

# QUASICONFORMAL SYMBOLS AND PROJECTED COMPOSITION OPERATORS

SINEM YELDA SÖNMEZ AND JARI TASKINEN

**ABSTRACT.** We study projected composition operators  $K_\varphi$  with quasiconformal symbols  $\varphi$  on weighted Bergman spaces on the open unit disc  $\mathbb{D}$ . If the symbol were conformal, i.e. a Möbius transform of  $\mathbb{D}$ , the corresponding composition operator would be automatically invertible at least in standard weighted spaces. We show that the invertibility remains, if the Beltrami coefficient is small enough, in particular, it satisfies a certain vanishing condition at the boundary of the disc. We also consider the invertibility of  $K_\varphi$  for symbols  $\varphi$  which are conformal in an annulus  $\{R < |z| < 1\}$ . The weight classes in our considerations include both standard and exponentially decreasing weights.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The set of conformal mappings  $\varphi$  from the unit disk  $\mathbb{D}$  of the complex plane  $\mathbb{C}$  onto itself is very restricted, as it only consists of Möbius-transforms. Among many consequences of this fact we remark that it often makes the study of the invertibility of analytic composition operators in spaces of analytic functions on  $\mathbb{D}$  quite uninteresting, although the question of the invertibility is in general most important for a given linear operator. However, a long time ago it has been observed that, in many other questions and phenomena in mathematical analysis, the analyticity of  $\varphi$  can be relaxed and especially replaced by quasiconformality, yet the mapping still has many important properties similar to those of conformal mappings; see [1], [18], [28].

In the Bergman space  $A^2$  of square integrable analytic functions  $f : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ , a composition operator  $C_\varphi : f \mapsto f \circ \varphi$  with a quasiconformal symbol would, in general, map  $f$  outside the space, but this can be adjusted most naturally by composing  $C_\varphi$  with the Bergman projection  $P : L^2 \rightarrow A^2$ . This leads to the definition of the projected composition operator  $K_\varphi = PC_\varphi$ . In view of the fact that the set of quasiconformal self-maps of the disc  $\mathbb{D}$  is much richer than the set of conformal mappings (which induce invertible composition operators), we are naturally led to study the invertibility of operators  $K_\varphi$  with quasiconformal  $\varphi$  and, in particular, to derive sufficient conditions for the invertibility. This is the purpose of the present paper.

In Theorem 3.1 we will prove the invertibility of projected composition operators  $K_\varphi$  for quasiconformal  $\varphi$  with small enough Beltrami coefficients in weighted Bergman  $L^2$ -spaces. A function  $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  is quasiconformal, if it is an orientation-preserving homeomorphism, which belongs to the Sobolev space  $W^{1,2}$  of functions whose first-order distributional derivatives belong to  $L^2$  and if it is a weak solution

---

*Key words and phrases.* Bergman projection, standard weight, doubling weight, large Bergman space, projected composition operator,  $\partial$ -operator, Wirtinger derivative, quasiconformal mapping, invertibility.

of the Beltrami equation

$$(1.1) \quad \bar{\partial}f(z) = \mu(z)\partial f(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{D},$$

for some Lebesgue measurable function  $\mu$  with  $\sup_{z \in \mathbb{D}} |\mu(z)| < 1$ , called the Beltrami coefficient. Here,  $\partial = \partial/\partial z$  and  $\bar{\partial} = \partial/\partial \bar{z}$  are the Wirtinger derivatives; see the end of this section for related terminology. Apparently, all conformal mappings satisfy (1.1), as they are solutions of the homogeneous  $\bar{\partial}$ -equation. The magnitude of the Beltrami coefficient gives a measure for the distance of a quasiconformal  $\varphi$  to analyticity. Accordingly, the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 include smallness requirements for  $\mu$ , see (3.2)–(3.5). Another invertibility result for operators  $K_\varphi$  in weighted  $L^p$ -spaces is contained in Proposition 4.1. Here, the symbol  $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  is assumed to be conformal in an annulus  $\mathbb{A}_R = \{R < |z| < 1\}$  for a large enough  $R \in (0, 1)$ , and the proof is based on a different perturbation argument.

We refer to [18] for an introduction to the topic of quasiconformal mappings.

We will study the above mentioned questions in the setting of Bergman spaces with weighted  $L^p$ -norms,  $1 < p < \infty$ . Here, a weight  $\omega : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  is a continuous function which is radial ( $\omega(z) = \omega(|z|)$  for  $z \in \mathbb{D}$ ) and satisfies  $\lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \omega(r) = 0$ . The classes of weights under consideration contain standard and exponentially decreasing weights, and they will be discussed in detail in the next section. Given  $1 < p < \infty$  and a weight  $\omega$ , we denote by  $L_\omega^p$  the  $L^p$ -space with respect to the measure  $\omega dA$ , where  $dA$  is the normalized Lebesgue area measure on  $\mathbb{D}$ , i.e.  $dA = \pi^{-1} r dr d\theta$ , and write

$$\|f\|_{p,\omega}^p := \int_{\mathbb{D}} |f(z)|^p \omega(z) dA(z).$$

The weighted Bergman space  $A_\omega^p$  is the closed subspace of  $L_\omega^p$  consisting of analytic functions. Our considerations also contain the case with no weight, i.e.  $\omega = 1$  on  $\mathbb{D}$ , in which case we denote the spaces and the norm by  $L^p, A^p$  and  $\|\cdot\|_p$ , respectively.

As for linear operators in these Banach spaces, we denote by  $P_\omega$  the orthogonal projection from  $L_\omega^2$  onto  $A_\omega^2$ . In the sequel, we will consider situations with two weights  $\omega$  and  $\nu$ , which may or may not be the same, such that  $P_\omega$  is a bounded projection from  $L_\nu^p$  onto  $A_\omega^p$ . Given a map  $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  and a weight  $\omega$ , we define the projected composition operator

$$K_{\omega,\varphi}f = P_\omega C_\varphi = P_\omega(f \circ \varphi),$$

where  $C_\varphi : f \mapsto f \circ \varphi$  is a composition operator. We also write  $K_\varphi = K_{\omega,\varphi}$ , if the weight is clear from the context.

Projected composition operators were probably first studied in the setting of analytic function spaces in the paper [22] by S. Pattanyak, C. Mohapatra and A. Mishra. Their boundedness properties have been considered for example by R. Rochberg [26] in Hardy spaces and by C. Zhao [29] and Ž. Čučković [8] in Bergman spaces. Also, the reader is probably aware of the fact that there exists a vast literature on the properties of analytic composition operators, that is, on operators with analytic  $\varphi$ . A review of that field of research is outside the scope of this article. Finally, it should be mentioned that composition operators with quasiconformal symbols acting in Sobolev spaces have been investigated in many papers, see for example [5], [19], [25]. However, due to the different nature of Sobolev and Bergman spaces, the interesting questions and methods in the mentioned papers are quite different from

the present study. The recent paper [10] treats the boundedness of the operator  $C_\varphi$  from the Bergman space into  $L^2$ , however, only in the unweighted case.

As for the contents of his paper, the main results on the invertibility of projected composition operators are presented in Theorem 3.1 and also Proposition 4.1. Section 2 also contains the preliminary material like the definitions of the weight classes, a simple construction of a left inverse for the  $\bar{\partial}$ -operator in a subspace of  $L_\omega^p$  (Proposition 2.6), and some remarks on the boundedness of composition operators with non-analytic symbols. In Section 5 we present a related example of a non-invertible projected composition operator with a quasiconformal symbol.

We will use standard notation, see for example [30]. All function spaces are defined on the domain  $\mathbb{D}$ , unless otherwise indicated. Moreover,  $\Delta$  denotes the Laplace operator in the real coordinates of the plane. If  $z = x + iy \in \mathbb{C}$ , the Wirtinger derivatives are defined as  $\partial = \partial/\partial z = (\partial/\partial x - i\partial/\partial y)/2$  and  $\bar{\partial} = \partial/\partial \bar{z} = (\partial/\partial x + i\partial/\partial y)/2$ . If  $\varphi \in W^{1,2}$  is a homeomorphism of  $\mathbb{D}$  onto itself, we denote by  $J_\varphi$  its Jacobian determinant (in the real planar coordinates).

If  $f$  and  $g$  are real valued, positive expressions depending for example on a parameter  $x$ , the expression  $f(x) \asymp g(x)$  means that there is constant  $C > 0$  such that  $C^{-1}f(x) \leq g(x) \leq Cf(x)$  for all  $x$ .

## 2. PRELIMINARIES ON WEIGHT CLASSES AND THE $\bar{\partial}$ -EQUATION IN WEIGHTED $L^p$ -SPACES

We present in this section the definitions of the weight classes and some basic results related with them and then proceed to a simple construction of a left inverse of the  $\bar{\partial}$ -operator in weighted  $L^p$ -spaces. Our weight classes contain both standard ( $1^\circ$ , below) and exponentially decreasing ( $3^\circ$ ) weights. Also, upper doubling weights ( $2^\circ$ , below) will be mentioned in some relevant preliminary results, although we will not formulate the main invertibility results for them.

As mentioned, by a weight in general we mean a continuous, radial function  $\omega : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  with limit 0 at the boundary of  $\mathbb{D}$ .

**Definition 2.1.**  $1^\circ$ . A weight  $\omega$  is standard, if  $\omega(z) = (1 - |z|^2)^\alpha$  for some  $\alpha \geq 0$ . In particular, the unweighted or constant weight case corresponds to  $\alpha = 0$ .

$2^\circ$ . A weight  $\omega$  is upper doubling and belongs to the class  $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}$ , if the weight  $\widehat{\omega}(z) = \int_{|z|}^1 \omega(s) ds$  satisfies  $\widehat{\omega}(r) \leq C\widehat{\omega}(\frac{1+r}{2})$ , for some constant  $C > 0$  and for all  $r \in (0, 1)$ . See [2], Section 4 and [23]. Note that all standard weights belong to  $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}$ .

$3^\circ$ . A weight  $\omega$  belongs to the class  $\mathcal{W}_A$ , if it is of the form

$$(2.1) \quad \omega(z) = e^{-2\phi(z)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D},$$

for some subharmonic, twice continuously differentiable function  $\phi$ , which satisfies  $(\Delta\phi(z))^{-1/2} \asymp \tau(z)$  for some continuously differentiable, radial and positive function  $\tau$  with the following properties:

- (i)  $\lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \tau(r) = 0$  and  $\lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \tau'(r) = 0$ ;
- (ii) there is a constant  $C > 0$  such that  $\tau(r)(1 - r)^{-C}$  increases for  $r$  close to 1, or  $\tau'(r) \log(\tau(r)) \rightarrow 0$  as  $r \rightarrow 1$ ;
- (iii) there holds

$$(2.2) \quad \varphi(r) = \frac{\partial\varphi(r)}{\partial r} \asymp \frac{1}{R(r)}, \quad r \in (0, 1),$$

where

$$(2.3) \quad R(r) = \frac{\tau(r)^2}{1-r}, \quad r \in (0, 1).$$

with a radial extension  $R(z) := R(|z|)$  for  $z \in \mathbb{D}$ . (Note that  $R$  tends to 0 at the boundary of  $\mathbb{D}$ .)

There holds  $\widehat{\mathcal{D}} \cap \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{A}} = \emptyset$ . The weight class  $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{A}}$  was introduced in [4] in the study of pointwise estimates for the Bergman kernel in large Bergman spaces. The prototype of the weights in  $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{A}}$  is the exponential type weight

$$(2.4) \quad \omega_{a,b}(z) = \exp\left(\frac{-b}{(1-|z|^2)^a}\right), \quad b, a > 0.$$

The class  $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{A}}$  is contained in a slightly larger class  $\mathcal{W}$ , which together with other related classes of rapidly decreasing weights appear in the study of various operators on  $A_{\omega}^p$ , such as Bergman projections [16], Hankel [12, 17], integration [7, 9, 20, 21] and Toeplitz operators [3, 27] and others.

Given a weight  $\omega$  and  $1 < p < \infty$ , we define the weight

$$(2.5) \quad \nu_p = \begin{cases} \omega, & \text{if } \omega \in \widehat{\mathcal{D}}, \\ \omega^{p/2}, & \text{if } \omega \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{A}}. \end{cases}$$

With a small abuse of notation, we denote by  $L_{\nu}^p$  and  $A_{\nu}^p$  the  $L^p$ - and Bergman spaces with respect to the measure  $\nu_p dA$ . The need of such a notation is explained in the following result, which clarifies the question on the boundedness of Bergman projections in relation with our weight classes. If  $\omega \in \widehat{\mathcal{D}}$ , the result is proved in [23], Theorem 7, and if  $\omega \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{A}}$ , it follows from Theorem 4.1 of [16], since our class  $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{A}}$  is contained in the class  $\mathcal{W}_0$  of the citation.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Assume  $\omega \in \widehat{\mathcal{D}} \cup \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $1 < p < \infty$ . Then, the Bergman projection  $P_{\omega}$  is a bounded operator from  $L_{\nu}^p$  onto  $A_{\nu}^p$  for all  $p \in (1, \infty)$ .*

We denote by  $d_P = d_P(p, \omega)$  the norm of  $P_{\omega}$  in  $L_{\nu}^p$ .

Let us next recall a Littlewood-Paley-type inequality, which will be needed later.

**Lemma 2.3.** *Assume  $\omega$  is a standard weight or belongs to  $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{A}}$ , and let us define for all  $z \in \mathbb{D}$*

$$(2.6) \quad \rho_2(z) = \begin{cases} (1-|z|^2)^2, & \text{if } \omega \text{ is standard,} \\ R^2(|z|), & \text{if } \omega \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{A}}. \end{cases}$$

*There exists a constant  $d_{LP} = d_{LP}(p, \omega) > 0$  such that the inequality*

$$(2.7) \quad \int_{\mathbb{D}} |f'|^2 \rho_2 \omega dA \leq d_{LP}^2 \|f\|_{2,\nu}^2$$

*holds for all  $f \in A_{\omega}^2$ .*

For a standard  $\omega$  this claim is well-known, see for example the remark after the proof of Theorem 4.28 in [30]; see also [23], Theorem 5, for a more general result. If  $\omega \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{A}}$ , (2.7) follows from Theorem 5.1.(i) of [4]: one takes  $p = q = 2$ ,  $n = 1$  and the unweighted Lebesgue measure  $dA$  for the Borel measure  $\mu$ . Then, in the notation of [4],  $\mu(D_{\delta})(z) \asymp \tau^2(z)$  for  $z \in \mathbb{D}$ , and the claim follows from the citation.

Given  $p, \omega$  and  $\nu_p$  as in (2.5), we define the subspace  $H \subset L^p_\nu$  to consist of functions  $g$  such that the expression

$$(2.8) \quad \|g\|_H^p = \int_{\mathbb{D}} |g|^p \nu_p dA + \int_{\mathbb{D}} |\bar{\partial}g|^p \nu_p dA$$

is finite, where  $\bar{\partial}g$  denotes the weak derivative. Then, the space  $H$  endowed with the norm  $\|\cdot\|_H$  is a Banach space.

We will need the following simple observations.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $1 < p \leq 2$  and assume that  $\omega$  is a standard weight or belongs to the class  $\mathcal{W}_A$ . The operator  $\bar{\partial}$  is a bounded surjection  $H \rightarrow L^p_\nu$ .*

*Proof.* Assume first  $\omega \in \mathcal{W}_A$ . Then, the function  $\phi$  in (2.1) is subharmonic, and the case  $p = 2$  in Lemma 2.4 follows from Hörmander's solution of the  $\bar{\partial}$  problem, see [14]: for every  $f \in L^2_\nu = L^2_\omega$  there exists  $u \in L^2_\omega$  with  $\bar{\partial}u = f$ . (Another reference is Theorem 4.2.1 in [15], where the weight factors  $1 + |z|^2$  in the inequality (4.2.8)' do not matter, since the domain  $X = \mathbb{D}$  is bounded.) By definition,  $u$  belongs to the space  $H$ . If  $1 < p < 2$ , the function  $\varphi/p$  is still subharmonic, and one can argue in the same way, by using the result of [11] instead of [14], see also Theorem 1 in [6].

If  $\omega(z) = (1 - |z|^2)^\alpha$  is a standard weight with  $\alpha \geq 0$ , the above argument still applies, since  $\omega = e^{-2\phi}$  with the subharmonic function  $\phi(z) = -\alpha \log(1 - |z|^2)/2$ . The unweighted case  $\alpha = 0$  is not excluded.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $p \in (1, 2]$  and assume  $\omega$  is a standard weight or belongs to  $\mathcal{W}_A$ . Then, the Bergman space  $A^p_\nu$  is a closed subspace of the Banach space  $H$ , and  $P_\omega$  is a bounded projection operator from  $H$  onto  $A^p_\nu$ . The space  $H$  has a direct sum decomposition  $H = A^p_\nu \oplus Y$  with the closed subspace (complement of  $A^p_\nu$ )  $Y = Q_\omega(H)$ , where  $Q_\omega := I - P_\omega$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\bar{\partial}f = 0$  for all  $f \in A^p_\nu$ , we note that  $A^p_\nu \subset H$  and the norm  $\|\cdot\|_H$  coincides with the norm of  $L^p_\nu$  in this subspace. We infer that  $A^p_\nu$  is complete, when endowed with the norm of  $H$ , and thus a closed subspace. Moreover, the Bergman projection  $P_\omega$  is a bounded operator from  $H$  onto  $A^p_\nu$ , since by Lemma 2.2,

$$(2.9) \quad \|P_\omega f\|_H = \|P_\omega f\|_{p,\nu} \leq d_P \|f\|_{p,\nu} \leq d_P \|f\|_H$$

for all  $f \in H$ . That  $P_\omega$  is a projection onto  $A^p_\nu$  follows trivially from its mapping properties in  $L^p_\nu$ .

The remaining statements belong to elementary functional analysis.  $\square$

The following result on the left inverse of the  $\bar{\partial}$ -operator is known, but we give a proof for the sake of the completeness of the presentation. Indeed, this one variable version is sufficient for our purposes, and its proof is simpler than those for higher dimensional domains, see for example the review in Notes for Chapter V in [24].

**Proposition 2.6.** *Assume  $p \in (1, 2]$  and that  $\omega$  is a standard weight or belongs to  $\mathcal{W}_A$ . There exists a bounded linear operator  $M : L^p_\nu \rightarrow L^p_\nu$  such that  $M\bar{\partial}f = Q_\omega f$  for all  $f \in H$  and hence*

$$(2.10) \quad M\bar{\partial}f = f \quad \text{for all } f \in Y = Q_\omega(H) \subset H \subset L^p_\nu.$$

We denote by  $d_M = d_M(p, \omega)$  the operator norm of  $M$  in the space  $L^p_\omega$ .

Proof. We consider  $\bar{\partial}$  as a bounded, surjective operator  $H \rightarrow L_\nu^p$ , see Lemma 2.4. There holds  $\ker \bar{\partial} \cap Y = A_\nu^p \cap Y = \{0\} \subset H$ , hence, by the open mapping theorem,  $\bar{\partial}$  is an isomorphism from  $Y$  onto  $L_\nu^p$ , and in particular it is bounded from below. Let us denote  $M = (\bar{\partial})^{-1} : L_\nu^p \rightarrow Y \subset H$ . Then, the operator  $M\bar{\partial}$  is the identity on  $Y$  and its kernel coincides with  $A_\nu^p$ . Thus,  $M\bar{\partial}$  is the projection onto  $Y$  corresponding to the direct sum decomposition  $H = A_\nu^p \oplus Y$ , i.e.  $M\bar{\partial} = Q_\omega$ .

Note that since  $M$  is bounded as an operator  $L_\nu^p \rightarrow Y \subset H$ , it is also bounded  $L_\nu^p \rightarrow L_\nu^p$ .  $\square$

At the end of this section we briefly review the boundedness properties of composition operators; boundedness of  $C_\varphi$  will be needed in the proof of the invertibility results. Due to the non-analyticity of the symbols and the generality of our weight classes, known results on the boundedness of analytic composition operators do not suffice for our purposes. A sufficient condition for the boundedness of  $C_\varphi$  is given in the following observation. Recall that  $J_\varphi$  denotes the Jacobian.

**Proposition 2.7.** *Let  $p \in (1, \infty)$  and  $\omega \in \widehat{\mathcal{D}} \cup \mathcal{W}_A$ . Assume  $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  is a homeomorphism such that  $\varphi \in W^{1,2}$  and  $\varphi^{-1} =: \psi \in W^{1,2}$  and such that, for some constants  $b_2 \geq b_1 > 0$ ,*

$$(2.11) \quad b_1 \omega \circ \varphi(z) |J_\varphi(z)| \leq \omega(z) \leq b_2 \omega \circ \varphi(z) |J_\varphi(z)|$$

for all  $z \in \mathbb{D}$ . Then, the composition operators  $C_\varphi$  and  $C_\psi$  are bounded as mappings from  $L_\omega^p$  into  $L_\omega^p$ .

For the operator  $C_\varphi$ , this follows by a simple change of variable, which is justified for example by Lemma 5.12 of [18]:

$$\|f \circ \varphi\|_{p,\omega}^p = \int_{\mathbb{D}} |f \circ \varphi|^p \omega dA \leq b_2 \int_{\mathbb{D}} |f \circ \varphi|^p \omega \circ \varphi |J_\varphi| dA = b_2 \int_{\mathbb{D}} |f|^p \omega dA.$$

The operator  $C_\psi$  can be treated in the same way, since the second inequality in (2.11) for  $\psi$  follows from the first inequality of (2.11) for  $\varphi$ . Also, cf. [13], Section 2.

We finally mention the following characterization of the boundedness of  $C_\varphi$ , when considered as a mapping from the weighted Bergman space into the corresponding  $L^p$ -space. First, if  $1 < p < \infty$  and  $\omega \in \widehat{\mathcal{D}} \cup \mathcal{W}_A$  are given, we recall that a positive measure  $dm$  on  $\mathbb{D}$  is called a Carleson measure for the space  $A_\omega^p$ , if there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{D}} |f|^p dm \leq C \int_{\mathbb{D}} |f|^p \omega dA$$

for all  $f \in A_\omega^p$ . Moreover, if  $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  is Lebesgue measurable, we define the corresponding pull-back measure  $V_\varphi = V_\varphi(p, \omega)$  by setting

$$V_\varphi(E) = \int_{\varphi^{-1}(E)} \omega dA$$

for all Lebesgue measurable sets  $E \subset \mathbb{D}$ . We leave it to the reader to verify that the proof of Proposition 1 of [8] can be generalized to show the next statement.

**Proposition 2.8.** *Assume that  $p \in (1, \infty)$ ,  $\omega \in \widehat{\mathcal{D}} \cup \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{A}}$  and that  $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  is Lebesgue measurable. Then, the composition operator  $C_\varphi$  is bounded  $A_\omega^p \rightarrow L_\omega^p$ , if and only if the pull-back measure  $V_\varphi(p, \omega)$  is Carleson for the space  $A_\omega^p$ .*

### 3. INVERTIBILITY OF $K_\varphi$ IN THE HILBERT SPACE CASE

In this section we formulate and prove the main invertibility result for projected composition operators with quasiconformal symbols  $\varphi$ . In the case of analytic composition operators, it is quite obvious that a Möbius-transform  $\varphi$  would generate an invertible operator with inverse  $C_\psi$ , where  $\psi = \varphi^{-1}$ , if the weight in the underlying space is standard or at least doubling. Theorem 3.1 generalizes this result for quasiconformal symbols with small enough Beltrami coefficients.

Recall that if  $p$  and  $\omega$  are given,  $d_M$  denotes the operator norm of the operator  $M : L_\omega^2 \rightarrow L_\omega^2$ , (2.10), and that the constant  $d_{LP}$  was defined in (2.7). In addition, for a homeomorphism  $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  with inverse  $\psi = \varphi^{-1}$ , we denote by  $d_\varphi = d_\varphi(p, \omega)$  and  $d_\psi = d_\psi(p, \omega)$  the operator norms of  $C_\varphi : L_\omega^2 \rightarrow L_\omega^2$  and  $C_\psi : L_\omega^2 \rightarrow L_\omega^2$ , respectively, if the operators are bounded. Also,  $\mu$  stands for the Beltrami coefficient of a quasiconformal mapping  $\varphi$ , i.e., there holds

$$(3.1) \quad \bar{\partial}\varphi = \mu\partial\varphi.$$

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  be a quasiconformal mapping with inverse  $\psi = \varphi^{-1}$  such that  $|\mu(z)| \leq 1/2$  for all  $z \in \mathbb{D}$  and such that the composition operators  $C_\varphi$  and  $C_\psi$  are bounded  $L_\omega^2 \rightarrow L_\omega^2$ , and let the constant  $\delta \in (0, 1/\sqrt{2})$  be arbitrary.*

(i) *If  $\omega$  is a standard weight  $\omega(z) = (1 - |z|^2)^\alpha$ ,  $\alpha \geq 0$ , and the Beltrami coefficient satisfies for all  $z \in \mathbb{D}$ ,*

$$(3.2) \quad |\mu(z)| < \gamma_\psi \frac{(1 - |\varphi(z)|^2)^{1+\alpha/2}}{(1 - |z|^2)^{\alpha/2}} \quad \text{with the constant } \gamma_\psi = \frac{\delta}{d_{LP}d_Md_\psi},$$

and

$$(3.3) \quad |\mu(z)| < \gamma_\varphi \frac{(1 - |\psi(z)|^2)^{2+\alpha}}{(1 - |z|^2)^\alpha} \quad \text{with the constant } \gamma_\varphi = \frac{\delta}{d_{LP}d_Md_\varphi},$$

then the projected composition operator  $K_\varphi = K_{\omega, \varphi} : A_\omega^2 \rightarrow A_\omega^2$  is invertible.

(ii) *If  $\omega \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{A}}$  and for all  $z \in \mathbb{D}$  there holds*

$$(3.4) \quad |\mu(z)| < \gamma_\psi \frac{\tau(\varphi(z))^2 \omega(\varphi(z))^{1/2}}{(1 - |\varphi(z)|) \omega(z)^{1/2}} \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathbb{D},$$

and

$$(3.5) \quad |\mu(z)| < \gamma_\varphi \frac{\tau(\psi(z))^2 \omega(\psi(z))^{1/2}}{(1 - |\psi(z)|) \omega(z)^{1/2}} \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathbb{D},$$

then the projected composition operator  $K_\varphi = K_{\omega, \varphi} : A_\omega^2 \rightarrow A_\omega^2$  is invertible.

**Proof.** We prove both cases (i) and (ii) simultaneously. Given  $f \in A_\omega^2$ , we start by showing that  $f \circ \varphi$  belongs to the space  $H$  defined in (2.8). First, the assumptions of the theorem yield

$$(3.6) \quad \|f \circ \varphi\|_{2, \omega}^2 \leq d_\varphi^2 \|f\|_{2, \omega}^2$$

To treat the derivative term in (2.8), we use the relation  $\bar{\partial}(f \circ \varphi) = (\partial f \circ \varphi)\bar{\partial}\varphi$  and (3.1), and calculate as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\bar{\partial}(f \circ \varphi)\|_{2,\omega}^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{D}} |\partial f \circ \varphi|^2 |\bar{\partial}\varphi|^2 \omega dA \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{D}} |\partial f \circ \varphi|^2 (-2\mu^2 |\bar{\partial}\varphi|^2 + (1 + 2\mu^2) |\bar{\partial}\varphi|^2) \omega dA \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{D}} |\partial f \circ \varphi|^2 (-2\mu^2 |\bar{\partial}\varphi|^2 + (1 + 2\mu^2) \mu^2 |\partial\varphi|^2) \omega dA \\
(3.7) \quad &= \int_{\mathbb{D}} |\partial f \circ \varphi|^2 (-2\mu^2 |\bar{\partial}\varphi|^2 + 2\mu^2 |\partial\varphi|^2 + \mu^2(2\mu^2 - 1) |\partial\varphi|^2) \omega dA.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that the Jacobian  $J_\varphi$  of the function  $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ , when understood as a coordinate transform for real area integrals, equals

$$(3.8) \quad J_\varphi = |\partial\varphi|^2 - |\bar{\partial}\varphi|^2,$$

see for example [1], formula (9) on p. 4, or [18], p. 80. Moreover, it follows from (2.3) and (2.6) that both (3.2) and (3.4) can be written as the inequality

$$(3.9) \quad \mu(z)^2 \omega(z) \leq \gamma_\psi^2 \rho_2(\varphi(z)) \omega(\varphi(z)), \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Hence, we can use (3.8) and  $2\mu^2 - 1 \leq 0$  and (2.7) to infer that (3.7) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{D}} |\partial f \circ \varphi|^2 2\mu^2 (-|\bar{\partial}\varphi|^2 + |\partial\varphi|^2) \omega dA \leq \int_{\mathbb{D}} |\partial f \circ \varphi|^2 |J_\varphi| 2\mu^2 \omega dA \\
&\leq 2\gamma_\psi^2 \int_{\mathbb{D}} |\partial f \circ \varphi|^2 \rho_2 \circ \varphi \omega \circ \varphi |J_\varphi| dA \leq 2\gamma_\psi^2 \int_{\mathbb{D}} |\partial f|^2 \rho_2 \omega(z) dA \\
(3.10) \quad &\leq 2\gamma_\psi^2 \int_{\mathbb{D}} |f'|^2 \rho_2 \omega dA \leq 2\gamma_\psi^2 d_{LP}^2 \|f\|_{2,\omega}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

So, combining (3.7)–(3.10) yields

$$(3.11) \quad \|\bar{\partial}(f \circ \varphi)\|_{2,\omega}^2 \leq 2\gamma_\psi^2 d_{LP}^2 \|f\|_{2,\omega}^2,$$

and together with (3.6) this proves that  $f \circ \varphi \in H$ . Now, we can use Proposition 2.6 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|C_\varphi f - K_\varphi f\|_{2,\omega}^2 = \|(P_\omega - I)C_\varphi f\|_{2,\omega}^2 = \|Q_\omega(f \circ \varphi)\|_{2,\omega}^2 \\
(3.12) \quad &= \|M\bar{\partial}(f \circ \varphi)\|_{2,\omega}^2 \leq d_M^2 \|\bar{\partial}(f \circ \varphi)\|_{2,\omega}^2
\end{aligned}$$

This and (3.11) yields us

$$(3.13) \quad \|C_\varphi f - K_\varphi f\|_{2,\omega}^2 \leq 2\gamma_\psi^2 d_{LP}^2 d_M^2 \|f\|_{2,\omega}.$$

Since the inverse of a quasiconformal mapping is quasiconformal with the same Beltrami coefficient ([18], Theorem 6.3), we also obtain by using (3.3), (3.5) instead of (3.2), (3.4),

$$(3.14) \quad \|C_\psi f - K_\psi f\|_{2,\omega}^2 = \|C_\psi f - K_{\omega,\psi} f\|_{2,\omega}^2 \leq 2\gamma_\varphi^2 d_{LP}^2 d_M^2 \|f\|_{2,\omega}.$$

for all  $f \in A_\omega^2$ , by the same calculation as in (3.6)–(3.13).



Assume now that  $f \in A_\omega^2$  is arbitrary. We have  $K_\psi C_\varphi f = P_\omega(f \circ \varphi \circ \psi) = P_\omega f = f$  due to the analyticity of  $f$ . Hence,

$$(3.15) \quad f - K_\psi K_\varphi f = K_\psi (C_\varphi - K_\varphi) f.$$

Here, we estimate using (3.13) and the choice of the constant  $\gamma_\psi$  in (3.14),

$$\|(I - K_\psi K_\varphi) f\|_{2,\omega} = \|K_\psi (C_\varphi - K_\varphi) f\|_{2,\omega} \leq d_\psi \|(C_\varphi - K_\varphi) f\|_{2,\omega} \leq \sqrt{2}\delta \|f\|_{2,\omega}.$$

which, in view of the choice  $\delta < 1/\sqrt{2}$  and the Neumann series, means that the operator  $K_\psi K_\varphi$  is invertible. In the same way, interchanging the roles of  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  in (3.15) and using (3.13), one proves that  $K_\varphi K_\psi$  is invertible. We conclude that  $K_\psi (K_\varphi K_\psi)^{-1}$  is the bounded inverse of  $K_\varphi$ :

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{aligned} & K_\varphi (K_\psi (K_\varphi K_\psi)^{-1}) = I \quad \text{and} \quad (K_\psi (K_\varphi K_\psi)^{-1}) K_\varphi \\ & = K_\psi (K_\varphi K_\psi)^{-1} K_\varphi K_\psi K_\varphi (K_\psi K_\varphi)^{-1} = K_\psi K_\varphi (K_\psi K_\varphi)^{-1} = I. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

We refer to Proposition 2.7 for a sufficient condition for the boundedness of the composition operators, cf. the assumptions of the theorem. As it is obvious from the proof, it would be enough to assume that  $C_\varphi$  is bounded as an operator from the closed span of  $A_\omega^2 \cup C_\psi(A_\omega^2)$  to  $L_\omega^2$  and similarly for the operator  $C_\psi$ .

#### 4. ON THE INVERTIBILITY OF $K_\varphi$ IN WEIGHTED $L^p$ -SPACES

In this section we present another approach to the invertibility of projected composition operators, which also works in weighted Bergman spaces which are not necessarily Hilbert. Instead of Möbius mappings, the idea is to consider functions  $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  which only map the annulus  $\mathbb{A}_R = \mathbb{D} \setminus \mathbb{D}_R$ , where  $R \in (0, 1)$  and  $\mathbb{D}_R = \{z \in \mathbb{D} : |z| \leq R\}$ , conformally onto a neighborhood of  $\partial\mathbb{D}$ .

Recall that a slightly less standard form of the Riemann mapping theorem states that any doubly connected domain  $\Omega$  can be conformally mapped onto an annulus of the form  $\mathbb{A}_R$ , where the number  $R$  is uniquely determined by  $\Omega$ . Assume that the outer boundary component of  $\Omega$  consists of the unit circle and the inner boundary component of a quite arbitrary, smooth closed curve contained in  $\mathbb{D}$ . Denoting such a conformal map by  $\psi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_R$ , its inverse can be taken for  $\varphi$ . Obviously, the class of such mappings  $\varphi$  is infinitely richer than the pure Möbius maps. In addition, we will assume in the next that  $\varphi$  has an extension as a quasiconformal mapping on  $\mathbb{D}$ .

For the formulation of the result, let us define some parameters. We fix  $\beta_\infty > 0$  such that

$$(4.1) \quad \max\{|f(z)|, |f'(z)|\} \leq \beta_\infty \|f\|_{p,\omega}$$

for all  $|z| \leq 1/2$ ,  $f \in A_\omega^p$ . As well-known, the existence of such a constant follows from the Cauchy integral formula. Given a quasiconformal  $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  with inverse  $\psi = \varphi^{-1}$ , we denote

$$(4.2) \quad \beta_\varphi := \max \left\{ 1, \operatorname{esssup}_{z \in \mathbb{D}_{1/2}} |\nabla \varphi(z)|, \operatorname{esssup}_{z \in \mathbb{D}_{1/2}} |\nabla \psi(z)| \right\}.$$

We will assume that the operators  $C_\varphi$  and  $C_\psi$  are bounded  $L_\nu^p \rightarrow L_\nu^p$  and denote the operator norms by  $d_\varphi$  and  $d_\psi$ . Recall that  $d_M = d_M(p, \omega)$  stands for the norm of

the operator  $M$  of Proposition 2.6 and  $d_P = d_P(p, \omega)$  for the norm of the Bergman projection  $P_\omega : L_\nu^p \rightarrow A_\nu^p$ , see Lemma 2.2. Finally, we let

$$(4.3) \quad \delta = \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2\beta_\varphi}, \frac{1}{\pi^{1/2}\beta_\varphi^{1+p/2}(\beta_\infty d_P d_M \max(d_\varphi, d_\psi))^{p/2}} \right\} \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

The result reads as follows.

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $p \in (1, 2]$  and let  $\omega$  be standard weight or belong to  $\mathcal{W}_A$ . Let  $\varphi$  be a quasiconformal mapping from  $\mathbb{D}$  onto itself with  $\varphi(0) = 0$  such that the composition operators  $C_\varphi$  and  $C_\psi$ ,  $\psi = \varphi^{-1}$ , are bounded  $L_\omega^p \rightarrow L_\omega^p$  and such that  $\beta_\varphi < \infty$ . If the mapping  $\varphi$  is conformal on  $\mathbb{A}_R$  for some  $R \in (0, \delta)$ , then operator  $K_\varphi = K_{\varphi, \omega} : A_\nu^p \rightarrow A_\nu^p$  is invertible.*

*Proof.* We denote  $S = \inf\{|\varphi(z)| : |z| \leq R\}$  and note that due to the assumption  $\varphi(0) = 0$ , (4.2) and the mean value theorem,  $S \leq \beta_\varphi R < \beta_\varphi \delta \leq 1/2$ .

Given  $f \in L_\nu^p$ , we follow (3.15) and write

$$(4.4) \quad f - K_\varphi K_\psi f = K_\varphi (C_\psi - K_\psi) f$$

and

$$(4.5) \quad f - K_\psi K_\varphi f = K_\psi (C_\varphi - K_\varphi) f$$

and next show that the norms of these two expressions are at most  $C\|f\|_{p, \omega}$  for a constant  $C > 0$  smaller than one, which implies the claimed invertibility of  $K_\varphi$  in the same way as at the end of the proof of Theorem 3.1.

In order to use Proposition 2.6, let us next show that  $f \circ \psi \in H$ . Since the composition operator is assumed to be bounded in  $L_\nu^p$ , there holds  $f \circ \psi \in L_\nu^p$ . In addition, we have  $\bar{\partial}(f \circ \psi) = (\partial f \circ \psi) \bar{\partial} \psi$  and

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\bar{\partial}(f \circ \psi)\|_{p, \omega}^p &= \int_{\varphi(\mathbb{A}_R)} |\partial f \circ \psi|^p |\bar{\partial} \psi|^p \omega dA + \int_{\varphi(\mathbb{D}_R)} |\partial f \circ \psi|^p |\bar{\partial} \psi|^p \omega dA \\ &= 0 + \int_{\varphi(\mathbb{D}_R)} |\partial f \circ \psi|^p |\bar{\partial} \psi|^p \omega dA. \end{aligned}$$

By  $R, S < 1/2$ , (4.1), (4.2), this expression is bounded by

$$(4.7) \quad \max_{z \in \mathbb{D}_{1/2}} |f'(z)|^p \int_{\mathbb{D}_S} |\nabla \psi|^p \omega dA \leq \pi S^2 \beta_\infty^p \beta_\varphi^p \|f\|_{p, \omega}^p,$$

This implies that  $\bar{\partial}(f \circ \psi) \in L_\nu^p$  and thus  $f \circ \psi \in H$ . Hence, Proposition 2.6 and (4.6)–(4.7) yield the estimate

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \|C_\psi f - K_\psi f\|_{p, \omega}^p &= \|(P_\omega - I)C_\psi f\|_{p, \omega}^p = \|Q_\omega(f \circ \psi)\|_{p, \omega}^p \\ &= \|M\bar{\partial}(f \circ \psi)\|_{p, \omega}^p \leq d_M^p \|\bar{\partial}(f \circ \psi)\|_{p, \omega}^p \leq \pi S^2 \beta_\infty^p \beta_\varphi^p d_M^p \|f\|_{p, \omega}^p. \end{aligned}$$

We obtain

$$(4.9) \quad \|K_\varphi (C_\psi - K_\psi) f\|_{p, \omega} \leq (\pi S^2)^{1/p} d_P d_\varphi d_M \beta_\infty \beta_\varphi \|f\|_{p, \omega}.$$

Since  $S < \beta_\varphi \delta$ , the coefficient on the right is strictly smaller than

$$(4.10) \quad \delta^{2/p} \pi^{1/p} \beta_\varphi^{1+2/p} \beta_\infty d_P d_\varphi d_M \leq 1,$$

due to the choice of  $\delta$  in (4.3). Thus, from (4.4), (4.9)–(4.10) we get that  $K_\varphi K_\psi$  is invertible.

The expression (4.5) can be estimated similarly to (4.6)–(4.9) with obvious changes, e.g., replacing the integration domains in (4.6) by  $\mathbb{A}_R$  and  $\mathbb{D}_R$ . This yields the bound

$$\|K_\psi(C_\varphi f - K_\varphi)f\|_{p,\omega} \leq (\pi R^2)^{1/p} d_P d_M d_\psi \beta_\infty \beta_\varphi \|f\|_{p,\omega}^p =: C \|f\|_{p,\omega},$$

and as above, we deduce that also  $K_\psi K_\varphi$  is invertible. This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 5. EXAMPLES

In the next examples we consider projected composition operators in the simplest case of the standard unweighted Bergman-Hilbert space  $A^2$ .

**Example 5.1.** Let us define the mapping  $\varphi$  on  $\mathbb{D}$  as

$$(5.1) \quad \varphi(z) = \varphi(re^{i\theta}) = re^{i\theta+ib(r)} = ze^{ib(r)}$$

where  $b : [0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a continuously differentiable function. We denote  $b'(r) = db(r)/dr$  and claim that if

$$(5.2) \quad |b'(r)| \leq C(1 - r^2), \quad \text{where } C = \min(1, \gamma_\psi, \gamma_\varphi).$$

then  $\varphi$  is quasiconformal and satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 and  $T_\varphi : A^2 \rightarrow A^2$  is thus invertible. Here,  $\gamma_\psi$  and  $\gamma_\varphi$  are as in (3.2), (3.3).

We calculate

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial\varphi(z) &= \partial(ze^{ib(r)}) = e^{ib(r)} + iz e^{ib(r)} \partial b(r) = e^{ib(r)} \left(1 + \frac{i}{2} r b'(r)\right), \\ \bar{\partial}\varphi(z) &= z \bar{\partial} e^{ib(r)} = \frac{iz^2}{2r} b'(r) e^{ib(r)} \end{aligned}$$

This yields

$$(5.4) \quad |\mu(z)| = \frac{|\bar{\partial}\varphi(z)|}{|\partial\varphi(z)|} = \frac{r|b'(r)|}{2|1 + \frac{1}{2} r b'(r)|} \leq \frac{Cr(1 - r^2)}{2|1 - Cr(1 - r^2)/2|}.$$

Here, we proceed with the bounds  $r(1 - r^2) \leq 2/(3\sqrt{3}) \approx 0.3849$  and  $C \leq 1$ , which show that (5.4) is not larger than

$$(5.5) \quad \begin{aligned} &\frac{Cr(1 - r^2)}{2(1 - 1/(3\sqrt{3}))} \leq \frac{C}{2}(1 - r^2) \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{3\sqrt{3} - 1} \\ &< \frac{1}{2} \min(1, \gamma_\psi, \gamma_\varphi)(1 - r^2) \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{2\sqrt{3}} = \frac{3}{4} \min(1, \gamma_\psi, \gamma_\varphi)(1 - r^2). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that  $\varphi$  is quasiconformal. Now, there holds  $|\varphi(z)| = |z|$  and, by the choice of the space,  $\alpha = 0$  so that the right-hand side of (3.2) reduces to  $\gamma_\psi(1 - |z|^2)$ . Thus, (5.4)–(5.5) imply that (3.2) holds. Also, since  $|\psi(z)| = |\varphi^{-1}(z)| = |ze^{-ib(r)}| = |z|$ , condition (3.3) is satisfied as well, due to (5.5). We conclude that (5.2) is sufficient for the invertibility of  $T_\varphi$ .

**Example 5.2.** Let  $a \in (0, \infty)$  and  $R \in (0, 1)$  and let us define

$$(5.6) \quad \varphi(z) = \begin{cases} R^{1-a} z |z|^{a-1}, & \text{if } |z| \leq R, \\ z & \text{for } R < |z| < 1. \end{cases}$$

Then,  $\varphi$  is weakly differentiable and belongs to the Sobolev space  $W^{1,2}$ . According to Example 10.1.(2) in [18],  $\varphi$  is quasiconformal, since its Beltrami coefficient satisfies

$|\mu(z)| = (a-1)/(a+1)$  for  $|z| \leq R$  and, obviously,  $\mu(z) = 0$  for  $|z| > R$ . By a direct calculation,

$$(5.7) \quad \psi(z) := \varphi^{-1}(z) = \begin{cases} R^{1-1/a} z |z|^{1/a-1}, & \text{if } |z| \leq R, \\ z & \text{for } R < |z| < 1. \end{cases}$$

We claim that if

$$(5.8) \quad a < \frac{1 + \min(\gamma_\psi, \gamma_\varphi)(1 - R^2)}{1 - \min(\gamma_\psi, \gamma_\varphi)(1 - R^2)}$$

then  $T_\varphi$  is invertible. Since  $\varphi$  is analytic in  $\{|z| > R\}$ , it suffices to prove (3.2), (3.3) for  $|z| \leq R$ . Now, (5.8) implies

$$(5.9) \quad |\mu(z)| = \frac{a-1}{a+1} < \min(\gamma_\psi, \gamma_\varphi)(1 - R^2),$$

and, in view of the facts  $|\varphi(z)|^2 = R^{2-2a}|z|^{2a}$  and  $|\psi(z)|^2 = R^{2-2/a}|z|^{2/a}$ , the expression on the right is not larger than

$$(5.10) \quad \gamma_\psi(1 - |\varphi(z)|^2) \quad \text{or} \quad \gamma_\varphi(1 - |\psi(z)|^2)$$

for  $|z| \leq R$ . We thus obtain (3.2), (3.3) from (5.9).

**Example 5.3.** Let us complement the above considerations by presenting an example of a non-invertible projected composition operator in  $A^2$  such that the symbol is quasiconformal on  $\mathbb{D}$  and equal to the identity on an annulus  $\mathbb{A}_R$ . For simplicity, we start by introducing a symbol which is not quasiconformal, namely, we choose  $R = (3/7)^{1/4} \approx 0.8091$  and define

$$(5.11) \quad \tilde{\varphi}(z) = \begin{cases} z, & \text{if } |z| > R, \\ -Re^{i\theta} & \text{for } z = re^{i\theta} \text{ with } r \leq R. \end{cases}$$

This can also be written as

$$(5.12) \quad \tilde{\varphi}(re^{i\theta}) = \tilde{b}(r)e^{i\theta+i\tilde{a}(r)}, \quad re^{i\theta} \in \mathbb{D},$$

where

$$(5.13) \quad \tilde{a}(r) = \begin{cases} \pi, & \text{if } r \in [0, R], \\ 0 & \text{if } r \in [R, 1] \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{b}(r) = \begin{cases} R, & \text{if } r \in [0, R], \\ r & \text{if } r \in [R, 1] \end{cases}$$

Apparently, the restriction of  $\tilde{\varphi}$  onto  $\mathbb{A}_R$  is conformal. However, the operator  $K_{\tilde{\varphi}}$  is not invertible in  $A^2$ , since it maps the function  $f(z) = z$  into 0. To see this, we calculate

$$(5.14) \quad \begin{aligned} PC_{\tilde{\varphi}}f(z) &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\tilde{b}(r)e^{i\theta+i\tilde{a}(r)}}{(1 - zre^{-i\theta})^2} r d\theta dr \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+1) z^n \tilde{b}(r) r^{n+1} e^{i\theta(1-n)} d\theta e^{i\tilde{a}(r)} dr = 4z \int_0^1 \tilde{b}(r) r^2 e^{i\tilde{a}(r)} dr. \end{aligned}$$

The expression (5.14) vanishes, since it is 4z times

$$\int_0^R \tilde{b}(r) r^2 e^{i\tilde{a}(r)} dr + \int_R^1 \tilde{b}(r) r^2 e^{i\tilde{a}(r)} dr$$

$$(5.15) \quad = -R \int_0^R r^2 dr + 2 \int_R^1 r^3 dr' = 2 \left( -\frac{R^4}{3} + \frac{1-R^4}{4} \right) = 0$$

due to the choice of  $R$ .

The rest of the example consists of a technical modification of the above symbol  $\tilde{\varphi}$  so as to make it quasiconformal while still preserving the non-injectivity of the corresponding projected composition operator. This can be achieved by defining (cf. (5.12)–(5.13))

$$(5.16) \quad \varphi(re^{i\theta}) = b(r)e^{i\theta+ia(r)}, \quad re^{i\theta} \in \mathbb{D},$$

where the smooth functions  $a : [0, 1) \rightarrow [0, \pi]$  and  $b : [0, 1) \rightarrow [0, 1]$  (modifications of  $\tilde{a}$  and  $\tilde{b}$ ) will be chosen such that  $\varphi$  becomes a diffeomorphism of  $\mathbb{D}$  onto itself. Then, the quasiconformality of  $\varphi$  follows from [18], Example 1.1.5., since  $\varphi$  is analytic in a neighborhood of  $\partial\mathbb{D}$ . The details will require some efforts.

To define  $a$ , we let  $R = (3/7)^{1/4} \approx 0.8091$  be as above and set  $R' = 9/10$ . Then, we consider arbitrary parameters  $\delta_a \in (0, 1/20)$  and  $\delta \in (0, 1/20)$  and set

$$(5.17) \quad a(r) = \begin{cases} \pi, & \text{if } r \in [0, R], \\ a_1(r), & \text{if } r \in [R, R + \delta], \\ 0, & \text{if } r \in [R + \delta, R'], \\ a_2(r), & \text{if } r \in [R', R' + \delta_a], \\ 0 & \text{if } r \in [R' + \delta_a, 1]. \end{cases}$$

To choose the function  $a_1$ , we first take a  $C^\infty$ -function  $\hat{a}_1 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \pi]$  such that  $\hat{a}_1(r) = \pi$  for  $r \leq 0$  and  $\hat{a}_1(r) = 0$  for  $r \geq 1$  and such that it decreases monotonically on the subinterval  $(0, 1)$ . We set  $a_1(r) = \hat{a}_1((r - R)/\delta)$ . Then,  $a_1$  becomes a monotonically decreasing  $C^\infty$ -function with  $a_1(R) = \pi$  and  $a_1(R + \delta) = 0$ .

As for the function  $a_2$ , we first choose a  $C^\infty$ -function  $\hat{a}_2 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [-1, 0]$  with  $\hat{a}_2(-1) = \hat{a}_2(1) = 0$ ,  $\hat{a}_2(0) = -1$  and  $\hat{a}_2(r) = 0$  for  $|r| \geq 1$  such that it decreases monotonically on the subinterval  $(-1, 0)$  and increases monotonically on the subinterval  $(0, 1)$ . Then, we define  $a_2$  by scaling: we set

$$a_2(r) = \hat{a}_2\left(\frac{2(r - R')}{\delta_a} - 1\right).$$

Consequently,  $a_2 : [R', R' + \delta] \rightarrow (-\infty, 0]$  is a  $C^\infty$ -function decreasing monotonically from the value  $\hat{a}(R') = 0$  to the value  $\hat{a}(R' + \delta_a/2) = -1$  and then increasing monotonically to the value  $\hat{a}(R' + \delta_a) = 0$ , and the values of  $a_2$  are negative on  $(R', R' + \delta_a)$ . It is also clear that with these definitions, the function  $a$  in (5.17) becomes  $C^\infty$ -smooth.

We choose  $b$  such that

$$(5.18) \quad b(r) = \begin{cases} b_1(r), & \text{if } r \in [0, R], \\ r, & \text{if } r \in [R, 1]. \end{cases}$$

where  $b_1 : [0, R] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is a smooth, increasing function such that  $b_1(0) = 0$  and  $b_1(R) = R$ ; we will fix  $b_1$  later.

In the same way as in (5.14) we see that  $PC_\varphi f(z) = 4z \int_0^1 b(r) r e^{ia(r)} dr$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 b(r) r^2 e^{ia(r)} dr &= \int_0^1 b(r) r^2 \cos(a(r)) dr + i \int_0^1 b(r) r^2 \sin(a(r)) dr \\ &= \int_0^1 b(r) r^2 \cos(a(r)) dr + i \int_R^{R'+\delta_a} r^3 \sin(a(r)) dr =: I_{\text{Re}}(\delta_a, \delta) + i I_{\text{Im}}(\delta_a, \delta), \end{aligned}$$

due to the choice of the functions  $a$  and  $b$ .

We now note that for every sufficiently small  $\epsilon > 0$ , we can choose  $\delta_a \in (0, \epsilon)$  and  $\delta \in (0, \epsilon)$  such that  $I_{\text{Im}}(\delta_a, \delta) = 0$  (\*). This follows from the observation that

$$(5.19) \quad I_{\text{Im}}(\delta_a, \delta) = \int_R^{R+\delta} r^3 \sin(a(r)) dr + \int_{R'}^{R'+\delta_a} r^3 \sin(a(r)) dr =: J_1(\delta) + J_2(\delta_a),$$

where, due to the choice of the function  $a_1$  by scaling with respect to  $\delta$ , the function  $\delta \mapsto J_1(\delta)$  is continuous and positive on the interval  $(0, 1/20)$  and satisfies  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} J_1(\delta) = 0$ . Similarly, the function  $\delta_a \mapsto J_2(\delta_a)$  is continuous and negative on the interval  $(0, 1/20)$  and has the property  $\lim_{\delta_a \rightarrow 0} J_2(\delta_a) = 0$ . This implies the claim about the choice (\*).

In order to choose  $b_1$ , we consider another parameter  $\delta_b \in (0, 1/10)$  and, first, a piecewise linear, monotonely increasing function  $\widehat{b}$  such that  $\widehat{b}(r) = r$  for  $0 \leq r < \delta_b/2$ ,  $\widehat{b}(\delta_b) = R - \delta_b$  and  $\widehat{b}(r) = r$  for  $r \geq R$ . It is not difficult to see that, using a suitable  $C^\infty$  mollifier (e.g.  $\Phi_{\delta_b/10}$ , see the remark after the proof) and defining  $b_1$  as the convolution of the mollifier and  $\widehat{b}$ , the function

$$\delta_b \mapsto - \int_0^R b_1(r) r^2 dr =: K_1(\delta_b)$$

is continuous on the interval  $(0, 1/10)$  and that

$$\lim_{\delta_b \rightarrow 0} K_1(\delta_b) = - \int_0^R R r^2 dr = B_1.$$

(Note also that  $b : [0, 1) \rightarrow [0, 1)$  becomes an invertible  $C^\infty$ -function.) We also have  $K_1(\delta_b) > B_1$  for all  $\delta_b \in (0, 1/10)$ . In particular, there exists  $\epsilon_0 > 0$  such that for all  $\epsilon' \in (0, \epsilon_0)$  we can find  $\delta_b$  such that

$$(5.20) \quad K_1(\delta_b) - B_1 = \epsilon'.$$

As the last step we note that, for any choice of the function  $a(r)$  as above, we have

$$K_2(\delta_a, \delta) := \int_R^1 b(r) r^2 \cos(a(r)) dr = \int_R^1 r^3 \cos(a(r)) dr < \int_R^1 r^3 dr = B_2.$$

and, due to the definition of  $a$ , the difference

$$B_2 - K_2(\delta_a, \delta)$$

can be made arbitrarily small, if  $\delta_a$  and  $\delta$  are small enough. Accordingly, we finally fix  $\delta_a, \delta$  such that  $I_{\text{Im}}(\delta_a, \delta) = 0$  (see  $(*)$ ) and such that  $B_2 - K_2(\delta, \delta_a) < \epsilon_0$ . We then choose  $\delta_b$  such that (5.20) holds with  $\epsilon' = B_2 - K_2(\delta_a, \delta)$ . This yields

$$I_{\text{Re}}(\delta_a, \delta) = \int_0^1 b(r)r^2 \cos(a(r))dr = K_1(\delta_b) + K_2(\delta_a, \delta) = B_1 + \epsilon' + B_2 - \epsilon' = 0,$$

by (5.15). This shows that  $PC_\varphi f = 0$  and thus  $K_\varphi$  is not invertible.

We finally remark that  $\varphi$  is a diffeomorphism and thus quasiconformal, since its inverse is the smooth function  $re^{i\theta} \mapsto b^{-1}(r)e^{i\theta - ia(b^{-1}(r))}$ . Note that  $\varphi(z) = z$  in a neighborhood of 0, by the choice of the functions  $a$  and  $b$ .  $\square$

The standard mollifier  $\Phi_\alpha$ ,  $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ , is defined as  $\Phi_\alpha(x) = \Phi(x/\alpha)/\alpha$ , where  $\Phi(x) = C \exp(-1/(1-x^2))$  for  $|x| < 1$  and  $\Phi(x) = 0$  for  $|x| \geq 1$  and the normalization factor  $C > 0$  makes the integral of  $J$  equal one.

**Acknowledgment.** The first named author was supported by a TÜBİTAK project with project number 1059B192300654. The second named author acknowledges the support of the Academy of Finland projects no. 359563 and 359642.

## REFERENCES

- [1] L. Ahlfors, Lectures on quasiconformal mappings, Mathematical Studies vol.10, D. Van Nostrand Company Inc., Princeton NJ (1966).
- [2] A. Aleman, A. Siskakis, Integration operators on Bergman spaces, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 46, 2 (1997), 337–356.
- [3] H. Arroussi, I. Park, J. Pau, Schatten class Toeplitz operators acting on large weighted Bergman spaces, Studia Math. 229, 3 (2015), 203–221.
- [4] H. Arroussi, J. Taskinen, J. Virtanen, Estimates for the derivatives of the Bergman kernel in large Bergman spaces and applications to operator theory, submitted.
- [5] K. Astala, A remark on quasiconformal mappings and BMO-functions. Michigan Math. J. 30, 209–12 (1983)
- [6] B. Berndtsson, Weighted estimates for  $\bar{\partial}$  in domains in  $\mathbf{C}$ . Duke Math. J. 66 (1992), no. 2, 239–255.
- [7] O. Constantin, Carleson embeddings and some classes of operators on weighted Bergman spaces. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 365 (2010), no. 2, 668–682.
- [8] Z. Cuckovic, Projected composition operators on pseudoconvex domains, Integr. Eq. Oper. Theory 93 (35), (2021).
- [9] M. Dostanić, Integration operators on Bergman spaces with exponential weights, Revista Mat. Iberoamericana 23 (2007), 421–436.
- [10] X. Fang, K. Guo, Z. Wang, Fang, Composition operators on the Bergman space with quasiconformal symbols, J. Geometric Anal. (2023) 33:125
- [11] J. E. Fornæss and N. Sibony, On  $L^p$  estimates for  $\bar{\partial}$ , Several complex variables and complex geometry, Part 3 (Santa Cruz, CA, 1989), Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., vol. 52, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1991, pp. 129–163.
- [12] P. Galanopoulos, J. Pau, Hankel operators on large weighted Bergman spaces, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. 37 (2012), 635–648.
- [13] N.G. Göğüş, N., S.Y. Sönmez, Toeplitz Operators on Weighted Bergman Spaces on Finitely Connected Domains. Annals of Functional Analysis (2022)
- [14] L. Hörmander, An introduction to complex analysis in several variables, North-Holland Mathematical Library, vol. 7, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1990.
- [15] L. Hörmander, Notions of convexity BOOK.
- [16] Hu, Z., Lv, X., Schuster, A.: Bergman spaces with exponential weights. J.Functional Anal. 276, (2019), 1402–1429

- [17] Z. Hu and J. Pau, Hankel operators on exponential Bergman spaces. *Sci. China Math.* 65, 421–442 (2022).
- [18] P. Koskela, *Lectures on quasiconformal and quasisymmetric mappings*, University of Jyväskylä (2009).
- [19] P. Koskela, J. Xiao, Y. Ru-Ya Zhang, Y. Zhou, A quasiconformal composition problem for the  $Q$ -spaces, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* 19, 1159–1187
- [20] J. Pau, J.A. Peláez, Embedding theorems and integration operators on Bergman spaces with rapidly decreasing weights, *J. Funct. Anal.* 259 (2010), 2727–2756.
- [21] J. Pau, J.A. Peláez, Volterra type operators on Bergman spaces with exponential weights, *Contemp. Math.* 561 (2012), 239–252.
- [22] S. Pattanayak, C.K. Mohapatra, A.K. Mishra, A new class of composition operators, *Internat. J. Math. & Math. Sci.* 10 (1987), 473–482.
- [23] J.A. Peláez, J. Rättyä, Bergman projection induced by radial weight, *Advances Math.* 391(2021) 107950 1–70.
- [24] M. Range, *Holomorphic functions and integral representations in several complex variables*, Graduate texts in mathematics 108 Springer New York Berlin Heidelberg (1986)
- [25] H.M. Reimann, Functions of bounded mean oscillation and quasiconformal mappings. *Comment. Math. Helv.* 49 (1974), 260–276
- [26] R. Rochberg, Projected Composition Operators on the Hardy Space, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 43 (2), (1994).
- [27] S. Sönmez, J. Taskinen, Relaxing the positivity assumption on the symbol of a Bergman-Toeplitz operator. To appear in *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*
- [28] J. Väisälä, *Lectures on  $n$ -dimensional quasiconformal mappings*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1971.
- [29] C. Zhao, Boundedness of projected composition operators over the unit disc, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 467 (2018), 521–536.
- [30] K. Zhu, *Operator Theory in Function Spaces*, 2nd ed. Vol. 138, Mathematical surveys and monographs, American Mathematical Society, Providence RI, 2007.

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING AND ARCHITECTURE, ALTINBAŞ UNIVERSITY, BAGCILAR, ISTANBUL, 34218, TURKEY

*Email address:* `sinem.sonmez@altinbas.edu.tr`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI, P.O.BOX 68 (PIETARI KALMIN KATU 5), 00014 HELSINKI, FINLAND

*Email address:* `sinem.sonmez@helsinki.fi`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI, P.O.BOX 68 (PIETARI KALMIN KATU 5), 00014 HELSINKI, FINLAND

*Email address:* `jari.taskinen@helsinki.fi`