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Abstract. A complete characterization of nearly-invariant subspaces of finite defect for the backward shift operator acting on the Hardy space is provided in the spirit of Hitt and Sarason’s theorem. As a corollary we describe the almost-invariant subspaces for the shift and its adjoint.

1. Introduction

Let $B$ be an infinite-dimensional separable complex Banach space, and $T \in \mathcal{L}(B)$ a linear bounded operator on $B$. A subspace, that is, a closed linear manifold $M$ is called invariant if $T(M) \subset M$. Further, $M$ is said to be almost-invariant if there exists a finite-dimensional subspace $F$ of $B$ such that

$$TM \subset M + F.$$ 

In such a case, the smallest possible dimension of such $F$ is called the defect of the space $M$.

A well-known feature is that the structure of the invariant subspaces of an operator $T$ plays an important role in giving a better understanding of its action on the whole space. To that aim, Androulakis, Popov, Tcaciuc and Troitsky [1] initiated in 2009 the study of almost-invariant half-spaces of operators $T$ acting on complex Banach spaces. Recall that a half-space is a space of infinite dimension and infinite codimension. Observe also that every subspace $M$ of $B$ that is not a half-space is clearly almost-invariant under any operator.

In 2013, Popov and Tcaciuc [11] proved that adjoint operators on dual spaces have almost-invariant half-spaces; and in particular every operator on a complex infinite-dimensional reflexive Banach space has an almost-invariant half-space. Recently, Sirotkin and Wallis [13] have studied the structure of almost-invariant half-spaces of some operators, proving, in particular, that every quasinilpotent operator on any infinite dimensional separable complex Banach space $B$ (not necessarily reflexive) admits an almost-invariant
half-space. A recent preprint of Tcaciuc [14] shows that the same holds for any linear bounded operator acting on $B$ (not necessarily reflexive).

As Androulakis et al. [1] pointed out, the natural question whether the usual unilateral right shift operator $S$ acting on the Hilbert space $H^2$ has almost-invariant half-spaces has an affirmative answer. It is well known that this operator has even invariant half-spaces. Indeed, by Beurling’s Theorem [3], any shift invariant subspace has the form $\theta H^2$, where $\theta$ is an inner function, that is, an analytic function in the unit disc $D$ with contractive values ($|\theta(z)| \leq 1$ for $z \in D$) such that its boundary values

$$\theta(e^{it}) := \lim_{r \to 1^-} \theta(re^{it})$$

(which exists for almost every $e^{it}$ with respect to Lebesgue measure on the unit circle) have modulus one for almost all $e^{it}$. Moreover, every inner function $\theta$ can be factorized, in principle, as a product of two inner functions: one collecting all the zeroes of $\theta$ in $D$ (a Blaschke product), and the other, lacking zeroes in $D$, a singular inner function (i.e., it can be expressed by means of an integral formula involving a singular measure on the unit circle) (see [8], for instance). From here, it is not difficult to see that $M$ is an invariant half-space for $S$ if and only if $M = \theta H^2$ with $\theta$ not a finite Blaschke product.

The aim of this work is studying almost-invariant spaces for the unilateral shift operator in the Hardy space. We will provide a complete characterization in terms of nearly invariant subspaces for the adjoint $S^*$. Recall that a subspace $M$ is nearly invariant for $S^*$ if $S^* f \in M$ whenever $f \in M$ and $f(0) = 0$. This concept can be traced back to Sarason’s work [12] (see also [7], where they were called weakly invariant).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall some preliminaries and observe that every nearly invariant subspace for $S^*$ is indeed an almost-invariant subspace for $S$. In Section 3, we will prove our main theorem. To that end, we introduce the definition of nearly invariant subspaces with defect $m$ for $S^*$, as a generalization of nearly invariant subspaces, and classify them together with the almost-invariant subspaces. As a consequence, we can describe the almost-invariant subspaces for $S$. In Section 4, we discuss the same issues for the bilateral shift on $L^2(T)$. We also provide examples of almost-invariant subspaces for the unilateral and bilateral shifts that do not contain any nontrivial invariant subspaces.

2. A first approach: nearly invariant subspaces for $S^*$

Let $D$ denote the open unit disc of the complex plane and $H^2$ the classical Hardy space, that is, the space consisting of analytic functions $f$ on $D$ such that the norm

$$\|f\| = \left( \sup_{0 \leq r < 1} \int_0^{2\pi} |f(re^{it})|^2 \frac{dt}{2\pi} \right)^{1/2}$$

is finite. A classical result due to Fatou (see [5], for instance) states that the radial limit $f(e^{it}) := \lim_{r \to 1^-} f(re^{it})$ exists a.e. on the boundary $T$. In this regard, it is well known
that $H^2$ can be regarded as a closed subspace of $L^2(\mathbb{T})$, and moreover, $L^2(\mathbb{T})$ may be decomposed in the following way

$$L^2(\mathbb{T}) = H^2 \oplus \overline{H^2_0},$$

where $\overline{H^2_0} = \{ f \in L^2(\mathbb{T}) : \overline{f} \in H^2$ and $f(0) = 0 \}$. Note that in the above identity we are identifying $H^2$ through the non-tangential boundary values of the $H^2$ functions.

Throughout this paper, $\langle \ , \ \rangle$ will denote the inner product in $L^2(\mathbb{T})$.

Let $S$ denote the unilateral shift acting on $H^2$, that is, $Sf(z) = zf(z)$, for $z \in \mathbb{D}$. The adjoint $S^*$ is defined in $H^2$ as the operator

$$S^*f(z) = \frac{f(z) - f(0)}{z}, \quad (z \in \mathbb{D}),$$

for $f \in H^2$. As was pointed out in the introduction, Beurling’s Theorem provides a complete characterization of the lattice of the invariant subspaces of $S$; and therefore of the lattice of the invariant subspaces for $S^*$; that is, $K_\theta := (\theta H^2)^\perp$, with $\theta$ an inner function. These spaces are usually referred to as model spaces (we refer to Nikolskii’s monograph for more on the subject).

The concept of nearly invariant subspace for $S^*$, already mentioned and defined in the introduction, was introduced by Sarason in [12].

**Definition 2.1.** A closed subspace $M \subset H^2$ is said to be nearly invariant for $S^*$ if whenever $f \in M$ and $f(0) = 0$, then $S^*f \in M$.

Nearly invariant subspaces for $S^*$ were characterized by Hitt [7] and Sarason [12]. More precisely, any nontrivial nearly invariant subspace has the form $M = gK$ where $g$ is the element of $M$ of unit norm which has positive value at the origin and is orthogonal to all elements of $M$ vanishing at the origin (the reproducing kernel in $M$ at 0), $K$ is an $S^*$-invariant subspace (so, if nontrivial, $K_\theta$ for some inner function $\theta$), and the operator $M_g$ of multiplication by $g$ is everywhere defined and isometric from $K$ into $H^2$.

Our first observation provides a link between nearly invariant subspaces for $S^*$ and almost-invariant spaces for $S$.

**Proposition 2.2.** Every nearly invariant subspace $M = gK_\theta$ for $S^*$ is almost-invariant for $S$ with defect 1. Moreover, if $\theta$ is not rational, it is an almost-invariant half-space with defect 1.

**Proof.** First, we claim that $SK_\theta \subset K_\theta + \mathbb{C}\theta$. Indeed, the orthocomplement is given by

$$(K_\theta + \mathbb{C}\theta)^\perp = \theta H^2 \cap (\mathbb{C}\theta)^\perp = z\theta H^2;$$

and $\langle z\theta h , zf \rangle = 0$ for any $h \in H^2$ and $f \in K_\theta$. Hence $z\theta H^2 \subset (zK_\theta)^\perp$, as claimed.
On the other hand, since the multiplication operator $M_\theta$ is everywhere defined and isometric from $K_\theta$ into $H^2$, one has $SM \subset M + Cg\theta$. This shows that $M$ is almost-invariant with defect 1. For the last statement, note that the fact that $M$ is a half-space follows straightforwardly since $\theta$ is not rational. This concludes the proof. □

Our next result will state that the orthocomplement of certain nearly invariant subspaces for $S^*$ are also almost-invariant for $S$ of defect 1. Before stating it, we need the following easy lemma.

**Lemma 2.3.** Let $\psi$ and $\theta$ be non-constant inner functions. Then $(\psi K_\theta)^\perp = \theta \psi H^2 \oplus K_\psi$.

**Proof.** Let $f \in H^2$. Then

$$\langle f, \psi k \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } k \in K_\theta \iff f\overline{\psi} \in \theta H^2 \oplus H^2_0 \iff f \in \theta \psi H^2 \oplus K_\psi,$$

where the last statement follows since $f \in H^2 \cap \psi H^2_0$ if and only if $f \in K_\psi$. This concludes the proof. □

With Lemma 2.3 in hand, we deduce the following result.

**Proposition 2.4.** Let $\psi$ and $\theta$ be non-constant inner functions. Then $(\psi K_\theta)^\perp$ is an almost-invariant space of defect 1. Moreover, if $\psi$ is not rational (finite Blaschke product); or if $\psi$ is rational but $\theta$ is not a rational inner function, then $(\psi K_\theta)^\perp$ is an almost-invariant half-space of defect 1.

**Proof.** The statement just follows bearing in mind that $SK_\psi \subset K_\psi + C \psi$ for any inner $\psi$ and the identity $(\psi K_\theta)^\perp = \theta \psi H^2 \oplus K_\psi$ proved in Lemma 2.3. Note that the hypotheses of the last statement ensure that the space has infinite dimension and infinite codimension (so it is a half-space). □

In this regard, we shall show that not every almost-invariant half-space $M$ for $S$ is, indeed, a nearly invariant subspace for $S^*$. In other words, the converse of Proposition 2.2 does not hold.

**Proposition 2.5.** There exist almost-invariant half-spaces for $S$ which are not nearly invariant for $S^*$. More precisely, if $\theta$ is not a rational inner function and $\theta(0) = 0$, then $(\theta K_\theta)^\perp$ is an almost-invariant half-space of defect 1, but not nearly invariant for $S^*$.

**Proof.** Let $\theta$ be an inner function, not rational, and satifying $\theta(0) = 0$. Let $f = \theta^2$. It follows that $f \in (\theta K_\theta)^\perp$, and $f(0) = 0$. Assume on the contrary that $(\theta K_\theta)^\perp$ is nearly invariant for $S^*$. Then $z \mapsto \frac{f(z)}{z}$ belongs to $(\theta K_\theta)^\perp = \theta^2 H^2 \oplus K_\theta$, by Lemma 2.3. Since $\theta(0) = 0$, there exists an inner function $\theta_1$ such that $\theta(z) = z\theta_1(z)$, and then

$$\frac{\theta^2(z)}{z} = \theta(z)\theta_1(z) = \theta^2(z)h(z) + k(z),$$
for some \( k \in K_\theta \) and \( h \in H^2 \). Since \( k \in K_\theta \cap \theta H^2 \), \( k(z) = 0 \) and then \( h(z) = \frac{1}{z} \), a contradiction.

\[ \square \]

3. Classification of nearly invariant subspaces

In order to describe the almost-invariant subspaces for \( S \), let us introduce the definition of nearly invariant subspaces with defect \( m \) for \( S^* \) as a generalization of nearly invariant subspaces.

**Definition 3.1.** A closed subspace \( M \subset H^2 \) is said to be nearly \( S^* \)-invariant with defect \( m \) if and only if there is an \( m \)-dimensional subspace \( F \) (which may be taken to be orthogonal to \( M \)) such that if \( f \in M \), \( f(0) = 0 \) then \( S^* f \in M \oplus F \). We say that \( M \) is \( S^* \) almost-invariant with defect \( m \) if and only if \( S^* M \subset M \oplus F \), where \( \dim F = m \).

Clearly \( S^* \) almost-invariance implies nearly \( S^* \)-invariance (with the same defect). The work of Hitt [7] shows a connection between the two concepts in the case of \( m = 0 \), as a nearly \( S^* \) invariant subspace has the form \( M = fK \), where \( K \) is an \( S^* \)-invariant subspace and \( f \in H^2 \) satisfies \( \| fk \| = \| k \| \) for all \( k \in K \). See also [4] for a vectorial version.

We shall generalize Hitt’s algorithm to obtain a representation of nearly \( S^* \)-invariant subspaces with defect \( m \) (finite), as follows.

Consider a subspace \( M \) that is nearly \( S^* \)-invariant with defect 1, so that \( F = \langle e_1 \rangle \), say, where \( \| e_1 \| = 1 \).

Suppose first that not all functions in \( M \) vanish at 0, and let \( f_0 \in M \) denote the normalized reproducing kernel at 0, so that \( f_0 = k_0 / \| k_0 \| \), where \( \langle f, k_0 \rangle = f(0) \) for all \( f \in M \). Clearly \( k_0(0) \neq 0 \), so \( f_0(0) \neq 0 \).

For each \( f \in M \) we may write \( f = \alpha_0 f_0 + f_1 \), where \( \alpha_0 \in \mathbb{C} \) and \( f_1(0) = 0 \). So \( S^* f_1 = g_1 + \beta_1 e_1 \) where \( g_1 \in M \) and \( \beta_1 \in \mathbb{C} \).

Thus

\[
(1) \quad f(z) = \alpha_0 f_0(z) + z g_1(z) + \beta_1 z e_1(z), \quad (z \in \mathbb{D}),
\]

and

\[
\| f \|^2 = |\alpha_0|^2 + \| f_1 \|^2 = |\alpha_0|^2 + \| g_1 \|^2 + |\beta_1|^2.
\]

We may now iterate this, starting with \( g_1 \), to obtain

\[
f(z) = (\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 z + \ldots + \alpha_{n-1} z^{n-1}) f_0(z) + z^n g_n(z) + (\beta_1 z + \ldots + \beta_n z^n) e_1(z),
\]

where

\[
\| f \|^2 = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} |\alpha_k|^2 + \| g_n \|^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{n} |\beta_k|^2.
\]
Now in fact $\|g_n\| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. This can be seen on writing $g_n = P_1 S^* P_2 g_{n-1}$, where $P_1$ is the orthogonal projection with kernel $\langle e_1 \rangle$ and $P_2$ the orthogonal projection with kernel $\langle f_0 \rangle$. Now the backward shift is a $C_0$ operator, so that $\|S^n h\| \to 0$ for all $h \in H^2$. It follows by applying [2, Lemma 3.3] to the adjoint operators that first $P_1 S^*$ is $C_0$ (with finite defect), and then, on applying the same lemma again, that $P_2 P_1 S^*$ is also $C_0$, and hence $\|g_n\| \to 0$.

Consequently, we may write

$$f(z) = \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k z^k \right) f_0 + \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \beta_k z^k \right) e_1, \quad (z \in \mathbb{D}),$$

where the sums converge in $H^2$ norm and indeed

$$\|f\|^2 = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |\alpha_k|^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\beta_k|^2.$$

We may alternatively express this as saying that $f \in M$ if and only if

$$f(z) = k_0(z) f_0(z) + z k_1(z) e_1(z),$$

where $(k_0, k_1)$ lies in a subspace $K \subseteq H^2 \times H^2$. Now, recall that $H^2 \times H^2$ can be identified with $H^2(\mathbb{D}; \mathbb{C}^2)$, that is, the space consisting of all analytic functions $F : \mathbb{D} \to \mathbb{C}^2$ such that

$$\|F\| = \left( \sup_{0 < r < 1} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \|F(re^{i\theta})\|_{C^2}^2 \, d\theta \right)^{1/2} < \infty.$$

By virtue of (2) we see that $K \subseteq H^2(\mathbb{D}; \mathbb{C}^2)$ is indeed closed. Moreover, $K$ is invariant under the backward shift $S^* \oplus S^*$, since in the algorithm above,

$$g_1 = S^* k_0 f_0 + z S^* k_1 e_1 \in M.$$

Conversely, if

$$M = \{ k_0 f_0 + z k_1 e_1 : (k_0, k_1) \in K \},$$

is a closed subspace of $H^2$, where $K$ is invariant under the backward shift, then $M$ is nearly $S^*$-invariant with defect 1.

If all the functions in $M$ vanish at 0, then there is no nontrivial reproducing kernel at 0, but the calculations are simpler, as we may replace (1) with

$$f(z) = z (g_1(z) + \beta_1 e_1(z)), \quad (z \in \mathbb{D}),$$

with $g_1 \in M$ and $\beta_1 \in \mathbb{C}$, where $\|g_1\|^2 + \|\beta_1\|^2 = \|f\|^2$. The algorithm is then iterated to yield

$$f(z) = \beta_1 z e_1(z) + \beta_2 z^2 e_1(z) + \ldots.$$

For general finite defect $m$ the analogous calculations produce the following result.
Theorem 3.2. Let $M$ be a closed subspace that is nearly $S^*$-invariant with defect $m$. Then:

(i) in the case where there are functions in $M$ that do not vanish at 0,

$$M = \{ f : f(z) = k_0(z)f_0(z) + z \sum_{j=1}^{m} k_j(z)e_j(z) : (k_0, \ldots, k_m) \in K \},$$

where $f_0$ is the normalized reproducing kernel for $M$ at 0, $\{e_1, \ldots, e_m\}$ is any orthonormal basis for $F$, and $K$ is a closed $S^* \oplus \cdots \oplus S^*$ invariant subspace of the vector-valued Hardy space $H^2(\mathbb{D}; \mathbb{C}^{m+1})$, and $\|f\|^2 = \sum_{j=0}^{m} \|k_j\|^2$.

(ii) In the case where all functions in $M$ vanish at 0,

$$M = \{ f : f(z) = z \sum_{j=1}^{m} k_j(z)e_j(z) : (k_1, \ldots, k_m) \in K \},$$

with the same notation as in (i), except that $K$ is now a closed $S^* \oplus \cdots \oplus S^*$ invariant subspace of the vector-valued Hardy space $H^2(\mathbb{D}; \mathbb{C}^m)$, and $\|f\|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \|k_j\|^2$.

Conversely, if a closed subspace $M \subset H^2$ has a representation as in (i) or (ii), then it is a nearly $S^*$-invariant subspace of defect $m$.

Remark 3.3. If $L$ is a non-trivial invariant subspace for $S^*$ and $x_0 \in H^2 \setminus L$, then it is clear that the subspace $L \oplus \mathbb{C}x_0$ is nearly invariant with defect 1. However, not all such subspaces occur in this way, since the example $M = \theta H^2$, where $\theta(0) = 0$, discussed above, occurs as case (ii) with $m = 1$, $K = H^2$, and $e_1 = S^*\theta$. However $M$ contains no nontrivial invariant subspace for $S^*$.

Note that $K^\perp$ can be described using the Lax–Beurling theorem (e.g. [10, Thm 3.1.7]), since it is invariant under $S \oplus \cdots \oplus S$. Indeed $K^\perp = \Theta H^2(\mathbb{D}; \mathbb{C}^r)$, where $0 \leq r \leq m + 1$ and $\Theta$ is inner in the matrix-valued version of $H^\infty$, that is $\Theta \in H^\infty(\mathbb{D}; \mathbb{L}(\mathbb{C}^r, \mathbb{C}^{m+1}))$ is an isometry almost everywhere on the unit circle.

Corollary 3.4. A closed subspace $M$ is an almost-invariant subspace for $S^*$ with defect $m$ if and only if it satisfies the conditions of Theorem 3.2, together with the extra condition that $S^*f_0 \in M \oplus F$ in case (i), while case (ii) is unchanged.

Remark 3.5. Note also that $S^*M \subset M \oplus F$ is equivalent to the condition that

$$(S(M \oplus F))^\perp \subset M^\perp = (M \oplus F)^\perp \oplus G,$$

where $G = F \oplus M^\perp$ and $\dim G = \dim F$; this gives an expression for $S$ almost-invariant subspaces too (see also [1]).

Note that it is impossible for a nontrivial subspace $M$ to satisfy $SM = M \oplus F$ with $F$ finite-dimensional, since this would imply that $M \subset SM$, and so $M \subset S^nM$ for all $n \geq 1$, and hence $M = \{0\}$.\[\]
Remark 3.6. We expect a version of Theorem 3.2 to hold in the case of the shift on the vector-valued Hardy space $H^2(D; \mathbb{C}^m)$, derived by methods similar to those of [4, Thm. 4.4]. We leave this as a subject for further investigation.

4. Almost invariant subspaces for the bilateral shift

Denote by $U$ the multiplication by $t \mapsto e^{it}$ on $L^2(\mathbb{T})$. Such operator is called the bilateral shift, it is unitary and $U^*f(\xi) = \bar{\xi}f(\xi)$ for all $f \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$. The famous Lax–Beurling theorem provides a complete description of the closed invariant subspace $M$ by $U$, namely:

- if $UM = M$, then there exists a Borel set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{T}$ such that $M = \{ f \in L^2(\mathbb{T}) : f(\xi) = 0 \text{ a.e. on } \Omega \}$;
- if $UM \subset M$, then there exists $\theta \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ such that $|\theta(\xi)| = 1 \text{ a.e. on } \mathbb{T}$ and $M = \theta H^2$.

It follows that one can easily describe the lattice of invariant subspaces of $U^{-1} = U^*$. Indeed, since $UM = M$ is equivalent to $U^{-1}M = M$ and since $UM \subset M$ is equivalent to $U^*M^\perp \subset M^\perp$, the invariant subspaces $N$ of $U^* = U^{-1}$ can be described as follows:

- if $U^*N = N$, then there exists a Borel set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{T}$ such that $M = \{ f \in L^2(\mathbb{T}) : f(\xi) = 0 \text{ a.e. on } \Omega \}$;
- if $U^*N \subset N$, then there exists $\theta \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ such that $|\theta(\xi)| = 1 \text{ a.e. on } \mathbb{T}$ and $N = \theta H^2$.

We first investigate almost-invariant subspaces for $U$ of defect 1. Our first observation shows that the case of the bilateral shift is drastically different from the case of the unilateral shift.

**Proposition 4.1.** Let $M$ be a closed subspace of $L^2(\mathbb{T})$ such that

$$ U(M) = M \oplus^\perp \mathbb{C}x_0. $$

Then $M = \theta H^2$ for some $\theta \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ taking unimodular values on the unit circle a.e. Conversely, if $M = \theta H^2$ as above, then $U(M) = M \oplus^\perp \mathbb{C}x_0$ where $x_0 = \theta$.

**Proof.** Since $U^{-1}$ is isometric, it follows that $M = U^{-1}M \oplus^\perp CU^{-1}(x_0)$, which implies in particular that $U^{-1}(M) \subset M$. Our hypothesis implies that $U^{-1}M \neq M$, and the Lax–Beurling theorem says that there exists a unimodular function $\theta$ such that $M = \theta H^2$. The converse is clear. \qed

We also observe by the same argument that we cannot have $U(M) = M \oplus F$, with $\dim F > 1$, as in the case of $S$. 

The second case is not that easy to deal with. As in Proposition 4.1 (where this condition is automatically satisfied) we shall add the supplementary condition that $x_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$.

**Proposition 4.2.** Let $M$ be a closed subspace of $L^2(\mathbb{T})$ such that

$$U(M) \subseteq M + \mathbb{C}x_0,$$

where $x_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ with $\|x_0\|_2 = 1$. Then

$$M = \{ g + hx_0 : (g, h) \in K \},$$

where $K \subseteq L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times \overline{H^2_0}$ is a closed subspace invariant under $U \oplus P_-U$, where $P_- : L^2(\mathbb{T}) \to \overline{H^2_0}$ is the orthogonal projection.

**Proof.** Take $m_0 \in M$; then we can write $Um_0 = m_1 + \lambda_0 x_0$, where $m_1 \in M$ and $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C}$. Hence

$$m_0(z) = m_1(z)/z + \lambda_0 x_0 / z, \quad (z \in \mathbb{D}),$$

and by orthogonality $\|m_0\|^2 = \|m_1\|^2 + |\lambda_0|^2$.

Repeating this decomposition for $Um_1$, and continuing, we arrive at

$$m_0(z) = \frac{m_n(z)}{z^n} + \left( \frac{\lambda_0}{z} + \ldots + \frac{\lambda_{n-1}}{z^n} \right) x_0(z),$$

with

$$\|m_0\|^2 = \|m_n\|^2 + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} |\lambda_j|^2.$$

Clearly, letting $n \to \infty$, we see that $\lambda_0/z + \ldots + \lambda_{n-1}/z^n$ converges in $L^2$ norm to some $h \in \overline{H^2_0}$. Hence $m_n(z)/z^n$ also converges in $L^2$, with limit, $g$, say, and we have $\|g\|^2 + ||h||^2 = \|m_0\|^2$.

The set of pairs $(g, h)$ that can occur is clearly a linear subspace, and the fact that it is closed follows because it is the image of $M$ under an isometric mapping. Moreover, if $m_0$ corresponds to $(g, h)$, then $m_1$ corresponds to $(Ug, P_-Uh)$. \hfill \square

Note that the adjoint of $U \oplus P_-U$ is $U^* \oplus U^*|_{H^2_0}$, and its invariant subspaces are known thanks to the classical results of Lax–Beurling and Wiener. Thus we have a complete description in this case. Moreover, if $M$ has the representation (5), it is clearly an almost-invariant subspace for $U$ with defect 1.

In general, denote by $\langle x_0 \rangle$ the smallest invariant subspace for $U$ generated by $x_0$. Then the closure of $M \oplus \langle x_0 \rangle$ is invariant by $U$, and therefore $M^\perp \cap \langle x_0 \rangle^\perp$ is a closed invariant subspace for $U^{-1}$.

Obviously this information is useful only in the case where $\langle x_0 \rangle$ is not the whole space, which is a condition that we can reformulate thanks to Helson's theorem.
Theorem 4.3 (4). Let \( x_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{T}) \). The following assertions are equivalent:

1. \( \langle x_0 \rangle = L^2(\mathbb{T}) \);
2. \(|x_0(\xi)| > 0 \, \text{a.e. on } \mathbb{T} \) and \( \int_\mathbb{T} \log |x_0(\xi)| d\xi = -\infty \).

Assume that \( x_0 \) vanishes on a Borel subset \( \Omega \) of \( \mathbb{T} \) of positive measure, and denote by \( \Omega^c \) its complement set in \( \mathbb{T} \). Using the Lax–Beurling theorem, it follows that \( \langle x_0 \rangle \perp = \{ f \in L^2(\mathbb{T}) : f(\xi) = 0 \, \text{a.e. on } \Omega^c \} \) and then there exists a Borel subset \( \Omega_1 \supset \Omega \) of \( \mathbb{T} \) such that

\[ M \perp \cap \langle x_0 \rangle \perp = \{ f \in L^2(\mathbb{T}) : f(\xi) = 0 \, \text{a.e. on } \Omega_1 \}. \]

Assume now that \( |x_0(\xi)| > 0 \, \text{a.e. on } \mathbb{T} \) and that \( \log |x_0| \in L^1(\mathbb{T}) \). Using the Lax–Beurling theorem, there exists \( \theta \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T}) \) taking values on the unit circle a.e. such that \( \langle x_0 \rangle \perp = \theta H^2_0 \). It follows that

\[ M \perp \cap \theta H^2_0 = \theta_1 H^2_0, \]

with \( \theta_1 \) of modulus 1 a.e on the unit circle, and such that \( \theta_1 H^2_0 \subset \theta H^2_0 \). This last inclusion is equivalent to \( \theta H^2 \subset \theta_1 H^2 \), which means that there exists an inner function, say \( I \), such that \( \theta = I\theta_1 \).

Remark 4.4. As in Remark 3.3, we see that we can have \( U(M) \subset M \oplus \mathbb{C} x_0 \), with \( M \) not containing any nontrivial invariant subspace for \( U \). For if \( M = \theta H^2_0 \), with \( \theta \) unimodular, then we cannot have \( M \supset \chi_E L^2(\mathbb{T}) \) for any nontrivial subset \( E \subset \mathbb{T} \) (clearly), nor \( M \supset \phi H^2 \) for \( \phi \) unimodular, since in the second case we could write \( \phi = \theta \bar{g} \), where \( g \in H^2 \) and is necessarily inner; then \( \theta H^2_0 \subset \theta \bar{g} H^2 \), which is a contradiction since the right-hand side contains the function \( \theta \).

Finally, we would like to pose the following question:

Characterize the bilateral shift half-invariant subspaces with finite defect in \( L^2(\mathbb{T}) \).
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