

A canonical decomposition of strong L^2 -functions

In Sung Hwang and Woo Young Lee

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to establish a canonical decomposition of operator-valued strong L^2 -functions by the aid of the Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem which characterizes the shift-invariant subspaces of vector-valued Hardy space. This decomposition reduces to the Douglas-Shapiro-Shields factorization if the flip of a strong L^2 -function is of bounded type. To consider a converse of the Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem, we introduce a notion of the “Beurling degree” for inner functions by employing a canonical decomposition of strong L^2 -functions induced by the given inner functions. Eventually, we establish a deep connection between the Beurling degree of the given inner function and the spectral multiplicity of the truncated backward shift on the corresponding model space.

Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Preliminaries	8
3. Auxiliary lemmas	10
3.1. Vector-valued Hardy classes	10
3.2. The Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem	18
3.3. The complementary factor of an inner function	21
3.4. Strong L^2 -functions of bounded type	26
4. Proof of Theorem A	31
5. The Beurling degree: Proof of Theorem B	36
6. The case of the Beurling degree 1	42
6.1. Characteristic scalar inner functions	42
6.2. Proof of Theorem C	45
References	50

Date: November 26, 2018

MSC(2010): Primary 30H10, 47B35, 30J05, 47A56; Secondary 43A15, 47A15

Keywords: Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem, functions of bounded type, complementary factor of an inner function, degree of non-cyclicity, Douglas-Shapiro-Shields factorization, a canonical decomposition, the Beurling degree, the spectral multiplicity.

1. Introduction

The celebrated Beurling Theorem [Beu] characterizes the shift-invariant subspaces of the Hardy space. P.D. Lax [La] has extended the Beurling Theorem to the case of finite multiplicity, which is so called the Beurling-Lax Theorem. P.R. Halmos [Ha1] has given a beautiful proof for the case of infinite multiplicity, which is so called the Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem. Since then, the Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem has been extended and applied in the various settings and in the connection with the model theory, the system theory and the interpolation problem, etc. by many authors (cf. [ADR], [AS], [BH1], [BH2], [BH3], [Ca], [dR], [Hed], [Po], [Ri], [SFBK], etc). In this paper, we will closely analyze the Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem for infinite multiplicity. Of course, we also consider the cases of finite multiplicity because, in comparison with the operator-valued theory, the matrix-valued theory makes it possible to lend a more transparent meaning to the theory related to the Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem. Throughout the paper, whenever we deal with operator-valued functions Φ on the unit circle \mathbb{T} , we assume that for almost all $z \in \mathbb{T}$, $\Phi(z)$ belongs to the set of all bounded linear operators, denoted by $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$, between *separable* complex Hilbert spaces D and E . We write simply $\mathcal{B}(E)$ for $\mathcal{B}(E, E)$. Unless otherwise stated, the functions in this paper are operator-valued functions. For a separable complex Hilbert space E , if S_E is the shift operator on the E -valued Hardy space H_E^2 , i.e.,

$$(S_E f)(z) := z f(z) \quad \text{for each } f \in H_E^2,$$

then the Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem states that every invariant subspace M under S_E (i.e., a closed subspace M of H_E^2 such that $S_E f \in M$ for all $f \in M$) is of the form $\Delta H_{E'}^2$, where E' is a closed subspace of E and Δ is an (possibly one-sided) inner function, i.e., $\Delta(z)^* \Delta(z)$ is the identity operator $I_{E'}$ for almost all $z \in \mathbb{T}$, but $\Delta(z) \Delta^*(z)$ is not required to be the identity operator I_E . Equivalently, if a closed subspace M of H_E^2 is invariant for the backward (or the adjoint) shift operator S_E^* , then $M = \mathcal{H}(\Delta) := H_E^2 \ominus \Delta H_{E'}^2$ for some inner function Δ , where $\mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ is often called a model space or a de Branges-Rovnyak space [dR], [Sa], [SFBK]. Thus, for a subset F of H_E^2 , if E_F^* denotes the smallest S_E^* -invariant subspace containing F , i.e.,

$$E_F^* := \bigvee \left\{ S_E^{*n} F : n \geq 0 \right\},$$

where \bigvee denotes the closed linear span, then $E_F^* = \mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ for some inner function Δ . Now, given a backward shift-invariant subspace $\mathcal{H}(\Delta)$, we may ask:

What is the smallest number of vectors in F satisfying $\mathcal{H}(\Delta) = E_F^*$?

More generally, we are interested in the problem of describing the set F in H_E^2 such that $\mathcal{H}(\Delta) = E_F^*$. This problem invites us to consider a bigger class than the set of operator-valued L^2 -functions. This question is closely related to a canonical decomposition of (operator-valued) strong L^2 -functions, where a *strong L^2 -function* Φ is a $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$ -valued function Φ defined almost everywhere on the unit circle \mathbb{T} such that $\Phi(\cdot)x \in L_E^2$ for each $x \in D$: indeed, every operator-valued L^p -function ($p \geq 2$) is a strong L^2 -function (cf. p.11). Following to V. Peller [Pe], we write $L_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ for the set of strong L^2 -functions with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$. The set $L_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ is nicely served as general symbols of vectorial Hankel operators (see [Pe]). Similarly, we write $H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ for the set of strong L^2 -functions with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$ such that $\Phi(\cdot)x \in H_E^2$ for each $x \in D$. Of course, $H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ contains all $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$ -valued H^2 -functions. The terminology a

“strong H^2 -function” is reserved for the operator-valued functions on the unit disk \mathbb{D} , following to N.K. Nikolskii [Ni1]: A function $\Phi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(D, E)$ is called a *strong H^2 -function* if $\Phi(\cdot)x \in H_E^2$ for each $x \in D$. In general, the boundary values of strong H^2 -functions do not need to be bounded linear operators (see p.12). Thus we do not guarantee that every strong H^2 -function belongs to $H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$. On the other hand, we may regard $\Phi \in H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ as an (linear, but not necessarily bounded) operator-valued function defined on the unit disk \mathbb{D} (cf. p.13). Thus if $\dim D < \infty$, then every function in $H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ is a strong H^2 -function. In particular, if $\dim D < \infty$ and $\dim E < \infty$, then $H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ coincides with the set of strong H^2 -functions (see Lemma 3.3).

In this paper we explore a canonical decomposition of strong L^2 -functions. We first observe that if Φ is an operator-valued L^∞ -function, then the kernel of the Hankel operator H_{Φ^*} is shift-invariant. Thus by the Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem, the kernel of a Hankel operator H_{Φ^*} is of the form $\Delta H_{E'}^2$, for some inner function Δ . If the kernel of a Hankel operator H_{Φ^*} is trivial, take $E' = \{0\}$. Of course, Δ need not be a two-sided inner function. In fact, we can show that if Φ is an operator-valued L^∞ -function and Δ is a two-sided inner function, then the kernel of a Hankel operator H_{Φ^*} is $\Delta H_{E'}^2$, if and only if Φ is expressed in the form

$$(1) \quad \Phi = \Delta A^*,$$

where A is an operator-valued H^∞ -function such that Δ and A are right coprime (see Lemma 3.13). The expression (1) is called the *Douglas-Shapiro-Shields factorization* of an operator-valued L^∞ -function Φ (see [DSS], [FB], [Fu2]; in particular, [Fu2] contains many important applications of the Douglas-Shapiro-Shields factorization to the linear system theory). We recall that a meromorphic function $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is said to be of *bounded type* (or *in the Nevanlinna class*) if it is a quotient of two bounded analytic functions. A matrix function of bounded type is defined by a matrix-valued function whose entries are of bounded type. Very recently, a systematic study on matrix-valued functions of bounded type was done in a monograph [CHL3]. It was also known that every matrix-valued L^∞ -function whose adjoint is of bounded type admits the expression (1) (cf. [GHR]). In fact, if we extend the notion of “bounded type” for operator-valued L^∞ -functions (we will do this in section 3.4 for a more bigger class), then we may say that the expression (1) is a monopoly for L^∞ -functions whose flips are of bounded type, where the flip $\check{\Phi}$ of Φ is defined by $\check{\Phi}(z) := \Phi(\bar{z})$. From this viewpoint, we may ask whether there exists an appropriate decomposition corresponding to general L^∞ -functions, more generally, to strong L^2 -functions. The following problem is the first object of this paper:

Find a canonical decomposition of strong L^2 -functions.

For an answer to this problem, we should make several programs. This will be done in section 3. Firstly, to understand the smallest S_E^* -invariant subspace containing a subset $F \subseteq H_E^2$, we need to consider the kernels of the adjoints of unbounded Hankel operators with strong L^2 -symbols involved with F . Thus we will deal with unbounded Hankel operators H_Φ with strong L^2 -symbols Φ . However, the adjoint of the unbounded Hankel operator need not be a Hankel operator. Of course, if Φ is an L^∞ -function then $H_{\Phi^*} = H_\Phi^*$. Thus for an L^∞ -symbol Φ , we may use the notations H_{Φ^*} and H_Φ^* interchangeably with one another. By contrast, H_{Φ^*} may not be equal to H_Φ^* for a strong L^2 -function Φ . In particular, the kernel of an unbounded Hankel operator H_{Φ^*} is liable to be trivial because it is defined in the subset of polynomials in H_D^2 . In spite of it, since the kernel

of the adjoint of a densely defined operator is always closed, we can show that via the Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem, the kernel of H_{Φ}^* with strong L^2 -symbol Φ is still of the form $\Delta H_{E'}^2$ (see Corollary 3.15). Therefore, we will consider H_{Φ}^* rather than H_{Φ^*} for a strong L^2 -function Φ .

To establish a canonical decomposition of strong L^2 -functions, we need to introduce a new notion - the ‘‘complementary factor’’, denoted by Δ_c , of an inner function Δ with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$. This notion is defined by using the kernel of Δ^* , denoted by $\ker \Delta^*$, which is defined by the set of vectors f in H_E^2 such that $\Delta^* f = 0$ a.e. on \mathbb{T} . Moreover, the kernel of H_{Δ^*} can be represented by complementing the complementary factor Δ_c to Δ (see Lemma 3.16). We also employ a notion of ‘‘degree of non-cyclicity’’ on the set of all subsets (or vectors) of H_E^2 , which is a complementary notion of ‘‘degree of cyclicity’’ due to V.I. Vasyunin and N.K. Nikolskii [VN]. The *degree of non-cyclicity*, denoted by $\text{nc}(F)$, of subsets F , $F \subseteq H_E^2$, is defined by the number

$$\text{nc}(F) := \sup_{\zeta \in \mathbb{D}} \dim \{g(\zeta) : g \in H_E^2 \ominus E_F^*\}.$$

Thus, in comparison with the degree of cyclicity, the degree of non-cyclicity admits ∞ , which is more beneficial to understand the Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem. If Φ is a strong L^2 -function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$ and $\{d_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ is an orthonormal basis for D , then we define $\{\Phi\} := \{\Phi d_k\}_{k \geq 1}$, which may be regarded as the set of ‘‘column’’ vectors of Φ because we may think of Φ as an infinite matrix-valued function. Then we can show that if the kernel of H_{Φ}^* is $\Theta H_{E'}^2$ for some inner function Θ , then the dimension of E' can be computed by the degree of non-cyclicity of $\{\Phi_+\}$, where Φ_+ denotes the analytic part of Φ (Lemma 3.19). Thus, the degree of non-cyclicity of $\{\Phi_+\}$ is independent of a particular choice of the orthonormal basis of D , so that $\text{nc}\{\Phi_+\}$ is well-defined. As a corollary, we may also obtain an extension of Abrahamse’s Lemma ([Ab, Lemma 4]) to L^2 -functions: if $\phi \in L^2$, then ϕ is of bounded type if and only if $\ker H_{\phi}^* \neq \{0\}$ (see Remark 3.20(3)).

On the other hand, if Δ is an inner matrix function, we may ask when we complement Δ to a two-sided inner function by aid of an inner matrix function Ω , in other words, $[\Delta, \Omega]$ is two-sided inner, where $[\Delta, \Omega]$ is understood as an 1×2 operator matrix. In fact, this question can be answered by the Complementing Lemma (see [VN] or [Ni1]). To understand this question more precisely, we should remark that if Δ is an inner matrix function, Δ^* need not be of bounded type (see Example 3.4). In fact, Δ^* is of bounded type if and only if Δ is complemented to a two-sided inner function: in this case, if Δ_c is the complementary factor of Δ , then $[\Delta, \Delta_c]$ is two-sided inner (see Remark 3.20(4)). The following question asks a more general complementation: If Δ is an $n \times r$ inner matrix function, which condition on Δ allows us to complement Δ to an $n \times (r + q)$ inner matrix function $[\Delta, \Omega]$ by aid of an $n \times q$ inner matrix function Ω ? An answer to this question is also subject to the degree of non-cyclicity of $\{\Delta\}$ (see Proposition 3.21).

Now, for a canonical decomposition of strong L^2 -functions Φ , we are tempted to guess that Φ can be factorized as the form ΔA^* (where Δ is a possibly one-sided inner function) like the Douglas-Shapiro-Shields factorization, in which Δ is two-sided inner. But this is not such a case. In fact, we can see that a canonical decomposition is affected by the kernel of Δ^* through some examples (see p. 32). Indeed, we recognize that this is not accidental. The following main theorem realizes the idea inside those examples:

Theorem A. (A canonical decomposition of strong L^2 -functions) *If Φ is a strong L^2 -function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$, then Φ can be expressed in the form*

$$(2) \quad \Phi = \Delta A^* + B,$$

where

- (i) Δ is an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$;
- (ii) \tilde{A} belongs to $H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E'))$ such that Δ and A are right coprime;
- (iii) B is a strong L^2 -function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$ such that $\Delta^* B = 0$;
- (iv) $\text{nc}\{\Phi_+\} \leq \dim E'$.

In particular, if $\dim E' < \infty$ (more specially, $\dim E < \infty$), then the expression (2) is unique (up to a unitary constant right factor): in this case, Δ is given by the equation

$$\ker H_{\Phi}^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2.$$

Moreover, if $\check{\Delta}$ is of bounded type then B in (2) is given by $B = \Delta_c \Delta_c^* \Phi$, where Δ_c is the complementary factor of Δ , with values in $\mathcal{B}(E'', E)$.

Definition. The expression (2) will be called a *canonical decomposition* of a strong L^2 -function Φ .

The proof of Theorem A (p. 32) shows that the inner function Δ in a canonical decomposition (2) of a strong L^2 -function Φ can be obtained from equation $\ker H_{\Phi}^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2$, which is guaranteed by the Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem (see Corollary 3.15). In this case, the expression (2) will be called the *BLH-canonical decomposition* of Φ in the viewpoint that Δ comes from the Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem. However, if $\dim E' = \infty$ (even though $\dim D < \infty$), then it is possible to get another inner function Θ of a canonical decomposition (2) for the same function: in this case, $\ker H_{\Phi}^* \neq \Theta H_{E''}^2$. Therefore the canonical decomposition of a strong L^2 -function is not unique in general (see Remark 4.3). But the second assertion of Theorem A says that if the codomain of $\Phi(z)$ is finite-dimensional (in particular, if Φ is a matrix-valued L^2 -function), then the canonical decomposition (2) of Φ is unique, in other words, the inner function Δ in (2) should be obtained from the equation $\ker H_{\Phi}^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2$. Thus the unique canonical decomposition (2) of matrix-valued L^2 -functions is just the BLH-canonical decomposition.

If the flip $\check{\Phi}$ of Φ is of bounded type (or equivalently, $\ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^* = \Delta H_E^2$ for some *two-sided* inner function Δ), then we have $B = 0$ in the BLH-canonical decomposition (2) of Φ , which reduces to the Douglas-Shapiro-Shields factorization. In fact, the Douglas-Shapiro-Shields factorization was given for L^∞ -functions, while the case of $B = 0$ in the BLH-canonical decomposition (2) is an extended version to strong L^2 -functions. Prior to this result, we notice that the notion of “bounded type” for matrix-valued functions is not appropriate for operator-valued functions, i.e., the statement “each entry of the matrix is of bounded type” is not a natural extension to operator-valued functions even though it may have a meaning for infinite matrices (remember that we treat operators between separable complex Hilbert spaces). Thus we need to introduce an appropriate notion of “bounded type” for strong L^2 -functions. We will do this in section 3.4. Let $D_e \equiv \{z : 1 < |z| \leq \infty\}$, the complement of the closed unit disk in the extended complex plane \mathbb{C}_∞ . To guarantee the statement “each entry is of bounded type,” we adopt

the notion of “meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type” in D_e for strong L^2 -functions (cf. [Fu1]) - by definition, the meromorphic pseudocontinuation $\hat{\Phi}$ of a $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$ -valued strong L^2 -function Φ is of the form $\hat{\Phi} = \frac{G}{\theta}$ (where θ is a scalar inner function in D_e and G is a strong H^2 -function defined in D_e , with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$) such that Φ is the nontangential SOT limit of $\hat{\Phi}$, which is collapsed to the notion of “bounded type” for the flips of matrix-valued functions (see Corollary 3.31).

On the other hand, we recall that the *spectral multiplicity* for a bounded linear operator T acting on a separable complex Hilbert space E is defined by the number μ_T :

$$\mu_T := \inf \dim F,$$

where $F \subseteq E$, the infimum being taken over all generating subspaces F , i.e., subspaces such that $M_F \equiv \bigvee \{T^n F : n \geq 0\} = E$. In the definition of the spectral multiplicity, F may be taken as a subset rather than a subspace. In this case, we may regard $\mu_T = \inf \dim \bigvee \{f : f \in F\}$ such that $M_F = E$. Unless this leads to ambiguity, we will deal with M_F for subsets $F \subseteq E$. If S_E is the shift operator on H_E^2 , then it was known that $\mu_{S_E} = \dim E$. By contrast, if S_E^* is the backward shift operator on H_E^2 , then S_E^* has a cyclic vector, i.e., $\mu_{S_E^*} = 1$. Moreover, the cyclic vectors of S_E^* form a dense subset of H_E^2 (see [Ha2], [Ni1], [Wo]). We here observe that the problem of finding $\inf \text{card} \{F \subseteq E : \mathcal{H}(\Delta) = E_F^*\}$ is identical to the problem of finding the spectral multiplicity of the truncated backward shift operator $S_E^*|_{\mathcal{H}(\Delta)}$, i.e., the restriction of S_E^* to its invariant subspace $\mathcal{H}(\Delta)$. The truncated backward shift operator has been studied by many authors because it is the functional model for a contraction operator $T \in B(H)$ for a complex Hilbert space H , satisfying that $T^n x \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for each $x \in H$: i.e., if $\|T\| \leq 1$ and $T^n x \rightarrow 0$ for each $x \in H$, then T is unitarily equivalent to $S_E^*|_{\mathcal{H}(\Delta)}$ for an inner function Δ (cf. [Ni1], [SFBK]). Thus the truncated backward shift operator is often called the model operator. The second object of this paper is to show that this problem has a deep connection with a canonical decomposition of strong L^2 -functions involved with the inner function Δ .

To proceed, we need to consider a question. By the Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem, we saw that the kernel of the adjoint of a Hankel operator with a strong L^2 -symbol is of the form $\Delta H_{E'}^2$, for some inner function Δ . In view of its converse, we may ask the following question: Is every shift-invariant subspace $\Delta H_{E'}^2$, represented by the kernel of H_{Φ}^* with some strong L^2 -symbol Φ with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$? This question is to ask whether a strong L^2 -solution Φ , with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$, always exists for the equation $\ker H_{\Phi}^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2$, for a given inner function Δ with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$. Indeed, we give an affirmative answer to this question (see Lemma 5.1). The matrix-valued version of this answer is as follows (see Corollary 5.2): for a given $n \times r$ inner matrix function Δ , there exists at least a solution $\Phi \in L_{M_{n \times m}}^\infty$ (namely, $m \leq r + 1$) of the equation $\ker H_{\Phi}^* = \Delta H_{\mathbb{C}^r}^2$. Thus it is reasonable to ask whether such a solution $\Phi \in L_{M_{n \times m}}^2$ exists for each $m = 1, 2, \dots$ even though it exists for some m . But the answer to this question is negative (see Remark 5.4). From this viewpoint, we may ask how to determine a possible dimension of D for which there exists a strong L^2 -solution Φ , with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$, of the equation $\ker H_{\Phi}^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2$. In fact, we would like to ask what is the infimum of $\dim D$ such that there exists a strong L^2 -solution Φ of the equation $\ker H_{\Phi}^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2$. To find a way to determine such an infimum, we introduce a notion of the “Beurling degree” for an inner function by employing the canonical decomposition of a strong L^2 -function induced

by the given inner function: if Δ is an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$, then the *Beurling degree*, denoted by $\deg_B(\Delta)$, of Δ is defined by the infimum of the dimension of nonzero space D for which there exists a pair (A, B) such that $\Phi \equiv \Delta A^* + B$ is a canonical decomposition of a strong L^2 -function Φ with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$ (Definition 5.5).

Now we can prove that if Δ is an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$, with $\dim E' < \infty$ (in particular, Δ is an inner matrix function) then the spectral multiplicity of the model operator, i.e., the truncated backward shift on $\mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ is equal to the Beurling degree of the inner function Δ - this is the second object of this paper.

Theorem B. (The spectral multiplicity and the Beurling degree) *Given an inner function Δ with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$, with $\dim E' < \infty$, let $T := S_E^*|_{\mathcal{H}(\Delta)}$. Then*

$$(3) \quad \mu_T = \deg_B(\Delta).$$

On the other hand, we give a special interest to the case of $\deg_B(\Delta) = 1$ for an inner function Δ . In view of Theorem B, if $\dim E' < \infty$ and $T := S_E^*|_{\mathcal{H}(\Delta)}$, then this case is equal to the case of $\mu_T = 1$, in other words, T has a cyclic vector. We may thus consider the following question: For which inner function Δ , does it follow

$$(4) \quad \deg_B(\Delta) = 1?$$

To get an answer to the question (4), we need to consider the notion of “characteristic scalar inner functions” for inner functions, which is a generalization of the cases of two-sided inner matrix functions (often, we call it *square-inner* matrix function) (cf. [Hel], [SFBK], [CHL3]). On the other hand, if Δ is an inner function and Δ_c is the complementary factor of Δ , we write $\Delta_{cc} \equiv (\Delta_c)_c$, $\Delta_{ccc} \equiv (\Delta_{cc})_c, \dots$, etc. for iterated complementary factors of Δ . Then the key idea for an answer to the question (4) is given in the following: If an inner function Δ has a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e and if $\tilde{\Delta}$ is an outer function then $\Delta_{cc} = \Delta$ (see Lemma 6.13). We can then get an answer to the question (4):

Theorem C. Let Δ be an inner function having a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e . If $\tilde{\Delta}$ is an outer function, then $\deg_B(\Delta) = 1$.

Since for an inner matrix function Δ , the condition “ Δ has a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type” in D_e is equivalent to the condition “ $\tilde{\Phi}$ is of bounded type” (see Corollary 3.31), the matrix-valued version of Theorem C can be rephrased as: If Δ is an inner matrix function whose flip $\tilde{\Delta}$ is of bounded type and if Δ^t , the transpose of Δ , is an outer function, then $\deg_B(\Delta) = 1$ (see Corollary 6.14).

On the other hand, we may ask whether the converse of the key idea (Lemma 6.13) for Theorem C is true: i.e., if Δ is an inner function having a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e and $\Delta_{cc} = \Delta$, does it follow that $\tilde{\Delta}$ is an outer function? We can show that the answer to this question is affirmative when Δ is an inner *matrix* function: i.e., if $\Delta_{cc} = \Delta$, then $\tilde{\Delta}$ is an outer function when Δ is an inner matrix function whose flip $\tilde{\Delta}$ is of bounded type (see Corollary 6.15).

The organization of this paper is as follows. The main results of this paper are Theorem A, Theorem B and Theorem C. In section 2, we provide notations and preliminary notions, which will be used in this paper. To prove the main theorems, we need to consider several

auxiliary lemmas, and new notions of the “complementary factor” of an inner function, the “degree of non-cyclicity”, “bounded type” strong L^2 -functions, and the “Beurling degree” of an inner function. In section 3, we provide auxiliary lemmas to prove the main results. In section 3.1, we review vector-valued Hardy classes, and then prove some properties which will be used in the sequel. In section 3.2, we introduce the Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem and the Douglas-Shapiro-Shields factorization, and in section 3.3, we coin the notions of the complementary factor of an inner function and the degree of non-cyclicity. In section 3.4, we introduce strong L^2 -functions of bounded type, which is collapsed to the functions whose entries are of bounded type for the matrix-valued functions. In section 4, we establish a canonical decomposition of a strong L^2 -functions and give a proof of Theorem A. In section 5, we establish a connection between the spectral multiplicity of the truncated backward shift on $\mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ and the Beurling degree of the inner function Δ and give a proof of Theorem B. As an application of the preceding results, in section 6.1, we consider the characteristic scalar inner function of an inner function, by using results of section 3.4, and then in section 6.2, we analyze the case of the Beurling degree 1 and give a proof of Theorem C.

2. Preliminaries

In this section we provide notations and preliminary notions, which will be used in this paper.

- (a) Write \mathbb{D} for the open unit disk in the complex plane \mathbb{C} and \mathbb{T} for the unit circle in \mathbb{C} . To avoid a confusion, we will write z for points on \mathbb{T} and ζ for points in \mathbb{D} .
- (b) For $\phi \in L^2$, write

$$\check{\phi}(z) := \phi(\bar{z}) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\phi}(z) := \overline{\phi(\bar{z})}.$$

For $\phi \in L^2$, write

$$\phi_+ := P_+ \phi \quad \text{and} \quad \check{\phi}_- := P_- \phi,$$

where P_+ and P_- are the orthogonal projections from L^2 onto H^2 and $L^2 \ominus H^2$, respectively. Then we may write $\phi = \check{\phi}_- + \phi_+$.

- (c) Throughout the paper, we assume that

X and Y are complex Banach spaces;

D and E are separable complex Hilbert spaces.

Write $\mathcal{B}(X, Y)$ for the set of all bounded linear operators from X to Y and abbreviate $\mathcal{B}(X, X)$ to $\mathcal{B}(X)$. For a complex Banach space X , write X^* for its dual and $\langle x, \phi \rangle$ for $\phi(x)$ for $x \in X$ and $\phi \in X^*$.

- (d) If $A : D \rightarrow E$ is a linear operator whose domain is a subspace of D , then A is also a linear operator from the closure of the domain of A into E . So we will only consider those A such that the domain of A is dense in D . Such an operator A is said to be *densely defined*. If $A : D \rightarrow E$ is densely defined, we write $\text{dom } A$, $\ker A$, and $\text{ran } A$ for the domain, the kernel, and the range of A , respectively. It is well known from the unbounded operator theory (cf. [Go], [Con]) that if A is densely defined, then $\ker A^* = (\text{ran } A)^\perp$, so that $\ker A^*$ is closed even though $\ker A$ is not closed.

- (e) We recall ([Ab], [Co2], [GHR], [Ni1]) that a meromorphic function $\phi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is said to be of *bounded type* (or in the Nevanlinna class \mathcal{N}) if there are functions $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in H^\infty$ such that

$$\phi(z) = \frac{\psi_1(z)}{\psi_2(z)} \quad \text{for almost all } z \in \mathbb{T}.$$

It was known that ϕ is of bounded type if and only if $\phi = \frac{\psi_1}{\psi_2}$ for some $\psi_i \in H^p$ ($p > 0, i = 1, 2$). If $\psi_2 = \psi^i \psi^e$ is the inner-outer factorization of ψ_2 , then $\phi = \overline{\psi^i} \frac{\psi_1}{\psi^e}$. Thus if $\phi \in L^2$ is of bounded type, then ϕ can be written as

$$\phi = \overline{\theta} a,$$

where θ is inner, $a \in H^2$ and θ and a are coprime.

- (f) Write $D_e := \{z : 1 < |z| \leq \infty\}$. For a function $g : D_e \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, define a function $g_{\mathbb{D}} : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$g_{\mathbb{D}}(\zeta) := \overline{g(1/\overline{\zeta})} \quad (\zeta \in \mathbb{D}).$$

For a function $g : D_e \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, we say that g belongs to $H^p(D_e)$ if $g_{\mathbb{D}} \in H^p$ ($1 \leq p \leq \infty$). A function $g : D_e \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is said to be of *bounded type* if $g_{\mathbb{D}}$ is of bounded type.

- (g) If $f \in H^2$, then the function \hat{f} defined in D_e is called a *pseudocontinuation* of f if \hat{f} is a function of bounded type and $\hat{f}(z) = f(z)$ for almost all $z \in \mathbb{T}$. Then we can easily show that \check{f} is of bounded type if and only if f has a pseudocontinuation \hat{f} . In this case, $\hat{f}_{\mathbb{D}}(z) = \overline{f(z)}$ for almost all $z \in \mathbb{T}$. In particular,

$$(5) \quad \phi \equiv \check{\phi}_- + \phi_+ \in L^2 \text{ is of bounded type} \iff \phi_- \text{ has a pseudocontinuation.}$$

- (h) Write $M_{n \times m}$ for the set of $n \times m$ complex matrices and abbreviate $M_{n \times n}$ to M_n .

- (i) Write $\text{g.c.d.}(\cdot)$ and $\text{l.c.m.}(\cdot)$ for the greatest common inner divisor and the least common inner multiple, respectively. Also, write $\text{left-g.c.d.}(\cdot)$ and $\text{left-l.c.m.}(\cdot)$ for the greatest common left inner divisor and the least common left inner multiple, respectively.

- (j) Let $(\Omega, \mathfrak{M}, \mu)$ be a positive σ -finite measure space and X be a complex Banach space. A function $f : \Omega \rightarrow X$ of the form $f = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} x_k \chi_{\sigma_k}$ (where $x_k \in X$, $\sigma_k \in \mathfrak{M}$ and $\sigma_k \cap \sigma_j = \emptyset$ for $k \neq j$) is said to be *countable-valued*. A function $f : \Omega \rightarrow X$ is called *weakly measurable* if the map $s \mapsto \langle f(s), \phi \rangle$ is measurable for all $\phi \in X^*$ and is called *strongly measurable* if there exist countable-valued functions f_n such that $f(s) = \lim_n f_n(s)$ for almost all $s \in \Omega$. It is known that when X is separable,

(a) If f is weakly measurable, then $\|f\|$ is measurable;

(b) f is strongly measurable if and only if it is weakly measurable.

A countable-valued function $f = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} x_k \chi_{\sigma_k}$ is called (*Bochner*) *integrable* if

$$\int_{\Omega} \|f(s)\| d\mu(s) < \infty$$

and its integral is defined by

$$\int_{\Omega} f d\mu := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} x_k \mu(\sigma_k).$$

A function $g : \Omega \rightarrow X$ is called *integrable* if there exist countable-valued integrable functions g_n such that $g(s) = \lim_n g_n(s)$ for almost all $s \in \Omega$ and $\lim_n \int_{\Omega} \|g - g_n\| d\mu = 0$. Then $\int_{\Omega} g d\mu \equiv \lim_n \int_{\Omega} g_n d\mu$ exists and $\int_{\Omega} g d\mu$ is called the (*Bochner*) *integral* of g . If $f : \Omega \rightarrow X$ is integrable, then we can see that

$$(6) \quad T \left(\int_{\Omega} f d\mu \right) = \int_{\Omega} (Tf) d\mu \quad \text{for each } T \in \mathcal{B}(X, Y).$$

(k) For a function $\Phi : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(D, E)$, write $\Phi^*(z) := \Phi(z)^*$ for $z \in \mathbb{T}$.

3. Auxiliary lemmas

To prove the main theorems, we need to set up the new notions of the ‘‘complementary factor’’ of an inner function, the ‘‘degree of non-cyclicity’’ and ‘‘bounded type’’ strong L^2 -functions and then establish several auxiliary lemmas.

3.1. Vector-valued Hardy classes.

In this section, we consider vector-valued L^p - and H^p -functions, using [FF], [Ni1], [Ni2], [Pe], [Sa] for general references and then derive some properties, which will be used in the sequel.

Let m denote the normalized Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{T} . For a complex Banach space X and $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, let

$$L_X^p \equiv L^p(\mathbb{T}, X) := \{f : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow X : f \text{ is strongly measurable and } \|f\|_p < \infty\},$$

where

$$\|f\|_p \equiv \|f\|_{L_X^p} := \begin{cases} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} \|f(z)\|_X^p dm(z) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} & (1 \leq p < \infty); \\ \text{ess sup}_{z \in \mathbb{T}} \|f(z)\|_X & (p = \infty). \end{cases}$$

Then we can see that L_X^p forms a Banach space. For $f \in L_X^1$, the n -th Fourier coefficient of f , denoted by $\hat{f}(n)$, is defined by

$$\hat{f}(n) := \int_{\mathbb{T}} \bar{z}^n f(z) dm(z) \quad \text{for each } n \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Also, $H_X^p \equiv H^p(\mathbb{T}, X)$ is defined by the set of $f \in L_X^p$ with $\hat{f}(n) = 0$ for $n < 0$. Also we write $H^2(\mathbb{D}, X)$ for the set of all analytic functions $f : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow X$ satisfying

$$\|f\|_{H^2(\mathbb{D}, X)} := \sup_{0 < r < 1} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} \|f(rz)\|_X^2 dm(z) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty.$$

If E is a separable Hilbert space then we conventionally identify $H^2(\mathbb{D}, E)$ with $H_E^2 \equiv H^2(\mathbb{T}, E)$: in this case, as in the scalar-valued case, if $f \in H^2(\mathbb{D}, E)$, then the nontangential limit bf exists a.e. on \mathbb{T} and f can be recaptured by the Poisson integral $bf * P_r$ (cf. [Ni2, Theorem 3.11.7]). For $f, g \in L_E^2$ with a separable complex Hilbert space E , the inner product $\langle f, g \rangle$ is defined by

$$\langle f, g \rangle \equiv \langle f(z), g(z) \rangle_{L_E^2} := \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle f(z), g(z) \rangle_E dm(z).$$

If $f, g \in L_X^2$ with $X = M_{n \times m}$, then $\langle f, g \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \text{tr}(g^* f) dm$.

A function $\Phi : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(X, Y)$ is called *SOT measurable* if $z \mapsto \Phi(z)x$ is strongly measurable for every $x \in X$ and is called *WOT measurable* if $z \mapsto \Phi(z)x$ is weakly measurable for every $x \in X$. We can easily check that if $\Phi : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(X, Y)$ is strongly measurable, then Φ is SOT-measurable and if D and E are separable complex Hilbert spaces then $\Phi : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(D, E)$ is SOT measurable if and only if Φ is WOT measurable.

We then have:

Lemma 3.1. If $\Phi : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(D, E)$ is WOT measurable, then so is Φ^* .

Proof. Suppose that Φ is WOT measurable. Then the function

$$z \mapsto \overline{\langle \Phi^*(z)y, x \rangle} = \langle x, \Phi^*(z)y \rangle = \langle \Phi(z)x, y \rangle,$$

is measurable for all $x \in D$ and $y \in E$. Thus the function $z \mapsto \langle \Phi^*(z)y, x \rangle$ is measurable for all $x \in D$ and $y \in E$. \square

Let $\Phi : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(D, E)$ be a WOT measurable function. Then Φ is called *WOT integrable* if $\langle \Phi(\cdot)x, y \rangle \in L^1$ for every $x \in D$ and $y \in E$, and there exists an operator $U \in \mathcal{B}(D, E)$ such that $\langle Ux, y \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \Phi(z)x, y \rangle dm(z)$. Also Φ is called *SOT integrable* if $\Phi(\cdot)x$ is integrable for every $x \in D$. In this case, the operator $V : x \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{T}} \Phi(z)x dm(z)$ is bounded, i.e., $V \in \mathcal{B}(D, E)$. If $\Phi : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(D, E)$ is SOT integrable, then it follows from (6) that for every $x \in D$ and $y \in E$,

$$(7) \quad \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{T}} \Phi(z)x dm(z), y \right\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \Phi(z)x, y \rangle dm(z),$$

which implies that Φ is WOT integrable and that the SOT integral of Φ is equal to the WOT integral of Φ .

We can say more:

Lemma 3.2. For $\Phi \in L^1_{\mathcal{B}(D, E)}$, the Bochner integral of Φ is equal to the SOT integral of Φ , i.e.,

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} \Phi(z) dm(z) \right) x = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \Phi(z)x dm(z) \quad \text{for all } x \in D.$$

Proof. This follows from a straightforward calculation. \square

Write $L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ for the set of all bounded WOT measurable $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$ -valued functions on \mathbb{T} . For $\Phi \in L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, define

$$\|\Phi\|_\infty := \text{ess sup}_{z \in \mathbb{T}} \|\Phi(z)\|.$$

Following to V. Peller [Pe], for $1 \leq p < \infty$, we define the class $L^p_s(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ by the set of all WOT measurable $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$ -valued functions Φ on \mathbb{T} such that $\Phi(\cdot)x \in L^p_E$ for each $x \in D$, i.e.,

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \|\Phi(z)x\|^p dm(z) < \infty \quad \text{for each } x \in D.$$

We can easily check that

$$(8) \quad L^p_{\mathcal{B}(D, E)} \subseteq L^p_s(\mathcal{B}(D, E));$$

$$(9) \quad L^\infty_{\mathcal{B}(D, E)} \subseteq L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E)) \subseteq L^p_s(\mathcal{B}(D, E)).$$

If $\Phi \in L_s^1(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ and $x \in D$, then $\Phi(\cdot)x \in L_E^1$. Thus the n -th Fourier coefficient $\widehat{\Phi(\cdot)x}(n)$ of $\Phi(\cdot)x$ is given by

$$\widehat{\Phi(\cdot)x}(n) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \bar{z}^n \Phi(z)x \, dm(z).$$

We now define the n -th Fourier coefficient of $\Phi \in L_s^1(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, denoted by $\widehat{\Phi}(n)$, by

$$\widehat{\Phi}(n)x := \widehat{\Phi(\cdot)x}(n) \quad (n \in \mathbb{Z}, x \in D).$$

A function $\Phi \in L_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ will be called a *strong L^2 -function* with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$. We also define

$$H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E)) := \{\Phi \in L_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E)) : \widehat{\Phi}(n) = 0 \text{ for } n < 0\},$$

in other words, a function $\Phi \in H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ is a $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$ -valued function defined almost everywhere on the unit circle such that $\Phi(\cdot)x \in H_E^2$ for each $x \in D$. If $\Phi \in L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, then $\Phi \in L_s^1(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$. Thus we may define

$$H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E)) := \{\Phi \in L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E)) : \widehat{\Phi}(n) = 0 \text{ for } n < 0\}.$$

By (8), we have $L_{\mathcal{B}(D, E)}^1 \subseteq L_s^1(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$. Thus if $\Phi \in L_{\mathcal{B}(D, E)}^1$, then there are two kinds of definitions for the n -th Fourier coefficient of Φ . However we can, by Lemma 3.2, see that the n -th Fourier coefficient of Φ as an element of $L_{\mathcal{B}(D, E)}^1$ coincides with the n -th Fourier coefficient of Φ as an element of $L_s^1(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$. Also we note that if $\dim D = m < \infty$ and $\dim E = n < \infty$, then $L_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ and $H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ are the spaces of matrix-valued functions, i.e.,

$$L_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E)) = L_{M_{n \times m}}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E)) = H_{M_{n \times m}}^2.$$

The terminology a “strong H^2 -function” is reserved for the operator-valued functions on the unit disk \mathbb{D} , following to N.K. Nikolskii [Ni1]: A function $\Phi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(D, E)$ is called a *strong H^2 -function* if $\Phi(\cdot)x \in H^2(\mathbb{D}, E)$ for each $x \in D$. In general, the boundary values of strong H^2 -functions do not need to be bounded linear operators (defined almost everywhere on the unit circle \mathbb{T}). Thus we do not guarantee that the boundary value of a strong H^2 -function belongs to $H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$. For example, if Φ is defined on the unit disk \mathbb{D} by

$$\Phi(\zeta) = [1 \quad \zeta \quad \zeta^2 \quad \zeta^3 \quad \dots] : \ell^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \quad (\zeta \in \mathbb{D}),$$

then $\Phi(\zeta)$ is a bounded linear operator for each $\zeta \in \mathbb{D}$ and $\Phi(\zeta)x \in H^2(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C})$ for each $x \equiv (x_n) \in \ell^2$. Thus Φ is a strong H^2 -function with values in $\mathcal{B}(\ell^2, \mathbb{C})$. However, the boundary value

$$\Phi(z) = [1 \quad z \quad z^2 \quad z^3 \quad \dots] : \ell^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \quad (z \in \mathbb{T})$$

is not bounded for all $z \in \mathbb{T}$ because for any $z_0 \in \mathbb{T}$, if we let

$$x_0 := \left(1, \bar{z}_0, \frac{\bar{z}_0^2}{2}, \frac{\bar{z}_0^3}{3}, \dots\right)^t \in \ell^2,$$

then

$$\Phi(z_0)x_0 = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} = \infty,$$

which shows that $\Phi \notin H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$. In spite of it, there are useful relations between the set of strong H^2 -functions and the set $H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$. To see this, let $\Phi \in H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$. Then $\Phi(z) \in \mathcal{B}(D, E)$ for almost all $z \in \mathbb{T}$ and $\Phi(z)x \in H_E^2$ for each $x \in D$. We now

define a (function-valued with domain D) function $p\Phi$ on the unit disk \mathbb{D} by the Poisson integral in the strong sense:

$$\begin{aligned} p\Phi(re^{i\theta})x &:= (\Phi(\cdot)x * P_r)(e^{i\theta}) \quad (x \in D) \\ &= \int_0^{2\pi} P_r(\theta - t)\Phi(e^{it})x \, dm(t) \in E, \end{aligned}$$

where $P_r(\cdot)$ is the Poisson kernel. Then $p\Phi(\zeta)x \in H^2(\mathbb{D}, E)$ for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{D}$. Thus, for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{D}$, $p\Phi(\zeta)$ can be viewed as a function from D into E . A straightforward calculation shows that $p\Phi(\zeta)$ is a linear map for each $\zeta \in \mathbb{D}$. Since $p\Phi(\zeta)x \in H^2(\mathbb{D}, E)$ is the Poisson integral of $\Phi(z)x \in H_E^2$, we will conventionally identify $\Phi(z)x$ and $p\Phi(\zeta)x$ for each $x \in D$. From this viewpoint, we will also regard $\Phi \in H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ as an (linear, but not necessarily bounded) operator-valued function defined on the unit disk. Thus if $\dim D < \infty$, then every function $\Phi \in H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ becomes a strong H^2 -function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$.

We thus have:

Lemma 3.3. The following hold:

- (a) If $\dim D < \infty$, then every function in $H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ is a strong H^2 -function.
- (b) Every function in $H_{\mathcal{B}(D, E)}^2 \cup H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ is a strong H^2 -function.
- (c) If $\dim D < \infty$ and $\dim E < \infty$, then $H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ coincides with the set of all strong H^2 -functions with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$.

Proof. (a) This follows from the preceding remark.

(b) Let $\Phi \in H_{\mathcal{B}(D, E)}^2 \cup H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$. Then we first claim that there exists $M > 0$ such that

$$(10) \quad \sup \left\{ \|\Phi(\cdot)x\|_{L_E^1} : x \in D \text{ with } \|x\| = 1 \right\} < M,$$

To see this, if $\Phi \in H_{\mathcal{B}(D, E)}^2$, then for all $x \in D$ with $\|x\| = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi(\cdot)x\|_{L_E^1} &\leq \|\Phi(\cdot)x\|_{L_E^2} \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} \|\Phi(z)\|_{\mathcal{B}(D, E)}^2 dm(z) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \|\Phi\|_{L_{\mathcal{B}(D, E)}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

If instead $\Phi \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, then for all $x \in D$ with $\|x\| = 1$,

$$\|\Phi(\cdot)x\|_{L_E^1} = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \|\Phi(z)x\|_E dm(z) \leq \|\Phi\|_\infty,$$

which proves the claim (10). Now, in view of the preceding remark, it suffices to show $\Phi(\zeta) \in \mathcal{B}(D, E)$ for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{D}$. Let $\zeta = re^{i\theta} \in \mathbb{D}$ and $x \in D$ with $\|x\| = 1$. Then for $y \in E$

with $\|y\|_E \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \langle \Phi(re^{i\theta})x, y \rangle_E \right| &= \left| \left\langle \int_0^{2\pi} P_r(\theta - t) \Phi(e^{it}) x dm(t), y \right\rangle_E \right| \\ &= \left| \int_0^{2\pi} \left\langle P_r(\theta - t) \Phi(e^{it}) x, y \right\rangle_E dm(t) \right| \quad (\text{by (7)}) \\ &\leq \frac{1+r}{1-r} \int_0^{2\pi} |\langle \Phi(e^{it})x, y \rangle_E| dm(t), \end{aligned}$$

which implies, by our assumption,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi(\zeta)x\|_E &\leq \frac{1+r}{1-r} \int_0^{2\pi} \|\Phi(e^{it})x\| dm(t) \\ &= \frac{1+r}{1-r} \|\Phi(\cdot)x\|_{L^1_E} \\ &< \infty, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that $\Phi(\zeta) \in \mathcal{B}(D, E)$ for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{D}$. Thus Φ is a strong H^2 -function.

(c) If $\dim D = m < \infty$ and $\dim E = n < \infty$, then $H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E)) = H_{M_{n \times m}}^2$. Also by (b), $H_{M_{n \times m}}^2$ is contained in the set of all strong H^2 -functions with values in $M_{n \times m}$. Conversely, if Φ is a strong H^2 -function with values in $M_{n \times m}$, then $\langle \Phi(\zeta)x, y \rangle$ is a H^2 -function for all $x \in \mathbb{C}^m$ and $y \in \mathbb{C}^n$. Thus $\Phi \in H_{M_{n \times m}}^2$. \square

A function $\Delta \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ is called an *inner* function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$ if $\Delta(z)$ is an isometric operator from D into E for almost all $z \in \mathbb{T}$, i.e., $\Delta^* \Delta = I_D$ a.e. on \mathbb{T} and is called a *two-sided inner* function if $\Delta \Delta^* = I_E$ a.e. on \mathbb{T} and $\Delta^* \Delta = I_D$ a.e. on \mathbb{T} . If Δ is an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$, we may assume that D is a subspace of E , and if further Δ is two-sided inner then we may assume that $D = E$.

We write \mathcal{P}_D for the set of all polynomials with values in D . If F is a strong H^2 -function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$, then the function Fp belongs to H_E^2 for all $p \in \mathcal{P}_D$. The strong H^2 -function F is called *outer* if $\text{cl } F\mathcal{P}_D = H_E^2$. We then have an analogue of the scalar factorization theorem (called the *inner-outer factorization*): Every strong H^2 -function F with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$ can be expressed in the form

$$F = F^i F^e,$$

where F^e is an outer function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E')$ and F^i is an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$ for some subspace E' of E (cf. [Ni1, Corollary I. 9]). For a function $\Phi : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(D, E)$, write

$$\check{\Phi}(z) := \Phi(\bar{z}), \quad \check{\check{\Phi}} := \check{\Phi}^*.$$

Often, $\check{\Phi}$ is called the *flip* of Φ . For $\Phi \in L_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, we denote by $\check{\Phi}_- \equiv \mathbb{P}_- \check{\Phi}$ and $\Phi_+ \equiv \mathbb{P}_+ \Phi$ the function

$$\begin{aligned} ((\mathbb{P}_- \check{\Phi})(\cdot))x &:= P_-(\Phi(\cdot)x) \quad \text{a.e. on } \mathbb{T} \quad (x \in D); \\ ((\mathbb{P}_+ \Phi)(\cdot))x &:= P_+(\Phi(\cdot)x) \quad \text{a.e. on } \mathbb{T} \quad (x \in D), \end{aligned}$$

where P_+ and P_- are the orthogonal projections from L_E^2 onto H_E^2 and $L_E^2 \ominus H_E^2$, respectively. Then we may write $\Phi \equiv \check{\Phi}_- + \Phi_+$. Note that if $\Phi \in L_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, then $\Phi_+, \check{\Phi}_- \in H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$.

In the sequel, we will often encounter the adjoints of inner matrix functions. If Δ is a two-sided inner matrix function, it is easy to show that Δ^* is of bounded type, i.e., all entries of Δ^* are of bounded type (see p. 3). We also guess that if Δ is an inner matrix function then Δ^* is of bounded type. However the following example shows that this is not such a case.

Example 3.4. Let $h(z) := e^{\frac{1}{z-3}}$. Then $h \in H^\infty$ and \bar{h} is not of bounded type. Let

$$f(z) := \frac{h(z)}{\sqrt{2}\|h\|_\infty}.$$

Clearly, \bar{f} is not of bounded type. Let $h_1(z) := \sqrt{1-|f(z)|^2}$. Then $h_1 \in L^\infty$ and $|h_1| \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$. Thus there exists an outer function g such that $|h_1| = |g|$ a.e. on \mathbb{T} (see [Do1, Corollary 6.25]). Put

$$\Delta := \begin{bmatrix} f \\ g \end{bmatrix} \quad (f, g \in H^\infty).$$

Then $\Delta^* \Delta = |f|^2 + |g|^2 = |f|^2 + |h_1|^2 = 1$ a.e. on \mathbb{T} , which implies that Δ is an inner function. Note that Δ^* is not of bounded type.

For a function $\Phi \in H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, we say that an inner function Δ with values in $\mathcal{B}(D', E)$ is a *left inner divisor* of Φ if $\Phi = \Delta A$ for $A \in H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, D'))$. For $\Phi \in H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D_1, E))$ and $\Psi \in H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D_2, E))$, we say that Φ and Ψ are *left coprime* if the only common left inner divisor of both Φ and Ψ is a unitary operator. Also, for $\Phi \in H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(E, D_1))$ and $\Psi \in H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(E, D_2))$, we say that Φ and Ψ are *right coprime* if $\tilde{\Phi}$ and $\tilde{\Psi}$ are left coprime. Left or right coprime-ness seems to be somewhat delicate problem. Left or right coprime-ness for matrix-valued functions was developed in [CHKL], [CHL1], [CHL2], [CHL3], and [FF].

Lemma 3.5. If Θ is a two-sided inner function, then any left inner divisor of Θ is two-sided inner.

Proof. Suppose that Θ is a two-sided inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(E)$ and Δ is a left inner divisor, with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$, of Θ . Then we may write $\Theta = \Delta A$ for some $A \in H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(E, E'))$. Since Θ is two-sided inner, it follows that $I_E = \Theta \Theta^* = \Delta A A^* \Delta^*$ a.e. on \mathbb{T} , so that $I_{E'} = \Delta^* \Delta = A A^*$ a.e. on \mathbb{T} . Thus $I_E = \Delta \Delta^*$ a.e. on \mathbb{T} , and hence Δ is two-sided inner. \square

Lemma 3.6. If $\Phi \in L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, then $\Phi^* \in L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E, D))$. In this case,

$$(11) \quad \widehat{\Phi^*}(-n) = \widehat{\Phi}(n) = \widehat{\Phi}(n)^* \quad (n \in \mathbb{Z}).$$

In particular, $\Phi \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ if and only if $\tilde{\Phi} \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E, D))$.

Proof. Suppose $\Phi \in L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$. Then $\text{ess sup}_{z \in \mathbb{T}} \|\Phi^*(z)\| = \text{ess sup}_{z \in \mathbb{T}} \|\Phi(z)\| < \infty$, which together with Lemma 3.1 implies $\Phi^* \in L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E, D))$. The first equality of the assertion (11) comes from the definition. For the second equality, observe that for each

$x \in D$, $y \in E$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \widehat{\Phi}(n)x, y \rangle &= \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{T}} \bar{z}^n \Phi(z) x dm(z), y \right\rangle \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \bar{z}^n \Phi(z) x, y \rangle dm(z) \quad (\text{by (7)}) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle x, \bar{z}^n \widetilde{\Phi}(z) y \rangle dm(z) \\ &= \langle x, \widehat{\Phi}(n)y \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

□

Let E be a separable complex Hilbert space. For a function $f : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow E$, define $[f] : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}, E)$ by

$$(12) \quad [f](z)\alpha := \alpha f(z) \quad (\alpha \in \mathbb{C}).$$

If $g : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow E$ is a countable-valued function of the form

$$g = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} x_k \chi_{\sigma_k} \quad (x_k \in E),$$

then for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} [x_k] \chi_{\sigma_k} \right) \alpha = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha x_k \chi_{\sigma_k} = \alpha g = [g] \alpha,$$

which implies that $[g]$ is a countable-valued function of the form $[g] = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} [x_k] \chi_{\sigma_k}$.

We then have:

Lemma 3.7. Let E be a separable complex Hilbert space and $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. Define $\Gamma : L_E^p \rightarrow L_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}, E)}^p$ by

$$\Gamma(f)(z) = [f](z),$$

where $[f](z) : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow E$ is given by $[f](z)\alpha := \alpha f(z)$. Then

- (a) Γ is unitary, and hence $L_E^p \cong L_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}, E)}^p$;
- (b) $L_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}, E)}^p = L_s^p(\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}, E))$ for $1 \leq p < \infty$;
- (c) For each $f \in L_E^p$, $[\widehat{f}](n) = [\widehat{f}(n)]$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

In particular, $H_E^p \cong H_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}, E)}^p = H_s^p(\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}, E))$ for $1 \leq p < \infty$.

Proof. (a) Let $f \in L_E^p$ ($1 \leq p \leq \infty$) be arbitrary. We first show that $[f] \in L_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}, E)}^p$. Since f is strongly measurable, there exist countable-valued functions f_n such that $f(z) = \lim_n f_n(z)$ for almost all $z \in \mathbb{T}$. Observe that for almost all $z \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\|[f](z)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}, E)} = \sup_{|\alpha|=1} \|[f](z)\alpha\|_E = \|f(z)\|_E.$$

Thus we have that

$$\|[f_n](z) - [f](z)\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}, E)} = \|f_n(z) - f(z)\|_E \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

which implies that $[f]$ is strongly measurable and $\|[f]\|_{L^p_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}, E)}} = \|f\|_{L^p_E}$. Thus Γ is an isometry. For $h \in L^p_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}, E)}$, let $g(z) := h(z)1 \in L^p_E$. Then for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, we have

$$\Gamma(g)(z)\alpha = \alpha h(z)1 = h(z)\alpha,$$

which implies that Γ is a surjection from L^p_E onto $L^p_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}, E)}$. Thus Γ is unitary, so that $L^p_E \cong L^p_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}, E)}$. This proves (a)

(b) Suppose $h \in L^p_s(\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}, E))$ ($1 \leq p < \infty$). If $g(z) := h(z)1 \in L^p_E$, then $h = [g] \in L^p_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}, E)}$. The converse is clear.

(c) Let $f \in L^p_E$. Then for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\widehat{[f]}(n)\alpha = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \bar{z}^n [f](z)\alpha dm = \alpha \int_{\mathbb{T}} \bar{z}^n f(z) dm = \alpha \hat{f}(n) = [\hat{f}(n)]\alpha,$$

which gives (c).

The last assertion follows at once from (b) and (c). \square

Remark 3.8. By Lemma 3.7, we can see that if $1 \leq p < \infty$ and $\dim D < \infty$, then

$$L^p_{\mathcal{B}(D, E)} = L^p_s(\mathcal{B}(D, E)) \quad \text{and} \quad H^p_{\mathcal{B}(D, E)} = H^p_s(\mathcal{B}(D, E)).$$

Lemma 3.9. Let $1 \leq p < \infty$. If $\Phi \in L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, then $\Phi L^p_s(\mathcal{B}(E', D)) \subseteq L^p_s(\mathcal{B}(E', E))$. Also, if $\Phi \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, then $\Phi H^2_s(\mathcal{B}(E', D)) \subseteq H^2_s(\mathcal{B}(E', E))$.

Proof. Suppose that $\Phi \in L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ and $A \in L^p_s(\mathcal{B}(E', D))$. Let $x \in E'$ be arbitrary. Then we have $A(z)x \in L^p_D$. Let $\{d_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ be an orthonormal basis for D . Thus we may write

$$(13) \quad A(z)x = \sum_{k \geq 1} \langle A(z)x, d_k \rangle d_k \quad \text{for almost all } z \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Thus it follows that for all $y \in E$,

$$\langle \Phi(z)A(z)x, y \rangle = \sum_{k \geq 1} \langle A(z)x, d_k \rangle \langle \Phi(z)d_k, y \rangle,$$

which implies that ΦA is WOT measurable. On the other hand, since $\Phi \in L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, it follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \|(\Phi A)(z)x\|_E^p dm(z) \leq \|\Phi\|_\infty^p \int_{\mathbb{T}} \|A(z)x\|_D^p dm(z) < \infty \quad (x \in E'),$$

which implies that $\Phi A \in L^p_s(\mathcal{B}(E', E))$. This proves the first assertion. For the second assertion, suppose $\Phi \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ and $A \in H^2_s(\mathcal{B}(E', D))$. Then $\Phi A \in L^2_s(\mathcal{B}(E', E))$. Assume to the contrary that $\Phi A \notin H^2_s(\mathcal{B}(E', E))$. Thus, there exists $n_0 > 0$ such that $\widehat{\Phi A}(-n_0) \neq 0$. Thus for some $x_0 \in E'$,

$$(14) \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}} z^{n_0} \Phi(z)A(z)x_0 dm(z) \neq 0.$$

Then by (7), there exists a nonzero $y_0 \in E$ such that

$$(15) \quad 0 \neq \left\langle \int_{\mathbb{T}} z^{n_0} \Phi(z)A(z)x_0 dm(z), y_0 \right\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle A(z)x_0, \bar{z}^{n_0} \Phi^*(z)y_0 \rangle dm(z).$$

On the other hand, since $\Phi \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, it follows from Lemma 3.6 that $\widehat{\Phi^*}(n_0) = \widehat{\Phi}(-n_0)^* = 0$. Thus it follows from (7) that

$$0 = \langle \widehat{\Phi^*}(n_0)y_0, A(z)x_0 \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \bar{z}^{n_0} \Phi^*(z)y_0, A(z)x_0 \rangle dm(z),$$

a contradiction. \square

Corollary 3.10. Let $1 \leq p < \infty$. If $\Phi \in L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, then $\Phi L_D^p \subseteq L_E^p$. Also, if $\Phi \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, then $\Phi H_D^2 \subseteq H_E^2$.

Proof. Suppose that $\Phi \in L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$. Then for $f \in L_D^p$, we can see that $[\Phi f] = \Phi[f]$. The result thus follows from Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 3.9. \square

For an inner function $\Delta \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, $\mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ denotes the orthogonal complement of the subspace ΔH_D^2 in H_E^2 , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{H}(\Delta) := H_E^2 \ominus \Delta H_D^2.$$

We then have:

Corollary 3.11. Let Δ be an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$. Then $f \in \mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ if and only if $f \in H_E^2$ and $\Delta^* f \in L_D^2 \ominus H_D^2$.

Proof. Let $f \in H_E^2$. By Lemma 3.6 and Corollary 3.10, $\Delta^* f \in L_D^2$. Then $f \in \mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ if and only if $\langle f, \Delta g \rangle = 0$ for all $g \in H_D^2$ if and only if $\langle \Delta^* f, g \rangle = 0$ for all $g \in H_D^2$, which gives the result. \square

3.2. The Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem.

We first review a few essential facts for (vectorial) Toeplitz operators and (vectorial) Hankel operators, and for that we will use [BS], [Do1], [Do2], [MR], [Ni1], [Ni2], and [Pe]. For $\Phi \in L_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, a Hankel operator $H_\Phi : H_D^2 \rightarrow H_E^2$ is a densely defined operator defined by

$$H_\Phi p := JP_-(\Phi p) \quad (p \in \mathcal{P}_D),$$

where J denotes the unitary operator from L_E^2 to L_E^2 given by $(Jg)(z) := \bar{z}g(\bar{z})$ for $g \in L_E^2$. Also a Toeplitz operator $T_\Phi : H_D^2 \rightarrow H_E^2$ is a densely defined operator defined by

$$T_\Phi p := P_+(\Phi p) \quad (p \in \mathcal{P}_D).$$

The following lemma gives a characterization of the bounded Hankel operators on H_D^2 .

Lemma 3.12. [Pe, Theorem II.2.2] Let Φ be a strong L^2 -function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$. Then H_Φ is extended to a bounded operator on H_D^2 if and only if there exists a function $\Psi \in L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ such that $\widehat{\Psi}(n) = \widehat{\Phi}(n)$ for $n < 0$ and

$$\|H_\Phi\| = \text{dist}_{L^\infty}(\Psi, H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))).$$

The following basic properties can be easily derived: If D , E , and D' are separable complex Hilbert spaces and $\Phi \in L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, then

$$(16) \quad T_\Phi^* = T_{\Phi^*}, \quad H_\Phi^* = H_{\tilde{\Phi}};$$

$$(17) \quad H_\Phi T_\Psi = H_{\Phi\Psi} \quad \text{if } \Psi \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D', D));$$

$$(18) \quad H_{\Psi\Phi} = T_\Psi^* H_\Phi \quad \text{if } \Psi \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E, D')).$$

A *shift operator* S_E on H_E^2 is defined by

$$(S_E f)(z) := z f(z) \quad \text{for each } f \in H_E^2.$$

Thus we may write $S_E = T_{zI_E}$.

The following theorem is the fundamental result in the modern operator theory.

The Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem. [Beu], [La], [Ha1], [Pe] A subspace M of H_E^2 is invariant for the shift operator S_E on H_E^2 if and only if

$$M = \Delta H_{E'}^2,$$

where E' is a subspace of E and Δ is an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$. Furthermore, Δ is unique up to a unitary constant right factor, i.e., if $M = \Theta H_{E''}^2$, where Θ is an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(E'', E)$, then $\Delta = \Theta V$, where V is a unitary operator from E' onto E'' .

As customarily done, we say that two inner functions $A, B \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ are *equal* if they are equal up to a unitary constant right factor. If $\Phi \in L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, then by (17) and (18),

$$H_{\Phi^*} S_E = S_E^* H_{\Phi^*},$$

which implies that the kernel of a Hankel operator H_{Φ^*} is an invariant subspace of the shift operator S_E on H_E^2 . Thus, by the Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem,

$$\ker H_{\Phi^*} = \Delta H_{E'}^2$$

for some inner function Δ with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$. We note that E' may be the zero space and Δ need not be two-sided inner.

We however have:

Lemma 3.13. If $\Phi \in L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ and Δ is a two-sided inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(E)$, then the following are equivalent:

- (a) $\ker H_{\Phi^*} = \Delta H_E^2$;
- (b) $\Phi = \Delta A^*$, where $A \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E, D))$ is such that Δ and A are right coprime.

Proof. Let $\Phi \in L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ and Δ be a two-sided inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(E)$.

(a) \Rightarrow (b): Suppose $\ker H_{\Phi^*} = \Delta H_E^2$. If we put $A := \Phi^* \Delta \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E, D))$, then $\Phi = \Delta A^*$. We now claim that Δ and A are right coprime. To see this, suppose Ω is a common left inner divisor, with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$, of $\tilde{\Delta}$ and \tilde{A} . Then we may write $\tilde{\Delta} = \Omega \tilde{\Delta}_1$ and $\tilde{A} = \Omega \tilde{A}_1$, where $\tilde{\Delta}_1 \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E, E'))$ and $\tilde{A}_1 \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E'))$. Since Δ is two-sided inner, it follows that Δ_1 is two-sided inner. Since $\Phi = \Delta_1 A_1^*$, by Lemma 3.6, we have

$$\Delta_1 H_{E'}^2 \subseteq \ker H_{\Phi^*} = \Delta H_E^2 = \Delta_1 \tilde{\Omega} H_E^2,$$

which implies $H_{E'}^2 = \tilde{\Omega}H_E^2$. Thus by the Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem, $\tilde{\Omega}$ is a unitary constant and so is Ω . Therefore, Δ and A are right coprime.

(b) \Rightarrow (a): Suppose (b) holds. Clearly, $\Delta H_E^2 \subseteq \ker H_{\Phi^*}$. By the Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem, $\ker H_{\Phi^*} = \Theta H_{E'}^2$, for some inner function Θ , so that $\Delta H_E^2 \subseteq \Theta H_{E'}^2$. Thus Θ is a left inner divisor of Δ (cf. [FF], [Pe]), so that we may write $\Delta = \Theta \Delta_0$ for some two-sided inner function Δ_0 with values in $\mathcal{B}(E, E')$. Put $G := \Phi^* \Theta$. Then it follows from Lemma 3.9 that G belongs to $H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(E', D))$. Then $G = A \tilde{\Delta}_0^*$, and hence, $\tilde{A} = \tilde{\Delta}_0 \tilde{G}$. But since Δ and A are right coprime, $\tilde{\Delta}_0$ is a unitary operator, and so is Δ_0 . Therefore $\ker H_{\Phi^*} = \Delta H_E^2$, which proves (a). \square

We recall that the factorization (b) in Lemma 3.13 is called the *Douglas-Shapiro-Shields factorization* of $\Phi \in L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ (see [DSS], [FB], [Fu2]). Consequently, Lemma 3.13 says that $\Phi \in L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ admits a Douglas-Shapiro-Shields factorization if and only if $\ker H_{\Phi^*} = \Delta H_E^2$ for some two-sided inner function $\Delta \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E))$.

The following lemma will be frequently used in the sequel.

Complementing Lemma. [Ni1, p. 49, p. 53] Let $\Psi \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E', E))$ with $E' \subseteq E$ and $\dim E' < \infty$, and let θ be a scalar inner function. Then the following are equivalent:

- (a) There exists a function G in $H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E, E'))$ such that $G\Psi = \theta I_{E'}$;
- (b) There exist functions Φ and Ω in $H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E))$ with $\Phi|_{E'} = \Psi$, $\Phi|_{(E \ominus E')}$ being an inner function such that $\Omega\Phi = \Phi\Omega = \theta I_E$.

In addition, if $\dim E < \infty$, then (a) and (b) are equivalent to the following:

- (c) $\text{ess inf}_{z \in \mathbb{T}} \min\{|\Psi(z)x| : \|x\| = 1\} > 0$.

We recall that if Φ is a strong H^2 -function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$, with $\dim E < \infty$, the *local rank* of Φ is defined by (cf. [Ni1])

$$\text{Rank } \Phi := \max_{\zeta \in \mathbb{D}} \text{rank } \Phi(\zeta),$$

where $\text{rank } \Phi(\zeta) := \dim \Phi(\zeta)(D)$.

As we have remarked in the introduction, if Φ is a strong L^2 -function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$, then H_Φ^* need not be a Hankel operator. Of course, if $\Phi \in L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, then by (16), $H_\Phi^* = H_{\tilde{\Phi}}^* = H_{\Phi^*}$. By contrast, in general, $H_\Phi^* \neq H_{\Phi^*}$ for a strong L^2 -function Φ with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$. We note that if Φ is a strong L^2 -function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$, then $\ker H_{\Phi^*}$ is liable to be trivial because H_{Φ^*} is defined in the subset of polynomials in H_D^2 . Thus it is much better to deal with H_Φ^* in place of H_{Φ^*} . Even though H_Φ^* need not be a Hankel operator, we can show that the kernel of H_Φ^* is still of the form ΔH_D^2 , for some inner function Δ . To see this, we observe:

Lemma 3.14. Let Φ be a strong L^2 -function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$. Then,

$$\ker H_\Phi^* = \left\{ f \in H_E^2 : \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \Phi(z)x, z^n f(z) \rangle_E dm(z) = 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in D \text{ and } n = 1, 2, 3, \dots \right\}.$$

Proof. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
f \in \ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^* &\iff \langle H_{\check{\Phi}} p, f \rangle_{L^2_E} = 0 \quad \text{for all } p \in \mathcal{P}_D \\
&\iff \langle \check{\Phi}(z)p(z), (Jf)(z) \rangle_{L^2_E} = 0 \quad \text{for all } p \in \mathcal{P}_D \\
&\iff \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \Phi(\bar{z})xz^k, \bar{z}f(\bar{z}) \rangle_E dm(z) = 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in D \text{ and } k = 0, 1, 2, \dots \\
&\iff \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \Phi(z)x, z^n f(z) \rangle_E dm(z) = 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in D \text{ and } n = 1, 2, 3, \dots,
\end{aligned}$$

which gives the result. \square

We then have:

Corollary 3.15. If Φ is a strong L^2 -function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$, then

$$\ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2,$$

where E' is a subspace of E and Δ is an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.14, if $f \in \ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^*$, then $zf \in \ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^*$. Since $\ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^*$ is always closed, it follows that $\ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^*$ is an invariant subspace for S_E . Thus, by the Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem, there exists an inner function Δ with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$ such that $\ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2$ for a subspace E' of E . \square

3.3. The complementary factor of an inner function.

For $\Phi \in L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, we symbolically define the kernel of Φ by

$$\ker \Phi := \{f \in H_D^2 : \Phi(z)f(z) = 0 \text{ for almost all } z \in \mathbb{T}\}.$$

Note that the kernel of Φ consists of functions in H_D^2 , but not in L_D^2 , such that $\Phi f = 0$ a.e. on \mathbb{T} .

Let Δ be an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$. If $g \in \ker \Delta^*$, then $g \in H_E^2$, so that by Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.7, $[g]$ is a strong H^2 -function with values in $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}, E)$ (see p.16 for the definition of $[g]$). Write

$$[g] = [g]^i [g]^e \quad (\text{inner-outer factorization}),$$

where $[g]^e$ is an outer function with values in $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}, E')$ and $[g]^i$ is an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$ for some subspace E' of E . If $g \neq 0$, then $[g]^e : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow E'$ is a nonzero outer function, so that $E' = \mathbb{C}$. Thus, $[g]^i \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}, E))$. If instead $g = 0$, then $0 = [g]^e : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow E'$, so that $E' = \{0\}$. Therefore, in this case, $[g]^i \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(\{0\}, E))$.

We then have:

Lemma 3.16. Let Δ be an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$. Put

$$(19) \quad \Delta_c := \text{left-g.c.d.} \{ [g]^i : g \in \ker \Delta^* \}.$$

Then

- (a) $\ker \Delta^* = \Delta_c H_{D'}^2$, for some subspace D' of E ;
- (b) $[\Delta, \Delta_c]$ is an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D \oplus D', E)$;
- (c) $\ker H_{\Delta^*} = [\Delta, \Delta_c] H_{D \oplus D'}^2 \equiv \Delta H_D^2 \oplus \Delta_c H_{D'}^2$,

where $[\Delta, \Delta_c]$ is obtained by complementing Δ_c to Δ , in other words, $[\Delta, \Delta_c]$ is regarded as a 1×2 operator matrix.

Definition. The inner function Δ_c defined in (19) will be called the *complementary factor* of an inner function Δ .

Proof. If $\ker \Delta^* = \{0\}$, then (a) and (b) are trivial. Suppose that $\ker \Delta^* \neq \{0\}$. Since $\ker \Delta^*$ is invariant for the shift operator S_E on H_E^2 , by the Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem, there exists an inner function Ω with values in $\mathcal{B}(D', E)$ such that

$$(20) \quad \ker \Delta^* = \Omega H_{D'}^2,$$

where D' is a nonzero subspace of E . Put

$$(21) \quad \Delta_c := \text{left-g.c.d.} \{ [g]^i : g \in \ker \Delta^* \} \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D'', E)),$$

where D'' is a nonzero subspace of E . If $g \in \ker \Delta^*$, then $\Delta^*[g] = 0$. Thus we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_c H_{D''}^2 &= \bigvee \{ [g]^i H^2 : g \in \ker \Delta^* \} \\ &= \bigvee \{ [g] \mathcal{P}_C : g \in \ker \Delta^* \} \\ &\subseteq \ker \Delta^* = \Omega H_{D'}^2. \end{aligned}$$

For the reverse inclusion, let $0 \neq g \in \ker \Delta^*$. Then it follows that

$$g(z) = [g](z)1 = ([g]^i [g]^e)(z)1 = [g]^i(z)([g]^e(z)1) \in [g]^i H^2.$$

Thus we have

$$\Omega H_{D'}^2 = \ker \Delta^* \subseteq \bigvee \{ [g]^i H^2 : g \in \ker \Delta^* \} = \Delta_c H_{D''}^2.$$

Therefore, by the Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem, $\Omega = \Delta_c$ and $D' = D''$, which gives (a). Note that $\Delta^* \Delta_c = 0$. We thus have

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Delta^* \\ \Delta_c^* \end{bmatrix} [\Delta, \Delta_c] = \begin{bmatrix} I_D & 0 \\ 0 & I_{D'} \end{bmatrix},$$

which implies that $[\Delta, \Delta_c]$ is an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D \oplus D', E)$, which gives (b). For (c), we first note that ΔH_D^2 and $\ker \Delta^*$ are orthogonal and

$$\Delta H_D^2 \bigoplus \ker \Delta^* \subseteq \ker H_{\Delta^*}.$$

For the reverse inclusion, suppose that $f \in H_E^2$ and $f \notin \Delta H_D^2 \bigoplus \ker \Delta^* \equiv M$. Write

$$f_1 := P_M f \quad \text{and} \quad f_2 := f - f_1 \neq 0.$$

Since $f_2 \in H_E^2 \ominus M = \mathcal{H}(\Delta) \cap (H_E^2 \ominus \ker \Delta^*)$, it follows from Corollary 3.11 that $\Delta^* f_2 \in L_D^2 \ominus H_D^2$ and $\Delta^* f_2 \neq 0$. We thus have $H_{\Delta^*} f = J(\Delta^* f_2)$, and hence, $\|H_{\Delta^*} f\| = \|\Delta^* f_2\| \neq 0$, which implies that $f \notin \ker H_{\Delta^*}$. We thus have that

$$\ker H_{\Delta^*} = \Delta H_D^2 \bigoplus \ker \Delta^*.$$

Thus it follows from (a) that

$$\ker H_{\Delta^*} = \Delta H_D^2 \bigoplus \Delta_c H_{D'}^2 = [\Delta, \Delta_c] H_{D \oplus D'}^2,$$

which gives (c). This completes the proof. \square

For a subset F of H_E^2 , let E_F^* denote the smallest S_E^* -invariant subspace containing F , i.e.,

$$E_F^* = \bigvee \{S_E^{*n} F : n \geq 0\}.$$

Then by the Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem, $E_F^* = \mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ for an inner function Δ with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$. In general, if $\dim E = 1$, then every S_E^* -invariant subspace M admits a generating vector, i.e., $M = E_f^*$ for some $f \in H^2$. However, if $\dim E \geq 2$, then this is not such a case. For example, if $M = \mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ with $\Delta = \begin{bmatrix} z & 0 \\ 0 & z \end{bmatrix}$, then M does not admit a generating vector, i.e., $M \neq E_f^*$ for any vector $f \in H_{\mathbb{C}^2}^2$.

For a function $f(z) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \widehat{f}(n)z^n \in L_E^2$ (where $\widehat{f}(\cdot)$ denotes the Fourier coefficient of f), write

$$(22) \quad \overline{f}(z) := \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \overline{\widehat{f}(n)} z^{-n},$$

where $\overline{\widehat{f}(n)}$ is defined by

$$\overline{\widehat{f}(n)} := \sum_{n \geq 1} \overline{\alpha_n} e_n \quad \text{if } \widehat{f}(n) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \alpha_n e_n \quad (\alpha_n \in \mathbb{C}),$$

where $\{e_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is an orthonormal basis for E .

If $\Phi \in H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ and $\{d_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ is an orthonormal basis for D , write

$$\phi_k := \Phi d_k \in H_E^2 \cong H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}, E)).$$

We then define

$$\{\Phi\} := \{\phi_k\}_{k \geq 1} \subseteq H_E^2.$$

Hence, $\{\Phi\}$ may be regarded as the set of ‘‘column’’ vectors (in H_E^2) of Φ , in which we may think of Φ as an infinite matrix-valued function.

We then have:

Lemma 3.17. For $\Phi \in H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, we have

$$(23) \quad E_{\{\Phi\}}^* = \text{cl ran } H_{\mathbb{Z}\check{\Phi}}.$$

Remark. By definition, $\{\Phi\}$ depends on the orthonormal basis of D . However, Lemma 3.17 shows that $E_{\{\Phi\}}^*$ is independent of a particular choice of the orthonormal basis of D because the right-hand side of (23) is independent of the orthonormal basis of D .

Proof. We first claim that if $g \in L_E^2$, then

$$(24) \quad JS_E^* \overline{P_- g} = P_- \tilde{g}.$$

Indeed, if $g \in L_E^2$, then we may write $g(z) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \widehat{g}(k)z^k$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} JS_E^* \overline{P_- g}(z) &= JS_E^* \sum_{k=-\infty}^{-1} \overline{\widehat{g}(k)} z^{-k} \\ &= J \left(\sum_{k=-\infty}^{-1} \overline{\widehat{g}(k)} z^{-k-1} \right) \\ &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{-1} \overline{\widehat{g}(k)} z^k = P_- \tilde{g}(z), \end{aligned}$$

which proves (24). We next claim that if $f \in H_E^2$, then

$$(25) \quad E_f^* = \text{cl ran } H_{[\bar{z}\check{f}]}$$

To see this, observe that for each $k = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$S_E^{*k} f(z) = S_E^* \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \widehat{f}(k+j) z^{j+1} \right) = S_E^* \left(\overline{P_-(z^{k-1}\bar{f}(z))} \right).$$

Thus, for each $k = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$\begin{aligned} S_E^{*k} f &= S_E^* \overline{P_-(z^{k-1}\bar{f})} \\ &= J(JS_E^* \overline{P_-(z^{k-1}\bar{f})}) \quad (JJ = I) \\ &= JP_-(z^{k-1}\check{f}) \quad (\text{by (24)}) \\ &= H_{[\bar{z}\check{f}]} z^k. \end{aligned}$$

which proves (25). Let $\{d_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ be an orthonormal basis for D , and let $\phi_k := \Phi d_k$. Since by (25), $E_{\phi_k}^* = \text{cl ran } H_{[\bar{z}\check{\phi}_k]}$ for each $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, it follows that

$$E_{\{\Phi\}}^* = \bigvee \text{ran } H_{[\bar{z}\check{\phi}_k]} = \text{cl ran } H_{\bar{z}\check{\Phi}},$$

which gives the result. \square

We introduce:

Definition 3.18. Let $F \subseteq H_E^2$. The *degree of non-cyclicity*, denoted by $\text{nc}(F)$, of F is defined by the number

$$\text{nc}(F) := \sup_{\zeta \in \mathbb{D}} \dim \{g(\zeta) : g \in H_E^2 \ominus E_F^*\}.$$

Since E_F^* is an invariant subspace for S_E^* , it follows from the Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem that $E_F^* = \mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ for some inner function Δ with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$. Thus

$$\text{nc}(F) = \sup_{\zeta \in \mathbb{D}} \dim \{g(\zeta) : g \in \Delta H_D^2\} = \dim D.$$

In particular, $\text{nc}(F) \leq \dim E$. We note that $\text{nc}(F)$ may take ∞ . So it is customary to make the following conventions: (i) if n is real then $n + \infty = \infty$; (ii) $\infty + \infty = \infty$. If $\dim E = r < \infty$, then $\text{nc}(F) \leq r$ for every subset $F \subseteq H_E^2$. If $F \subseteq H_E^2$ and $\dim E = r < \infty$, then the *degree of cyclicity*, denoted by $\text{dc}(F)$, of $F \subseteq H_E^2$ is defined by the number (cf. [VN])

$$\text{dc}(F) := r - \text{nc}(F).$$

In particular, if $E_F^* = \mathcal{H}(\Delta)$, then Δ is two-sided inner if and only if $\text{nc}(F) = r$.

We then have:

Lemma 3.19. Let Φ be a strong L^2 -function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$. In view of the Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem and Corollary 3.15, we may write

$$E_{\{\Phi_+\}}^* = \mathcal{H}(\Delta) \quad \text{and} \quad \ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^* = \Theta H_{E'}^2,$$

for some inner functions Δ and Θ with values in $\mathcal{B}(E'', E)$ and $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$, respectively. Then

$$(26) \quad \Delta = \Theta \Delta_1$$

for some two-sided inner function Δ_1 with values in $\mathcal{B}(E'', E')$. Hence, in particular,

$$(27) \quad \ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^* = \Theta H_{E'}^2 \iff \text{nc}\{\Phi_+\} = \dim E'.$$

Proof. Suppose that $\ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^* = \Theta H_{E'}^2$, for some inner function Θ with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$ and $E_{\{\Phi_+\}}^* = \mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ for some inner function Δ with values in $\mathcal{B}(E'', E)$. Then it follows from Lemma 3.17 that

$$\mathcal{H}(\Delta) = E_{\{\Phi_+\}}^* = \text{cl ran } H_{z\check{\Phi}} = (\ker H_{z\check{\Phi}}^*)^\perp.$$

It thus follows from Lemma 3.14 that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta H_{E''}^2 &= \ker H_{z\check{\Phi}}^* \\ &= \left\{ f \in H_E^2 : \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \Phi(z)x, z^n f(z) \rangle_E dm(z) = 0 \text{ for all } x \in D \text{ and } n = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots \right\} \\ &\subseteq \left\{ f \in H_E^2 : \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \Phi(z)x, z^n f(z) \rangle_E dm(z) = 0 \text{ for all } x \in D \text{ and } n = 1, 2, 3, \dots \right\} \\ &= \ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^* = \Theta H_{E'}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that Θ is a left inner divisor of Δ . Thus we can write

$$(28) \quad \Delta = \Theta \Delta_1$$

for some inner function $\Delta_1 \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E'', E'))$. By the same argument as above, we also have $z\Theta H_{E'}^2 \subseteq \Delta H_{E''}^2$, so that we may write $z\Theta = \Delta \Delta_2$ for some inner function $\Delta_2 \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E', E''))$. Therefore by (28), we have $zI_{E'} = \Delta_1 \Delta_2$, and hence by Lemma 3.5, Δ_1 is two-sided inner. This proves (26) and in turn (27). This completes the proof. \square

Remark 3.20. From Lemma 3.19, we obtain several useful observations as follows.

- (1) Lemma 3.19 shows that if Φ is a strong L^2 -function with value in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$, then the following are equivalent:
 - (a) $E_{\{\Phi_+\}}^* = H_E^2$;
 - (b) $\text{nc}\{\Phi_+\} = 0$;
 - (c) $\ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^* = \{0\}$.
- (2) Lemma 3.19 together with Lemma 3.16(c) shows that if Δ is an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$ and if Δ_c is the complementary factor, with values in $\mathcal{B}(D', E)$, of Δ , then $\text{nc}\{\Delta\} = \dim D + \dim D'$.
- (3) From Corollary 2 of [Nil, p.47], (5) and Lemma 3.19, we can see that if Φ is an $n \times m$ matrix L^2 -function, i.e., $\Phi \in L_{M_n \times m}^2$, then the following are equivalent:
 - (a) Φ is of bounded type (i.e., Φ is of entrywise bounded type);
 - (b) $\ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^* = \Theta H_{\mathbb{C}^n}^2$ for some two-sided inner matrix function Θ ;
 - (c) $\text{nc}\{\Phi_-\} = n$.

The equivalence (a) \Leftrightarrow (b) was known from [GHR] for the cases of $\Phi \in L_{M_n}^\infty$. It was also known ([Ab, Lemma 4]) that if $\phi \in L^\infty$, then

$$(29) \quad \phi \text{ is of bounded type} \iff \ker H_\phi^* \neq \{0\}.$$

Thus the equivalence (a) \Leftrightarrow (b) shows that (29) still holds for L^2 -functions.

- (4) The above remark (3) together with Lemma 3.16 shows that if Δ is an $n \times r$ inner matrix function then the following are equivalent:
- (a) Δ^* is of bounded type, or equivalently, $\check{\Delta}$ is of bounded type;
 - (b) $[\Delta, \Delta_c]$ is two-sided inner,
- where Δ_c is the complementary factor of Δ .

On the other hand, in view of Remark 3.20(4), we may ask a more general complementation: *If Δ is an $n \times r$ inner matrix function, which condition on Δ allows us to complement Δ to an $n \times (r + q)$ inner matrix function $[\Delta, \Omega]$ by aid of an $n \times q$ inner matrix function Ω ?*

We can give an answer, to this question, whose proof uses the complementary factor.

Proposition 3.21. If Δ is an $n \times r$ inner matrix function, then $[\Delta, \Omega]$ is inner for some $n \times q$ ($q \geq 1$) inner matrix function Ω if and only if

$$q \leq \text{nc}\{\Delta\} - r.$$

In particular, Δ is complemented to a two-sided inner function if and only if $\text{nc}\{\Delta\} = n$.

Proof. Suppose that $[\Delta, \Omega]$ is an inner matrix function for some $n \times q$ ($q \geq 1$) inner matrix function Ω . Then

$$I_{r+q} = [\Delta, \Omega]^* [\Delta, \Omega] = \begin{bmatrix} I_r & \Delta^* \Omega \\ \Omega^* \Delta & I_q \end{bmatrix},$$

which implies that $\Omega H_{\mathbb{C}^q}^2 \subseteq \ker \Delta^*$. Since by Lemma 3.16, $\ker \Delta^* = \Delta_c H_{\mathbb{C}^p}^2$, it follows that $\Omega H_{\mathbb{C}^q}^2 \subseteq \Delta_c H_{\mathbb{C}^p}^2$, so that Δ_c is a left inner divisor of Ω . Thus we can write

$$\Omega = \Delta_c \Omega_1 \quad \text{for some } p \times q \text{ inner matrix function } \Omega_1.$$

Thus we have $q \leq p$. But since by Remark 3.20(2), $\text{nc}\{\Delta\} = r + p$, it follows that $q \leq \text{nc}\{\Delta\} - r$. For the converse, suppose that $q \leq \text{nc}\{\Delta\} - r$. Then it follows from Remark 3.20(2) that the complementary factor Δ_c of Δ is in $H_{M_{n \times p}}^\infty$ for some $p \geq q$. Thus if we take $\Omega := \Delta_c|_{\mathbb{C}^q}$, then $[\Delta, \Omega]$ is inner. \square

3.4. Strong L^2 -functions of bounded type.

In this section we introduce the notion of “bounded type” for strong L^2 -functions. Recall that a matrix-valued function of bounded type was defined by a matrix whose entries are of bounded type (see p. 3). But this definition is not appropriate for operator-valued functions, in particular, strong L^2 -functions even though “entry” may be properly interpreted. Thus we need an idea of defining “bounded type” strong L^2 -functions, which is equivalent to the condition that each entry is of bounded type when the function is matrix-valued. Indeed, we get an inspiration from the equivalence (a) \Leftrightarrow (b) in Remark 3.20(3).

Definition 3.22. A strong L^2 -function Φ with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$ is said to be of *bounded type* if $\ker H_\Phi^* = \Theta H_E^2$ for some two-sided inner function Θ with values in $\mathcal{B}(E)$.

On the other hand, in [FB], it was shown that if Φ belongs to $L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, then Φ admits a Douglas-Shapiro-Shields factorization (see p. 20) if and only if $E_{\{\Phi_+\}}^* = \mathcal{H}(\Theta)$ for a two-sided inner function Θ . Thus by Lemma 3.19, we can see that if $\Phi \in L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, then

(30) $\check{\Phi}$ is of bounded type $\iff \Phi$ admits a Douglas-Shapiro-Shields factorization.

We can prove more:

Lemma 3.23. Let Φ be a strong L^2 -function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$. Then the following are equivalent:

- (a) $\check{\Phi}$ is of bounded type;
- (b) $E_{\{\Phi_+\}}^* = \mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ for some two-sided inner function Δ with values in $\mathcal{B}(E)$;
- (c) $E_{\{\Phi_+\}}^* \subseteq \mathcal{H}(\Theta)$ for some two-sided inner function Θ with values in $\mathcal{B}(E)$;
- (d) $\{\Phi_+\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}(\Theta)$ for some two-sided inner function Θ with values in $\mathcal{B}(E)$;
- (e) For $\{\varphi_{k_1}, \varphi_{k_2}, \dots\} \subseteq \{\Phi\}$, write $\Psi \equiv [\varphi_{k_1}, \varphi_{k_2}, \dots]$. Then $\check{\Psi}$ is of bounded type.

Proof. (a) \Rightarrow (b): Suppose that $\check{\Phi}$ is of bounded type. Then $\ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^* = \Theta H_E^2$ for some two-sided inner function Θ with values in $\mathcal{B}(E)$. It thus follows from Lemma 3.19 that $E_{\{\Phi_+\}}^* = \mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ for some two-sided inner function Δ with values in $\mathcal{B}(E)$.

(b) \Rightarrow (c), (c) \Rightarrow (d): Clear.

(d) \Rightarrow (e): Suppose that $\{\varphi_{k_1}, \varphi_{k_2}, \dots\} \subseteq \{\Phi\}$ and $\{\Phi_+\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}(\Theta)$ for some two-sided inner function $\Theta \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E))$. Write $\Psi \equiv [\varphi_{k_1}, \varphi_{k_2}, \dots]$. Then $\{\Psi_+\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}(\Theta)$, so that $E_{\{\Psi_+\}}^* \subseteq \mathcal{H}(\Theta)$. Suppose that $E_{\{\Psi_+\}}^* = \mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ for some inner function Δ with values in $\mathcal{B}(D', E)$. Thus $\Theta H_E^2 \subseteq \Delta H_{D'}^2$, so that by Lemma 3.5, Δ is two-sided inner. Thus, by Lemma 3.19, $\ker H_{\check{\Psi}}^* = \Omega H_E^2$ for some two-sided inner function Ω with values in $\mathcal{B}(E)$, so that Ψ is of bounded type.

(e) \Rightarrow (a): Clear. □

Corollary 3.24. Let Δ be an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$. Then

$$\check{\Delta} \text{ is of bounded type } \iff [\Delta, \Delta_c] \text{ is two-sided inner,}$$

where Δ_c is the complementary factor of Δ . Hence, in particular, if Δ is a two-sided inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(E)$, then $\check{\Delta}$ is of bounded type.

Proof. The first assertion follows from Lemma 3.16. The second assertion follows from the first assertion together with the observation that if Δ is two-sided inner then $[\Delta, \Delta_c] = \Delta$. □

Corollary 3.25. Let Δ be an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$. Then $[\Delta, \Omega]$ is two-sided inner for some inner function Ω with values in $\mathcal{B}(D', E)$ if and only if $\check{\Delta}$ is of bounded type.

Proof. Suppose that $[\Delta, \Omega]$ is two-sided inner for some inner function Ω with values in $\mathcal{B}(D', E)$. Then $\Delta^* \Omega = 0$, so that $\Omega H_{D'}^2 \subseteq \ker \Delta^* = \Delta_c H_{D'}^2$. Thus Δ_c is a left inner divisor of Ω , and hence $[\Delta, \Delta_c]$ is a left inner divisor of $[\Delta, \Omega]$. Therefore by Lemma 3.5, $[\Delta, \Delta_c]$ is two-sided inner, so that by Corollary 3.24, $\check{\Delta}$ is of bounded type. The converse comes at once from Corollary 3.24 with $\Omega = \Delta_c$. □

In Lemma 3.23(e), we could not proceed that if a strong L^2 -function Φ is of bounded type then $\phi_{ij} \equiv \langle \Phi d_j, e_i \rangle$ is of bounded type for each i, j , where $\{d_j\}$ and $\{e_i\}$ are orthonormal bases of D and E , respectively. But if we strengthen the assumption then we can reach that. To see this, as in the scalar-valued case (cf. p.9), for a function $\Psi : D_e \equiv \{z : 1 < |z| \leq \infty\} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(D, E)$, we define $\Psi_{\mathbb{D}} : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(E, D)$ by

$$\Psi_{\mathbb{D}}(\zeta) := \Psi^*(1/\bar{\zeta}) \quad \text{for } \zeta \in \mathbb{D}.$$

If $\Psi_{\mathbb{D}}$ is of bounded type, strong H^2 -function, inner, and two-sided inner with values in $\mathcal{B}(E, D)$, then we shall say that Ψ is of bounded type, strong H^2 -function, inner, and two-sided inner with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$, respectively.

A $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$ -valued function Ψ is said to be *meromorphic of bounded type* in D_e if it can be represented by

$$\Psi = \frac{G}{\theta},$$

where G is a strong H^2 -function in D_e , with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$ and θ is a scalar inner function in D_e . (cf. [Fu2]). A function $\Phi \in L_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ is said to have a *meromorphic pseudocontinuation* $\hat{\Phi}$ of bounded type in D_e if $\hat{\Phi}$ is meromorphic of bounded type in D_e and Φ is the nontangential SOT limit of $\hat{\Phi}$, that is, for all $x \in D$,

$$\Phi(z)x = \lim_{r \rightarrow 1+} \hat{\Phi}(rz)x \equiv \hat{\Phi}(z)x \quad \text{for almost all } z \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Note that for almost all $z \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\hat{\Phi}(z)x = \lim_{r \rightarrow 1+} \hat{\Phi}(rz)x = \lim_{r \rightarrow 1+} \hat{\Phi}_{\mathbb{D}}^*(r^{-1}z)x = \hat{\Phi}_{\mathbb{D}}^*(z)x \quad (x \in D).$$

We then have:

Lemma 3.26. Let Φ be a strong L^2 -function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$. If Φ has a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e , then $\check{\Phi}$ is of bounded type.

Proof. Suppose that Φ has a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e . Thus the meromorphic pseudocontinuation $\hat{\Phi}$ of Φ can be written as

$$\hat{\Phi}(\zeta) := \frac{G(\zeta)}{\delta(\zeta)} \quad (\zeta \in D_e),$$

where G is a strong H^2 -function in D_e , with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$ and δ is a scalar inner function in D_e . Then for all $x \in D$,

$$\Phi(z)x = \hat{\Phi}(z)x = \frac{G(z)x}{\delta(z)} = \delta_{\mathbb{D}}(z)G_{\mathbb{D}}^*(z)x \quad \text{for almost all } z \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Thus for all $x \in D$, $p \in \mathcal{P}_E$, and $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \Phi(z)x, z^n \delta_{\mathbb{D}}(z)p(z) \rangle_E dm(z) &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle G_{\mathbb{D}}^*(z)x, z^n p(z) \rangle_E dm(z) \\ &= \langle x, z^n G_{\mathbb{D}}(z)p(z) \rangle_{L^2_{\mathbb{D}}} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that $z^n G_{\mathbb{D}}(z)p(z) \in zH_D^2$. Thus by Lemma 3.14, we have that

$$\delta_{\mathbb{D}}H_E^2 = \text{cl } \delta_{\mathbb{D}}\mathcal{P}_E \subseteq \ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^*.$$

It thus follows from Lemma 3.5 that $\check{\Phi}$ is of bounded type. \square

The following lemma was proved in [Fu1] under the setting of $H_{\mathcal{B}(D,E)}^\infty$.

Lemma 3.27. Let $\Phi \in L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$. Then the following are equivalent:

- (a) Φ has a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e ;
- (b) $\theta H_E^2 \subseteq \ker H_\Phi^*$ for some scalar inner function θ ;
- (c) $\Phi = \theta A^*$ (a.e. on \mathbb{T}) for a scalar inner function θ and some $A \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E, D))$.

Proof. First of all, recall that $L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E)) \subseteq L_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$.

(a) \Rightarrow (b): This follows from the proof of Lemma 3.26.

(b) \Rightarrow (c): Suppose that $\theta H_E^2 \subseteq \ker H_\Phi^*$ for some scalar inner function θ . Then it follows from Lemma 3.14 that for all $x \in D$, $f \in H_E^2$, and $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$,

$$0 = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \Phi(z)x, z^n \theta(z)f(z) \rangle_E dm(z) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \bar{\theta}(z)\Phi(z)x, z^n f(z) \rangle_E dm(z).$$

Thus, again by Lemma 3.14, $H_{\theta\Phi}^* = 0$, and hence $H_{\bar{\theta}\Phi} = 0$. Put $A := \theta\Phi^*$. Then by Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 3.12, A belongs to $H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E, D))$ and $\Phi = \theta A^*$.

(c) \Rightarrow (a): Suppose that $\Phi = \theta A^*$ (a.e. on \mathbb{T}) for a scalar inner function θ and some $A \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E, D))$. Thus it follows from Lemma 3.3(b) that A is a strong H^2 -function. Let

$$\hat{\Phi}(\zeta) := \frac{A^*(1/\bar{\zeta})}{\theta(1/\bar{\zeta})} \quad (\zeta \in D_e).$$

Then $\hat{\Phi}$ is meromorphic of bounded type in D_e and for all $x \in D$,

$$\hat{\Phi}(z)x = \frac{A^*(z)x}{\bar{\theta}(z)} = \theta(z)A^*(z)x = \Phi(z)x \quad \text{for almost all } z \in \mathbb{T},$$

which implies that Φ has a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e . \square

An examination of the proof of Lemma 3.27 shows that Lemma 3.27 still holds for every function $\Phi \in L_{\mathcal{B}(D,E)}^2$.

Corollary 3.28. If $\Phi \in L_{\mathcal{B}(D,E)}^2$, then Lemma 3.27 holds with $A \in H_{\mathcal{B}(E,D)}^2$ in place of $A \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E, D))$.

We now have:

Proposition 3.29. Let D and E be separable complex Hilbert spaces and let $\{d_j\}$ and $\{e_i\}$ be orthonormal bases of D and E , respectively. If $\Phi \in L_{\mathcal{B}(D,E)}^2$ has a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e , then $\check{\phi}_{ij}(z) \equiv \langle \check{\Phi}(z)d_j, e_i \rangle_E$ is of bounded type for each i, j .

Proof. Let $\Phi \in L_{\mathcal{B}(D,E)}^2$. Suppose that Φ has a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e . Then by Corollary 3.28, $\Phi = \theta A^*$ (a.e. on \mathbb{T}) for a scalar inner function θ and some $A \in H_{\mathcal{B}(E,D)}^2$. Write

$$\phi_{ij}(z) := \langle \Phi(z)d_j, e_i \rangle_E \quad \text{and} \quad a_{ij}(z) := \langle \tilde{A}(z)d_j, e_i \rangle_E.$$

Then for each i, j ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |\phi_{ij}(z)|^2 dm(z) &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} |\langle \Phi(z)d_j, e_i \rangle_E|^2 dm(z) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{T}} \|\Phi(z)\|_{\mathcal{B}(D,E)}^2 dm(z) < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $\phi_{ij} \in L^2$. Similarly, $a_{ij} \in L^2$ and for $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$,

$$\widehat{a_{ij}}(-n) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} z^n \langle \tilde{A}(z)d_j, e_i \rangle_E dm(z) = \langle d_j, z^{-n} \check{A}(z)e_i \rangle_{L_D^2} = 0,$$

which implies $a_{ij} \in H^2$. Note that

$$\check{\phi}_{ij}(z) = \check{\theta}(z) \langle \tilde{A}(z)d_j, e_i \rangle_E = \check{\theta}(z) a_{ij}(z),$$

which implies that $\check{\phi}_{ij}$ is of bounded type for each i, j . \square

Example 3.30. Let $\{\alpha_n\}$ be a sequence of distinct points in \mathbb{D} such that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - |\alpha_n|) = \infty$ and put $\Delta := \text{diag}(b_{\alpha_n})$, where $b_{\alpha_n}(z) := \frac{z - \alpha_n}{1 - \overline{\alpha_n}z}$. Then Δ is two-sided inner, and hence by Corollary 3.24, $\check{\Delta}$ is of bounded type. On the other hand, by Lemma 3.16, $\ker H_{\Delta^*} = \Delta H_{\ell_2}^2$. Thus if Δ had a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e , then by Lemma 3.27, we would have $\theta H_{\ell_2}^2 \subseteq \Delta H_{\ell_2}^2$ for a scalar inner function θ , so that $\theta(\alpha_n) = 0$ for each $n = 1, 2, \dots$, and hence $\theta = 0$, a contradiction. Therefore, Δ cannot have a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e .

For the matrix-valued case, the function having a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e is collapsed to the function whose flip is of bounded type.

Corollary 3.31. For $\Phi \equiv [\phi_{ij}] \in L_{M_n \times m}^2$, the following are equivalent:

- (a) Φ has a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e ;
- (b) $\check{\Phi}$ is of bounded type;
- (c) $\check{\phi}_{ij}$ is of bounded type for each i, j .

Proof. (a) \Rightarrow (b): This follows from Lemma 3.26.

(b) \Rightarrow (a): Suppose that $\check{\Phi}$ is of bounded type. Then $\ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^* = \Theta H_{\mathbb{C}^n}^2$ for some two-sided inner function $\Theta \in H_{M_n}^{\infty}$. Thus by the Complementing Lemma (cf. p. 20), there exists a function G in $H_{M_n}^{\infty}$ such that $G\Theta = \Theta G = \theta I_n$, and hence, $\theta H_{\mathbb{C}^n}^2 = \Theta G H_{\mathbb{C}^n}^2 \subseteq \Theta H_{\mathbb{C}^n}^2 = \ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^*$. It thus follows from Corollary 3.28 that $\check{\Phi}$ has a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e .

(a) \Leftrightarrow (c): This follows from Lemma 3.27 and Proposition 3.29. \square

However, by contrast to the matrix-valued case, it may happen that an L^{∞} -function Φ is not of bounded type in the sense of Definition 3.22 even though each entry ϕ_{ij} of Φ is of bounded type.

Example 3.32. Let $\{\alpha_j\}$ be a sequence of distinct points in $(0, 1)$ satisfying $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (1 - \alpha_j) < \infty$. For each $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, choose a sequence $\{\alpha_{ij}\}$ of distinct points on the circle $C_j := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = \alpha_j\}$. Let

$$B_{ij} := \frac{\bar{b}_{\alpha_{ij}}}{(i+j)!} \quad (i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_+),$$

where $b_{\alpha}(z) := \frac{z-\alpha}{1-\bar{\alpha}z}$, and let

$$\Phi := [B_{ij}] = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\bar{b}_{\alpha_{11}}}{2!} & \frac{\bar{b}_{\alpha_{12}}}{3!} & \frac{\bar{b}_{\alpha_{13}}}{4!} & \cdots \\ \frac{\bar{b}_{\alpha_{21}}}{3!} & \frac{\bar{b}_{\alpha_{22}}}{4!} & \frac{\bar{b}_{\alpha_{23}}}{5!} & \cdots \\ \frac{\bar{b}_{\alpha_{31}}}{4!} & \frac{\bar{b}_{\alpha_{32}}}{5!} & \frac{\bar{b}_{\alpha_{33}}}{6!} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}.$$

Observe that

$$\sum_{i,j} |B_{ij}(z)|^2 = \sum_i \frac{i}{((1+i)!)^2} \leq \sum_i \frac{1}{(1+i)^2} < \infty,$$

which implies that $\Phi \in L^\infty(\mathcal{B}(\ell_2))$. For a function $f \in H_{\ell_2}^2$, we write $f = (f_1, f_2, f_3, \dots)^t$ ($f_n \in H^2$). Thus if $f = (f_1, f_2, f_3, \dots)^t \in \ker H_\Phi$, then $\sum_j \frac{\bar{b}_{\alpha_{ij}}}{(i+j)!} f_j \in H^2$ for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, which forces that $f_j(\alpha_{ij}) = 0$ for each i, j . Thus $f_j = 0$ for each j (by the Identity Theorem). Therefore we can conclude that $\ker H_\Phi^* = \{0\}$, so that $\tilde{\Phi}$ is not of bounded type. But we note that every entry of $\tilde{\Phi}$ is of bounded type.

4. Proof of Theorem A

In this section, we give a proof of Theorem A. To understand a canonical decomposition of strong L^2 -functions, we first consider an example of a matrix-valued L^2 -function that does not admit a Douglas-Shapiro-Shields factorization. Suppose that θ_1 and θ_2 are coprime inner functions. Consider

$$\Phi := \begin{bmatrix} \theta_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \theta_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a \end{bmatrix} \equiv [\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3] \in H_{M_3}^\infty,$$

where $a \in H^\infty$ is such that \bar{a} is not of bounded type. Then a direct calculation shows that

$$\ker H_{\Phi^*} = \begin{bmatrix} \theta_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \theta_2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} H_{\mathbb{C}^2}^2 \equiv \Delta H_{\mathbb{C}^2}^2.$$

Since Δ is not two-sided inner, it follows from Lemma 3.13 that Φ does not admit a Douglas-Shapiro-Shields factorization. For a decomposition of Φ , suppose that

$$(31) \quad \Phi = \Omega A^*,$$

where $\Omega, A \in H_{M_{3 \times k}}^2$ ($k = 1, 2$), Ω is an inner function, and Ω and A are right coprime. We then have

$$(32) \quad \Phi^* \Omega = A \in H_{M_{3 \times k}}^2.$$

But since \bar{a} is not of bounded type, it follows from (32) that the 3rd row vector of Ω is zero. Thus by (31), we must have $a = 0$, a contradiction. Therefore we could not get any decomposition of the form $\Phi = \Omega A^*$ with a $3 \times k$ inner matrix function Ω for each $k = 1, 2, 3$. To get another idea, we note that $\ker \Delta^* = [0 \ 0 \ 1]^t H^2 \equiv \Delta_c H^2$. Then by a direct manipulation, we can get

$$(33) \quad \Phi = \begin{bmatrix} \theta_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \theta_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \theta_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \theta_2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^* + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} [0 \ 0 \ a] \equiv \Delta A^* + \Delta_c C,$$

where Δ and A are right coprime because $\tilde{\Delta} H_{\mathbb{C}^3}^2 \vee \tilde{A} H_{\mathbb{C}^3}^2 = H_{\mathbb{C}^2}^2$.

To encounter another situation, consider

$$\Phi := \begin{bmatrix} f & f & 0 \\ g & g & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \theta \bar{a} \end{bmatrix} \equiv [\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3] \in H_{M_3}^\infty,$$

where f and g are given in Example 3.4, θ is inner, and $a \in H^\infty$ is such that θ and a are coprime. It then follows from Lemma 3.16 that

$$\ker H_{[\bar{f} \ \bar{g}]} = \begin{bmatrix} f \\ g \end{bmatrix} H^2.$$

We thus have that

$$\ker H_{\Phi^*} = \ker H_{[\bar{f} \ \bar{g}]} \oplus \ker H_{\bar{\theta} a} = \begin{bmatrix} f & 0 \\ g & 0 \\ 0 & \theta \end{bmatrix} H_{\mathbb{C}^2}^2 \equiv \Delta H_{\mathbb{C}^2}^2.$$

By the same argument as the preceding example, we see that Φ does not admit a Douglas-Shapiro-Shields factorization. Observe that

$$(34) \quad \Phi = \begin{bmatrix} f & f & 0 \\ g & g & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \theta \bar{a} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} f & 0 \\ g & 0 \\ 0 & \theta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & a \end{bmatrix}^* = \Delta A^*.$$

Since $\tilde{\theta}$ and \tilde{a} are coprime, it follows that Δ and A are right coprime. Note that Δ is not two-sided inner and $\ker \Delta^* = \{0\}$.

The above examples (33) and (34) show that the decomposition of a matrix-valued H^2 -functions Φ satisfying $\ker H_{\Phi^*}^* = \Delta H_{\mathbb{C}^n}^2$ is affected by the kernel of Δ^* and in turn, the complementary factor Δ_c of Δ . Indeed, if we regard Δ^* as an operator acting from L_E^2 , and hence $\ker \Delta^* \subseteq L_E^2$, then B in the canonical decomposition (2) satisfies the inclusion $\{B\} \subseteq \ker \Delta^*$. Theorem A gives a canonical decomposition of strong L^2 -functions which realizes the idea inside those examples.

We are ready for a proof of Theorem A.

Proof of Theorem A. If $\ker H_{\Phi^*}^* = \{0\}$, take $E' := \{0\}$ and $B := \Phi$. Then $\tilde{\Delta}$ and \tilde{A} are zero operator with codomain $\{0\}$. Thus $\Phi = \Delta A^* + B$, where Δ and A are right coprime. It also follows from Lemma 3.19 that $\text{nc}\{\Phi_+\} = 0$, which gives the inequality (iv). If instead $\ker H_{\Phi^*}^* \neq \{0\}$, then in view of Corollary 3.15, we may suppose $\ker H_{\Phi^*}^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2$ for some nonzero inner function Δ with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$. Put $A := \Phi^* \Delta$. Then it thus

follows from Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 3.9 that $\tilde{A} = \tilde{\Delta}\check{\Phi}$ is a strong L^2 -function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E')$. Since $\ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2$, it follows that for all $p \in \mathcal{P}_D$ and $h \in H_{E'}^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \langle H_{\check{\Phi}} p, \Delta h \rangle_{L_E^2} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \check{\Phi}(z)p(z), \bar{z}\Delta(\bar{z})h(\bar{z}) \rangle_E dm(z) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \tilde{\Delta}(z)\check{\Phi}(z)p(z), \bar{z}h(\bar{z}) \rangle_{E'} dm(z) \\ &= \langle H_{\tilde{A}} p, h \rangle_{L_{E'}^2}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $H_{\tilde{A}} = 0$. Thus by Lemma 3.12, \tilde{A} belongs to $H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$. Put $B := \Phi - \Delta A^*$. Then by Lemma 3.9, B is a strong L^2 -function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$. Observe that

$$\Phi = \Delta A^* + B \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta^* B = 0.$$

For the first assertion, we need to show that Δ and A are right coprime. To see this, we suppose that Ω is a common left inner divisor, with values in $\mathcal{B}(E'', E')$, of $\tilde{\Delta}$ and \tilde{A} . Then we may write

$$\tilde{\Delta} = \Omega \tilde{\Delta}_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{A} = \Omega \tilde{A}_1,$$

where $\tilde{\Delta}_1 \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E, E''))$ and $\tilde{A}_1 \in H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E''))$. Thus we have

$$(35) \quad \Delta = \Delta_1 \tilde{\Omega} \quad \text{and} \quad A = A_1 \tilde{\Omega}.$$

Since Ω is inner, it follows that $I_{E''} = \widetilde{\Omega^* \Omega} = \tilde{\Omega} \tilde{\Omega}^*$. Thus by (35), $\Delta_1 = \Delta \tilde{\Omega}^*$, and hence, by Lemma 3.6, Δ_1 is inner. We now claim that

$$(36) \quad \Delta_1 H_{E''}^2 = \ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2.$$

Since Ω is an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(E'', E')$, we know that $\tilde{\Omega} \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E', E''))$ by Lemma 3.6. Thus it follows from Corollary 3.10 and (35) that

$$\Delta H_{E'}^2 = \Delta_1 \tilde{\Omega} H_{E'}^2 \subseteq \Delta_1 H_{E''}^2.$$

For the reverse inclusion, by (35), we may write $\Phi = \Delta_1 A_1^* + B$. Since $0 = \Delta^* B = \tilde{\Omega}^* \Delta_1^* B$, it follows that $\Delta_1^* B = 0$. Therefore for all $f \in H_{E''}^2$, $x \in D$ and $n = 1, 2, \dots$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \Phi(z)x, z^n \Delta_1(z)f(z) \rangle_E dm(z) &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle (\Delta_1(z)A_1^*(z) + B(z))x, z^n \Delta_1(z)f(z) \rangle_E dm(z) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle A_1^*(z)x, z^n f(z) \rangle_{E''} dm(z) \\ &= \langle A_1^*(z)x, z^n f(z) \rangle_{L_{E''}^2} \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that $A_1^*(z)x = \tilde{A}_1^*(\bar{z})x \in L_{E''}^2 \ominus zH_{E''}^2$. Thus by Lemma 3.14, we have

$$\Delta_1 H_{E''}^2 \subseteq \ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2,$$

which proves (36). Thus it follows from the Beurling-Lax-Halmos Theorem and (35) that $\tilde{\Omega}$ is a unitary operator, and so is Ω . Therefore A and Δ are right coprime. The assertion (iv) on the nc-number comes from Lemma 3.19. This proves the first assertion (2).

Suppose $\dim E' < \infty$. For the uniqueness of the expression (2), we suppose that $\Phi = \Delta_1 A_1^* + B_1 = \Delta_2 A_2^* + B_2$ are two canonical decompositions of Φ . We want to show that $\Delta_1 = \Delta_2$, which gives

$$A_1^* = \Delta_1^*(\Delta_1 A_1^* + B_1) = \Delta_2^*(\Delta_2 A_2^* + B_2) = A_2^*$$

and in turn, $B_1 = B_2$, which implies that the representation (2) is unique. To prove $\Delta_1 = \Delta_2$, it suffices to show that if $\Phi = \Delta A^* + B$ is a canonical decomposition of Φ , then

$$(37) \quad \ker H_{\Phi}^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2.$$

If $E' = \{0\}$, then $\text{nc}\{\Phi_+\} = 0$. Thus it follows from Remark 3.20(1) that

$$\ker H_{\Phi}^* = \{0\} = \Delta H_{E'}^2,$$

which proves (37). If instead $E' \neq \{0\}$, then we suppose $r := \dim E' < \infty$. Thus, we may assume that $E' \equiv \mathbb{C}^r$, so that Δ is an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^r, E)$. Suppose that $\Phi = \Delta A^* + B$ is a canonical decomposition of Φ in $L_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$. Then

- (i) \tilde{A} belongs to $H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, \mathbb{C}^r))$ such that Δ and A are right coprime;
- (ii) B is a strong L^2 -function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$ such that $\Delta^* B = 0$;
- (iii) $\text{nc}\{\Phi_+\} \leq r$.

We first claim that

$$(38) \quad \Delta H_{\mathbb{C}^r}^2 \subseteq \ker H_{\Phi}^*.$$

Observe that for each $g \in H_{\mathbb{C}^r}^2$, $x \in D$ and $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \Phi(z)x, z^k \Delta(z)g(z) \rangle_E dm(z) &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle A^*(z)x, z^k g(z) \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^r} dm(z) \\ &= \langle \tilde{A}(\bar{z})x, z^k g(z) \rangle_{L_{\mathbb{C}^r}^2} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

It thus follows from Lemma 3.14 that $\Delta H_{\mathbb{C}^r}^2 \subseteq \ker H_{\Phi}^*$, which proves (38). In view of Corollary 3.15, we may assume that $\ker H_{\Phi}^* = \Theta H_{E''}^2$ for some inner function Θ with values in $\mathcal{B}(E'', E)$. Then by Lemma 3.19,

$$(39) \quad p \equiv \dim E'' = \text{nc}\{\Phi_+\} \leq r.$$

Thus we may assume $E'' \equiv \mathbb{C}^p$. Since

$$(40) \quad \Delta H_{\mathbb{C}^r}^2 \subseteq \ker H_{\Phi}^* = \Theta H_{\mathbb{C}^p}^2,$$

it follows that Θ is left inner divisor of Δ , i.e., there exists a $p \times r$ inner matrix function Δ_1 such that $\Delta = \Theta \Delta_1$. Since Δ_1 is inner, it follows that $r \leq p$. But since by (39), $p \leq r$, we must have $r = p$, which implies that Δ_1 is two-sided inner. Thus we have

$$(41) \quad \Theta^* \Phi = \Delta_1 A^* + \Delta_1 \Delta^* B = \Delta_1 A^*.$$

Since $\ker H_{\Phi}^* = \Theta H_{\mathbb{C}^r}^2$, it follows from Lemma 3.14 and (41) that for all $f \in H_{\mathbb{C}^r}^2$, $x \in D$ and $n = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$(42) \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \Delta_1(z)A^*(z)x, z^n f(z) \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^r} dm(z) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \Phi(z)x, z^n \Theta(z)f(z) \rangle_E dm(z) = 0.$$

Write $\Psi := \Delta_1 A^*$. Then by Lemma 3.9, $\Psi \in L_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, \mathbb{C}^r))$. Thus by Lemma 3.12, Lemma 3.14 and (42), we have $\check{\Psi} \in H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, \mathbb{C}^r))$. Since $\tilde{A} = \tilde{\Delta}_1 \check{\Psi}$, it follows that $\tilde{\Delta}_1$ is a common left inner divisor of $\tilde{\Delta}$ and \tilde{A} . But since Δ and A are right coprime, it follows

that $\tilde{\Delta}_1$ is a unitary matrix, and so is Δ_1 , which proves (37). This proves the uniqueness of the expression (2) when $\dim E' < \infty$.

For the last assertion, we suppose that $\check{\Delta}$ is of bounded type. Then by Corollary 3.24, $[\Delta, \Delta_c]$ is two-sided inner, where Δ_c is the complementary factor of Δ , with values in $\mathcal{B}(D', E)$. We thus have

$$I = [\Delta, \Delta_c][\Delta, \Delta_c]^* = \Delta\Delta^* + \Delta_c\Delta_c^*,$$

so that

$$B = \Phi - \Delta A^* = (I - \Delta\Delta^*)\Phi = \Delta_c\Delta_c^*\Phi.$$

This proves the last assertion.

This completes the proof. \square

Remark 4.1. If $\check{\Delta}$ is of bounded type and $\dim E' < \infty$ in Theorem A, then the dimension of the domain D' of Δ_c can be computed by the degrees of non-cyclicity of $\check{\Phi}_+$ and Δ : i.e., $\dim D' = \text{nc}\{\Delta\} - \text{nc}\{\check{\Phi}_+\}$. Indeed, this follows from the facts that $\text{nc}\{\check{\Phi}_+\} = \dim E' < \infty$ (by Lemma 3.19) and $\text{nc}\{\Delta\} = \dim E' + \dim D'$ (by Remark 3.20(2)).

The following corollary is an extension of Lemma 3.13 (the Douglas-Shapiro-Shields factorization) to strong L^2 -functions.

Corollary 4.2. If Φ is a strong L^2 -function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$, then the following are equivalent:

- (a) The flip $\check{\Phi}$ of Φ is of bounded type;
- (b) $\Phi = \Delta A^*$ (Δ is two-sided inner) is a canonical decomposition of Φ .

Proof. The implication (a) \Rightarrow (b) follows from the proof of Theorem A. For the implication (b) \Rightarrow (a), suppose $\Phi = \Delta A^*$ (Δ is two-sided inner) is a canonical decomposition of Φ . By Corollary 3.15, there exists an inner function Θ with values in $\mathcal{B}(D', E)$ such that $\ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^* = \Theta H_{D'}^2$. Then it follows from Lemma 3.14 that $\Delta H_E^2 \subseteq \ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^* = \Theta H_{D'}^2$. Since Δ is two-sided inner, we have that by Lemma 3.5, Θ is two-sided inner, and hence the flip $\check{\Phi}$ of Φ is of bounded type. This completes the proof. \square

Remark 4.3. (a) If $\dim E' = \infty$ (even though $\dim D < \infty$), the canonical decomposition (2) may not be unique even if $\check{\Phi}$ is of bounded type. To see this, let Φ be an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^2, \ell^2)$ defined by

$$\Phi := \begin{bmatrix} \theta_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \theta_2 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots \end{bmatrix},$$

where θ_1 and θ_2 are scalar inner functions. Then by Lemma 3.16, we have

$$\ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^* = \ker H_{\Phi^*} = \Phi H_{\mathbb{C}^2}^2 \oplus \ker \Phi^* = \text{diag}(\theta_1, 1, \theta_2, 1, 1, 1, \dots) H_{\ell^2}^2 \equiv \Theta H_{\ell^2}^2,$$

which implies that $\check{\Phi}$ is of bounded type since Θ is two-sided inner (see Definition 3.22). Let

$$A := \Phi^* \Theta = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B := 0.$$

Then \tilde{A} belongs to $H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^2, \ell^2))$ and $\tilde{\Theta} H_{\ell^2}^2 \vee \tilde{A} H_{\mathbb{C}^2}^2 = H_{\ell^2}^2$, which implies that Θ and A are right coprime. Clearly, $\Theta^* B = 0$ and $\text{nc}\{\Phi_+\} \leq \dim \ell^2 = \infty$. Therefore,

$$\Phi = \Theta A^*$$

is the BLH-canonical decomposition of Φ . On the other hand, to get another canonical decomposition of Φ , let

$$\Delta := \begin{bmatrix} \theta_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & \theta_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then Δ is an inner function. If we define

$$A_1 := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B := 0,$$

then \tilde{A}_1 belongs to $H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^2, \ell^2))$ such that Δ and A_1 are right coprime, $\Delta^* B = 0$ and $\text{nc}\{\Phi_+\} \leq \dim \ell^2 = \infty$. Therefore $\Phi = \Delta A_1^*$ is also a canonical decomposition of Φ . In this case, $\ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^* \neq \Delta H_{\ell^2}^2$. Therefore, the canonical decomposition of Φ is not unique.

(b) Let Δ be an inner matrix function with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$. Then Theorem A says that if $\dim E' < \infty$, the expression (2) satisfying the conditions (i) - (iv) in Theorem A gives $\ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2$. We note that the condition (iv) on nc-number cannot be dropped from the assumptions of Theorem A. To see this, let

$$\Delta := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} z \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad A := \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{2} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B := 0.$$

If $\Phi := \Delta A^* + B = \begin{bmatrix} z & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, then Φ satisfies the conditions (i), (ii), and (iii), but $\ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^* = zH^2 \oplus H^2 \neq \Delta H^2$. Note that by Lemma 3.19, $\text{nc}\{\Phi_+\} = 2$, which does not satisfy the condition on nc-number, say $\text{nc}\{\Phi_+\} \leq 1$.

5. The Beurling degree: Proof of Theorem B

In this section we give a proof of Theorem B. To do so, we first consider the question: *If Δ is an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$, does there exist a strong L^2 -function Φ with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$ satisfying the equation*

$$(43) \quad \ker H_{\check{\Phi}}^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2 ?$$

To closely understand an answer to the question (43), we examine a question whether there exists an *inner* function Ω satisfying $\ker H_{\Omega^*} = \Delta H_{E'}^2$, if Δ is an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$. In fact, the answer to this question is negative. Indeed, if

$\ker H_{\Omega^*} = \Delta H_{E'}^2$ for some inner function $\Omega \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, then by Lemma 3.16, we have $[\Omega, \Omega_c] = \Delta$, and hence $\Delta_c = 0$. Conversely, if $\Delta_c = 0$ then by again Lemma 3.16, we should have $\ker H_{\Delta^*} = \Delta H_{E'}^2$. Consequently, $\ker H_{\Omega^*} = \Delta H_{E'}^2$ for some inner function Ω if and only if $\Delta_c = 0$. Thus if

$$\Delta := \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

then there exists no inner function Ω such that $\ker H_{\Omega^*} = \Delta H^2$. On the other hand, we note that the solution Φ is not unique although there exists an inner function Φ satisfying the equation (43). For example, if $\Delta := \text{diag}(z, 1, 1)$, then the following Φ are all such solutions:

$$\Phi = \begin{bmatrix} z \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} z & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Delta.$$

The following lemma gives an affirmative answer to the question (43): we can always find a strong L^2 -function Φ with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$ satisfying the equation $\ker H_\Phi^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2$.

Lemma 5.1. Let Δ be an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$. Then there exists a function Φ in $H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, with either $D = E'$ or $D = \mathbb{C} \oplus E'$, satisfying

$$\ker H_\Phi^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2.$$

Proof. If $\ker \Delta^* = \{0\}$, take $\Phi = \Delta$. Then it follows from Lemma 3.16 that

$$\ker H_\Phi^* = \ker H_{\Delta^*} = \Delta H_{E'}^2.$$

If instead $\ker \Delta^* \neq \{0\}$, let Δ_c be the complementary factor of Δ with values in $\mathcal{B}(E'', E)$ for some nonzero Hilbert space E'' . Choose a cyclic vector $g \in H_{E''}^2$ of $S_{E''}^*$, and define

$$\Phi := [[z\Delta_c g], \Delta],$$

where $[z\Delta_c g](z) : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow E$ is given by $[z\Delta_c g](z)\alpha := \alpha z\Delta_c(z)g(z)$. Then it follows from Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 3.9 that Φ belongs to $H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, where $D = \mathbb{C} \oplus E'$. For each $x \equiv \alpha \oplus x_0 \in D$, $f \in H_{E'}^2$, and $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \Phi(z)x, z^n \Delta(z)f(z) \rangle_E dm(z) &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \alpha z\Delta_c(z)g(z) + \Delta(z)x_0, z^n \Delta(z)f(z) \rangle_E dm(z) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle x_0, z^n f(z) \rangle_{E'} dm(z) \quad (\text{since } \Delta^* \Delta_c = 0) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

It thus follows from Lemma 3.14 that

$$(44) \quad \Delta H_{E'}^2 \subseteq \ker H_\Phi^*.$$

For the reverse inclusion, suppose $h \in \ker H_\Phi^*$. Then by Lemma 3.14, we have that for each $x \equiv \alpha \oplus x_0 \in D$ and $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle [z\Delta_c g](z)\alpha, z^n h(z) \rangle_E dm(z) + \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \Delta(z)x_0, z^n h(z) \rangle_E dm(z) = 0.$$

Take $\alpha = 0$. Then we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \Delta(z)x_0, z^n h(z) \rangle_E dm(z) = 0,$$

which implies, by Lemma 3.14, that $h \in \ker H_{\Delta^*}$. It thus follows from Lemma 3.16 that

$$(45) \quad \ker H_{\Phi}^* \subseteq \ker H_{\Delta^*} = \Delta H_{E'}^2 \oplus \Delta_c H_{E''}^2.$$

Assume to the contrary that $\ker H_{\Phi}^* \neq \Delta H_{E'}^2$. Then by (44) and (45), there exists a nonzero function $f \in H_{E''}^2$ such that $\Delta_c f \in \ker H_{\Phi}^*$. It thus follows from Lemma 3.14 that for each $x \equiv \alpha \oplus x_0 \in D$ and $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \Phi(z)x, z^n \Delta_c(z)f(z) \rangle_E dm(z) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \alpha z \Delta_c(z)g(z) + \Delta(z)x_0, z^n \Delta_c(z)f(z) \rangle_E dm(z) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle z[g](z)\alpha, z^n f(z) \rangle_{E''} dm(z) \quad (\text{since } \Delta^* \Delta_c = 0), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $f \in \ker H_{\bar{z}[g]}^*$. Since g is a cyclic vector of $S_{E''}^*$, it thus follows from Lemma 3.17 that

$$f \in (\text{cl ran } H_{\bar{z}[g]}^*)^\perp = (E_g^*)^\perp = \{0\},$$

which is a contradiction. This completes the proof. \square

If Δ is an $n \times r$ inner matrix function, then we can find a solution $\Phi \in H_{M_{n \times m}}^\infty$ (with $m \leq r + 1$) of the equation $\ker H_{\Phi}^* = \Delta H_{\mathbb{C}^r}^2$.

Corollary 5.2. For a given $n \times r$ inner matrix function Δ , there exists at least a solution $\Phi \in H_{M_{n \times m}}^\infty$ (with $m \leq r + 1$) of the equation $\ker H_{\Phi}^* = \Delta H_{\mathbb{C}^r}^2$.

Proof. If $\ker \Delta^* = \{0\}$, then this is obvious. Let $\ker \Delta^* \neq \{0\}$ and $\Delta_c \in H_{M_{p \times n}}^\infty$ be the complementary factor of Δ . Then by Lemma 3.16, $1 \leq p \leq n - r$. For $j = 1, 2, \dots, p$, put

$$g_j := e^{\frac{1}{z - \alpha_j}},$$

where α_j are distinct points in the interval $[2, 3]$. Then it is known that (cf. [Ni1, P. 55])

$$g := \begin{bmatrix} g_1 \\ g_2 \\ \vdots \\ g_p \end{bmatrix} \in H_{\mathbb{C}^p}^\infty$$

is a cyclic vector of $S_{\mathbb{C}^p}^*$. Put $\Phi := [[z\Delta_c g], \Delta]$. Then by Lemma 3.7, we have $\Phi \in H_{M_{n \times (r+1)}}^\infty$. The same argument as the proof of Lemma 5.1 gives the result. \square

Corollary 5.3. If Δ is an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$, then there exists a function $\Phi \in L_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ (with $D = E'$ or $D = \mathbb{C} \oplus E'$) such that $\Phi \equiv \Delta A^* + B$ is the BLH-canonical decomposition of Φ .

Proof. By Lemma 5.1, there exists a function $\Phi \in H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ such that $\ker H_{\Phi}^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2$, with $D = E'$ or $D = \mathbb{C} \oplus E'$. If we put $A := \Phi^* \Delta$ and $B := \Phi - \Delta A^*$, then by the proof of the first assertion of Theorem A, $\Phi = \Delta A^* + B$ is the BLH-canonical decomposition of Φ . \square

Remark 5.4. In view of Corollary 5.2, it is reasonable to ask whether such a solution $\Phi \in L^2_{M_{n \times m}}$ of the equation $\ker H_{\Phi}^* = \Delta H^2_{\mathbb{C}^r}$ (Δ an $n \times r$ inner matrix function) exists for each $m = 1, 2, \dots$ even though it exists for some m . For example, let

$$(46) \quad \Delta := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} z \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, by Corollary 5.2, there exists a solution $\Phi \in L^2_{M_{2 \times m}}$ ($m = 1$ or 2) of the equation $\ker H_{\Phi}^* = \Delta H^2$. For $m = 2$, let

$$(47) \quad \Phi := \begin{bmatrix} z & za \\ 1 & -a \end{bmatrix} \in H^\infty_{M_2},$$

where $a \in H^\infty$ is such that \bar{a} is not of bounded type. Then a direct calculation shows that $\ker H_{\Phi}^* = \ker H_{\Phi^*} = \Delta H^2$. We may then ask how about the case $m = 1$. In this case, the answer is affirmative. To see this, let

$$\Psi := \begin{bmatrix} z + za \\ 1 - a \end{bmatrix} \in H^\infty_{M_{2 \times 1}},$$

where $a \in H^\infty$ is such that \bar{a} is not of bounded type. Then a direct calculation shows that $\ker H_{\Psi^*} = \Delta H^2$. Therefore, if Δ is given by (46), then we may assert that there exists a solution $\Phi \in L^2_{M_{n \times m}}$ of the equation $\ker H_{\Phi}^* = \Delta H^2$ for each $m = 1, 2$. However, this assertion is not true in general, i.e., a solution exists for some m , but may not exist for another $m_0 < m$. To see this, let

$$\Delta := \begin{bmatrix} z & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & z & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in H^\infty_{M_{4 \times 3}}.$$

Then Δ is inner. We will show that there exists no solution $\Phi \in L^2_{M_{4 \times 1}}$ (i.e., the case $m = 1$) of the equation $\ker H_{\Phi}^* = \Delta H^2_{\mathbb{C}^3}$. Assume to the contrary that $\Phi \in L^2_{M_{4 \times 1}}$ is a solution of the equation $\ker H_{\Phi}^* = \Delta H^2_{\mathbb{C}^3}$. By Theorem A, Φ can be written as

$$\Phi = \Delta A^* + B,$$

where $A \in H^2_{M_{1 \times 3}}$ is such that Δ and A are right coprime. But since $\tilde{\Delta} H^2_{\mathbb{C}^4} = zH^2 \oplus zH^2 \oplus H^2$, it follows that

$$\tilde{\Delta} H^2_{\mathbb{C}^4} \vee \tilde{A} H^2 \neq H^2_{\mathbb{C}^3},$$

which implies that Δ and A are not right coprime, a contradiction. Therefore we cannot find any solution Φ , in $L^2_{M_{4 \times 1}}$ (the case $m = 1$), of the equation $\ker H_{\Phi}^* = \Delta H^2_{\mathbb{C}^3}$. However, if $m = 2$, then we can find a solution $\Phi \in L^2_{M_{4 \times 2}}$. Indeed, let

$$\Phi := \begin{bmatrix} z & 0 \\ 0 & z \\ 0 & 0 \\ a & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $a \in H^\infty$ is such that \bar{a} is not of bounded type. A straightforward calculation shows that $\ker H_{\Phi^*} = zH^2 \oplus zH^2 \oplus H^2 \oplus \{0\} = \Delta H^2_{\mathbb{C}^3}$. Thus we obtain a solution for $m = 2$ although there exists no solution for $m = 1$.

Let Δ be an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$. In view of Remark 5.4, we may ask how to determine a possible dimension of D for which there exists a solution $\Phi \in L_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ of the equation $\ker H_\Phi^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2$. In fact, if we have a solution $\Phi \in L_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ of the equation $\ker H_\Phi^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2$, then a solution $\Psi \in L_s^2(D', E)$ also exists if D' is a separable complex Hilbert space containing D : indeed, if $\mathbf{0}$ denotes the zero operator in $\mathcal{B}(D' \ominus D, E)$ and $\Psi := [\Phi, \mathbf{0}]$, then it follows from Lemma 3.14 that $\ker H_\Phi^* = \ker H_\Psi^*$. Thus we would like to ask what is the infimum of $\dim D$ such that there exists a solution $\Phi \in L_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ of the equation $\ker H_\Phi^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2$.

To answer this question, we introduce a notion of the ‘‘Beurling degree’’ for an inner function, by employing a canonical decomposition of strong L^2 -functions induced by the given inner function.

Definition 5.5. Let Δ be an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$. Then the *Beurling degree* of Δ , denoted by $\deg_B(\Delta)$, is defined by the infimum of the dimension of nonzero space D for which there exists a pair (A, B) such that $\Phi = \Delta A^* + B$ is a canonical decomposition of Φ in $L_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$: i.e.,

$$\deg_B(\Delta) := \inf \dim D \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \cup \{\infty\}.$$

Note. By Corollary 5.3, $\deg_B(\Delta)$ is well-defined: indeed, $1 \leq \deg_B(\Delta) \leq 1 + \dim E'$. In particular, if $E' = \{0\}$, then $\deg_B(\Delta) = 1$. Also if Δ is a unitary operator then clearly, $\deg_B(\Delta) = 1$.

Given a backward shift-invariant subspace $\mathcal{H}(\Delta)$, where Δ is an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$, we may ask what is the smallest number m of vectors in F satisfying $\mathcal{H}(\Delta) = E_F^*$. We recall that the smallest number m of vectors in F such that $\mathcal{H}(\Delta) = E_F^*$ is exactly the spectral multiplicity μ_T of the truncated backward shift $T \equiv S_E^*|_{\mathcal{H}(\Delta)}$. Now it is somewhat surprised that if Δ is an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$, with $\dim E' < \infty$ (in particular, Δ is an inner matrix function), then the spectral multiplicity of the model operator, i.e., truncated backward shift on $\mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ coincides with the Beurling degree of the inner function Δ - this is the second object of this paper.

We are ready for:

Proof of Theorem B. We first claim that

$$(48) \quad \deg_B(\Delta) = \inf \{ \dim D : \ker H_\Phi^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2, \text{ for some } \Phi \in L_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E)) \text{ with } D \neq \{0\} \}.$$

To see this, let Δ be an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$, with $\dim E' < \infty$. Suppose that $\Phi = \Delta A^* + B$ is a canonical decomposition of Φ in $L_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$. Then by the uniqueness of Δ in Theorem A, we have

$$(49) \quad \ker H_\Phi^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2,$$

which implies

$$(50) \quad \deg_B(\Delta) \geq \inf \{ \dim D : \ker H_\Phi^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2, \text{ for some } \Phi \in L_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E)) \text{ with } D \neq \{0\} \}.$$

For the reverse inequality of (50), suppose $\Phi \in L_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ satisfies $\ker H_\Phi^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2$. Then by the same argument as in the proof of the first assertion of Theorem A,

$$\Phi = \Delta A^* + B \quad (A := \Phi^* \Delta \text{ and } B := \Phi - \Delta A^*)$$

is a canonical decomposition of Φ , and hence we have the reverse inequality of (50). This proves the claim (48). We will next show that

$$(51) \quad \deg_B(\Delta) \leq \mu_T.$$

If $\mu_T = \infty$, then (51) is trivial. Suppose $p \equiv \mu_T < \infty$. Then there exists a subset $G = \{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_p\} \subseteq H_E^2$ such that $E_G^* = \mathcal{H}(\Delta)$. Put

$$\Psi := z[G].$$

Then by Lemma 3.7, $\Psi \in H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^p, E))$. It thus follows from Lemma 3.17 that

$$\mathcal{H}(\Delta) = E_G^* = \text{cl ran } H_{\bar{z}[G]} = \text{cl ran } H_{\Psi},$$

which implies $\ker H_\Psi^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2$. Thus by (48), $\deg_B(\Delta) \leq p = \mu_T$, which proves (51). For the reverse inequality of (51), suppose that $r \equiv \dim E' < \infty$. Write $m_0 \equiv \deg_B(\Delta)$. Then it follows from Lemma 5.1 and (48) that $m_0 \leq r + 1 < \infty$ and there exists a function $\Phi \in L_s^2(\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^{m_0}, E))$ such that

$$(52) \quad \ker H_\Phi^* = \Delta H_{\mathbb{C}^r}^2.$$

Now let

$$G := \Phi_+ - \hat{\Phi}(0).$$

Thus we may write $G = zF$ for some $F \in H_s^2(\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^{m_0}, E))$. Then by Lemma 3.17, we have that

$$E_{\{F\}}^* = \text{cl ran } H_{\bar{z}F} = (\ker H_\Phi^*)^\perp = \mathcal{H}(\Delta),$$

which implies $\mu_T \leq m_0 = \deg_B(\Delta)$. This completes the proof of Theorem B. \square

Remark 5.6. We give some interesting remarks on Theorem B.

- (a) From a careful analysis of the proof of Theorem B, we can see that (51) holds in general without the assumption “ $\dim E' < \infty$ ”: more concretely, given an inner function Δ with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$, if $T := S_E^*|_{\mathcal{H}(\Delta)}$, then

$$\deg_B(\Delta) \leq \mu_T.$$

- (b) Suppose Δ is an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$, with $\dim E' < \infty$. If $\Phi = \Delta A^* + B$ is a canonical decomposition of Φ in $L_s^2(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$. Then by Theorem A, we have that

$$\ker H_\Phi^* = \Delta H_{E'}^2.$$

It thus follows from the proof of Theorem B that

$$E_{\{F\}}^* = \mathcal{H}(\Delta),$$

where F is defined by $F(z) := \bar{z}(\Phi_+(z) - \hat{\Phi}(0))$. This gives an answer to the problem of describing the set $\{F\}$ in H_E^2 such that $\mathcal{H}(\Delta) = E_{\{F\}}^*$, given an inner function Δ with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$, with $\dim E' < \infty$ (cf. p.2).

(c) From Remark 5.4 and (48), we see that if

$$\Delta := \begin{bmatrix} z & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & z & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

then $\deg_B(\Delta) = 2$. Let $T := S_{\mathbb{C}^4}^*|_{\mathcal{H}(\Delta)}$. Observe that $\mathcal{H}(\Delta) = \mathcal{H}(z) \oplus \mathcal{H}(z) \oplus \{0\} \oplus H^2$. Since $\mathcal{H}(z) \oplus \mathcal{H}(z)$ has no cyclic vector, we must have $\mu_T \neq 1$. In fact, if we put $f = (1 \ 0 \ 0 \ a)^t$ (\bar{a} is not of bounded type) and $g = (0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0)^t$, then $E_{\{f,g\}}^* = \mathcal{H}(\Delta)$, which implies $\mu_T = 2$. This illustrates Theorem B.

It was known (cf. [Ni1, p. 41]) that if Δ is an $n \times r$ inner matrix function and $T := S_{\mathbb{C}^n}^*|_{\mathcal{H}(\Delta)}$, then $\mu_T \leq r + 1$. Its proof uses the Wold-Kolmogorov Lemma and the Hahn-Banach Theorem. As a corollary of Theorem B, we can say more:

Corollary 5.7. Let Δ be an $n \times r$ inner matrix function and let $T := S_{\mathbb{C}^n}^*|_{\mathcal{H}(\Delta)}$. Then $\mu_T \leq r + 1$. Further if $\ker \Delta^* = \{0\}$ (e.g. Δ is square-inner), then $\mu_T \leq r$.

Proof. This follows from Lemma 3.16, Corollary 5.2, (48) and Theorem B. \square

6. The case of the Beurling degree 1

In this section, we consider the question (4): *For which inner function Δ with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$, dose it follow that*

$$\deg_B(\Delta) = 1?$$

and then prove Theorem C. If $\dim E' < \infty$, then in the viewpoint of Theorem B, the question (4) is equivalent to the following: if T is the truncated backward shift $S_E^*|_{\mathcal{H}(\Delta)}$, which inner function Δ guarantees that $\mu_T = 1$, i.e., T has a cyclic vector? To answer the question (4), in section 6.1, we extend the notion of the characteristic scalar inner function to operator-valued inner functions having a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e . In section 6.2, we give an answer to the question (4) and in turn a proof of Theorem C.

6.1. Characteristic scalar inner functions.

We first consider the characteristic scalar inner functions of operator-valued inner functions, by using the results of section 3. The characteristic scalar inner function of a two-sided inner matrix function has been studied in [Hel], [SFBK], [CHL3], etc.

Let $\Delta \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ have a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e . Then by Lemma 3.27, there exists a scalar inner function δ such that $\delta H_E^2 \subseteq \ker H_{\Delta^*}$. Put $G := \delta \Delta^* \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E, D))$. If further Δ is inner then $G\Delta = \delta I_D$, so that

$$\text{g.c.d. } \{\delta : G\Delta = \delta I_D \text{ for some } G \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E, D))\}$$

always exists. Thus we may introduce:

Definition 6.1. Let Δ be an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$. If Δ has a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e , define

$$m_\Delta := \text{g.c.d.} \{ \delta : G\Delta = \delta I_D \text{ for some } G \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E, D)) \},$$

where δ is a scalar inner function. The inner function m_Δ is called the *characteristic scalar inner function* of Δ .

The notion of m_Δ arises in the Sz.-Nagy–Foiaş theory of contraction operators T of class C_0 (cf. [Ber], [SFBK], [CHL3]).

If Δ is an $n \times n$ square inner matrix function then we may write $\Delta \equiv [\theta_{ij} \bar{b}_{ij}]$, where θ_{ij} is inner and θ_{ij} and $b_{ij} \in H^\infty$ are coprime for each $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, n$. In Lemma 4.12 of [CHL3], it was shown that

$$m_\Delta = \text{l.c.m.} \{ \theta_{ij} : i, j = 1, 2, \dots, n \}.$$

In this section, we examine the cases of general inner function that has a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e .

On the other hand, if $\Phi \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ has a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e , then by Lemma 3.27, $\delta H_E^2 \subseteq \ker H_{\Phi^*}$ for some scalar inner function δ . Thus we may also define

$$\omega_\Phi := \text{g.c.d.} \{ \delta : \delta H_E^2 \subseteq \ker H_{\Phi^*} \text{ for some scalar inner function } \delta \}.$$

If Δ is an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$ and has a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e , then m_Δ is an inner divisor of ω_Δ . If further Δ is two-sided inner, then

$$(53) \quad \delta H_E^2 \subseteq \ker H_{\Delta^*} \iff G \equiv \delta \Delta^* \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E)) \iff G\Delta = \Delta G = \delta I_E,$$

which implies $m_\Delta = \omega_\Delta$. We would like to remark that

$$(54) \quad \text{g.c.d.} \{ \delta : G\Delta = \delta I_D \text{ for some } G \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E, D)) \}$$

may exist for some inner function Δ that has no meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e . To see this, let

$$\Delta := \begin{bmatrix} f \\ g \end{bmatrix},$$

where f and g are given in Example 3.4. Then Δ^* is not of bounded type, so that by Corollary 3.31, Δ has no meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e . On the other hand, since Δ is inner, by the Complementing Lemma (cf. p. 20), there exists a function $G \in H_{M_{1 \times 2}}^\infty$ such that $G\Delta$ is a scalar inner function, so that (54) exists.

The following lemma shows how to determine ω_Φ more easily.

Lemma 6.2. Let D and E be separable complex Hilbert spaces and let $\{d_j\}$ and $\{e_i\}$ be orthonormal bases of D and E , respectively. Suppose $\Phi \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ has a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e . In view of Proposition 3.29, we may write

$$\phi_{ij} \equiv \langle \Phi d_j, e_i \rangle_E = \theta_{ij} \bar{a}_{ij},$$

where θ_{ij} is inner and θ_{ij} and $a_{ij} \in H^\infty$ are coprime. Then we have

$$\omega_\Phi = \text{l.c.m.} \{ \theta_{ij} : i, j = 1, 2, \dots \}.$$

Proof. Let $\Phi \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ have a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e . By Lemma 3.27, we may write $\Phi = \theta A^*$ (a.e. on \mathbb{T}) for some $A \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E, D))$ and a scalar inner function θ . Also by an analysis of the proof of Proposition 3.29, we can see that $\theta_0 \equiv \text{l.c.m.} \{ \theta_{ij} : i, j = 1, 2, \dots, \}$ is an inner divisor of θ . Thus by Lemma 3.27, θ_0 is an inner divisor of ω_Φ . Since $\Phi \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$, it follows that for all $f \in H_E^2$ and $j, n \geq 1$,

$$(55) \quad \langle \Phi(z)d_j, z^n \theta_0(z)f(z) \rangle_E \in L^2.$$

On the other hand, for all $f \in H_E^2$,

$$(56) \quad f(z) = \sum_{i \geq 1} \langle f(z), e_i \rangle e_i \equiv \sum_{i \geq 1} f_i(z)e_i \quad \text{for almost all } z \in \mathbb{T} \quad (f_i \in H^2).$$

Since $\theta_0 = \text{l.c.m.} \{ \theta_{ij} : i, j = 1, 2, \dots, \}$, it follows from (55) and (56) that for all $j, n \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \Phi(z)d_j, z^n \theta_0(z)f(z) \rangle_E dm(z) &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \bar{z}^n \sum_{i \geq 1} \bar{f}_i(z) \bar{\theta}_0(z) \theta_{ij}(z) \bar{a}_{ij}(z) dm(z) \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that $\bar{z}^n \sum_{i \geq 1} \bar{f}_i(z) \bar{\theta}_0(z) \theta_{ij}(z) \bar{a}_{ij}(z) \in L^2 \ominus H^2$. Since $\{d_i\}$ is an orthonormal basis for D , it follows from the Fatou's Lemma that for all $x \in D$ and $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \Phi(z)x, z^n \theta_0(z)f(z) \rangle_E dm(z) = 0.$$

Thus by Lemma 3.14, $\theta_0 H_E^2 \subseteq \ker H_{\Phi^*}$, so that ω_Φ is an inner divisor of θ_0 , and therefore $\theta_0 = \omega_\Phi$. This complete the proof. \square

Corollary 6.3. Let Δ be a two-sided inner function and have a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e . Thus, in view of Proposition 3.29, we may write $\Delta \equiv [\theta_{ij} \bar{b}_{ij}]$, where θ_{ij} is an inner function and θ_{ij} and $b_{ij} \in H^\infty$ are coprime for each $i, j = 1, 2, \dots$. Then

$$\omega_\Delta = m_\Delta = \text{l.c.m.} \{ \theta_{ij} : i, j = 1, 2, \dots, \}.$$

Proof. Immediate from Lemma 6.2. \square

Remark 6.4. If Δ is not two-sided inner then Corollary 6.3 may fail. To see this, let

$$\Delta := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ z \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then by Corollary 3.31, Δ has a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e . It thus follows from Lemma 6.2 that $\omega_\Delta = z$. On the other hand, let $G := [\sqrt{2} \ 0]$. Then $G\Delta = 1$, so that $m_\Delta = 1 \neq z = \omega_\Delta$. Note that by Corollary 6.3

$$[\Delta, \Delta_c] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ z & -z \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad m_{[\Delta, \Delta_c]} = \omega_{[\Delta, \Delta_c]} = z.$$

The following lemma shows that Remark 6.4 is not accidental.

Lemma 6.5. Let Δ be an inner function and have a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e . Then

$$m_{[\Delta, \Delta_c]} = \omega_{[\Delta, \Delta_c]} = \omega_\Delta$$

and Δ_c has a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e : in this case, ω_{Δ_c} is an inner divisor of ω_Δ .

Proof. Suppose that Δ is an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$ and has a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e . Then it follows from Corollary 3.24 and Lemma 3.26 that $[\Delta, \Delta_c]$ is two-sided inner. On the other hand, it follows from Lemma 3.16 that

$$\ker H_{\Delta^*} = [\Delta, \Delta_c] H_{D \oplus D'}^2 = \ker H_{[\Delta, \Delta_c]^*}.$$

Thus by Lemma 3.27, $[\Delta, \Delta_c]$ has a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e and $m_{[\Delta, \Delta_c]} = \omega_{[\Delta, \Delta_c]} = \omega_\Delta$. This proves the first assertion. Since $[\Delta, \Delta_c]$ has a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e , it follows from Lemma 3.27 that Δ_c has a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e . Since $[(\Delta_c)_c, \Delta_c]$ is a left inner divisor of $[\Delta, \Delta_c]$, it follows from Lemma 3.5 that $\omega_{\Delta_c} = \omega_{[(\Delta_c)_c, \Delta_c]}$ is an inner divisor of $\omega_\Delta = \omega_{[\Delta, \Delta_c]}$. This proves the second assertion. \square

6.2. Proof of Theorem C.

In this section we give an answer to the question (4) and a proof of Theorem C. This is accomplished by several lemmas.

Lemma 6.6. Let $\Phi \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ have a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e . Then for each cyclic vector g of S_D^* ,

$$\ker H_{[z\Phi g]^\sim}^* = \ker \Phi^*,$$

where $[z\Phi g]^\sim$ denotes the flip of $[z\Phi g]$.

Proof. Let $\Phi \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ have a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e . Then by Lemma 3.27, there exists a scalar inner function δ such that $\delta H_E^2 \subseteq \ker H_{\Phi^*}$. We thus have

$$(57) \quad \delta \Phi^* h \in H_D^2 \quad \text{for any } h \in H_E^2.$$

Let g be a cyclic vector of S_D^* and $h \in \ker H_{[z\Phi g]^\sim}^*$. Then it follows from Lemma 3.14 that for all $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle z\Phi(z)g(z), z^n \delta(z)h(z) \rangle_E dm(z) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle S_D^{*(n-1)}g(z), \delta(z)\Phi^*(z)h(z) \rangle_D dm(z) \\ &= \langle S_D^{*(n-1)}g(z), \delta(z)\Phi^*(z)h(z) \rangle_{L_D^2}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies, by (57), that $\delta \Phi^* h = 0$, and hence $h \in \ker \Phi^*$. We thus have

$$\ker H_{[zg\Phi]^\sim}^* \subseteq \ker \Phi^*.$$

The reverse inclusion follows at once from Lemma 3.14. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 6.7. Let $\Phi \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(D, E))$ have a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e . Then for each cyclic vector g of S_D^* , we have:

- (a) If $\ker \Phi^* = \{0\}$, then Φg is a cyclic vector of S_E^* ;
- (b) If $\ker \Phi^* \neq \{0\}$, then $E_{\{\Phi g\}}^* = \mathcal{H}((\Phi^i)_c)$, where Φ^i denotes the inner part of the inner-outer factorization of Φ .

Hence, in particular, if $\ker \Phi^* \neq \{0\}$ and $T := S_E^*|_{\mathcal{H}((\Phi^i)_c)}$, then T has a cyclic vector.

Proof. Suppose that $\ker \Phi^* = \{0\}$. By Lemma 6.6, $\ker H_{[z\Phi g]^\sim}^* = \{0\}$. It thus follows from Lemma 3.17 that

$$E_{\{\Phi g\}}^* = \text{cl ran } H_{[z\Phi g]^\sim} = (\ker H_{[z\Phi g]^\sim}^*)^\perp = H_E^2,$$

which implies that Φg is a cyclic vector of S_E^* . This proves (a). For (b), write

$$\Phi \equiv \Phi^i \Phi^e \quad (\text{inner-outer factorization}),$$

where Φ^i is an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(E', E)$ and Φ^e is an outer function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E')$. Now we will show that

$$(58) \quad \ker \Phi^* = \ker (\Phi^i)^*$$

Since $\Phi^* = (\Phi^e)^*(\Phi^i)^*$, it follows that $\ker (\Phi^i)^* \subseteq \ker \Phi^*$. For the reverse inclusion, let $f \in \ker \Phi^*$. If $f \notin \ker (\Phi^i)^*$, then $0 \neq (\Phi^i)^* f \in \ker (\Phi^e)^*$. Thus for all $h \in H_D^2$,

$$\langle (\Phi^i)^* f, \Phi^e h \rangle_{L_{E'}^2} = \langle \Phi^* f, h \rangle_{L_D^2} = 0,$$

which implies that $(\Phi^i)^* f = 0$, a contradiction. This proves (58). It thus follows from Lemma 3.16, Lemma 3.17 and Lemma 6.6 that

$$E_{\{\Phi g\}}^* = (\ker H_{[z\Phi g]^\sim}^*)^\perp = (\ker \Phi^*)^\perp = \mathcal{H}((\Phi^i)_c),$$

which proves (b). □

The following corollary is a matrix-valued version of Lemma 6.7.

Corollary 6.8. Let Δ be an $n \times r$ inner matrix function such that $\check{\Delta}$ is of bounded type. If g is a cyclic vector of $S_{\mathbb{C}^r}^*$, then $E_{\{\Delta g\}}^* = \mathcal{H}(\Delta_c)$. In particular, if $n > r$ and $T := S_{\mathbb{C}^n}^*|_{\mathcal{H}(\Delta_c)}$, then T has a cyclic vector.

Proof. It follows from Corollary 3.31 and Lemma 6.7. □

In the setting of Corollary 6.8, we may ask whether

$$\{\Delta g : g \text{ is a cyclic vector of } S_{\mathbb{C}^r}^*\}$$

is the set of all cyclic vectors of $T := S_{\mathbb{C}^n}^*|_{\mathcal{H}(\Delta_c)}$? The answer to this question is negative. For example, let

$$\Delta = \begin{bmatrix} z & 0 \\ 0 & z \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then

$$\Delta_c = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H}(\Delta_c) = H_{\mathbb{C}^2}^2 \oplus \{0\}.$$

Choose a cyclic vector $(f_1, f_2)^t$ of $S_{\mathbb{C}^2}^*$ such that $f_1(0) \neq 0$. Then $f = (f_1, f_2, 0)^t$ is a cyclic vector of $S_{\mathbb{C}^3}^*|_{\mathcal{H}(\Delta_c)}$. However, $f \neq \Delta g$ for any cyclic vector g of $S_{\mathbb{C}^2}^*$.

The following lemma shows that the flip of the adjoint of an inner function may be an outer function.

Lemma 6.9. Let Δ be an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$, with its complementary factor Δ_c with values in $\mathcal{B}(D', E)$. If $\dim D' < \infty$, then $\widetilde{\Delta}_c$ is an outer function.

Proof. If $D' = \{0\}$, then this is trivial. Suppose that $D' = \mathbb{C}^p$ for some $p \geq 1$. Write

$$(59) \quad \widetilde{\Delta}_c \equiv (\widetilde{\Delta}_c)^i (\widetilde{\Delta}_c)^e \quad (\text{inner-outer factorization}),$$

where $(\widetilde{\Delta}_c)^i \in H_{M_p \times q}^\infty$ and $(\widetilde{\Delta}_c)^e \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E, \mathbb{C}^q))$ for some $q \leq p$. It thus follows that

$$q = \text{Rank}(\widetilde{\Delta}_c)^i \geq \text{Rank} \widetilde{\Delta}_c = \max_{\zeta \in \mathbb{D}} \text{rank} \widetilde{\Delta}_c(\zeta) \widetilde{\Delta}_c(\zeta)^* = p,$$

which implies $p = q$. Since $(\widetilde{\Delta}_c)^i \in H_{M_p}^\infty$ is inner, by the Complementing Lemma (cf. p. 20), there exists a function $G \in H_{M_p}^\infty$ and a scalar inner function θ such that $G(\widetilde{\Delta}_c)^i = \theta I_p$. Thus by (59), we have $G \widetilde{\Delta}_c = \theta I_p (\widetilde{\Delta}_c)^e$, and hence we have

$$\check{\theta} I_E \Delta_c \widetilde{G} = \overline{\theta} I_p G \widetilde{\Delta}_c = \widetilde{(\Delta_c)^e} \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^p, E)).$$

Thus by Corollary 3.10, we have

$$(60) \quad \check{\theta} I_E \Delta_c \widetilde{G} H_{\mathbb{C}^p}^2 \subseteq H_E^2.$$

It thus follows from Lemma 3.16 and (60) that

$$\Delta_c \check{\theta} I_p \widetilde{G} H_{\mathbb{C}^p}^2 = \check{\theta} I_E \Delta_c \widetilde{G} H_{\mathbb{C}^p}^2 \subseteq \ker \Delta^* = \Delta_c H_{\mathbb{C}^p}^2,$$

which implies $\check{\theta} I_p \widetilde{G} H_{\mathbb{C}^p}^2 \subseteq H_{\mathbb{C}^p}^2$. We thus have $\check{\theta} I_p \widetilde{G} \in H_{M_p}^\infty$, so that $\overline{\theta} I_p G \in H_{M_p}^\infty$. Therefore we may write $G = \theta I_p G_1$ for some $G_1 \in H_{M_p}^\infty$. It thus follows that

$$\theta I_p = G(\widetilde{\Delta}_c)^i = \theta I_p G_1 (\widetilde{\Delta}_c)^i,$$

which gives that $G_1 (\widetilde{\Delta}_c)^i = I_p$. Therefore, by Corollary 3.10, we have

$$(61) \quad H_{\mathbb{C}^p}^2 = \widetilde{(\Delta_c)^i} G_1 H_{\mathbb{C}^p}^2 \subseteq \widetilde{(\Delta_c)^i} H_{\mathbb{C}^p}^2,$$

which implies that $\widetilde{(\Delta_c)^i}$ is a unitary matrix, and so is $(\widetilde{\Delta}_c)^i$. Thus, $\widetilde{\Delta}_c$ is an outer function. This completes the proof. \square

Corollary 6.10. If Δ is an inner matrix function, then Δ_c^t is an outer function.

Proof. Immediate from Lemma 6.9. \square

Remark 6.11. Let $T := S_{\mathbb{C}^n}^*|_{\mathcal{H}(\Delta)}$ for some non-square inner matrix function Δ . Then Corollary 6.8 shows that if $\Delta = \Omega_c$ for an inner matrix function Ω such that $\check{\Omega}$ is of bounded type, then $\mu_T = 1$. However, the converse is not true in general, i.e., the condition “ $\mu_T = 1$ ” does not guarantee that $\Delta = \Omega_c$. To see this, let $\Delta := [0 \ z]^t$. Then Δ is inner and $\check{\Delta}$ is of bounded type. Since $\Delta^t = [0 \ z]$ is not an outer function, it follows from Corollary 6.10 that $\Delta \neq \Omega_c$ for any inner matrix function. Let $f := (a \ 1)^t$ (\bar{a} is not of bounded type). Then $E_f^* = \mathcal{H}(\Delta)$, so that $\mu_T = 1$.

Lemma 6.12. Let Δ be an inner function and have a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e . If $\tilde{\Delta}$ is an outer function and $\ker \Delta^* = \{0\}$, then Δ is a unitary operator.

Proof. Let Δ be an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$ and have a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e . Then by Lemma 3.26, $\check{\Delta}$ is of bounded type. Suppose that $\tilde{\Delta}$ is an outer function and $\ker \Delta^* = \{0\}$. Then by Lemma 3.16 and Corollary 3.24, Δ is two-sided inner, and so is $\tilde{\Delta}$. Thus Δ is a unitary operator \square

For iterated complementary factors of an inner function Δ , we write

$$\Delta_{cc} \equiv (\Delta_c)_c, \quad \Delta_{ccc} \equiv (\Delta_{cc})_c, \quad \dots, \quad \text{etc.}$$

The following lemma is a key idea for an answer to the question (4).

Lemma 6.13. Let Δ be an inner function and have a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e . If $\tilde{\Delta}$ is an outer function, then

$$\Delta_{cc} = \Delta.$$

Proof. Let Δ be an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$ and have a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e . Also suppose $\tilde{\Delta}$ is an outer function. If $\ker \Delta^* = \{0\}$, then the result follows at once from Lemma 6.12. Suppose that $\ker \Delta^* \neq \{0\}$. By Lemma 3.26, $\check{\Delta}$ is of bounded type, so that by Corollary 3.24, $[\Delta, \Delta_c]$ is a two-sided inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D \oplus D', E)$ for some nonzero Hilbert space D' . We now claim that

$$(62) \quad \Delta = \Delta_{cc}\Omega \quad \text{for a two-sided inner function } \Omega \text{ with values in } \mathcal{B}(D).$$

Since $\Delta_c^*\Delta = 0$, it follows that $\Delta H_D^2 \subseteq \ker \Delta_c^*$, and therefore $\Delta H_D^2 \subseteq \Delta_{cc}H_{D''}^2$ for some nonzero Hilbert space D'' by Lemma 3.16(a), which implies that Δ_{cc} is a left inner divisor of Δ . Thus we may write

$$(63) \quad \Delta = \Delta_{cc}\Omega$$

for an inner function Ω with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, D'')$. Assume to the contrary that Ω is not two-sided inner. Since Δ has a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e , it follows from Lemma 3.27 that

$$\theta H_E^2 \subseteq \ker H_{\Delta^*} = \ker H_{\Omega^*\Delta_c^*}$$

for some scalar inner function θ . Thus $\Omega^*\Delta_c^*\theta H_E^2 \subseteq H_D^2$. In particular, we have

$$\Omega^*\theta H_{D''}^2 = \Omega^*\Delta_c^*\theta \Delta_{cc}H_{D''}^2 \subseteq H_D^2,$$

and hence $\theta H_{D''}^2 \subseteq \ker H_{\Omega^*}$, which implies, by Lemma 3.27, that Ω has a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e . Thus by Lemma 3.26, $\check{\Omega}$ is of bounded type. It thus follows from Corollary 3.24 that

$$[\Omega, \Omega_c] \text{ is two-sided inner,}$$

where Ω_c is an inner function, with values in $\mathcal{B}(D_1, D'')$ for some nonzero Hilbert space D_1 . On the other hand, for all $f \in H_{D_1}^2$,

$$[\Delta, \Delta_c]^*\Delta_{cc}\Omega_c f = \begin{bmatrix} \Omega^*\Omega_c f \\ \Delta_c^*\Delta_{cc}\Omega_c f \end{bmatrix} = 0,$$

which implies that $D_1 = \{0\}$, a contradiction. This proves (62). Thus we may write

$$(64) \quad \tilde{\Delta} = \tilde{\Omega} \widetilde{\Delta_{cc}}$$

for a two-sided inner function $\tilde{\Omega}$ with values in $\mathcal{B}(D)$. Since $\tilde{\Delta}$ is an outer function and $\tilde{\Omega}$ is two-sided inner, it follows from (64) that $\tilde{\Omega}$ is a unitary operator, and so is Ω . This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 6.13 may fail if the condition “ Δ has a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e ” is dropped. To see this, let

$$\Delta := \begin{bmatrix} f \\ g \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where f and g are given in Example 3.4. Then $\tilde{\Delta}$ is an outer function. Observe that

$$\Delta_c = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_{cc} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \neq \Delta.$$

Note that $\check{\Delta}$ is not of bounded type. Thus, by Corollary 3.31, Δ has no meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e .

We are ready for:

Proof of Theorem C. Suppose that Δ is an inner function with values in $\mathcal{B}(D, E)$ and has a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e . Also suppose $\tilde{\Delta}$ is an outer function. Let $T := S_E^* |_{\mathcal{H}(\Delta)}$. If $\ker \Delta^* = \{0\}$, then by Lemma 6.12, Δ is a unitary operator, so that evidently, $\deg_B(\Delta) = 1$. If instead $\ker \Delta^* \neq \{0\}$, then by Lemma 6.5, Δ_c has a meromorphic pseudocontinuation of bounded type in D_e . Since $\tilde{\Delta}$ is an outer function it follows from Lemma 6.13 that $\Delta = \Delta_{cc}$. Applying Lemma 6.7 with $\Phi \equiv \Delta_c$, we can see that T has a cyclic vector, i.e., $\mu_T = 1$. Thus by Remark 5.6 (a), $\deg_B(\Delta) \leq 1$. But since by definition, $\deg_B(\Delta) \geq 1$, it follows that $\deg_B(\Delta) = 1$. \square

The following corollary is an immediate result of Theorem C.

Corollary 6.14. Let Δ be an inner matrix function whose flip $\check{\Delta}$ is of bounded type. If Δ^t is an outer function, then $\deg_B(\Delta) = 1$.

Proof. This follows from Theorem C and Corollary 3.31. \square

If Δ is an inner matrix function then the converse of Lemma 6.13 is also true.

Corollary 6.15. Let Δ be an inner matrix function whose flip $\check{\Delta}$ is of bounded type. Then the following are equivalent:

- (a) Δ^t is an outer function;
- (b) $\tilde{\Delta}$ is an outer function;
- (c) $\Delta_{cc} = \Delta$;
- (d) $\Delta = \Omega_c$ for some inner matrix function Ω .

Hence, in particular, $\Delta_{ccc} = \Delta_c$.

Proof. The implication (a) \Rightarrow (b) is clear and the implication (b) \Rightarrow (c) follows from Corollary 3.31 and Lemma 6.13. Also the implication (c) \Rightarrow (d) is clear and the implication (d) \Rightarrow (a) follows from Corollary 6.10. The second assertion follows from the first assertion together with Corollary 6.10. \square

Acknowledgements. The work of the first named author was supported by NRF(Korea) grant No. 2016R1A2B4012378. The work of the second named author was supported by NRF(Korea) grant No. 2018R1A2B6004116.

REFERENCES

- [Ab] M.B. Abrahamse, *Subnormal Toeplitz operators and functions of bounded type*, Duke Math. J. **43** (1976), 597–604.
- [ADR] D. Alpay, A. Dijksma, and J. Rovnyak, *A theorem on Beurling-Lax type for Hilbert spaces of functions analytic in the unit ball*, Integral Equations Operator Theory **47** (2003), 251–274.
- [AS] D. Alpay and I. Sabodini, *Beurling-Lax type theorems in the complex and quaternionic setting*, Linear Alg. Appl. **530** (2017), 15–46.
- [BH1] J.A. Ball and J.W. Helton, *A Beurling-Lax theorem for the Lie group $U(m, n)$ which contains most classical interpolation theory*, J. Operator Theory **9** (1983), 107–142.
- [BH2] J.A. Ball and J.W. Helton, *Beurling-Lax representations using classical Lie groups with many applications. III. Groups preserving two bilinear forms*, Amer. J. Math. **108** (1986), 95–174.
- [BH3] J.A. Ball and J.W. Helton, *Shift invariant manifolds and nonlinear analytic function theory*, Integral Equations Operator Theory **11** (1988), 615–725.
- [Ber] H. Bercovici, *Operator Theory and Arithmetic in H^∞* , Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 26, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1988.
- [Beu] A. Beurling, *On two problems concerning linear transformations in Hilbert space*, Acta Math. **81** (1949), 239–255.
- [BS] A. Böttcher and B. Silbermann, *Analysis of Toeplitz Operators*, Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg, 2006.
- [Ca] M. Carlsson, *On the Beurling-Lax theorem for domains with one hole*, New York J. Math. **17A** (2011), 193–212.
- [Con] J.B. Conway, *A Course in Functional Analysis*, Springer, New York, 1990.
- [Co1] C. Cowen, *Hyponormality of Toeplitz operators*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **103** (1988), 809–812.
- [Co2] C. Cowen, *Hyponormal and subnormal Toeplitz operators*, Surveys of Some Recent Results in Operator Theory, I (J.B. Conway and B.B. Morrel, eds.), Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics, Vol **171** (1988), 155–167.
- [CHKL] R.E. Curto, I.S. Hwang, D. Kang and W.Y. Lee, *Subnormal and quasinormal Toeplitz operators with matrix-valued rational symbols*, Adv. Math. **255** (2014), 561–585.
- [CHL1] R.E. Curto, I.S. Hwang and W.Y. Lee, *Which subnormal Toeplitz operators are either normal or analytic?*, J. Funct. Anal. **263(8)** (2012), 2333–2354.
- [CHL2] R.E. Curto, I.S. Hwang and W.Y. Lee, *Hyponormality and subnormality of block Toeplitz operators*, Adv. Math. **230** (2012), 2094–2151.
- [CHL3] R.E. Curto, I.S. Hwang and W.Y. Lee, *Matrix functions of bounded type: An interplay between function theory and operator theory*, Memoirs Amer. Math. Soc. (to appear), x+106 pp., Amer. Math. Soc., Providence (in press); arXiv:1611.06462.
- [dR] L. de Branges and J. Rovnyak, *Square summable power series*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York-Toronto, 1966.
- [Do1] R.G. Douglas, *Banach Algebra Techniques in Operator Theory*, Academic Press, New York, 1972.
- [Do2] R.G. Douglas, *Banach Algebra Techniques in the Theory of Toeplitz Operators*, CBMS vol. 15, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1973.
- [DSS] R.G. Douglas, H. Shapiro, and A. Shields, *Cyclic vectors and invariant subspaces for the backward shift operator*, Ann. Inst. Fourier(Grenoble) **20** (1970), 37–76.

- [FF] C. Foiaş and A. Frazho, *The commutant lifting approach to interpolation problems*, Oper. Th. Adv. Appl. vol. 44, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1993.
- [FB] A. Frazho and W. Bhosri, *An operator perspective on signals and systems*, Oper. Th. Adv. Appl. vol. 204, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2010.
- [Fu1] P. Fuhrmann, *On Hankel operator ranges, meromorphic pseudo-continuation and factorization of operator-valued analytic functions*, J. London Math. Soc.(2), **13** (1975), 323–327.
- [Fu2] P. Fuhrmann, *Linear Systems and Operators in Hilbert Spaces*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1981.
- [Go] S. Goldberg, *Unbounded Linear Operators*, Dover, New York, 2006.
- [GHR] C. Gu, J. Hendricks and D. Rutherford, *Hyponormality of block Toeplitz operators*, Pacific J. Math. **223** (2006), 95–111.
- [Ha1] P.R. Halmos, *Shifts on Hilbert spaces*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **208** (1961), 102–112.
- [Ha2] P.R. Halmos, *A Hilbert Space Problem Book*, Springer, New York, 1982.
- [Hed] H. Hedenmalm, *A factorization theorem for square area-integrable analytic functions*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **422** (1991), 45–68.
- [Hel] H. Helson, *Lectures on Invariant Subspaces*, Academic Press, New York, 1964.
- [La] P.D. Lax, *Translation invariant subspaces*, Acta Math. **101** (1959), 163–178.
- [MR] R. A. Martinez-Avenidaño and P. Rosenthal, *An Introduction to Operators on the Hardy-Hilbert Space*, Springer, New York, 2007.
- [Ni1] N.K. Nikolskii, *Treatise on the Shift Operator*, Springer, New York, 1986.
- [Ni2] N.K. Nikolskii, *Operators, Functions, and Systems: An Easy Reading Volume I: Hardy, Hankel, and Toeplitz*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 92, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 2002.
- [Pe] V.V. Peller, *Hankel Operators and Their Applications*, Springer, New York, 2003.
- [Po] V.P. Potapov, *The multiplicative structure of J -contractive matrix functions*, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. **15(2)** (1960), 131–243.
- [Ri] S. Richter, *A representation theorem for cyclic analytic two-isometries*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **328(1)** (1991), 325–349.
- [Sa] D. Sarason, *Sub-Hardy Hilbert spaces in the unit disk*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1994.
- [SFBK] B. Sz.-Nagy, C. Foiaş, H. Berkovici, and L. Kérchy, *Harmonic Analysis of Operators on Hilbert Space*, Springer, New York, 2010.
- [VN] V.I. Vasyunin and N.K. Nikolskii, *Classification of H^2 -functions according to the degree of their cyclicity*, Math. USSR Izvestiya **23(2)** (1984), 225–242.
- [Wo] W.R. Wogen, *On some operators with cyclic vectors*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **27** (1978), 163–171.

In Sung Hwang

Department of Mathematics, Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon 16419, Korea

E-mail: ihwang@skku.edu

Woo Young Lee

Department of Mathematics and RIM, Seoul National University, Seoul 08826, Korea

E-mail: wylee@snu.ac.kr