

Some Results for the Szegő and Bergman Projections on Planar Domains

Nathan A. Wagner

ABSTRACT. The purpose of this note is to prove some boundedness/compactness results of a harmonic analysis flavor for the Bergman and Szegő projections on certain classes of planar domains using conformal mappings. In particular, we prove weighted estimates for the projections, provide quantitative L^p estimates and a specific example of such estimates on a domain with a sharp p range, prove a weak-type inequality, and show that the “difference” of the Bergman and Szegő projections is compact on L^p in several situations. We also pose some open questions that naturally arise from our investigation.

1. Introduction

Let \mathbb{D} denote the unit disc and $\partial\mathbb{D}$ the unit circle. Let $A^2(\mathbb{D})$ denote the Bergman space of square-integrable holomorphic functions on the unit disc and $H^2(\partial\mathbb{D})$ denote the Hardy space on the unit circle, which is the closed subspace of $L^2(\partial\mathbb{D})$ consisting of functions whose Fourier series are of the form $f(e^{i\theta}) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n e^{in\theta}$. It is well-known that every function in $H^2(\partial\mathbb{D})$ can be identified with a holomorphic function in \mathbb{D} with square-summable Taylor coefficients via the Poisson extension, and conversely, the boundary values of any such holomorphic function are well-defined as non-tangential limits and belong to $H^2(\partial\mathbb{D})$. The Bergman projection \mathcal{B}_0 is the orthogonal projection from $L^2(\mathbb{D})$ to $A^2(\mathbb{D})$, and can be expressed as the following integral for $f \in L^2(\mathbb{D})$ and $z \in \mathbb{D}$:

$$\mathcal{B}_0 f(z) = \int_{\mathbb{D}} \frac{f(w)}{(1 - \bar{w}z)^2} dA(w),$$

where dA denotes (normalized) Lebesgue area measure on \mathbb{D} . On the other hand, the Szegő projection \mathcal{S}_0 is the orthogonal projection from $L^2(\partial\mathbb{D})$ to $H^2(\partial\mathbb{D})$, and has the following integral representation for $f \in L^2(\partial\mathbb{D})$ and $\zeta \in \partial\mathbb{D}$:

$$\mathcal{S}_0 f(\zeta) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{f(e^{i\theta})}{(1 - e^{-i\theta} r \zeta)} d\theta.$$

Conformal mapping then allows us to express the Bergman and Szegő projections on other planar domains in terms of the projections on the unit disc/circle. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a simply connected domain. When we consider the Szegő projection, we will make the additional assumption that Ω is bounded and has rectifiable boundary. For such a domain, we know by the Riemann mapping theorem that there exists a biholomorphic map $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \Omega$. In particular, if Ω is also assumed to be bounded and rectifiable, we know that φ extends to a continuous bijective mapping of the closures $\mathbb{D} \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}$ and φ' has non-tangential boundary limits almost everywhere. Moreover, if we identify φ' with its boundary values, it is known $\varphi' \in H^1(\partial\mathbb{D})$ (see [17]). When we refer to φ' in the case of the Szegő projection, we will make this identification without further comment.

The Bergman projection \mathcal{B} is again defined to be the orthogonal projection from $L^2(\Omega)$ to $A^2(\Omega)$, where $A^2(\Omega)$ is the Bergman space of square-integrable functions on Ω . Having fixed a conformal map φ , define a

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 43A99, Secondary: 30E20, 30H10, 30H20, 30C20 .

The research that led to this manuscript was partially completed when the author was supported by an NSF GRF grant (DGE-1745038). The author would also like to thank Brett Wick and Cody Stockdale for several helpful comments.

map τ from $L^2(\Omega)$ to $L^2(\mathbb{D})$ as follows:

$$\tau(f) := (f \circ \varphi) \times (\varphi')$$

and notice that τ is a unitary operator. Then, using a transformation law for the Bergman kernel, one can show the Bergman projection \mathcal{B} can be expressed

$$(1.1) \quad \mathcal{B} = \tau^{-1} \mathcal{B}_0 \tau.$$

Similarly, the Szegő projection \mathcal{S} can be (somewhat imprecisely) defined as the orthogonal projection from $L^2(\partial\Omega)$ to $H^2(\partial\Omega)$, where $H^2(\partial\Omega)$ is an appropriate notion of Hardy space. This definition can be made more concrete by conformal mapping: analogously define a unitary map $\tau_{1/2}$ from $L^2(\partial\Omega)$ to $L^2(\partial\mathbb{D})$ as follows:

$$\tau_{1/2}(f)(e^{i\theta}) := f(\varphi(e^{i\theta})) \times (\varphi'(e^{i\theta}))^{1/2}.$$

Then the Szegő projection on $L^2(\partial\Omega)$ may be defined

$$(1.2) \quad \mathcal{S} = \tau_{1/2}^{-1} \mathcal{S}_0 \tau_{1/2}.$$

This technique of relating the projections via conformal mapping was used by Lanzani and Stein to study the L^p regularity of the Bergman and Szegő projections in [17] on several classes of planar domains including graph domains, local graph domains, domains with the vanishing chord-arc property, and Lipschitz domains. In some of these cases (local graph, graph, and Lipschitz) they show that the Szegő/Bergman projections are bounded on L^p for a limited range $p_0 < p < p'_0 = \frac{p_0}{p_0-1}$ where $p_0 > 1$, and they additionally demonstrate that the range cannot be improved in the Lipschitz case. This behavior of the projections stands in stark contrast to the smooth boundary case, or even the case when the boundary is of class C^1 or convex. In these situations, the L^p boundedness for $1 < p < \infty$ can be recovered (see, for example [5], [22]). However, in the case that Ω has the vanishing chord-arc property, Lanzani and Stein proved that the projections are bounded on L^p for the full range as well.

It turns out that the *unweighted* L^p regularity of either projection on Ω or $\partial\Omega$ is equivalent to the boundedness on a *weighted* L^p space of the corresponding projection on the unit disc/circle. The boundedness on the unit disc/circle can then be deduced from known weighted theory; in particular, the Szegő projection is bounded on $L^p_\omega(\partial\Omega)$ if and only if $\omega \in A_p(\partial\mathbb{D})$ (see [19]), and the Bergman projection is bounded on $L^p_\omega(\mathbb{D})$ if and only if $\omega \in A^+_p(\mathbb{D})$ (see [5]). These weight classes are defined precisely in Section 2. We also mention that this conformal mapping technique was used by Lanzani and Koenig [16] to study mapping properties of the difference operator $\mathcal{BP} - \mathcal{PS}$, where \mathcal{P} denotes the Poisson extension operator.

In this note, we prove a collection of results, including weighted estimates and compactness, for the Bergman and Szegő projections and related operators on planar domains. The unifying principle in our exploration is the use of conformal mapping techniques, in particular equations (1.1) and (1.2) and related identities to prove these harmonic analysis theorems. First, we provide sufficient conditions on a weight ω for the Bergman or Szegő projection to be bounded on L^p_ω for a general planar domain. In specific cases, these conditions translate to membership in an expected weight class that is the intersection of a Muckenhoupt class with a reverse Hölder class. We also use conformal mapping to provide a quantitative estimate on the operator norms of the projections on unweighted L^p spaces and work out a specific example where we also provide a lower bound. Additionally, we obtain weak-type (1,1) estimates on the projections for a class of planar domains and study the compactness of the difference operator $\mathcal{BP} - \mathcal{PS}$. Throughout the paper, we list several open questions as well.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we prove the weighted L^p estimates for the projection operators and note several applications to specific domain classes. In Section 3, we show how the conformal techniques lead to quantitative L^p norm estimates for the projections and work out an example where we can obtain concrete upper and lower bounds. In Section 4, we prove weak-type (1,1) estimates for the projections on Dini-smooth domains. Finally, in Section 5, we prove compactness results for the difference operator $\mathcal{BP} - \mathcal{PS}$.

2. Weighted Estimates

In this section, we prove general weighted estimates for the Bergman and Szegő projections. As a consequence, we deduce specific results on certain classes of planar domains. To summarize, we establish

that for these domain classes, if the Szegő or Bergman projection is bounded on L^p for a limited range of p , then the operator extends boundedly in the same range to the weighted space $L^p_\omega(\Omega)$, provided the pullback of the weight ω to the unit disc belongs to an appropriate Muckenhoupt class intersected with a reverse Hölder class. In particular, see Subsection 2.2.

Weighted theory for operators that are bounded on a limited range of L^p spaces has been studied by several authors. Auscher and Martell proved that for a certain class of operators \mathcal{T} that are bounded on a limited range $p_0 < p < q_0$ of L^p spaces, weighted L^p estimates can be obtained [1]. In particular, if $\omega \in A_{\frac{p}{p_0}} \cap \text{RH}\left(\frac{q_0}{p}\right)'$, then \mathcal{T} maps $L^p(\omega)$ to $L^p(\omega)$. Bernicot, Frey, and Petermichel later elaborated on this result to provide a sharp weighted estimate using techniques of sparse bounds [7]. The weight classes we consider below are inspired by these results.

Recall that a weight is a locally integrable function that is positive almost everywhere. For $1 < p < \infty$, we say a weight ω on $\partial\mathbb{D}$ belongs to $A_p(\partial\mathbb{D})$ if the following quantity is finite:

$$[\omega]_{A_p} := \sup_I \frac{1}{|I|} \int_I \omega \, d\theta \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I \omega^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} \, d\theta \right)^{p-1},$$

where I is an arc on the boundary of \mathbb{D} , $d\theta$ denotes arc length measure, and $|I| = \int_I d\theta$ denotes the arc length of I . On the other hand, for $1 < q < \infty$ we say that ω lies in the reverse Hölder class $\text{RH}_q(\partial\mathbb{D})$ if

$$[\omega]_{\text{RH}_q(\partial\mathbb{D})} := \sup_I \frac{\left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I \omega^q \, d\theta \right)^{1/q}}{\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I \omega \, d\theta} < \infty.$$

Analogously for the Bergman projection, we define the A_p^+ class of weights with respect to certain Carleson regions. For $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$, let $D_r(z_0) = \{z : |z - z_0| < r\}$ be the (Euclidean) disc of radius r centered at z_0 . We say a weight ω on \mathbb{D} belongs to $A_p^+(\mathbb{D})$ if the following quantity is finite:

$$[\omega]_{A_p^+} := \sup_{\substack{z \in \partial\mathbb{D} \\ r > 0}} \frac{1}{|D_r(z) \cap \mathbb{D}|} \int_{D_r(z) \cap \mathbb{D}} \omega \, dA \left(\frac{1}{|D_r(z) \cap \mathbb{D}|} \int_{D_r(z) \cap \mathbb{D}} \omega^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} \, dA \right)^{p-1},$$

where dA denotes (normalized) planar Lebesgue measure and $|D_r(z)| = A(D_r(z))$.

Analogous to our earlier definition, for $1 < q < \infty$ we say that $\omega \in \text{RH}_q(\mathbb{D})$ if

$$[\omega]_{\text{RH}_q(\mathbb{D})} := \sup_{\substack{z \in \partial\mathbb{D} \\ r > 0}} \frac{\left(\frac{1}{|D_r(z) \cap \mathbb{D}|} \int_{D_r(z) \cap \mathbb{D}} \omega^q \, dA \right)^{1/q}}{\frac{1}{|D_r(z) \cap \mathbb{D}|} \int_{D_r(z) \cap \mathbb{D}} \omega \, dA} < \infty.$$

We remark in passing that a subclass of A_p^+ weights (more precisely, a limiting class when $p = \infty$ that satisfy an additional regularity condition) that belong to $\text{RH}_q(\mathbb{D})$ were the main object of study in [2].

We have the following two general theorems.

THEOREM 2.1. *Suppose $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ is a bounded, simply connected domain with rectifiable boundary and $1 < p_0 < 2$. Suppose there exists a biholomorphic mapping $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \Omega$ that has the property that $|\varphi'|^{(1-\frac{p}{2})\left(\frac{p_0}{p(p_0-1)}\right)} \in A_2(\partial\mathbb{D})$ for $p_0 < p < \frac{p_0}{p_0-1}$. If $p_0 < p < \frac{p_0}{p_0-1}$ and $\omega \circ \varphi \in A_{\frac{p}{p_0}}(\partial\mathbb{D}) \cap \text{RH}\left(\frac{p_0}{p}\right)'(\partial\mathbb{D})$, then the Szegő projection \mathcal{S} extends to a bounded operator on $L^p_\omega(\partial\Omega)$. Moreover,*

$$\|\mathcal{S}\|_{L^p(\partial\Omega)} \lesssim \left([\omega \circ \varphi]_{A_{\frac{p}{p_0}}} \times [\omega \circ \varphi]_{\text{RH}\left(\frac{p_0}{p}\right)'} \times \left[|\varphi'|^{(1-\frac{p}{2})\left(\frac{p_0}{p(p_0-1)}\right)} \right]_{A_2}^{\frac{p(p_0-1)}{p_0}} \right)^{\max\{1, \frac{1}{p-1}\}}.$$

THEOREM 2.2. *Suppose $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ is a simply connected domain. Suppose there exists a biholomorphic mapping $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \Omega$ that has the property that $|\varphi'|^{(2-p)\left(\frac{p_0}{p(p_0-1)}\right)} \in A_2^+(\mathbb{D})$ for $p_0 < p < \frac{p_0}{p_0-1}$. If $p_0 < p < \frac{p_0}{p_0-1}$ and $\omega \circ \varphi \in A_{\frac{p}{p_0}}^+(\mathbb{D}) \cap \text{RH}\left(\frac{p_0}{p}\right)'(\mathbb{D})$, then the Bergman projection \mathcal{B} is bounded on $L^p_\omega(\Omega)$. Moreover,*

$$\|\mathcal{B}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \lesssim \left([\omega \circ \varphi]_{A_{\frac{p}{p_0}}^+} \times [\omega \circ \varphi]_{\text{RH}\left(\frac{p'_0}{p}\right)'} \times \left[|\varphi'|^{(2-p)\left(\frac{p_0}{p(p_0-1)}\right)} \right]_{A_2^+} \right)^{\max\{1, \frac{1}{p-1}\}}.$$

We denote arc length measure on $\partial\Omega$ by $d\sigma$. For convenience in what follows, for a positive function f we let

$$\int_I f d\theta = \frac{1}{|I|} \int_I f d\theta.$$

We use analogous notation for averages in the Bergman case when the integrals are taken over a domain in \mathbb{C} with respect to Lebesgue measure dA in the plane.

2.1. Proofs of main theorems. These theorems are established by transferring the problem to the unit disc via the following two lemmas. In what follows, $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}$ always denotes the (fixed) Riemann map.

LEMMA 2.3. *Let $1 \leq p < \infty$. The boundedness of \mathcal{S} on $L_\omega^p(\partial\Omega)$ is equivalent to the boundedness of \mathcal{S}_0 on $L_{(\omega \circ \varphi)\nu}^p(\partial\mathbb{D})$ where $\nu(e^{i\theta}) = |\varphi'(e^{i\theta})|^{1-\frac{p}{2}}$. Therefore, for $1 < p < \infty$, the boundedness of \mathcal{S} on $L_\omega^p(\partial\Omega)$ is equivalent to the condition $(\omega \circ \varphi)\nu \in A_p(\partial\mathbb{D})$.*

PROOF. To prove the first statement, it suffices to show that $\tau_{1/2}$ is also a surjective isometry from $L_\omega^p(\partial\Omega)$ to $L_{(\omega \circ \varphi)\nu}^p(\partial\mathbb{D})$. It is well-known (see [17]) that $d\sigma(\zeta) = |\varphi'(e^{i\theta})|d\theta$ where $\zeta = \varphi(e^{i\theta})$, so we may apply a change of variable. We compute, for a function $f \in L_\omega^p(\partial\Omega)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial\Omega} |f|^p \omega d\sigma &= \int_{\partial\mathbb{D}} |f(\varphi)|^p (\omega \circ \varphi) |\varphi'| d\theta \\ &= \int_{\partial\mathbb{D}} |f(\varphi)|^p |\varphi'|^{p/2} (\omega \circ \varphi) |\varphi'|^{1-\frac{p}{2}} d\theta \\ &= \int_{\partial\mathbb{D}} |\tau_{1/2}(f)|^p (\omega \circ \varphi) |\varphi'|^{1-\frac{p}{2}} d\theta \end{aligned}$$

which establishes that $\tau_{1/2}$ is isometric. Surjectivity is obvious.

The second statement is an immediate consequence of the first by standard facts about the Szegő projection on the unit disc (see [17] or [19]). \square

The second lemma is completely analogous to the first.

LEMMA 2.4. *The boundedness of \mathcal{B} on $L_\omega^p(\Omega)$ is equivalent to the boundedness of \mathcal{B}_0 on $L_{(\omega \circ \varphi)\nu}^p(\mathbb{D})$ where $\nu(z) = |\varphi'(z)|^{2-p}$. Therefore, the boundedness of \mathcal{B} on $L_\omega^p(\Omega)$ is equivalent to the condition $(\omega \circ \varphi)\nu \in A_p^+(\mathbb{D})$.*

PROOF. The proof is virtually identical to the proof of the preceding lemma with minor changes. In particular, the map $\tau_{1/2}$ needs to be replaced by the map τ and the integration now takes places on \mathbb{D} . \square

The following two propositions will enable us to prove Theorems 2.1 and 2.2.

PROPOSITION 2.5. Let $1 < p_0 < p < \frac{p_0}{p_0-1}$ and suppose $(\omega \circ \varphi) \in A_{\frac{p}{p_0}}(\partial\mathbb{D}) \cap \text{RH}\left(\frac{p'_0}{p}\right)'(\partial\mathbb{D})$. Let $\nu(e^{i\theta}) = |\varphi'(e^{i\theta})|^{1-\frac{p}{2}}$. If $\nu^{\frac{p_0}{p(p_0-1)}} \in A_2(\partial\mathbb{D})$, then $(\omega \circ \varphi)\nu \in A_p(\partial\mathbb{D})$ and

$$[\omega \circ \varphi]\nu_{A_p} \leq [\omega \circ \varphi]_{A_{\frac{p}{p_0}}} \times [\omega \circ \varphi]_{\text{RH}\left(\frac{p'_0}{p}\right)'} \times \left[\nu^{\frac{p'_0}{p}} \right]_{A_2}^{\frac{p}{p_0}}.$$

PROOF. We must show

$$\sup_I \int_I (\omega \circ \varphi)\nu d\theta \left(\int_I ((\omega \circ \varphi)\nu)^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} d\theta \right)^{p-1} \leq [\omega \circ \varphi]_{A_{\frac{p}{p_0}}} \times [\omega \circ \varphi]_{\text{RH}\left(\frac{p'_0}{p}\right)'} \times \left[\nu^{\frac{p'_0}{p}} \right]_{A_2}^{\frac{p}{p_0}}.$$

Applying Hölder's inequality with exponents $r = \frac{p'_0}{p}$ and r' and using the fact that $(\omega \circ \varphi) \in \text{RH}_{r'}(\partial\mathbb{D})$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_I (\omega \circ \varphi) \nu \, d\theta &\leq \left(\int_I (\omega \circ \varphi)^{r'} \, d\theta \right)^{\frac{1}{r'}} \left(\int_I \nu^r \, d\theta \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \\ &\leq [\omega \circ \varphi]_{\text{RH}_{r'}} \left(\int_I (\omega \circ \varphi) \, d\theta \right) \left(\int_I \nu^r \, d\theta \right)^{\frac{1}{r}}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, let $s = \frac{p}{p_0}$. Let $t = \frac{(p-1)}{s-1}$ and note $t > 1$. Then, applying Hölder's inequality with exponents t and $t' = \frac{p_0(p-1)}{p(p_0-1)} = (p-1)r$, we obtain

$$\left(\int_I ((\omega \circ \varphi) \nu)^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} \, d\theta \right)^{p-1} \leq \left(\int_I (\omega \circ \varphi)^{-\frac{1}{s-1}} \, d\theta \right)^{s-1} \left(\int_I \nu^{-r} \, d\theta \right)^{\frac{1}{r}}.$$

Putting these facts together, we then get

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_I (\omega \circ \varphi) \nu \, d\theta \left(\int_I ((\omega \circ \varphi) \nu)^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} \, d\theta \right)^{p-1} \\ &\leq [\omega \circ \varphi]_{\text{RH}_{r'}} \left(\int_I (\omega \circ \varphi) \, d\theta \right) \left(\int_I \nu^r \, d\theta \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \left(\int_I (\omega \circ \varphi)^{-\frac{1}{s-1}} \, d\theta \right)^{s-1} \left(\int_I \nu^{-r} \, d\theta \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \\ &\leq [\omega \circ \varphi]_{A_s(\partial\mathbb{D})} \times [\omega \circ \varphi]_{\text{RH}_{r'}} \times [\nu^r]_{A_2(b\mathbb{D})}^{\frac{1}{r}} \end{aligned}$$

as required. □

PROPOSITION 2.6. Let $1 < p_0 < p < \frac{p_0}{p_0-1}$ and suppose $(\omega \circ \varphi) \in A_{\frac{p_0}{p}}^+(\mathbb{D}) \cap \text{RH}_{\left(\frac{p'_0}{p}\right)'(\mathbb{D})}$. Let $\nu(z) = |\varphi'(z)|^{2-p}$. If $\nu^{\frac{p_0}{p(p_0-1)}} \in A_2^+(\mathbb{D})$, then $(\omega \circ \varphi) \nu \in A_p^+(\mathbb{D})$ and $[\omega \circ \varphi \nu]_{A_p^+} \leq [\omega \circ \varphi]_{A_{\frac{p_0}{p}}^+} \times [\omega \circ \varphi]_{\text{RH}_{\left(\frac{p'_0}{p}\right)'}} \times \left[\nu^{\frac{p'_0}{p}} \right]_{A_2^+}^{\frac{p}{p'_0}}$.

PROOF. The proof follows exactly the same way as Proposition 2.5. □

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1. The theorem follows from Lemma 2.3, Proposition 2.5, and the fact that $\|\mathcal{S}_0\|_{L_\omega^p(\partial\mathbb{D})} \lesssim C_p [\omega]_{A_p(\partial\mathbb{D})}^{\max\{1, \frac{1}{p-1}\}}$. Moreover, the constant C_p blows up only at $p = 1$ and $p = \infty$, so we can omit the dependence on p for the implicit constant in the statement. These facts can be deduced as follows: note that the Szegő projection can be viewed as a Calderón-Zygmund operator on the circle viewed as a space of homogeneous type with arc length metric and measure. The sharp weighted estimates on L^p then follow from the A_2 theorem on spaces of homogeneous type (see [4]), a line-by-line imitation of the Euclidean extrapolation proof in [8, Theorem 3.22], and the estimate for the maximal function in [14, Proposition 7.13]. See also [10] for a similar estimate in the Euclidean setting of \mathbb{R}^n . □

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.2. The theorem follows from Lemma 2.4, Proposition 2.6, and the fact that $\|\mathcal{B}_0\|_{L_\omega^p(\mathbb{D})} \lesssim C_p [\omega]_{A_p^+(\mathbb{D})}^{\max\{1, \frac{1}{p-1}\}}$. This last fact can be found in [21]. Similar remarks for the constant C_p apply as before. □

2.2. Applications. We now present several applications of Theorems 2.1 and 2.2. We consider in particular local graph domains and bounded Lipschitz domains. We say Ω is a graph domain if there exist an angle $\alpha > 0$ and a continuous function $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ so that if $z = x + iy$,

$$\Omega = \{e^{i\alpha} z : y > \gamma(x)\}.$$

Similarly, we say Ω is a local graph domain if there exist finitely many graph domains $\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_n$ together with arcs on the boundary $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_n$ covering $\partial\Omega$ and discs D_j so that $\Gamma_j \subset D_j$ and $\Omega \cap D_j = \Omega_j \cap D_j$ for

$1 \leq j \leq n$. If each γ_j is a Lipschitz map with Lipschitz constant M_j , we further say that Ω is a bounded Lipschitz domain with Lipschitz constant $M = \max M_j$.

COROLLARY 2.7. Let Ω be a bounded, simply connected local graph domain. Then the Szegő projection \mathcal{S} is bounded on $L_\omega^p(\partial\Omega)$ for $\frac{4}{3} < p < 4$ and all ω satisfying $(\omega \circ \varphi) \in A_{\frac{3p}{4}}(\partial\mathbb{D}) \cap \text{RH}_{(\frac{4}{p})'}(\partial\mathbb{D})$.

COROLLARY 2.8. Let Ω be a bounded Lipschitz domain with Lipschitz constant M and let $p_M = 2(\frac{\pi}{2\arctan M} + 1)$. Then the Szegő projection \mathcal{S} is bounded on $L_\omega^p(\partial\Omega)$ for $p'_M < p < p_M$ and all ω satisfying $(\omega \circ \varphi) \in A_{\frac{p}{p_M}}(\partial\mathbb{D}) \cap \text{RH}_{(\frac{p_M}{p})'}(\partial\mathbb{D})$.

COROLLARY 2.9. Let Ω be a bounded, simply connected local graph domain. Then the Bergman projection \mathcal{B} is bounded on $L_\omega^p(\Omega)$ for $\frac{4}{3} < p < 4$ and all ω satisfying $(\omega \circ \varphi) \in A_{\frac{4}{3}}^+(\mathbb{D}) \cap \text{RH}_{(\frac{4}{p})'}(\mathbb{D})$.

COROLLARY 2.10. Let Ω be a bounded Lipschitz domain with Lipschitz constant M and let $p_M = 2(\frac{\pi}{2\arctan M} + 1)$. Then the Bergman projection \mathcal{B} is bounded on $L_\omega^p(\Omega)$ for $p'_M < p < p_M$ and all ω satisfying $(\omega \circ \varphi) \in A_{\frac{p}{p_M}}^+(\mathbb{D}) \cap \text{RH}_{(\frac{p_M}{p})'}(\mathbb{D})$.

All of these corollaries are deduced via Theorem 2.1 or 2.2 in the same way; by verifying that $|\varphi'|^{(1-\frac{p}{2})(\frac{p_0}{p(p_0-1)})}$ (or its square) is an $A_2(\partial\mathbb{D})$ or (respectively, $A_2^+(\mathbb{D})$) weight. The details can be found in [17], but we recall relevant facts for completeness. If Ω is a local graph domain, it is shown in [17] that $|\varphi'|^r \in A_2(\partial\mathbb{D})$ for $0 \leq r < 1$ (and thus actually for $-1 < r < 1$). Note if $p_0 = \frac{4}{3}$ and $p \in (\frac{4}{3}, 4)$, we have $(1-\frac{p}{2})(\frac{p_0}{p(p_0-1)}) = \frac{4}{p} - 2$, and $-1 < \frac{4}{p} - 2 < 1$ for p in this range. The argument for when Ω is a bounded Lipschitz domain is basically identical.

On the other hand, for the same domains when considering the Bergman projection, Lanzani and Stein show that φ' is an outer function on \mathbb{D} . They then quote a result of Békollè in [5] that shows if φ' is outer, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, and $|\varphi'(e^{i\theta})|^\alpha \in A_p(\partial\mathbb{D})$, then $|\varphi'(z)|^{2\alpha} \in A_p^+(\mathbb{D})$. Thus, the two corresponding results for the Bergman projection follow from the arguments above pertaining to the Szegő projection.

REMARK 2.11. Notice that the conditions on the weights for boundedness in all of these results are, of course, in terms of its pullback to the unit disc. It is unclear to the author whether these weights can be described in a conformal-free way that is intrinsic to the domain Ω , especially in the case of a domain with non-smooth boundary. This leads to the following question.

OPEN QUESTION 2.12. Is there a way to describe the weight classes that appear in the above corollaries (or more generally in Theorems 2.1 and 2.2) in a way that avoids the conformal map φ and is intrinsic to Ω ?

3. An Upper Bound and A Quantitative Example

One can use similar methods as above to obtain quantitative estimates on the norm of the unweighted Szegő or Bergman projection. We have the following result:

THEOREM 3.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a simply connected, bounded domain with rectifiable boundary. Let $\varphi : \bar{\mathbb{D}} \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}$ be a conformal mapping. The following estimate holds for the Szegő projection \mathcal{S} :*

$$\|\mathcal{S}\|_{L^p(\partial\Omega) \rightarrow L^p(\partial\Omega)} \leq C_p \left[|\varphi'|^{1-\frac{p}{2}} \right]_{A_p}^{\max\{1, \frac{1}{p-1}\}},$$

where C_p is a constant that depends on p .

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1. First, note that the proof of Lemma 2.3 demonstrates that

$$\|\mathcal{S}\|_{L^p(\partial\Omega) \rightarrow L^p(\partial\Omega)} = \|\mathcal{S}_0\|_{L_\omega^p(\partial\mathbb{D}) \rightarrow L_\omega^p(\partial\mathbb{D})},$$

where $\omega = |\varphi'|^{1-\frac{p}{2}}$. The upper bound then follows from noting that the Szegő projection on the unit circle is a Calderón-Zygmund operator on a space of homogeneous type as we argued in the proof of Theorem 2.1. It should be noted that in the important case that \mathcal{S} is bounded for a limited range $p_0 < p < p'_0$, the constant C_p can be chosen to be independent of p (the blowup occurs as $p \rightarrow 1^-$ or $p \rightarrow \infty$). \square

Of course, we have an analogous statement for the Bergman projection, and in fact we can additionally provide a lower estimate in this case.

THEOREM 3.2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a simply connected domain. Let $\varphi : \bar{\mathbb{D}} \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}$ be a conformal mapping. The following estimate holds for the Bergman projection \mathcal{B} :*

$$c_p \left[|\varphi'|^{2-p} \right]_{A_p^+}^{\frac{1}{2p}} \leq \|\mathcal{B}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C_p \left[|\varphi'|^{2-p} \right]_{A_p^+}^{\max\{1, \frac{1}{p-1}\}},$$

where c_p, C_p are constants that depend on p .

PROOF. Lemma 2.4 gives that


$$\|\mathcal{B}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} = \|\mathcal{B}_0\|_{L^p(\mathbb{D})},$$

where $\omega = |\varphi'|^{2-p}$. The upper and lower bounds then follow from [21, Theorem 1]. \square

3.1. An Example. We now provide an example of a domain in the plane where the upper bound of the L^p operator norm of the Szegő projection can be estimated directly, and in fact a lower bound may be computed as well. This example is inspired by a family of examples in [17]. Let \mathbb{R}_+^2 denote the upper half-plane in \mathbb{C} . Consider the following planar domains:

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_1 &= \Phi_1(\mathbb{R}_+^2), \Phi_1(z) = z^{3/2} e^{-i\pi/4} - i; & \Omega_2 &= \Phi_2(\mathbb{R}_+^2), \Phi_2(z) = -z^{3/2} e^{-i\pi/4} + i; \\ \Omega_3 &= \Phi_3(\mathbb{R}_+^2), \Phi_3(z) = z^{1/2} e^{-i\pi/4} - 2; & \Omega_4 &= \Phi_4(\mathbb{R}_+^2), \Phi_4(z) = -z^{1/2} e^{-i\pi/4} + 2; \\ \Omega_5 &= \Phi_5(\mathbb{R}_+^2), \Phi_5(z) = z^{1/2} e^{i\pi/4} - \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{3}{2}i\right); & \Omega_6 &= \Phi_6(\mathbb{R}_+^2), \Phi_6(z) = z^{1/2} e^{i\pi/4} + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{3}{2}i\right); \\ \Omega_7 &= \Phi_7(\mathbb{R}_+^2), \Phi_7(z) = -z^{1/2} e^{i\pi/4} + \left(-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{3}{2}i\right); & \Omega_8 &= \Phi_8(\mathbb{R}_+^2), \Phi_8(z) = -z^{1/2} e^{i\pi/4} + \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{3}{2}i\right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, let $\Omega = \bigcap_{j=1}^4 \Omega_j$. It is clear Ω is a local graph domain with corresponding graph domains Ω_j , $1 \leq j \leq 8$. We provide a picture of this domain created using Mathematica below:



It is obvious that Ω is a Lipschitz domain and it is easy to see that the Lipschitz constant is 1. We note that the points $(0, 1)$ and $(0, -1)$ in $\mathbb{R}^2 = \mathbb{C}$ are distinguished because the domain is not locally convex at those points. We know from previous work that since $M = 1$, \mathcal{S} is bounded on $L^p(\Omega)$ for $\frac{6}{5} < p < 6$. The arguments in [17] establish that \mathcal{S} is in fact bounded only in this p range, but the authors do not provide quantitative estimates on the $L^p(\Omega)$ operator norm of \mathcal{S} . Here we provide such estimates for the operator norm.

Let $\varphi : \bar{\mathbb{D}} \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}$ be a conformal map. We now proceed to compute the $A_p(\partial\mathbb{D})$ characteristic of $|\varphi'|^{1-\frac{2}{p}}$. We have the following proposition, which is a quantitative sharpening of [17, Proposition 2.4].

PROPOSITION 3.3. Let Ω be a local graph domain with corresponding graph domains $\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_n$ and conformal maps $\Phi_j : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \rightarrow \Omega_j$ that fix the point at infinity (these maps have non-tangential limits on the

boundary of \mathbb{R}_+^2 almost everywhere). Suppose $|\Phi'_j(x)|^r \in A_p(\mathbb{R})$ for some $r > 0$ and all $1 \leq j \leq n$. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}$ be a conformal map. Then $|\varphi'(e^{i\theta})|^r \in A_p(\partial\mathbb{D})$, and moreover:

$$[|\varphi'|^r]_{A_p(\partial\mathbb{D})} \approx \max\{N_1, N_2\}$$

where

$$N_1 = \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} [|\Phi'_j|^r]_{A_p(\mathbb{R})}$$

and

$$N_2 = \int_{\mathbb{D}} |\varphi'|^r d\theta \left(\int_{\mathbb{D}} |\varphi'|^{-\frac{r}{p-1}} d\theta \right)^{p-1}.$$

PROOF. The proof is essentially contained in [17], so we omit some of the details. Let $\psi_j = \varphi^{-1} \circ \Phi_j$. The main gist of the argument is that it is possible to choose a finite covering I_1, \dots, I_n of $\partial\mathbb{D}$ together with intervals on \mathbb{R} (identified as the boundary of \mathbb{R}_+^2), $J_j = \psi_j^{-1}(I_j)$, so that $|\psi'_j|$ is bounded above and below in a neighborhood of J_j and consequently $|\Phi'_j(z)| \approx |\varphi'(\psi_j(z))|$ for $z \in J_j$. Since there are finitely many such intervals I_j and $|\Phi'_j|^r \in A_p(\mathbb{R})$ for all j , it is clear that $|\varphi'|^r$ and $|\varphi'|^{-\frac{r}{p-1}}$ belong to $L^1(\partial\mathbb{D})$.

It is possible to choose $\delta > 0$ small enough so that if $|I| < \delta$, then $I \subseteq I_j$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. We then can estimate using change of variables:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|I|} \int_I |\varphi'|^r d\theta \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I |\varphi'|^{-\frac{r}{p-1}} d\theta \right)^{p-1} &\approx \frac{1}{|\psi_j^{-1}(I)|} \int_{\psi_j^{-1}(I)} |\varphi' \circ \psi_j|^r |\psi'_j| dx \left(\frac{1}{|\psi_j^{-1}(I)|} \int_{\psi_j^{-1}(I)} |\varphi' \circ \psi_j|^{-\frac{r}{p-1}} |\psi'_j| dx \right)^{p-1} \\ &\approx \frac{1}{|\psi_j^{-1}(I)|} \int_{\psi_j^{-1}(I)} |\Phi'_j|^r dx \left(\frac{1}{|\psi_j^{-1}(I)|} \int_{\psi_j^{-1}(I)} |\Phi'_j|^{-\frac{r}{p-1}} dx \right)^{p-1} \\ &\lesssim M. \end{aligned}$$

If $|I| \geq \delta$, simply note averages of $|\varphi'|^r$ and $|\varphi'|^{-\frac{r}{p-1}}$ can be controlled by a constant multiple (where the constant depends on δ) of the $L^1(\partial\mathbb{D})$ norms of these functions. \square

We now compute the $A_p(\mathbb{R})$ characteristics of $|\Phi'_1(x)|^{1-\frac{p}{2}} = \frac{3}{2}|x|^{\frac{2-p}{4}}$ and $|\Phi'_3(x)| = \frac{1}{2}|x|^{\frac{p-2}{4}}$, which are the relevant derivatives for the domain Ω introduced at the beginning of the section. The computations for the other derivatives are obviously identical so we omit them.

First, we compute the following average for I an interval centered at 0 with length δ :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|I|} \int_I |x|^{\frac{2-p}{4}} dx &\approx \frac{1}{\delta} \int_0^\delta x^{\frac{2-p}{4}} dx \\ &= \delta^{\frac{2-p}{4}} \left(\frac{4}{6-p} \right) \end{aligned}$$

and on the other hand

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I |x|^{\frac{p-2}{4(p-1)}} dx \right)^{p-1} &\approx \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \int_0^\delta x^{\frac{p-2}{4(p-1)}} dx \right)^{p-1} \\ &= \delta^{\frac{p-2}{4}} \left(\frac{4(p-1)}{5p-6} \right)^{p-1}. \end{aligned}$$

The product of these two factors gives

$$\left(\frac{4}{6-p} \right) \left(\frac{4(p-1)}{5p-6} \right)^{p-1}.$$

If I is not centered at the origin, we consider two cases. Let x_0 denote the center of I and R the radius. First suppose $|x_0| < 2R$. Then $I \subset 3I'$, where I' is the translate of I centered at 0. Note I and $3I'$ have comparable measure, so we can just apply the computation above to deduce

$$\left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I |x|^{\frac{2-p}{4}} dx \right) \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I |x|^{\frac{p-2}{4(p-1)}} dx \right)^{p-1} \lesssim \left(\frac{4}{6-p} \right) \left(\frac{4(p-1)}{5p-6} \right)^{p-1}.$$

In the other case, I is such that $|x_0| \geq 2R$. In this case, if $x \in I$, $|x| \approx R$. It is then clear

$$\left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I |x|^{\frac{2-p}{4}} dx \right) \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I |x|^{\frac{p-2}{4(p-1)}} dx \right)^{p-1} \approx 1.$$

It follows from these calculations that

$$\left[|\Phi'_1|^{1-\frac{p}{2}} \right]_{A_p(\mathbb{R})} \approx \left(\frac{1}{6-p} \right) \left(\frac{4(p-1)}{5p-6} \right)^{p-1}.$$

Similar calculations may be employed to deduce

$$\left[|\Phi'_3|^{1-\frac{p}{2}} \right]_{A_p(\mathbb{R})} \approx \left(\frac{1}{p+2} \right) \left(\frac{4(p-1)}{3p-2} \right)^{p-1}.$$

Note that the first characteristic blows up at the endpoints $p = \frac{6}{5}$ and $p = 6$ while the second one does not. In fact, it is easy to see that there exists $C > 0$ so that $\sup_{\frac{6}{5} \leq p \leq 6} \left[|\Phi'_3|^{1-\frac{p}{2}} \right]_{A_p(\mathbb{R})} \leq C$, and each factor of the characteristic is similarly bounded. The crucial behavior of the weight evidently occurs at the points $p_1 = \varphi^{-1}(i)$ and $p_2 = \varphi^{-1}(-i)$. Thus, we may conclude using the arguments in Proposition 3.3 that

$$\left[|\varphi'|^{1-\frac{p}{2}} \right]_{A_p(\partial\mathbb{D})} \approx \left(\frac{1}{6-p} \right) \left(\frac{4(p-1)}{5p-6} \right)^{p-1}.$$

With this information, we can obtain upper and lower bounds the norm of the Szegő projection in this case. First, we will need a preliminary lemma.

LEMMA 3.4. *Suppose $r < \frac{2}{5}$. If I_1 is an arc of radius r centered at $p_1 \in \partial\mathbb{D}$, then there exists a point $p_2 \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ and a disjoint arc I_2 of radius r centered at p_2 so that for any function $f > 0$ supported in I_j and $z \in I_k$ with $j \neq k$ we have the estimate for $j \in \{1, 2\}$:*

$$|\mathcal{S}_0 f(z)| \geq \frac{1}{24} \langle f \rangle_{I_j}.$$

PROOF. Let $S_0(z, w) = \frac{1}{1-\bar{w}z}$ denote the kernel of \mathcal{S}_0 . An easy computation shows that S_0 satisfies the smoothness estimate

$$(3.1) \quad |S_0(z, w) - S_0(z, w')| \leq \frac{3}{2} \frac{|w - w'|}{|w - z|^2}$$

provided $|w - w'| \leq \frac{1}{3}|z - w|$. It suffices to prove the inequality for $j = 1$. Now, let $w' = p_1$ as above. Select p_2 so that if $z \in I_2$ and $w \in I_1$, then $6r \geq |z - w| \geq 3r \geq 3|w - w'|$ (this is possible if $r < \frac{2}{5}$). Then we compute, using (3.1) and noting that $z \notin \text{supp}(f)$:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{S}_0 f(z)| &= \left| \int_{I_1} S_0(z, w) f(w) d\theta(w) \right| \\ &\geq \left| \int_{I_1} S_0(z, w') f(w) d\theta(w) \right| - \left| \int_{I_1} [S_0(z, w) - S_0(z, w')] f(w) d\theta(w) \right| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{|z - w'|} \int_{I_1} f(w) d\theta(w) - \int_{I_1} |S_0(z, w) - S_0(z, w')| f(w) d\theta(w) \\ &\geq \frac{3}{4|z - w|} \int_{I_1} f(w) d\theta(w) - \int_{I_1} \frac{3}{2} \frac{|w - w'|}{|w - z|^2} f(w) d\theta(w) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4|z - w|} \int_{I_1} f(w) d\theta(w) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{24} \langle f \rangle_{I_1}, \end{aligned}$$

as required. □

THEOREM 3.5. *The following estimate holds for the domain Ω defined at the beginning of Subsection 3.1:*

$$\left(\frac{1}{6-p} \left(\frac{4(p-1)}{5p-6} \right)^{p-1} \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \lesssim \|\mathcal{S}\|_{L^p(\Omega) \rightarrow L^p(\Omega)} \lesssim \left(\frac{1}{6-p} \left(\frac{4(p-1)}{5p-6} \right)^{p-1} \right)^{\max\{1, \frac{1}{p-1}\}}.$$

PROOF. The upper estimate follows from Theorem 3.1 and the above computation of $[\|\varphi'\|^{1-\frac{p}{2}}]_{A_p(\partial\mathbb{D})}$. The lower bound follows from a standard argument used for the Hilbert/Riesz transforms, see [12, Theorem 7.4.7] or the proof of the lower bound in [21]. We include this argument for completeness. Let $\omega = |\varphi'|^{1-\frac{p}{2}}$, and let I_1 be any arc with radius less than $\frac{2}{5}$. First, note that by Lemma 3.4, if $f > 0$ is supported in I_1 we have the set containment

$$I_2 \subseteq \{z \in \partial\mathbb{D} : |\mathcal{S}_0 f(z)| \geq C\langle f \rangle_{I_1}\}.$$

This then implies

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(I_2) &\leq \omega(\{z \in \partial\mathbb{D} : |\mathcal{S}_0 f(z)| \geq C\langle f \rangle_{I_1}\}) \\ &\leq \frac{\|\mathcal{S}_0\|_{L_\omega^p(\partial\mathbb{D}) \rightarrow L_\omega^p(\partial\mathbb{D})}^p}{C^p \langle f \rangle_{I_1}^p} \|f\|_{L_\omega^p(\partial\mathbb{D})}^p \\ &= \frac{\|\mathcal{S}\|_{L^p(\partial\Omega) \rightarrow L^p(\partial\Omega)}^p}{C^p \langle f \rangle_{I_1}^p} \|f\|_{L_\omega^p(\partial\mathbb{D})}^p. \end{aligned}$$

Assume without loss of generality that $\omega^{\frac{-1}{p-1}}$ is locally integrable (if not, replace ω by $\omega + \varepsilon$ and use a limiting argument). Then take $f = \omega^{\frac{-1}{p-1}} \chi_{I_1}$ and note that $\|f\|_{L_\omega^p(\partial\mathbb{D})}^p = \int_{I_1} \omega^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} d\theta$ and $|I_1| = |I_2|$. Using these facts and rearranging the above display, we obtain

$$\left(\int_{I_2} \omega d\theta \right) \left(\int_{I_1} \omega^{\frac{-1}{p-1}} \right)^{p-1} \leq \frac{\|\mathcal{S}\|_{L^p(\partial\Omega) \rightarrow L^p(\partial\Omega)}^p}{C^p}.$$

Interchanging the roles of I_1 and I_2 , we obtain the analogous inequality:

$$\left(\int_{I_1} \omega d\theta \right) \left(\int_{I_2} \omega^{\frac{-1}{p-1}} \right)^{p-1} \leq \frac{\|\mathcal{S}\|_{L^p(\partial\Omega) \rightarrow L^p(\partial\Omega)}^p}{C^p}.$$

Finally, multiplying these two inequalities together and noting that $\left(\int_{I_2} \omega d\theta \right) \left(\int_{I_2} \omega^{\frac{-1}{p-1}} \right)^{p-1} \geq 1$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{I_1} \omega d\theta \right) \left(\int_{I_1} \omega^{\frac{-1}{p-1}} \right)^{p-1} &\leq \left(\int_{I_2} \omega d\theta \right) \left(\int_{I_1} \omega^{\frac{-1}{p-1}} \right)^{p-1} \left(\int_{I_1} \omega d\theta \right) \left(\int_{I_2} \omega^{\frac{-1}{p-1}} \right)^{p-1} \\ &\leq \frac{\|\mathcal{S}\|_{L^p(\partial\Omega) \rightarrow L^p(\partial\Omega)}^{2p}}{C^{2p}}. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging this inequality and taking a supremum over intervals I_1 with small radius then yields the desired result. \square

REMARK 3.6. Notice that the lower bound blows up at the endpoints $p = \frac{6}{5}$ and $p = 6$, giving a proof that the Szegő projection on this domain is only bounded for $\frac{6}{5} < p < 6$.

OPEN QUESTION 3.7. As the reader may have noted, the dependences on p in the upper and lower bounds appearing in Theorem 3.5 are slightly different. It would be quite interesting to determine $\|\mathcal{S}\|_{L^p(\Omega) \rightarrow L^p(\Omega)}$ exactly or asymptotically in this case, or else come up with a different example to show that the upper bound in Theorem 2.1 is in fact sharp.

4. Weak-Type Estimates

Let $L^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{D})$ denote the quasi-Banach space of measurable functions on \mathbb{D} satisfying

$$\|f\|_{L^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{D})} := \sup_{\lambda>0} \lambda |\{z \in \mathbb{D} : |f(z)| > \lambda\}| < \infty.$$

The space $L^{1,\infty}(\partial\mathbb{D})$ and weighted spaces $L_{\omega}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{D})$ and $L_{\omega}^{1,\infty}(\partial\mathbb{D})$ are defined in an analogous manner, as well as the norms on arbitrary planar domains Ω .

We denote by $A_1(\partial\mathbb{D})$ the class of all weights ω on $\partial\mathbb{D}$ satisfying

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\zeta \in \partial\mathbb{D}} \frac{\mathcal{M}\omega(\zeta)}{\omega(\zeta)} < \infty,$$

where \mathcal{M} denotes the usual Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator on the circle. The class $A_1^+(\mathbb{D})$ may be defined in an analogous manner (see also [6]).

We now use similar techniques of conformal mapping to establish that the Bergman and Szegő projections are weak-type $(1, 1)$ on a certain class of planar domains. It is well-known that both the Bergman and Szegő projections are weak-type $(1, 1)$ when $\Omega = \mathbb{D}$ (see [5, 9, 19]). We consider the case when Ω is Dini smooth, which means there is a parametrization $r(t)$ of the boundary Jordan curve C so that $r'(t)$ is Dini continuous. In this case, if $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \Omega$ is a conformal map, then it is known (see [20]) that φ' extends continuously to $\bar{\mathbb{D}}$ and is non-vanishing on $\bar{\mathbb{D}}$. We have the following theorem:

THEOREM 4.1. *Let Ω be Dini smooth. Then the Bergman and Szegő projections are unbounded on L^1 , but are bounded from L^1 to $L^{1,\infty}$. Consequently, they are bounded on L^p for $1 < p < \infty$.*

PROOF. We present the proof for the case of the Szegő projection \mathcal{S} , as the case for the Bergman projection is similar. The boundedness of \mathcal{S} on $L^1(\Omega)$ is equivalent to the boundedness of \mathcal{S}_0 on $L_{\nu}^1(\partial\mathbb{D})$, where $\nu = |\varphi'|^{\frac{1}{2}}$. But since ν is uniformly bounded above and below in this case, this is equivalent to the boundedness of \mathcal{S}_0 on $L^1(\partial\mathbb{D})$, and the Szegő projection on the disc is well-known to be unbounded on L^1 [19].

On the other hand, since \mathcal{S}_0 is an example of a Calderón-Zygmund operator on a space of homogeneous type, it is clear that \mathcal{S}_0 defines a bounded map from $L_{\nu}^1(\partial\mathbb{D})$ to $L_{\nu}^{1,\infty}(\partial\mathbb{D})$ if $\nu \in A_1$, and in our case obviously $\nu \in A_1$. Moreover, for any function $g \in L^{1,\infty}(\partial\mathbb{D})$ and $z \in \partial\Omega$, note that $\tau_{1/2}^{-1}(g)(z) = g(\varphi^{-1}(z))\varphi'(\varphi^{-1}(z))^{-1/2}$ and that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tau_{1/2}^{-1}g\|_{L^{1,\infty}(\partial\Omega)} &= \sup_{\lambda>0} \lambda \int_{\partial\Omega} \chi_{\{|\tau_{1/2}^{-1}g(z)|>\lambda\}}(w) d\sigma(w) \\ &= \sup_{\lambda>0} \lambda \int_{\partial\Omega} \chi_{\{z \in \partial\Omega : |g(\varphi^{-1}(z))\varphi'(\varphi^{-1}(z))^{-1/2}|>\lambda\}}(w) d\sigma(w) \\ &= \sup_{\lambda>0} \lambda \int_{\partial\Omega} \chi_{\{\xi \in \partial\mathbb{D} : |g(\xi)\varphi'(\xi)^{-1/2}|>\lambda\}}(\varphi^{-1}(w)) d\sigma(w) \\ &= \sup_{\lambda>0} \lambda \int_{\partial\mathbb{D}} \chi_{\{\xi \in \partial\mathbb{D} : |g(\xi)\varphi'(\xi)^{-1/2}|>\lambda\}}(\zeta) |\varphi'(\zeta)| d\theta(\zeta) \\ &= \sup_{\lambda>0} \lambda \int_{\partial\mathbb{D}} \chi_{\{\xi \in \partial\mathbb{D} : |g(\xi)\varphi'(\xi)^{-1/2}|>\lambda\}}(\zeta) |\varphi'(\zeta)|^{1/2} \nu(\zeta) d\theta(\zeta) \\ &\lesssim \sup_{\lambda>0} \lambda \int_{\partial\mathbb{D}} \chi_{\{\xi \in \partial\mathbb{D} : |g(\xi)|>c\lambda\}}(\zeta) \nu(\zeta) d\theta(\zeta) \\ &\lesssim \|g\|_{L_{\nu}^{1,\infty}(\partial\mathbb{D})}, \end{aligned}$$

using the fact that $|\varphi'|$ is uniformly bounded above and below.

Then we have, putting these facts together

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{S}f\|_{L^{1,\infty}(\partial\Omega)} &= \|\tau_{1/2}^{-1}\mathcal{S}_0\tau_{1/2}f\|_{L^{1,\infty}(\partial\Omega)} \\
&\lesssim \|\mathcal{S}_0\tau_{1/2}f\|_{L^{1,\infty}(\partial\mathbb{D})} \\
&\lesssim \|\tau_{1/2}f\|_{L^1_+(\partial\mathbb{D})} \\
&= \|f\|_{L^1(\partial\Omega)}
\end{aligned}$$

using Lemma 2.3 with $\omega \equiv 1$, which establishes the first part. The final conclusion holds by interpolation and duality (we remark that it can also be established directly using Lemma 2.3). \square

We remark that a similar result was proved by Békollé for convex domains in [6].

Of course, the condition that $|\varphi'|$ is uniformly bounded above and below is very strong. It is unclear whether one can replace this hypothesis by a weaker condition. For instance, if Ω has the vanishing chord arc property, then the Bergman and Szegő projections are bounded on L^p for $1 < p < \infty$, but to the author's best knowledge, weak-type estimates at the endpoint $p = 1$ have not been studied for these domains. Moreover, it would be quite interesting to see if endpoint weak-type estimates hold for the domains in Corollaries 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, and 2.10 (for instance, does \mathcal{S} satisfy a weak-type $(\frac{4}{3}, \frac{4}{3})$ estimate if Ω is a local graph domain?).

OPEN QUESTION 4.2. Determine if the Bergman/Szegő projections are weak-type $(1, 1)$ on vanishing chord arc domains.

OPEN QUESTION 4.3. Investigate weak-type estimates for the Bergman/Szegő projections at the endpoints of the L^p boundedness ranges for local graph domains and Lipschitz domains.

5. Bergman vs. Szegő

It is of interest to compare the Bergman and Szegő projections via the Poisson extension operator \mathcal{P} (see, for example [16]). Assuming that the boundary of Ω is sufficiently smooth, recall that the Poisson extension of a continuous function f on $\partial\Omega$ is given by

$$\mathcal{P}f(z) = \int_{\partial\Omega} P(z, w)f(w) d\sigma(w), z \in \Omega,$$

where $P(z, w)$ denotes the Poisson kernel for Ω . Notice that the two operators $\mathcal{B}\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}$ produce holomorphic functions in the interior of Ω from boundary data, and if the domain Ω is sufficiently regular, both will be bounded maps from $L^p(\partial\Omega)$ to $L^p(\Omega)$. Let \mathcal{P}_0 denote the Poisson extension operator on \mathbb{D} . On the disc (and also the unit ball in \mathbb{C}^n) in fact we have the identity $\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{P}_0 = \mathcal{P}_0\mathcal{S}_0$, but this is in general not the case. For domains with some degree of smoothness, one would expect the difference operator $\mathcal{B}\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}$ to be small in an appropriate sense. The authors in [16] analyzed the mapping properties of the difference operator in terms of a gain in the Sobolev or Lipschitz space scale, but did not consider compactness on L^p spaces. We have the following additional result for Dini-smooth domains, which is a weaker condition than the ones imposed in [16]:

THEOREM 5.1. *Let Ω be Dini-smooth. Then $\mathcal{B}\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}$ is a compact operator from $L^p(\partial\Omega)$ to $L^p(\Omega)$ for $1 < p < \infty$.*

PROOF. First, using a result in [16], we may write

$$\mathcal{B}\mathcal{P} - \mathcal{P}\mathcal{S} = \tau^{-1} \circ ([\mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{M}_{\varphi'}]\mathcal{P}_0\mathcal{M}_{(\varphi')^{-1/2}} + \mathcal{M}_{\varphi'}\mathcal{P}_0[\mathcal{S}_0, \mathcal{M}_{(\varphi')^{-1/2}}]) \circ \tau_{1/2},$$

where the notation $[A, B]$ means the commutator $AB - BA$ and \mathcal{M}_f denotes the multiplication operator with symbol f .

It is clear from Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4 and the fact that φ' is bounded above and below on $\bar{\mathbb{D}}$ that $\tau_{1/2}$ is a surjective isometry from $L^p(\partial\Omega)$ to $L^p(\partial\mathbb{D})$, and similarly τ^{-1} is isometric from $L^p(\mathbb{D})$ to $L^p(\Omega)$. Since the function φ' is uniformly bounded in modulus above and below, the operators $\mathcal{M}_{\varphi'}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{(\varphi')^{-1/2}}$ are evidently bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{D})$ and $L^p(\partial\mathbb{D})$ respectively. We also know the Poisson extension \mathcal{P}_0 is a bounded operator from $L^p(\partial\mathbb{D})$ to $L^p(\mathbb{D})$ for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$.

Since compact operators form an ideal, it suffices to show that the commutators $[\mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{M}_{\varphi'}]$ and $[\mathcal{S}_0, \mathcal{M}_{(\varphi')^{-1/2}}]$ are compact operators, respectively. The compactness of $[\mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{M}_{\varphi'}]$ follows from the fact that φ' is continuous on $\bar{\mathbb{D}}$ and hence belongs to VMO with respect to the Bergman metric, see [3, 23].

On the other hand, the compactness of $[\mathcal{S}_0, \mathcal{M}_{(\varphi')^{-1/2}}]$ follows from the fact that $(\varphi'(e^{i\theta}))^{-1/2} \in \text{VMO}(\partial\mathbb{D})$, as the function φ' is continuous on $\bar{\mathbb{D}}$ and non-vanishing, together with the fact that \mathcal{S}_0 is a Calderón-Zygmund operator (see [16, 18]). We should mention that the $p = 2$ case follows easily from the classical theorem of Hartman [13]. \square

By assuming slightly more smoothness on the boundary, we can actually extend this compactness result to the endpoints $p = 1$ and $p = \infty$. We say a domain Ω has $C^{k,\alpha}$ boundary if its boundary can be locally represented as the graph of a $C^{k,\alpha}$ function.

THEOREM 5.2. *Suppose Ω has $C^{k,\alpha}$ boundary, where $k \geq 2$ and $0 < \alpha \leq 1$. Then $\mathcal{BP} - \mathcal{PS}$ is a compact operator from $L^p(\partial\Omega)$ to $L^p(\Omega)$ for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$.*

PROOF. Again, it suffices to prove the compactness of the two commutators $[\mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{M}_{\varphi'}]$ and $[\mathcal{S}_0, \mathcal{M}_{(\varphi')^{-1/2}}]$. We only prove the compactness of $[\mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{M}_{\varphi'}]$, as the other commutator is similar. Note that it suffices to demonstrate the result at the endpoints, because the case $1 < p < \infty$ is covered in the previous theorem. It also suffices to prove result for $p = \infty$; the result for $p = 1$ will follow using the same argument.

Let $k_z(w) = K(z, w) = \frac{(\varphi'(z) - \varphi'(w))}{(1 - \bar{w}z)^2}$ denote the kernel of the operator $[\mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{M}_{\varphi'}]$. It is easy to check that $K(z, w)$ is uniformly continuous on the set $\{(z, w) \in \bar{\mathbb{D}} \times \bar{\mathbb{D}} : |z - w| \geq r\}$ for each $r > 0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |k_z(w)| &= \frac{|\varphi'(z) - \varphi'(w)|}{|1 - \bar{w}z|^2} \\ &\leq C_\varphi \frac{|z - w|}{|1 - \bar{w}z|^2} \\ &\leq \frac{C_\varphi}{|z - w|}. \end{aligned}$$

It is thus obvious

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{D}} \int_{\mathbb{D}} |k_z(w)| dA(w) < \infty.$$

Moreover, an easy computation shows

$$(5.1) \quad \int_{D_\delta(z)} \frac{1}{|z - w|} dA(w) = 2\pi\delta$$

where the implicit constant is independent of z .

By a characterization given in [11], it is sufficient to show that the set of functions $\{k_z\}_{z \in \mathbb{D}}$ is relatively compact in $L^1(\mathbb{D})$. This can be checked using a version of the Riesz-Kolmogorov theorem given in [15]:

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \sup_{z \in \mathbb{D}} \int_{\mathbb{D}} |k_z(w) - \langle k_z \rangle_{D_r(w)}| dA(w) = 0.$$

Fix an arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $\delta = \varepsilon$ and let $r < \delta$. We will show that we can make a sufficiently small choice of r so

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{D}} \int_{\mathbb{D}} |k_z(w) - \langle k_z \rangle_{D_r(w)}| dA(w) \lesssim \delta.$$

First, we show

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{D}} \int_{D_\delta(z)} |k_z(w) - \langle k_z \rangle_{D_r(w)}| dA(w) \lesssim \delta.$$

To see this, note that by (5.1) and the triangle inequality it is clearly enough to show

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{D}} \int_{D_\delta(z)} |\langle k_z \rangle_{D_r(w)}| dA(w) \lesssim \delta.$$

Let $G = \{w : |z - w| \geq 2r\}$. Note that if $w \in G$ and $\zeta \in D_r(w)$, then $|z - w| \leq 2|z - \zeta|$. We further split the region of integration and estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{D_\delta(z) \cap G} |\langle k_z \rangle_{D_r(w)}| dA(w) &\leq \int_{D_\delta(z) \cap G} \left(\frac{1}{|D_r(w)|} \int_{D_r(w)} |k_z(\zeta)| dA(\zeta) \right) dA(w) \\ &\leq 2C_\varphi \int_{D_\delta(z) \cap G} \left(\frac{1}{|D_r(w)|} \int_{D_r(w)} \frac{1}{|z - w|} dA(\zeta) \right) dA(w) \\ &\leq 2C_\varphi \int_{D_\delta(z)} \frac{1}{|z - w|} dA(w) \\ &\leq 4\pi C_\varphi \delta. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{D_\delta(z) \cap G^c} |\langle k_z \rangle_{D_r(w)}| dA(w) &\leq \int_{D_{2r}(z)} \left(\frac{1}{|D_r(w)|} \int_{D_{3r}(z)} |k_z(\zeta)| dA(\zeta) \right) dA(w) \\ &\leq 24\varphi C_\varphi r \\ &\lesssim \delta, \end{aligned}$$

establishing the first claim.

For the other region of integration, by uniform continuity we can choose r small enough so

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{D}} \int_{\mathbb{D} \setminus B(z, \delta)} |k_z(w) - \langle k_z \rangle_{D_r(w)}| dA(w) < \delta,$$

establishing the result. □

The proofs above make use of fairly strong smoothness hypotheses. Again, it would be of interest to determine if the Dini-smooth condition could be weakened for the compactness of the difference operator $L^p(\partial\Omega) \rightarrow L^p(\Omega)$ for $1 < p < \infty$. The analogous question could be asked for the $C^{k,\alpha}$ condition and compactness at the endpoints.

OPEN QUESTION 5.3. Determine if there is a class larger than the Dini-smooth domains so that $\mathcal{BP} - \mathcal{PS}$ is compact from $L^p(\partial\Omega)$ to $L^p(\Omega)$ for $1 < p < \infty$. Similarly, determine if there is a class larger than the $C^{k,\alpha}$ domains ($k \geq 2$) so that $\mathcal{BP} - \mathcal{PS}$ is compact from $L^p(\partial\Omega)$ to $L^p(\Omega)$ for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$.

References

- [1] Pascal Auscher and José María Martell, *Weighted norm inequalities, off-diagonal estimates and elliptic operators. I. General operator theory and weights*, Adv. Math. **212** (2007), no. 1, 225–276.
- [2] Alexandru Aleman, Sandra Pott, and María Carmen Reguera, *Characterizations of a limiting class B_∞ of Békollé-Bonami weights*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam. **35** (2019), no. 6, 1677–1692.
- [3] Sheldon Axler, *The Bergman space, the Bloch space, and commutators of multiplication operators*, Duke Math. J. **53** (1986), no. 2, 315–332.
- [4] Theresa C. Anderson and Armen Vagharshakyan, *A simple proof of the sharp weighted estimate for Calderón-Zygmund operators on homogeneous spaces*, J. Geom. Anal. **24** (2014), no. 3, 1276–1297.
- [5] David Békollé, *Inégalité à poids pour le projecteur de Bergman dans la boule unité de \mathbf{C}^n* , Studia Math. **71** (1981/82), no. 3, 305–323 (French).
- [6] David Békollé, *Projections sur des espaces de fonctions holomorphes dans des domaines plans*, Canad. J. Math. **38** (1986), no. 1, 127–157 (French).
- [7] Frédéric Bernicot, Dorothee Frey, and Stefanie Petermichl, *Sharp weighted norm estimates beyond Calderón-Zygmund theory*, Anal. PDE **9** (2016), no. 5, 1079–1113.
- [8] David V. Cruz-Uribe, José Maria Martell, and Carlos Pérez, *Weights, extrapolation and the theory of Rubio de Francia*, Operator Theory: Advances and Applications, vol. 215, Birkhäuser/Springer Basel AG, Basel, 2011.
- [9] Yaohua Deng, Li Huang, Tao Zhao, and Dechao Zheng, *Bergman projection and Bergman spaces*, J. Operator Theory **46** (2001), no. 1, 3–24.
- [10] Oliver Dragičević, Loukas Grafakos, María Cristina Pereyra, and Stefanie Petermichl, *Extrapolation and sharp norm estimates for classical operators on weighted Lebesgue spaces*, Publ. Mat. **49** (2005), no. 1, 73–91.

- [11] S. P. Eveson, *Compactness criteria for integral operators in L^∞ and L^1 spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **123** (1995), no. 12, 3709–3716.
- [12] Loukas Grafakos, *Classical Fourier analysis*, 3rd ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 249, Springer, New York, 2014.
- [13] Philip Hartman, *On completely continuous Hankel matrices*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **9** (1958), 862–866.
- [14] Tuomas Hytönen and Anna Kairema, *Systems of dyadic cubes in a doubling metric space*, Colloq. Math. **126** (2012), no. 1, 1–33.
- [15] I. A. Ivanishko and V. G. Krotov, *Compactness of embeddings of Sobolev type on metric measure spaces*, Mat. Zametki **86** (2009), no. 6, 829–844 (Russian, with Russian summary).
- [16] Kenneth D. Koenig and Loredana Lanzani, *Bergman versus Szegő via conformal mapping*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **58** (2009), no. 2, 969–997.
- [17] Loredana Lanzani and Elias M. Stein, *Szegő and Bergman projections on non-smooth planar domains*, J. Geom. Anal. **14** (2004), no. 1, 63–86.
- [18] Steven G. Krantz and Song-Ying Li, *Boundedness and compactness of integral operators on spaces of homogeneous type and applications. II*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **258** (2001), no. 2, 642–657.
- [19] Nikolai K. Nikolski, *Operators, functions, and systems: an easy reading. Vol. 1*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 92, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002. Hardy, Hankel, and Toeplitz; Translated from the French by Andreas Hartmann.
- [20] Ch. Pommerenke, *Boundary behaviour of conformal maps*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 299, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992.
- [21] Rob Rahm, Edgar Tchoundja, and Brett D. Wick, *Weighted estimates for the Berezin transform and Bergman projection on the unit ball*, Math. Z. **286** (2017), no. 3-4, 1465–1478.
- [22] A. A. Solov'ev, *Estimates in L^p of the integral operators that are connected with spaces of analytic and harmonic functions*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **240** (1978), no. 6, 1301–1304 (Russian).
- [23] Ke He Zhu, *BMO and Hankel operators on Bergman spaces*, Pacific J. Math. **155** (1992), no. 2, 377–395.

NATHAN A. WAGNER
DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
BROWN UNIVERSITY
151 THAYER STREET
PROVIDENCE, RI, 02912 USA
Email address: nathan_wagner@brown.edu