

# Fixed points of the Ruelle-Thurston operator and the Cauchy transform \*

Genadi Levin †

Institute of Mathematics, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel

## Abstract

We give necessary and sufficient conditions for a function in a naturally appearing functional space to be a fixed point of the Ruelle-Thurston operator associated to a rational function, see Lemma 1.1. The proof uses essentially a recent [10]. As an immediate consequence, we revisit Theorem 1 and Lemma 5.2 of [11], see Theorem 1 and Lemma 1.2 below.

## 1 Statements and comments

Let  $f$  be a rational function of degree at least 2. The Ruelle-Thurston (pushforward) operator  $T_f$  associated to  $f$  acts on a function  $g$  as follows:

$$T_f g(x) = \sum_{w:f(w)=x} \frac{g(w)}{f'(w)^2}$$

whenever the right-hand side is well-defined. (See [20], [4], [14] and references therein for some background.) We say that  $H : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  which is defined Lebesgue almost everywhere is a fixed point of  $T_f$  if  $T_f H(z) = H(z)$  for almost every  $z \in \mathbf{C}$ .

Given a finite complex measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbf{C}$ , consider the Cauchy transform of  $\mu$ :

$$\hat{\mu}(z) = \int \frac{d\mu(w)}{w - z}. \quad (1)$$

---

\*Results of this note were reported partially in [9]

†Supported in part by ISF grant 1226/17

The integral converges absolutely Lebesgue almost everywhere and  $\mu$  is holomorphic in  $\mathbf{C} \setminus \text{supp}(\mu)$  (see Sect 2 for more details). We will assume additionally that  $\mu$  satisfies the following condition at  $\infty$ :

$$\int_{|z|>10} |z| \log |z| d|\mu|(z) < \infty. \quad (2)$$

In particular, (2) holds if  $\mu$  has a compact support on  $\mathbf{C}$ . Denote

$$A = \int d\mu(z) = \mu(\mathbf{C}), \quad B = \int z d\mu(z)$$

existing by (2). Note that  $\hat{\mu}$  is integrable at  $\infty$  if and only if  $A = B = 0$ . We use the following terminology and notations.

**Definition 1.1** (cf. [11]) *A compact  $E \subset \mathbf{C}$  is a  $A$ -compact if  $A(E) = R(E)$  where  $A(E)$  is the algebra of all continuous function on  $E$  which are analytic in the interior of  $E$  and  $R(E)$  is the algebra of uniform limits on  $E$  of rational functions with poles outside  $E$  (=uniform limits on  $E$  of functions holomorphic on  $E$ ).  $E \subset \mathbf{C}$  is a  $A$ -compact if  $M(E)$  is a  $A$ -compact for some (hence, any) Mobius transformation  $M$  such that  $M(E) \subset \mathbf{C}$ . If an  $A$ -compact  $E$  is nowhere dense, it is called a  $C$ -compact ( $C$ =continuous since in this case  $A(E) = C(E)$ , the set of all continuous functions on  $E$ ).*

Necessary and sufficient conditions for a compact in the plane to be  $A$ - or  $C$ -compact are given by Vitushkin [22]. In particular [6], a compact  $E$  is a  $C$ -compact if the area of  $E$  is zero.  $E$  is  $C$ -(respectively,  $A$ -)compact if every point of  $E$  (respectively, every point of  $\partial E$ ) belongs to the boundary of a component of the complement  $\mathbf{C} \setminus E$ , in particular, if the complement to  $E$  consists of a finitely many components or if  $E$  is (a closed subset of) the boundary of an open set (then  $E$  is a  $C$ -compact).

Recall that the Herman ring  $A$  is a periodic component of the Fatou set  $F(f)$  of  $f$  which is homeomorphic to an annulus. The boundary  $\partial A$  of  $A$  consists of two connected components.

**Definition 1.2** *Given a closed subset  $K$  of the Julia set  $J(f)$  of  $f$ , denote by  $\mathcal{H}(K)$  a collection of all Herman rings  $A$  of  $f$  such that  $\partial A \subset K$  and let*

$$\mathcal{H}_K = \cup \{\bar{A} : A \in \mathcal{H}(K)\}.$$

Main result is the following.

**Lemma 1.1** *Let  $f$  be a rational function which is not a flexible Lattes map.*

**1.** *Suppose  $f$  is normalized so that  $f(z) = \sigma z + b + O(1/z)$  for some  $\sigma \neq 0, \infty$ . Let  $\mu$  be a measure that satisfies (2) such that the function  $H(z) := \hat{\mu}(z)$  is a fixed point of the operator  $T_f$ . Assume that either (1.1) or (1.2) holds:*

(1.1)  $A = B = 0$ ,

(1.2) either  $|\sigma| > 1$ , or  $\sigma^q = 1$  for some  $q \in \mathbf{N}$  and  $b = 0$ , or  $\sigma = 1$  and  $A = 0$ .

Assume that  $K := \text{supp}(\mu) \subset J(f)$  and, moreover,

(CL)  $K$  is a  $C$ -compact.

Then  $\mu = 0$  outside  $\mathcal{H}_K$ , i.e.,  $K \subset \partial\mathcal{H}_K = \cup_{A \in \mathcal{H}(K)} \partial A$ . In particular,  $\mu = 0$  if  $\mathcal{H}_K = \emptyset$ . If  $\mu \neq 0$  and, additionally to (CL),

(AL)  $\mathcal{H}_K$  is a  $A$ -compact,

then the following representation holds:

$$\mu = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{H}(K)} \mu_A \quad (3)$$

where  $\mu_A$  is a measure supported on  $\partial A$ ,  $\mu_A$  is absolutely continuous w.r.t. harmonic measure of  $A$ , at least one of  $\mu_A$  is not trivial, and  $\mu_A, \mu_{A'}$  are mutually singular for  $A \neq A'$ . In particular,  $\mu$  is non-atomic. Moreover, if  $\mu_A \neq 0$ , then  $A \in \mathcal{H}(K)$  must satisfy the following property: if  $\psi_A : \Delta_A \rightarrow A$  is a holomorphic homeomorphism from a round annulus  $\Delta_A$  onto  $A$ , then  $1/\psi'_A$  is in the  $H^1$ -Hardy space, i.e.,

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\{z \in \Delta_A : \text{dist}(z, \partial\Delta_A) = \epsilon\}} \frac{|dw|}{|\psi'_A(w)|} < \infty \quad (4)$$

if  $\mathcal{H}_K \subset \mathbf{C}$  is bounded, and otherwise (4) holds for  $M(A)$  instead of  $A$  where  $M$  is a Mobius transformation such that  $M(\mathcal{H}_K)$  is a bounded subset of  $\mathbf{C}$ .

**2.** Vice versa, let  $\mathcal{H} = \{A, f(A), \dots, f^{q-1}(A)\}$  be the cycle of a Herman ring  $A$ . Assume that  $1/\psi'_A \in H^1$ . Then  $1/\psi'_B \in H^1$  for every  $B \in \mathcal{H}$  and there exists a finite complex measure  $\mu \neq 0$  which is supported on  $\cup_{B \in \mathcal{H}} \partial B$  such that:

(2.1)  $T_f \hat{\mu} = \hat{\mu}$  in  $\mathbf{C} \setminus \text{supp}(\mu)$  and  $\hat{\mu} = 0$  in  $\bar{\mathbf{C}} \setminus \cup_{B \in \mathcal{H}} \bar{B}$ ,

(2.2) the representation (3) holds (with  $\mathcal{H}$  instead of  $\mathcal{H}(K)$ ).

The measure  $\mu$  is unique in the following sense: if  $\nu$  is another measure with the same support  $\text{supp}(\nu) = \cup_{B \in \mathcal{H}} \partial B$  for which (2.1) holds with  $\mu$  replaced by  $\nu$ , then  $\nu = k\mu$  for some constant  $k \in \mathbf{C}$ .

Notice that if the boundary curves of a Herman ring  $A$  happen to be smooth enough (say  $C^2$ ) then  $1/\psi'_A \in H^1$ .

**Comment 1** Conjecturally, the union of closures of Herman rings of a rational function is always a  $A$ -compact, in particular, the condition (AL) always holds. Note that this is the case if, for example, boundaries of Herman rings are locally connected (e.g., Jordan curves) because in this case the complement to  $\mathcal{H}_K$  consists of a finitely many components.

**Comment 2** (cf. [2]) Condition (CL) can be replaced by the following one:

( $\widetilde{CL}$ )  $f$  carries no an invariant linefield on  $K$ .

This follows at once from Step III of the proof of Lemma 1.1, see Sect 3. The condition  $(\widetilde{CL})$  in the case when  $\mathcal{H}_K$  is empty, i.e.,  $K$  contains no boundaries of Herman rings was, in fact, observed in [2].

The proof of Lemma 1.1 goes along the following lines, see Section 3. First, using the contraction property of the operator  $T_f$ , it is shown that  $H = 0$  outside  $K \cup \mathcal{H}_K$ . If  $K$  contains no boundaries of Herman rings and  $K$  is a  $\mathbb{C}$ -compact, it follows that then  $\mu = 0$ . In fact, in this case the proof is not original and is more or less minor variation of arguments scattered in [4], [5], [13], [16], [12], [11]. The case that  $K$  does contain boundaries of Herman rings is the main content of the present note. In this case, we use some recent results about the Cauchy transform from [10]: the claim involving (CL) will follow from Lemma 2.1 and involving also (AL) - from Corollary 2.1 of [10], we state them in Sect 2 for the reader's convenience.

Let us draw a corollary which is suitable for the main application, Theorem 1. Suppose that  $V := \{v_1, \dots, v_\ell\} \subset J(f)$  is a collection of critical values of  $f$ . Let

$$K = \overline{\cup_{j=1}^{\ell} O^+(v_j)}$$

where  $O^+(x) = \{f^i(x)\}_{i \geq 0}$  denotes the forward orbit of a point  $x$ . Note that  $K \subset J(f)$ .

**Definition 1.3** Let  $\mathcal{H}_{crit}(V)$  be a subcollection of  $\mathcal{H}(K)$  of those Herman rings  $A$  such that there is a pair of different indices  $1 \leq i < i' \leq \ell$  with the property that  $O^+(v_i)$  is a dense subset of  $L := \cup_{k=0}^{q-1} f^k(L_A)$  and  $O^+(v_{i'})$  is a dense subset of  $L' := \cup_{k=0}^{q-1} f^k(L'_A)$  where  $L_A, L'_A$  are two components of  $\partial A$  and  $q$  is the period of  $A$ . Denote

$$\mathcal{H}_{crit,V} := \cup \{\overline{A} : A \in \mathcal{H}_{crit}(V)\}.$$

Now, suppose that, as in Lemma 1.1,  $f$  is not a flexible Lattes map with the normalization  $f(z) = \sigma z + b + O(1/z)$  at  $\infty$ . For each  $j \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ , let  $m_j$  be a (discrete, finite, complex) measure supported in  $O^+(v_j) \cap \mathbb{C}$ . Let us apply Lemma 1.1 to a measure  $m$  which is a linear combination of  $m_1, \dots, m_\ell$ .

**Lemma 1.2** (cf. [11], Lemma 5.2) Let

$$H(x) := \hat{m}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_k}{b_k - x}, \quad \sum_{k \geq 0} |\alpha_k| (1 + |b_k|^2) < \infty. \quad (5)$$

In particular,  $A = \sum_{k \geq 0} \alpha_k$ ,  $B = \sum_{k \geq 0} \alpha_k b_k$  exist. Assume that  $m_i(\{v_i\}) \neq 0$  whenever  $v_i$  is neither periodic nor in the forward orbit of any other  $v_{i'}$ ,  $i' \neq i$ . Assume, additionally, that the following conditions of the part 1 of Lemma 1.1 are satisfied: either (1.1) or (1.2) as well as (CL). Finally, assume

(AL<sub>cr</sub>)  $\mathcal{H}_{crit,V}$  is a  $A$ -compact.

Then  $T_f H = H$  implies  $m = 0$  (i.e.,  $H = 0$ ).

Indeed, let by a contradiction  $m \neq 0$  so that after perhaps throwing away some indices and re-numerating the rest, one can assume that  $m = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq \ell} a_j m_j$  where all  $a_j \neq 0$ . As, by (CL),  $K$  is a C-compact, by Lemma 1.1, part **1**,  $\text{supp}(m) \subset \partial\mathcal{H}_K$ , in particular, one can assume from the beginning that each  $O^+(v_j)$  falls into the boundary of some  $A \in \mathcal{H}(K)$ . If  $v_j$  is periodic, then this obviously implies that  $v_j$  is in the boundary of some herman ring. If  $v_j$  is not periodic, then  $v_j$  is in the forward orbit of some  $v_i$  which is neither periodic nor in the forward orbit of any other  $v_i$ . Hence,  $m(\{v_i\}) = a_i m_i(\{v_i\}) \neq 0$  which implies that again  $v_i$ , hence,  $v_j$  is in the boundary of some Herman ring. This proves that any  $v_j$  is in the boundary of some Herman ring. Therefore, the union  $\cup_{1 \leq j \leq \ell} O^+(v_j)$  is a dense subset of  $\partial\mathcal{H}(K)$ . Having that, the following **Claim** shows that  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{crit}}(V) = \mathcal{H}(K)$ , hence, by (AL<sub>cr</sub>), that  $\mathcal{H}(K)$  is a A-compact. Therefore, by Lemma 1.1, part **1**,  $m$  has no atom, a contradiction. **Claim.** *Let  $x$  be in a component  $L_A$  of the boundary of a Herman ring  $A$ . Then  $O^+(x)$  is either nowhere dense or (everywhere) dense in  $L = \cup_{k=0}^{q-1} f^k(L_A)$ ,  $q$  is the period of  $A$ . Indeed, assume without loss of generality that  $q = 1$  and that there is a ball  $B$  centered at a point of  $L (= L_A)$  such  $B \cap L = B \cap \omega(x)$ . As the harmonic measure of  $B \cap L$  is positive, there is a subset  $X_B$  of positive Lebesgue length in one of the boundary circle  $S$  of the annulus  $\Delta_A$  which uniformizes  $A$  such that for each  $w \in X_B$  there exists the radial limit  $\psi_A(w)$  of  $\psi_A : \Delta_A \rightarrow A$  and  $\psi_A(w) \in B$ . Hence, the set  $X = \cup_{i \geq 0} \lambda^i X_B$ , for the corresponding  $\lambda \in S^1$  where  $\psi_A^{-1} \circ f \circ \psi_A : w \mapsto \lambda w$ , has the full length in  $S$  and, for each  $w \in X$ ,  $\psi_A(w)$  exists and is in  $\omega(x)$ . Therefore,  $\omega(x)$  is a closed and dense subset of  $L$ , i.e.,  $\omega(x) = L$ . Thus either  $\omega(x)$  is nowhere dense in  $L$  or is equal to  $L$ .*

The proof of the following Theorem 1 is (literally) identical to the proof of Theorem 1 of [11] (see Sect 5.3 there), after replacing Lemmas 5.2-5.3 of [11] by Lemma 1.2. Recall that a critical point  $c$  of  $f$  with the forward orbit in  $\mathbf{C}$  is called summable if, for  $v = f(c)$ ,  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1+|f^n(v)|^2}{1+|v|^2} \frac{1}{|(f^n)'(v)|} < \infty$ .

**Theorem 1** (cf. [11], Theorem 1) *Let  $f$  be an arbitrary rational function of degree  $d \geq 2$  which is not a flexible Lattes example. Suppose that  $\{c_1, \dots, c_r\}$  is a collection of  $r$  summable critical points of  $f$ , and the union*

$$\mathcal{C} := \cup_{j=1}^r \omega(c_j)$$

*of their  $\omega$ -limit sets satisfies the following conditions:*

(C)  $\mathcal{C}$  is a C-compact,

(A<sub>cr</sub>)  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{crit}, \mathbf{v}}$  is a A-compact where  $\mathbf{v} := \{f(c_1), \dots, f(c_r)\}$ .

*Replacing if necessary  $f$  by its equivalent (i.e., Mobius conjugate), one can assume the forward orbits of  $c_1, \dots, c_r$  avoid infinity. Consider the set  $X_f$  of all rational functions of degree  $d$  which are close enough to  $f$  and have the same number  $p'$  of*

different critical points with the same corresponding multiplicities. Then there is a  $p'$ -dimensional manifold  $\Lambda_f$  and its  $r$ -dimensional submanifold  $\Lambda$ ,  $f \in \Lambda \subset \Lambda_f \subset X_f$ , with the following properties:

- (a) every  $g \in X_f$  is equivalent to some  $\hat{g} \in \Lambda_f$ ,
- (b) for every one-dimensional family  $f_t \in \Lambda$  through  $f$ , such that  $f_t(z) = f(z) + tu(z) + O(|t|^2)$  as  $t \rightarrow 0$ , if  $u \neq 0$ , then, for some  $1 \leq j \leq r$ , the limit

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\frac{d}{dt}|_{t=0} f_t^m(c_j(t))}{(f^{m-1})'(v_j)} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{u(f^n(c_j))}{(f^n)'(f(c_j))} \quad (6)$$

exists and is a non-zero number. Here  $c_j(t)$  is the critical point of  $f_t$ , such that  $c_j(0) = c_j$ , and  $v_j = f(c_j)$ .

In Theorem 1 of [11], the condition  $(A_{cr})$  of the present Theorem 1 was absent. Conjecturally,  $(A_{cr})$  holds always, see Comment 1. The case  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{C}) = \emptyset$  was covered in [11] (see also [2]). Here we treat the missing case, i.e, when boundaries of some Herman rings are contained in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

**Comment 3** • since  $\mathcal{C}$  is closed and forward invariant, either  $\mathcal{C}$  is nowhere dense or  $\mathcal{C} = \bar{\mathcal{C}} = J(f)$ , hence, under the condition  $(C)$ ,  $\mathcal{C}$  has to be nowhere dense,

- $\mathcal{C}$  is a  $C$ -compact if and only if  $\omega(c_j)$  is a  $C$ -compact for every  $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ . If  $c_j \in \partial U$  where  $U$  is a component of the Fatou set of  $f$  (say, an iterate of  $c_j$  is in the boundary of a Herman ring), then  $\omega(c_j) \subset \cup_{n \geq 0} f^n(\partial U)$ , hence  $\omega(c_j)$  is a  $C$ -compact (we use that  $U$  is (pre-)periodic, by Sullivan's no wandering domain theorem),
- By Definition 1.3,  $\mathcal{H}_{crit,v}$  is empty, hence, the condition  $(A_{cr})$  is void if all points  $c_1, \dots, c_r$  belong to the same grand orbit i.e.,  $f^{n_i}(c_i) = f^{n_j}(c_j)$  for any  $i, j$  and some  $n_i, n_j > 0$  (e.g.,  $(A_{cr})$  is void if  $r = 1$  or if  $r > 1$  and  $f(c_1) = f(c_2) = \dots = f(c_r)$ ).

Let us list some classes of rational maps  $f$  and corresponding sets  $\mathcal{C}$  for which the conclusion of Theorem 1 of [11](=conclusion of Theorem 1 of this note) holds:

**Corollary 1.1** *The conclusion of Theorem 1 holds whenever  $f$  is not a flexible Lattes and one of (1)-(8) takes place:*

- (1)  $f$  has no Herman rings and  $\mathcal{C}$  is a  $C$ -compact,
- (2)  $f$  is a polynomial,
- (3)  $J(f) = \bar{\mathcal{C}}$ , and  $\mathcal{C}$  is a  $C$ -compact,
- (4)  $\mathcal{C} \neq \bar{\mathcal{C}}$  and the complement to  $\mathcal{C}$  consists of a finitely many components,

- (5) note two particular cases of (4): (i)  $\mathcal{C}$  is totally disconnected, for example, finite, (ii)  $\mathcal{C}$  lies in a finite union of disjoint Jordan curves in  $\bar{\mathbf{C}}$ , for example,  $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbf{R}$ ,
- (6)  $f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  is expanding (e.g., the critical points  $c_1, \dots, c_r$  satisfy Misiurewicz's condition),
- (7) the following two conditions hold:
- (7.1) the area of  $\mathcal{C} \setminus \partial \mathcal{H}_{\text{crit}, \mathbf{v}}$  is zero,
- (7.2) either  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{crit}, \mathbf{v}}$  is empty (e.g., all  $c_1, \dots, c_r$  are in a single grand orbit), or the boundary of every Herman rings of  $f$  is locally connected.
- (8) All critical values of  $f$  which are in  $J(f)$  are summable. Here either  $\mathcal{C}$  is nowhere dense or  $\mathcal{C} = \bar{\mathbf{C}} = J(f)$ .

It follows from Corollary 1.1 that Corollaries 1.1-1.2 of [11] and their proofs remain untouched. Indeed, in Corollary 1.2 of [11] case (6) of the Corollary 1.1 above applies, and in Corollary 1.2,[11], one can use that by Ricardo Mane's result [15] structurally stable rational maps do not have Herman rings, or alternatively apply the last part of Comment 3. By similar reasons, applications of Theorem 1 of [11] in [8] and in [1] are unaffected as well because in [8]  $f$  is a polynomial (so case (2) of Corollary 1.1 applies) and in [1]  $f$  is expanding on  $\mathcal{C}$ , i.e., case (6) of Corollary 1.1 works (in fact, the case (1) applies as well because  $f$  as in [1] cannot have Herman rings).

Corollary 1.1 follows immediately from the next consequence of Lemma 1.1:

**Corollary 1.2** *In the notations of Lemma 1.1,  $T_f H = H$  (where  $H = \hat{\mu}$  with  $\text{supp}(\mu) \subset J(f)$ ) implies  $\mu = 0$  if  $f$  is not a flexible Lattes and one of the conditions (1)-(8) of Corollary 1.1 holds with the following obvious changes:  $\mathcal{C}$  should be replaced by  $K \subset J(f)$  and, additionally, in cases (1)-(7),  $K$  is nowhere dense, and in case (7)  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{crit}, (\mathbf{v})}$  is replaced by  $\mathcal{H}_K$ . In the case (8),  $K$  can have interior points.*

**Proof.** We handle here cases (1)-(7); for the case (8), see the end of Section 3. In cases (1)-(7),  $K \subset J(f)$  is a  $\mathbf{C}$ -compact. Indeed, in cases (1),(3) it is a condition, in cases (2) and (4), every point of  $K$  belongs to a component of the complement, and in cases (6),(7),  $K$  is of measure zero: It remains to note the following. In cases (1)-(3),  $f$  have no Herman rings. In case (4), the complement to  $K$  as well as to  $\mathcal{H}_K$  consist of finitely many components, therefore,  $K$  is a  $\mathbf{C}$ -compact (being also nowhere dense) and  $\mathcal{H}_K$  is a  $\mathbf{A}$ -compact. It remains to consider cases (6)-(7). In case (7), if the boundary of every Herman ring is locally connected it is easy to see that the closures of two different Herman rings are disjoint and the complement to the closure of every Herman ring consists of a finitely many components. Therefore,  $\mathcal{H}_K$  is a  $\mathbf{A}$ -compact. Finally, as for the case

(6), if  $f : K \rightarrow K$  is expanding then  $K$  cannot contain the boundary of a Herman ring as it is shown in the next lemma. □

**Lemma 1.3** *Let  $\Omega$  be a Herman ring of a rational function  $f$  which is invariant by  $f$ . Then, for either component  $L$  of  $\partial L$ ,  $f : L \rightarrow L$  is not expanding.*

**Proof.** Assume the contrary. Then, passing to an iterate, one can find a neighborhood  $U$  of  $L$  such that  $|Df(z)| > 2$  for any  $z \in U$ . Fix a conformal homeomorphism  $\psi : \{1 < |w| < r\} \rightarrow \Omega$  so that  $f = \psi R \psi^{-1}$  where  $R(w) = \lambda w$  is an irrational rotation. We can suppose that  $L = \overline{\cap_{1 < r' < r} \psi(\{1 < |w| < r'\})}$ . Fix  $1 < \rho < r$  so that  $U_0 := \psi(\{1 < |w| \leq \rho\})$  is compactly contained in  $U$ . Let  $\Gamma = \psi(\{|w| = \rho\})$  and  $h > 0$  is the distance between two disjoint compact sets  $L$  and  $\Gamma$ . Find  $u \in L$  and  $v \in \Gamma$  so that  $h = |u - v|$ . The interval  $(u, v]$  must be a subset of  $U_0$  because otherwise there would exist  $u' \in L$ ,  $v' \in \Gamma$  with  $|u' - v'| < h$ . Let  $g := \psi R^{-1} \psi^{-1}$  the branch of  $f^{-1}$  leaving  $\Omega$  invariant and let  $\gamma = g((u, v])$ . Then  $\gamma$  is a semi-open curve in  $U_0$  which begins at  $v_{-1} = g(v)$  and tends to  $L$ . Since  $|Df(x)| > 2$  for all  $x \in \gamma$ , the length of  $\gamma$ ,  $l(\gamma) < h/2$ . As  $v_{-1} \in \Gamma$  and  $\gamma$  joins  $v_{-1}$  and  $L$ , we arrive at a contradiction with the definition of  $h$ . □

**Acknowledgments.** The author would like to thank Magnus Aspenberg for asking about the proof of Lemma 5.2 in [11], and Matthieu Astorg for discussions.

## 2 The Cauchy transform of measures

Given a finite complex measure  $\nu$  with  $\text{supp}(\nu) \subset \mathbf{C}$ , let

$$\hat{\nu}(z) = \int \frac{d\nu(w)}{w - z}$$

be the Cauchy transform of  $\nu$ . For the following facts, see e.g. [7]. As  $\nu$  is finite, by Fubini's theorem,  $\int \frac{d|\nu|(w)}{|w-z|}$  (hence,  $\hat{\nu}$ ) is locally in  $L^1(dx dy)$ . In particular,  $\hat{\nu}$  exists almost everywhere on  $\mathbf{C}$ . Besides,  $\hat{\nu}$  is holomorphic outside of  $\text{supp}(\nu)$ , and  $\nu(\infty) = 0$  if  $\nu$  has a compact support. Moreover,  $\hat{\nu} \neq 0$  on a set of a positive area unless  $\nu = 0$ . The following two propositions are the main auxiliary statements we use. They appear in [10] as Lemma 2.1 and Corollary 2.1, respectively.

**Proposition 1** (a) *Any closed subset of a  $C$ -compact is  $C$ -compact.*

(b) *Let  $K$  be a nowhere dense compact in  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\mu$  a measure on  $K$ . Suppose that for a neighborhood  $W$  of a point  $x \in K$ ,  $K \cap \overline{W}$  is a  $C$ -compact and  $\hat{\mu} = 0$  on  $W \setminus K$ . Then  $\mu$  vanishes on  $K \cap W$ , i.e.,  $|\mu|(W) = 0$ .*



**Proposition 2** *Suppose  $\mathcal{H}$  is a non empty collection of bounded rotation domains of a rational function  $f$ . Let  $V = \cup\{A : A \in \mathcal{H}\}$ ,  $E \subset \mathbf{C} \setminus V$  a nowhere dense compact subset such that  $\partial V \subset E$ , and  $\nu$  be a bounded complex measure supported on  $E$  such that  $\hat{\nu} = 0$  off  $E \cup V$ . If  $E$  is a  $C$ -compact and  $\bar{V}$  is a  $A$ -compact, then  $\nu$  is, in fact, supported on  $\partial V = \cup_{A \in \mathcal{H}} \partial A$ ,  $\nu|_{\partial A}$ ,  $A \in \mathcal{H}$ , are mutually singular and, for each  $A$ ,  $\nu|_{\partial A}$  is absolutely continuous w.r.t. harmonic measure of  $A$ . In particular,  $\nu$  is non-atomic. Moreover, for each  $A \in \mathcal{H}$ ,*

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\{z \in \Delta_A : \text{dist}(z, \partial \Delta_A) = \epsilon\}} |\hat{\nu} \circ \psi_A(z)| |\psi'_A(z)| |dz| < \infty,$$

where  $\psi_A : \Delta_A \rightarrow A$  is a holomorphic homeomorphism from a round annulus  $\Delta_A$  onto  $A$ .

### 3 Proof of Lemma 1.1

Let us start with the part **1**. We split the proof into Steps I-VIII. Note that most of arguments are not original and included for completeness. Namely, Step I is taken from the proof of Lemma 5.2, [11] and along with Steps II-V and the first claim of Lemma 3.5 of Step VI are indeed minor modifications of [4], [5], [13], [16], [12]. After that, the proof when  $K$  contains no boundaries of Herman rings is straightforward, see Step VII. In a short step VIII we deal with the general case applying Propositions 1-2.

We prove the part **1** by a contradiction. So let  $H$  be the Cauchy transform of a finite complex measure  $\mu$  that satisfies (2). Assume that  $\mu \neq 0$ ,  $T_f H = H$ , and the conditions of Lemma 1.1, part **1** hold.

**I.** The function

$$\tilde{H}(z) := H(z) + \frac{A}{z} + \frac{B}{z^2} = \int \left[ \frac{1}{w-z} + \frac{1}{z} + \frac{w}{z^2} \right] d\mu(w) = \int \frac{w^2}{z^2(w-z)} d\mu(w)$$

is integrable at  $\infty$ . Indeed, for every  $w$ , the function (of  $z$ )  $w^2/[z^2(w-z)]$  is integrable at  $\infty$ , and one can write:

$$\int_{|z|>1} \left| \frac{w^2}{z^2(w-z)} \right| d\sigma_z = |w| \int_{|u|>1/|w|} \left| \frac{1}{u^2(1-u)} \right| d\sigma_u \leq C_1 |w| (1 + \ln^+ |w|),$$

where  $\ln^+ |w| = \max\{0, \ln |w|\}$ . Hence,

$$\int_{|z|>1} |\tilde{H}(z)| d\sigma_z \leq \int d|\mu|(w) \int_{|z|>1} \left| \frac{w^2}{z^2(w-z)} \right| d\sigma_z \leq C_1 \int |w| (1 + \ln^+ |w|) d|\mu|(w) < \infty,$$

by the condition (2). Now, take  $R$  big enough and consider the disk  $D(R) = \{|x| < R\}$ . We claim that

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \int_{f^{-1}(D(R))} |H(x)| d\sigma_x - \int_{D(R)} |H(x)| d\sigma_x \right\} \leq 0. \quad (7)$$

Indeed, in the case (1.1), i.e., if  $A = B = 0$ , this follows at once from the integrability of  $H$  at  $\infty$ . In the case (1.2), the conditions on  $\sigma$  imply that there is  $a > 0$ , such that

$$f^{-1}(D(R)) \subset D(R + |b| + \frac{a}{R}) \quad (8)$$

(actually,  $f^{-1}(D(R)) \subset D(R)$ , if  $|\sigma| > 1$ ). On the other hand,

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \int_{R < |x| < R + |b| + a/R} |H(x)| d\sigma_x = 0 \quad (9)$$

since  $\tilde{H}(x) = H(x) + \frac{A}{x} + \frac{B}{x^2}$  is integrable at  $\infty$ , and an easy calculation shows that the conditions in the case (1.2) guarantee that

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \int_{R < |x| < R + |b| + a/R} \left| \frac{A}{x} + \frac{B}{x^2} \right| d\sigma_x = 0. \quad (10)$$

(9) along with (8) imply (7) in the case (1.2). As in the proof of Lemma 5.2, [11], (7) implies that

$$|H(x)| = |T_f H(x)| = \left| \sum_{w: f(w)=x} \frac{H(w)}{f'(w)^2} \right| = \sum_{w: f(w)=x} \frac{|H(w)|}{|f'(w)|^2} \quad (11)$$

almost everywhere. Indeed, otherwise there is a set  $A \subset D(R_0)$  of positive measure (for some  $R_0$ ) and  $\delta > 0$ , such that  $|T_f H(x)| < (1 - \delta) \sum_{w: f(w)=x} \frac{|H(w)|}{|f'(w)|^2}$  for  $x \in A$ . Then, for all  $R > R_0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{D(R)} |H(x)| d\sigma_x &= \int_{D(R) \setminus A} |T_f H(x)| d\sigma_x + \int_A |T_f H(x)| d\sigma_x < \\ &\int_{f^{-1}(D(R) \setminus A)} |H(x)| d\sigma_x + (1 - \delta) \int_{f^{-1}(A)} |H(x)| d\sigma_x = \int_{f^{-1}(D(R))} |H(x)| d\sigma_x - \delta \int_{f^{-1}(A)} |H(x)| d\sigma_x \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts (7).

**II.** By Sect 2,  $H$  is well-defined on a set  $Y \subset \mathbf{C}$  such that  $\mathbf{C} \setminus Y$  has zero Lebesgue measure and  $H(x) \neq 0$  on a set  $Z \subset Y$  of a positive Lebesgue measure. Replacing  $Y$  by  $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbf{Z}} f^n(Y)$ , one can assume that  $Y$  is completely invariant. (11) immediately implies

**Lemma 3.1** For every measurable  $A \subset \mathbf{C}$  such that

$$\Lambda(A) := \int_A |H(z)| d\sigma_z < \infty,$$

we have:

$$\Lambda(A) = \Lambda(f^{-1}(A)).$$

In other words,  $\Lambda$  is an  $f$ -invariant positive measure on  $\mathbf{C}$  (which is finite in the case (1.1) though not necessary finite in the case (1.2)).

### III.

**Lemma 3.2** Assume  $x \in Y$ ,  $f'(x) \neq 0$  and  $H(x) \neq 0$ . Then there is a real constant  $L_x \geq 1$  such that

$$H(f(x))(f'(x))^2 = L_x H(x). \quad (12)$$

In particular,  $x \in Z$  implies  $f(x) \in Z$ . If  $f(x), x$  are in  $K^c := \mathbf{C} \setminus K$  then there is a neighborhood  $U$  of  $x$  so that (12) holds for all  $x \in U$  and, moreover,  $L_x$  is a constant function in  $U$ .

**Proof.** (12) follows at once from (11). If, additionally,  $f(x), x \in K^c$  then there is a connected neighborhood  $U$  of  $x$  such that  $U \cup f(U) \subset K^c$  and  $H, f'$  do not admit 0 in  $U$ . It follows that  $L_x = H(f(x))(f'(x))^2/H(x)$  is a real holomorphic function in  $x \in U$ , therefore, a constant.

□

Let

$$l(z) = \overline{H(z)}/|H(z)|$$

whenever  $H(z)$  is well-defined and not zero. Since  $L_x > 0$  in (12), it follows that

$$l(f(z))\overline{f'(z)}/f'(z) = l(z)$$

whenever  $z \in Z$  and  $f'(z) \neq 0$ . This means that  $l(z)\overline{dz}/dz$  is an invariant line field defined initially on the set of all  $z \in Z$ ,  $f'(z) \neq 0$ .

Consider the case  $J(f) = \overline{\mathbf{C}}$ . The condition (CL) that  $K$  is a  $\mathbf{C}$ -compact implies that  $K$  is nowhere dense, hence,  $\mathbf{C} \setminus K$  is a non-empty open set. Assume by contradiction that  $H(z) \neq 0$  on a non-empty open  $U \subset \mathbf{C} \setminus K$ . Then  $l(z)\overline{dz}/dz$  is an invariant holomorphic linefield  $U$ . Therefore, by Lemma 3.16 of [17],  $f$  is a flexible Lattes map which contradicts to condition (i). Thus  $H \equiv 0$  off a  $\mathbf{C}$ -compact  $K$ , hence, by (classical) fact of Lemma 5.3, [11],  $H \equiv 0$ , i.e., we are done in this case.

**IV.** From now on,  $J(f) \neq \overline{\mathbf{C}}$ . To deal with the (non-)integrability of  $H$  at  $\infty$  we use the following

**Lemma 3.3** *Let  $g$  be a local holomorphic map in a neighborhood of 0 such that  $g(0) = 0$ ,  $g'(0) = 1$ . Let  $h(z) = \tilde{A}/z^3 + \tilde{B}/z^2 + \tilde{h}(z)$  where  $\tilde{A}, \tilde{B} \in \mathbf{C}$  and  $\tilde{h}$  is an integrable function in a neighborhood of 0. Assume that either (a)  $g(z) = z + O(z^3)$  or (b)  $g(z) = z + O(z^2)$  and  $\tilde{A} = 0$ . Then:*

- (1) *every attracting petal  $P$  of  $g$  at 0 contains a domain  $U_P$  such that  $g(U_P) \subset U_P$ ,  $U_P \setminus g(U_P)$  contains a disk,  $0 \in \partial U_P$ , every forward orbit in  $P$  enters  $U_P$  and*

$$\int_{U_P} |h(z)| d\sigma_z < \infty,$$

- (2) *there is an open set  $U_-$  such that  $g^{-1}(U_-) \subset U_-$ , the union of  $U_-$  with all attracting petals of  $g$  at 0 and the point  $\{0\}$  constitutes a neighborhood of 0 and*

$$\int_{U_-} |h(z)| d\sigma_z < \infty.$$

**Proof.** (2) follows directly from (1) and the local dynamics at a parabolic fixed point so it is enough to prove only (1). To this end, we begin with a remark that given a local holomorphic map (coordinate change)  $\psi$  near 0 such that  $\psi(0) = 0$  and  $\psi'(0) = 1$  it is easy to see that enough to show the existence of  $\tilde{U}$  instead of  $U$  as in (1) for  $\tilde{g} = \psi^{-1} \circ g \circ \psi$  and  $h \circ \psi$  instead of  $g$  and  $h$  respectively and then let  $U = \psi(\tilde{U})$ . Consider the case (a). It is well-known the existence of a local coordinate change  $\psi$  such that  $\tilde{g}(z) = z + z^{\nu+1} + \alpha z^{2\nu+1} + O(|z|^{2\nu+2})$  where  $\nu \geq 2$  (since  $g(z) = z + O(z^3)$ ). Moreover, making a local change of coordinate  $w = l(z) := -1/(\nu z^\nu)$  in the attracting petal  $\tilde{P} = \psi^{-1}(P)$  of  $\tilde{g}$  we get  $F(w) = l \circ \tilde{g} \circ l^{-1}(w) = w + 1 + C/w + O(1/|w|^2)$  as  $w \rightarrow \infty$  in  $U_\infty = l(\tilde{U})$  which contains a set of the form  $\{w = w_1 + iw_2 : w_1 > M_0 - \kappa|w_2|\}$  for some big  $M_0 > 0$  and  $\kappa > 0$ . Finally, there is a Fatou coordinate  $\Psi : U_\infty \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  such that  $\Psi(w) = w - C \log w + O(1)$  for the main branch of  $\log$  such that  $\Psi \circ F(w) = \Psi(w) + 1$ . Now, given  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $M > 0$  let  $U_\infty(\epsilon, M) := \{w = w_1 + iw_2 : w_1 > M, |w_2| < w_1^\epsilon\}$ . It is straightforward to check that given  $\epsilon > 0$  there is  $M_\epsilon$  such that  $F(U_\infty(\epsilon, M_\epsilon)) \subset U_\infty(\epsilon, M_\epsilon)$ . Making  $M_\epsilon$  even bigger if necessary and using the asymptotics for the Fatou coordinate we check also that every forward orbit of  $F$  in  $P_\infty$  enters  $U_\infty(\epsilon, M_\epsilon)$ . Let us fix  $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$  and the corresponding  $U_\infty := U_\infty(\epsilon, M_\epsilon)$ . Let  $\tilde{U} := l^{-1}(U_\infty) \subset \tilde{P}$ . It is straightforward to check that for a boundary point  $z = x + iy$  of  $\tilde{U}$  as  $x \rightarrow 0$  the following asymptotics holds:  $|v| = Bu^\gamma + O(|u|^{\gamma'})$  where  $\gamma' > \gamma$  while  $\gamma = \nu + 1 - \epsilon\nu > 2$  (as  $\nu \geq 2$  and  $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$ ). Since  $h(\psi(z)) = O(|z|^{-3})$  we then get that  $\int_{\tilde{U}} |h(\psi(z))| dx dy < \infty$ .

The case (b) is very similar to (a) though simpler and is left to the reader. □

**V.** Let  $\Omega$  be a component of  $F(f)$ .

**Lemma 3.4** *If  $\Omega$  is not periodic then  $H|_{\Omega} = 0$ .*

**Proof.** Assume the contrary and choose  $A \subset \Omega$  such that  $\mu(A) > 0$ . Since  $\Omega$  is not periodic,  $f^{-n}(A) \cap f^{-m}(A) = \emptyset$  for all non-negative  $n \neq m$ . Hence, by Step II,  $\Lambda(\cup_{n \geq 0} f^{-n}(A)) = \int_{\cup_{n \geq 0} f^{-n}(A)} |H(z)| d\sigma_z = \infty$ . In the case (1.1)  $H$  is integrable on  $\bar{C}$ , a contradiction. Consider the case (1.2). If  $|\sigma| > 1$  then  $\infty$  is an attracting fixed point of  $f$ . Hence, all  $f^{-n}(A)$  stay away from a neighborhood of  $\infty$ , therefore,  $\Lambda(\cup_{n \geq 0} f^{-n}(A)) = \int_{\cup_{n \geq 0} f^{-n}(A)} |H(z)| d\sigma_z < \infty$ , a contradiction. In the remaining two possibilities of the case (1.2),  $\infty$  is a parabolic fixed point. Let  $\Omega_{\infty}$  be its immediate basin. As  $\cup_{n \geq 0} f^{-n}(A) \subset \mathbf{C} \setminus \Omega_{\infty}$ , we get a contradiction if show that

$$\int_{\mathbf{C} \setminus \Omega_{\infty}} |H(z)| d\sigma_z < \infty. \quad (13)$$

To this end, passing to  $f^q$  we get: either  $f^q(z) = z + O(1/z)$  or  $f(z) = z + O(1)$  and  $A = 0$ . Now, making the change  $w = 1/z$  we arrive at a map  $g(w) = 1/f(1/w)$  and  $|H(z)| d\sigma_z = |h(w)| d\sigma_w$  where  $h(w) = H(1/w)w^{-4}$  precisely as in Lemma 3.3 of Step IV. Let  $U_-$  be the set appeared in (2) of that Lemma. Since  $\mathbf{C} \setminus \Omega_{\infty} \cap \{|z| > R\} \subset 1/U_-$  for  $R$  big enough, (13) follows. □

**VI.** We are left with the case when  $\Omega$  is a periodic component of  $F(f)$ .

**Lemma 3.5** (1) *If  $\Omega$  is not a Herman ring then  $H|_{\Omega} = 0$ .*

(2) (cf. [13], p.190; [2]) *If  $\Omega$  is a Herman ring and  $H|_{\Omega} \neq 0$  then there is  $C_{\Omega} \neq 0$  so that,  $H|_{\Omega} = C_{\Omega} \left\{ \frac{\varphi_{\Omega}}{\varphi_{\Omega}} \right\}^2$  where  $\varphi_{\Omega} : \Omega \rightarrow \{1 < |w| < R_{\Omega}\}$  is a conformal isomorphism. Moreover,  $C_{\Omega} = C_{f^i(\Omega)}$  for all  $i > 0$ , i.e. depends only on the cycle that contains  $\Omega$ . Moreover,  $\partial\Omega \subset K$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $q$  be so that  $f^q(\Omega) = \Omega$  and  $H|_{\Omega} \neq 0$ , i.e.,  $H$  is a non-zero holomorphic function on a connected open set  $\Omega$ . First, let  $\Omega$  be an immediate basin of attraction of either attracting or parabolic point  $a \in \bar{\Omega}$ . To prove that  $H|_{\Omega} = 0$  it is enough to find an open set  $X \subset \Omega$  such that  $\Lambda(X) < \infty$  and either (i)  $X \subset f^{-q}(X)$ ,  $f^{-q}(X) \setminus X$  contains a ball or (ii)  $X \supset f^{-q}(X)$ ,  $X \setminus f^{-q}(X)$  contains a ball. Indeed, then  $\Lambda(f^{-q}(X) \setminus X) = \Lambda(f^{-q}(X)) - \Lambda(X) = 0$  in case (i) and  $\Lambda(X \setminus f^{-q}(X)) = 0$  in case (ii), hence, in either case  $H = 0$  on a ball in  $\Omega$ , hence, everywhere in  $\Omega$ . Let us show that such a set  $X$  exists. If  $a$  is attracting or parabolic and  $a \neq \infty$ ,  $X$  can be taken a neighborhood of  $a$  if  $a$  attracting and an attracting petal at  $a$  if  $a$  parabolic. If  $a = \infty$  attracting (i.e.,  $|\sigma| > 1$ ), define  $X = \Omega \setminus U$  where  $U$  is a neighborhood of  $\infty$ . Finally, if  $a = \infty$  parabolic, by Lemma 3.3 define  $X = 1/U_P$  where  $U_P$  be an attracting petal at 0 of  $g(z) = 1/f(1/z)$ .

Now, let  $\Omega$  be either a Siegel disk or a Herman ring. Since  $f^q : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  is a homeomorphism, by Step V,  $H$  is a holomorphic non-zero map on  $\Omega$  such that  $H \circ f^q [(f^q)']^2 = H$  on  $\Omega$ . Then it is easily checked it is impossible if  $\Omega$  Siegel, and if  $\Omega$  is Herman-this is possible if and only if  $H$  is proportional to  $\{\frac{\varphi'_\Omega}{\varphi_\Omega}\}^2$ . In the latter case, i.e., if  $H|_\Omega \neq 0$ , every point  $z \in \partial\Omega$  must belong to  $K$ . Indeed, otherwise  $H$  is a holomorphic function in a neighborhood  $V$  of  $z$  such that  $H \neq 0$  in  $\Omega \cap V$ . On the other hand  $z = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} z_n$  for a sequence  $z_n$  of points of some non-periodic components of  $F(f)$ , hence, by Lemma 3.4,  $H(z_n) = 0$  and by the Uniqueness Theorem,  $H|_V = 0$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

By Steps V-VI,  $H = 0$  outside  $K \cup \mathcal{H}_K$ .

**VII.**  $\mathcal{H}(K) = \emptyset$ , i.e.,  $K$  contains no boundaries of Herman rings. Then by Steps V-VI,  $H = \hat{\mu} = 0$  off  $K$ . Assume (CL), i.e.,  $K$  is a C-compact. Then, by (well-known) Lemma 5.3 of [11],  $\mu = 0$ , a contradiction.

**VIII:**  $\mathcal{H}(K) \neq \emptyset$ . Assuming (CL), i.e.,  $K$  is a C-compact, by Lemma 1,  $\mu = 0$  in  $\mathbf{C} \setminus \mathcal{H}_K$ , i.e.,  $K = \text{supp}(\mu) \subset \partial\mathcal{H}_K$  (cf. with the proof of Theorem 1 of [10]). By Lemma 3.5(2), for each  $A \in \mathcal{H}_K$ ,  $H|_A = \hat{\mu}|_A = C_A \{\varphi'_A/\varphi_A\}^2$ , therefore,

$$\hat{\mu} \circ \psi_A(w) \psi'_A(w) = C_A \{w^2 \psi'_A(w)\}^{-1}. \quad (14)$$

Now we also assume (AL). There are two cases. If  $\mathcal{H}_K$  is bounded, we directly apply Proposition 2 to  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}$ ,  $E = K$  and  $\nu = \mu$ , and get the desired conclusion. If  $\infty \in \mathcal{H}_K$ , let  $M(z) = 1/(x_0 - z)$  for some  $x_0 \in \mathbf{C} \setminus \mathcal{H}_K$  and let  $E = M(K)$ ,  $\mathcal{H} = \{M(A) | A \in \mathcal{H}_K\}$ , and  $\nu$  is defined by  $d\nu(u) = u d\mu(M^{-1}(u))$  so that  $\hat{\nu}(v) = v^{-1} \hat{\mu}(M^{-1}(v)) = 0$  off the bounded set  $E \cup V \subset \mathbf{C}$ . Now we can apply Proposition 2 to the rational map  $M \circ f \circ M^{-1}$ , its collection of bounded Herman rings  $\mathcal{H} = \{B = M(A) | A \in \mathcal{H}_K\}$ , the set  $E$  and the measure  $\nu$  just defined. We obtain the representation  $\nu = \sum_{\{B \in \mathcal{H}\}} \nu_B$  where  $\nu_B$  is supported on  $\partial B$  and absolutely continuous w.r.t. the harmonic measure  $\omega_B$  of  $B$ , i.e.,  $d\nu_B = h_B d\omega_B$  where  $h_B \in L^1(\partial B, \omega_B)$ . By the connection of  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  and since  $d\omega_{M(A)}(M(z)) = M'(z) d\omega_A(z)$ , we get the representation (3), as in the conclusion of part Lemma 1.1, part 1. That  $1/\psi'_A \in H^1$  provided  $C_A \neq 0$  follows from (14) as well.

Part 1 has been proved.

Let us prove part 2. After perhaps a Mobius change, one can assume that all Herman rings  $B \in \mathcal{H}$  are bounded subsets of  $\mathbf{C}$ . Let us show that  $1/\psi'_B \in H^1$  for all  $B \in \mathcal{H}$ . By a condition this holds for  $B = A$ . Let now  $B = f^j(A)$  for some  $j \in \{1, \dots, q-1\}$ . Then  $\psi_B = f^j \circ \psi_A : \Delta_A \rightarrow B$  and, for an appropriate  $\lambda \in S^1$  and all  $w \in \Delta_A$ ,

$$|\psi'_B(w)| = |(f^j)'(\psi_A(w)) \psi'_A(w)| = \left| \frac{\psi'_A(w) (f^q)'(\psi_A(w))}{(f^{q-j})'(f^j(\psi_A(w)))} \right| =$$

$$\frac{|\lambda\psi'_A(\lambda w)|}{|(f^{q-j})'(f^j(\psi_A(w)))|} \geq M^{-(q-j)}|\psi'_A(\lambda w)|$$

where  $M = \sup\{|f'(z)| : z \in \cup_{B \in \mathcal{H}} B\} < \infty$ . We get immediately that  $1/\psi'_B \in H^1$  as well. Now the existence of the measure  $\mu$  follows easily from (14) if we apply [10], Theorem 1, **P2** where we take  $\Omega_i = f^{i-1}(A)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, q-1$ , and  $\kappa_i = (\varphi'_i/\varphi_i)^2$  where  $\varphi_i : f^{i-1}(A) \rightarrow \{1 < |w| < R\}$  is a conformal homeomorphism. As for the uniqueness, if  $\nu$  is another measure as in part **2**, by (14), there is  $C \in \mathbf{C}$  such that, for the measure  $\tau := \nu - C\mu$ ,  $\hat{\tau} = 0$  off  $K := \cup\{\partial B : B \in \mathcal{H}\}$ . On the other hand,  $K$  is a  $\mathbf{C}$ -compact because every  $x \in K$  lies at the boundary of one of the components  $B \in \mathcal{H}$  of its complement. Hence,  $\tau = 0$ .

*Case (8) of Corollary 1.2.* So assume that every critical point in  $J(f)$  is summable. If  $J(f) \neq \bar{\mathbf{C}}$ , then by [19],  $J(f)$  is of measure zero and  $f$  has no Herman rings, hence,  $K \subset J(f)$  is a  $\mathbf{C}$ -compact and  $\mathcal{H}_K$  is empty, and Lemma 1.1 applies. Let  $J(f) = \bar{\mathbf{C}}$ , in particular,  $f$  has no Herman rings. Assume  $H$  is non-trivial. By Step III of the above proof of Lemma 1.1,  $f$  admits a non-trivial invariant line field on a forward invariant set of a positive Lebesgue measure (which is the set  $Z$  minus forward orbits of critical points). On the other hand, by [21] (see also [18]), Lebesgue almost every point of  $\mathbf{C}$  is conical for  $f$ , which leads (as in [17]) to the existence of a holomorphic line field for  $f$ , hence,  $f$  is a flexible Lattes example, a contradiction.

## References

- [1] Magnus Aspenberg: *Semi-hyperbolic maps are rare*. Intern. Math. Research Notices, issue 19, 2018, 5938-5946
- [2] Astorg, M.: *Summability Condition and Rigidity for Finite Type Maps*. arXiv:1602.05172v2, 2017
- [3] Bruin, H. & van Strien, S.: *Expansion of derivatives in one dimensional dynamics*. Israel J. Math. 137 (2003), 223-263
- [4] Douady, A. & Hubbard, J.H.: *A proof of Thurston's topological characterization of rational maps*. Acta Math. 171 (1993), no. 2, 263-297
- [5] Epstein, A.: *Infinitesimal Thurston rigidity and the Fatou-Shishikura inequality*, preprint Stony Brook, 1999.
- [6] Gamelin, T.: *Uniform Algebras*, Prentice Hall, 1969.
- [7] John Garnett: *Analytic Capacity and Measure*. Lecture Notes in Math. 297, Springer-Verlag, 1972
- [8] Gao, B., & Shen, W.: *Summability implies Collet-Eckmann almost surely*. Ergod. Th. Dynam. Sys. (2013) doi:10.1017/etds.2012.173.

- [9] Genadi Levin: *Fixed points of the Ruelle-Thurston operator and the Cauchy transform*. Talk at the workshop "Low-dimensional and Complex Dynamics", 02 - 06 December 2019, Bernoulli center, Lausanne, <https://tube.switch.ch/cast/videos/bc2e0b84-2fa1-47c6-860d-201d3714a75a>
- [10] Levin, G.: *On the Cauchy transform vanishing outside a compact*. arXiv:1911.05336, 2019
- [11] Levin, G. M. *Perturbations of weakly expanding critical orbits*. Frontiers in Complex Dynamics: In Celebration of John Milnor's 80th Birthday, Araceli Bonifant, Mikhail Lyubich, Scott Sutherland, Princeton Mathematical Series, 2014, Princeton University Press, 163-196
- [12] Levin, G.: *Multipliers of periodic orbits in spaces of rational maps*. Ergod. Th. Dynam. Sys. 31 (2011), no.1, 197-243
- [13] Levin, G.: *On an analytic approach to the Fatou conjecture*. Fundamenta Mathematicae 171 (2002), 177-196
- [14] Levin, G., Sodin, M. & Yuditski, P.: *A Ruelle operator for a real Julia set*. Comm. Math. Phys. 141 (1991), 119-132
- [15] Mane, R.: *On the instability of Herman rings*. Invent. mathematicae, 81(1985), 459-472
- [16] Makienko, P.: *Remarks on Ruelle operator and invariant line field problem. II*. Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys. 25 (2005), 1561-1581.
- [17] McMullen, C.: *Complex dynamics and renormalization*, Ann. of Math. Studies **135**, Princeton University Press (1994)
- [18] Przytycki, F.: *On measure and Hausdorff dimension of Julia sets for holomorphic Collet-Eckmann maps*. International conference on dynamical systems, Montevideo 1995 a tribute to Ricardo Mañé. Eds. F. Ledrappier, J. Lewowicz, S. Newhouse. Pitman Res. Notes in Math. series, 362. Longman 1996. 167-181. )
- [19] Rivera-Letelier, J.: *A connecting lemma for rational maps satisfying a no-growth condition*. Ergod. Th. Dynam. Sys. (2007), 27, 595-636
- [20] Ruelle, D.: *The thermodynamics formalism for expanding maps*. Commun. Math. Phys. 125 (1989), 239-262
- [21] Rivera-Letelier, J. & Shen, W.: *Statistical properties of one-dimensional maps under weak hyperbolicity assumptions*. Annales Scientifiques de l'ENS, 47 (2014), 1027-1083 11(1956), no 4(70), 163-166
- [22] Vitushkin, A.G.: *Analytic capacity of sets in problems of approximation theory*. Russian Math. Surveys 22(1968), 139-200