

COMPACT COMPOSITION OPERATORS ON HARDY-ORLICZ SPACES

Ajay K. Sharma and S. D. Sharma

Abstract. In this paper, compact composition operators acting on Hardy-Orlicz spaces

$$H^\Phi = \left\{ f \in H(\mathbb{D}) : \sup_{0 < r < 1} \int_{\partial\mathbb{D}} \Phi(\log^+ |f(re^{i\theta})|) d\sigma < \infty \right\}$$

are studied. In fact, we prove that if Φ is a twice differentiable, non-constant, non-decreasing non-negative, convex function on \mathbb{R} , then the composition operator C_φ induced by a holomorphic self-map φ of the unit disk is compact on Hardy-Orlicz spaces H^Φ if and only if it is compact on the Hardy space H^2 .

1. Introduction

Let \mathbb{D} be the open unit disk in the complex plane \mathbb{C} and φ be a holomorphic self-map of \mathbb{D} . Then the equation $C_\varphi f = f \circ \varphi$, for f analytic in \mathbb{D} defines a composition operator C_φ with inducing map φ . As a consequence of the Littlewood subordination principle, every φ induces a bounded composition operator on the classical Hardy spaces H^p ($0 < p < \infty$) and the weighted Bergman spaces A_α^p for all p ($0 < p < \infty$) and for all α ($-1 < \alpha < \infty$) of the disk [4]. Amongst the nice composition operators on these spaces are compact composition operators.

The study of compact composition operators on H^2 was initiated by H. J. Schwartz [9] in his thesis in the late 1960's. This work was continued by Shapiro and Taylor [10], who showed that C_φ is not compact whenever φ has an angular derivative at some point of the unit circle. Non-existence of the angular derivative is not a sufficient condition for compactness of C_φ in general. MacCluer and Shapiro [7] showed that the non-existence of the angular derivative is also a sufficient condition for compactness of C_φ on the weighted Bergman spaces A_α^p but it fails to be a sufficient condition for compactness of C_φ on Hardy spaces H^p . However the

AMS Subject Classification: Primary 47B33, 46E38; Secondary 30D55.

Keywords and phrases: Hardy-Orlicz space, Composition operator, Nevanlinna counting function, vanishing Carleson measure.

First named author is supported by CSIR-grant (F.No. 9/100(100)2002 EMR-1).

angular derivative condition does characterize the compactness of C_φ on H^p if the inducing map is univalent.

Finally J. H. Shapiro [12] in 1987 was able to discover the connection between the essential norm of a composition operator on the Hardy space H^2 and the Nevanlinna counting function for φ , which is defined as $N_\varphi(w) = \sum_{z \in \varphi^{-1}(w)} \log \frac{1}{|z|}$, and obtained the general expression

$$\|C_\varphi\|_e^2 = \limsup_{|w| \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{N_\varphi(w)}{\log \frac{1}{|w|}},$$

where by the essential norm of C_φ , we mean its distance, in the operator norm, from the space of compact operators on H^2 . In particular, he proved that C_φ is compact on H^2 if and only if $N_\varphi(w) = o(\log \frac{1}{|w|})$ as $|w| \rightarrow 1$, thus providing a complete function theoretic characterization of compact composition operators in terms of the inducing map's Nevanlinna counting function N_φ .

Another solution to the compactness problem can be given by means of the positive measures m_λ that are defined on the unit circle $\partial\mathbb{D}$ by the Poisson representation

$$\Re \frac{\lambda + \varphi(z)}{\lambda - \varphi(z)} = \int_{\partial\mathbb{D}} P(z, \zeta) dm_\lambda(\zeta)$$

for each $\lambda \in \partial\mathbb{D}$. These measures are often called the Aleksandrov measures of φ . In [2], Cima and Matheson showed that the essential norm of C_φ on H^2 can also be expressed as

$$\|C_\varphi\|_e^2 = \sup_{\lambda \in \partial\mathbb{D}} \|\sigma_\lambda\|,$$

where σ_λ is the singular part of m_λ . In particular, it follows that C_φ is compact on the Hardy space H^2 if and only if all the measures m_λ are absolutely continuous. If φ is a holomorphic-self map of \mathbb{D} , then Liu, Cao and Wang [5] show that C_φ is bounded on each of the Hardy-Orlicz spaces. Furthermore, they discuss the compactness of C_φ on a particular subspace of H^Φ , a question that is intimately related to the main result of this paper. In fact, we are inspired by the following results.

(1). If C_φ is compact on one of the Hardy space H^p for some p ($0 < p < \infty$), then it is compact on all of the Hardy spaces H^p ($0 < p < \infty$) [10].

(2). A holomorphic composition operator is compact on L^1 if and only if it is compact on H^2 [11].

(3). For an arbitrary φ the compactness of C_φ on Hardy spaces H^p is quite different from the compactness of C_φ on weighted Bergman spaces A_α^p . For example, there exists inner function φ such that C_φ is compact on A_α^p for all p ($0 < p < \infty$) and for all α ($-1 < \alpha < \infty$) but it is well known that no inner function can induce a compact composition operator on any Hardy space H^p [7].

(4). That C_φ is compact on the Nevanlinna class N if and only if it is compact on H^2 [1].

All these results lead us to ask whether the compactness of C_φ on Hardy-Orlicz spaces implies compactness of C_φ on H^2 and conversely. The purpose of this paper is to give an affirmative answer to this question.

2. Preliminaries

Let $H(\mathbb{D})$ denote the space of all holomorphic functions on \mathbb{D} . Let σ denote the normalized Lebesgue measure on the unit circle $\partial\mathbb{D}$, that is, $\sigma(\partial\mathbb{D}) = 1$. Let $ST^2(\mathbb{R})$ denote the class of strongly convex functions $\Phi : [-\infty, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ (that is, Φ is non-negative, convex and nondecreasing with $\frac{\Phi(t)}{t} \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$), which satisfy

- (i) $\Phi(t) = 0$ for all $t < 0$ with $\Phi(0) = \Phi'(0) = 0$,
- (ii) Φ'' exists for all $t > 0$ and,
- (iii) $\Phi(2t) \leq C\Phi(t)$ for some positive constant C and for all $t > 0$.

For $\Phi \in ST^2(\mathbb{R})$, we define the Hardy-Orlicz space H^Φ by

$$H^\Phi = \left\{ f \in H(\mathbb{D}) : \sup_{0 < r < 1} \int_{\partial\mathbb{D}} \Phi(\log^+ |f(re^{i\theta})|) d\sigma < \infty \right\}.$$

Although the integral expression above does not define a norm in H^Φ , it holds that the distance

$$d(f, g) = \int_{\partial\mathbb{D}} \Phi(\log^+ |f(re^{i\theta}) - g(re^{i\theta})|) d\sigma$$

defines a translation-invariant metric on H^Φ , and turns H^Φ into a complete metric space. Abusing notation, we will denote

$$\|f\|_\Phi = \sup_{0 < r < 1} \int_{\partial\mathbb{D}} \Phi(\log^+ |f(re^{i\theta})|) d\sigma,$$

for $f \in H^\Phi$. Obviously, the inequalities

$$\log^+ x \leq \log(1 + x) \leq 1 + \log^+ x, \quad x \geq 0$$

and

$$2 \log^+ x \leq \log(1 + x^2) \leq 1 + 2 \log^+ x, \quad x \geq 0$$

and the fact that Φ is nondecreasing convex function imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\log^+ x) &\leq \Phi(\log(1 + x)) \leq \Phi(1 + \log^+ x) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\Phi(2) + \frac{1}{2}\Phi(2 \log^+ x) \leq \frac{1}{2}\Phi(2) + \frac{1}{2}C\Phi(\log^+ x) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\log^+ x) &\leq \Phi(2 \log^+ x) \leq \Phi(\log(1 + x^2)) \leq \Phi(1 + 2 \log^+ x) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\Phi(2) + \frac{1}{2}\Phi(4 \log^+ x) \leq \frac{1}{2}\Phi(2) + \frac{1}{2}C\Phi(\log^+ x). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $f \in H^\Phi$ if and only if

$$\sup_{0 < r < 1} \int_{\partial \mathbb{D}} \Phi(\log(1 + |f(re^{i\theta})|)) d\sigma < \infty$$

or if and only if

$$\sup_{0 < r < 1} \int_{\partial \mathbb{D}} \Phi(\log(1 + |f(re^{i\theta})|^2)) d\sigma < \infty.$$

3. Compactness

As noted in the introduction, we want to prove the following result.

THEOREM 3.1. *Let $\Phi \in ST^2(\mathbb{R})$ and φ be a holomorphic self-map of \mathbb{D} . Then C_φ is compact on H^Φ if and only if C_φ is compact on H^2 .*

In order to prove the theorem, we need a series of lemmas.

First of all we recall the remarkable formula of C.S. Stanton for integral means of subharmonic functions in the disk \mathbb{D} [13]. If u is a positive subharmonic function on \mathbb{D} and φ is a holomorphic self-map of \mathbb{D} , then for $0 < r < 1$,

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} u(\varphi(re^{i\theta})) d\theta = u(\varphi(0)) + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{r\mathbb{D}} N_\varphi(r, z) d\mu(z),$$

where μ is the Riesz measure of u , and $N_\varphi(r, \cdot)$ denotes the partial Nevanlinna counting function of φ defined by

$$N_\varphi(r, z) = \sum_{w \in \varphi^{-1}(z), |w| \leq r} \log \frac{r}{|w|}$$

for $r \in (0, 1)$. Let f be an analytic map. Applying Stanton's formula to the subharmonic function $z \rightarrow \Phi(\log(1 + |f(z)|^2))$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \Phi(\log(1 + |f(\varphi(re^{i\theta}))|^2)) d\theta = \Phi(\log(1 + |f(\varphi(0))|^2)) + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{r\mathbb{D}} N_\varphi(r, z) d\mu(z),$$

where μ is the Riesz measure of $\Phi(\log(1 + |f(z)|^2))$. An easy calculation on the same lines as in [14] yields that, if $\Phi \in ST^2(\mathbb{R})$, $f \in H(\mathbb{D})$ and $g(z) = \Phi(\log(1 + |f(z)|^2))$, $z \in \mathbb{D}$, then

$$\nabla^2 g(z) = 4[\Phi''(\log(1 + |f(z)|^2))|f(z)|^2 + \Phi'(\log(1 + |f(z)|^2))] \frac{|f'(z)|^2}{(1 + |f(z)|^2)^2}$$

and the Riesz measure μ_g of g is given by

$$d\mu_g(z) = 4[\Phi''(\log(1 + |f(z)|^2))|f(z)|^2 + \Phi'(\log(1 + |f(z)|^2))] \frac{|f'(z)|^2}{(1 + |f(z)|^2)^2} dA(z),$$

where $dA(z)$ is the two dimensional area measure on \mathbb{D} .

Set

$$f^\Phi(z) = \frac{2}{\pi} [\Phi''(\log(1 + |f(z)|^2))|f(z)|^2 + \Phi'(\log(1 + |f(z)|^2))] \frac{|f'(z)|^2}{(1 + |f(z)|^2)^2}.$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \Phi(\log(1 + |f(\varphi(re^{i\theta}))|^2)) d\theta \\ = \Phi(\log(1 + |f(\varphi(0))|^2)) + \int_{r\mathbb{D}} f^\Phi(z) N_\varphi(r, z) dA(z). \end{aligned}$$

Since $N_\varphi(r, z)$ increases monotonically to $N_\varphi(z)$, an application of Monotone convergence theorem yields

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \Phi(\log(1 + |f(re^{i\theta})|^2)) d\theta \\ = \Phi(\log(1 + |f(\varphi(0))|^2)) + \int_{\mathbb{D}} f^\Phi(z) N_\varphi(z) dA(z). \end{aligned}$$

The important special case of the previous formula is obtained if we choose φ to be the identity map.

$$\|f\|_\Phi \approx \Phi(\log(1 + |f(0)|^2)) + \int_{\mathbb{D}} f^\Phi(z) \log \frac{1}{|z|} dA(z).$$

The following lemma asserts that sequences that are norm bounded in H^Φ are uniformly bounded on compact subsets of \mathbb{D} . In other words, for $0 < r < 1$, there has to be a uniform bound for all point-evaluation functionals corresponding to points in $r\mathbb{D}$.

LEMMA 3.2. *Let $\Phi \in ST^2(\mathbb{R})$. Then for $z = \rho e^{i\theta} \in \mathbb{D}$*

$$|f(z)| \leq \exp\left(\Phi^{-1}\left(\frac{2\|f\|_\Phi}{1-\rho}\right)\right)$$

for all $f \in H^\Phi$.

Proof. Since f is analytic

$$f(z) = \int_0^{2\pi} P(r, \theta - t) f(e^{it}) d\sigma(t),$$

where $P(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the Poisson kernel. Replacing the unit disk \mathbb{D} by $r\mathbb{D}$, where $0 < r < 1$ is arbitrarily fixed, we get for $0 \leq \rho < 1$,

$$f(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} P(\rho e^{i\theta}, re^{i\theta}) f(e^{it}) dt.$$

Since $\Phi(\log^+ |f|)$ is convex and increasing, we have by Jensen's inequality

$$\Phi(\log^+ |f(\rho e^{i\theta})|) \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} P(\rho e^{i\theta}, re^{i\theta}) \Phi(\log^+ |f(re^{i\theta})|) dt.$$

Using the inequality $P(\rho e^{i\theta}, r e^{i\theta}) \leq \frac{2}{r - \rho}$, we get

$$\Phi(\log^+ |f(\rho e^{i\theta})|) \leq \frac{2}{1 - \rho} \|f\|_\Phi.$$

That is,

$$|f(z)| \leq \exp\left(\Phi^{-1}\left(\frac{2\|f\|_\Phi}{1 - \rho}\right)\right). \quad \blacksquare$$

The following lemma characterizes the compactness of C_φ on H^Φ in terms of sequential convergence.

LEMMA 3.3. *Let φ be a holomorphic self-map of \mathbb{D} . Then C_φ is compact on H^Φ if and only if for every sequence $\{f_n\}$, which is norm bounded and converges to zero uniformly on compact subsets of \mathbb{D} , we have $\|f_n \circ \varphi\|_\Phi \rightarrow 0$.*

The proof is similar to that of Proposition 3.11 in [3]. So we omit the details.

In what follows we say that a positive Borel measure μ on $\bar{\mathbb{D}}$ is a vanishing Carleson measure if

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(S(\delta, \zeta))}{\delta} = 0$$

uniformly in $\zeta \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ where $0 < \delta < 1$ and $S(\delta, \zeta) = \{z \in \mathbb{D} : |z - \zeta| < \delta\}$. The next criterion for compactness of C_φ on H^2 which is due to Shapiro [12] and MacCluer [6] is useful in the proof of the main result.

LEMMA 3.4. *For a holomorphic self-map φ of \mathbb{D} , the following are equivalent:*

- (i) C_φ is compact on H^2 .
- (ii) $N_\varphi(z) = o\left(\log \frac{1}{|z|}\right)$ as $|z| \rightarrow 1^-$.
- (iii) The pull-back measure $\mu_\varphi = \sigma \circ \varphi^{-1}$ is a vanishing Carleson measure on $\bar{\mathbb{D}}$.

We are now in a position to prove the main result of this paper.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. First assume that C_φ is compact on H^2 . The approach to the proof comes from [13, Chapter 10]. Fix a sequence $\{f_n\}$ that is bounded by a finite constant M in H^Φ and converges to zero uniformly on compact subsets of \mathbb{D} . By Lemma 3.3, it is enough to show that $\|f_n \circ \varphi\|_\Phi \rightarrow 0$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. Then it follows by Lemma 3.4, that we can choose r , $0 < r < 1$ such that

$$N_\varphi(z) < \epsilon \log \frac{1}{|z|}, \text{ whenever } r \leq |z| < 1.$$

Since $f_n \rightarrow 0$ uniformly on compact subsets of \mathbb{D} , so is f'_n . Thus we can choose $\eta(\epsilon)$ so that

$$|f_n| < \sqrt{\epsilon} \text{ and } |f'_n| < \sqrt{\epsilon}$$

on $r\mathbb{D}$ whenever $n > \eta(\epsilon)$. Hence for such n we have

$$\|C_\varphi f_n\|_\Phi \leq \Phi(\log(1 + |f_n(\varphi(0))|^2)) + \int_{\mathbb{D}} f_n^\Phi(z) N_\varphi(z) dA(z).$$

Since $|f_n(\varphi(0))| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ so

$$\Phi(\log(1 + |f_n(\varphi(0))|^2)) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

Thus it remains to show that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{D}} f_n^\Phi(z) N_\varphi(z) dA(z) = 0.$$

Now

$$\int_{\mathbb{D}} f_n^\Phi(z) N_\varphi(z) dA(z) = \int_{r\mathbb{D}} + \int_{\mathbb{D} \setminus r\mathbb{D}} f_n^\Phi(z) N_\varphi(z) dA(z) = I + II.$$

We first show that the first term above is bounded by a constant multiple of ϵ .

$$\begin{aligned} I &\leq \frac{2}{\pi} (\Phi''(\log(1 + \epsilon)\epsilon + \Phi'(\log(1 + \epsilon))) \epsilon \int_{r\mathbb{D}} N_\varphi(z) dA(z) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\pi} (\Phi''(\log(1 + \epsilon)\epsilon + \Phi'(\log(1 + \epsilon))) \epsilon (\|\varphi\|_\Phi - |\varphi(0)|^2)) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\pi} (\Phi''(\log(1 + \epsilon)\epsilon + \Phi'(\log(1 + \epsilon))) \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we show that the second term above is bounded by a constant multiple of ϵ .

$$II \leq \epsilon \int_{\mathbb{D} \setminus r\mathbb{D}} f_n^\Phi(z) \log \frac{1}{|z|} dA(z) \leq \epsilon (\|f_n\|_\Phi - \log(1 + |f_n(0)|^2)) \leq \epsilon \|f_n\|_\Phi \leq \epsilon M.$$

To prove the converse direction we assume that C_φ is compact on H^Φ . Because of Lemma 3.4, we only need to verify that the pull-back measure $\sigma \circ \varphi^{-1}$ is a vanishing Carleson measure on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. To prove this let $a = (1 - \delta)\zeta$, where $\zeta \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ and $0 < \delta < 1$. Let

$$g_a(e^{i\theta}) = \frac{1 - |a|^2}{|1 - \bar{a}e^{i\theta}|^2}.$$

Then g_a is non-negative and $g_a \in L^1(d\sigma)$. Let $K(e^{i\theta}) = \Phi^{-1}(g_a(e^{i\theta}))$. Then K is well defined, for K is strictly increasing in the range of g_a . Since Φ is convex, Φ^{-1} is concave and so there is a constant $C > 0$ such that $\Phi^{-1}(s) \leq Cs$ for sufficiently large s . Thus $K \in L^1(d\sigma)$. We set

$$h(z) = \exp \left\{ \int_0^{2\pi} H(z, e^{it}) K(e^{it}) d\sigma(t) \right\},$$

where $H(z, e^{it})$ denotes the Herglotz kernel for \mathbb{D} ; namely,

$$H(z, e^{it}) = \frac{e^{it} + z}{e^{it} - z}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Then

$$\Phi(\log^+ |h(e^{i\theta})|) = \Phi(K(e^{i\theta})) = g_a(e^{i\theta}) \in L^1(d\sigma).$$

This means that $h \in H^\Phi$. Let

$$f_a(z) = \frac{2(1 - |a|)^2}{(1 - \bar{a}z)^2} h(z).$$

Then clearly $f_a \rightarrow 0$ uniformly on compact subsets of \mathbb{D} as $|a| \rightarrow 1$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_a\|_\Phi &= \sup_{0 < r < 1} \int_0^{2\pi} \Phi(\log^+ |f_a(re^{i\theta})|) d\sigma(\theta) \\ &\leq \sup_{0 < r < 1} \int_0^{2\pi} \Phi(\log^+(2|h(re^{i\theta})|)) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \\ &\leq \sup_{0 < r < 1} \int_0^{2\pi} \Phi\left(\log^+ 2 + \log^+ \left(\exp \left\{ \int_0^{2\pi} H(re^{i\theta}, e^{it}) K(e^{it}) d\sigma(t) \right\}\right)\right) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \Phi(2 \log^+ 2) + \frac{1}{2} C \sup_{0 < r < 1} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{1 - |a|^2}{|1 - \bar{a}re^{i\theta}|^2} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} = \frac{1}{2} \Phi(2 \log^+ 2) + \frac{1}{2} C. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1 - |a|^2}{|1 - \bar{a}z|^2} &\geq \Re\left(\frac{1 - |a|^2}{(1 - \bar{a}z)^2}\right) = \frac{1 - |a|^2}{(1 - |a|)^2} \Re\left(\frac{1 - |a|}{1 - \bar{a}z}\right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1 - |a|^2}{(1 - |a|)^2} \Re\left(1 + \frac{|a|(1 - z\bar{\zeta})}{(1 - |a|)}\right)^{-2}, \quad (\zeta = \frac{a}{|a|}) \\ &> \frac{1}{2} \frac{1 - |a|^2}{(1 - |a|)^2} \geq \frac{1}{2\delta}, \end{aligned}$$

if $\frac{|1 - z\bar{\zeta}|}{1 - |a|} < \gamma_0$ for some fixed $0 < \gamma_0 < 1/4$, that is, if $z \in S(\gamma_0\delta, \zeta)$. That is,

$$\Phi^{-1}\left(\frac{1 - |a|^2}{|1 - \bar{a}z|^2}\right) \geq \Phi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{2\delta}\right)$$

if $z \in S(\gamma_0\delta, \zeta)$. Thus for $z \in S(\gamma_0\delta, \zeta)$,

$$\Phi(\log^+ |f_a(z)|) = \Phi(\log^+ \frac{2(1 - |a|)^2}{(1 - \bar{a}z)^2} |h(z)|) \geq \Phi(\log^+(\exp \Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{2\delta}))) = \frac{1}{2\delta}.$$

Hence for all $\zeta \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ and $0 < \delta < 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\delta} \mu_\varphi(S(\gamma_0\delta, \zeta)) &\leq \int_{S(\gamma_0\delta, \zeta)} \Phi(\log^+ |f_a(z)|) d\mu_\varphi(z) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{D}} \Phi(\log^+ |f_a(z)|) d\mu_\varphi(z) \\ &\leq \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \int_0^{2\pi} \Phi(\log^+ |(f_a \circ \varphi)(re^{i\theta})|) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} = \|f_a \circ \varphi\|_\Phi. \end{aligned}$$

But the compactness of C_φ on H^Φ forces $\|f_a \circ \varphi\|_\Phi$ to tend to 0 as $|a| \rightarrow 1$, which implies that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu_\varphi(S(\gamma_0\delta, \zeta))}{\delta} = 0,$$

uniformly in $\zeta \in \partial D$. Hence μ_φ is a vanishing-Carleson measure on \mathbb{D} . ■

REMARK. One can certainly consider H^Φ spaces when either Φ does not belong to $ST^2(\mathbb{R})$ or Φ is log-convex but not convex. However, Theorem 3.1 may fail if we consider Hardy-Orlicz space H^Φ induced by an arbitrary convex. For example, if Φ is a non-negative function on \mathbb{R} such that $\Phi(x) \rightarrow 0$, as $x \rightarrow -\infty$, and Φ is non-decreasing but $\Phi(x) > 0$ for some $x \neq 0$, then compactness of C_φ on H^Φ is quite different from the compactness of C_φ on H^2 . Here H^Φ is defined as follows;

$$H^\Phi = \left\{ f \in H(\mathbb{D}) : \int_0^{2\pi} \Phi(\log|\gamma f(re^{i\theta})|) d\sigma(\theta) \right. \\ \left. \text{is bounded for } 0 \leq r < 1 \text{ and for some } \gamma > 0. \right\}$$

In fact, if we take $\Phi(x) = 0$ for $x \leq 1$, and $\Phi(x) = \infty$ for $x > 1$, then H^Φ becomes H^∞ and it is well known that the C_φ is compact on H^∞ if and only if $\|\varphi\|_\infty < 1$ [9]. Thus $\varphi(z) = 1 - (1 - z)^b$ $0 < b < 1$ is a conformal map of \mathbb{D} whose closure intersects the unit circle only at 1 and so φ induces a non-compact composition operator on H^∞ . However φ induces a compact composition operator on H^2 [3, p. 131].

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT. We are extremely thankful to referees for going through the manuscript thoroughly and pointing out several typographical and mathematical errors which strengthened the manuscript a lot.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. S. Choa and H. O. Kim, *Compact composition operators on the Nevanlinna class*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **125** (1997), 145–151.
- [2] J. Cima and A. Matheson, *Essential norms of a Composition operators and Aleksandrov Measures*, Pacific J. Math. **179** (1997), 59–63.
- [3] C. C. Cowen and B. D. MacCluer, *Composition Operators on Apaces of Analytic Functions*, CRC Press Boca Raton, New York, 1995.
- [4] J. E. Littlewood, *On inequalities in the theory of functions*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **23** (1925)
- [5] L. Liu, G. Cao and X. Wang, *Composition operators on Hardy-Orlicz spaces*, Acta Math. Sci. Ser. B Engl. Ed. **25** (2005), 105–111.
- [6] B. D. MacCluer, *Compact composition operators on $H^p(B_N)$* , Michigan Math. J. **32** (1985), 237–248.
- [7] B. D. MacCluer and J. H. Shapiro, *Angular derivatives and compact composition operators on Hardy and Bergman spaces*, Can. J. Math. **38** (1986), 878–906.
- [8] M. M. Rao and Z. D. Ren, *Theory of Orlicz Spaces*, Dekker, New York, 1991.
- [9] H. J. Schwartz, *Composition operators on H^p* , Thesis, University of Toledo, 1969.
- [10] J. H. Shapiro and P. D. Taylor, *Compact, nuclear and Hilbert-Schmidt composition operators on H^2* , Indiana Univ. Math J. **23** (1973), 471–496.
- [11] J. H. Shapiro and C. Sundberg, *Compact composition operators on L^1* , Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **108** (1990), 443–449.
- [12] J. H. Shapiro, *The essential norm of a composition operator*, Ann. Math. **125** (1987), 375–404.
- [13] J. H. Shapiro, *Composition Operators and Classical Function Theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York. 1993.

[14] M. Stoll, *A Characterization of Hardy-Orlicz spaces on Planar Domains*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **117** (1993) 1032–1038.

(received 15.08.2007, in revised form 18.10.2007)

Department of Mathematics, University of Jammu, Jammu-180006, India
E-mail: aksju.76@yahoo.com, somdatt_jammu@yahoo.co.in