+) and let $0 < p \leq \infty$. For a function f analytic in Δ the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (a) $f \in h_p(\varphi)$,
- (b) $\operatorname{Re} f \in h_p(\varphi)$,
- (c) $f' \in h_p(\varphi')$.

Recall that (c) means $M_p(f', r) = O(\varphi'(r))$, $r \rightarrow 1^-$. Since the case $p \geq 1$ is somewhat easier (for instance, (a) is deduced from (c) by means of Minkowski's inequality) we shall assume from now on that $0 < p < 1$.

Lemma 2.1. *There is a constant $C_p < \infty$ such that*

$$(2.2) \quad \sup\{|u(w)|^p : w \in \Delta_{R/2}(z)\} \leq C_p \int_{\Delta_R(z)} |u|^p dA$$

whenever u is harmonic in Δ and $\Delta_R(z) := \{w : |w - z| < R\} \subset \Delta$.

P r o o f. By dilatations and translations the proof reduces to the case where $z = 0$ and $R = 1$. We may also assume that u is continuous on the closed disc. Under this hypothesis we choose $z_0 \in \Delta$ such that the function

$$h(z) = (1 - |z|)^2 |u(z)|^p, \quad z \in \Delta,$$

attains its maximum for $z = z_0$. Then we apply the mean value property over the disc $\Delta_r(z_0)$, $r = (1 - |z_0|)/2$ to get

$$(2.3) \quad |u(z_0)| \leq r^{-2} \int_{\Delta_r(z_0)} |u(z)| dA(z).$$

On the other hand, we have that $(1 - |z|)^{-1} \leq 2(1 - |z_0|)^{-1}$ for $z \in \Delta_r(z_0)$ which, along with the inequality $h(z) \leq h(z_0)$, shows that $|u(z)| \leq 2^{2/p} |u(z_0)|$ for $z \in \Delta_r(z_0)$. Hence

$$|u(z)| \leq C |u(z)|^p |u(z_0)|^{1-p}, \quad z \in \Delta_r(z_0),$$

where C depends only on p . Combining this with (2.3) we obtain

$$h(z_0) \leq C_p \int_{\Delta} |u|^p dA.$$

Now the desired result follows from the inequality $|u(z)|^p \leq 4h(z) \leq 4h(z_0)$, $|z| \leq 1/2$. \square

Lemma 2.2. *If $u = \operatorname{Re} f$, where f is analytic in Δ , then there is a constant C_p such that*

$$(2.4) \quad M_p(f', r) \leq C_p (\varrho - r)^{-1} \sup_{0 < t < \varrho} M_p(u, t)$$

whenever $0 < r < \varrho < 1$.

P r o o f. Using the simple, familiar estimate

$$|f'(z)| \leq CR^{-1} \sup_{\Delta_{R/2}(Z)} |u|$$

we deduce from (2.2) that

$$|f'(r)|^p \leq C(\varrho - r)^{-p-2} \int_{\Delta_R(r)} |u|^p dA,$$

where $R = \varrho - r$, $0 < r < \varrho < 1$. Applying this to the functions $z \mapsto f(ze^{i\theta})$ we obtain

$$|f'(re^{i\theta})|^p \leq C(\varrho - r)^{-p-2} \int_{\Delta_R(r)} |u(we^{i\theta})|^p dA(w),$$

where C depends only on p . Integrating this inequality over $0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi$ we find that

$$\begin{aligned} M_p^p(f', r) &\leq (\varrho - r)^{-p-2} \int_{\Delta_R(r)} M_p^p(u, |w|) dA(w), \\ &\leq C(\varrho - r)^{-p} \sup_{w \in \Delta_R(r)} M_p(u, |w|). \end{aligned}$$

The result follows because $\Delta_R(r) \subset \Delta_\varrho(0)$. □

Lemma 2.3. *There exists a constant C_p such that*

$$(2.5) \quad M_p^p(f, \varrho) - M_p^p(f, r) \leq C_p(\varrho - r)^p M_p^p(f', \varrho)$$

whenever $0 < r < \varrho < 1$ and f is analytic in Δ .

Proof. With these hypotheses let $s_j = \varrho - 2^{-j}(\varrho - r)$ and $t_j = (s_j + s_{j+1})/2$, $j \geq 0$. Using Lemma 2.1 ($u = f'$) we get

$$\begin{aligned} |f(s_{j+1}) - f(s_j)|^p &\leq (s_{j+1} - s_j)^p \sup_{s_j < x < s_{j+1}} |f'(x)|^p \\ &\leq C(s_{j+1} - s_j)^p (\varrho - t_j)^{-2} \int_{\Delta_j} |f'|^p dA, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta_j = \{w: |w - t_j| < \varrho - t_j\}$. Now we apply this to the functions $z \mapsto f(ze^{i\theta})$ and then integrate with respect to θ . As a result we have

$$M_p^p(f, s_{j+1}) - M_p^p(f, s_j) \leq C(s_{j+1} - s_j)^p M_p^p(f', \varrho).$$

(We also have to use the “increasing property” of $M_p(f', \cdot)$.) Now (2.5) is obtained by summation from $j = 0$ to $j = \infty$. □

Remark. The proof can be made shorter by use of the Complex Maximal Theorem (see [5]).

Proof of Theorem 2.1. The implication (a) \Rightarrow (b) is obvious. To prove the rest we may assume that $\varphi' > 0$ on $[0, 1)$ and $\varphi(0) = 1$. Then we define a sequence $\{r_j\}$ ($j \geq 0$) by $\varphi(r_j) = 2^j$ and choose $t_j \in (R_j, r_{j+1})$ so that

$$\varphi(r_{j+1}) - \varphi(r_j) = \varphi'(t_j)(r_{j+1} - r_j)$$

i.e.,

$$(2.6) \quad r_{j+1} - r_j = \frac{2^j}{\varphi'(t_j)} \quad (j \geq 0).$$

Assuming that φ satisfies (L^+) we have the relation

$$(2.7) \quad \varphi'(t) \leq C\varphi'(r), \quad r_j \leq r \leq t \leq r_{j+2},$$

where C is a constant independent of j, r, t . To show (2.7) choose $m > 0$ such that φ'/φ^{m+1} is almost decreasing on $[0, 1)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi'(t) &\leq C\varphi'(r)(\varphi(t)/\varphi(r))^{m+1} \\ &\leq C\varphi'(r)(\varphi(r_{j+2})/\varphi(r_j))^{m+1}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies (2.7).

Proof of (b) \Rightarrow (c). Let $u = \operatorname{Re} f \in h_p(\varphi)$. Then $M_p(u, r_j)C\varphi(r_j) = C2^j$ and hence, by (2.4) and (2.6),

$$M_p(f', r_j) \leq C(r_{j+1} - r_j)^{-1}\varphi(r_{j+1}) = 2C\varphi'(t_j)$$

for some constant C . If $r \in (0, 1)$ is arbitrary, we choose j such that $r_j \leq r \leq r_{j+1}$. Then

$$M_p(f, r) \leq M_p(f, r_{j+1}) \leq 2C\varphi'(r_{j+1}).$$

Now (c) follows from (2.7).

Proof of (c) \Rightarrow (a). Let $f' \in h_p(\varphi')$. By (2.5), (2.7) and (2.6) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} M_p^p(f, r_{j+1}) - M_p^p(f, r_j) &\leq C(r_{j+1} - r_j)^p M_p^p(f', r_{j+1}) \\ &\leq C(r_{j+1} - r_j)^p \varphi'(t_j)^p = C2^p. \end{aligned}$$

Now summation yields

$$M_p^p(f, r_{k+1}) - |f(0)|^p \leq C2^{kp} = C\varphi(r_k)^p,$$

which implies (a). This completes the proof of Theorem 2.1. \square

3. EXAMPLES OF MAJORANTS

In this section we briefly discuss some classes of majorants for which the corresponding h_p -spaces are self-conjugate.

(i) (U) + (L) implies (L⁺) (provided φ is C^1 near 1).

Indeed, (U) + (L) is equivalent to

$$(3.1) \quad \varphi'(r) \asymp (1-r)^{-1}\varphi(r), \quad r \rightarrow 1^-.$$

Since (L) implies that $(1-r)^{-1}\varphi(r)^{-m} \downarrow 0$ for some $m > 0$, we see that $\varphi'(r)/\varphi(r)^{m+1}$ is almost decreasing near 1.

Remark. We write $A(r) \asymp B(r)$, $r \rightarrow 1$, to denote that $A(r)/B(r)$ and $B(r)/A(r)$ remain bounded when r tends to 1.

It is clear that (U) implies

$$(3.2) \quad \varphi(r) = o(\varphi(r^2)), \quad r \rightarrow 1^-.$$

On the other hand, (L⁺) + (3.2) implies (L) + (U). Indeed, as remarked before Theorem 2.1, (L⁺) implies (L). Then we apply (2.1) to $F = \varphi^{-m}$ to get

$$\frac{\varphi(r)^{-m} - \varphi(r^2)^{-m}}{r - r^2} \leq -Cm\varphi(r)^{-m-1}\varphi'(r).$$

Using this and (3.2) we find that $\varphi'(r) \leq \gamma(1-r)^{-1}\varphi(r)$, $\gamma = \text{const.}$, which implies (U).

(ii) It is known [4, 6, 8, 9] that $h_p(\psi)$ is self-conjugate provided

$$(N) \quad \begin{aligned} (1-r)^\alpha\psi(r) & \text{ is almost increasing and } (1-r)^\beta\psi(r) \\ & \text{ is almost decreasing near 1 for some } \alpha > 0, \beta > 0. \end{aligned}$$

This can be deduced from Theorem 2.1 by using the fact that (N) implies the existence of a majorant φ satisfying (3.1) (= (L) + (U)) and such that $\varphi(r) \asymp \psi(r)$, $r \rightarrow 1^-$.

To see the latter assume that ψ is defined and positive on $[0, 1)$ and let

$$(3.2') \quad \varphi(r) = \int_0^r (1-t)^{-1}\psi(t) dt.$$

Using (N) one shows that $\varphi \asymp \psi$ and since $\varphi'(r) = (1-r)^{-1}\psi(r)$ the result follows.

(iii) For a majorant ψ satisfying (L^+) let us choose $m > 0$ such that ψ'/ψ^{m+1} is almost decreasing near 1 and let

$$\eta(r) = \sup_{r < t < 1} \psi'(t)/\psi(t)^{m+1}.$$

Then define φ by

$$\varphi(r)^{-m} = \int_r^1 \eta(t) dt.$$

It is easily seen that $\varphi(r) \asymp \psi(r)$, $r \rightarrow 1^-$, and that φ^{-m} is convex near 1. By calculating the second derivative of φ^{-m} one concludes that the convexity of φ^{-m} for some $m > 0$, where φ is C^2 , is equivalent to

$$(3.3) \quad \limsup_{r \rightarrow 1} \frac{\varphi''(r)\varphi(r)}{\varphi'(r)^2} < \infty.$$

Thus (3.3) ensures the conclusion of Theorem 2.1.

A slightly stronger condition

$$(3.4) \quad \limsup_{r \rightarrow 1} \frac{|\varphi''(r)|\varphi(r)}{\varphi'(r)^2} < \infty$$

means that there is a constant $m > 0$ such that both φ^m and φ^{-m} are convex near 1. If ψ satisfies (U) + (L) and φ is defined by (3.2)', then φ satisfies (3.4). A consequence of this and (ii) is that every majorant satisfying (N) is "proportional" to one satisfying (3.4).

(iv) There is a large class of majorants, including (1.1), for which (3.4) holds. Sometimes it is convenient to represent φ as

$$\varphi(r) = F\left(\frac{1}{1-r}\right),$$

where F is a positive, continuous function defined on some $[A, \infty)$, $A > 0$, and such that $F(\infty) = \infty$. In [8], such an F is called a *weight*. With this notation we have

Proposition 3.1. *Let F be a weight such that F is C^2 and $F' > 0$. Then condition (3.4) is equivalent to*

$$(3.5) \quad \limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|F''(x)|F(x)}{F'(x)^2} < \infty.$$

Proof. The validity of the implication (3.4) \Rightarrow (3.5) follows from the formula

$$\frac{F''(x)F(x)}{F'(x)^2} = \frac{\varphi''(r)\varphi(r)}{\varphi'(r)^2} - \frac{2\varphi(r)}{(1-r)\varphi'(r)}, \quad x = (1-r)^{-1}$$

and the facts that (3.4) implies (L^+) and (L^+) implies (2.2). In the opposite direction we use the formula

$$\frac{\varphi''(r)\varphi(r)}{\varphi'(r)^2} = \frac{F''(x)F(x)}{F'(x)^2} + \frac{2F(x)}{xF'(x)}$$

and the fact (3.5) means that there is a constant $m > 0$ such that F^m and F^{-m} are convex near ∞ . In particular, if F satisfies (3.5), then there is a $c > 0$ such that

$$\frac{F(x)^m - F(c)^m}{x - c} \leq mF'(x)F(x)^{m-1}, \quad x > c.$$

Hence $\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} F(x)/xF'(x) \leq m$, which concludes the proof.

(v) A remarkable result of Hardy (cf. [1], Ch. V) makes the verification of (3.5) for a large class of weights almost trivial. Let $h(x)$ be an expression composed from $\{e^x, \log x, \text{constants}\}$ by successive applications of arithmetic operations and substitutions. We write $h \in (H)$ if $h(x)$ is defined in a neighbourhood of ∞ . The result of Hardy states that $\text{sign } h(x)$, for $h \in (H)$, is constant near ∞ . And since $h' \in (H)$ whenever $h \in (H)$ it follows that the limit $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} h(x)$ exists. Then it is easily shown that if a weight F belongs to (H) , then the limit

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F''(x)F(x)}{F'(x)^2} =: L(F)$$

exists (finite or not). Then by the L'Hospital rule

$$0 \leq \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(x)/F'(x)}{x} = 1 - L(F).$$

This shows that when $\varphi(r) = F(1/(1-r))$, $F \in (H)$, conditions (L) , (L^+) , (3.3), (3.4) and (3.5) are equivalent. Moreover, each of them is implied by the existence of an $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} F(x)/x^\alpha = \infty.$$

A concrete example is

$$F(x) = x^a (\log x)^b \exp(cx^d + k(\log x)^m),$$

where $c > 0$, $d > 0$ or $c = 0$, $k > 0$, $m > 1$.

4. A PROBLEM

The “norm” in $h_p(\varphi)$ can be defined as follows. Choose $r_0 < 1$ such that $\varphi > 0$ on $[r_0, 1)$ and let

$$\|u\| = \sup_{r_0 < r < 1} M_p(u, r)/\varphi(r).$$

Then, using Lemma 2.1, one shows that the norm convergence in $h_p(\varphi)$ implies the uniform convergence on compact subsets of Δ . A consequence is that $h_p(\varphi)$ is norm complete. The space $H_p(\varphi)$ spanned by analytic functions is a closed subspace of $h_p(\varphi)$.

Problem. If φ satisfies (L^+) and $\limsup_{r \rightarrow 1} \varphi(r)/\varphi(r^2) = \infty$, is the space $h_p(\varphi)$ isomorphic to $H_p(\varphi)$?

This simplest case is that where $\varphi(r) = \exp(1/(1-r))$.

It is not hard to prove that if $h_p(\varphi)$ is self-conjugate, then the space $h_p(\varphi(r))$ is isomorphic to $H_p(\varphi(r^2))$ via the operator T defined by

$$(Tu)(z) = f(z^2) + zg(z^2),$$

where f, g are the unique analytic functions such that $u(z) = f(z) + g(\bar{z})$, $g(0) = 0$. □

References

- [1] *N. Bourbaki*: Éléments de mathématique, Fonctions d’une variable réelle. Hermann, Paris, 1949.
- [2] *C. Fefferman and E. M. Stein*: H^p spaces of several variables. *Acta Math.* 129 (1972), 137–193.
- [3] *G. H. Hardy and J. E. Littlewood*: Some properties of conjugate functions. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 167 (1931), 405–423.
- [4] *M. Jevtić*: Growth of harmonic conjugates in the unit disc. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 98 (1986), 41–45.
- [5] *M. Mateljević and M. Pavlović*: Multipliers of H^p and BMOA. *Pacific J. Math.* 146 (1990), 71–84.
- [6] *M. Pavlović*: Mean values of harmonic conjugates in the unit disc. *Complex Variables* 10 (1988), 53–65.
- [7] *M. Pavlović*: On subharmonic behaviour and oscillation of functions on balls in R^n . *Publ. Inst. Math. (Belgrade)* 55 (1994), 18–22.
- [8] *A. L. Shields and D. L. Williams*: Bounded projections, duality and multipliers in spaces of harmonic functions. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 299/300 (1978), 256–279.
- [9] *A. L. Shields and D. L. Williams*: Bounded projections and the growth of harmonic conjugates in the unit disc. *Mich. Math. J.* 29 (1982), 3–25.

Author’s address: Matematički fakultet, Studentski trg 16, 11001 Belgrade, p.p. 550, Serbia, Yugoslavia.