

# THE INVARIANCE OF $p$ -ESSENTIAL NORMALITY OF HILBERT MODULES ON BOUNDED SYMMETRIC DOMAINS

LJIA DING

ABSTRACT. We investigate the biholomorphic invariance of  $p$ -essential normality of Hilbert modules on irreducible bounded symmetric domains. We first establish a new integral formula with the rational function (Szegő) kernel for the Taylor functional calculus and then prove a biholomorphic invariance result related to the  $p$ -essential normality of quotient Hilbert submodules. Furthermore, we develop an approach based on the change of module categories to prove that the  $p$ -essential normality of quotient weighted Bergman submodules determined by analytic varieties are invariant under the biholomorphic automorphism, and the case of general Hilbert modules corresponding to the Wallach set is also proved. As a consequence, we show that the  $p$ -essential normality of quotient Hardy, Drury-Arveson and weighted Bergman submodules determined by analytic varieties is invariant when the coordinate multipliers are replaced by arbitrary biholomorphic automorphism multipliers. Moreover, the Taylor spectrum of the compression on the quotient submodule is calculated when the corresponding submodule is finitely generated, which is the closure of the analytic variety and actually gives the solvability of the related corona problem for the quotient submodule.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

A complex Hilbert space  $H$  is called a Hilbert module over a complex unit algebra  $A$ , if there exists a representation of  $A$  on  $H$ , and the module action is induced by the representation. The case we are most interested in is that  $A = \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]$  is the holomorphic polynomial algebra and  $H$  equipped with a bounded commuting operator tuple  $T = (T_1, \dots, T_m)$ , whose module actions are given by

$$q \cdot h := q(T_1, \dots, T_m)h$$

for every  $h \in H$  and  $q \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]$ , which is denoted by  $(H, T)$ . A closed subset  $M \subset H$  is called a (Hilbert) submodule denoted by  $(M, T)$ , if it is a joint invariant space of the module actions, i.e.,  $A \cdot M \subset M$ , and in this case its orthogonal complement  $M^\perp$  is also a submodule called a quotient (Hilbert) submodule, whose module actions are given by

$$q \cdot h := P_{M^\perp} q(T_1, \dots, T_m)h = q(P_{M^\perp} T_1, \dots, P_{M^\perp} T_m)h, \quad (1.1)$$

since  $P_{M^\perp} T_i P_{M^\perp} T_j = P_{M^\perp} T_i T_j$  for all  $i, j = 1, \dots, m$ , where  $P_{M^\perp} : H \rightarrow M^\perp$  is the orthogonal projection.

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 47A13; Secondary 32B15; 32M15; 47B10.

*Key words and phrases.* Hilbert module; Essential normality; Taylor functional calculus; Biholomorphic automorphism; Analytic variety; Corona problem; Symmetric domain.

The study of  $p$ -essentially normal Hilbert modules begins with Arveson's seminal works [4, 5] in which it is applied to investigate the dilation theory and the geometric invariant theory of the commuting operator tuple. Following Arveson, a Hilbert submodule is said to be  $p$ -essentially normal if all cross-commutators

$$[T_i, T_j^*] = T_i T_j^* - T_j^* T_i \quad (1.2)$$

belong to the Schatten class operator ideal  $\mathcal{L}^p$ , where  $p \in [1, \infty]$  and  $\mathcal{L}^\infty$  is the compact operator ideal. We refer the reader to [8, 12] and references therein for the Schatten class. However, in the case of quotient Hilbert submodule, each operator in (1.2) should be replaced by its compression. In recent years, the  $p$ -essential normality of analytic Hilbert modules of various holomorphic function spaces equipped with the coordinate function multipliers on the unit ball, the unit polydisc and the bounded strongly pseudoconvex domain have continuously attracted more attention and been a very active area of research [14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 36, 37], and the results reveal the beautiful and profound relationship among the complex algebraic geometry, operator theory and index theory. The following two conjectures play a dominant role in the development of the  $p$ -essential normality theory for analytic Hilbert modules. The Arveson Conjecture predicts that every graded submodule of the Drury-Arveson module on the unit ball  $\mathbb{B}^n$  is  $p$ -essentially normal for  $p > n$ . Douglas [13, 14] observes that in the case of the quotient submodule it should be  $p > d$ , where  $d$  is the complex dimension of the affine homogeneous algebraic variety involved, this is now called the Geometric Arveson-Douglas Conjecture. There are abundant works on the above conjectures on more general spaces such as the Bergman space and Hardy space, we refer the reader to the survey [22] for a thorough introduction.

Bounded symmetric domains are non-compact Hermitian symmetric spaces, which play a role in many branches of mathematics, such as the arithmetic algebraic geometry, differential geometry and representation theory of Lie groups. The present paper focuses on the several-variable operator theory on bounded symmetric domains. More precisely, the paper mainly concerns the biholomorphic invariance of  $p$ -essential normality of Hilbert modules determined by complex analytic varieties on bounded symmetric domains in finite dimensions. It is known that the Hardy and weighted Bergman modules will not be always  $p$ -essentially normal in the high rank case due to the foliation structure for the Toeplitz  $C^*$ -algebra [32], but there indeed exist many nontrivial quotient submodules determined by analytic varieties which are  $p$ -essentially normal, see example for [34, 37]. Let us now explain our main motivation. Recently, Douglas, Wang and Xia [17, 36] consider the  $p$ -essential normality for quotient Bergman and Hardy submodules on the unit ball which are determined by analytic varieties rather than merely affine algebraic varieties, and obtain some affirmative answers of the Geometric Arveson-Douglas Conjecture in mild assumptions. On the other hand, Davidson, Ramsey, Kennedy and Shalit [9, 25] prove that the  $p$ -essential normality of some quotient Hilbert submodules on the unit ball which are determined by some homogeneous algebraic varieties is invariant under the unitary change of variables. It is natural to consider the invariance of  $p$ -essential normality under the more general biholomorphism and on the more general bounded domain. However, the image of an algebraic variety under a biholomorphism is not an algebraic variety in general but

an analytic variety, thus we work on submodules and quotient submodules which are determined by analytic varieties. That is the first reason why we consider the biholomorphic invariance of  $p$ -essential normality of the Hilbert module determined by an analytic variety on the bounded symmetric domain. The second reason why we consider the biholomorphic invariance of  $p$ -essential normality of Hilbert modules is the following. In [18], Engliš and Eschmeier prove by the theory of generalized Toeplitz operators of Boutet de Monvel and Guillemin together with the algebraic geometry method of blow-up that the quotient weighted Bergman submodule on the unit ball determined by a homogeneous algebraic variety with the single singularity of origin is unitary equivalent to a quotient weighted Bergman submodule on a strongly pseudoconvex domain of a complex analytic manifold determined by a smooth submanifold, and then prove the Geometric Arveson-Douglas Conjecture in this case. This seems to indicate that one can develop the  $p$ -essentially normal theory of Hilbert modules on some complex analytic manifolds. Once we attempt to consider the  $p$ -essentially normal theory of Hilbert modules on complex analytic manifolds (say Stein manifolds), we have to handle with the problem that the  $p$ -essential normality of Hilbert modules is independent on the choice of holomorphic coordinates.

To express our main results clearly, we introduce the following terminologies and notations. Let  $\Omega$  be an irreducible bounded symmetric domain in the complex number space  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , and  $(H, T)$  be an abstract Hilbert module over the algebra  $\mathbb{C}[z]$ . Let  $(M, T)$  be a submodule of  $(H, T)$ , its complement  $M^\perp$  is a quotient submodule, whose module action is given by (1.1). We denote  $S = (P_{M^\perp}T_1, \dots, P_{M^\perp}T_n)$  by the compression of  $T$ . In these notations,  $(M, T)$  is said to be  $p$ -essentially normal if the tuple  $T$  satisfying (1.2), and the quotient submodule  $(M^\perp, S)$  is said to be  $p$ -essentially normal if the tuple  $S$  satisfying (1.2). Our first main result involves in the Taylor functional calculus for the commuting operator tuple.

**Theorem 1.** Suppose  $\phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)$  is an arbitrary biholomorphic automorphism on an irreducible bounded symmetric domain  $\Omega$ , then the following are equivalent.

- (1)  $(M^\perp, S)$  is  $p$ -essentially normal.
- (2)  $(M^\perp, \widehat{S})$  is  $p$ -essentially normal.
- (3)  $(M^\perp, \phi(\widehat{S}))$  is  $p$ -essentially normal.

Where  $\widehat{S}$  is an arbitrary permissive linear transformation for the triple  $(\Omega, M^\perp, S)$ , see the definition in Section 3, and  $\phi(\widehat{S})$  is the Taylor functional calculus for  $\widehat{S}$ .

Our second main result deals with the biholomorphic invariance of  $p$ -essential normality of analytic Hilbert modules of reproducing kernel holomorphic function spaces on irreducible bounded symmetric domains in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . It is well known that  $\Omega$  can biholomorphically be realized as the open unit ball with respect to the so-called spectral norm in the Jordan triple system or the Harish-Chandra realization, thus we can identify  $\Omega$  with the spectral unit ball. In what follows we use  $(\Omega, z)$  to indicate that  $\Omega$  is an irreducible bounded symmetric domain assigned a given coordinate  $z$ . Let  $(M, T)$  be a submodule of a weighted Bergman module determined by an analytic variety in the bounded symmetric domain  $\Omega$  and equipped with  $T = (M_{z_1}, \dots, M_{z_n})$ , which is the usual coordinate function multipliers, its quotient Bergman submodule is denoted by  $(M^\perp, S)$  where  $S$  is the compression of  $T$ . We will replace  $T, S$  with  $T_z, S_z$  respectively,

if it is necessary to emphasize the given coordinate  $z$ . Let  $\phi : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  be a biholomorphic automorphism, we denote  $\phi^*(M^\perp)$  by the pull back of  $M^\perp$  under  $\phi$ , which is a quotient submodule of the pull back of the weighted Bergman module, see Section 4 below.

**Theorem 2.** Let  $\Omega$  be an irreducible bounded symmetric domain in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and  $M$  be a weighted Bergman submodule determined by an analytic variety. Suppose that  $\phi : (\Omega, w) \rightarrow (\Omega, z)$  is an arbitrary biholomorphic automorphism with  $z = \phi(w)$ , then  $(\phi^*(M^\perp), S_w)$  is  $p$ -essentially normal if and only if  $(M^\perp, S_z)$  is  $p$ -essentially normal.

As a direct consequence of Theorem 2, we obtain a result that the  $p$ -essential normality of a quotient weighted Bergman submodule determined by an analytic variety with the compression of the coordinate multipliers on an irreducible bounded symmetric domain is invariant when the coordinate multipliers are replaced by arbitrary biholomorphic automorphism multipliers, see Corollary 4.8 and Corollary 5.7. After additional efforts, the similar results on analytic Hilbert modules corresponding to the continuous part of Wallach set are also obtained, particularly Hardy and Drury-Arveson modules, see Theorem 5.6. The special case that submodule determined by an analytic variety in an open neighborhood of the closure  $\bar{\Omega}$  is most considered in the analytic version of the Geometric Arveson-Douglas Conjecture [15, 17, 22, 35, 36]. Although the above two theorems only deal with the quotient submodule, the same is also true for submodules, see Corollary 3.10 and Corollary 4.7 below, there is no essential difference between proofs for the cases of submodules and quotient submodules. As its application, one can apply the results to establish the Geometric Arveson-Douglas conjecture for new classes of examples from the known results as [25] does. These results not only broadly generalize some results on the unit ball [9, 25] and cover all irreducible bounded symmetric domains, but also establish a connection between operator theory and geometry of bounded symmetric domains. This work can be also viewed as a first step toward developing the  $p$ -essentially normal theory of analytic Hilbert modules on Stein manifolds.

Moreover, we consider the Taylor spectrum of compression operator tuple on the quotient submodule, since the Taylor functional calculus plays a key role in our approach to prove the above theorems and the calculation of the Taylor spectrum is of independent interest. We calculate the Taylor spectrum of compression operator tuple on the quotient submodule when the submodule is finitely generated, as we expected, which is determined by an analytic variety in an open neighborhood of  $\bar{\Omega}$ , see the following Proposition 6.1. As an application, we prove the solvability of the related corona problem of the quotient Drury-Arveson submodule for a multiplier subalgebra that is in fact the set of restriction of holomorphic functions on some neighborhoods of  $\bar{\Omega}$ , see Corollary 6.7, 6.8 below. In particular, when  $\Omega = \mathbb{B}^n$  the solvability gives an affirmative answer to a problem recently raised by Davidson, Ramsey and Shalit [10, Remarks 5.5].

We now explain briefly the main ideas of the proofs. Our proof of Theorem 1 is inspired by the method due to Connes [8] to handle with the Dunford-Riesz functional calculus of the Schatten class commutator. Actually this idea goes back at least as far as Helton and Howe [23]. In the case of the commuting operator tuple, it is natural to

apply Taylor functional calculus. However, the Taylor functional calculus is originally proved by means of the Cauchy-Weil formula for cohomology class and the formula is difficult to apply in practice. Although there are several alternative simpler integral formulas such as Cauchy-Fantappie-Leray formulas and Martinelli formulas, it is still difficult to apply them directly. For handling these difficulties we establish a new integral formula with the rational function (Szegő) kernel for Taylor functional calculus by the Hardy space theory on irreducible bounded symmetric domains. We now turn to the idea how to prove Theorem 2. In the special case that the submodule is determined by an analytic variety in an open neighborhood of  $\bar{\Omega}$  and the submodule is finitely generated, we prove in the following Proposition 6.1 that the Taylor spectrum of compression operator tuple on the quotient submodule is the closure of the analytic variety, thus one can still prove Theorem 2 by the Taylor functional calculus based on Theorem 1. However, in the general case, the primary obstruction or difficulty in this operator theoretic method is the accurate estimate of the Taylor spectrum of the compression operator tuple. The seed of our main idea in the proof of Theorem 2 is the following observations. The first observation is that a closed subset of the Bergman space on an irreducible bounded symmetric domain is a submodule over the polynomial algebra if and only if it is a submodule over a Noetherian holomorphic function algebra on the irreducible bounded symmetric domain, which in fact indicates that the Bergman module category over the polynomial algebra and the Bergman module category over the Noetherian holomorphic function algebra are the same on the bounded symmetric domain, see Proposition 4.3 and Remark 4.4 below for more explicit description. We remark that the construction of the Noetherian holomorphic function algebra is inspired by the notion of germ in the sheaf theory, see the beginning of the Section 4, moreover the coincide of the above two Bergman module categories can be viewed as an analogy with Chevalley-Shephard-Todd type theorem [7, Corollary 6.4] in spirit. The major advantage of Bergman module over the holomorphic function algebra is that there exist abundant module actions, and the  $p$ -essential normality problem we concerned is independent on the choice of the above two module categories. Thus we consider the  $p$ -essential normality problem in the Bergman module category over the holomorphic function algebra rather than the polynomial algebra. One major advantage of the method of the change of the module categories is that we need not consider the behavior of the analytic variety near the boundary. Moreover, our method should be able to investigate the invariance of  $k$ -normality on irreducible bounded symmetric domains, at least for Hardy quotient submodules. The concept of  $k$ -normality ( $1 \leq k \leq r$ ) for Hilbert modules on the bounded symmetric domain with rank  $r$  is explicitly proposed by Upmeyer, which has close association with the foliation structure for the Toeplitz  $C^*$ -algebra.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review some of the standard facts on analytic varieties and bounded symmetric domains in term of the Jordan triple Systems. In Section 3, we give the proof of the Theorem 1. Section 4 is devoted to prove the Theorem 2. Section 5 discusses the case of Hilbert modules corresponding to the continuous part of Wallach set. In Section 6, we calculate the Taylor spectrum of compression operator tuple on the quotient submodule when the corresponding submodule

is finitely generated, and consider the related corona problem for the quotient submodule. Section 7 contains a brief discussion on Geometric Arveson-Douglas conjecture.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we will recall some basic results that will be used later on. We first present facts on pseudoconvex domains and analytic varieties, and the interested readers can consult [11, 19].

A domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  is called (Hartogs) pseudoconvex if there exists a continuous plurisubharmonic function  $\rho$  on  $\Omega$  such that the set  $\{z \in \Omega : \rho(z) < r\}$  is relatively compact in  $\Omega$  for every real number  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ , and such a function  $\rho$  is called an exhaustion function. It is well known that a domain in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  is pseudoconvex if and only if it is holomorphically convex. A domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  is called holomorphically convex if for every compact subset  $K \subset \Omega$ , its holomorphically convex hull

$$\hat{K}_\Omega := \{z \in \Omega : |f(z)| \leq \sup_K |f|, \forall f \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)\}$$

is again compact, where  $\mathcal{O}(\Omega)$  is the collections of holomorphic functions on  $\Omega$ . A basic fact is that every convex domain  $\Omega$  in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  is pseudoconvex. The notion of pseudoconvex and holomorphically convex applies to the complex analytic manifold. A holomorphically convex manifold must be (weak) pseudoconvex, but the converse is not true in general.

Let  $\Omega$  be a domain in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , in general  $\Omega$  can be a complex analytic manifold. A closed subset  $A \subset \Omega$  is said to be an (complex) analytic variety, if for every  $z_0 \in A$  there exists a neighborhood  $U$  of  $z_0$  and holomorphic functions  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in \mathcal{O}(U)$  such that

$$A \cap U = \{z \in U : f_1(z) = \dots = f_m(z) = 0\}.$$

Then  $f_1, \dots, f_m$  are said to be local equations of  $A$  in  $U$ . Note that the definition of the analytic variety is local. A nontrivial fact is that every analytic variety can be globally defined by finitely many holomorphic functions on Stein manifolds which in fact means that every analytic variety in a Stein manifold has a global equations [19, Theorem 5.14], especially on pseudoconvex domains in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . Roughly speaking, a complex analytic manifold is called a Stein manifold, if it is holomorphically convex and has abundant holomorphic functions [11, 19]. As we shall mention below, the bounded symmetric domain are always pseudoconvex, thus in the following, we need only consider the analytic variety which is globally defined in the bounded symmetric domain. It is easy to see that, if  $f : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2$  is a holomorphic map between two domains and  $A \subset \Omega_2$  is an analytic variety, so is its preimage  $f^{-1}(A) \subset \Omega_1$ .

We now briefly recall some known facts on bounded symmetric domains and their Jordan theoretic description without proofs, we refer the reader to [12, 26, 30, 33] for general background. A bounded domain  $\Omega \subset Z = \mathbb{C}^n$  is called symmetric, if for every  $z \in \Omega$  there exists a  $s_z \in \text{Aut}(\Omega)$  such that  $s_z \circ s_z = \text{Id}$  and  $z$  is an isolate fixed point of  $s_z$ , where  $\text{Aut}(\Omega)$  denoted by the biholomorphic automorphism group of  $\Omega$  and  $\text{Id}$  is the identity map. A bounded symmetric domain is said to be irreducible if it can not be written as the Cartesian product of bounded symmetric domains of lower dimensions up to biholomorphism. Let  $G$  be the identity component of the biholomorphic automorphism group of  $\Omega$ . Then  $\Omega = G/K$  is a realization of Hermitian

symmetric space of the non-compact type, where  $K = \{g \in G : g(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}\}$  is the isotropy subgroup of  $\mathbf{0} \in \Omega$ . It is well known [26, 33] that  $Z$  can be equipped with the structure of a Hermitian Jordan triple and then  $\Omega$  can biholomorphically be realized as the spectral unit ball in  $Z$ , thus we identify  $\Omega$  with the unit ball in the spectral norm, the spectral unit ball is also called symmetric ball in [33]. Note that the spectral unit ball in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  is a bounded balanced convex domain, especially a pseudoconvex domain, the one-to-one correspondence between the bounded balanced convex domains and Minkowski norm functions on  $\mathbb{C}^n$  implies that the spectral norm coincides with the Minkowski function of the spectral unit ball. We point out that there is a parallel description of the bounded symmetric domain in term of the Harish-Chandra realization in the Lie theory, since there exists a one-to-one corresponding between semi-simple Lie algebras of Hermitian type and Hermitian Jordan triple Systems, see for instance [12, 30]. Note that any two norms of the finite dimensional complex vector space  $\mathbb{C}^n$  are equivalent, thus the topologies induced by the spectral norm and the usual Euclidian norm coincide on  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . Since  $\Omega$  is circular one can show that the isotropy subgroup  $K = \{g \in GL(\mathbb{C}^n) : g(\Omega) = \Omega\}$ . We denote the Jordan triple product by

$$Z \times Z \times Z \rightarrow Z, \quad (u, v, w) \mapsto \{uv^*w\}$$

which is complex linear in  $u, w$  and complex conjugate linear in  $v$ . For each pair  $(u, v) \in Z \times Z$  the linear endomorphism

$$B(u, v)w := w - 2\{uv^*w\} + \{u\{vw^*v\}^*u\}$$

is called the Bergman endomorphism associated with  $(u, v)$ . One can show that  $B(z, \xi) \in GL(Z)$  is invertible whenever  $z, \xi \in \Omega$ . A pair  $(z, \xi) \in Z \times Z$  is said to be quasi-invertible if the Bergman endomorphism  $B(z, \xi)$  is invertible, in this case

$$z^\xi := B(z, \xi)^{-1}(z - \{z\xi^*z\})$$

is called the quasi-inverse of the pair  $(z, \xi)$ , see [26, 34] for details. Now fix  $z_0 \in \Omega$ , one can show that

$$g_{z_0}(w) = z_0 + B(z_0, z_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}w^{-z_0}$$

defines a biholomorphic automorphism  $g_{z_0} \in \text{Aut}(\Omega)$  called the Möbius transformation associated with  $z_0$  which satisfies

$$g_{z_0}(0) = z_0, g_{z_0}(-z_0) = 0,$$

and its inverse is  $g_{-z_0}$ .

By the classification of semi-simple Lie algebra, there only exist six type irreducible bounded symmetric domains up to biholomorphism due to Cartan [26], and the others are the Cartesian product of irreducible bounded symmetric domains up to biholomorphism. We give two typical examples of bounded symmetric domains in the Jordan theoretic description.

**Example 2.1.** (1) Type  $I_{r \times n}$ . Let  $Z = \mathbb{C}^{r \times n}$  be the complex  $(r \times n)$ -matrix space with  $r \leq n$ . Then

$$I_{r \times n} = \{u \in Z : \text{Id}_r - uu^* > 0\}$$

is an irreducible bounded symmetric domain, where  $\text{Id}_r$  is the  $(r \times r)$ -unit matrix and  $u^*$  is the conjugate matrix of  $u$ . The associated Jordan triple product on  $Z$  is the generalized anti-commutator product

$$\{uv^*w\} := \frac{1}{2}(uv^*w + wv^*u)$$

for  $u, v, w \in Z$ , where the multiplication in the right side is the usual matrix multiplication. In this case, the Bergman endomorphism associated with  $(u, v)$  is given by

$$B(u, v)w = (\text{Id}_r - uv^*)w(\text{Id}_n - v^*u)$$

and the quasi-inverse of the pair  $(z, \xi)$  is

$$z^\xi = (\text{Id}_r - z\xi^*)^{-1}z.$$

It implies that the corresponding generic polynomial  $\Delta(u, v)$  is

$$\Delta(u, v) = \text{Det}(\text{Id}_r - uv^*).$$

The case of  $r = 1$  is the unit ball  $I_{1 \times n} = \mathbb{B}^n \subset \mathbb{C}^{1 \times n} = \mathbb{C}^n$  in the usual Euclidian norm, in this case,  $\Delta(u, v) = 1 - \langle u, v \rangle$ , where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  is the standard Hermitian inner product on  $\mathbb{C}^n$ .

(2) Polydisc  $\mathbb{D}^n$ . The unit polydisc  $\mathbb{D}^n$  is the  $n$ -Cartesian product of the unit disc  $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{B}^1$  in  $Z = \mathbb{C}^{1 \times n}$ , i.e.,

$$\mathbb{D}^n = \{u = (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in Z : 1 - u_i \bar{u}_i > 0, i = 1, \dots, n\}.$$

The associated Jordan triple product on  $Z$  is the generalized anti-commutator product

$$\{uv^*w\} := (u_1 \bar{v}_1 w_1, \dots, u_n \bar{v}_n w_n)$$

for  $u, v, w \in Z$ . The Bergman endomorphism associated with  $(u, v)$  is given by

$$B(u, v)w = ((1 - u_1 \bar{v}_1)^2 w_1, \dots, (1 - u_n \bar{v}_n)^2 w_n)$$

and the quasi-inverse of the pair  $(z, \xi)$  is

$$z^\xi = \left( \frac{z_1}{1 - z_1 \xi_1}, \dots, \frac{z_n}{1 - z_n \xi_n} \right).$$

Then the corresponding generic polynomial  $\Delta(u, v)$  is

$$\Delta(u, v) = \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - u_i \bar{v}_i).$$

Assume from now on that the bounded symmetric domain in  $Z = \mathbb{C}^n$  is always irreducible. It is well known that there exists a unique generic polynomial  $\Delta(z, w)$  in  $z, \bar{w}$  and an analytic numerical invariant  $N$  satisfying the property that the Bergman kernel of  $\Omega$  is given by

$$K_N(z, w) = \Delta(z, w)^{-N}, \quad (2.1)$$

where the numerical invariant  $N$  is also called the genus of domain  $\Omega$ , and the generic polynomial  $\Delta(z, w)$  is also called Jordan triple determinant or a denominator of the quasi-inverse such that  $\Delta(0, 0) = 1$ . Denote the  $K$ -invariant probability measure  $dv_\gamma$  on  $\Omega$  by

$$dv_\gamma(w) = c_\gamma \Delta(w, w)^\gamma dv(w)$$



for  $\gamma > -1$ , where  $c_\gamma$  is the normalized constant and  $K$  is the isotropic subgroup as above. Denote  $A^2(dv_\gamma)$  by the weighted Bergman space consisted of square integrable holomorphic functions with respect to the measure  $dv_\gamma$  on  $\Omega$ , which is occasionally denoted by  $A^2(\Omega, dv_\gamma)$ . The Bergman kernel  $K_\gamma(z, w)$  of the spectral unit ball is given by

$$K_{N+\gamma}(z, w) = \Delta(z, w)^{-(N+\gamma)},$$

which is degenerated to the formula (2.1) when  $\gamma = 0$ . The weighted Bergman space  $A^2(dv_\gamma)$  is a reproducing kernel Hilbert function space, since

$$f(z) = \langle f, K_{N+\gamma, z} \rangle_\gamma = \int_\Omega f(w) \overline{K_{N+\gamma, z}(w)} dv_\gamma(w), \quad z \in \Omega \quad (2.2)$$

for every  $f \in A^2(dv_\gamma)$ , where

$$K_{N+\gamma, w}(z) = K_{N+\gamma}(z, w) = \Delta(z, w)^{-(N+\gamma)}, \quad z, w \in \Omega,$$

is also called the reproducing kernel of  $A^2(dv_\gamma)$ .

By [33] the natural action of  $K$  on  $\mathcal{P}(Z) = \mathbb{C}[z]$  induces the Peter-Schmid-Weyl decomposition

$$\mathcal{P}(Z) = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq 0} \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{m}}(Z),$$

where  $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_r) \geq 0$  runs over all integer partitions, namely

$$m_1 \geq \dots \geq m_r \geq 0.$$

The decomposition is irreducible under the action of  $K$  and is orthogonal under the Fischer-Fock (or Segal-Bargmann) inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_F$ , see [33, Section 2.7]. For a  $r$ -tuple  $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_r) \in \mathbb{C}^r$ , the Gindikin Gamma function [12, 33] is given by

$$\Gamma_\Omega(\mathbf{s}) = (2\pi)^{\frac{ar(r-1)}{4}} \prod_{j=1}^r \Gamma(s_j - \frac{a}{2}(j-1)),$$

of the usual Gamma function  $\Gamma$  whenever the right side is well defined, where  $r$  is the rank of  $\Omega$  and  $a, b$  are two analytic numerical invariants associated the joint Peirce decomposition for a chosen frame  $e_1, \dots, e_r$  of minimal tripotents such that the dimension count

$$n = r + \frac{a}{2}r(r-1) + br \quad (2.3)$$

holds and the genus  $N$  is given by

$$N := 2 + a(r-1) + b.$$

The multi-variable Pochhammer symbol is

$$(\lambda)_{\mathbf{s}} := \frac{\Gamma_\Omega(\lambda + \mathbf{s})}{\Gamma_\Omega(\mathbf{s})},$$

where  $\lambda + \mathbf{s} := (\lambda + s_1, \dots, \lambda + s_r)$ . And the  $G$ -orbit

$$\mathcal{S} := G \cdot (e_1 + \dots + e_r)$$

is called the Shilov boundary of  $\Omega$ , which is a compact analytic manifold contained in the topological boundary  $\partial\Omega$ . In general the topological boundary  $\partial\Omega$  is not smooth,

actually it is smooth if and only if  $\Omega$  is the unit ball of rank 1 in the usual Euclidian norm. It can be verified that

$$(\lambda)_s = \prod_{j=1}^r \left(\lambda - \frac{a}{2}(j-1)\right)_{s_j} \quad (2.4)$$

of the usual Pochhammer symbols  $(\mu)_m = \prod_{j=1}^m (\mu + j - 1)$ . It is known from [3, 33] that

$$\Delta(z, w)^{-\lambda} = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq 0} (\lambda)_{\mathbf{m}} K_{\mathbf{m}}(z, w) \quad (2.5)$$

converges compactly and absolutely on  $\Omega \times \Omega$ , where  $K_{\mathbf{m}}$  is the reproducing kernel of  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{m}}(Z)$  in the Fischer-Fock inner product, for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ . The Wallach set  $W_{\Omega}$  with respect to  $\Omega$  is defined to be the set consists of all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  satisfying

$$(\lambda)_{\mathbf{m}} \geq 0$$

for all integer partitions  $\mathbf{m} \geq 0$ , which is exactly the set of value  $\lambda$  such that  $\Delta(z, w)^{-\lambda}$  is a positive kernel. The Wallach set  $W_{\Omega}$  admits the following decomposition

$$W_{\Omega} = W_{\Omega, d} \cup W_{\Omega, c}$$

where  $W_{\Omega, d} = \{\lambda = (j-1)\frac{a}{2}, j = 1, \dots, r\}$  and  $W_{\Omega, c} = \{\lambda > (r-1)\frac{a}{2}\}$ .

The set  $W_{\Omega, c}$  is called the continuous part, in this case the function  $\Delta(z, w)^{-\lambda}$  is the reproducing kernel of the Hilbert holomorphic function space

$$H_{\lambda}^2(\Omega) = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq 0} \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{m}}(Z),$$

whose inner product is induced by

$$(p, q)_{\lambda} = \frac{1}{(\lambda)_{\mathbf{m}}} \langle p, q \rangle_F \quad (2.6)$$

for all  $p, q \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{m}}(Z)$ ,  $\mathbf{m} \geq 0$ . The weighted Bergman space  $A^2(dv_{\gamma})$  is coincided with  $H_{N+\gamma}^2(\Omega)$ ,  $\gamma > -1$  and the classical Hardy space  $H^2(\Omega)$  defined in [33, Definition 2.8.4] is coincided with  $H_{\frac{2}{r}}^2(\Omega)$ . When  $\Omega = \mathbb{B}^n$  the usual unit ball, we see that  $H_1^2(\mathbb{B}^n)$  coincides with the Drury-Arveson space defined in [4]. Thus in general we define the Drury-Arveson space to be  $H_{(r-1)\frac{a}{2}+1}^2(\Omega)$ . The set  $W_{\Omega, d}$  is called the discrete part, in the case of  $\lambda = (j-1)\frac{a}{2}$ , the function  $\Delta(z, w)^{-\lambda}$  is the reproducing kernel of the Hilbert holomorphic function space

$$H_{\lambda}^2(\Omega) = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq 0, m_j = 0} \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{m}}(Z),$$

whose inner product is induced by

$$(p, q)_{\lambda} = \frac{1}{(\lambda)_{\mathbf{m}}} \langle p, q \rangle_F$$

for all  $p, q \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{m}}(Z)$  where  $\mathbf{m} \geq 0, m_j = 0$ . In the case of  $\Omega = \mathbb{B}^n$ , it is well known that the Drury-Arveson space  $H_1^2(\mathbb{B}^n)$  is complete Nevanlinna-Pick [10], actually the reproducing kernel Hilbert holomorphic function space  $H_{\lambda}^2(\mathbb{B}^n)$  is complete Nevanlinna-Pick if and only if  $0 < \lambda \leq 1$ . On the contrary, in the higher rank case of  $r \geq 2$ , one can show that  $H_{\lambda}^2(\Omega)$  is not complete Nevanlinna-Pick for every  $\lambda \in W_{\Omega}$ , by the

characterization of complete Nevanlinna-Pick kernels due to Agler and McCarthy [1, Theorem 1.2].

### 3. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1

In this section, we will prove Theorem 1, which gives a criterion of the  $p$ -essential normality of Hilbert modules by the Taylor functional calculus on irreducible bounded symmetric domains. We first recall some notations involved.

Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  be an irreducible bounded symmetric domain with rank  $r$ , and  $(H, T)$  be an abstract Hilbert module over the polynomial algebra  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]$ . Let  $(M, T)$  be a submodule of  $(H, T)$ , its orthogonal complement  $M^\perp$  is a quotient submodule, whose module action is given by

$$q \cdot h := q(S_1, \dots, S_n)h,$$

where  $S_i = P_{M^\perp} T_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ . For a holomorphic polynomial  $q \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]$ , denote  $S_q$  by

$$S_q := q(S_1, \dots, S_n) = P_{M^\perp} q(T_1, \dots, T_n). \quad (3.1)$$

The following two operator identities are elementary, which can be immediately verified by direct calculations.

**Lemma 3.1.** Let  $U, V, W$  be bounded operators on a Banach space, then the following hold.

- (1)  $[UV, W] = U[V, W] + [U, W]V$ .
- (2) If  $U$  is invertible, then

$$[U^{-m}, V] = U^{-m}[V, U^m]U^{-m} = U^{-(m+1)}[U, V] - U^{-(m+1)}[U^{m+1}, V]U^{-m},$$

for every integer  $m \geq 0$ .

**Proposition 3.2.** The following are equivalent.

- (1)  $[S_i, S_j^*] \in \mathcal{L}^p$  for all  $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ .
- (2)  $[S_h, S_q^*] \in \mathcal{L}^p$  for all  $h, q \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]$ .

*Proof.* It comes from (1) of Lemma 3.1 and the mathematical induction.  $\square$

For a bounded commuting operator tuple  $T = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$  on a Hilbert space  $H$ , denote  $Sp(T)$  by its Taylor spectrum, which is a nonempty compact subset of the closed polydisc  $\Delta_T = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : |z_i| \leq r(T_i), i = 1, \dots, n\}$ , where  $r(T_i) = \lim_m \|T_i^m\|_m^{\frac{1}{m}}$  is the spectral radius of  $T_i$ , see the following Section 6 for the explicit definition of the Taylor spectrum. Let  $B(H)$  be the set of bounded linear operators and  $\mathcal{O}(Sp(T))$  be the set of holomorphic functions on some neighborhoods of the compact set  $Sp(T)$ , then there exists a unique continuous algebraic homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}(Sp(T)) &\rightarrow (T)'' \subset B(H), \\ f &\mapsto f(T), \end{aligned}$$

which satisfies

$$\mathbf{1}(T) = \text{Id}, z_i(T) = T_i, i = 1, \dots, n,$$

and the following spectral mapping theorem, where  $(T)''$  is the bicommutant of the algebra generated by the tuple  $T$ . It is called the Taylor functional calculus [27]. Suppose that  $f = (f_1, \dots, f_m) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^m$  is a holomorphic map,  $Sp(T) \subset \Omega$  and denote

$f(T) = (f_1(T), \dots, f_m(T))$  which is also a commuting bounded operator tuple, then the spectral mapping theorem holds:

$$f(Sp(T)) = Sp(f(T)).$$

The existence of the Taylor functional calculus is proved in [27] by means of Cauchy-Weil formulas and its proof is rather involved. In what follows, we will provide a simpler integral formula of the Taylor functional calculus when the holomorphic function belongs to the Hardy space on the bounded symmetric domain. We first briefly recall the definition of the Hardy space. The Hardy space  $H^2(\Omega)$  consists of all holomorphic functions on  $\Omega$  satisfying

$$\sup_{R \rightarrow 1^-} \int_{\mathcal{S}} |f(Rw)|^2 d\sigma(w) < \infty,$$

where  $\mathcal{S}$  is the Shilov boundary of  $\Omega$  with normalized  $K$ -invariant Haar measure  $d\sigma$ . There exists a canonical unitary isomorphism between  $H^2(\Omega)$  and a closed subspace  $H^2(\mathcal{S})$  of  $L^2(\mathcal{S}, d\sigma)$ , see [33, Corollary 2.8.47] for details. Thus we identify  $H^2(\Omega)$  with  $H^2(\mathcal{S})$ . And Szegő kernel of  $\Omega$  is given by

$$S(z, \xi) = \Delta(z, w)^{-\frac{n}{r}}, \quad (z, w) \in \Omega \times \mathcal{S}.$$

Denote  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$  by the set of holomorphic functions on some neighborhoods of  $\bar{\Omega}$ . Then the following integral formula of the Taylor functional calculus over the Hardy space holds.

**Lemma 3.3.** Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  be an irreducible bounded symmetric domain with rank  $r$  satisfying  $Sp(T) \subset \Omega$ . Then for every  $f \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ , the following integral formula holds,

$$f(T) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} \frac{f(w)}{\Delta(T, w)^{\frac{n}{r}}} d\sigma(w). \quad (3.2)$$

*Proof.* By the spectral mapping theorem, it yields  $Sp \Delta(T, w) = \Delta(Sp(T), w)$ , for every  $w \in \mathcal{S} \subset \partial\Omega$ . Note by [26, Section 7.5] that  $\Delta(z, \xi) \neq 0$  for the pair  $(z, \xi) \in Z \times Z$  whenever the spectrum norm satisfying  $\|z\| \cdot \|\xi\| < 1$ . It follows that  $0 \notin Sp \Delta(T, w)$ , thus the map  $\Delta(T, w)$  is invertible on the Shilov boundary  $\mathcal{S}$ . Combining with the formula (2.5) and the uniqueness of the Taylor expansion of analytic functions, it implies that

$$\Delta(z, w)^{-\lambda} = \sum_{m \geq 0} (\lambda)_m K_m(z, w)$$

converges compactly and absolutely on the circular domain  $t\Omega \times t^{-1}\Omega$  for every  $t > 0$ , where  $t\Omega = \{tz : z \in \Omega\}$ . Thus, by the continuity and uniqueness of the Taylor functional calculus, it implies that for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\Delta(T, w)^{-\lambda} = \sum_{m \geq 0} (\lambda)_m K_m(T, w) \quad (3.3)$$

for every  $w \in \mathcal{S}$ , and the convergence is uniform on  $\mathcal{S}$  as the compactness of  $\mathcal{S}$ . Let  $f = \sum_{m \geq 0} f_m$  be the Peter-Schmid-Weyl decomposition of  $f$ , clearly, the convergence

is compactly on  $\Omega \cup \mathcal{S}$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
f(T) &= \sum_{m \geq 0} f_m(T) \\
&= \sum_{m \geq 0} \int_{\mathcal{S}} f_m(w) \left(\frac{n}{r}\right)_m K_m(T, w) d\sigma(w) \\
&= \sum_{m \geq 0} \int_{\mathcal{S}} f(w) \left(\frac{n}{r}\right)_m K_m(T, w) d\sigma(w) \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{S}} f(w) \sum_{m \geq 0} \left(\frac{n}{r}\right)_m K_m(T, w) d\sigma(w) \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{S}} \frac{f(w)}{\Delta(T, w)^{\frac{n}{r}}} d\sigma(w).
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete.  $\square$

**Example 3.4.** (1) Let  $\Omega = \mathbb{B}^n$  be the open unit ball of rank 1 in the usual Euclidian norm, the integral formula (3.2) becomes to

$$f(T) = \int_{\partial \mathbb{B}^n} \frac{f(w)}{(1 - \langle T, w \rangle)^n} d\sigma(w)$$

for every  $f \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathbb{B}}^n)$

(2) If the compact set  $\Delta_T \subset \Omega$ , then the Dunford-Riesz functional calculus for a single operator is enough for our purposes. We now give a brief explanation. Since  $Sp(T) \subset \Delta_T \subset \Omega$ , there exist polydiscs  $\Delta_r = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : |z_i| < r_i, i = 1, \dots, n\}$  and  $\Delta_{r'} = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : |z_i| < r'_i, i = 1, \dots, n\}$  such that

$$\Delta_T \subsetneq \Delta_r \subset \bar{\Delta}_r \subset \Delta_{r'} \subset \bar{\Delta}_{r'} \subset \Omega.$$

Note that a holomorphic function on a circular domain containing the origin has a homogeneous holomorphic polynomial expansion which converges compactly, combining with the continuity and uniqueness of the Taylor functional calculus, it implies that

$$f(T) = \frac{1}{(2\pi\sqrt{-1})^n} \int_{|\xi_1|=r_1} \cdots \int_{|\xi_n|=r_n} \frac{d\xi_1}{\xi_1 - T_1} \cdots \frac{d\xi_n}{\xi_n - T_n} f(\xi)$$

for  $f \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$ , where the right side repeatedly uses the Cauchy integral formula.

In the following, we prove a local extension property of the biholomorphic automorphism on bounded symmetric domains. Suppose that  $\Omega_1, \Omega_2$  are two domains, we say that  $\phi : \bar{\Omega}_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2$  is holomorphic if  $\phi$  is the restriction of a holomorphic map from an open neighborhood of  $\bar{\Omega}_1$  to  $\Omega_2$ , namely there exists an open set  $U \supset \bar{\Omega}_1$  and a holomorphic map  $\tilde{\phi} : U \rightarrow \Omega_2$  satisfying  $\tilde{\phi}|_{\bar{\Omega}_1} = \phi$ . We also say that  $\phi : \bar{\Omega}_1 \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}_2$  is biholomorphic if  $\phi$  is the restriction of a biholomorphism between neighborhoods of  $\bar{\Omega}_1, \bar{\Omega}_2$ . The following lemma shows that every biholomorphic automorphism on  $\Omega$  is actually a biholomorphism on  $\bar{\Omega}$ .

**Lemma 3.5.** If  $\phi \in \text{Aut}(\Omega)$ , then  $\phi : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}$  is biholomorphic.

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we suppose  $\phi(0) = z_0$ . Note that  $g_{z_0}(w) = z_0 + B(z_0, z_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} w^{-z_0}$  satisfying  $g_{z_0}(0) = z_0$ , where  $z^\xi = B(z, \xi)^{-1}(z - \{z\xi^*z\})$  is the quasi-inverse of the pair  $(z, \xi) \in \Omega \times \Omega$ . Thus  $g_{z_0}^{-1} \circ \phi \in \text{Aut}(\Omega)$  and  $g_{z_0}^{-1} \circ \phi(0) = 0$ ,

it means that  $g_{z_0}^{-1} \circ \phi \in K$ . It indeed shows that the biholomorphic automorphism  $\phi$  admits the factorization  $\phi = g_{z_0} \circ k$  where  $k \in K$ . Suppose  $z_0 \neq \mathbf{0}$ , denote the open ball  $\Omega_{z_0}$  by  $\Omega_{z_0} := \{\|z\| < \frac{1}{\|z_0\|}\} \supset \bar{\Omega}$ . Note that  $k \in K \subset GL(Z)$  is linear and  $k(\Omega) = \Omega$ , thus  $k(\Omega_{z_0}) = \Omega_{z_0}$ . It suffices to show that  $g_{z_0}$  is biholomorphic on  $\Omega_{z_0} = \{\|z\| < \frac{1}{\|z_0\|}\} \supset \bar{\Omega}$  by the holomorphic version of the inverse function theorem. To show that  $g_{z_0}$  is biholomorphic on  $\Omega_{z_0}$ , it is enough to show that the Jacobi matrix  $g'_{z_0}$  of  $g_{z_0}(z) = z_0 + B(z_0, z_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} z^{-z_0}$  is nondegenerate on  $\Omega_{z_0}$ . By [24, Formula (2.18)], we conclude that

$$g'_{z_0}(z) = B(z_0, z_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} B(z, -z_0)$$

for  $z \in \Omega_{z_0}$ . Then the quasi-invertibility of  $z^{-z_0}$  on  $\Omega_{z_0}$  implies that  $g'_{z_0}$  is nondegenerate on  $\Omega_{z_0}$ . The remaining case of  $z_0 = \mathbf{0}$  is trivial, since in this case  $\phi = k \in K$ , which is biholomorphic on every open set  $t\Omega = \{tz : z \in \Omega\} \supset \bar{\Omega}$  for  $t > 1$ .  $\square$

**Example 3.6.** In the case of  $\Omega = \mathbb{B}^n$  the open unit ball of rank 1 in the usual Euclidian norm, we can obtain more than Lemma 3.5. Let  $\mathbf{0} \neq z_0 \in \mathbb{B}^n$ , it is easy to see that the map  $g_{z_0}$  is in fact holomorphic on  $|z_0|^{-1}\mathbb{B}^n$ . Denote  $r_{z_0} = \frac{1}{2}(|z_0| + \frac{1}{|z_0|})$ . Clearly,  $1 < r_{z_0} < \frac{1}{|z_0|}$ . By the well-known formula

$$1 - |g_{z_0}(z)|^2 = \frac{(1 - |z_0|^2)(1 - |z|^2)}{|1 - \langle z, z_0 \rangle|^2}$$

for every  $z \in |z_0|^{-1}\mathbb{B}^n$ , it follows that the open set  $g_{z_0}(r_{z_0}\mathbb{B}^n)$  satisfying

$$\bar{\mathbb{B}}^n \subset g_{z_0}(r_{z_0}\mathbb{B}^n) \subset |z_0|^{-1}\mathbb{B}^n,$$

and moreover, the map

$$g_{z_0} : r_{z_0}\mathbb{B}^n \rightarrow g_{z_0}(r_{z_0}\mathbb{B}^n)$$

is biholomorphic.

We now provide the following composition law for the Taylor functional calculus on irreducible bounded symmetric domains.

**Lemma 3.7.** Suppose that  $Sp(T) \subset \Omega_1$  and  $g : \bar{\Omega}_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2$  is a holomorphic map between two irreducible bounded symmetric domains. If  $f : \bar{\Omega}_2 \rightarrow \Omega_3$  is a holomorphic map, then

$$(f \circ g)(T) = f(g(T)).$$

*Proof.* It suffices to prove the scalar case that  $f$  is a holomorphic function. Note that the compact set  $Sp(T) \subset \Omega_1$  and  $g(\Omega_1) \subset \Omega_2$ , it follows from the spectral mapping theorem that

$$Sp(g(T)) = g(Sp(T)) \subset \Omega_2.$$

Let  $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2$  be the Shilov boundaries of  $\Omega_1, \Omega_2$ , respectively. Since  $f \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega}_2)$  and every component of  $g$  belongs to  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega}_1)$ , it follows from the integral formula (3.2) and

Fubini's theorem that

$$\begin{aligned}
f(g(T)) &= \int_{\mathcal{S}_2} f(w) \Delta_2(g(T), w)^{-\frac{n_2}{r_2}} d\sigma_2(w) \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{S}_2} f(w) d\sigma_2(w) \int_{\mathcal{S}_1} \Delta_2(g(z), w)^{-\frac{n_2}{r_2}} \Delta_1(T, z)^{-\frac{n_1}{r_1}} d\sigma_1(z) \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{S}_1} \Delta_1(T, z)^{-\frac{n_1}{r_1}} d\sigma_1(z) \int_{\mathcal{S}_2} f(w) \Delta_2(g(z), w)^{-\frac{n_2}{r_2}} d\sigma_2(w) \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{S}_1} f(g(z)) \Delta_1(T, z)^{-\frac{n_1}{r_1}} d\sigma_1(z) \\
&= (f \circ g)(T),
\end{aligned}$$

where  $n_1, n_2$  (resp.  $r_1, r_2$ ) are the complex dimension (resp. rank) of domains  $\Omega_1, \Omega_2$ , respectively. The second equality comes from the fact that if the irreducible bounded symmetric domain  $\Omega_1 \supset Sp(T)$  and  $h \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega}_1)$  is invertible then  $h(T)$  is invertible and its inverse is  $h(T)^{-1} = \int_{\mathcal{S}_1} h(z)^{-1} \Delta_1(T, z)^{-\frac{n_1}{r_1}} d\sigma_1(z)$ . That finishes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 3.8.** The composition law for Taylor functional calculus actually holds in more general case, see for instance [28], however the current form is enough for our application.

For every  $c > 0$  and  $d \in \mathbb{C}^n$ , we see that they determine a linear transformation of the operator tuple  $T = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$  on the Hilbert space  $H$  in the form of  $cT + d$ , such a linear transformation is called permissive for the triple  $(\Omega, H, T)$ , if the compact set

$$Sp(cT + d) = c \cdot Sp(T) + d \subset \bar{\Omega}. \quad (3.4)$$

For a given triple  $(\Omega, H, T)$ , there always exist infinitely many permissive linear transformations. In the sequel, we will use the notation  $\hat{T} = (\hat{T}_1, \dots, \hat{T}_n)$  to stand for an arbitrary permissive linear transformation for a given triple  $(\Omega, H, T)$ .

**Theorem 1.** Suppose  $\phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)$  is an arbitrary biholomorphic automorphism on an irreducible bounded symmetric domain  $\Omega$ , then the following are equivalent.

- (1)  $(M^\perp, S)$  is  $p$ -essentially normal.
- (2)  $(M^\perp, \hat{S})$  is  $p$ -essentially normal.
- (3)  $(M^\perp, \phi(\hat{S}))$  is  $p$ -essentially normal.

Where  $\hat{S}$  is an arbitrary permissive linear transformation for the triple  $(\Omega, M^\perp, S)$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $\hat{S} = cS + d$ , where  $c > 0$  and  $d = (d_1, \dots, d_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ . Then

$$[\hat{S}_i, \hat{S}_j^*] = [cS_i + d_i, cS_j^* + \bar{d}_j] = c^2[S_i, S_j^*],$$

for all  $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ . It implies the equivalence between (1) and (2).

It remains to prove the equivalence of (2) and (3). We first prove that (2) implies (3). Since  $\Omega$  is an irreducible bounded symmetric domain whose rank is denoted by  $r$ , it implies from Lemma 3.5 that every component function  $\phi_i$  of the biholomorphic automorphism  $\phi$  belongs to  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ . Applying the integral formula of Taylor functional calculus (3.2) to holomorphic functions  $\phi_i \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ , it implies that

$$\phi_i(\hat{S}) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} \phi_i(z) \Delta(\hat{S}, z)^{-\frac{n}{r}} \sigma(z), \quad (3.5)$$

where  $\Delta(\widehat{S}, z)$  is invertible in  $B(M^\perp)$  for  $z \in \mathcal{S}$ . It follows from (2.3) and the multiplication property of Taylor functional calculus that

$$\Delta(\widehat{S}, z)^{-\frac{a}{r}} = \Delta(\widehat{S}, z)^{-(1+b)} \Delta(\widehat{S}, z)^{-\frac{a}{2}(r-1)}.$$

Since  $\frac{a}{2}(r-1) \in \mathcal{F}$ , it implies by the following Lemma 3.9 that  $\Delta(\widehat{S}, z)^{-\frac{a}{2}(r-1)}$  is a polynomial of  $\widehat{S}, \bar{z}$ . On the other hand, it follows from Lemma 3.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} [\Delta(\widehat{S}, z)^{-\frac{a}{r}}, \widehat{S}_j^*] &= [\Delta(\widehat{S}, z)^{-(1+b)} \Delta(\widehat{S}, z)^{-\frac{a}{2}(r-1)}, \widehat{S}_j^*] \\ &= \Delta(\widehat{S}, z)^{-(1+b)} [\Delta(\widehat{S}, z)^{-\frac{a}{2}(r-1)}, \widehat{S}_j^*] + [\Delta(\widehat{S}, z)^{-(1+b)}, \widehat{S}_j^*] \Delta(\widehat{S}, z)^{-\frac{a}{2}(r-1)} \\ &= V_1 + V_2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} V_1 &= \Delta(\widehat{S}, z)^{-(1+b)} [\Delta(\widehat{S}, z)^{-\frac{a}{2}(r-1)}, \widehat{S}_j^*], \\ V_2 &= -\Delta(\widehat{S}, z)^{-(1+b)} [\Delta(\widehat{S}, z)^{1+b}, \widehat{S}_j^*] \Delta(\widehat{S}, z)^{-(1+b)} \Delta(\widehat{S}, z)^{-\frac{a}{2}(r-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then  $z \mapsto \phi_i(z) [\Delta(\widehat{S}, z)^{-\frac{a}{r}}, \widehat{S}_j^*] \in \mathcal{L}^p$  is continuous on  $\mathcal{S}$  by Proposition 3.2, for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Thus  $[\phi_i(\widehat{S}), \widehat{S}_j^*] \in \mathcal{L}^p$  by the formula (3.5), for all  $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ . Observe that an operator belongs to Schatten class  $\mathcal{L}^p$  if and only if its adjoint belongs to Schatten class  $\mathcal{L}^p$ . It follows that

$$[\widehat{S}_j, \phi_i(\widehat{S})^*] = [\phi_i(\widehat{S}), \widehat{S}_j^*]^* \in \mathcal{L}^p.$$

Similarly, by using of the integral formula of Taylor functional calculus (3.2) again, we conclude that

$$[\phi_i(\widehat{S}), \phi_j(\widehat{S})^*] = [\phi_j(\widehat{S}), \phi_i(\widehat{S})^*]^* \in \mathcal{L}^p,$$

for all  $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ . Thus (2) implies (3).

Similarly, the same argument for  $\phi^{-1}$  and the commuting operator tuple  $\phi(\widehat{S}) = (\phi_1(\widehat{S}), \dots, \phi_n(\widehat{S}))$  implies that  $[\phi^{-1}_i(\phi(\widehat{S})), \phi^{-1}_j(\phi(\widehat{S}))^*] \in \mathcal{L}^p$  if  $[\phi_i(\widehat{S}), \phi_j(\widehat{S})^*] \in \mathcal{L}^p$ . Then Lemma 3.7 shows that

$$[\widehat{S}_i, \widehat{S}_j^*] = [\phi^{-1}_i(\phi(\widehat{S})), \phi^{-1}_j(\phi(\widehat{S}))^*] \in \mathcal{L}^p,$$

for all  $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ . This proves that (3) implies (2), and the proof is complete.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.9.** Let  $\mathcal{F} = \{j = \frac{a}{2}(l-1) - k : 1 \leq l \leq r, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be a real subset related to  $\Omega$ , where  $\mathbb{N}$  is the set of all nonnegative integers. Then the following are equivalent.

- (1)  $\lambda \in \mathcal{F}$ .
- (2)  $\Delta(z, w)^{-\lambda}$  is a polynomial in  $z, \bar{w}$ .
- (3)  $(\lambda)_m = 0$  for all but finitely many integer partitions  $\mathbf{m} \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* The equivalence of (1) and (3) can be directly verified by the formula (2.4). The equivalence of (2) and (3) comes from the formula (2.5) and the uniqueness of the Taylor expansion of analytic functions.  $\square$

We remark here that the set  $\mathcal{F}$  is introduced in [12], which completely characterizes the finite rank Bergman-type operators.

Similarly, the same is also true for the submodule  $(M, T)$ .

**Corollary 3.10.** Suppose  $\phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)$  is an arbitrary biholomorphic automorphism on a pseudoconvex domain  $\Omega$ , then the following are equivalent.



- (1)  $(M, T)$  is  $p$ -essentially normal.
- (2)  $(M, \widehat{T})$  is  $p$ -essentially normal.
- (3)  $(M, \phi(\widehat{T}))$  is  $p$ -essentially normal.

#### 4. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 2

This section is mainly devoted to prove Theorem 2, which shows the  $p$ -essential normality of submodules and quotient submodules determined by analytic varieties in the setting of weighted Bergman modules are invariant under biholomorphic automorphisms on irreducible bounded symmetric domains.

Let  $\Omega$  be an irreducible bounded symmetric domain in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$  be the set of holomorphic functions on some neighborhoods of  $\bar{\Omega}$ . We now briefly explain why  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$  is called an algebra. Two functions  $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$  are said to be equivalent if there exists an open neighborhood  $D \supset \bar{\Omega}$  such that the restrictions of  $f_1, f_2$  on  $D$  are equal, i.e.,  $f_1|_D = f_2|_D$ , which is denoted by  $f_1 \sim f_2$  and its equivalence class is denoted by  $[f_1]$ . Suppose  $f_1$  is holomorphic on  $D_1 \supset \bar{\Omega}$  and  $f_2$  is holomorphic on  $D_2 \supset \bar{\Omega}$ , where  $D_1, D_2$  are open. We can define three binary operations for equivalence classes as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} [f_1] + [f_2] &:= [f_1|_{D_1 \cap D_2} + f_2|_{D_1 \cap D_2}], \\ [f_1] \cdot [f_2] &:= [f_1|_{D_1 \cap D_2} \cdot f_2|_{D_1 \cap D_2}], \\ c \cdot [f_1] &:= [cf_1], \quad \forall c \in \mathbb{C}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

It clearly that the definitions in (4.1) are well defined. Thus  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})/\sim$  becomes a complex unit algebra under the operations in (4.1). Note that  $[\mathbf{1}]$  is its unit where  $\mathbf{1}$  is the constant function valued 1 in a neighborhood of  $\bar{\Omega}$ . We see that  $[f]$  is invertible in  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})/\sim$  if and only if  $[f]$  has a representative which has no zeros in  $\bar{\Omega}$ , and its inverse is denoted by  $[f]^{-1}$ . By abuse of notation, we continue to write  $f, \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$  instead of  $[f], \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})/\sim$ , respectively, and we also write  $f^{-1}$  instead of  $[f]^{-1}$  if  $[f]$  is invertible. In fact,  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$  is the inductive limit of the sets of sections of the holomorphic function sheaf on  $\mathbb{C}^n$  over the open sets contain  $\bar{\Omega}$ . The Noetherianess of  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$  comes from that every bounded symmetric domain has a pseudoconvex (or Stein) neighborhood basis (see Remark 4.4 below) and a deep result due to Frisch and Siu [31]. We point out here that the Noetherian holomorphic function algebra  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{D})$  which satisfies the Hilbert Nullstellensatz with various topologies has been considered when  $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  is a bounded strongly pseudoconvex domain of real analytic boundary, see for instance [15]. However, in our current case of the bounded symmetric domain, although we do not explicitly mention, we essentially work only in the uniform topology of the Noetherian holomorphic function algebra. Recall that  $A^2(dv_\gamma)$  is the weighted Bergman space with respect to the probability measure  $dv_\gamma, \gamma > -1$  on  $\Omega$ . We can equip  $A^2(dv_\gamma)$  with a natural  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -module structure by the multiplication of functions, namely

$$f \cdot h := f|_\Omega h,$$

for every  $f \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$  and  $h \in A^2(dv_\gamma)$ , which is well defined. Let  $M$  be an  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -submodule and  $M^\perp$  be its orthogonal complement, we denote the operator  $S_f : M^\perp \rightarrow$

$M^\perp$  with symbol  $f \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega)$  by

$$S_f h := P_{M^\perp} M_f h = P_{M^\perp}(fh), \quad (4.2)$$

for every  $h \in M^\perp$ , where  $\mathcal{A}(\Omega)$  is the set of bounded holomorphic functions on  $\Omega$ ,  $M_f$  is the multiplication operator on  $A^2(dv_\gamma)$  with symbol  $f$ , and  $P_{M^\perp} : A^2(dv_\gamma) \rightarrow P_{M^\perp}$  is the orthogonal projection. This coincides with the definition (3.1) when  $T = (M_{z_1}, \dots, M_{z_n})$  is the coordinate multipliers and  $f$  is a polynomial, and in this case  $S_i = S_{z_i}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . The following lemma implies that  $M^\perp$  is an  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -submodule, whose module actions are given by

$$f \cdot h := S_f h,$$

for every  $h \in M^\perp$  and  $f \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** Suppose  $f, g \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ , then the following operator identity holds on  $M^\perp$ ,

$$S_{fg} = S_f S_g.$$

*Proof.* Suppose  $h \in M^\perp$ , by definition we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S_f S_g h &= P_{M^\perp}(f P_{M^\perp}(gh)) \\ &= P_{M^\perp}(f((\text{Id} - P_M)(gh))) \\ &= P_{M^\perp}(fgh) - P_{M^\perp}(f(P_M(gh))) \\ &= S_{fg} h, \end{aligned}$$

where  $P_M : A^2(dv_\gamma) \rightarrow P_M$  is the orthogonal projection. The third identity holds because that  $M$  is an  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -module.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.2.** If  $f \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$  and has no zeros in  $\bar{\Omega}$ , then  $S_f$  is invertible on  $M^\perp$  and its inverse is

$$S_f^{-1} = S_{f^{-1}}.$$

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we can suppose that  $f$  is holomorphic on an open set  $D \supset \bar{\Omega}$ . Note that the set  $D_f = \{z \in D : f(z) \neq 0\}$  is open, and the assumption means that  $\bar{\Omega} \subset D_f$ . Thus  $f$  is invertible on  $D_f$  and its inverse  $f^{-1} \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ . Combining with Lemma 4.1, it follows the desired operator identity.  $\square$

It is clear that a closed subset of  $A^2(dv_\gamma)$  is a  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]$ -module if it is an  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -module, Corollary 4.2 indicates that the  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -module action is more abundant than  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]$ -module action, since a nonconstant polynomial is not invertible in the polynomial algebra  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]$ . Even so, the following proposition shows that the above two notions of weighted Bergman submodules (and quotient submodules) are in fact coincide on bounded symmetric domains.

**Proposition 4.3.** Suppose that  $\Omega$  is an irreducible bounded symmetric domain in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and  $M$  is a closed subset of  $A^2(dv_\gamma)$ , then the following hold.

- (1)  $M$  is a  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]$ -module if and only if  $M$  is an  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -module.
- (2) Moreover,  $M^\perp$  is a quotient submodule over the algebra  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]$  if and only if  $M^\perp$  is a quotient submodule over the algebra  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ .

*Proof.* (1) The sufficiency part is clear, it is enough to prove the necessity part. Suppose that  $M$  is a  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]$ -module of  $A^2(dv_\gamma)$  and  $f \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ , we have to prove that  $f \cdot g = f|_\Omega g \in M$  for every  $g \in M$ . Since  $f \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ , there exists an open set  $D$  which contains the compact set  $\bar{\Omega}$  such that  $f$  is holomorphic on  $D$ . Observe that the open set  $\Omega$  is the unit ball in the spectral norm, and the topology induced by the spectral norm is coincide with the topology induced by the usual Euclidian norm. Combining with the Lebesgue number lemma, it follows that there exists a  $\delta > 0$  satisfying

$$\Omega \subsetneq (1 + \delta)\Omega \subsetneq (1 + \delta)\bar{\Omega} \subsetneq D. \quad (4.3)$$

Note that  $(1 + \delta)\Omega$  is a circular domain containing the origin, it implies that  $f \in \mathcal{O}(D) \subset \mathcal{O}((1 + \delta)\Omega)$  has a homogeneous expansion

$$f(z) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} f_i(z) \quad (4.4)$$

on the domain  $(1 + \delta)\Omega$  where each  $f_i$  is  $i$ -homogeneous holomorphic polynomial, which converges compactly on  $(1 + \delta)\Omega$ . Hence the expansion (4.4) converges uniformly on  $\Omega$  since  $\Omega \subsetneq \bar{\Omega} \subsetneq (1 + \delta)\Omega$ . Thus

$$f \cdot g = \lim_i \sum_{j=0}^i f_j \cdot g = \lim_i \sum_{j=0}^i f_j g \in M, \quad (4.5)$$

as  $M$  is closed in  $A^2(dv_\gamma)$ .

(2) It is also enough to prove the necessity part. Since  $M^\perp$  is a quotient submodule over the algebra  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]$  of  $A^2(dv_\gamma)$ , it implies that  $M$  is a  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]$ -submodule of  $A^2(dv_\gamma)$ . It follows from (1) that  $M$  is an  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -submodule of  $A^2(dv_\gamma)$ . Hence  $M^\perp$  is a quotient submodule over the algebra  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ . □

**Remark 4.4.** (1) In the proof of Proposition 4.3, we prove and use the fact that every bounded symmetric domain has a neighborhood basis of bounded symmetric domains and especially a pseudoconvex (or Stein) neighborhood basis. The same is true on strongly pseudoconvex domains, however it is false for pseudoconvex domains in general, see [6] and references therein.

(2) For a moment, we will reinterpret Proposition 4.3 from the point of view of category. Denote  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]$ -Bmod by the category of weighted Bergman modules on  $\Omega$ , whose objects are submodules and quotient submodules of weighted Bergman module  $A^2(dv_\gamma)$  over the algebra  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]$  for some  $\gamma > -1$  and morphisms are continuous  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]$ -module homomorphisms. Similarly,  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -Bmod is denoted by the category of weighted Bergman modules on  $\Omega$ , whose objects are submodules and quotient submodules of weighted Bergman module  $A^2(dv_\gamma)$  over the algebra  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$  for some  $\gamma > -1$  and morphisms are continuous  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -module homomorphisms. Let  $M_1 \xrightarrow{\varphi} M_2$  be a morphism in  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]$ -Bmod. Then Proposition 4.3 implies that  $M_1, M_2$  are two objects in  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -Bmod. Moreover, since  $\varphi$  is continuous, combining with (4.5) follows that

$M_1 \xrightarrow{\varphi} M_2$  is actually a morphism in  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})\text{-Bmod}$ . That introduces a functor  $\iota$  satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \iota : \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]\text{-Bmod} &\rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})\text{-Bmod}, \\ M_1 \xrightarrow{\varphi} M_2 &\xrightarrow{\iota} M_1 \xrightarrow{\varphi} M_2. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})\text{-Bmod}$  is a subcategory of  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]\text{-Bmod}$  in general, whose injection functor is denoted by  $\tau$ . Then by the direct check shows that  $\iota\tau = \text{Id}$  and  $\tau\iota = \text{Id}$ . The above shows that if  $\Omega$  is an irreducible bounded symmetric domain then

$$\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]\text{-Bmod} = \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})\text{-Bmod}$$

and  $\iota$  is the identity functor (or an isomorphism). As an application, we deduce that  $(M_i, d_i)$  is a chain complex in the category  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]\text{-Bmod}$  if and only if  $(M_i, d_i) = (\iota(M_i), \iota(d_i))$  is a chain complex in the category  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})\text{-Bmod}$ . And in this case  $\iota$  induces the identity (or isomorphism) of homology groups. Especially,  $(M_i, d_i)$  is a resolution of finite length of the module  $M$  in  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]\text{-Bmod}$  if and only if  $(M_i, d_i)$  is a resolution of finite length of the module  $M$  in  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})\text{-Bmod}$ , see [14] for the definition of resolution.

Note that the operator problems we concerned is independent on the choice of the two above module categories, thus in the sequel, we will consider the  $p$ -essential normality problems in the context of  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -modules rather than  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]$ -modules. Suppose  $V$  is an analytic variety in  $\Omega$ , as we mention above, which can be globally defined, namely there exist finitely many holomorphic functions  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$  satisfying

$$V = \{z \in \Omega : f_1(z) = \dots = f_m(z) = 0\}.$$

We denote  $M_V$  by

$$M_V := \{f \in A^2(dv_\gamma) : f(z) = 0, \forall z \in V\}, \quad (4.6)$$

Since evaluation functionals are continuous on  $A^2(dv_\gamma)$ , it implies that  $M_V$  is an  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -submodule of  $A^2(dv_\gamma)$ . If we further assume all  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ , then  $V$  can be naturally extended to an open neighborhood of  $\bar{\Omega}$ , this is the most considered case in the analytic version of the Geometric Arveson-Douglas Conjecture [17, 22, 35, 36]. Suppose  $\tilde{V}$  is an analytic variety on the closure  $\bar{\Omega}$ , namely there exists a neighborhood  $D$  of  $\bar{\Omega}$  such that  $\tilde{V}$  is an analytic variety in  $D$ . where  $V = \tilde{V} \cap \Omega$ . If all  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ , then  $M_V$  is nontrivial whenever  $V$  is proper in  $\Omega$ .

Let  $\phi : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2$  be a holomorphic map between two bounded symmetric domains. The pull back of functions by the holomorphic map  $\phi$  is given by

$$\phi^* : \mathcal{O}(\Omega_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\Omega_1), \quad f \mapsto \phi^*(f) = f \circ \phi,$$

which is a complex algebraic (module) homomorphism and especially a linear operator. The measure  $dv_\gamma$  can also be pulled back by the holomorphic map  $\phi$ , which is defined by

$$\phi^*(dv_\gamma)(w) := c_\gamma \Delta(\phi(w), \phi(w))^\gamma dv(\phi(w)).$$

When  $\phi : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2$  is biholomorphic, then  $\phi^* : A^2(\Omega_2, dv_\gamma) \rightarrow A^2(\Omega_1, \phi^*(dv_\gamma))$  is a unitary operator. Not to be confused with the concept of adjoint of an operator. Let  $M$  be an  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega}_1)$ -submodule of  $A^2(\Omega_1, dv_\gamma)$  which is determined by an analytic variety. In this case, the pull back  $\phi^*(M) = \{\phi^*(f) : f \in M\}$  is an  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega}_2)$ -submodule of

$A^2(\Omega_2, \phi^*(dv_\gamma))$ , which is determined by the analytic variety  $\phi^{-1}(V) = \{\phi^{-1}(z) : z \in V\}$ . Moreover,  $\phi^*(M)$  is unitarily equivalent to  $M$ . Then the pull back  $\phi^*(M^\perp)$  is a quotient submodule and unitarily equivalent to  $M^\perp$ , which implies that

$$\phi^*P_{M^\perp} = P_{\phi^*(M^\perp)}\phi^*. \quad (4.7)$$

**Proposition 4.5.** Suppose that  $\phi : (\Omega_1, w) \rightarrow (\Omega_2, z)$  is a biholomorphism with  $z = \phi(w)$ , and let  $M$  be a submodule of  $A^2(\Omega_2, dv_\gamma)$  determined by an analytic variety, then the following hold.

- (1)  $M_{z_i}^M = (\phi^*)^{-1}M_{\phi_i(w)}^{\phi^*(M)}\phi^*$ .
- (2)  $S_{z_i}^{M^\perp} = (\phi^*)^{-1}S_{\phi_i(w)}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)}\phi^*$ .

*Proof.* (1) Let  $f \in M$ . Since  $\phi^*$  is an algebraic homomorphism and  $\phi^*(z_i) = w_i$ , it follows that

$$\phi^*(z_i f) = \phi^*(z_i)\phi^*(f) = \phi_i(w)\phi^*(f) \in \phi^*(M),$$

which implies

$$\phi^*M_{z_i} = M_{\phi_i(w)}\phi^*,$$

i.e.,  $M_{z_i} = (\phi^*)^{-1}M_{\phi_i(w)}\phi^*$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .

(2) Similarly, combining with (4.7), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^*S_{z_i}^{M^\perp}f &= \phi^*P_{M^\perp}M_{z_i}f \\ &= \phi^*P_{M^\perp}(\phi^*)^{-1}\phi^*M_{z_i}f \\ &= \phi^*P_{M^\perp}(\phi^*)^{-1}\phi^*(z_i f) \\ &= \phi^*P_{M^\perp}(\phi^*)^{-1}\phi_i(w)\phi^*f \\ &= P_{\phi^*(M^\perp)}\phi_i(w)\phi^*f \end{aligned}$$

for every  $f \in M^\perp$  and  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Thus  $S_{z_i}^{M^\perp} = (\phi^*)^{-1}S_{\phi_i(w)}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)}\phi^*$ . □

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 2, we first prove it in a spacial case.

**Lemma 4.6.** Let  $\Omega$  be an irreducible bounded symmetric domain in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and  $M$  be a weighted Bergman submodule determined by an analytic variety. Suppose that  $\phi : (\Omega, w) \rightarrow (\Omega, z)$  is a linear automorphism that is  $\phi \in K$ , then  $(\phi^*(M^\perp), S_w)$  is  $p$ -essentially normal if and only if  $(M^\perp, S_z)$  is  $p$ -essentially normal.

*Proof.* Since  $\phi : (\Omega, w) \rightarrow (\Omega, z)$  is a linear automorphism, without loss of generality, we can assume  $z_i = \phi_i(w) = a_i^j w_j$ , where  $(a_i^j)$  is an invertible matrix and the Einstein summation convention is adopted. It follows from Proposition 4.5 that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^*[S_{z_i}^{M^\perp}, S_{z_j}^{M^\perp}] (\phi^*)^{-1} &= [S_{\phi_i(w)}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)}, S_{\phi_j(w)}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)}]^* \\ &= [S_{a_i^l w_l}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)}, S_{a_j^m w_m}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)}]^* \\ &= a_i^l \bar{a}_j^m [S_{w_l}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)}, S_{w_m}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)}]^*, \end{aligned}$$

where  $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ . It follows that  $[S_{z_i}^{M^\perp}, S_{z_j}^{M^\perp}] \in \mathcal{L}^p$  if  $[S_{w_i}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)}, S_{w_j}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)}]^* \in \mathcal{L}^p$ . Thus  $(M^\perp, S_z)$  is  $p$ -essentially normal if  $(\phi^*(M^\perp), S_w)$  is  $p$ -essentially normal. Since

the matrix  $(a_i^j)$  is invertible, we denote its inverse by  $(b_i^j)$ , it implies that  $w_i = b_i^j z_j$ . The same argument shows that  $(\phi^*(M^\perp), S_w)$  is  $p$ -essentially normal if  $(M^\perp, S_z)$  is  $p$ -essentially normal.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.** Let  $\Omega$  be an irreducible bounded symmetric domain in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and  $M$  be a weighted Bergman submodule determined by an analytic variety. Suppose that  $\phi : (\Omega, w) \rightarrow (\Omega, z)$  is an arbitrary biholomorphic automorphism with  $z = \phi(w)$ , then  $(\phi^*(M^\perp), S_w)$  is  $p$ -essentially normal if and only if  $(M^\perp, S_z)$  is  $p$ -essentially normal.

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we suppose  $\phi(0) = z_0$ . It follows by Lemma 3.5 that the biholomorphic automorphism  $\phi$  admits the factorization  $\phi = g_{z_0} \circ k$  where  $k \in K$ , which means  $\phi$  admits the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Omega & \xrightarrow{k} & \Omega \\ & \searrow \phi & \downarrow g_{z_0} \\ & & \Omega \end{array}$$

By Lemma 4.6, the  $p$ -essential normality of quotient weighted Bergman submodules is invariant under the linear automorphism  $k$ , so it suffices to prove the conclusion in the case of  $\phi = g_{z_0}$ . On the other hand, by [33, Section 1.5], if the quasi-inverse of the pair  $(z, \xi) \in \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n$  exists, then its quasi-inverse can be written in the rational form of

$$z^\xi = \frac{p(z, \xi)}{\Delta(z, \xi)},$$

where  $p(z, \xi)$  is a  $\mathbb{C}^n$ -valued polynomial in  $z, \bar{\xi}$ ,  $\Delta(z, \xi)$  is the Jordan triple determinant and has no common factors with  $p(z, \xi)$ . Moreover, by [26, Section 7.5], the quasi-inverse of the pair  $(z, \xi)$  exists whenever the spectrum norm satisfying  $\|z\| \cdot \|\xi\| < 1$ , and  $\Delta(z, \xi) \neq 0$  whenever the quasi-inverse of the pair  $(z, \xi)$  exists. Therefore, for every  $z_0 \in \Omega = \{\|z\| < 1\}$ , the biholomorphism  $g_{z_0} \in \text{Aut}(\Omega)$  is in fact holomorphic on the irreducible bounded symmetric domain  $\Omega_{z_0} = \{\|z\| < \frac{1}{\|z_0\|}\} \supset \bar{\Omega}$  and  $g_{z_0} : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}$  is biholomorphic by Lemma 3.5. Thus each component function of  $g_{z_0}$  can be uniquely extended to a holomorphic function in  $\mathcal{O}(\Omega_{z_0})$ , it implies that each component function of  $g_{z_0}$  is a rational function and belongs to  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ . So, we can write

$$g_{z_0} = \left( \frac{p_1}{q_1}, \dots, \frac{p_n}{q_n} \right),$$

where rational functions  $\frac{p_i}{q_i}$  belong to  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ , and  $q_i$  have no zeros in  $\bar{\Omega}$ . Applying Proposition 4.5 to the case of  $\phi = g_{z_0}$ , and combining with Lemma 3.1 and Corollary 4.2, it implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^*[S_{z_i}^{M^\perp}, S_{z_j}^{M^{\perp*}}](\phi^*)^{-1} &= [S_{\frac{p_i}{q_i}}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)}, S_{\frac{p_j}{q_j}}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)*}] \\ &= [S_{p_i}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)} S_{q_i}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)^{-1}}, S_{p_j}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)*} S_{q_j}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)*^{-1}}] \\ &= S_{p_i}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)} [S_{q_i}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)^{-1}}, S_{p_j}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)*} S_{q_j}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)*^{-1}}] \\ &\quad + [S_{p_i}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)}, S_{p_j}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)*} S_{q_j}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)*^{-1}}] S_{q_i}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)^{-1}} \\ &= U_1 + U_2 + U_3 + U_4, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} U_1 &= S_{p_i}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)} S_{p_j}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)} S_{q_i}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)^{-1}} S_{q_j}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)^{-1}} [S_{q_i}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)}, S_{q_j}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)*}] S_{q_j}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)^{-1}} S_{q_i}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)^{-1}}, \\ U_2 &= -S_{p_i}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)} S_{q_i}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)^{-1}} [S_{q_i}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)}, S_{p_j}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)*}] S_{q_i}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)^{-1}} S_{q_j}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)^{-1}}, \\ U_3 &= -S_{p_j}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)*} S_{q_j}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)^{-1}} [S_{p_i}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)}, S_{q_j}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)*}] S_{q_j}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)^{-1}} S_{q_i}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)^{-1}}, \\ U_4 &= [S_{p_i}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)}, S_{p_j}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)*}] S_{q_j}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)^{-1}} S_{q_i}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)^{-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

for all  $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ . It follows that  $[S_{z_i}^{M^\perp}, S_{z_j}^{M^\perp*}] \in \mathcal{L}^p$  if  $[S_{w_i}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)}, S_{w_j}^{\phi^*(M^\perp)*}] \in \mathcal{L}^p$  by Proposition 3.2 and the fact that  $\mathcal{L}^p$  is an operator ideal. It implies that  $(M^\perp, S_z)$  is  $p$ -essentially normal if  $(\phi^*(M^\perp), S_w)$  is  $p$ -essentially normal. Similarly, the same argument for the automorphism  $\phi^{-1} : (\Omega, z) \rightarrow (\Omega, w)$  implies that  $(\phi^*(M^\perp), S_w)$  is  $p$ -essentially normal if  $(M^\perp, S_z)$  is  $p$ -essentially normal. The proof is complete.  $\square$

Similarly, the same is also true for the submodule  $(M, T_z)$ .

**Corollary 4.7.** Let  $\Omega$  be an irreducible bounded symmetric domain in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and  $M$  be a Bergman submodule determined by an analytic variety. Suppose that  $\phi : (\Omega, w) \rightarrow (\Omega, z)$  is an arbitrary biholomorphic automorphism with  $z = \phi(w)$ , then  $(\phi^*(M), T_w)$  is  $p$ -essentially normal if and only if  $(M, T_z)$  is  $p$ -essentially normal.

As a consequence of Theorem 2, it implies that the  $p$ -essential normality of a quotient weighted Bergman submodule with the compression of coordinate multipliers determined by an analytic variety on a bounded symmetric domain is invariant when the coordinate multipliers are replaced by biholomorphic automorphism multipliers.

**Corollary 4.8.** Let  $(\Omega, z)$  be an irreducible bounded symmetric domain in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and  $(M^\perp, S)$  be a quotient Bergman submodule determined by an analytic variety, where  $S$  is the compression of coordinate multipliers. Suppose that  $\phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n) : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  is an arbitrary biholomorphic automorphism, then the following are equivalent.

- (1)  $[S_{z_i}, S_{z_j}^*] \in \mathcal{L}^p$  for all  $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ .
- (2)  $[S_{\phi_i}, S_{\phi_j}^*] \in \mathcal{L}^p$  for all  $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ .

*Proof.* It comes from Theorem 2, Lemma 3.5 and Proposition 4.5.  $\square$

## 5. THE CASE ON THE WALLACH SET

In the previous section we consider the  $p$ -essential normality of Hilbert modules in the context of weighted Bergman space on irreducible bounded symmetric domains. However, as mentioned in the end of Section 2, on the irreducible bounded symmetric domain, the weighted Bergman spaces is a fraction of the reproducing kernel Hilbert holomorphic function spaces corresponding to the continuous part of the Wallach set. In this section, we will consider that the biholomorphic invariance of  $p$ -essential normality of Hilbert modules on the more general holomorphic function space determined by the Wallach set.

The main ideal of the proof is similar to the case of the weighted Bergman modules, we consider the operator problems in the  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -module category, but the situation is a few different in general. When  $\lambda > N - 1$ , it is trivial to equip the weighted Bergman

spaces  $H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$  with module actions by the multiplication of functions over algebras  $\mathcal{P}(Z)$  and  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$  since those norms or inner products are induced by the integration with suitable probability measures. However, in general we require additional efforts to equip  $H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$  with an  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -module action by the multiplication of functions when it is a Hilbert module over the algebra  $\mathcal{P}(Z)$ .

We first observe that the holomorphic function space  $H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$  on an irreducible bounded symmetric domain  $\Omega$  determined by the discrete part  $W_{\Omega,d}$  of the Wallach set  $W_\Omega$  is not a Hilbert module over the polynomial algebra  $\mathcal{P}(Z) = \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]$  by the coordinate function multipliers. However, for every continuous point  $\lambda \in W_{\Omega,c}$ , the function space  $(H_\lambda^2(\Omega), T)$  is always a Hilbert module over  $\mathcal{P}(Z)$  by the coordinate function multipliers, which is in fact a restatement of [3, Theorem 4.1]. We formulate it in the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.1.** Let  $\lambda \in W_\Omega$ , then  $(H_\lambda^2(\Omega), T)$  is a Hilbert module over  $\mathcal{P}(Z)$  with the coordinate function multipliers if and only if  $\lambda \in W_{\Omega,c}$ . Moreover, the Taylor spectrum  $Sp(T) = \bar{\Omega}$  whenever  $\lambda \in W_{\Omega,c}$ .

*Proof.* By [3, Theorem 4.1], it implies that the function space  $(H_\lambda^2(\Omega), T)$  with the coordinate function multipliers is always a Hilbert module over  $\mathcal{P}(Z)$  and the Taylor spectrum  $Sp(T) = \bar{\Omega}$  whenever  $\lambda \in W_{\Omega,c}$ . Thus it is sufficient to prove that  $H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$  is not a Hilbert module over  $\mathcal{P}(Z)$  by the coordinate function multipliers if  $\lambda \in W_{\Omega,d}$ . Suppose it were false. Then we could find  $\lambda_0 = \frac{a}{2}(j_0 - 1)$  for some  $1 \leq j_0 \leq r$  such that  $H_{\lambda_0}^2(\Omega)$  is a Hilbert module over  $\mathcal{P}(Z)$  by the coordinate function multipliers. By the construction of  $H_{\lambda_0}^2(\Omega)$ , we know that

$$H_{\lambda_0}^2(\Omega) = \sum_{m \geq 0, m_{j_0} = 0} \mathcal{P}_m(Z).$$

Note that the constant function  $\mathbf{1} \in H_{\lambda_0}^2(\Omega)$ , hence

$$\mathcal{P}(Z) \cdot \mathbf{1} = \mathcal{P}(Z) \subset H_{\lambda_0}^2(\Omega),$$

which contradicts  $\mathcal{P}(Z) = \sum_{m \geq 0} \mathcal{P}_m(Z)$ , and the proof is finished.  $\square$

In the Section 4, we define an  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -module action by the function multipliers on the weighted Bergman spaces  $H_{N+\gamma}^2(\Omega) = A^2(dv_\gamma)$ ,  $\gamma > -1$ . Notice that

$$N + \gamma > N - 1 > (r - 1)\frac{a}{2}.$$

Actually, we can also define an  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -module action by the function multipliers on  $H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$  for all  $\lambda \in W_{\Omega,c} = \{\lambda > (r - 1)\frac{a}{2}\}$ . To cover the gap  $\{(r - 1)\frac{a}{2} < \lambda \leq N - 1\}$ , we need the following lemma which generalizes the classical fact that the Hardy space is a subspace of the Bergman space on the unit ball of rank one. To make its proof more precise, we introduce the following notations. Let  $I_\Omega$  be the set of all integer partitions with length  $r$ . Define

$$\begin{aligned} I_\Omega(0) &= \{\mathbf{0}\}, \\ I_\Omega(j) &= \{(m_1, \dots, m_j, 0, \dots, 0) : m_1 \geq \dots \geq m_j > 0\}, 1 \leq j \leq r - 1, \\ I_\Omega(r) &= \{(m_1, \dots, m_r) : m_1 \geq \dots \geq m_r > 0\}. \end{aligned}$$



It obvious that

$$I_\Omega = \bigcup_{j=0}^r I_\Omega(j) \quad \text{and} \quad I_\Omega(i) \cap I_\Omega(j) = \emptyset$$

whenever  $i \neq j$ .

**Lemma 5.2.** Suppose  $(r-1)\frac{a}{2} < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ , then the imbedding

$$i : H_{\lambda_1}^2(\Omega) \rightarrow H_{\lambda_2}^2(\Omega), \quad f \mapsto i(f) = f$$

is continuous.

*Proof.* Let  $f \in H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$  for  $\lambda \in W_{\Omega,c}$  and  $f = \sum_{m \geq 0} f_m$  be its Peter-Schmid-Weyl decomposition. Then

$$\|f\|_\lambda = \sum_{m \geq 0} \|f_m\|_\lambda.$$

Hence it suffices to prove that there exists an uniform positive constant  $C$  satisfying

$$\|p_m\|_{\lambda_2} \leq C \|p_m\|_{\lambda_1}$$

for all  $p_m \in \mathcal{P}_m$  and  $m \geq 0$ . Combining with the formula (2.6), it suffices to prove that there exists an uniform positive constant  $C$  satisfying

$$\frac{(\lambda_1)_m}{(\lambda_2)_m} \leq C \tag{5.1}$$

for every  $m \geq 0$ . By the definition of the multi-variable Pochhammer symbol, we obtain

$$\frac{(\lambda_1)_m}{(\lambda_2)_m} = \frac{\Gamma_\Omega(\lambda_1 + m)}{\Gamma_\Omega(\lambda_2 + m)} = \prod_{j=1}^r \frac{\Gamma(\lambda_1 + m_j - (j-1)\frac{a}{2})}{\Gamma(\lambda_2 + m_j - (j-1)\frac{a}{2})}. \tag{5.2}$$

It is easy to see that

$$\frac{(\lambda_1)_0}{(\lambda_2)_0} = \prod_{j=1}^r \frac{\Gamma(\lambda_1 - (j-1)\frac{a}{2})}{\Gamma(\lambda_2 - (j-1)\frac{a}{2})}. \tag{5.3}$$

Note that Stirling's formula implies that there exists an uniform positive constant  $C_j$  satisfying

$$\frac{\Gamma(\lambda_1 + m_j - (j-1)\frac{a}{2})}{\Gamma(\lambda_2 + m_j - (j-1)\frac{a}{2})} \leq C_j \frac{1}{m_j^{\lambda_2 - \lambda_1}},$$

for  $j = 1, \dots, r$ . Then (5.2) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(\lambda_1)_m}{(\lambda_2)_m} &\leq \prod_{j=1}^k C_j \prod_{j=k+1}^r \frac{\Gamma(\lambda_1 - (j-1)\frac{a}{2})}{\Gamma(\lambda_2 - (j-1)\frac{a}{2})} \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{1}{m_j^{\lambda_2 - \lambda_1}} \\ &\leq \prod_{j=1}^k C_j \prod_{j=k+1}^r \frac{\Gamma(\lambda_1 - (j-1)\frac{a}{2})}{\Gamma(\lambda_2 - (j-1)\frac{a}{2})} \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

for every  $m \in I_\Omega(j)$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq r-1$ . Similarly,

$$\frac{(\lambda_1)_m}{(\lambda_2)_m} \leq \prod_{j=1}^r C_j \tag{5.5}$$

for every  $m \in I_\Omega(r)$ . Thus (5.1) follows by (5.3), (5.4) and (5.5). This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.3.** Let  $\lambda \in W_{\Omega,c}$ , then  $H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$  is an  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -module whose module actions are the multiplication of functions. In particular,  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega}) \subset H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$  is dense.

*Proof.* The case of  $\lambda > N - 1$  is clearly, since in this case every  $H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$  is a weighted Bergman space whose inner product is induced by a finite volume measures on  $\Omega$ . Thus it suffices to consider the case of  $\lambda \in \{(r-1)\frac{a}{2} < \lambda \leq N-1\}$ . Since the Taylor spectrum  $Sp(T) = \bar{\Omega}$  by Lemma 5.1, it implies that we can define an  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -module action on  $H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$  by Taylor functional calculus, namely

$$f \cdot h := f(T)h \quad (5.6)$$

for every  $f \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$  and  $h \in H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$ . Since  $f \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ , there exists an open set  $D$  which contains the compact set  $\bar{\Omega}$  such that  $f$  is holomorphic on  $D$ . It follows from (4.4) that there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$\Omega \subsetneq (1+\delta)\Omega \subsetneq (1+\delta)\bar{\Omega} \subsetneq D$$

and  $f \in \mathcal{O}(D) \subset \mathcal{O}((1+\delta)\Omega)$  has a homogeneous polynomial expansion

$$f(z) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} f_i(z)$$

on the domain  $(1+\delta)\Omega$  where each  $f_i$  is  $i$ -homogeneous holomorphic polynomial, which converges uniformly on  $(1+\frac{\delta}{2})\Omega$ . Thus  $f(T) = \lim_i \sum_{j=0}^i f_j(T)$  in the strongly operator topology, which yields

$$f \cdot h = f(T)h = \lim_i \sum_{j=0}^i f_j(T)h = \lim_i \sum_{j=0}^i f_j h \quad (5.7)$$

for every  $h \in H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$ . On the other hand, it follows from Lemma 5.2 that the imbedding  $H_\lambda^2(\Omega) \subset H_N^2(\Omega) = A^2(dv)$  is continuous because  $(r-1)\frac{a}{2} < \lambda < N$ . Then  $\sum_{j=0}^i f_j h$  is convergent to  $f \cdot h$  in  $H_N^2(\Omega)$ . Observe that  $f = \lim_i \sum_{j=0}^i f_j$  converges uniformly on  $(1+\frac{\delta}{2})\Omega$ . Thus  $\sum_{j=0}^i f_j h$  converges to  $fh$  in  $H_N^2(\Omega)$  by the integral formula of the norm with respect to the measure  $dv$ . Hence

$$f \cdot h = \lim_i \sum_{j=0}^i f_j h = fh. \quad (5.8)$$

This implies that we can define an  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -module action by the multiplication of functions, which is coincided with the  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -module action (5.6) defined by the Taylor functional calculus.  $\square$

**Remark 5.4.** Actually (5.8) can be also obtained directly from (5.7) by the continuity of the evaluation functional. On the other hand, we know from [4, Theorem 3.3] that  $\mathcal{A}_0(\Omega) = C(\bar{\Omega}) \cap \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$  is not always contained in  $H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$ ,  $\lambda \in W_{\Omega,c}$  in general.

As a consequence, we can generalize Proposition 4.3 to the following form.

**Corollary 5.5.** Suppose that  $\Omega$  is an irreducible bounded symmetric domain in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and  $M$  is a closed set of  $H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$  for some  $\lambda \in W_{\Omega,c}$ , then the following hold.

- (1)  $M$  is a  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]$ -module if and only if  $M$  is an  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -module.

- (2) Moreover,  $M^\perp$  is a quotient submodule over the algebra  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]$  if and only if  $M^\perp$  is a quotient submodule over the algebra  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ .

Thus all notions we defined in Section 4 for the weighted Bergman modules can be generalized to the current situation of the Hilbert modules  $H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$  for  $(r-1)\frac{a}{2} < \lambda \leq N-1$ , except the pull back of measures. It is an interesting question to construct integral formulas with suitable probability measures  $dv_\lambda$  for the  $K$ -invariant inner products associated with the Wallach points, we refer the reader to [3, 33]. It is known that the  $K$ -invariant inner products on  $H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$  for  $\lambda \in W_{\Omega,c}$  can be realized as the integration with a unique probability measures  $dv_\lambda$  supported inside  $\bar{\Omega}$  if and only if

$$\lambda \in \{\lambda_j = N - 1 - (j - 1)\frac{a}{2}, j = 1, \dots, r\} \cup \{\lambda > N - 1\}.$$

Moreover, the measure  $dv_\lambda$  is quasi-invariant if  $\lambda = \lambda_j, j = 1, \dots, r$ , namely

$$dv_{\lambda_j}(g(z)) = |\det(g'(z))|^{\frac{2\lambda_j}{N}} dv_{\lambda_j}(z)$$

for all  $g \in G$  and  $z \in \bar{\Omega}$ . In fact  $dv_{\lambda_j}$  supported on the  $G$ -orbit  $G \cdot (e_1 + \dots + e_j)$  which is a part of the topological boundary  $\partial\Omega$ . Hence in the special case of  $\lambda = \lambda_j$  we can still pull back the measures  $dv_{\lambda_j}, j = 1, \dots, r$ . However, in general we will directly pull back the inner product rather than the measure as follows. Let  $\phi : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  be a biholomorphic automorphism. The pull back of functions is given by

$$\phi^* : \mathcal{O}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\Omega), \quad f \mapsto \phi^*(f) = f \circ \phi,$$

which is a complex algebraic (module) homomorphism and especially a linear operator. For  $H_\lambda^2(\Omega), \lambda \in W_{\Omega,c}$ , its pull back under  $\phi$  is denoted by  $\phi^*(H_\lambda^2(\Omega))$ , we equip with it an inner product by

$$\langle \phi^*(f), \phi^*(g) \rangle_{\lambda, \phi^*} := \langle f, g \rangle_\lambda \quad (5.9)$$

whenever  $f, g \in H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$ , which is called the pull back of the inner product. By direct check we see that the inner product (5.9) is  $K$ -invariant and  $\phi^*(H_\lambda^2(\Omega))$  is completed in this inner product, which coincides with the integration with respect to the pull backed measure whenever the inner product of  $H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$  can be realized as the integration with respect to a probability measure. Thus  $\phi^* : H_\lambda^2(\Omega) \rightarrow \phi^*(H_\lambda^2(\Omega))$  is a unitary operator. Furthermore, if  $M$  is an  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -submodule in  $H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$  determined by an analytic variety, then its pull back  $\phi^*(M)$  is also an  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -submodule in  $\phi^*(H_\lambda^2(\Omega))$  determined by the pull back of the analytic variety. The similar is also true for the quotient submodule.

Now we list the result of the biholomorphic invariance of  $p$ -essential normality of quotient Hilbert submodules in  $H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$  for  $\lambda \in W_{\Omega,c}$ , the core case of weighted Bergman modules of  $\lambda > N - 1$  is our main Theorem 2 above, moreover the case of  $(r-1)\frac{a}{2} < \lambda \leq N - 1$  can be proved by the similar method to the case of weighted Bergman modules and we left this proof to the reader.

**Theorem 5.6.** Let  $\Omega$  be an irreducible bounded symmetric domain in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and  $M$  be a submodule in  $H_\lambda^2(\Omega), \lambda \in W_{\Omega,c}$  determined by an analytic variety. Suppose that  $\phi : (\Omega, w) \rightarrow (\Omega, z)$  is an arbitrary biholomorphic automorphism with  $z = \phi(w)$ , then  $(\phi^*(M^\perp), S_w)$  is  $p$ -essentially normal if and only if  $(M^\perp, S_z)$  is  $p$ -essentially normal.

**Corollary 5.7.** Let  $\Omega$  be an irreducible bounded symmetric domain in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and  $(M^\perp, S)$  be a quotient submodule in  $H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$ ,  $\lambda \in W_{\Omega, c}$  determined by an analytic variety, where  $S$  is the compression of coordinate multipliers. Suppose that  $\phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n) : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  is an arbitrary biholomorphic automorphism, then the following are equivalent.

- (1)  $[S_{z_i}, S_{z_j}^*] \in \mathcal{L}^p$  for all  $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ .
- (2)  $[S_{\phi_i}, S_{\phi_j}^*] \in \mathcal{L}^p$  for all  $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ .

**Remark 5.8.** (1) Let  $\Omega = \mathbb{D}$  be the unit disc and  $V \subsetneq \mathbb{D}$  be a nonempty analytic variety, it follows from Weierstrass's factorization theorem that  $V$  is in fact a sequence of points without accumulations in the inner of  $\mathbb{D}$ . By Beurling's theorem, it implies that the Hardy submodule  $M_V \neq \mathbf{0}$  if and only if  $V$  satisfies the Blaschke condition if and only there exists a nonsingular inner function  $\theta$  satisfying  $V = Z(\theta)$  the zeroes of  $\theta$  if and only if  $M_V = \theta H^2(\mathbb{D})$  for some minimal Blaschke product  $\theta$ . A Blaschke product is called minimal if each zero has order 1. And so in this case the quotient submodule  $M_V^\perp$  is the so-called model space. Thus the compression of the multiplication operator we defined in (4.2) for the quotient Hardy submodule coincides with the definition of the truncated Toeplitz operator formally introduced by Sarason [29], which actually goes back at least as far as Ahern and Clark [2], however we only consider the case of bounded holomorphic symbols. From the above observation, we see that there exists a one-to-one correspondence between nonempty proper analytic varieties in  $\mathbb{D}$  satisfying the Blaschke condition and nontrivial invariant subspaces in  $H^2(\mathbb{D})$  for the shift operator  $T_z$  which are determined by minimal Blaschke products. Moreover, there indeed exist many nonempty analytic varieties  $V \neq \mathbb{D}$  satisfying the Hardy submodule  $M_V = \mathbf{0}$ , in particular such a  $V$  is definitely not the zeroes of a function in the Hardy space  $H^1(\mathbb{D})$  by the Factorization theorem for  $H^1(\mathbb{D})$ . Besides the above, if  $V \subset \mathbb{D}$  is an analytic variety and the Hardy submodule  $M_V = \theta H^2(\mathbb{D})$  for a singular inner function  $\theta$ , then  $V = \emptyset$ .

(2) When  $V \subset \Omega$  is an analytic variety in a neighborhood of  $\bar{\Omega}$  and  $M_V$  is finitely generated, the following Proposition 6.1 shows that the Taylor spectrum of the compression operator tuple  $S$  on the quotient submodule  $M_V^\perp$  is

$$Sp(S) = \bar{V} \subset \bar{\Omega}.$$

Thus in this case one can prove Theorem 5.6 by the alternative operator theoretic method based on Theorem 1 (take  $c = 1, d = \mathbf{0}$ ), Lemma 3.5, Lemma 5.1 and the fact obtained in Lemma 5.3 that the  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -module action given by the multiplication of functions coincides with the  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -module action (5.6) defined by the Taylor functional calculus. However, in the general case, as we mentioned before, the primary obstruction in this operator theoretic method is the accurate estimate of the Taylor spectrum of the compression operator tuple  $S$ .

## 6. THE TAYLOR SPECTRUM OF THE COMPRESSION

In the above sections, we see that the Taylor spectrum of the compression operator tuple plays a key role in the investigate of the biholomorphic invariance of  $p$ -essential normality. Moreover, the calculation of the Taylor spectrum for bounded holomorphic multipliers is particularly an extension of the corresponding corona problem. Thus in

this section we shall calculate the Taylor spectrum of the compression operator tuple of the analytic Hilbert quotient submodule on the irreducible bounded symmetric domain. We first recall the definition of the Taylor spectrum.

Let  $\Lambda^k \mathbb{C}^n$  be the complex linear space spanned by the  $k$ -th exterior power for non-negative integer  $k$ , and  $\Lambda \mathbb{C}^n$  denoted by the exterior algebra, i.e.,  $\Lambda \mathbb{C}^n = \bigoplus_{k=0}^n \Lambda^k \mathbb{C}^n$  which is a graded algebra. We chose a linear basis  $\{\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n\}$  for  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , then

$$\{1\} \cup \{\eta_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \eta_{i_k} : 1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq n, k = 1, \dots, n\}$$

is a linear basis of  $\Lambda \mathbb{C}^n$ , thus the exterior algebra  $\Lambda \mathbb{C}^n$  can be equipped with a natural Hilbert inner product structure with respect to the chosen linear base. The canonical creation operators  $\Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_n$  are defined on the Hilbert space  $\Lambda \mathbb{C}^n$  as follows:

$$\Theta_i : \Lambda \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \Lambda \mathbb{C}^n, \quad \xi \mapsto \Theta_i(\xi) = \eta_i \wedge \xi,$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Let  $H$  be a Hilbert space and  $T = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$  is a commuting operator tuple on  $H$ . We denote  $\Lambda^k(H) = H \otimes \Lambda^k \mathbb{C}^n$  and denote the operator  $D_{T,k} : \Lambda^k(H) \rightarrow \Lambda^{k+1}(H)$  by

$$D_{T,k} = \sum_{i=0}^n T_i \otimes \Theta_i,$$

for nonnegative integer  $k$ . A direct verification shows that  $D_{T,k+1} \circ D_{T,k} = 0$  for  $k \geq 0$ . The boundary operator  $D_{T,k}$  will be written as  $D_T$  for short as usual in the following. The above shows in fact that the sequence  $\{(\Lambda^k, D_T)\}$  is a Koszul complex

$$0 \rightarrow \Lambda^0(H) \xrightarrow{D_T} \Lambda^1(H) \xrightarrow{D_T} \dots \xrightarrow{D_T} \Lambda^n(H) \rightarrow 0.$$

The commuting operator tuple  $T = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$  on  $H$  is called (Taylor) regular if the Koszul complex  $\{(\Lambda^k, D_T)\}$  is exact, i.e.,  $\text{Ker } D_{T,k+1} = \text{Im } D_{T,k}$ . The operator tuple  $T = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$  is called (Taylor) singular if it is not regular. The Taylor spectrum  $Sp(T)$  is the set of all  $w = (w_1, \dots, w_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$  such that the commuting operator tuple  $T - w = (T_1 - w_1, \dots, T_n - w_n)$  is singular. As we mentioned before, the Taylor spectrum  $Sp(T)$  is nonempty compact. As an application of the snake lemma follows that the definition of the Taylor spectrum is independent on the choice of the basis  $\{\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n\}$  for  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . Denote  $(T)$  by the commutative Banach subalgebra generated by  $T_1, \dots, T_n$  and Id in the Banach operator algebra  $B(H)$ . Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a commutative Banach algebra which contains  $T_1, \dots, T_n$  and Id. Then  $T$  is called non-singular relative to  $\mathcal{B}$  if the operator equation

$$T_1 U_1 + \dots + T_n U_n = \text{Id}$$

has a solution for  $U_1, \dots, U_n \in \mathcal{B}$ . The joint spectrum  $Sp_{\mathcal{B}}(T)$  of  $T$  relative to  $\mathcal{B}$  is defined to be the set of all  $w \in \mathbb{C}^n$  such that  $T - w$  is singular relative to  $\mathcal{B}$ . It is known that  $Sp(T) \subset Sp_{\mathcal{B}}(T)$  for every such a Banach algebra  $\mathcal{B}$ , see [27]. In particular,

$$Sp(T) \subset Sp_{(T)}(T). \quad (6.1)$$

Let  $\Omega$  be an irreducible bounded symmetric domain in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , namely it is the unit ball in the finite dimensional normed linear space  $(Z, \|\cdot\|)$ , where  $Z = \mathbb{C}^n$  is the Jordan triple and  $\|\cdot\|$  is the spectrum norm. Let  $(M_{\mathcal{V}}^{\perp}, S)$  be a quotient submodule

in  $H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$ ,  $\lambda \in W_{\Omega,c}$  determined by an analytic variety  $V$  such that there exist finitely many  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in \mathcal{A}_0(\Omega)$  satisfying

$$V = \{z \in \Omega : f_1(z) = \dots = f_m(z) = 0\},$$

where  $\mathcal{A}_0(\Omega) = C(\bar{\Omega}) \cap \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$  is a complex commutative Banach algebra and  $S$  is the compression of coordinate multipliers. We say that a submodule  $M \subset H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$ ,  $\lambda \in W_{\Omega,c}$  is called finitely generated if there exist finitely many  $g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathcal{A}_0(\Omega)$  such that the closure  $\text{Cl}[g_1\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega}) + \dots + g_m\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})] = M$ . In this case we say that the submodule  $M$  is finitely generated by  $g_1, \dots, g_m$ . The notion of finitely generated  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -module we used here can be roughly viewed the replacement of coherent ideal sheaf of an analytic variety in a complex space in the global case. The main feature of the coherence is locally finitely generated, see for instance [11].

We see that if  $V = \{z \in \Omega : f_1(z) = \dots = f_m(z) = 0\}$  for some  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$  and  $M_V$  is finitely generated by  $g_1, \dots, g_l \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ , then  $V = \{z \in \Omega : g_1(z) = \dots = g_l(z) = 0\}$ , since  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega}) \subset H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$ ,  $\lambda \in W_{\Omega,c}$ . Thus in the following discussion, we only consider the case that  $V = \{z \in \Omega : f_1(z) = \dots = f_m(z) = 0\}$  for some  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$  and  $M_V$  is finitely generated by  $f_1, \dots, f_m$ .

The following proposition shows that the Taylor spectrum of the compression  $S$  on the quotient submodule  $M_V^\perp$  is the closure of the analytic variety  $V$  if  $M_V$  is finitely generated by some functions in  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ . Recall that  $t\Omega = \{tz : z \in \Omega\} = \{z \in Z : \|z\| < t\}$  for every  $t > 0$ , which is biholomorphic to  $\Omega = \{z \in Z : \|z\| < 1\}$ . A complex linear functional on a complex commutative Banach algebra is said to be multiplicative if it is also a nonzero algebraic (ring) homomorphism.

**Proposition 6.1.** Suppose that  $V = \{z \in \Omega : f_1(z) = \dots = f_m(z) = 0\}$  is an analytic variety with  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ . If  $M_V$  is finitely generated by  $f_1, \dots, f_m$ , then the Taylor spectrum of  $S$  is

$$Sp(S) = \bar{V}.$$

*Proof.* Observe that  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ , it follows that there exists an open domain  $D \supset \bar{\Omega}$  such that  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in \mathcal{O}(D)$ . As the same proof in (4.3), we know that there exists a  $t_0 > 1$  such that

$$\Omega \subsetneq t\Omega \subsetneq t\bar{\Omega} \subsetneq D$$

for every  $1 < t \leq t_0$ . Thus  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in \mathcal{A}_0(t\Omega)$  for every  $0 < t \leq t_0$ . For every  $0 < t \leq t_0$ , we denote  $V_t$  by

$$V_t = \{z \in t\Omega : f_1(z) = \dots = f_m(z) = 0\}.$$

Note that  $V_1 = V$ . Clearly  $\bar{V}_t = \{z \in t\bar{\Omega} : f_1(z) = \dots = f_m(z) = 0\}$  for every  $1 \leq t \leq t_0$ . We now fix an arbitrary  $t \in (1, t_0]$  and let  $w_t = (w_{t,1}, \dots, w_{t,n}) \notin \bar{V}_t$ . Denote  $I_t$  by the closed ideal generated by  $f_1, \dots, f_m, z_1 - w_{t,1}, \dots, z_n - w_{t,n}$  in the commutative Banach algebra  $\mathcal{A}_0(t\Omega)$  where  $1 < t \leq t_0$ . We first prove that  $I_t = \mathcal{A}_0(t\Omega)$ . Otherwise, there exists a maximal ideal  $J_t$  of  $\mathcal{A}_0(t\Omega)$  satisfying  $I_t \subset J_t$ , since every  $\mathcal{A}_0(t\Omega)$  is a the commutative ring. The one-to-one correspondence between multiplicative linear functionals on  $\mathcal{A}_0(t\Omega)$  and maximal ideals in  $\mathcal{A}_0(t\Omega)$  implies that there exists a unique multiplicative linear functional  $\Phi_t$  satisfying  $I_t \subset J_t = \text{Ker } \Phi_t$ . By the following Lemma 6.2, it implies that there exists a unique  $w'_t \in t\bar{\Omega}$  such that  $\Phi_t(f) = f(w'_t)$  for every

$f \in \mathcal{A}_0(t\Omega)$ . Since  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in I_t \subset \text{Ker } \Phi_t$ , it follows that  $f_1(w'_t) = \dots = f_m(w'_t) = 0$ , namely  $w'_t \in \bar{V}_t$ . On the other hand, the condition that  $z_1 - w_{t,1}, \dots, z_n - w_{t,n} \in I_t \subset \text{Ker } \Phi_t$  implies  $w_t = w'_t$ , which contradicts the assumption  $w_t \notin \bar{V}_t$ . This proves that  $I_t = \mathcal{A}_0(t\Omega)$ . Thus there exist  $g_{t,1}, \dots, g_{t,m}, h_{t,1}, \dots, h_{t,n} \in \mathcal{A}_0(t\Omega) \subset \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$  such that

$$f_1 g_{t,1} + \dots + f_m g_{t,m} + (z_1 - w_{t,1})h_{t,1} + \dots + (z_n - w_{t,n})h_{t,n} = 1$$

on  $t\Omega$  where  $1 < t \leq t_0$ . Combining with Lemma 4.1 and the fact  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in M_V$ , it implies that

$$S_{z_1 - w_{t,1}} S_{h_{t,1}} + \dots + S_{z_n - w_{t,n}} S_{h_{t,n}} = \text{Id} \quad (6.2)$$

on  $M_V^\perp$ . On the other hand, as we proved in Lemma 5.3, the  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -module action given by the multiplication of functions coincides with the  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ -module action (5.6) defined by the Taylor functional calculus. Combining with the continuity of the Taylor functional calculus, it implies that  $S_f = P_{M_V^\perp} f(T) \in (S)$  for all  $f \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ , where  $T = (M_{z_1}, \dots, M_{z_n})$  is the coordinate function multipliers. Therefor the identity (6.2) implies that  $w_t \notin Sp_{(S)}(S)$ , the joint spectrum of  $S$  relative to the commutative Banach algebra  $(S)$ . Then the inclusion of spectrums (6.1) and the arbitrariness of  $t$  imply that  $Sp(S) \subset \bar{V}_t$  for every  $1 < t \leq t_0$ . Together with the definition of  $V_t$ , it yields

$$Sp(S) \subset \bigcap_{1 < t \leq t_0} \bar{V}_t = \bar{V}.$$

It remains to prove the another direction, i.e.,  $Sp(S) \supset \bar{V}$ . Since the compactness of  $Sp(S)$ , it suffices to prove that  $w \notin V$  if  $w \notin Sp(S)$ . Now suppose  $w \notin Sp(S)$ . By the definition of the Taylor spectrum, it follows that

$$\Lambda^{n-1}(M_V^\perp) \xrightarrow{D_{S-w}} \Lambda^n(M_V^\perp) \rightarrow 0$$

is exact, and hence  $D_{S-w}$  is surjective. Note that  $\Lambda^n(M_V^\perp) = M_V^\perp \otimes (\eta_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \eta_n) \cong M_V^\perp$  up to the natural isomorphism. Thus

$$M_V^\perp = S_{z_1 - w_1} M_V^\perp + \dots + S_{z_n - w_n} M_V^\perp.$$

Therefor, for every  $g \in H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$ ,  $\lambda \in W_{\Omega, c}$ , there exist  $g_1, \dots, g_n \in M_V^\perp$  and  $h \in M_V$  such that

$$(z_1 - w_1)g_1(z) + \dots + (z_n - w_n)g_n(z) + h(z) = g(z).$$

If  $w \in \Omega$ , take  $g(z) = \prod_{i=1}^n (z_i - w_i) + 1$ , we have that  $h(w) = 1 \neq 0$ . Since  $\text{Cl}[f_1 \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega}) + \dots + f_m \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})] = M_V$ , it follows that  $f_1 \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega}) + \dots + f_m \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$  is dense in  $M_V$ , we conclude that there exist  $h_1, \dots, h_m \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$  such that

$$f_1(w)h_1(w) + \dots + f_m(w)h_m(w) \neq 0,$$

which means  $w \notin V$ . When  $w \notin \Omega$ , we see that  $w \notin V$  is trivial. The proof is complete.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.2.** Let  $t > 0$ , then every complex multiplicative linear functional on  $\mathcal{A}_0(t\Omega)$  is an evaluation at some point of  $t\bar{\Omega}$ .

*Proof.* Clearly  $\mathcal{A}_0(t\Omega)$  is a commutative Banach algebra and the polynomial algebra  $\mathcal{P}(Z) = \mathbb{C}[z]$  is its dense subset for every  $t > 0$ . We now fix a  $t > 0$ . Let  $\Phi : \mathcal{A}_0(t\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be a multiplicative linear functional. Put  $w = (\Phi(z_1), \dots, \Phi(z_n))$ . We claim that  $w \in t\bar{\Omega}$ . Otherwise,  $w \notin t\bar{\Omega}$ , that is  $\|w\| > t > 0$ . Denote  $\|\cdot\|_t$  by  $\|z\|_t = \frac{1}{t}\|z\|$  for

every  $z \in Z$ . It is clear that  $(Z, \|\cdot\|_t)$  is a finite dimensional normed linear space (in fact a Banach space). Moreover,  $t\Omega$  is the open unit ball in  $(Z, \|\cdot\|_t)$  and the norm of  $w$  is  $\|w\|_t = \frac{1}{t}\|w\| > 1$ . By the Hahn-Banach theorem, there exists a complex linear functional  $q$  on  $(Z, \|\cdot\|_t)$  such that  $q(w) = \|w\|_t > 1$  and the operator norm  $\|q\| = \sup_{z \in t\bar{\Omega}} |q(z)| = 1$ . Note that  $Z$  is finite dimensional, we see that every complex linear functional on  $Z$  must be a homogeneous holomorphic polynomial of degree 1. Thus  $q$  is a holomorphic polynomial such that its maximal modulus  $\|q\|_\infty = \|q\| = 1$  on the unit ball  $t\Omega$ . Since  $\Phi : \mathcal{A}_0(t\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is a multiplicative linear functional, it follows that the operator norm  $\|\Phi\| = 1$  and  $\Phi(h) = h(w)$  for every polynomial  $h \in \mathcal{P}(Z)$ . In particular,  $\Phi(q) = q(w) = \|w\|_t > 1$ , which contradicts the fact that  $|\Phi(q)| \leq \|\Phi\| \cdot \|q\|_\infty = 1$ . This proves that  $w \in t\bar{\Omega}$ . Note that  $\Phi(h) = h(w)$  for every polynomial  $h \in \mathcal{P}(Z)$ , combining with the continuity of  $\Phi$  and the density of  $\mathcal{P}(Z)$  in  $\mathcal{A}_0(t\Omega)$ , it follows that  $\Phi(f) = f(w)$  for every  $f \in \mathcal{A}_0(t\Omega)$ . This finishes the proof.  $\square$

Combining with the spectral mapping theorem, we have the following two corollaries.

**Corollary 6.3.** As assumed in Proposition 6.1, for  $f \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ , the Taylor spectrum of  $S_f$  on  $M_V^\perp$  is

$$Sp(S_f) = f(\bar{V}).$$

**Corollary 6.4.** As assumed in Proposition 6.1, let  $\phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_m)$  with  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_m \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ . Denote  $S_\phi = (S_{\phi_1}, \dots, S_{\phi_m})$ , then the Taylor spectrum of  $S_\phi$  on  $M_V^\perp$  is

$$Sp(S_\phi) = \phi(\bar{V}).$$

**Example 6.5.** A trivial example is that  $V = \Omega$ . In this case, the submodule  $M_V = \mathbf{0}$  is generated by the zero function  $\mathbf{0}$ . Its quotient submodule  $M_V^\perp = H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$ ,  $\lambda \in W_{\Omega, c}$ , and indeed  $(M_V^\perp, S) = (H_\lambda^2(\Omega), T)$ . Thus in the current case we have

$$Sp(S) = Sp(T) = \bar{\Omega}.$$

This is the known result in [3, Theorem 4.1]. Moreover, when the Drury-Arveson submodule  $M_V \subset H_1^2(\mathbb{B}^n)$  is generated by a homogeneous polynomial, then  $Sp(S) = \bar{V}$  is known in [20, Theorem 5.1]

A nonempty analytic variety  $V$  in a domain  $U \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  is called a hypersurface or (Weil) divisor if there exists a  $f \in \mathcal{O}(U)$  such that  $V = \{z \in U : f(z) = 0\}$ . Clearly the hypersurface has pure dimension  $n - 1$ .

**Example 6.6.** Suppose that  $V \subset \mathbb{B}^n$  is a homogeneous algebraic hypersurface which is smooth away the origin, then the Taylor spectrum of  $S$  on the quotient Bergman submodule  $M_V^\perp$  is

$$Sp(S) = \bar{V}.$$

*Proof.* It follows from [15, Theorem A.3] that there exists a homogeneous polynomial  $h$  such that  $V = \{h(z) = 0\} \subset \mathbb{B}^n$  and

$$\text{Cl}[h\mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathbb{B}}^n)] = M_V.$$

Then combining with Proposition 6.1 leads to the desired results.  $\square$



As an application, we establish a result of the solvability of the corona problem for the quotient submodule. Recently, Davidson, Ramsey and Shalit raised a problem in [10, Remarks 5.5], they conjectured that on the unit ball  $\Omega = \mathbb{B}^n$  the corona problem is solvable on the quotient Drury-Arveson submodule  $M_V^\perp$  for its multiplier algebra  $\mathcal{M}(M_V^\perp)$  when  $V$  is the common zeros of some functions in Hardy space  $H^2(\mathbb{B}^n)$ : for every  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in \mathcal{M}(M_V^\perp)$  if there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that  $|f_1(z)|^2 + \dots + |f_m(z)|^2 \geq \delta > 0$  for every  $z \in V$ , then for every  $g \in M_V^\perp$  there exist  $g_1, \dots, g_m \in M_V^\perp$  satisfying

$$f_1 g_1 + \dots + f_m g_m = g.$$

And the solution  $g_1, \dots, g_m$  may satisfy some uniform norm estimate. In particular, if the conjecture is true, then it implies that  $V$  is dense in the maximal ideal space of  $\mathcal{M}(M_V^\perp)$ . We refer the reader to [10] and references therein for more details on the corona problem. In the end of this section, we will consider this problem in the general case of irreducible bounded symmetric domains and give an affirmative answer. We note that if  $V = \Omega$  then the corona problem for the quotient submodule  $M_V^\perp$  is degenerated to the classical corona problem for Hardy space  $H_{\frac{n}{r}}^2(\Omega)$ , Drury-Arveson space  $H_{(r-1)\frac{n}{2}+1}^2(\Omega)$  and weighted Bergman space  $H_{N+\gamma}^2(\Omega)$ . As we mentioned in Section 2, the space  $H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$  will not be complete Nevanlinna-Pick for every  $\lambda \in W_\Omega$  whenever its rank  $r \geq 2$ . Thus in the general case, it is rather difficult to give a complete answer to the corona problem.

We first recall the definition of the multiplier algebra. Let  $H$  be a reproducing kernel Hilbert holomorphic function space on  $\Omega$  with reproducing kernel  $K$ , we denote  $\mathcal{M}(H)$  by the multiplier algebra of  $H$ , i.e., the set of functions  $f \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$  satisfying  $fg \in H$  for every  $g \in H$ . It implies from the closed graph theorem that if  $f$  is a multiplier, then multiplication operator  $M_f$  with symbol  $f$  is a bounded linear operator on  $H$ . Thus  $f \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega)$  is a multiplier if and only if  $M_f$  is bounded. We identify the multiplier algebra with the bounded multiplication operator algebra. By direct calculations, it follows that  $M_f^* K_z = \overline{f(z)} K_z$  for every  $z \in \Omega$ . Then the boundedness of  $M_f$  implies that  $f \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega)$  is bounded holomorphic. Indeed we obtain a criterion that a bounded holomorphic function  $f$  is a multiplier if and only if  $V K_z = \overline{f(z)} K_z$  can be extends to be a bounded linear operator on all of  $H$ . In this case  $V = M_f^*$ . Note that the constant function  $\mathbf{1} \in H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$ ,  $\lambda \in W_{\Omega,c}$ , combining with Lemma 5.3 it implies that

$$\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega}) \subset \mathcal{M}(H_\lambda^2(\Omega)) \subset H_\lambda^2(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{A}(\Omega)$$

for  $\lambda \in W_{\Omega,c}$ . Since  $M_V^\perp = \mathcal{F}_V = \overline{\text{span}}\{K_{\lambda,z}\} \subset H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$  is a closed space where  $K_\lambda$  is the reproducing kernel of  $H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$ , it means that  $M_V^\perp$  is also a reproducing kernel Hilbert holomorphic function space on  $\Omega$ . And the above criterion for the multiplier shows that every  $f \in \mathcal{M}(H_\lambda^2(\Omega))$  induces a multiplier on  $M_V^\perp$ , and we denote it by  $f_V$ . Clearly, we see that if  $f, g \in \mathcal{M}(H_\lambda^2(\Omega))$ , then  $f_V = g_V$  if and only if  $f(z) = g(z)$  for all  $z \in V$ , we denote  $\mathcal{M}(H_\lambda^2(\Omega))_V$  by  $\mathcal{M}(H_\lambda^2(\Omega))_V = \{f_V : f \in \mathcal{M}(H_\lambda^2(\Omega))\}$ . Similarly, we have

$$\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})_V \subset \mathcal{M}(H_\lambda^2(\Omega))_V \subset \mathcal{M}(M_V^\perp) \subset \mathcal{A}(\Omega),$$

where  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})_V = \{f_V : f \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})\}$  is a multiplier subalgebra of  $\mathcal{M}(M_V^\perp)$ . When  $\Omega = \mathbb{B}^n$  and  $V$  is the common zeros of some functions in Hardy space  $H^2(\mathbb{B}^n)$ , we know from

[10, Proposition 2.6] that  $\mathcal{M}(H_1^2(\mathbb{B}^n))_V = \mathcal{M}(M_V^\perp)$ , and the restrictive condition for  $V$  is necessary.

As assumed in Corollary 6.4. Suppose  $w = (w_1, \dots, w_m) \notin \phi(\bar{V})$ , then for every  $g \in M_V^\perp \subset H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$ ,  $\lambda \in W_{\Omega, c}$ , there exist  $g_1, \dots, g_m \in M_V^\perp$  such that

$$(\phi_1 - w_1)g_1 + \dots + (\phi_m - w_m)g_m = g.$$

In particular, if  $\mathbf{0} \notin Sp(S_\phi) = \phi(\bar{V}) = \overline{\phi(V)}$ , equivalently there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that  $|\phi_1(z)|^2 + \dots + |\phi_m(z)|^2 \geq \delta > 0$  for every  $z \in V$ , it implies that for every  $g \in M_V^\perp$ , there exist  $g_1, \dots, g_m \in M_V^\perp$  such that

$$\phi_1 g_1 + \dots + \phi_m g_m = g.$$

This actually shows that the  $M_V^\perp$ -corona problem is solvable for multipliers belonging to  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})_V$ , then  $V$  is dense in the maximal ideal space of  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})_V$ . We formulate it in the following corollary.

**Corollary 6.7.** Suppose that  $V = \{z \in \Omega : f_1(z) = \dots = f_m(z) = 0\}$  is an analytic variety with  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})$ . If  $M_V$  is finitely generated by  $f_1, \dots, f_m$ , then the corona problem of the quotient submodule  $M_V^\perp \subset H_\lambda^2(\Omega)$ ,  $\lambda \in W_{\Omega, c}$  is solvable for the multiplier subalgebra  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\Omega})_V$ .

Thus, in particular, we have the following corollary which gives an affirmative answer to the problem raised by Davidson, Ramsey and Shalit [10, Remarks 5.5]. However, the method we used here can not give the norm estimate. This norm estimate maybe need the technique for solving  $\bar{\partial}$ -equations on analytic varieties with singularities, a promising approach maybe the resolution of singularities together with some cohomological arguments developed by Fornæss et al.

**Corollary 6.8.** Suppose that  $V = \{z \in \mathbb{B}^n : f_1(z) = \dots = f_m(z) = 0\}$  is an analytic variety with  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathbb{B}}^n)$ . If  $M_V$  is finitely generated by  $f_1, \dots, f_m$ , then the corona problem of the quotient Drury-Arveson submodule  $M_V^\perp$  is solvable for the multiplier subalgebra  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathbb{B}}^n)_V$ .

**Example 6.9.** When  $\Omega = \mathbb{D}$  is the unit disc, the Drury-Arveson space coincides with the Hardy space  $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ . If  $V \subsetneq \mathbb{D}$  is a nonempty analytic variety satisfying the Blaschke condition, it follows from Remark 5.8 that  $M_V = \theta H^2(\mathbb{D})$  for some minimal Blaschke product  $\theta$ , thus  $M_V = \text{Cl}[\theta \mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathbb{D}})]$ , combining with Corollary 6.8 we know that the corona problem of the quotient Drury-Arveson submodule  $M_V^\perp$  is solvable for the multiplier subalgebra  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathbb{D}})_V$ . If  $V \subsetneq \mathbb{D}$  is a nonempty analytic variety which does not satisfy the Blaschke condition, we know from Remark 5.8 that  $M_V = \mathbf{0}$  and  $M_V^\perp = H^2(\mathbb{D})$ , thus in this case the corona problem for the quotient submodule is degenerated to the classical corona problem for  $H^2(\mathbb{D})$  on the whole of  $\mathbb{D}$ . Note that the corona problem is solvable for the multiplier algebra  $\mathcal{M}(H^2(\mathbb{D})) = \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{D})$ . Thus in this case we see that  $V$  is dense in the maximal ideal space of  $\mathcal{M}(H^2(\mathbb{D}))_V$ . However,  $V$  is not dense in the maximal ideal space of  $\mathcal{M}(H^2(\mathbb{D}))$  unless  $V = \mathbb{D}$ .

**Example 6.10.** (1) Let  $V = \{z_1 z_2 = 0\} \subset \mathbb{B}^n$  which is an algebraic hypersurface. Then the corona problem of the quotient Drury-Arveson submodule  $M_V^\perp$  is solvable for the multiplier subalgebra  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathbb{B}}^n)_V$ .

(2) Suppose that  $V \subset \mathbb{B}^n$  is a homogeneous algebraic hypersurface which is smooth away the origin. Then the corona problem of the quotient Bergman submodule  $M_V^\perp$  is solvable for the multiplier subalgebra  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathbb{B}}^n)_V$ . An explicit example is the Fermat surface  $V = \{z_1^m + \cdots + z_n^m = 0\} \subset \mathbb{B}^n$  for some  $m \geq 1$ .

*Proof.* (1) We first claim that the closure  $\text{Cl}[z_1 z_2 \mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathbb{B}}^n)] = M_V$ . It suffices to prove that  $\text{Cl}[z_1 z_2 \mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathbb{B}}^n)] \supset M_V$ . Suppose  $f \in M_V \subset H_1^2(\mathbb{B}^n)$ . By the Weierstrass division theorem, it implies that  $f = z_1 h_1 + g_1$  in an open neighborhood of the origin, where  $g_1$  is a holomorphic function with respect to the  $n - 1$  variables  $z_2, \dots, z_n$ . Note that  $f|_V = 0$ , it implies that  $g(z_2, \dots, z_n) = 0$ . Hence

$$f = z_1 h_1 \quad (6.3)$$

in an open neighborhood of the origin. By the Weierstrass division theorem again, it implies that  $h_1 = z_2 h + g_2$  in an open neighborhood of the origin, where  $g_2$  is a holomorphic function with respect to the  $n - 1$  variables  $z_1, z_3, \dots, z_n$ . The same reason follows that  $g(z_1, z_3, \dots, z_n) = 0$ , namely  $h_1 = z_2 h$  in an open neighborhood of the origin. Combining with (6.3) we know that

$$f = z_1 z_2 h \quad (6.4)$$

in an open neighborhood of the origin.

Let  $f(z) = \sum a_l z^l$  and  $h = \sum b_l z^l$  be their Taylor expansions at the origin, where  $l = (l_1, \dots, l_n)$  is the multi-index and  $z^l = z_1^{l_1} \cdots z_n^{l_n}$ , of course  $l_1, \dots, l_n$  are nonnegative integers. It follows from (6.4) that  $a_{1+l_1, 1+l_2, \dots, l_n} = b_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n}$  for every multi-index. Since  $\mathbb{B}^n$  is circular, we see that the Taylor expansion  $f$  at the origin is globally defined in whole of  $\mathbb{B}^n$ . Let  $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_1 \partial z_2} f = \sum c_l z^l$  be its Taylor expansion at the origin which is globally defined on whole of  $\mathbb{B}^n$  because the same reason. Clearly, we have

$$|b_{l_1, \dots, l_n}| = |a_{1+l_1, 1+l_2, \dots, l_n}| \leq (1 + l_1)(1 + l_2)|a_{1+l_1, 1+l_2, \dots, l_n}| = |c_l|$$

for every multi-index. Thus the power series  $\sum b_l z^l$  is defined on whole of  $\mathbb{B}^n$ , denoted by  $\tilde{h}$ . Clearly,  $\tilde{h} = h$  in an open neighborhood of the origin, combining with (6.4) and the identity theorem of holomorphic functions, it follows that  $f = z_1 z_2 \tilde{h}$  on  $\mathbb{B}^n$ . Denote  $f_t(z) = f(tz)$  and  $\tilde{h}_t(z) = \tilde{h}(tz)$  for  $t > 0$ . Clearly, if  $0 < t < 1$ , then

$$f_t = t^2 z_1 z_2 \cdot \tilde{h}_t = z_1 z_2 \cdot t^2 \tilde{h}_t \in z_1 z_2 \mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathbb{B}}^n)$$

and  $f_t(z) = 0$  for every  $z \in V$ . Note that  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathbb{B}}^n) \subset H_1^2(\mathbb{B}^n)$ , it follows that  $f_t \in M_V$  for every  $0 < t < 1$ .

On the other hand, it follows from the norm formula that

$$\|f_t\|_{H_1^2}^2 = \sum_l |a_l|^2 t^{2|l|} \frac{l!}{|l|!} \leq \sum_l |a_l|^2 \frac{l!}{|l|!} = \|f\|_{H_1^2}^2,$$

where  $l! = l_1! \cdots l_n!$  and  $|l| = l_1 + \cdots + l_n$ . Hence  $g_m = f_{1 - \frac{1}{m+1}}$  converges pointwise to  $f$  and is a bounded sequence in the reproducing kernel Hilbert space  $M_V$ . By the Banach-Alaoglu theorem, there exists a subsequence of  $\{g_m\}$  that is weakly converge, since  $g_m$  converges to  $f$  pointwise, it follows that the weak limit must coincide with  $f$ . Thus  $f$  belongs to the weak closure of  $B_f$ , where

$$B_f = \{g \in z_1 z_2 \mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathbb{B}}^n) : \|g\|_{H_1^2} \leq \|f\|_{H_1^2}\} \subset M_V.$$

Note that  $B_f$  is convex, it follows from the Hahn-Banach theorem that the weak closure of  $B_f$  coincides with the norm closure of  $B_f$ . Thus there exists a sequence  $\{F_m\} \subset \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{B}^n)$  such that  $z_1 z_2 F_m$  converges to  $f$  in the norm of  $H_1^2(\mathbb{B}^n)$ , namely  $f \in \text{Cl}[z_1 z_2 \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{B}^n)]$ . Thus  $\text{Cl}[z_1 z_2 \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{B}^n)] \supset M_V$ , and the claim is proved. Then combing with Corollary 6.8 follows the desired result.

(2) We know from Example 6.6 that there exists homogeneous polynomial  $h$  such that  $V = \{h(z) = 0\} \subset \mathbb{B}^n$  and the Bergman submodule  $M_V = \text{Cl}[h\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{B}^n)]$ . Combining with Corollary 6.8 we know that the corona problem of the quotient Bergman submodule  $M_V^\perp$  is solvable for the multiplier subalgebra  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathbb{B}}^n)_V$ .  $\square$

We remark here that the core of the Example 6.10 is the finitely generated property of the submodule. When  $V \subset \mathbb{B}^n$  is a homogeneous algebraic variety and  $I_V$  the corresponding polynomial radical ideal, then the finitely generated property of the Bergman submodule  $M_V$  on the unit ball is coincide with the condition  $M_V = \text{Cl}[I_V]$ , however the finitely generated property maybe stronger than the latter in the case of the Drury-Arveson space. The method used in Example 6.6 or [15] for the case of Bergman space can not be directly applied to the Drury-Arveson space, since the Drury-Arveson norm can not be uniformly controlled by the uniform norm. The method we used here can actually handle the case of the Drury-Arveson submodule  $M_V$  for which the algebraic hypersurface  $V$  is determined by some monomial, and this idea may also be applied to the bounded symmetric domain.

## 7. FURTHER DISCUSSION

In this end section, we pay our attention to the case of  $\Omega = \mathbb{B}^n$  and discuss the Geometric Arveson-Douglas conjecture. From Corollary 4.8 and Corollary 5.7, we know that the  $p$ -essential normality of quotient Hardy and Bergman submodules determined by affine (irreducible) homogeneous algebraic variety on the unit ball  $\mathbb{B}^n$  is biholomorphic invariant, thus the Geometric Arveson-Douglas conjecture is equivalent to the following Conjecture 1. Let  $\emptyset \neq V \subset \mathbb{B}^n$  be an affine homogeneous algebraic variety, which means that there exist finitely many holomorphic homogeneous polynomials  $q_1, \dots, q_m$  satisfying  $V = \{z \in \mathbb{B}^n : q_1(z) = \dots = q_m(z) = 0\}$ . Define  $(M_V, T)$  to be the submodule with the coordinate multipliers in the Bergman module (or Hardy module), its quotient submodule with the compression of the coordinate multipliers  $T$  is denoted by  $(M_V^\perp, S)$ . And denote  $S_\phi = (S_{\phi_1}, \dots, S_{\phi_n})$ , for every  $\phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n) \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{B}^n)$ .

**Conjecture 1.** Let  $V \subset \mathbb{B}^n$  be an affine homogeneous algebraic variety. Then for some (every)  $\phi \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{B}^n)$ , the quotient submodule  $(M_V^\perp, S_\phi)$  is  $p$ -essentially normal for all  $p > \dim_{\mathbb{C}} V$ .

When  $M_V$  is finitely generated by some functions belong to  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathbb{B}}^n)$ , it follows from Proposition 6.1 that the Taylor spectrum  $Sp(S)$  of  $S$  on  $M_V^\perp$  is  $Sp(S) = \bar{V} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ . For  $A \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ , we denote its Hausdorff dimension by  $\dim_{\text{H}} A$ . Since the dimension  $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} V$  is equal the maximal dimension of the regular (smooth) part of  $V$  at some points, which is a locally finite union of complex submanifold with complex dimension less than  $n$ , and the Hausdorff dimension coincides its topological dimension on a Riemannian

manifold, it follows from Proposition 6.1 that

$$\frac{1}{2} \dim_{\mathbb{H}} Sp(S) = \frac{1}{2} \dim_{\mathbb{H}} \bar{V} \geq \frac{1}{2} \dim_{\mathbb{H}} V = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} V,$$

and the equality can be taken since in the current case  $V$  is homogeneous algebraic and  $M_V$  is finitely generated by some functions belong to  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathbb{B}}^n)$ . Thus the above observation supports us to consider the following problem involving the Taylor spectrum as follows.

**Problem 2.** Let  $M$  be an arbitrary Bergman submodule on  $\mathbb{B}^n$ . Does the quotient submodule  $M^\perp$  satisfy that  $M^\perp$  is the  $p$ -essentially normal for all  $p > \frac{1}{2} \dim_{\mathbb{H}} Sp(S)$ ?

The Problem 2 is equivalent to the Geometric Arveson-Douglas conjecture if  $M = M_V$  is finitely generated by some functions belong to  $\mathcal{O}(\bar{\mathbb{B}}^n)$  for some homogeneous algebraic variety  $V$ . From Example 6.6 and [16, 20, 21], we know that the Problem 2 is positive for  $M = M_V$  when  $V$  is an irreducible homogeneous algebraic hypersurface (say the Fermat surfaces  $V = \{z_1^m + \cdots + z_n^m = 0\} \subset \mathbb{B}^n, m \geq 1$ ).

### Acknowledgements.

The author is very grateful to Kunyu Guo for his valuable suggestion and continuous encouragement. The author would like to thank Kai Wang and Yi Wang for their helpful discussion. The author would like to thank Zhi Li and Bojie He for several discussion on complex algebraic geometry. The author would also like to thank Shuyi Zhang for several communication concerning the Taylor spectrum. The author was partially supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (12201571) and Scientific Research Foundation of Zhengzhou University (32213181).

### REFERENCES

- [1] J. Agler, J. McCarthy, *Complete Nevanlinna-Pick kernels*, J. Funct. Anal. **175**, 111-124 (2000)
- [2] P. Ahern, D. Clark, *On functions orthogonal to invariant subspaces*, Acta Math. **124** 191-204 (1970)
- [3] J. Arazy, G. Zhang, *Homogeneous multiplication operators on bounded symmetric domains*, J. Funct. Anal. **202**, No. 1, 44-66 (2003),
- [4] W. Arveson. *Subalgebras of  $C^*$ -algebras III: Multivariable operator theory*, Acta Math. **181**, 159-228 (1998)
- [5] W. Arveson,  *$p$ -summable commutators in dimension  $d$* , J. Oper. Theory, **54**, 101-117 (2005)
- [6] E. Bedford, J. Fornæss, *Domains with pseudoconvex neighborhood systems*, Invent. Math. **47**, 1-27 (1978)
- [7] S. Biswas, S. Datta, G. Ghosh, and S. Shyam Roy, *Reducing submodules of Hilbert modules and Chevalley-Shephard-Todd theorem*, Adv. Math. **403**, Paper No. 108366, 54 pp (2022)
- [8] A. Connes, *Noncommutative differential geometry*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. No. 62, 257-360 (1985)
- [9] K. Davidson, C. Ramsey and O. Shalit, *The isomorphism problem for some universal operator algebras*, Adv. Math. **228**, 167-218 (2011)
- [10] K. Davidson, C. Ramsey and O. Shalit, *Operator algebras for analytic varieties*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **367**, 1121-1150 (2015)

- [11] J. Demailly, *Complex Analytic and Differential Geometry*, <https://www-fourier.ujf-grenoble.fr/~demailly/manuscripts/agbook.pdf> (2009)
- [12] L. Ding, *Schatten class Bergman-type and Szegő-type operators on bounded symmetric domains*, *Adv. Math.* **401**, No. 108314, 27 pp (2022)
- [13] R. Douglas, *Essentially reductive Hilbert modules*, *J. Oper. Theory* **55**, 117-133 (2006)
- [14] R. Douglas, *A new kind of index theorem*, World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 369-382 (2006)
- [15] R. Douglas, X. Tang and G. Yu, *An analytic Grothendieck Riemann Roch theorem*, *Adv. Math.* **294**, 307-331 (2016)
- [16] R. Douglas, K. Wang, *A harmonic analysis approach to essential normality of principal submodules*, *J. Funct. Anal.* **261**, 3155-3180 (2011)
- [17] R. Douglas, Y. Wang, *Geometric Arveson-Douglas conjecture and holomorphic extensions*, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **66** 1499-1535 (2017)
- [18] M. Engliš, J. Eschmeier, *Geometric Arveson-Douglas conjecture*, *Adv. Math.* **274**, 606-630 (2015) *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **133**, 2377-2386 (2005)
- [19] H. Grauert, K. Fritzsche, *Several complex variables*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 38. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg (1976)
- [20] K. Guo, K. Wang, *Essentially normal Hilbert modules and  $K$ -homology*, *Math. Ann.* **340**, 907-934 (2008)
- [21] K. Guo, K. Wang, *Essentially normal Hilbert modules and  $K$ -homology. II. Quasi-homogeneous Hilbert modules over the two dimensional unit ball*, *J. Ramanujan Math. Soc.* **22**, 259-281 (2007)
- [22] K. Guo, Y. Wang, *A survey on the Arveson-Douglas conjecture*, *Oper. Theory Adv. Appl.* **278**, Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 289-311 (2020)
- [23] J. Helton, R. Howe, *Integral operators, commutator traces, index and homology*, in: *Proceedings of a Conference on Operator Theory*, in: *Lecture Notes in Math.*, vol. **345**, Springer Verlag, 141-209 (1973)
- [24] W. Kaup, *A Riemann mapping theorem for bounded symmetric domains in complex Banach spaces*, *Math. Zeit.* **183**, 503-529 (1983)
- [25] M. Kennedy, O. Shalit, *Essential normality and the decomposability of algebraic varieties*, *New York J. Math.* **18**, 877-890 (2012)
- [26] O. Loos, *Bounded symmetric domains and Jordan Pairs*, *Mathematical Lectures*, The University of California (1977)
- [27] J. Taylor, *The analytic-functional calculus for several commuting operators*, *Acta Math.* **125**, 1-38 (1970)
- [28] M. Putinar, *The superposition property for Taylor's functional calculus*. *J. Operator Theory* **7**, 149-155 (1982)
- [29] D. Sarason, *Algebraic properties of truncated Toeplitz operators*, *Oper. Matrices* **1**, 491-526 (2007)
- [30] I. Satake, *Algebraic structures of symmetric domains*, Iwanami Shoten, Tokyo, and Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ (1980)
- [31] Y. Siu, *Noetherianess of rings of holomorphic functions on Stein compact sets*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **21**, 483-489 (1969)
- [32] H. Upmeyer, *Toeplitz  $C^*$ -algebras on bounded symmetric domains*, *Ann. of Math.* (2) **119**, 549-576 (1984)
- [33] H. Upmeyer, *Toeplitz operators and index theory in several complex variables*. *Operator Theory: Advances and Applications*, 81. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel (1996)
- [34] H. Upmeyer, K. Wang, *Dixmier trace for Toeplitz operators on symmetric domains*, *J. Funct. Anal.* **271**, 532-565 (2016)

- [35] Y. Wang, J. Xia, *Essential normality for quotient modules and complex dimensions*. J. Funct. Anal. **276**, 1061-1096 (2019)
- [36] Y. Wang, J. Xia, *Geometric Arveson-Douglas conjecture for the Hardy space and a related compactness criterion*. Adv. Math. **388**, No. 107890, 54 pp (2021)
- [37] P. Wang, C. Zhao, *Essentially normal homogeneous quotient modules on the polydisc*, Adv. Math. **339**, 404-425 (2018)

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, ZHENGZHOU UNIVERSITY, ZHENGZHOU, HENAN 450001, P. R. CHINA