

ON THE SIMILARITY OF RESTRICTION OF THE OPERATOR TO AN INVARIANT SUBSPACE

KUI JI, SHANSHAN JI* AND JING XU

ABSTRACT. Let M_z be the multiplication operator on the Bergman space and M_I denote the restriction of M_z to an invariant subspace I . A question raised by K. Zhu is that when are two restriction operators M_I and M_J are similar? In this note, we give some sufficient conditions of this problem in a general case.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let \mathbb{D} be the open unit disk in the complex plane \mathbb{C} , $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be the set of all bounded linear operators on complex separable Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . One of the basic problems of operator theory is how to judge the similarity of two bounded linear operators. Let T and S be in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{K})$, respectively. We say T is similar to S (denoted by $T \sim_s S$), if there exists an invertible bounded linear operator $X : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$, such that $XT = SX$. We say T is unitarily equivalent to S (denoted by $T \sim_u S$), if X is an unitary operator. Compared with the unitary equivalence of operators, the similar equivalence problem is much more difficult. In general, one can only study more specific subclasses.

In 1949, Beurling theorem given by A. Beurling shows that invariant subspace of multiplication operator on Hardy space can be characterized by inner function (cf.[9]). According to Beurling's theorem, P. Bourdon proved that multiplication operator on Hardy space is unitarily equivalent to its restrictions on each invariant subspace in [10]. In fact, there are essential differences between Bergman space and Hardy space. Let M_I denote the restriction of multiplication operator M_z to an invariant subspace I . For Bergman space, in [11], S. Richter gave the following conclusion:

Theorem 1.1. [11] *Let M_z be the multiplication operator on Bergman space. Then M_I and M_J are unitarily equivalent if and only if $I = J$.*

This result tells us that the purpose of studying the properties of restriction operator M_I is to better understand the lattice of invariant subspace of multiplication operator on Bergman space. Let $Lat(T)$ be the lattice of invariant subspace operator T . In 1997, K. Zhu proposed the following two open problems about the restricted operators M_I and M_J in [12]:

- (1) When are two restriction operators M_I and M_J similar?
- (2) When are two restriction operators M_I and M_J quasi-similar?

Based on these two questions, the next three theorems give some partial answers. For quasi-similar case, H. Hedenmalm, B. Korenblum and K. Zhu proved the following result.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 47C15, 47B37; Secondary 47B48, 47L40.

Key words and phrases. Cowen-Douglas operators, Similarity, Reducibility, N -hypercontraction.

The first author was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11831006 and 11922108).

Theorem 1.2. [13] *Let M_z be the multiplication operator on Bergman space. If $I \in \text{Lat}(M_z)$, then M_I and M_z are quasi-similar if and only if I is generated by a bounded analytic function.*

Similarly, when J is the whole space, P. Bourdon solved the open problems of similar case using inner-outer factorization in [10].

Theorem 1.3. [10] *Let M_z be the multiplication operator on Bergman space. If $I \in \text{Lat}(M_z)$, then M_I and M_z are similar if and only if I is generated by a Blaschke product whose zero set is the union of finitely many interpolating sequences.*

It is well known that $\eta_\alpha(z) = \exp(-\alpha \frac{1+z}{1-z})$ is typical singular inner functions for some $\alpha > 0$. B. Korenblum found two invariant subspaces I_1, I_2 by such functions and gave a sufficient condition for open problem (2).

Theorem 1.4. [18] *For any two positive numbers α_1 and α_2 , set $S_k(z) = \exp(-\alpha_k \frac{1+z}{1-z})$, $k = 1, 2$. If I_1 and I_2 be the invariant subspaces generated by S_1 and S_2 , respectively, then M_{I_1} and M_{I_2} are similar.*

These three theorems partly answer two open problems proposed by K. Zhu. In general, these two problems are still unsolved. For the multiplication operator M_z on some analytic functional Hilbert space, if an operator T is similar to $M_z^* \oplus M_z^*$, it is not clear for an invariant subspace \mathcal{M} of T , when the restriction $T|_{\mathcal{M}}$ is similar to M_z^* .

In 1978, M. J. Cowen and R. G. Douglas introduced a class of operators denoted by $B_n(\Omega)$ in [4]. As we all know that the adjoint of multiplication operator on the Bergman space belongs to $B_1(\mathbb{D})$. For the similarity of operators in $B_n(\mathbb{D})$ is still an open problem raised by M. J. Cowen and R. G. Douglas.

Recently, R. G. Douglas, H. Kwon, S. Treil and first author in [7, 8] described the similar invariants of m -hypercontraction operators and weighted Bergman shifts by curvature of the Hermitian holomorphic bundles induces by corresponding operators.

Theorem 1.5. [7, 8] *Let $T \in B_n(\mathbb{D})$ be a m -hypercontraction and M_z is the multiplication operator on the weighted Bergman space. Then $T \sim_s \bigoplus_{i=1}^n M_z^*$ if and only if there exists a bounded subharmonic function ψ such that*

$$\text{trace } \mathcal{K}_{M_z^{*(n)}}(\omega) - \text{trace } \mathcal{K}_T(\omega) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \omega \partial \bar{\omega}} \psi(\omega), \omega \in \mathbb{D}.$$

In this note, we will consider the general case of K. Zhu's questions. That is, when two restrictions of operators which belongs to $B_n(\mathbb{D})$ are similar? In the main theorem, we will give some sufficient conditions in the terms of quotient of the metric of some jet Hermitian holomorphic bundles. The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce some notations and definitions about Cowen-Douglas operators. In Section 3, under the influence of the open problems proposed by K. Zhu, we investigate the similarity between the Cowen-Douglas operators restricted on invariant subspaces and the direct sum of multiplication operator. At the same time, we give a sufficient condition for open problems in the case of similar equivalence. In Section 4, we consider the reducibility of the n -hypercontractive operators by investigating the curvatures of the operators restricted on certain invariant subspaces.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Cowen-Douglas operator. An operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is said to be a Cowen-Douglas operator with index n associated with an open bounded subset Ω (or $T \in B_n(\Omega)$), if $T - w$ is surjective, $\dim \ker(T - w) = n$ for all $w \in \Omega$ and $\bigvee_{\omega \in \Omega} \ker(T - \omega) = \mathcal{H}$. In [4], M. J. Cowen and R. G. Douglas showed that each operator T in $B_n(\Omega)$ gives also rise to a rank n Hermitian holomorphic vector bundle E_T over Ω . That is,

$$E_T = \{(x, w) \in \mathcal{H} \times \Omega \mid x \in \ker(T - w)\} \text{ and } \pi : E_T \rightarrow \Omega, \text{ where } \pi(x, w) = w.$$

Let $T \in B_n(\Omega)$. We can find a holomorphic family $\{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^n$ satisfying $\gamma_i(\omega) \in \ker(T - \omega)$. The metric of holomorphic bundle E_T of inner products at ω is given by $h_T(\omega) = \left(\langle \gamma_j(\omega), \gamma_i(\omega) \rangle \right)_{i,j=1}^n$. Then the curvature function \mathcal{K}_T of E_T is defined as $\mathcal{K}_T(\omega) := -\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\omega}}(h_T^{-1}(\omega)\frac{\partial}{\partial \omega}h_T(\omega))$. Notice that the curvature can be thought of as a bundle map. According to the definition of covariant partial derivative of bundle map, the covariant partial derivatives $\mathcal{K}_{T, \omega^i \bar{\omega}^j}$, $i, j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ of \mathcal{K}_T are defined as follows:

- (1) $\mathcal{K}_{T, \omega^i \bar{\omega}^{j+1}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\omega}}(\mathcal{K}_{T, \omega^i \bar{\omega}^j})$;
- (2) $\mathcal{K}_{T, \omega^{i+1} \bar{\omega}^j} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega}(\mathcal{K}_{T, \omega^i \bar{\omega}^j}) + [h_T^{-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega} h_T, \mathcal{K}_{T, \omega^i \bar{\omega}^j}]$.

M. J. Cowen and R. G. Douglas gave the following important theorem in [4], and showed that the curvature and its covariant partial derivatives are complete unitary invariants of operators in the Cowen-Douglas class.

Theorem 2.1. [4] *Let T and \tilde{T} be two Cowen-Douglas operators with index n . Then $T \sim_u \tilde{T}$ if and only if there exists an isometric holomorphic bundle map $V : E_T \rightarrow E_{\tilde{T}}$ such that*

$$V(\mathcal{K}_{T, \omega^i \bar{\omega}^j}) = (\mathcal{K}_{\tilde{T}, w^i \bar{w}^j})V, \quad 0 \leq i, j \leq i + j \leq n, (i, j) \neq (0, n), (n, 0).$$

In particular, if T and \tilde{T} are Cowen-Douglas operators with index one, then $T \sim_u \tilde{T}$ if and only if $\mathcal{K}_T = \mathcal{K}_{\tilde{T}}$.

Theorem 2.1 states that the local geometric invariants of Cowen-Douglas operators can be regarded as global invariants from the perspective of unitary equivalence. Since invertible holomorphic bundle map can destroy rigidity. For similar equivalence, it is not clear how to describe global invariants in terms of local complex invariants of curvature and its covariant partial derivatives. However, M. J. Cowen and R. G. Douglas gave a necessary condition of similarity by curvature in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.2. [4] *Let T and \tilde{T} belong to $B_n(\Omega)$, which are similar via the bounded invertible operator X . Then*

$$\|X^{-1}\|^{-2} \|X\|^{-2} \|\mathcal{K}_T\| \leq \|\mathcal{K}_{\tilde{T}}\| \leq \|X^{-1}\|^2 \|X\|^2 \|\mathcal{K}_T\|,$$

at each point of Ω .

In fact, this necessary condition is not strong enough. Let T and \tilde{T} denote Hardy and Bergman shifts, respectively. We know that $\frac{\mathcal{K}_T}{\mathcal{K}_{\tilde{T}}} = \frac{1}{2}$. However, it is well known that they are not similar. Based on this, M. J. Cowen and R. G. Douglas made following conjecture in [4]. That is, let $T_i \in B_1(\mathbb{D})$ with the spectrums of T_i are closure of unit disk \mathbb{D} , $i = 1, 2$. Then $T_1 \sim_s T_2$ if and only if $\lim_{\omega \rightarrow \partial \mathbb{D}} \frac{\mathcal{K}_{T_1}(\omega)}{\mathcal{K}_{T_2}(\omega)} = 1$. This conjecture was shown by D. N. Clark and G. Misra to be inaccurate in [5, 6].

In fact, Cowen-Douglas operators with index one contain a large number of weighted backward shift operators. The following well-known theorem, given by A. L. Shields, describes the equivalent condition for the similarity of two weighted shift operators.

Theorem 2.3. [1] *Let S and T be weighted shift operators with non-zero weight sequences $\{\omega_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ and $\{v_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$, respectively. Then $S \sim_s T$ if and only if there exist real numbers m and M , such that*

$$0 < m \leq \left| \frac{\omega_i \omega_{i+1} \cdots \omega_j}{v_i v_{i+1} \cdots v_j} \right| \leq M, i \leq j.$$

In order to generalize the model theorem given by B. Sz.-Nagy and C. Foias, J. Agler introduced the concept of n -hypercontractive operator in [2]. We say $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is an n -hypercontraction, if

$$\sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} (T^*)^j T^j \geq 0,$$

for any $1 \leq k \leq n$. When $n = 1$, T is called as contractive.

Theorem 2.4 (Model Theorem, [3]). *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. There exists a Hilbert space E and an $M_{z,E}^*$ -invariant subspace $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{H}_K$, such that T is unitarily equivalent to $M_{z,E}^*|_{\mathcal{N}}$ if and only if T is an n -hypercontraction with $\lim_n \|T^n h\| = 0$ for every $h \in \mathcal{H}$, M_z is the multiplication operator on the analytic function space \mathcal{H}_K with reproducing kernel $K(z, \omega) = \frac{1}{(1-z\bar{\omega})^n}$.*

Then, the eigenvector bundle of T has the tensor structure as the following

$$(2.1) \quad \ker(T - \omega I) = \text{span}\{K_{\bar{\omega}}\} \otimes \mathcal{N}(\omega),$$

where $K(z, \omega) := K_{\bar{\omega}}(z) = \frac{1}{(1-z\bar{\omega})^n}$, $\mathcal{N}(\omega) := \{e \in E : K_{\bar{\omega}}e \in \mathcal{N}\}$. Suppose t is the non-zero cross-section of E_T , by equation (2.1) and Remark 4.3 of [25], then we have

$$(2.2) \quad \|t(\omega)\|^2 = \frac{1}{(1-|\omega|^2)^n} \left\| \left(\sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j \binom{n}{j} (T^*)^j T^j \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} t(\omega) \right\|^2.$$

To make more progress in similar case, we need the following theorem to simplify the structure of Cowen-Douglas operators.

Theorem 2.5 (Upper triangular representation theorem, [15]). *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be a Cowen-Douglas operator with index n , then there exists a orthogonal decomposition $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathcal{H}_n$ and operators $T_{1,1}, T_{2,2}, \dots, T_{n,n}$ in $B_1(\Omega)$ such that T takes following form*

$$(2.3) \quad T = \begin{pmatrix} T_{1,1} & T_{1,2} & T_{1,3} & \cdots & T_{1,n} \\ 0 & T_{2,2} & T_{2,3} & \cdots & T_{2,n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & T_{n-1,n-1} & T_{n-1,n} \\ 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & T_{n,n} \end{pmatrix}.$$

2.2. Strongly irreducible operator and uniqueness of operator decomposition. Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. $\mathcal{A}'(T)$ denoted the commutant of T , that is $\mathcal{A}'(T) = \{X \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) | TX = XT\}$. We say $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is strongly irreducible, if $\mathcal{A}'(T)$ doesn't have any nontrivial idempotent operator (see [19]). In fact, strongly irreducible operators are Jordan blocks and "minimal" operators in infinite dimensional space. In what follows, $T \in (SI)$ means that T is a strongly irreducible operator. In [23], C. K. Fong and C. L. Jiang shows that Cowen-Douglas operators with index one are typical strongly irreducible operators.

Theorem 2.6. [23] *If $T \in B_1(\Omega)$, then $T \in (SI)$. That is, $B_1(\Omega) \subset (SI)$.*

Let $M_k(\mathcal{A}'(T))$ be the collection of all $k \times k$ matrices with entries from the $\mathcal{A}'(T)$ and

$$M_\infty(\mathcal{A}'(T)) = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} M_k(\mathcal{A}'(T)).$$

Let $Proj(M_k(\mathcal{A}'(T)))$ be the algebraic equivalence classes of idempotents in $M_k(\mathcal{A}'(T))$ and

$$\vee(\mathcal{A}'(T)) = Proj(M_\infty(\mathcal{A}'(T))).$$

The K_0 -group of $\mathcal{A}'(T)$ (denoted by $K_0(\mathcal{A}'(T))$) is defined as the Grothendieck group of $\vee(\mathcal{A}'(T))$.

In [21], Y. Cao, J. S. Fang and C. L. Jiang first introduced the K -theory in the study of operator commutative algebra.

Definition 2.7. [21] *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. We say $\mathcal{P} = \{P_i\}_{i=1}^n$ ($n < \infty$), the set of idempotent elements of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$, is a unit finite decomposition of T , if the following are satisfied:*

- (1) $P_i \in \mathcal{A}'(T)$, $1 \leq i \leq n$;
- (2) $P_i P_j = \delta_{ij} P_i$ ($1 \leq i, j \leq n$), where $\delta_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & i = j \\ 0 & i \neq j \end{cases}$;
- (3) $\sum_{i=1}^n P_i = I_{\mathcal{H}}$, where $I_{\mathcal{H}}$ denotes identity operator on \mathcal{H} .

In addition, the following is satisfied:

- (4) $T|_{ran P_i} \in (SI)$, $1 \leq i \leq n$,

we call $\mathcal{P} = \{P_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is a unit finite (SI) decomposition of T .

By Definition 2.7, we know that $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ has a unit finite (SI) decomposition is equivalent to T can be written as a direct sum of finite strongly irreducible operators. Naturally, for any $T \in B_n(\Omega)$, T has a finite (SI) decomposition.

Definition 2.8. [21] *Let T have finite (SI) decomposition. If $\mathcal{P} = \{P_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and $\mathcal{Q} = \{Q_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are two unit finite (SI) decompositions of T , and the following are satisfied:*

- (1) $m = n$;
- (2) there exist an invertible operator $X \in \mathcal{A}'(T)$ and a permutation Π in $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that $X Q_{\Pi(i)} X^{-1} = P_i$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$),

then T has unique finite (SI) decomposition up to similarity.

Theorem 2.9. [21] *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$, and let $\mathcal{H}^{(n)}$ denote the direct sum of n copies of \mathcal{H} and $A^{(n)}$ the operator $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n A$ acting on $\mathcal{H}^{(n)}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $T \sim_s \bigoplus_{i=1}^k A_i^{(n_i)}$ with respect to the decomposition $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathcal{H}^{(n_i)}$, where $k, n_i < \infty$, $A_i \in (SI)$, $A_i \sim_s A_j$ ($i \neq j$), and for each natural number n , $T^{(n)}$ has unique finite (SI) decomposition up to similarity.
- (2) $\vee(\mathcal{A}'(T)) \cong \mathbb{N}^k$, $K_0(\mathcal{A}'(T)) \cong \mathbb{Z}^k$ and this isomorphism h sends $[I]$ to (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k) , i.e., $h([I]) = n_1 e_1 + n_2 e_2 + \dots + n_k e_k$, where $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^k$ are the generators of \mathbb{N}^k .

Theorem 2.9 transforms the study of operator similarity classification into the isomorphism of the K_0 -group of its commutant algebra. It is proved that each bounded operator has unique (SI) decomposition up to similarity. In [22], C. L. Jiang, X. Z. Guo and K. Ji characterize a completely similar invariant of Cowen-Douglas operators by the following theorem.

Theorem 2.10. [22] *Let $T, S \in B_n(\Omega)$. Suppose that $T = T_1^{(n_1)} \oplus T_2^{(n_2)} \oplus \cdots \oplus T_k^{(n_k)}$, where $0 \neq n_i \in \mathbb{N}, i = 1, 2, \dots, k, T_i \in (SI), T_i \approx_s T_j (i \neq j)$. Then $T \sim_s S$ if and only if*

- (1) $(K_0(\mathcal{A}'(T \oplus S)), V(\mathcal{A}'(T \oplus S)), I) \cong (\mathbb{Z}^k, \mathbb{N}^k, 1)$;
- (2) *The isomorphism h from $V(\mathcal{A}'(T \oplus S))$ to \mathbb{N}^k sends $[I]$ to $(2n_1, 2n_2, \dots, 2n_k)$, i.e.,*

$$h([I]) = 2n_1e_1 + 2n_2e_2 + \cdots + 2n_ke_k,$$

where I is the unit of $\mathcal{A}'(T \oplus S)$ and $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^k$ are the generators of \mathbb{N}^k .

Using Theorem 2.9, C. L. Jiang obtains the following:

Theorem 2.11. [20] *If $T \in B_n(\Omega) \cap (SI)$, then $v(\mathcal{A}'(T)) \cong \mathbb{N}, K_0(\mathcal{A}'(T)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$.*

2.3. Operator Model Theorem. Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. Suppose that $p(z, \omega) = \sum_{i=0}^n \alpha_i z^i \omega^i$ is a polynomial.

Define an operator $p(T^*, T) = \sum_{i=0}^n \alpha_i T^{*i} T^i$. Let \mathcal{H}_K be the generalized Bergman space of all analytic functions on \mathbb{D} satisfying

$$\|f\|^2 := \frac{\pi}{k-1} \int_{\mathbb{D}} (1-r^2)^{k-2} |f(re^{it})|^2 dm < \infty,$$

where m is the area measure and k is a integer ≥ 2 . In this case, $K(z, \omega) = \frac{1}{(1-z\bar{\omega})^k}$, so $K(T^*, T) = \sum_{i=0}^k (-1)^i \binom{k}{i} T^{*i} T^i$. The contractions satisfying $\frac{1}{K}(T^*, T) \geq 0$ are called k -hypercontractions. In [16], C. Ambrozie, M. Engliš and V. Müller gave a new expression of k -hypercontraction with reproducing kernel and gave a model theorem.

Theorem 2.12. [16] *Let \mathcal{H}_K be an analytic functional Hilbert space with reproducing kernel $K(z, \omega)$. If $\frac{1}{K}$ is a polynomial, then for any $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) T^* is unitarily equivalent to the restriction of M_z^* to an invariant subspace;
- (2) $\frac{1}{K}(T, T^*) \geq 0$ and $\lim_m f_m(T, T^*)h = 0, h \in \mathcal{H}$,

where $M_z \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_K \otimes \mathcal{H})$ and $f_m(z, \omega) = \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} e_k(z) \frac{1}{K}(z, \omega) e_k(\bar{\omega})$.

3. SIMILARITY OF OPERATOR RESTRICTION ON AN INVARIANT SUBSPACE.

Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. The subspace $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{H}$ is invariant under the operator T if $T\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{M}$. In this section, we will investigate the similarity of operators restricted on invariant subspaces by using operator Model Theorem.

Definition 3.1. *Let M_z be the multiplication operator on some analytic function space. If $I \in \text{Lat}(M_z)$, we let M_I denote the restriction of M_z to I .*

Clearly, restriction operator M_I is a bounded linear operator on I . Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. We say T to be Fredholm, if $\dim \ker T < \infty, \dim \operatorname{coker} T < \infty$ (cf.[14]). The Fredholm index $\operatorname{ind}(T)$ of T is defined as: $\operatorname{ind}(T) = \dim \ker T - \dim \operatorname{coker} T$, where $\operatorname{coker} T = (\operatorname{ran} T)^\perp$. For $T \in B_n(\Omega)$, $\operatorname{ind}(T - \omega) = \dim \ker(T - \omega) = n$.

Lemma 3.2.[14] *Let $T_i \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})(i = 1, 2, 3)$ and define $T : \mathcal{H}^{(2)} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{(2)}$ by the matrix $T = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & T_3 \\ 0 & T_2 \end{pmatrix}$. If T_1 is Fredholm, then T is Fredholm if and only if T_2 is Fredholm.*

If T_1 and T_2 are Fredholm, then $\operatorname{ind}(T) = \operatorname{ind}(T_1) + \operatorname{ind}(T_2)$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $T = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & T_3 \\ 0 & T_2 \end{pmatrix} \in B_{m+n}(\Omega)$ be a bounded linear operator on $\mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2$. If $T_1 \in B_m(\Omega)$, then $T_2 \in B_n(\Omega)$.*

Proof. If $T \in B_{m+n}(\Omega)$, then for any $\begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2$, there is $\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2$, such that

$$\begin{pmatrix} T_1 - \omega & T_3 \\ 0 & T_2 - \omega \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (T_1 - \omega)x_1 + T_3x_2 \\ (T_2 - \omega)x_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

That is to say, for any $y_2 \in \mathcal{H}_2$, there is $x_2 \in \mathcal{H}_2$, such that $(T_2 - \omega)x_2 = y_2$, then

$$(3.1) \quad \operatorname{ran}(T_2 - \omega) = \mathcal{H}_2, \quad \omega \in \Omega.$$

We know that $T - \omega, T_1 - \omega$ are Fredholm, and

$$\operatorname{ind}(T - \omega) = \dim \ker(T - \omega) = m + n, \operatorname{ind}(T_1 - \omega) = \dim \ker(T_1 - \omega) = m.$$

According to Lemma 3.2, T_2 is also a Fredholm operator and $\operatorname{ind}(T_2 - \omega) = n$. Combining with the equation (3.1), we obtain

$$\dim \ker(T_2 - \omega) = n, \omega \in \Omega \subset \sigma(T_2).$$

Since $T_1 \in B_m(\Omega)$, there exist a set of holomorphic frame $\{t_i\}_{i=1}^m$ of E_{T_1} . Setting $\gamma_i = \begin{pmatrix} t_i \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$. We can easily verify that $\gamma_i(\omega) \in \ker(T - \omega), 1 \leq i \leq m$. We can extend the set $\{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^m$ to a set of frame $\{\gamma_j\}_{j=1}^{m+n}$ of E_T , where

$$\gamma_j = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{j,1} \\ \gamma_{j,2} \end{pmatrix}, m+1 \leq j \leq m+n.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{pmatrix} T_1 - \omega & T_3 \\ 0 & T_2 - \omega \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{j,1}(\omega) \\ \gamma_{j,2}(\omega) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (T_1 - \omega)\gamma_{j,1}(\omega) + T_3\gamma_{j,2}(\omega) \\ (T_2 - \omega)\gamma_{j,2}(\omega) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The above equation can imply that $\gamma_{j,2}(\omega) \in \ker(T_2 - \omega), j = m+1, \dots, m+n$. We claim that $\gamma_{j,2} \neq 0$. Otherwise, $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m, \gamma_j$ are linearly correlated. Notice that $\bigvee_{\omega \in \Omega} \ker(T - \omega) = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2$, so $\bigvee_{\omega \in \Omega} \{\gamma_{j,2}(\omega)\}_{j=m+1}^{m+n} = \mathcal{H}_2$. Therefore, $T_2 \in B_n(\Omega)$ and $\{\gamma_{j,2}\}_{j=m+1}^{m+n}$ is the holomorphic frame of E_{T_2} . \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let $T \in B_n(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ ($n \geq 2$), and $\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}_i$. Then there exists a holomorphic frame $\{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^n$, such that $\gamma_i = (\gamma_{i,1}, \dots, \gamma_{i,i}, \underbrace{0, 0, \dots, 0}_{n-i})^T$, where $\gamma_{i,j} \in \mathcal{H}_j, 1 \leq i \leq n$.*

Proof. By Theorem 2.5, for $T \in B_n(\Omega)$, there exist operators T_1, \dots, T_n in $B_1(\Omega)$ such that

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & T_{1,2} & \cdots & T_{1,n} \\ 0 & T_2 & \cdots & T_{2,n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & T_n \end{pmatrix},$$

with respect to some decomposition $\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}_i$ of space \mathcal{H} , where $T_{i,j} : \mathcal{H}_j \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_i$. Let $\gamma_{i,i} \in \ker(T_i - \omega)$ be non-vanishing holomorphic sections of bundles E_{T_i} ($1 \leq i \leq n$). Next, to complete the proof by mathematica induction.

When $n = 2$,

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & T_{1,2} \\ 0 & T_2 \end{pmatrix} \in B_2(\Omega), T_1, T_2 \in B_1(\Omega).$$

It is easy to verify $\gamma_1(\omega) = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{1,1}(\omega) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \ker(T - \omega)$. Since $\dim \ker(T - \omega) = 2$, suppose that the

other non-zero holomorphic vector in the kernel space $\ker(T - \omega)$ is $\gamma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\gamma}_{2,1} \\ \tilde{\gamma}_{2,2} \end{pmatrix}$. It follows that

$$\begin{pmatrix} T_1 - \omega & T_{1,2} \\ 0 & T_2 - \omega \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\gamma}_{2,1}(\omega) \\ \tilde{\gamma}_{2,2}(\omega) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (T_1 - \omega)\tilde{\gamma}_{2,1}(\omega) + T_{1,2}\tilde{\gamma}_{2,2}(\omega) \\ (T_2 - \omega)\tilde{\gamma}_{2,2}(\omega) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and $\tilde{\gamma}_{2,2}(\omega) \in \ker(T_2 - \omega)$. We claim that $\tilde{\gamma}_{2,2} \neq 0$. If $\tilde{\gamma}_{2,2} = 0$, then $\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\}$ is not a frame of E_T . Setting $\gamma_{2,2} := \tilde{\gamma}_{2,2}$. Then $\gamma_{2,2}$ is a non-zero cross-section of holomorphic vector bundle E_{T_2} . So the conclusion of Lemma holds when T belongs to $B_2(\Omega)$. Let us assume that Lemma is valid for $T \in B_{k-1}(\Omega)$. Next, we prove that it is also true for $T \in B_k(\Omega)$.

Let $T \in B_k(\Omega)$. By Theorem 2.5 again, we can write T as $\begin{pmatrix} T_1 & \tilde{T}_{1,2} \\ 0 & \tilde{T}_2 \end{pmatrix}$. According to Lemma 3.3, we know $\tilde{T}_2 \in B_{k-1}(\Omega)$. By the induction hypothesis, there exists a holomorphic frame $\{\tilde{\gamma}_i\}_{i=2}^k$, such that $\tilde{\gamma}_i = (\gamma_{i,2}, \dots, \gamma_{i,i}, \underbrace{0, 0, \dots, 0}_{k-i})^T$. Then there exist holomorphic functions $\gamma_{i,1}$ satisfying

$(T_1 - \omega)\gamma_{i,1} + \tilde{T}_{1,2}\tilde{\gamma}_i = 0$ ($2 \leq i \leq k$). Setting $\gamma_1 := \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{1,1} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $\gamma_i := \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{i,1} \\ \tilde{\gamma}_i \end{pmatrix}$ ($2 \leq i \leq k$). Clearly, $\{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^k$ is a holomorphic frame of E_T . This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose that the Hermitian matrix A can be divided into $A = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{12}^* & A_{22} \end{pmatrix}$. If A_{11} is invertible, then A is positive if and only if A_{11} and $A_{22} - A_{12}^* A_{11}^{-1} A_{12}$ are positive.*

Proof. If A_{11} is invertible, then you have the following congruent transformation

$$\begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ -A_{12}^* A_{11}^{-1} & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{12}^* & A_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I - A_{11}^{-1} A_{12} \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & A_{22} - A_{12}^* A_{11}^{-1} A_{12} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence, $\begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & A_{22} - A_{12}^* A_{11}^{-1} A_{12} \end{pmatrix}$ is positive if and only if A_{11} and $A_{22} - A_{12}^* A_{11}^{-1} A_{12}$ are positive. We know the congruent transformation does not change the positive definiteness of the matrix. This completes the proof. \square

According to the model theorem given by C. Ambrozie, M. Engliš and V. Müller in [16](Theorem 2.12), and influenced by the similarity theorem given by R. G. Douglas, H. Kwon, S. Treil and K. Ji in [7, 8](Theorem 1.5), we have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) \cap B_n(\mathbb{D})$, \mathcal{H}_K be an analytic functional Hilbert space with reproducing kernel K . If $\frac{1}{K}$ is a polynomial and the contraction operator T satisfies:*

$$\frac{1}{K}(T^*, T) \geq 0, \text{ trace } \mathcal{K}_{M_z^{*(n)}} - \text{trace } \mathcal{K}_T = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial w \partial \bar{w}} \varphi,$$

then $T \sim_s M_z^{*(n)}$, where φ is a bounded subharmonic function, M_z is the multiplication operator on \mathcal{H}_K .

Theorem 3.7. *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) \cap B_n(\mathbb{D})$, \mathcal{H}_K be an analytic functional Hilbert space with reproducing kernel K . Suppose that $\frac{1}{K}$ is a polynomial and there exists $M > 0$, such that $\frac{\det h_T(\omega)}{K^n(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})} < M, \omega \in \mathbb{D}$. If there exists $\mathcal{M} \in \text{Lat}(T)$, such that contraction operators $T|_{\mathcal{M}}, (T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*$ satisfy the following conditions:*

- (1) $\frac{1}{K}((T|_{\mathcal{M}})^*, T|_{\mathcal{M}}) \geq 0, \frac{1}{K}(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp}, (T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*) \geq 0;$
- (2) $T|_{\mathcal{M}} \in B_m(\mathbb{D}), m < n;$
- (3) $\lim_{\omega \rightarrow \partial \mathbb{D}} \frac{\det h_{T|_{\mathcal{M}}}(\omega) \cdot \det h_{(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*}(\omega)}{K^n(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})} \neq 0,$

then $T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \sim_s M_z^{(n-m)}$, where M_z is the multiplication operator on \mathcal{H}_K .

Proof. Since $\mathcal{M} \in \text{Lat}(T)$, T has the following form under the space decomposition of $\mathcal{M} \oplus \mathcal{M}^\perp$:

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} T|_{\mathcal{M}} & P_{\mathcal{M}} T|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \\ 0 & P_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} T|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $P_{\mathcal{M}}, P_{\mathcal{M}^\perp}$ denote the orthogonal projection onto \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{M}^\perp , respectively. Similarly, we can represent T^* as

$$T^* = \begin{pmatrix} (T|_{\mathcal{M}})^* & 0 \\ (P_{\mathcal{M}} T|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^* & (P_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} T|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^* \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} P_{\mathcal{M}} T^*|_{\mathcal{M}} & P_{\mathcal{M}} T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \\ P_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} T^*|_{\mathcal{M}} & P_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \end{pmatrix}.$$

It follows that $P_{\mathcal{M}} T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} = 0$. Then, we have $\mathcal{M}^\perp \in \text{Lat}(T^*)$ and $P_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} = T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp}$. Moreover,

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} T|_{\mathcal{M}} & P_{\mathcal{M}} T|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \\ 0 & (T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^* \end{pmatrix}.$$

Notice that $T \in B_n(\mathbb{D}), T|_{\mathcal{M}} \in B_m(\mathbb{D})$, by Lemma 3.3, we obtain $(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^* \in B_{n-m}(\mathbb{D})$. From Lemma 3.4, there exists a holomorphic frame $\{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of E_T , where

$$\gamma_i = (\gamma_{i,1}, \dots, \gamma_{i,i}, \underbrace{0, 0, \dots, 0}_{n-i})^T.$$

Thus, the metric of Hermitian holomorphic vector bundle E_T is

$$h_T = \begin{pmatrix} \|\gamma_{11}\|^2 & \langle \gamma_{2,1}, \gamma_{1,1} \rangle & \cdots & \langle \gamma_{n,1}, \gamma_{1,1} \rangle \\ \langle \gamma_{1,1}, \gamma_{2,1} \rangle & \|\gamma_{21}\|^2 + \|\gamma_{22}\|^2 & \cdots & \langle \gamma_{n,1}, \gamma_{2,1} \rangle + \langle \gamma_{n,2}, \gamma_{2,2} \rangle \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \langle \gamma_{1,1}, \gamma_{n,1} \rangle & \langle \gamma_{2,1}, \gamma_{n,1} \rangle + \langle \gamma_{2,2}, \gamma_{n,2} \rangle & \cdots & \|\gamma_{n,1}\|^2 + \cdots + \|\gamma_{n,n}\|^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Next, we divide h_T into $\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$, where

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \|\gamma_{11}\|^2 & \langle \gamma_{2,1}, \gamma_{1,1} \rangle & \cdots & \langle \gamma_{m,1}, \gamma_{1,1} \rangle \\ \langle \gamma_{1,1}, \gamma_{2,1} \rangle & \|\gamma_{21}\|^2 + \|\gamma_{22}\|^2 & \cdots & \langle \gamma_{m,1}, \gamma_{2,1} \rangle + \langle \gamma_{m,2}, \gamma_{2,2} \rangle \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \langle \gamma_{1,1}, \gamma_{m,1} \rangle & \langle \gamma_{2,1}, \gamma_{m,1} \rangle + \langle \gamma_{2,2}, \gamma_{m,2} \rangle & \cdots & \|\gamma_{m,1}\|^2 + \cdots + \|\gamma_{m,m}\|^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then we can obtain the corresponding parts of B, C, D . According to the proof process of Lemma 3.4, we know $A = h_{T|_{\mathcal{M}}}$ and

$$h_{(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*} = \begin{pmatrix} \|\gamma_{m+1,m+1}\|^2 & \cdots & \langle \gamma_{n,m+1}, \gamma_{m+1,m+1} \rangle \\ \langle \gamma_{m+1,m+1}, \gamma_{m+2,m+1} \rangle & \cdots & \langle \gamma_{n,m+1}, \gamma_{m+2,m+1} \rangle + \langle \gamma_{n,m+2}, \gamma_{m+2,m+2} \rangle \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \langle \gamma_{m+1,m+1}, \gamma_{n,m+1} \rangle & \cdots & \|\gamma_{n,m+1}\|^2 + \cdots + \|\gamma_{n,n}\|^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Notice that there exists D_2 , such that $D = h_{(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*} + D_2$.

It is well known that for any $\begin{pmatrix} M_1 & M_2 \\ M_3 & M_4 \end{pmatrix}$, when M_1 is invertible,

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} M_1 & M_2 \\ M_3 & M_4 \end{pmatrix} = \det(M_1) \cdot \det(M_4 - M_3 M_1^{-1} M_2).$$

Note that the Gramian matrix $h_{T|_{\mathcal{M}}}$ is invertible, so

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \det h_T &= \det(h_{T|_{\mathcal{M}}}) \cdot \det[D - C(\det(T|_{\mathcal{M}}))^{-1}B] \\ &= \det(T|_{\mathcal{M}}) \cdot \det[h_{(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*} + D_2 - C(\det(T|_{\mathcal{M}}))^{-1}B]. \end{aligned}$$

Define a new frame as the following:

$$\widehat{\gamma}_i := \begin{cases} \gamma_i, & 1 \leq i \leq m; \\ (\gamma_{i,1}, \dots, \gamma_{i,m}, \underbrace{0, 0, \dots, 0}_{n-m})^T, & m+1 \leq i \leq n. \end{cases}$$

The Gramian matrix under the frame $\{\widehat{\gamma}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is $\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D_2 \end{pmatrix}$. From the invertibility of Gramian matrix $A = h_{T|_{\mathcal{M}}}$ and Lemma 3.5, we know $D_2 - C(\det(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}}))^{-1}B$ is also positive definite.

For the positive definite matrices N_1, N_2 , we have $\det(N_1 + N_2) \geq \det(N_1) + \det(N_2)$. Then equation (3.2) can imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \det h_T &\geq \det(h_{T|_{\mathcal{M}}}) \cdot [\det(h_{(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*}) + \det(D_2 - C(\det(h_{T|_{\mathcal{M}}}))^{-1}B)] \\ &= \det(h_{T|_{\mathcal{M}}}) \cdot \det(h_{(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*}) + \det(h_{T|_{\mathcal{M}}}) \cdot \det[D_2 - C(\det(h_{T|_{\mathcal{M}}}))^{-1}B] \\ &> \det(h_{T|_{\mathcal{M}}}) \cdot \det(h_{(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*}) \\ &= \det(h_{T|_{\mathcal{M} \oplus (T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*}}). \end{aligned}$$

Setting $\tilde{T} = T|_{\mathcal{M}} \oplus (T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*$. We have

$$\frac{\det h_{\tilde{T}}(\omega)}{\det h_{M_z^{*(n)}}(\omega)} = \frac{\det h_{\tilde{T}}(\omega)}{K^n(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})} < \frac{\det h_T(\omega)}{K^n(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})} < M, \omega \in \mathbb{D}.$$

For any $\omega \in \mathbb{D}$, $K(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega}), h_{T|_{\mathcal{M}}}(\omega), h_{(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*}(\omega)$ are invertible. And, by the positive definiteness of Gramian matrix, we obtain $K(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega}) > 0, \det(h_{T|_{\mathcal{M}}}(\omega)) > 0, \det(h_{(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*}(\omega)) > 0, \omega \in \mathbb{D}$. From $\frac{\det h_{\tilde{T}}(\omega)}{K^n(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})} < M$, we know $\frac{\det h_{\tilde{T}}(\omega)}{K^n(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})}$ has no singularity in \mathbb{D} , and it's always positive. Suppose that $m_1 = \min\{\frac{\det h_{\tilde{T}}(\omega)}{K^n(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})}, \omega \in \mathbb{D}\}$, then $m_1 > 0$. Since $\lim_{\omega \rightarrow \partial\mathbb{D}} \frac{\det h_{\tilde{T}}(\omega)}{K^n(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})} \neq 0$, which imply that the limit is greater than 0. Suppose that $m_2 = \min\{\lim_{\omega \rightarrow \partial\mathbb{D}} \frac{\det h_{\tilde{T}}(\omega)}{K^n(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})}\}$, then $m_2 > 0$. Setting $m = \min\{m_1, m_2\}$. Then $\inf \frac{\det h_{\tilde{T}}(\omega)}{K^n(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})} > m > 0$. Hence, we obtain that

$$(3.3) \quad \text{trace} \mathcal{K}_{M_z^{*(n)}} - \text{trace} \mathcal{K}_{\tilde{T}} = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \omega \partial \bar{\omega}} \varphi,$$

where $\varphi := \log \frac{\det h_{\tilde{T}}}{\det h_{M_z^{*(n)}}}$ is a bounded subharmonic function. Since $T|_{\mathcal{M}}, (T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*$ are contractive operators, and $\frac{1}{K}((T|_{\mathcal{M}})^*, T|_{\mathcal{M}}) \geq 0, \frac{1}{K}(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp}, (T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*) \geq 0$, we know \tilde{T} is contractive operator and $\frac{1}{K}(\tilde{T}^*, \tilde{T}) \geq 0$. By Lemma 3.6 and equation (3.3), we have $\tilde{T} \sim_s M_z^{*(n)}$.

Note that $M_z^* \in B_1(\mathbb{D})$, by Theorem 2.11, we know $K_0(\mathcal{A}'(M_z^*)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$. And, for any positive integer i , by Theorem 2.10, we can imply that

$$(3.4) \quad K_0(\mathcal{A}'(M_z^{*(i)})) = K_0(\mathcal{M}_i(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A}'(M_z^*)) \cong \mathbb{Z}.$$

Since $T|_{\mathcal{M}} \oplus (T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^* \sim_s M_z^{*(n)}$, by equation (3.4) and Theorem 2.10, we have the following equation

$$(3.5) \quad K_0(\mathcal{A}'(T|_{\mathcal{M}} \oplus (T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^* \oplus M_z^{*(n)})) = K_0(\mathcal{A}'(M_z^{*(n)})) \cong \mathbb{Z}.$$

Each Cowen-Douglas operator can be written as a direct sum of a finite number of strongly irreducible Cowen-Douglas operators. Suppose that

$$\begin{aligned} T|_{\mathcal{M}} &= \bigoplus_{i=1}^t A_i^{(m_i)}, A_i \in B_{n_i}(\mathbb{D}) \cap (SI), A_i \asymp_s A_j (i \neq j), \sum_{i=1}^t m_i n_i = m, m_i > 0; \\ (T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^* &= \bigoplus_{i=1}^s B_i^{(l_i)}, B_i \in B_{h_i}(\mathbb{D}) \cap (SI), B_i \asymp_s B_j (i \neq j), \sum_{i=1}^s h_i l_i = n - m, l_i > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that only $A_i (1 \leq i \leq t'), B_i (1 \leq i \leq s')$ satisfies $A_i \asymp_s M_z^{*(n_i)}, B_i \asymp_s M_z^{*(h_i)}$. We also assume that $A_i \asymp_s B_j, i = 1, 2, \dots, t, j = 1, 2, \dots, s$. Hence, we have

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^t A_i^{(m_i)} \bigoplus_{i=1}^s B_i^{(l_i)} \bigoplus M_z^{*(n)} \sim_s \bigoplus_{i=1}^{t'} A_i^{(m_i)} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{s'} B_i^{(l_i)} \bigoplus M_z^{*(k)},$$

and

$$K_0\left(\mathcal{A}'\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^t A_i^{(m_i)} \bigoplus_{i=1}^s B_i^{(l_i)} \bigoplus M_z^{*(n)}\right)\right) = K_0\left(\mathcal{A}'\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{t'} A_i^{(m_i)} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{s'} B_i^{(l_i)} \bigoplus M_z^{*(k)}\right)\right) \\ \cong \mathbb{Z}^{t'+s'+1},$$

where $k = n + \sum_{i=t'+1}^t m_i n_i + \sum_{i=s'+1}^s h_i l_i$. Combining with the equation (3.5), we can imply $t' = s' = 0$.

So, for any $A_i \in B_{n_i}(\mathbb{D})$, $B_j \in B_{h_j}(\mathbb{D})$, we have $A_i \sim_s M_z^{*(n_i)}$, $B_j \sim_s M_z^{*(h_j)}$. Note that $(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^* \in B_{n-m}(\mathbb{D})$, then $T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \sim_s M_z^{*(n-m)}$. \square

The following proposition is to explain the condition (3) in Theorem 3.7, which is naturally satisfied in many cases.

Proposition 3.8. *Let $T \in B_1(\mathbb{D})$, $T \sim_u (M_z^*, \mathcal{H}_{K_1}, K_1)$, where \mathcal{H}_{K_1} is an analytic functional Hilbert space with reproducing kernel $K_1(z, \omega) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n z^n \bar{\omega}^n$ ($b_n > 0$). Suppose that $\frac{1}{K_2}$ is a polynomial. If $\frac{1}{K_2}(T^*, T) \geq 0$, then $\frac{K_1(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})}{K_2(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})}$ is bounded below from zero.*

Proof. If $K_1(z, \omega) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n z^n \bar{\omega}^n$ ($b_n > 0$), T can be regarded as a weighted (backward) shift operator with weight sequence $\{\sqrt{\frac{b_n}{b_{n+1}}}\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ up to unitary equivalence. Since $\frac{1}{K_2}$ is a polynomial, we suppose that $\frac{1}{K_2}(z, \omega) = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^k a_n z^n \bar{\omega}^n$, $k > 0$. Then, we have

$$(3.6) \quad \frac{K_1(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})}{K_2(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})} = \left(1 + \sum_{n=1}^k a_n |\omega|^{2n}\right) \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n |\omega|^{2n}\right) \\ = b_0 + \sum_{i=1}^k (b_i + a_1 b_{i-1} + \cdots + a_i b_0) |\omega|^{2i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} (b_j + a_1 b_{j-1} + \cdots + a_k b_{j-k}) |\omega|^{2j}.$$

According to $\frac{1}{K_2}(T^*, T) \geq 0$, we can imply

$$1 + a_1 \frac{b_{i-1}}{b_i} + \cdots + a_i \frac{b_0}{b_i} \geq 0 (1 \leq i \leq k), 1 + a_1 \frac{b_{j-1}}{b_j} + \cdots + a_k \frac{b_{j-k}}{b_j} \geq 0 (j \geq k+1).$$

So the coefficients of $|\omega|^{2i}$ ($i > 0$) are not less than 0. Thus, $\frac{K_1(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})}{K_2(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})} \geq b_0$. \square

Corollary 3.9. *Let $T \in B_n(\mathbb{D})$, \mathcal{H}_K be an analytic functional Hilbert space with reproducing kernel $K(z, \omega) = (1 - z\bar{\omega})^{-k}$. Suppose that there exists $M > 0$, such that $\frac{\det h_T(\omega)}{K^n(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})} < M$ ($\omega \in \mathbb{D}$). If there exists $\mathcal{M} \in \text{Lat}(T)$, such that k -hypercontraction operators $T|_{\mathcal{M}}$, $(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*$ satisfy the following conditions:*

- (1) $T|_{\mathcal{M}} \in B_m(\mathbb{D})$, $m < n$;
- (2) $\lim_{\omega \rightarrow \partial\mathbb{D}} \frac{(\det h_{T|_{\mathcal{M}}}(\omega)) \cdot (\det h_{(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*}(\omega))}{K^n(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})} \neq 0$,

then $T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \sim_s M_z^{(n-m)}$, where M_z is the multiplication operator on \mathcal{H}_K .

Proof. Since $\mathcal{M} \in \text{Lat}(T)$, T has the following form under the space decomposition of $\mathcal{M} \oplus \mathcal{M}^\perp$:

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} T|_{\mathcal{M}} & P_{\mathcal{M}} T|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \\ 0 & P_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} T|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} T|_{\mathcal{M}} & P_{\mathcal{M}} T|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \\ 0 & (T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^* \end{pmatrix}.$$

If $T \in B_n(\mathbb{D})$, $T|_{\mathcal{M}} \in B_m(\mathbb{D})$, by Lemma 3.3, we have $(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^* \in B_{n-m}(\mathbb{D})$. From Lemma 3.4, there exists a holomorphic frame $\{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of E_T , where $\gamma_i = (\gamma_{i,1}, \dots, \gamma_{i,i}, \underbrace{0, 0, \dots, 0}_{n-i})^T$. Setting $\tilde{T} = T|_{\mathcal{M}} \oplus (T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*$. By the proof process of Theorem 3.7, we can find $m > 0$, such that

$$m < \frac{\det h_{\tilde{T}}(\omega)}{K^n(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})} \leq \frac{\det h_T(\omega)}{K^n(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})} < M.$$

The above inequality can be further translated as

$$(3.7) \quad \text{trace} \mathcal{K}_{M_z^{*(n)}} - \text{trace} \mathcal{K}_{\tilde{T}} = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \omega \partial \bar{\omega}} \varphi,$$

where $\varphi := \log \frac{\det(h_{\tilde{T}})}{\det(h_{M_z^{*(n)}})}$ is a bounded subharmonic function. Since $T|_{\mathcal{M}}, (T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*$ are k -hypercontraction operators, then \tilde{T} is also k -hypercontraction operator. By Theorem 1.5, we obtain $\tilde{T} \sim_s M_z^{*(n)}$. According to the proof process of Theorem 3.7 again, we have $T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \sim_s M_z^{(n-m)}$. \square

In Corollary 3.9, when $T \in B_2(\mathbb{D})$ and $T|_{\mathcal{M}} \in B_1(\mathbb{D})$, we concluded that $T|_{\mathcal{M}} \sim_s (T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^* \sim_s M_z^*$. In general, for any

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & T_{1,2} \\ 0 & T_2 \end{pmatrix} \in B_2(\mathbb{D}).$$

Suppose that $T \sim_s M_z^{*(2)}$, where M_z is a multiplication operator on some analytic functional Hilbert space. If there exist a diagonal invertible operator intertwining T and $M_z^{*(2)}$, by a simple calculation, we can verify that $T_1 \sim_s T_2 \sim_s M_z^*, T_{1,2} = 0$. If the invertible operator X intertwining T and $M_z^{*(2)}$ is upper triangular, i.e., $X = \begin{pmatrix} X_{1,1} & X_{1,2} \\ 0 & X_{2,2} \end{pmatrix}$. By calculation, we can obtain $T_1 \sim_s T_2 \sim_s M_z^*$, and $T_{1,2} = \text{ran} \tau_{T_1, T_2}$ (cf. [24]). In this case, the operator T is strongly reducible. Generally, invertible operator X is neither diagonal nor upper triangular, and the calculation will be more complicated. The above two simple examples also show that Theorem 3.7 and Corollary 3.9 are not trivial.

Corollary 3.10. *Let $T \in B_1(\mathbb{D})$, \mathcal{H}_K be an analytic functional Hilbert space with reproducing kernel $K(z, \omega) = (1 - z\bar{\omega})^{-n}$. Suppose that there exists $M > 0$, such that $\frac{h_T(\omega)}{K(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})} < M$ ($\omega \in \mathbb{D}$). If there exists $\mathcal{M} \in \text{Lat}(T)$, such that $(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*$ is a n -hypercontraction operator, and satisfy the following conditions::*

- (1) $\sigma(T|_{\mathcal{M}}) \cap \mathbb{D} = \emptyset$;
- (2) $\lim_{\omega \rightarrow \partial \mathbb{D}} \frac{h_{(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*}(\omega)}{K(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})} \neq 0$,

then $T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \sim_s M_z$, where M_z is the multiplication operator on \mathcal{H}_K .

Proof. Since $\mathcal{M} \in \text{Lat}(T)$, T, T^* have the following forms under the space decomposition of $\mathcal{M} \oplus \mathcal{M}^\perp$:

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} T|_{\mathcal{M}} & P_{\mathcal{M}} T|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \\ 0 & (T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^* \end{pmatrix}, T^* = \begin{pmatrix} (T|_{\mathcal{M}})^* & 0 \\ P_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} T^*|_{\mathcal{M}} & T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let $e(\omega) = \begin{pmatrix} e_1(\omega) \\ e_2(\omega) \end{pmatrix}$ be a non-zero cross-section of holomorphic vector bundle E_T , then

$$\begin{pmatrix} T|_{\mathcal{M}} - \omega & P_{\mathcal{M}} T|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \\ 0 & (T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^* - \omega \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e_1(\omega) \\ e_2(\omega) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (T|_{\mathcal{M}} - \omega)e_1(\omega) + P_{\mathcal{M}} T|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} e_2(\omega) \\ ((T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^* - \omega)e_2(\omega) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It follows that $e_2(\omega) \in \ker((T^*|_{\mathcal{M}})^* - \omega)$. Note that $\sigma(T|_{\mathcal{M}}) \cap \mathbb{D} = \emptyset$, so

$$e_1(\omega) = -(T|_{\mathcal{M}} - \omega)^{-1} P_{\mathcal{M}} T|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} e_2(\omega), \omega \in \mathbb{D}.$$

According to the relation between $e_1(\omega)$ and $e_2(\omega)$, we know that $e_2(\omega)$ is not zero, otherwise $e(\omega)$ is zero. Because of $\dim \ker(T - \omega) = 1$, we have $\dim \ker((T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^* - \omega) = 1$. By $\text{ran}(T - \omega) = \mathcal{M} \oplus \mathcal{M}^\perp$, then for any $\begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{M} \oplus \mathcal{M}^\perp$, there exists $\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{M} \oplus \mathcal{M}^\perp$, such that

$$\begin{pmatrix} T|_{\mathcal{M}} - \omega & P_{\mathcal{M}} T|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \\ 0 & (T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^* - \omega \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (T|_{\mathcal{M}} - \omega)x_1 + P_{\mathcal{M}} T|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} x_2 \\ ((T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^* - \omega)x_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

That is to say, for any $y_2 \in \mathcal{M}^\perp$, there exists $x_2 \in \mathcal{M}^\perp$, such that $((T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^* - \omega)x_2 = y_2$. Then $\text{ran}((T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^* - \omega) = \mathcal{M}^\perp$. According to the characteristics of $\ker(T - \omega)$ and the condition $\bigvee_{\omega \in \mathbb{D}} \ker(T - \omega) = \mathcal{M} \oplus \mathcal{M}^\perp$, we can obtain $\bigvee_{\omega \in \mathbb{D}} \ker((T^*|_{\mathcal{M}})^* - \omega) = \mathcal{M}^\perp$. Hence, $(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^* \in B_1(\mathbb{D})$.

Next, the metric of the operator T is

$$\begin{aligned} h_T(\omega) &= \|e_1(\omega)\|^2 + \|e_2(\omega)\|^2 \\ &= \|e_1(\omega)\|^2 + h_{(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*}(\omega) \\ &\geq h_{(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*}(\omega). \end{aligned}$$

From $\frac{h_T(\omega)}{K(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})} < M$, we have $\frac{h_{(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*}(\omega)}{K(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})} < M$. Similarly, by condition (2) and the proof of Theorem 3.7, there exists $m > 0$, such that $\frac{h_{(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*}(\omega)}{K(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})} > m$. Furthermore,

$$\mathcal{K}_{M_z^*}(\omega) - \mathcal{K}_{(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*}(\omega) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \omega \partial \bar{\omega}} \varphi(\omega),$$

where $\varphi(\omega) := \log \frac{h_{(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*}(\omega)}{(1-|\omega|^2)^{-n}}$ is a bounded subharmonic function, M_z is the multiplication operator on \mathcal{H}_K . Since $(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*$ is an n -hypercontraction operator, by Lemma 3.6, we have

$$T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \sim_s M_z.$$

□

Next, we will return to the open problem raised by K. Zhu: for the multiplication operator on the Bergman space and $I, J \in \text{Lat}(M_z)$, when $M_I \sim_s M_J$?

Corollary 3.11. *Let M_z be the multiplication operator on the Bergman space, \mathcal{H}_K be an analytic functional Hilbert space with reproducing kernel K , the multiplication operator on space \mathcal{H}_K is \widetilde{M}_z . Suppose that $\frac{1}{K}$ is a polynomial, and there exists $M > 0$ such that $\frac{(1-|\omega|^2)^{-2}}{K(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})} \leq M(\omega \in \mathbb{D})$. If $I_i \in \text{Lat}(M_z)(i = 1, 2)$ satisfy the following conditions:*

- (1) $(M_{I_i})^* \in B_1(\mathbb{D})$, $i = 1, 2$;
- (2) $\frac{1}{K}(M_{I_i}, (M_{I_i})^*) \geq 0$, $i = 1, 2$;
- (3) $\lim_{\omega \rightarrow \partial \mathbb{D}} \frac{h_{(M_{I_i})^*}(\omega)}{K(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})} \neq 0$, $i = 1, 2$,

then $M_{I_1} \sim_s M_{I_2}$.

Proof. Since $I_i \in \text{Lat}(M_z)(i = 1, 2)$, M_z and M_z^* have the following forms under the space decomposition of $I_i^\perp \oplus I_i$:

$$M_z = \begin{pmatrix} P_{I_i^\perp} M_z|_{I_i^\perp} & 0 \\ P_{I_i} M_z|_{I_i^\perp} & M_{I_i} \end{pmatrix}, \quad M_z^* = \begin{pmatrix} M_z^*|_{I_i^\perp} & (P_{I_i} M_z|_{I_i^\perp})^* \\ 0 & (M_{I_i})^* \end{pmatrix}.$$

Suppose that $e_i(\omega)$ is a non-zero cross-section of holomorphic vector bundle $E_{(M_{I_i})^*}$, $i = 1, 2$, there exist the non-zero cross-section of $E_{M_z^*}$,

$$e(\omega) = \begin{pmatrix} (M_z^*|_{I_i^\perp} - \omega)^{-1} (P_{I_i} M_z|_{I_i^\perp})^* e_i(\omega) \\ e_i(\omega) \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

and $\|e(\omega)\|^2 = (1 - |\omega|^2)^{-2}$. Then, we have $\|e_i(\omega)\|^2 \leq \|e(\omega)\|^2$, and $\frac{\|e_i(\omega)\|^2}{K(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})} \leq M(\omega \in \mathbb{D})$, $i = 1, 2$. By the condition (3) and the proof of Theorem 3.7, we can find $m > 0$, such that $\frac{h_{(M_{I_i})^*}(\omega)}{K(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})} \geq m$. And we can imply that

$$\mathcal{K}_{\widetilde{M}_z^*}(\omega) - \mathcal{K}_{(M_{I_i})^*}(\omega) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \omega \partial \bar{\omega}} \varphi(\omega),$$

where $\varphi(\omega) = \log \frac{\|e_i(\omega)\|^2}{K(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})}$ is a bounded subharmonic function. Note that M_z is a contraction operator, then operators M_{I_i} and $(M_{I_i})^*$ are contractive. By $\frac{1}{K}(M_{I_i}, (M_{I_i})^*) \geq 0$ and Lemma 3.6, we obtain $M_{I_i} \sim_s \widetilde{M}_z, i = 1, 2$. Hence, $M_{I_1} \sim_s M_{I_2}$. \square

Next, we extend the conclusion of the Corollary 3.11 to the finite direct sum of the multiplication operator on the Bergman space.

Corollary 3.12. *Let M_z be the multiplication operator on the Bergman space, \mathcal{H}_K be an analytic functional Hilbert space with reproducing kernel K , the multiplication operator on space \mathcal{H}_K is \widetilde{M}_z . Suppose that $\frac{1}{K}$ is a polynomial, and there exists $M > 0$ such that $\frac{(1 - |\omega|^2)^{-2}}{K(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})} \leq M(\omega \in \mathbb{D})$. If $I_i \in \text{Lat}(M_z^{(n)})(i = 1, 2)$ satisfy the following conditions:*

- (1) $M_z^{(n)}|_{I_i^\perp} \in B_m(\mathbb{D}), m < n, i = 1, 2;$
- (2) $\frac{1}{K}((M_z^{(n)}|_{I_i^\perp})^*, M_z^{(n)}|_{I_i^\perp}) \geq 0, \frac{1}{K}(M_z^{(n)}|_{I_i}, (M_z^{(n)}|_{I_i})^*) \geq 0, i = 1, 2;$
- (3) Let $T_i = M_z^{(n)}|_{I_i^\perp} \oplus (M_z^{(n)}|_{I_i})^*$, $\lim_{\omega \rightarrow \partial \mathbb{D}} \frac{\det h_{T_i}(\omega)}{K^n(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})} \neq 0, i = 1, 2,$

then $M_z^{(n)}|_{I_1} \sim_s M_z^{(n)}|_{I_2}$.

Proof. Since $I_i \in \text{Lat}(M_z^{(n)})(i = 1, 2)$, $M_z^{(n)}$ and $M_z^{*(n)}$ have the following forms under the space decomposition of $I_i^\perp \oplus I_i$:

$$M_z^{(n)} = \begin{pmatrix} P_{I_i^\perp} M_z^{(n)}|_{I_i^\perp} & 0 \\ P_{I_i} M_z^{(n)}|_{I_i^\perp} & M_z^{(n)}|_{I_i} \end{pmatrix}, \quad M_z^{*(n)} = \begin{pmatrix} M_z^{*(n)}|_{I_i^\perp} & P_{I_i^\perp} M_z^{*(n)}|_{I_i} \\ 0 & (M_z^{(n)}|_{I_i})^* \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is obvious that T_i is the contraction operator. By the proof of Theorem 3.7, we also have

$$\text{trace} \mathcal{K}_{\widetilde{M}_z^{*(n)}} - \text{trace} \mathcal{K}_{T_i} = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \omega \partial \bar{\omega}} \varphi_i, \quad i = 1, 2$$

where $\varphi_i = \log \frac{\det h_{T_i}}{K^n(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})}$ is a bounded subharmonic function. And by Lemma 3.6, we have $(M_z^{(n)}|_{I_i})^* \sim_s \widetilde{M}_z^{*(n-m)}, i = 1, 2$. Hence, $M_z^{(n)}|_{I_1} \sim_s M_z^{(n)}|_{I_2}$. \square

Example 3.13. Let M_z be the multiplication operator on an analytic functional Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_K with reproducing kernel $K(z, \omega) = \frac{1}{1-z\bar{\omega}}$. Let $T = \begin{pmatrix} M_z^* & S \\ 0 & M_z^* \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2)$, where $S = XM_z^* - M_z^*X$ and X is a bounded linear operator.

Suppose that t is the section of $E_{M_z^*}$. We know $E_{M_z^*}(\omega) = \text{span}\{t_1(\omega), X(t_1(\omega)) + t_1(\omega)\}$. Then we can obtain

$$h_T(\omega) = \begin{pmatrix} \|t_1(\omega)\|^2 & \langle X(t_1(\omega)), t_1(\omega) \rangle \\ \langle t_1(\omega), X(t_1(\omega)) \rangle & \|X(t_1(\omega))\|^2 + \|t_1(\omega)\|^2 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\det h_T(\omega) = \|t_1(\omega)\|^4 + \|t_1(\omega)\|^2 \|X(t_1(\omega))\|^2 - |\langle t_1(\omega), X(t_1(\omega)) \rangle|^2.$$

According to Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$1 \leq \frac{\det h_T(\omega)}{K^2(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\omega})} \leq 1 + \|X\|^2.$$

We know $\mathcal{H}_1 \in \text{Lat}(T)$ and $(T|_{\mathcal{H}_1})^* \sim_s M_z$.

In fact, in the example above, when $S \neq 0$, the operator T is not contractive. This will be proved in the next section.

4. REDUCIBILITY OF OPERATORS

In this section, we will continue to investigate the sufficient and necessary conditions for a bounded linear operator to be a contractive operator, and the reducibility of the operator when the operator is an n -hypercontraction on an invariant subspace ($n \geq 1$).

4.1. Contractility and reducibility of operators. In this subsection, we mainly study the properties of contraction operators.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. If there exist $\mathcal{M} \in \text{Lat}(T)$, such that*

$$\|T|_{\mathcal{M}}\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}, \|P_{\mathcal{M}}T|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp}\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}(1 - \|(T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^*\|^2),$$

then T is contractive.

Proof. Since $\mathcal{M} \in \text{Lat}(T)$, T has the following form under the space decomposition of $\mathcal{M} \oplus \mathcal{M}^\perp$:

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} T|_{\mathcal{M}} & P_{\mathcal{M}}T|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \\ 0 & P_{\mathcal{M}^\perp}T|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} T|_{\mathcal{M}} & P_{\mathcal{M}}T|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \\ 0 & (T^*|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp})^* \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & T_{1,2} \\ 0 & T_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

For any $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{H}$, we have

$$T \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & T_{1,2} \\ 0 & T_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} T_1x + T_{1,2}y \\ T_2y \end{pmatrix}.$$

Further, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \begin{pmatrix} T_1x + T_{1,2}y \\ T_2y \end{pmatrix} \right\|^2 &= \|T_1x + T_{1,2}y\|^2 + \|T_2y\|^2 \\
&\leq (\|T_1x\| + \|T_{1,2}y\|)^2 + \|T_2y\|^2 \\
&\leq 2\|T_1x\|^2 + 2\|T_{1,2}y\|^2 + \|T_2y\|^2 \\
&\leq 2\|T_1\|^2\|x\|^2 + 2\|T_{1,2}\|^2\|y\|^2 + \|T_2\|^2\|y\|^2 \\
&= 2\|T_1\|^2\|x\|^2 + (2\|T_{1,2}\|^2 + \|T_2\|^2)\|y\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

If $\|T_1\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $\|T_{1,2}\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}(1 - \|T_2\|^2)$, then $2\|T_1\| \leq 1$, $(2\|T_{1,2}\|^2 + \|T_2\|^2) \leq 1$. It follows that

$$2\|T_1\|^2\|x\|^2 + (2\|T_{1,2}\|^2 + \|T_2\|^2)\|y\|^2 \leq \|x\|^2 + \|y\|^2,$$

$$\left\| T \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \right\|^2 \leq \|x\|^2 + \|y\|^2.$$

By the arbitrariness of x, y , we know T is a contraction operator. \square

Lemma 4.2. *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. Suppose that $T = (T_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^n$ with respect to some decomposition $\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}_i$ of the space \mathcal{H} . If T is contractive, then $T_{i,j}(i, j = 1, \dots, n)$ are contraction operators.*

Proof. If T is contractive, then for any $x \in \mathcal{H}$, we have $\|Tx\| \leq \|x\|$. Setting

$$y_j = (\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{j-1}, x_j, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n-j})^T \in \mathcal{H}.$$

It follows that

$$\|Ty_j\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \|T_{i,j}x_j\|^2 \leq \|x_j\|^2.$$

By the property of norm, we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \|T_{i,j}\|^2 \leq 1, \|T_{i,j}\| \leq 1.$$

Therefore, $T_{i,j}(i, j = 1, \dots, n)$ are contraction operators. \square

Remark 4.3. In Lemma 4.2, a similar method can be obtained $\sum_{j=1}^n \|T_{i,j}\|^2 \leq 1$. If there exists $\|T_{i_0, j_0}\| = 1$, then $\|T_{i, j_0}\| = 0$, $\|T_{i_0, j}\| = 0$, that is, $T_{i, j_0} = 0, T_{i_0, j} = 0$.

Proposition 4.4. *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is a contraction operator. Suppose that $T = (T_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^n$ with respect to some decomposition $\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}_i$ of the space \mathcal{H} . If there exists $\|T_{i_0, i_0}\| = 1(i_0 = 1, \dots, n)$, then T is reducible.*

Proof. If there exists $\|T_{i_0, i_0}\| = 1(i_0 = 1, \dots, n)$, by Remark 4.3, we have

$$(4.1) \quad T_{i_0, j} = 0(j \neq i_0), T_{k, i_0} = 0(k \neq i_0).$$

We denote \tilde{T} by the operator T satisfy equations of (4.1) and denote the identity operator on \mathcal{H} by

$$I_{\mathcal{H}} = \begin{pmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}_1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{H}_2} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & I_{\mathcal{H}_n} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $I_{\mathcal{H}_i}$ the identity operator on \mathcal{H}_i . Denote $I_{\mathcal{H}}$ replace the i th and j th rows by $I_{\mathcal{H}}(i, j)_r$, denote $I_{\mathcal{H}}$ replace the i th and j th columns by $I_{\mathcal{H}}(i, j)_c$. In particular, in the case of $n = 1$, T is reducible. When $n > 1$. Setting $U := I_{\mathcal{H}}(1, i_0)_r$. We then have $U = U^* = U^{-1} = I_{\mathcal{H}}(1, i_0)_r = I_{\mathcal{H}}(1, i_0)_c$. And

$$U\tilde{T}U^* = T_{i_0, i_0} \oplus (T_{i, j})_{i, j \neq i_0},$$

where $(T_{i, j})_{i, j \neq i_0}$ is obtained by removing i_0 row and i_0 column from $(T_{i, j})_{i, j=1}^n$. Obviously, $U\tilde{T}U^*$ is reducible. And we know the unitary transformation does not change the reducibility of the operator, so the conclusion is valid. \square

From the above discussion, we can intuitively see that when a bounded linear operator T is contractive, the reducibility of the operator T can be characterized by some part.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $T \in B_1(\mathbb{D})$. Then T^* is an isometric operator if and only if $T \sim_u (M_z^*, \mathcal{H}_K, K)$, where \mathcal{H}_K is an analytic functional Hilbert space with reproducing kernel $K(z, \omega) = \frac{1}{1-z\bar{\omega}}$, M_z is the multiplication operator on \mathcal{H}_K .*

Proof. If there exists an unitary operator U , such that $T = UM_z^*U^*$, then $TT^* = UM_z^*U^*UM_zU^* = I$. So T^* is isometric.

Suppose that $e(\omega)$ be a non-zero section of Hermitian holomorphic vector bundle E_T . Then

$$(4.2) \quad Te(\omega) = \omega e(\omega), \omega \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Since T^* is isometric, we have $TT^*\omega e(\omega) = \omega e(\omega), \omega \in \mathbb{D}$. Combining with the equation (4.2), we obtain

$$TT^*\omega e(\omega) = Te(\omega), \quad T(T^*\omega e(\omega) - e(\omega)) = 0.$$

Next, we can find a holomorphic function $\lambda(\omega)$, such that $T^*\omega e(\omega) = e(\omega) + \lambda(\omega)e(0)$. And,

$$\|T^*\omega e(\omega)\|^2 = \|\omega e(\omega)\|^2 = \|e(\omega) + \lambda(\omega)e(0)\|^2.$$

Hence,

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} |\omega|^2 \|e(\omega)\|^2 &= \|e(\omega) + \lambda(\omega)e(0)\|^2 \\ &= \|e(\omega)\|^2 + \langle \lambda(\omega)e(0), e(\omega) \rangle + \langle e(\omega), \lambda(\omega)e(0) \rangle + |\lambda(\omega)|^2 \|e(0)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $e(0) = (1, 0, \dots)^T$. Equation (4.3) can be arranged as follows

$$\|e(\omega)\|^2(1 - |\omega|^2) = -\lambda(\omega) - \overline{\lambda(\omega)} - |\lambda(\omega)|^2 = 1 - |1 + \lambda(\omega)|^2.$$

Setting $\phi(\omega) = 1 + \lambda(\omega)$. Then

$$(4.4) \quad \|e(\omega)\|^2(1 - |\omega|^2) = 1 - |\phi(\omega)|^2.$$

Since $TT^* = I$, $\|T^*\| = \|T\| = 1$. According to Theorem 2.4, we have $E_T = E_{M_z^*} \otimes \mathcal{E}$, where \mathcal{E} is a Hilbert space. Then there exists a holomorphic vector-valued function $r(\omega)$, such that $\|e(\omega)\|^2 = \frac{1}{1-|\omega|^2} \|r(\omega)\|^2$. By equation (4.4), we have $\|r(\omega)\|^2 + |\phi(\omega)|^2 = 1$. It follows $\|r'(\omega)\|^2 + |\phi'(\omega)|^2 = 0$, $\phi(\omega) = c (c \in \mathbb{C})$. Then

$$\|e(\omega)\|^2(1 - |\omega|^2) = 1 - c.$$

By the calculation, $\mathcal{K}_T(\omega) = \mathcal{K}_{M_z^*}(\omega)$. According to Theorem 2.1, we have $T \sim_u M_z^*$. \square

Proposition 4.6. *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be a contraction operator. If there exists $\mathcal{M} \in \text{Lat}(T)$, such that $T|_{\mathcal{M}} \in B_1(\mathbb{D})$ and $(T|_{\mathcal{M}})^*$ is an isometric operator, then T is reducible.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{M} \in \text{Lat}(T)$, T has the following form under the space decomposition on $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{M} \oplus \mathcal{M}^\perp$:

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} T|_{\mathcal{M}} & P_{\mathcal{M}}T|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \\ 0 & P_{\mathcal{M}^\perp}T|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & T_{1,2} \\ 0 & T_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

If $T_1 \in B_1(\mathbb{D})$, T_1^* is an isometric operator, then by Lemma 4.5, there exists a unitary operator U , such that $M_z^* = UT_1U^*$, where M_z is the multiplication operator on an analytic functional Hilbert space with reproducing kernel $K(z, \omega) = \frac{1}{1-z\bar{\omega}}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} (U \oplus I)T(U \oplus I)^* &= \begin{pmatrix} U & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & T_{1,2} \\ 0 & T_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} U^* & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} UT_1U^* & UT_{1,2} \\ 0 & T_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} M_z^* & UT_{1,2} \\ 0 & T_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ &:= \tilde{T}. \end{aligned}$$

Unitary transformation does not change the reducibility and contractility of the operator, so we only prove that the contractive operator \tilde{T} is reducible.

If \tilde{T} is contractive, then $\tilde{T}^*\tilde{T}$ is also a contraction operator and

$$\tilde{T}^*\tilde{T} = \begin{pmatrix} M_zM_z^* & M_zUT_{1,2} \\ T_{1,2}^*U^*M_z^* & T_{1,2}^*T_{1,2} + T_2^*T_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $M_z^*M_z = I$, for any $x \in \mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\tilde{T}^*\tilde{T} \begin{pmatrix} M_zx \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} M_zM_z^* & M_zUT_{1,2} \\ T_{1,2}^*U^*M_z^* & T_{1,2}^*T_{1,2} + T_2^*T_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} M_zx \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} M_zM_z^*M_zx \\ T_{1,2}^*U^*M_z^*M_zx \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} M_zx \\ T_{1,2}^*U^*x \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} M_zx \\ T_{1,2}^*U^*x \end{pmatrix} \right\| \leq \left\| \begin{pmatrix} M_zx \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|.$$

Hence, $T_{1,2}^*U^*x = 0, x \in \mathcal{H}$. By the arbitrariness of x , we obtain $UT_{1,2} = 0$. So T is reducible. \square

Example 4.7. Let $T = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & T_{1,2} \\ 0 & T_2 \end{pmatrix}$, where $T_{1,2} = \text{diag}(d_1, \dots, d_k, 0, \dots)$, T_1, T_2 are weighted (backward) shifts with weight sequences $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^\infty, \{b_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$, respectively. Then T is a contraction operator if and only if

$$d_1^2 \leq 1 - a_1^2, d_i^2 \leq (1 - a_i^2)(1 - b_{i-1}^2) (i = 2, \dots, k), b_j^2 \leq 1 (j = k, k + 1, \dots).$$

In particular, when $1 - T_1^*T_1$ is invertible, T is a contraction operator if and only if

$$1 - T_2^*T_2 \geq T_{1,2}^*[1 + T_1(1 - T_1^*T_1)^{-1}T_1^*]T_{1,2}.$$

Proof. If T is contractive, by Lemma 4.2, we have $0 \leq a_i, b_i \leq 1 (i \geq 1), 0 \leq d_j \leq 1 (1 \leq j \leq k)$. We know that T is contractive if and only if

$$1 - T^*T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - T_1^*T_1 & -T_1^*T_{1,2} \\ -T_{1,2}^*T_1 & 1 - T_{1,2}^*T_{1,2} - T_2^*T_2 \end{pmatrix} \geq 0.$$

According to the properties of positive operators, there exists $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix}$, such that

$$1 - T^*T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - T_1^*T_1 & -T_1^*T_{1,2} \\ -T_{1,2}^*T_1 & 1 - T_{1,2}^*T_{1,2} - T_2^*T_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a^* & 0 \\ b^* & c^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a^*a & a^*b \\ b^*a & b^*b + c^*c \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that $1 - T_1^*T_1$ is a self-adjoint operator, so $a = a^* = \text{diag}(1, \sqrt{1 - a_1^2}, \sqrt{1 - a_2^2}, \dots)$. Next, we assume that $a_i \neq 1, i \geq 1$. Setting $b = \begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & x_{12} & \cdots \\ x_{21} & x_{22} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}$. Next, let's consider $-T_1^*T_{1,2} = a^*b$. We know

$\{x_{ij}\}$ satisfies $x_{i+1,i} = -\frac{a_i d_i}{\sqrt{1 - a_i^2}} (1 \leq i \leq k)$, else is zero. Thus, $b^*b = \text{diag}(\frac{a_1^2 d_1^2}{1 - a_1^2}, \frac{a_2^2 d_2^2}{1 - a_2^2}, \dots, \frac{a_k^2 d_k^2}{1 - a_k^2}, 0, \dots)$.

By equation $1 - T_{1,2}^*T_{1,2} - T_2^*T_2 = b^*b + c^*c$, we can imply

$$c^*c = \text{diag}(1 - \frac{d_1^2}{1 - a_1^2}, 1 - b_1^2 - \frac{d_2^2}{1 - a_2^2}, \dots, 1 - b_{k-1}^2 - \frac{d_k^2}{1 - a_k^2}, 1 - b_k^2, 1 - b_{k+1}^2, \dots).$$

Note that c^*c is a diagonal operator and a positive operator, so

$$1 - \frac{d_1^2}{1 - a_1^2} \geq 0, 1 - b_{i-1}^2 - \frac{d_i^2}{1 - a_i^2} \geq 0 (i = 2, \dots, k), 1 - b_j^2 \geq 0 (j = k, k + 1, \dots).$$

The above inequations are arranged as follows

$$d_1^2 \leq 1 - a_1^2, d_i^2 \leq (1 - a_i^2)(1 - b_{i-1}^2) (i = 2, \dots, k), b_j^2 \leq 1 (j = k, k + 1, \dots).$$

In particular, in the case of $1 - T_1^*T_1$ is invertible. By $-T_1^*T_{1,2} = (1 - T_1^*T_1)^{\frac{1}{2}}b$, we have

$$b = -(1 - T_1^*T_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}}T_1^*T_{1,2}, b^*b = T_{1,2}^*T_1(1 - T_1^*T_1)^{-1}T_1^*T_{1,2}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} c^*c &= 1 - T_{1,2}^*T_{1,2} - T_2^*T_2 - T_{1,2}^*T_1(1 - T_1^*T_1)^{-1}T_1^*T_{1,2} \\ &= 1 - T_2^*T_2 - T_{1,2}^*[1 + T_1(1 - T_1^*T_1)^{-1}T_1^*]T_{1,2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since c^*c is positive, $1 - T_2^*T_2 \geq T_{1,2}^*[1 + T_1(1 - T_1^*T_1)^{-1}T_1^*]T_{1,2}$. □

The Example 4.7 above shows that each part of the operator determines the contractility of the operator.

4.2. N-hypercontractivity and reducibility of operators. In [17], K. Ji, H. Kwon and J. Xu gave a necessary condition for a weighted backward shift operator to be an n -hypercontractive operator.

Theorem 4.8. [17] *Let T be the backward shift operator on the space*

$$H_w^2 = \left\{ f = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j z^j : \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |a_j|^2 w_j < \infty \right\},$$

where $w_j > 0$, $\liminf_j |w_j|^{\frac{1}{j}} = 1$, $\sup_j \frac{w_{j+1}}{w_j} < \infty$. If T is an n -hypercontraction, then we have for every nonnegative integer j ,

$$\frac{w_{j+1}}{w_j} \leq \frac{1+j}{n+j}.$$

Lemma 4.2 shows that: when a bounded linear operator is a contractive operator, every part of it is contractive. We use the following two discussions to show that this property can not be fully extended to the case of n -hypercontraction ($n \geq 2$).

Proposition 4.9. *Let $T = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & T_{1,2} \\ 0 & T_2 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. If T is n -hypercontractive, then T_1 is n -hypercontractive.*

Proof. If T is n -hypercontractive, which is equivalent to

$$\sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} (T^*)^j T^j \geq 0,$$

for any $1 \leq k \leq n$. That is to say,

$$\sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} (T^*)^j T^j = \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} (T_1^*)^j T_1^j & * \\ * & * \end{pmatrix}$$

is positive. According to the properties of positive operators, there exists $\begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} \end{pmatrix}$, such that

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} (T_1^*)^j T_1^j & * \\ * & * \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11}^* & a_{21}^* \\ a_{12}^* & a_{22}^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11}^* a_{11} + a_{21}^* a_{21} & * \\ * & * \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, we obtain $\sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} (T_1^*)^j T_1^j = a_{11}^* a_{11} + a_{21}^* a_{21}$ ($1 \leq k \leq n$) is positive. Hence, T_1 is n -hypercontractive. \square

Use the following example, we illustrate that T_2 in Proposition 4.9 is not necessarily n -hypercontractive.

Example 4.10. Let $T = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & T_{1,2} \\ 0 & T_2 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. Then there exists a not 2-hypercontractive operator T_2 , such that T is 2-hypercontractive.

Proof. If T is 2-hypercontractive, then T is contractive. By Lemma 4.2, $T_1, T_{1,2}, T_2$ are also contractive. And then

$$I - 2T^*T + T^{*2}T^2 = \begin{pmatrix} I - 2T_1^*T_1 + T_1^{*2}T_1^2 & -2T_1^*T_{1,2} + T_1^{*2}(T_1T_{1,2} + T_{1,2}T_2) \\ -2T_{1,2}^*T_1 + (T_{1,2}^*T_1^* + T_2^*T_{1,2}^*)T_1^2 & \Delta \end{pmatrix}$$

is positive, where $\Delta = I - 2T_2^*T_2 + T_2^{*2}T_2^2 - 2T_{1,2}^*T_{1,2} + (T_{1,2}^*T_1^* + T_2^*T_{1,2}^*)(T_1T_{1,2} + T_{1,2}T_2)$. Next, let T_1, T_2 and $T_{1,2}$ satisfy the following conditions,

$$T_1e_i = \sqrt{\frac{i}{i+3}}e_{i-1}, i \geq 1, T_2e_i = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\frac{13}{25}}e_{i-1}, i = 1; \\ \sqrt{\frac{i}{i+1}}e_{i-1}, i \geq 2, \end{cases} T_{1,2}e_i = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\frac{1}{5}}e_i, i = 0; \\ 0, i \geq 1, \end{cases}$$

where $e_i = \underbrace{(0, \dots, 0)}_i, 1, 0, 0, \dots)^T$. By Theorem 4.8, we know T_2 is not a 2-hypercontraction. But, there is $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix}$, such that

$$I - 2T^*T + T^{*2}T^2 = \begin{pmatrix} a^* & 0 \\ b^* & c^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a^*a & a^*b \\ b^*a & b^*b + c^*c \end{pmatrix},$$

where $a = \text{diag}(1, \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}, \sqrt{\frac{3}{10}}, \sqrt{\frac{1}{5}}, \dots)$, $b = \text{diag}(\sqrt{\frac{2}{5}}, \sqrt{\frac{13}{375}}, 0, \dots)$, $c = \text{diag}(0, \sqrt{\frac{11}{375}}, 0, \dots)$. According to the properties of positive operators, we obtain T is 2-hypercontractive. \square

Before discussing the relationship between the n -hypercontractivity and reducibility of operators, we need some lemmas.

Lemma 4.11. *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. If T is positive and $T \leq I$, then T is contractive.*

Proof. If T is positive, by the property of positive operators, there is S , such that $T = S^*S$. For any $x \in \mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\langle Tx, x \rangle = \langle S^*Sx, x \rangle = \langle Sx, Sx \rangle = \|Sx\|^2 \leq \|x\|^2,$$

So $\|S\| \leq 1$. Since $\|T\| = \|S^*S\| = \|S\|^2 \leq 1$, we know A is contractive. \square

Lemma 4.12. *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. If T is positive, then X^*TX is also positive, where X is a bounded operator.*

Proof. If T is positive, then there exist S , such that $T = S^*S$. For any $x \in \mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\langle X^*TXx, x \rangle = \langle (SX)^*(SX)x, x \rangle = \langle SXx, SXx \rangle = \|SXx\|^2 \geq 0.$$

Hence, X^*TX is also positive. \square

Lemma 4.13. *Suppose that $n \geq 2$. Then $\binom{n}{j} = \binom{n-1}{j-1} + \binom{n-2}{j-1} + \dots + \binom{j}{j-1} + \binom{j-1}{j-1}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$.*

Proof. For non-negative integers l, k , we have $\binom{l}{l} = \binom{k}{k}$ and $\binom{l}{k} = \binom{l-1}{k-1} + \binom{l-1}{k}$ ($1 \leq k \leq l-1$). Then we can obtain the following equation,

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{n}{j} &= \binom{n-1}{j-1} + \binom{n-1}{j} \\ &= \binom{n-1}{j-1} + \binom{n-2}{j-1} + \binom{n-2}{j} \\ &= \binom{n-1}{j-1} + \binom{n-2}{j-1} + \binom{n-3}{j-1} + \binom{n-3}{j} \\ &= \binom{n-1}{j-1} + \binom{n-2}{j-1} + \dots + \binom{j+1}{j-1} + \binom{j}{j-1} + \binom{j}{j} \\ &= \binom{n-1}{j-1} + \binom{n-2}{j-1} + \dots + \binom{j+1}{j-1} + \binom{j}{j-1} + \binom{j-1}{j-1}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma 4.14. *If $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is n -hypercontractive, then operator $\sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^{j+1} \binom{n}{j} (T^*)^j T^j$ is contractive.*

Proof. If $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is n -hypercontractive, we have the following n inequations:

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{cases} I - T^*T \geq 0 & (1) \\ I - \binom{2}{1}T^*T + (T^*)^2T^2 \geq 0 & (2) \\ I - \binom{3}{1}T^*T + \binom{3}{2}(T^*)^2T^2 - (T^*)^3T^3 \geq 0 & (3) \\ \vdots \\ I - \binom{n-1}{1}T^*T + \binom{n-1}{2}(T^*)^2T^2 + \dots + (-1)^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{n-1}(T^*)^{n-1}T^{n-1} \geq 0 & (n-1) \\ I - \binom{n}{1}T^*T + \binom{n}{2}(T^*)^2T^2 - \binom{n}{3}(T^*)^3T^3 + \dots + (-1)^n \binom{n}{n}(T^*)^nT^n \geq 0 & (n) \end{cases}$$

Summing up over inequations (1) \sim (n-1) of (4.5) and $I \geq 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} nI - \left(\binom{1}{1} + \binom{2}{1} + \dots + \binom{n-1}{1} \right) T^*T + \left(\binom{2}{2} + \binom{3}{2} + \dots + \binom{n-1}{2} \right) (T^*)^2T^2 + \dots \\ + (-1)^{n-2} \left(\binom{n-2}{n-2} + \binom{n-1}{n-2} \right) (T^*)^{n-2}T^{n-2} + (-1)^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{n-1} (T^*)^{n-1}T^{n-1} \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.13, we can simplify the coefficient of $(T^*)^jT^j$ ($j = 1, 2, 3, \dots$) and get the following inequation

$$(4.6) \quad \sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^{j-1} \binom{n}{j} (T^*)^{j-1}T^{j-1} \geq 0.$$

According to Lemma 4.12, inequation (4.6) can be further transformed into

$$(4.7) \quad T^* \left(\sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^{j-1} \binom{n}{j} (T^*)^{j-1}T^{j-1} \right) T = - \sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^j \binom{n}{j} (T^*)^jT^j \geq 0.$$

Notice that inequation (n) of (4.5) can be written as

$$(4.8) \quad - \sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^j \binom{n}{j} (T^*)^jT^j \leq I.$$

Then, by inequation (4.7) and inequation (4.8), we have

$$0 \leq - \sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^j \binom{n}{j} (T^*)^jT^j = \sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^{j+1} \binom{n}{j} (T^*)^jT^j \leq 1.$$

From the conclusion of Lemma 4.11, we know that $\sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^{j+1} \binom{n}{j} (T^*)^jT^j$ is contractive. \square

Theorem 4.15. *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be an n -hypercontraction. If there exists $\mathcal{M} \in \text{Lat}(T)$ satisfies:*

$$T|_{\mathcal{M}} \in B_1(\mathbb{D}), \mathcal{K}_{T|_{\mathcal{M}}}(\omega) = \frac{-n}{(1 - |\omega|^2)^2} (\omega \in \mathbb{D}),$$

then T is reducible.

Proof. If $T|_{\mathcal{M}} \in B_1(\mathbb{D})$, then $T|_{\mathcal{M}} \sim_u (M_z^*, \mathcal{H}_K, K)$, where \mathcal{H}_K is an analytic functional Hilbert space with reproducing kernel K , M_z^* is the adjoint of multiplication operator on \mathcal{H}_K . So there exists a unitary operator U , such that $M_z^* = UT|_{\mathcal{M}}U^*$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (U \oplus I)T(U \oplus I)^* &= \begin{pmatrix} U & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} T|_{\mathcal{M}} & P|_{\mathcal{M}}T|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \\ 0 & P|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp}T|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} U^* & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} UT|_{\mathcal{M}}U^* & UP|_{\mathcal{M}}T|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \\ 0 & P|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp}T|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} M_z^* & UP|_{\mathcal{M}}T|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \\ 0 & P|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp}T|_{\mathcal{M}^\perp} \end{pmatrix} \\ &:= \begin{pmatrix} M_z^* & T_{1,2} \\ 0 & T_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ &:= \tilde{T}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $U \oplus I$ is a unitary operator, and unitary transformation does not change the reducibility and n -hypercontractivity of operators, so we only prove that the n -hypercontractive operator \tilde{T} is reducible.

By Theorem 2.1, we know that curvature is a completely unitary invariant of Cowen-Douglas operator with index one. So, we obtain

$$(4.9) \quad \mathcal{K}_{M_z^*}(\omega) = \frac{-n}{(1 - |\omega|^2)^2}, \quad K(z, \omega) = \frac{1}{(1 - z\bar{\omega})^n}.$$

Therefore, M_z^* can be regarded as a backward weighted shift operator with weight sequence $\{\sqrt{\frac{i+1}{n+i}}\}_{i=0}^\infty$ up to unitary equivalence. That is,

$$M_z^* e_{i+1} = \gamma_i e_i, \quad \gamma_i = \sqrt{\frac{i+1}{n+i}}, \quad e_i = (\underbrace{0, 0, \dots, 0}_i, 1, 0, \dots)^T, \quad i \geq 0,$$

and M_z^* is n -hypercontractive. Recall a conclusion from [17]: If M_z^* satisfies equation (4.9), then the next equation holds

$$(4.10) \quad - \sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^j \binom{n}{j} M_z^j (M_z^*)^j e_i = \sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^{j+1} \binom{n}{j} M_z^j (M_z^*)^j e_i = \text{diag}(0, 1, 1, 1, \dots) e_i = e_i, \quad i \geq 1.$$

Based on the discussion above, let's consider the following equation,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^{j+1} \binom{n}{j} (T^*)^j T^j \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^{j+1} \binom{n}{j} M_z^j (M_z^*)^j & \sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^{j+1} \binom{n}{j} \left(\sum_{l=0}^{j-1} (T_2^*)^l T_{1,2}^* M_z^{j-l-1} \right) (M_z^*)^j \\ \sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^{j+1} \binom{n}{j} \left(\sum_{l=0}^{j-1} (T_2^*)^l T_{1,2}^* M_z^{j-l-1} \right) (M_z^*)^j & \Delta \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta = \sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^{j+1} \binom{n}{j} (T_2^*)^j T_2^j + \sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^{j+1} \binom{n}{j} \left(\sum_{h=0}^{j-1} (T_2^*)^h T_{1,2}^* M_z^{j-h-1} \right) \left(\sum_{h=0}^{j-1} (M_z^*)^h T_{1,2} T_2^{j-h-1} \right)$. And according to equation (4.10), we can imply

$$\sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^{j+1} \binom{n}{j} (T^*)^j T^j \begin{pmatrix} e_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} e_1 \\ \gamma_0 \binom{n}{1} T_{1,2}^* e_0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Lemma 4.14, we know operator $\sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^{j+1} \binom{n}{j} (T^*)^j T^j$ is contractive. Moreover,

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} e_1 \\ \gamma_0 \binom{n}{1} T_{1,2}^* e_0 \end{pmatrix} \right\| \leq \left\| \begin{pmatrix} e_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|.$$

Clearly, $\gamma_0 \binom{n}{1} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n}} \cdot n = \sqrt{n} \neq 0$, so $T_{1,2}^* e_0 = 0$.

By mathematical induction, suppose that $T_{1,2}^* e_i = 0$ is valid for $1 \leq i \leq m-1$. Next, we prove that $T_{1,2}^* e_m = 0$. We have

$$\sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^{j+1} \binom{n}{j} (T^*)^j T^j \begin{pmatrix} e_{m+1} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} e_{m+1} \\ \left(\gamma_0 \binom{n}{1} + \sum_{k=2}^{m+1} (-1)^{k+1} \binom{n}{k} \gamma_{m-k-1}^2 \times \cdots \times \gamma_{m-1}^2 \right) \gamma_m T_{1,2}^* e_m \end{pmatrix}.$$

According to the contractility of T again, we can obtain the followings

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} e_{m+1} \\ \left(\gamma_0 \binom{n}{1} + \sum_{k=2}^{m+1} (-1)^{k+1} \binom{n}{k} \gamma_{m-k-1}^2 \times \cdots \times \gamma_{m-1}^2 \right) \gamma_m T_{1,2}^* e_m \end{pmatrix} \right\| \leq \left\| \begin{pmatrix} e_{m+1} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|,$$

then

$$\left(\gamma_0 \binom{n}{1} + \sum_{k=2}^{m+1} (-1)^{k+1} \binom{n}{k} \gamma_{m-k-1}^2 \times \cdots \times \gamma_{m-1}^2 \right) \gamma_m T_{1,2}^* e_m = 0.$$

But, we know that $\gamma_0 \binom{n}{1} + \sum_{k=2}^{m+1} (-1)^{k+1} \binom{n}{k} \gamma_{m-k-1}^2 \times \cdots \times \gamma_{m-1}^2 \gamma_m \neq 0$, so $T_{1,2}^* e_m = 0$.

From what has been discussed above, for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $T_{1,2}^* e_i = 0$. Hence, $T_{1,2}^* = 0$, \tilde{T} is reducible. \square

Corollary 4.16. *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is irreducible and $\|T\| \leq 1$. If there exist $\mathcal{M} \in \text{Lat}(T)$ and a positive integer k , such that*

$$T|_{\mathcal{M}} \in B_1(\mathbb{D}), \mathcal{K}_{T|_{\mathcal{M}}}(\omega) = \frac{-k}{(1-|\omega|^2)^2} (\omega \in \mathbb{D}),$$

then T cannot be subnormal.

Proof. Suppose that the operator T is subnormal. It is known that an operator is an n -hypercontraction for all n if and only if it is a subnormal contraction (see [3]). According to the condition of $\|T\| \leq 1$, we know that T is n -hypercontractive for all positive integer n . By the characteristics of $T|_{\mathcal{M}}$ and Theorem 4.15, we can imply T is reducible. It's a contradiction. Hence, T is not subnormal. \square

Corollary 4.17. *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be an n -hypercontraction. If there exists $\mathcal{M} \in \text{Lat}(T)$, such that $T|_{\mathcal{M}} \in B_1(\mathbb{D})$ and*

$$(4.11) \quad \sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^i \binom{n}{i} (T|_{\mathcal{M}})^*{}^i (T|_{\mathcal{M}})^i = e \otimes e, e \in \mathcal{M}, |e| = 1,$$

then T is reducible.

Proof. Suppose that the orthonormal basis of \mathcal{M} is $\{e_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$, where $e_i = (\underbrace{0, 0, \dots, 0}_i, 1, 0, \dots)^T$. We know that unitary transformation is an isometric transformation, which can transform an orthonormal

basis into another. And e can be extended to an orthonormal basis. Then there exists a unitary operator U , such that $Ue = e_0$. For any $x \in \mathcal{M}$, we all have

$$U(e \otimes e)U^*x = U\langle U^*x, e \rangle e = \langle x, Ue \rangle Ue = (Ue \otimes Ue)x.$$

So we have $U(e \otimes e)U^* = Ue \otimes Ue = e_0 \otimes e_0$, and can transform equation (4.11) into

$$\sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^i \binom{n}{i} (U(T|_{\mathcal{M}})^*U^*)^i (UT|_{\mathcal{M}}U^*)^i = e_0 \otimes e_0.$$

Setting $\tilde{T} = UT|_{\mathcal{M}}U^*$. Then the above formula can be simplified as

$$(4.12) \quad \sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^i \binom{n}{i} (\tilde{T}^*)^i \tilde{T}^i = e_0 \otimes e_0.$$

We claim that: For operator $\tilde{T} \in B_1(\mathbb{D})$, there exists a open set Ω_0 and a non-vanishing holomorphic section $e(\omega)$ of vector bundle $E_{\tilde{T}}$, such that $\langle e(\omega), e_0 \rangle = 1$. For any $\tilde{e}(\omega) \in \ker(\tilde{T} - \omega)$, we have that $\tilde{e}(\omega) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \phi_i(\omega)e_i$, where $\{\phi_i(\omega)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ are holomorphic. Note that the holomorphic functions $\{\phi_i(\omega)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ have at most a finite number of zeros, so there is $\Omega_0 \subset \mathbb{D}$, such that $\phi_0(\omega) \neq 0, \omega \in \Omega_0$. Next, we setting

$$e(\omega) := \frac{\tilde{e}(\omega)}{\phi_0(\omega)} = 1 + \frac{\phi_1(\omega)}{\phi_0(\omega)}e_1 + \frac{\phi_2(\omega)}{\phi_0(\omega)}e_2 + \cdots.$$

We still have $e(\omega) \in \ker(\tilde{T} - \omega)$ and $\langle e(\omega), e_0 \rangle = 1, \omega \in \Omega_0$.

According to this feature, we can imply

$$(4.13) \quad \sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^i \binom{n}{i} \omega^i (\tilde{T}^*)^i e(\omega) = (e_0 \otimes e_0)e(\omega) = \langle e(\omega), e_0 \rangle e_0 = e_0.$$

It follows that

$$\left\langle \sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^i \binom{n}{i} \omega^i (\tilde{T}^*)^i e(\omega), e(\omega) \right\rangle = \sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^i \binom{n}{i} (|\omega|^2)^i \|e(\omega)\|^2 = 1.$$

Therefore, we have $\|e(\omega)\|^2 = \left(\sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^i \binom{n}{i} (|\omega|^2)^i \right)^{-1} = \frac{1}{(1-|\omega|^2)^n}$, and $\mathcal{K}_{\tilde{T}}(\omega) = \frac{-n}{(1-|\omega|^2)^2}$. By Theorem 2.1, we obtain

$$\mathcal{K}_T(\omega) = \mathcal{K}_{\tilde{T}}(\omega) = \frac{-n}{(1-|\omega|^2)^2}.$$

Since $T|_{\mathcal{M}} \in B_1(\mathbb{D})$, using Theorem 4.15, T is reducible. \square

In this section, we give some sufficient conditions for a bounded linear operator to be a reducible operator by using of the n -hypercontractivity of an operator on an invariant subspace.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. L. Shields, *Weighted shift operators and analytic function theory*, Math. Surveys, (1974), no. 13, 49-128.
- [2] J. Agler, *The Arveson extension theorem and coanalytic models*, Integr. Equat. Op. Thy., **5** (1982), no. 5, 608-631.
- [3] J. Agler, *Hypercontractions and subnormality*, J. Operator Theory, **13** (1985), no. 2, 203-217.
- [4] M. J. Cowen and R. G. Douglas, *Complex geometry and operator theory*, Acta Math., **141** (1978), no. 3-4, 187-261.
- [5] D. N. Clark, G. Misra, *On curvature and similarity*, Michigan Math. J., **30** (1983), no. 3, 361-367.
- [6] D. N. Clark, G. Misra, *On weighted shifts, curvature and similarity*, J.London Math.Soc.(2), **31** (1985), no. 2, 357-368.

- [7] R. G. Douglas, H. Kwon and S. Treil, *Similarity of n -hypercontractions and backward Bergman shifts.*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) **88** (2013), no. 3, 637-648.
- [8] Y. L. Hou, K. Ji and H. K. Kwon, *The trace of the curvature determines similarity*, Stud. Math., **236** (2017), no. 2, 193-200.
- [9] A. Beurling, *On two problems concerning linear transformations in Hilbert space*, Acta Mathematica, **81** (1948), 239-255.
- [10] P. Bourdon, *Similarity of parts to the whole for certain multiplication operators*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **99** (1987), no. 3, 563-567.
- [11] S. Richter, *Unitary equivalence of invariant subspaces of Bergman and Dirichlet spaces*, Pacific J. Math., **133** (1988), no. 1, 151-156.
- [12] K. Zhu, *Restriction of the Bergman shift to an invariant subspace*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser.(2), **48**(1997), no. 192, 519-532.
- [13] H. Hedenmalm, B. Korenblum and K. Zhu, *Beurling type invariant subspaces of the Bergman spaces*, J. London Math. Soc.(2), **53**(1996), no. 3, 601-614.
- [14] J. B. Conway, *A Course in Functional Analysis /-2nd*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 96, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003.
- [15] C. L. Jiang and Z. Y. Wang, *Strongly irreducible operators on Hilbert space*, Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series, vol. 389, Longman, Harlow, 1998.
- [16] C. Ambrozie, M. Engliš and V. Müller, *Operator tuples and analytic models over general domains in \mathbb{C}^n* , Journal of Operator Theory, **47**(2002), no. 2, 287-302.
- [17] K. Ji, H. Kwon and J. Xu, *N -hypercontractivity and similarity of Cowen-Douglas operators*, Linear Algebra Appl., **592**(2020), 20-47.
- [18] B. Korenblum, private communication.
- [19] F. Gilfeather, *Strong reducibility of operators*, Indiana U. Math. J., **22**(1972), no. 4, 393-397.
- [20] C. L. Jiang, *Similarity classification of Cowen-Douglas operators*, Canad. J. Math., **56**(2004), no. 4, 742-775.
- [21] Y. Cao, J. S. Fang and C. L. Jiang, *K -groups of Banach algebras and strongly irreducible decompositions of operators*, J. Operator Theory, **48**(2002), no. 2, 235-253.
- [22] C. L. Jiang, X. Z. Guo and K. Ji, *K -group and similarity classification of operators*, J. Funct. Anal., **225**(2005), no. 1, 167-192.
- [23] C. K. Fong and C. L. Jiang, *Approximation by Jordan type operators*, Houston J. Math., **19**(1993), no. 1, 51-62.
- [24] C. L. Jiang, K. Ji and D. K. Keshari, *Geometric similarity invariants of Cowen-Douglas Operators*, arXiv:1901.03993.
- [25] K. Ji, H. Kwon, J. Sarkar and J. Xu, *A subclass of the Cowen-Douglas class and similarity*, arXiv:1912.06861.

Current address, K. Ji, S. Ji and J. Xu: Department of Mathematics, Hebei Normal University, Shijiazhuang, Hebei 050016, China

Email address, K. Ji: jikui@hebtu.edu.cn, jikuikui@163.com

Email address, S. Ji: jishanshan15@outlook.com

Email address, J. Xu: xujingmath@outlook.com