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#### Abstract

Let $\mathbb{D}^{n}$ be the open unit polydisc in $\mathbb{C}^{n}, n \geq 1$, and let $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$ be the Hardy space over $\mathbb{D}^{n}$. For $n \geq 3$, we show that if $\theta \in H^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$ is an inner function, then the $n$-tuple of commuting operators ( $C_{z_{1}}, \ldots, C_{z_{n}}$ ) on the Beurling type quotient module $\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}$ is not essentially normal, where $$
\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}=H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right) / \theta H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right) \quad \text { and } \quad C_{z_{j}}=\left.P_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}} M_{z_{j}}\right|_{Q_{\theta}} \quad(j=1, \ldots, n) .
$$

Rudin's quotient modules of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{2}\right)$ are also shown to be not essentially normal. We prove several results concerning boundary representations of $C^{*}$-algebras corresponding to different classes of quotient modules including doubly commuting quotient modules, homogenous quotient modules and Clark type quotient modules.


## 1. Introduction

Let $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right), n \geq 1$, denote the Hardy space of holomorphic functions on the unit polydisc $\mathbb{D}^{n}=\left\{\boldsymbol{z}=\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}\right) \in \mathbb{C}^{n}:\left|z_{i}\right| \leq 1, i=1, \ldots, n\right\}$, that is,

$$
H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)=\left\{f=\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}^{n}} a_{\boldsymbol{k}} z^{k} \in \mathcal{O}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right):\|f\|^{2}:=\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}^{n}}\left|a_{\boldsymbol{k}}\right|^{2}<\infty\right\},
$$

where $\mathbb{N}$ is the set of all natural numbers including $0, \mathbb{N}^{n}=\left\{\boldsymbol{k}=\left(k_{1}, \ldots, k_{n}\right): k_{j} \in \mathbb{N}, j=\right.$ $1, \ldots, n\}$ and $\boldsymbol{z}^{k}:=z_{1}^{k_{1}} \cdots z_{n}^{k_{n}}$. It is well known that $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$ is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space corresponding to the Szegö kernel

$$
\mathbb{S}(\boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{w})=\prod_{i=1}^{n}\left(1-z_{i} \bar{w}_{i}\right)^{-1}, \quad\left(\boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{w} \in \mathbb{D}^{n}\right)
$$

and $\left(M_{z_{1}}, \ldots, M_{z_{n}}\right)$ is a commuting tuple of isometries on $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$, where

$$
\left(M_{z_{i}} f\right)(\boldsymbol{w})=w_{i} f(\boldsymbol{w}) \quad\left(f \in H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right), \boldsymbol{w} \in \mathbb{D}^{n}, i=1, \ldots, n\right) .
$$

We represent the $n$-tuple of multiplication operators $\left(M_{z_{1}}, \ldots, M_{z_{n}}\right)$ on $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$ as a Hilbert module over $\mathbb{C}[\boldsymbol{z}]:=\mathbb{C}\left[z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}\right]$ with the following module action:

$$
\mathbb{C}[\boldsymbol{z}] \times H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right) \rightarrow H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right), \quad(p, f) \mapsto p\left(M_{z_{1}}, \ldots, M_{z_{n}}\right) f .
$$

With the above module action $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$ is called the Hardy module over $\mathbb{C}[\boldsymbol{z}]$. A closed subspace $\mathcal{S}$ of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$ is called a submodule if $M_{z_{i}} \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ for all $i=1, \ldots, n$, and a closed

[^0]subspace $\mathcal{Q}$ of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$ is a quotient module if $\mathcal{Q}^{\perp}\left(\cong H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right) / \mathcal{Q}\right)$ is a submodule. A quotient module $\mathcal{Q}$ is said to be of Beurling type (cf. [12]) if
$$
\mathcal{Q}=\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}:=H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right) / \theta H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right) \cong H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right) \ominus \theta H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)
$$
for some inner function $\theta \in H^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$ (that is, $\theta$ is a bounded analytic function on $\mathbb{D}^{n}$ and $|\theta|=1$ a.e. on the distinguished boundary $\mathbb{T}^{n}$ of $\left.\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$. We denote by $\mathcal{S}_{\theta}$ the submodule $\theta H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$ of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$.

A quotient module $\mathcal{Q}$ of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$ is essentially normal (cf. [6]) if the commutator $\left[C_{z_{i}}^{\mathcal{Q}}, C_{z_{j}}^{\mathcal{Q} *}\right]$ is compact for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, where $C_{z_{i}}^{\mathcal{Q}}$ is the compression of the shift $M_{z_{i}}$ to $\mathcal{Q}$, that is,

$$
C_{z_{i}}^{\mathcal{Q}}:=\left.P_{\mathcal{Q}} M_{z_{i}}\right|_{\mathcal{Q}} \quad(i=1, \ldots, n) .
$$

We use the notation $C_{z_{i}}$ when $\mathcal{Q}$ is clear from the context. We also denote by $B(\mathcal{Q})$ and $C^{*}(\mathcal{Q})$ the Banach algebra and the $C^{*}$-algebra generated by $\left\{I_{\mathcal{Q}}, C_{z_{i}}\right\}_{i=1}^{n}$ respectively. For convenience in notation we put

$$
B(\mathcal{Q})=B\left(C_{z_{1}}, \ldots, C_{z_{n}}\right), \text { and } C^{*}(\mathcal{Q})=C^{*}\left(C_{z_{1}}, \ldots, C_{z_{n}}\right)
$$

It is well known that for an essentially normal quotient module $\mathcal{Q}$ of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right), B(\mathcal{Q})$ is an irreducible operator algebra and the $C^{*}$-algebra $C^{*}(\mathcal{Q})$ contains all compact operators in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Q})$.

Essential normality of Hilbert modules is a much studied object in operator theory and function theory. It establishes important connections between operator theory, algebraic geometry, homology theory and complex analysis through the BDF theory [3]. It is well known that any proper quotient module of $H^{2}(\mathbb{D})$ is of Beurling-type and essentially normal. This, however, does not hold in general:
(1) For $n=2$ a Beurling type quotient module $\mathcal{Q}_{\theta} \subseteq H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{2}\right)$ is essentially normal if and only if $\theta$ is a rational inner function of degree at most $(1,1)$ [12].
(2) For $n \geq 2$, a quotient module $\mathcal{Q}$ is a Beurling type quotient module of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$ if and only if $\mathcal{Q}^{\perp}$ is a doubly commuting submodule [18].
An incomplete list of references on the study of essential normality of different classes quotient modules, including Clark type quotient modules and homogeneous quotient modules, over bidisc is: [6], [7], [11], [12], [13] and [19].

In this paper we first investigate the essential normality of certain classes of quotient modules including Beurling-type quotient modules of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right), n \geq 3$. We prove that the Beurling type quotient modules of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)(n \geq 3)$ and Rudin quotient modules of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{2}\right)$ are not essentially normal. We obtain a complete characterization for essential normality of doubly commuting quotient modules of an analytic Hilbert module (defined in Section 2) over $\mathbb{C}[\boldsymbol{z}]$ including $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$ and the weighted Bergman modules $L_{a, \boldsymbol{\alpha}}^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)\left(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}, \alpha_{i}>-1, i=1, \ldots, n\right)$ as special cases ( $n \geq 2$ ).

We also study boundary representations, in the sense of Arveson ([1], [2]), of the $C^{*}$ algebra $C^{*}(\mathcal{Q})$ for different classes of quotient modules $\mathcal{Q}$ of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$. Before we describe them, let us recall the notion of boundary representations and some relevant results. Let $A$ be an operator algebra with identity, and let $C^{*}(A)$ be the $C^{*}$-algebra generated by $A$. An irreducible representation $\omega$ of $C^{*}(A)$ is a boundary representation relative to $A$ if $\left.\omega\right|_{A}$ has a
unique completely positive ( CP ) extension to $C^{*}(A)$. An operator algebra $A$ has sufficiently many boundary representations if

$$
\bigcap_{\omega \in \operatorname{bdy}(A)} \operatorname{ker} \omega=\{0\}
$$

where $\operatorname{bdy}(A)$ denotes the set of all boundary representations of $C^{*}(A)$ relative to $A$. It is worth mentioning here that, by a recent work of Davidson and Kenedy ([9]), the Silov boundary ideal of $A$ (in the sense of Arveson [1]) is $\cap_{\omega \in \operatorname{bdy}(A)} \operatorname{ker} \omega$. It is of great interest and importance to identify operator algebras with sufficiently many boundary representations. In the particular case of irreducible operator algebras containing compact operators, the existence of sufficiently many boundary representations and the fact that the identity representation is a boundary representation are closely related.
Theorem 1.1 ([2]). Let $A$ be an irreducible operator algebra with identity, and let $C^{*}(A)$ contain all the compact operators. Then $A$ has sufficiently many boundary representations if and only if the identity representation of $C^{*}(A)$ is a boundary representation relative to $A$.

In our context, if $\mathcal{Q}$ is an essentially normal quotient module of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$ then $B(\mathcal{Q})$ is irreducible and $C^{*}(\mathcal{Q})$ contains all the compact operators on $\mathcal{Q}$. Therefore, it is natural to ask whether the identity representation of $C^{*}(\mathcal{Q})$ is a boundary representation relative to $B(\mathcal{Q})$ for the case when $\mathcal{Q}$ is an essentially normal quotient module of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$. This problem has a complete solution for the case $n=1$ (see Arveson [1],[2]):
Theorem 1.2 (Arveson). Let $\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}$ be a quotient module of $H^{2}(\mathbb{D})$. Then the identity representation of $C^{*}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}\right)$ is a boundary representation relative to $B\left(\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}\right)$ if and only if $Z_{\theta}$ is a proper subset of $\mathbb{T}$, where $Z_{\theta}$ consists of all points $\lambda$ on $\mathbb{T}$ for which $\theta$ cannot be continued analytically from $\mathbb{D}$ to $\lambda$.

For the class of essentially normal Beurling type quotient modules of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{2}\right)$, the following characterization was obtained in [12].
Theorem 1.3 (Guo and Wang). Let $\theta \in H^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{D}^{2}\right)$ be a rational inner function of degree at most $(1,1)$, and $\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}$ be the corresponding essentially normal quotient module of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{2}\right)$. Then the identity representation of $C^{*}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}\right)$ is a boundary representation relative to $B\left(\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}\right)$ if and only if $\theta$ is not a one variable Blaschke factor.

In this paper, we study the same problem for several classes of quotient modules of some Hilbert modules over $\mathbb{D}^{n}, n \geq 2$. To be more precise, we study boundary representations for doubly commuting quotient modules of an analytic Hilbert module over $\mathbb{C}[\boldsymbol{z}]$, and obtain some direct results for the case of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$ and $L_{a}^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)(n \geq 2)$ (see Theorems 4.4 and 4.5). We also considered the class of Clark type (denoted by $\mathcal{Q}_{\eta}$ ) quotient modules of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$ and homogeneous quotient modules of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{2}\right)$.

The paper is organized as follows. After obtaining some preliminary results in Section 2 , we consider essential normality of Beurling type quotient module of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)(n \geq 3)$, doubly commuting quotients modules of an analytic Hilbert module over $\mathbb{C}[\boldsymbol{z}]$ and Rudin quotient module of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{2}\right)$ in Section 3. Section 4 is devoted to the study of boundary representations for doubly commuting quotient modules. In Section 5 and 6, we discuss
boundary representations for Clark type (denoted by $\left.\mathcal{Q}_{\eta}\right)$ quotient modules of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$ and homogeneous quotient modules of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{2}\right)$, respectively.

## 2. Preparatory results

In this section we recall some definitions, and prove some elementary results which will be used later. For each $\boldsymbol{w} \in \mathbb{D}^{n}$, the normalized kernel function $K_{\boldsymbol{w}}$ of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$ is defined by

$$
K_{\boldsymbol{w}}(\boldsymbol{z}):=\frac{1}{\|\mathbb{S}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{w})\|} \mathbb{S}(\boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{w})=\prod_{i=1}^{n} \sqrt{\left(1-\left|w_{i}\right|^{2}\right)} \frac{1}{1-\bar{w}_{i} z_{i}} \quad\left(\boldsymbol{z} \in \mathbb{D}^{n}\right),
$$

where $\mathbb{S}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{w})(\boldsymbol{z})=\mathbb{S}(\boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{w})$ for all $\boldsymbol{z} \in \mathbb{D}^{n}$.
Lemma 2.1. Let $l \in\{1, \ldots, n\}$ be a fixed integer, and let $\boldsymbol{w}_{l}=\left(w_{1}, \ldots, w_{l-1}, w_{l+1}, \ldots, w_{n}\right)$ be a fixed point in $\mathbb{D}^{n-1}$. Then $K_{\left(\boldsymbol{w}_{l}, w\right)}$ converges weakly to 0 as $w$ approaches to $\partial \mathbb{D}$, where $\left(\boldsymbol{w}_{l}, w\right)=\left(w_{1}, \ldots, w_{l-1}, w, w_{l+1}, \ldots, w_{n}\right)$.
Proof. For each $p \in \mathbb{C}[\boldsymbol{z}]$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\langle K_{\left(\boldsymbol{w}_{l}, w\right)}, p\right\rangle=\overline{p\left(\boldsymbol{w}_{l}, w\right)} \sqrt{1-|w|^{2}} \prod_{i=1, i \neq l}^{n} \sqrt{1-\left|w_{i}\right|^{2}} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

which converges to zero as $w$ approaches to $\partial \mathbb{D}$. For an arbitrary $f \in H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$, the result now follows from the fact that $\left\|K_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\right\|=1$ for all $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{D}^{n}$ and $\mathbb{C}[\boldsymbol{z}]$ is dense in $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$.

For a closed subspace $\mathcal{S}$ of a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, the orthogonal projection of $\mathcal{H}$ onto $\mathcal{S}$ is denoted by $P_{\mathcal{S}}$. For an inner function $\theta \in H^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$, it is well known that

$$
P_{\mathcal{S}_{\theta}}=M_{\theta} M_{\theta}^{*} \quad \text { and } \quad P_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}}=I_{H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)}-M_{\theta} M_{\theta}^{*},
$$

where $M_{\theta}$ is the multiplication operator defined by

$$
\left(M_{\theta} f\right)(\boldsymbol{w})=\theta(\boldsymbol{w}) f(\boldsymbol{w}) \quad\left(\boldsymbol{w} \in \mathbb{D}^{n}, f \in H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)\right)
$$

It follows from the reproducing property of the Szegö kernel that

$$
M_{\theta}^{*} K(\cdot, \boldsymbol{w})=\overline{\theta(\boldsymbol{w})} K(\cdot, \boldsymbol{w}),
$$

where $K(\cdot, \boldsymbol{w}):=K_{\boldsymbol{w}}, \boldsymbol{w} \in \mathbb{D}^{n}$. In particular, one has

$$
P_{\mathcal{S}_{\theta}}\left(K_{\boldsymbol{w}}\right)=M_{\theta} M_{\theta}^{*} K_{\boldsymbol{w}}=\overline{\theta(\boldsymbol{w})} \theta K_{\boldsymbol{w}} \quad\left(\boldsymbol{w} \in \mathbb{D}^{n}\right)
$$

These observations yield the following lemma.
Lemma 2.2. Let $\theta$ be an inner function in $H^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}}\left(K_{\boldsymbol{w}}\right)=(1-\overline{\theta(\boldsymbol{w})} \theta) K_{\boldsymbol{w}} \quad\left(\boldsymbol{w} \in \mathbb{D}^{n}\right) \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

We now recall the definition of an analytic Hilbert module over $\mathbb{C}[z]$ (see [4]). Let $k$ : $\mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a positive definite function such that $k(z, w)$ is analytic in $z$ and anti-analytic in $w$. Let $\mathcal{H}_{k} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C})$ be the corresponding reproducing kernel Hilbert space. The Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{k}$ is said to be reproducing kernel Hilbert module over $\mathbb{C}[z]$ if the multiplication operator $M_{z}$ is bounded on $\mathcal{H}_{k}$.

Definition 2.3. A reproducing kernel Hilbert module $\mathcal{H}_{k}$ over $\mathbb{C}[z]$ is said to be an analytic Hilbert module over $\mathbb{C}[z]$ if $k^{-1}(z, w)$ is a polynomial in $z$ and $\bar{w}$.

Typical examples of analytic Hilbert modules are the Hardy module $H^{2}(\mathbb{D})$ and the weighted Bergman modules $L_{a, \alpha}^{2}(\mathbb{D})(\alpha>-1, \alpha \in \mathbb{Z})$. It is known that a quotient module of an analytic Hilbert module is irreducible, that is, $C_{z}$ does not have any non-trivial reducing subspace (cf. Theorem 3.3 and Lemma 3.4 in [4]). Using this, we obtain the next lemma.
Lemma 2.4. Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a non-zero quotient module of an analytic Hilbert module $\mathcal{H}$ over $\mathbb{C}[z]$. Then $\left[C_{z}, C_{z}^{*}\right]=0$ if and only if $\mathcal{Q}$ is one dimensional.

Proof. First note that for any non-zero quotient module $\mathcal{Q}$ of $\mathcal{H}$, the $C^{*}$-algebra $C^{*}(\mathcal{Q})$ is irreducible. If $C_{z}$ is normal, then $C^{*}(\mathcal{Q}) \subseteq C^{*}(\mathcal{Q})^{\prime}=\mathbb{C} I$. Thus $C^{*}(\mathcal{Q})=\mathbb{C} I$, and therefore, $\mathcal{Q}$ is one dimensional. The converse part is trivial, and the proof follows.

Let $\left\{k_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{n}$ be positive definite functions on $\mathbb{D}$. Then $\mathcal{H}_{K}:=\mathcal{H}_{k_{1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_{k_{n}}$ is said to be an analytic Hilbert module over $\mathbb{C}[\boldsymbol{z}]$ if $\mathcal{H}_{k_{i}}$ is an analytic Hilbert module over $\mathbb{C}[z]$ for all $i=1, \ldots, n$. In this case, $\mathcal{H}_{K} \subseteq \mathcal{O}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}, \mathbb{C}\right)$ and

$$
K(\boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{w})=\prod_{i=1}^{n} k_{i}\left(z_{i}, w_{i}\right) \quad\left(\boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{w} \in \mathbb{D}^{n}\right)
$$

is the reproducing kernel function of $\mathcal{H}_{K}$ (cf. [4]). In the sequel, we will often identify $M_{z_{i}}$ on $\mathcal{H}_{K}$ with the operator $I_{\mathcal{H}_{k_{1}}} \otimes \cdots \otimes \underbrace{M_{z}}_{\text {i-th place }} \otimes \cdots \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}_{k_{n}}}, i=1, \ldots, n$, on the $n$-fold Hilbert space tensor product $\mathcal{H}_{k_{1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_{k_{n}}$. We end this section with a result on essential normality of a Beurling type quotient module $\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}$, where $\theta$ is a one variable inner function in $\mathbb{D}^{n}$.

Lemma 2.5. Let $\theta \in H^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$ be a one variable inner function and $n \geq 3$. Then $\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}$ is not essentially normal.

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\theta(\boldsymbol{z})=\theta^{\prime}\left(z_{1}\right)$ for some inner function $\theta^{\prime} \in H^{\infty}(\mathbb{D})$. Then it follows that $\mathcal{S}_{\theta}=\mathcal{S}_{\theta^{\prime}} \otimes H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n-1}\right)$ and

$$
\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}=H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right) \ominus \theta H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)=\mathcal{Q}_{\theta^{\prime}} \otimes H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n-1}\right)
$$

Now we compute the self commutator of $C_{z_{2}}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
{\left[C_{z_{2}}, C_{z_{2}}^{*}\right] } & =P_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}} M_{z_{2}} M_{z_{2}}^{*}\left|\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}-P_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}} M_{z_{2}}^{*} P_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}} M_{z_{2}}\right|_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}} \\
& =P_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}} M_{z_{2}} M_{z_{2}}^{*}\left|\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}-I_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}}+P_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}} M_{z_{2}}^{*} P_{\mathcal{S}_{\theta}} M_{z_{2}}\right|_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Using the fact

$$
\left.P_{\mathcal{S}_{\theta}} M_{z_{2}}\right|_{\mathcal{Q}^{\prime} \otimes \mathbb{C} \otimes H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n-2}\right)}=\left.\left(P_{\mathcal{S}_{\theta^{\prime}}} \otimes I_{H^{2}(\mathbb{D})} \otimes I_{H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n-2}\right)}\right) M_{z_{2}}\right|_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta^{\prime}} \otimes \mathbb{C} \otimes H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n-2}\right)}=0,
$$

and

$$
M_{z_{2}}^{*} \mid \mathcal{Q}_{\theta^{\prime} \otimes \mathbb{C} \otimes H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n-2}\right)}=0,
$$

we conclude that

$$
\left.\left[C_{z_{2}}, C_{z_{2}}^{*}\right]\right|_{\mathcal{Q}_{\prime^{\prime}} \otimes \mathbb{C} \otimes H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n-2}\right)}=-\left.I_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}}\right|_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta^{\prime}} \otimes \mathbb{C} \otimes H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n-2}\right)}=-I_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta^{\prime}} \otimes \mathbb{C} \otimes H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n-2}\right)}
$$

Since $\left.n \geq 3,\left[C_{z_{2}}, C_{z_{2}}^{*}\right]\right]_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta^{\prime}} \otimes \mathbb{C} \otimes H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n-2}\right)}$ is not compact, and hence the commutator $\left[C_{z_{2}}, C_{z_{2}}^{*}\right]$ is not compact. This completes the proof.

## 3. Essential normality

Our purpose in this section is to prove a list of results concerning essential normality for certain classes of quotient modules. We begin with the class of Beurling type quotient modules of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right), n \geq 3$.

Theorem 3.1. Let $\theta$ be an inner function in $H^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$ and $n \geq 3$. Then $\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}$ is not essentially normal.

Proof. By Lemma 2.5, we may assume without loss of generality that $\theta$ depends on both $z_{1}$ and $z_{2}$ variables. We now show that $\left[C_{z_{1}}, C_{z_{2}}^{*}\right]$ is not compact. To see this, we compute

$$
\left.\begin{aligned}
{\left[C_{z_{1}}, C_{z_{2}}^{*}\right] } & =\left.P_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}} M_{z_{1}} M_{z_{2}}^{*}\right|_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}}-\left.P_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}} M_{z_{2}}^{*} P_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}} M_{z_{1}}\right|_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}}=\left.P_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}} M_{z_{2}}^{*} P_{\mathcal{S}_{\theta}} M_{z_{1}}\right|_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}} \\
& =\left.P_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}} M_{z_{2}}^{*} P_{\mathcal{S}_{\theta} \ominus\left(z_{1} \mathcal{S}_{\theta}+z_{2} \mathcal{S}_{\theta}\right)} M_{z_{1}}\right|_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}}+P_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}} M_{z_{2}}^{*} P_{z_{1}} \mathcal{S}_{\theta}+z_{2} \mathcal{S}_{\theta}
\end{aligned} M_{z_{1}}\right|_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}} .
$$

Since $M_{z_{1}}$ and $M_{z_{2}}$ are isometries, we have

$$
P_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}} M_{z_{i}}^{*} P_{z_{i} \mathcal{S}_{\theta}}=0 \quad(i=1,2)
$$

This implies

$$
\left.P_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}} M_{z_{2}}^{*} P_{z_{1} \mathcal{S}_{\theta}+z_{2} \mathcal{S}_{\theta}} M_{z_{1}}\right|_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}}=0
$$

and

$$
\left[C_{z_{1}}, C_{z_{2}}^{*}\right]=\left.P_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}} M_{z_{2}}^{*} P_{\mathcal{S}_{\theta} \ominus\left(z_{1} \mathcal{S}_{\theta}+z_{2} \mathcal{S}_{\theta}\right)} M_{z_{1}}\right|_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}}
$$

On the other hand, since $\mathcal{S}_{\theta}=\theta H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{S}_{\theta} \ominus\left(z_{1} \mathcal{S}_{\theta}+z_{2} \mathcal{S}_{\theta}\right) & =\theta H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right) \ominus \theta\left(z_{1} H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)+z_{2} H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)\right) \\
& =\theta\left(\mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{C} \otimes H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n-2}\right)\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

and therefore,

$$
M_{z_{2}}^{*}\left(\mathcal{S}_{\theta} \ominus\left(z_{1} \mathcal{S}_{\theta}+z_{2} \mathcal{S}_{\theta}\right)\right) \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_{\theta}
$$

Consequently,

$$
\left[C_{z_{1}}, C_{z_{2}}^{*}\right]=\left.M_{z_{2}}^{*} P_{\mathcal{S}_{\theta} \ominus\left(z_{1} \mathcal{S}_{\theta}+z_{2} \mathcal{S}_{\theta}\right)} M_{z_{1}}\right|_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}}
$$

By Lemma 2.1, it is enough to show that $\left\langle\left[C_{z_{1}}, C_{z_{2}}^{*}\right] K_{\boldsymbol{w}}, K_{\boldsymbol{w}}\right\rangle$ does not converge to 0 as $w_{j}$ approaches to $\partial \mathbb{D}$ for some fixed $3 \leq j \leq n$, and keeping all other co-ordinates of $\boldsymbol{w}=$ $\left(w_{1}, \ldots w_{j-1}, w_{j}, w_{j+1}, \ldots, w_{n}\right) \in \mathbb{D}^{n}$ fixed. To this end, let $\boldsymbol{w} \in \mathbb{D}^{n}$. Since $\left\{\theta z_{3}^{m_{3}} \cdots z_{n}^{m_{n}}\right.$ :
$\left.m_{3}, \ldots, m_{n} \in \mathbb{N}\right\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{S}_{\theta} \ominus\left(z_{1} \mathcal{S}_{\theta}+z_{2} \mathcal{S}_{\theta}\right)$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_{\mathcal{S}_{\theta} \ominus\left(z_{1} \mathcal{S}_{\theta}+z_{2} \mathcal{S}_{\theta}\right)}\left(z_{2} K_{\boldsymbol{w}}\right) & =\sum_{m_{3}, \ldots, m_{n} \in \mathbb{N}}\left\langle z_{2} K_{\boldsymbol{w}}, \theta z_{3}^{m_{3}} \cdots z_{n}^{m_{n}}\right\rangle \theta z_{3}^{m_{3}} \cdots z_{n}^{m_{n}} \\
& =\sum_{m_{3}, \ldots, m_{n} \in \mathbb{N}}\left\langle K_{\boldsymbol{w}}, z_{3}^{m_{3}} \cdots z_{n}^{m_{n}}\left(M_{z_{2}}^{*} \theta\right)\right\rangle \theta z_{3}^{m_{3}} \cdots z_{n}^{m_{n}} \\
& =\frac{1}{\|\mathbb{S}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{w})\|} \theta \sum_{m_{3}, \ldots, m_{n} \in \mathbb{N}}\left(\overline{w_{3}} z_{3}\right)^{m_{3}} \cdots\left(\overline{w_{n}} z_{n}\right)^{m_{n}} \overline{M_{z_{2}}^{*} \theta(\boldsymbol{w})} \\
& =\overline{M_{z_{2}}^{*} \theta(\boldsymbol{w})} \prod_{j=1}^{2}\left(1-\left|w_{j}\right|^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\prod_{i=3}^{n} K_{w_{i}}\right) \theta .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\langle\left[C_{z_{1}}, C_{z_{2}}^{*}\right] K_{\boldsymbol{w}}, K_{\boldsymbol{w}}\right\rangle & =\left\langle M_{z_{2}}^{*} P_{\mathcal{S}_{\theta} \ominus\left(z_{1} \mathcal{S}_{\theta}+z_{2} \mathcal{S}_{\theta}\right)} M_{z_{1}} P_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}} K_{\boldsymbol{w}}, K_{\boldsymbol{w}}\right\rangle \\
& =\left\langle M_{z_{1}} P_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}} K_{\boldsymbol{w}}, P_{\mathcal{S}_{\theta} \ominus\left(z_{1} \mathcal{S}_{\theta}+z_{2} \mathcal{S}_{\theta}\right)}\left(z_{2} K_{\boldsymbol{w}}\right)\right\rangle \\
& =\overline{\left(M_{z_{2}}^{*} \theta\right)(\boldsymbol{w})} \prod_{j=1}^{2}\left(1-\left|w_{j}\right|^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left\langle M_{z_{1}} P_{\mathcal{Q}_{\theta}} K_{\boldsymbol{w}}, \prod_{i=3}^{n} K_{w_{i}} \theta\right\rangle \\
& =\overline{\left(M_{z_{2}}^{*} \theta\right)(\boldsymbol{w})} \prod_{j=1}^{2}\left(1-\left|w_{j}\right|^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left\langle M_{z_{1}}(1-\overline{\theta(\boldsymbol{w})} \theta) K_{\boldsymbol{w}}, \prod_{i=3}^{n} K_{w_{i}} \theta\right\rangle,
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last equality follows from (2.2). Since $M_{z_{1}}^{*}\left(\prod_{i=3}^{n} K_{w_{i}}\right)=0$ and $M_{\theta}^{*} M_{\theta}=I_{H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)}$, we have

$$
\left\langle M_{z_{1}} \theta K_{\boldsymbol{w}}, \prod_{i=3}^{n} K_{w_{i}} \theta\right\rangle=\left\langle\theta M_{z_{1}} K_{\boldsymbol{w}}, \prod_{i=3}^{n} K_{w_{i}} \theta\right\rangle=\left\langle K_{\boldsymbol{w}}, M_{z_{1}}^{*}\left(\prod_{i=3}^{n} K_{w_{i}}\right)\right\rangle=0 .
$$

Therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\langle\left[C_{z_{1}}, C_{z_{2}}^{*}\right] K_{\boldsymbol{w}}, K_{\boldsymbol{w}}\right\rangle & =\overline{\left(M_{z_{2}}^{*} \theta\right)(\boldsymbol{w})} \prod_{j=1}^{2}\left(1-\left|w_{j}\right|^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left\langle M_{z_{1}} K_{\boldsymbol{w}}, \prod_{i=3}^{n} K_{w_{i}} \theta\right\rangle \\
& =\overline{\left(M_{z_{2}}^{*} \theta\right)(\boldsymbol{w})} \prod_{j=1}^{2}\left(1-\left|w_{j}\right|^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left\langle K_{\boldsymbol{w}}, \prod_{i=3}^{n} K_{w_{i}}\left(M_{z_{1}}^{*} \theta\right)\right\rangle \\
& =\overline{\left(M_{z_{2}}^{*} \theta\right)(\boldsymbol{w})} \prod_{j=1}^{2}\left(1-\left|w_{j}\right|^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\overline{M_{z_{1}}^{*} \theta(\boldsymbol{w})} \frac{1}{\|\mathbb{S}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{w})\|} \prod_{i=3}^{n} \frac{1}{\left(1-\left|w_{j}\right|^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \\
& =\overline{\left(M_{z_{2}}^{*} \theta\right)(\boldsymbol{w})} \overline{\left(M_{z_{1}}^{*} \theta\right)(\boldsymbol{w})} \prod_{j=1}^{2}\left(1-\left|w_{j}\right|^{2}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\theta$ depends on both $z_{1}$ and $z_{2}$ variables, $M_{z_{1}}^{*} \theta$ and $M_{z_{2}}^{*} \theta$ are non-zero functions. Therefore it follows that there exists an $l \in\{3, \ldots, n\}$ such that the limit of

$$
\overline{\left(M_{z_{2}}^{*} \theta\right)(\boldsymbol{w})} \overline{\left(M_{z_{1}}^{*} \theta\right)(\boldsymbol{w})} \prod_{j=1}^{2}\left(1-\left|w_{j}\right|^{2}\right)
$$

as $w_{l}$ approaches to $\partial \mathbb{D}$ and keeping all other coordinates of $\boldsymbol{w}$ fixed, is a non-zero number. This completes the proof.

We now proceed to the case of doubly commuting quotient modules of an analytic Hilbert module over $\mathbb{C}[\boldsymbol{z}]$. Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a quotient module of an analytic Hilbert module $\mathcal{H}_{K}$ over $\mathbb{C}[\boldsymbol{z}]$. It is known that $\mathcal{Q}$ is doubly commuting (that is, $\left[C_{z_{i}}, C_{z_{j}}^{*}\right]=0$ for all $1 \leq i<j \leq n$ ) if and only if $\mathcal{Q}=\mathcal{Q}_{1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{Q}_{n}$ for some quotient module $\mathcal{Q}_{i}$ of $\mathcal{H}_{k_{i}}, i=1, \ldots, n$ (see [4], [15] and [17]).
THEOREM 3.2. Let $\mathcal{Q}=\mathcal{Q}_{1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{Q}_{n}$ be a doubly commuting quotient module of an analytic Hilbert module $\mathcal{H}_{K}=\mathcal{H}_{k_{1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_{k_{n}}$ over $\mathbb{C}[\boldsymbol{z}], n \geq 2$. Then $\mathcal{Q}$ is essentially normal if and only if one of the following holds:
(i) $\mathcal{Q}$ is finite dimensional.
(ii) There exits an $i \in\{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $\mathcal{Q}_{i}$ is an infinite dimensional essentially normal quotient module of $\mathcal{H}_{k_{i}}$, and $\mathcal{Q}_{j} \cong \mathbb{C}$ for all $j \neq i$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{Q}=\mathcal{Q}_{1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{Q}_{n}$ be an infinite dimensional essentially normal quotient module. Then at least one of $\mathcal{Q}_{1}, \ldots, \mathcal{Q}_{n}$ is infinite dimensional. Without loss of generality we assume that $\mathcal{Q}_{n}$ is infinite dimensional. For each $i=1, \ldots, n$, we now compute the self-commutator:

$$
\begin{align*}
{\left[C_{z_{i}}, C_{z_{i}}^{*}\right] } & =\left.P_{\mathcal{Q}} M_{z_{i}} M_{z_{i}}^{*}\right|_{\mathcal{Q}}-\left.P_{\mathcal{Q}} M_{z_{i}}^{*} P_{\mathcal{Q}} M_{z_{i}}\right|_{\mathcal{Q}} \\
& =P_{\mathcal{Q}_{1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes P_{\mathcal{Q}_{i-1}} \otimes \underbrace{\left[C_{z}, C_{z}^{*}\right]_{i}}_{\text {i-th place }} \otimes P_{\mathcal{Q}_{i+1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes P_{\mathcal{Q}_{n}}, \tag{3.3}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\left[C_{z}, C_{z}^{*}\right]_{i}$ is the self-commutator corresponding to the quotient module $\mathcal{Q}_{i}$. Since $\mathcal{Q}_{n}$ is infinite dimensional, the compactness of $\left[C_{z_{i}}, C_{z_{i}}^{*}\right]$ implies that $\left[C_{z}, C_{z}^{*}\right]_{i}=0$ for all $i=$ $1, \ldots, n-1$. Therefore, by Lemma 2.4, it follows that $\mathcal{Q}_{i} \cong \mathbb{C}, i=1, \ldots, n-1$.
Finally, for $i=n$, the compactness of $\left[C_{z_{n}}, C_{z_{n}}^{*}\right]=P_{\mathcal{Q}_{1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes P_{\mathcal{Q}_{n-1}} \otimes\left[C_{z}, C_{z}^{*}\right]_{n}$ implies that $\left[C_{z}, C_{z}^{*}\right]_{n}$ is compact, that is, $\mathcal{Q}_{n}$ is essentially normal.

For the converse, it is enough to show that (ii) implies $\mathcal{Q}$ is essentially normal. Again, without loss of generality, we assume that $\mathcal{Q}_{n}$ is infinite dimensional essentially normal quotient module. Then it readily follows from (3.3) that $\left[C_{z_{i}}, C_{z_{i}}^{*}\right]=0, i=1, \ldots, n-1$, and $\left[C_{z_{n}}, C_{z_{n}}^{*}\right]$ is compact. Now the proof follows from Fuglede-Putnam theorem.

The above result applies, in particular, if $\mathcal{H}_{K}$ is the $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$ or the weighted Bergman modules $L_{a, \boldsymbol{\alpha}}^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)\left(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}, \alpha_{i}>-1, i=1, \ldots, n\right)$. Moreover, since every quotient module of $H^{2}(\mathbb{D})$ is essentially normal, by Theorem 3.2 we have the following corollary.

Corollary 3.3. Let $\mathcal{Q}=\mathcal{Q}_{1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{Q}_{n}$ be a doubly commuting quotient module of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$, $n \geq 2$. Then $\mathcal{Q}$ is essentially normal if and only if one of the following holds:
(i) $\mathcal{Q}$ is finite dimensional.
(ii) There exits an $i \in\{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $\mathcal{Q}_{i}$ is infinite dimensional, and $\mathcal{Q}_{j} \cong \mathbb{C}$ for all $j \neq i$.

It is also well known that a quotient module $\mathcal{Q}$ of the Bergman module $L_{a}^{2}(\mathbb{D})$ is essentially normal if and only if

$$
\operatorname{dim}(\mathcal{S} \ominus z \mathcal{S})<\infty
$$

where $\mathcal{S}:=L_{a}^{2}(\mathbb{D}) \ominus \mathcal{Q}$ is the corresponding submodule (see [20, Theorem 3.1]). Using this and Theorem 3.2, we have the following result.

Corollary 3.4. Let $\mathcal{Q}=\mathcal{Q}_{1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{Q}_{n}$ be a doubly commuting quotient module of $L_{a}^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$, $n \geq 2$. Then $\mathcal{Q}$ is essentially normal if and only if one of the following holds:
(i) $\mathcal{Q}$ is finite dimensional.
(ii) There exists an $i \in\{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $\mathcal{Q}_{i}$ is infinite dimensional with $\operatorname{dim}\left(\mathcal{S}_{i} \ominus z \mathcal{S}_{i}\right)<$ $\infty$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{j} \cong \mathbb{C}$ for all $j \neq i$, where $\mathcal{S}_{i}=L_{a}^{2}(\mathbb{D}) \ominus \mathcal{Q}_{i}$.

We now restrict our attention to $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{2}\right)$, and formulate the definition of the Rudin quotient module of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{2}\right)$ (see [5], [8]). Let $\Psi=\left\{\psi_{n}\right\}_{n=0}^{\infty} \subseteq H^{2}(\mathbb{D})$ be an increasing sequence of finite Blaschke products and $\Phi=\left\{\varphi_{n}\right\}_{n=0}^{\infty} \subseteq H^{2}(\mathbb{D})$ be a decreasing sequence of Blaschke products, that is, $\psi_{n+1} / \psi_{n}$ and $\varphi_{n} / \varphi_{n+1}$ are non-constant inner functions for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the Rudin quotient module corresponding to $\Psi$ and $\Phi$ is denoted by $\mathcal{Q}_{\Psi, \Phi}$, and defined by

$$
\mathcal{Q}_{\Psi, \Phi}:=\bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{\psi_{n}} \otimes \mathcal{Q}_{\varphi_{n}}\right) .
$$

We denote by $\mathcal{S}_{\Psi, \Phi}$ the submodule $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{2}\right) \ominus \mathcal{Q}_{\Psi, \Phi}$ corresponding to $\mathcal{Q}_{\Psi, \Phi}$. The following representations of $\mathcal{Q}_{\Psi, \Phi}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\Psi, \Phi}$ are very useful (see [5]):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{Q}_{\Psi, \Phi}=\bigoplus_{n \geq 0}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{\psi_{n}} \ominus \mathcal{Q}_{\psi_{n-1}}\right) \otimes \mathcal{Q}_{\varphi_{n}} \text { and } \mathcal{S}_{\Psi, \Phi}=\mathcal{Q}^{\prime} \otimes H^{2}(\mathbb{D}) \bigoplus_{n \geq 0}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{\psi_{n}} \ominus \mathcal{Q}_{\psi_{n-1}}\right) \otimes \mathcal{S}_{\varphi_{n}}, \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathcal{Q}_{\psi_{-1}}:=\{0\}$ and $\mathcal{Q}^{\prime}=H^{2}(\mathbb{D}) \ominus \vee_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{Q}_{\psi_{n}}$.
Next we show that the Rudin quotient modules are not essentially normal.
Theorem 3.5. Let $\mathcal{Q}_{\Psi, \Phi}$ be a Rudin quotient module of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{2}\right)$ corresponding to an increasing sequence of finite Blaschke products $\Psi=\left\{\psi_{n}\right\}_{n \geq 0}$ and a decreasing sequence of Blaschke products $\Phi=\left\{\varphi_{n}\right\}_{n \geq 0}$. Then $\mathcal{Q}_{\Psi, \Phi}$ is not essentially normal.

Proof. Let $b_{\beta}$, the Blaschke factor corresponding to $\beta \in \mathbb{D}$, be a factor of $\psi_{m+1} / \psi_{m}$ for some $m \geq 0$. For contradiction, we assume that $\mathcal{Q}_{\Psi, \Phi}$ is essentially normal. Then, as $\psi_{m}$ is a finite Blaschke product, $\left[C_{\psi_{m}\left(z_{1}\right)}, C_{\psi_{m}\left(z_{1}\right)}^{*}\right]$ is compact, where $C_{\psi_{m}\left(z_{1}\right)}=\left.P_{\mathcal{Q}} M_{\psi_{m}\left(z_{1}\right)}\right|_{\mathcal{Q}}$ and $\mathcal{Q}:=\mathcal{Q}_{\Psi, \Phi}$. Now setting $\mathcal{S}:=\mathcal{S}_{\Psi, \Phi}$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
{\left[C_{\psi_{m}\left(z_{1}\right)}, C_{\psi_{m}\left(z_{1}\right)}^{*}\right] } & =\left.P_{\mathcal{Q}} M_{\psi_{m}\left(z_{1}\right)} M_{\psi_{m}\left(z_{1}\right)}^{*}\right|_{\mathcal{Q}}-\left.P_{\mathcal{Q}} M_{\psi_{m}\left(z_{1}\right)}^{*} P_{\mathcal{Q}} M_{\psi_{m}\left(z_{1}\right)}\right|_{\mathcal{Q}} \\
& =-\left.P_{\mathcal{Q}}\left(I-M_{\psi_{m}\left(z_{1}\right)} M_{\psi_{m}\left(z_{1}\right)}^{*}\right)\right|_{\mathcal{Q}}+\left.P_{\mathcal{Q}} M_{\psi_{m}\left(z_{1}\right)}^{*} P_{\mathcal{S}} M_{\psi_{m}\left(z_{1}\right)}\right|_{\mathcal{Q}} \\
& =-\left.P_{\mathcal{Q}}\left(P_{\mathcal{Q}_{\psi_{m}}} \otimes I\right)\right|_{\mathcal{Q}}+\left.P_{\mathcal{Q}} M_{\psi_{m}\left(z_{1}\right)}^{*} P_{\mathcal{S}} M_{\psi_{m}\left(z_{1}\right)}\right|_{\mathcal{Q}} . \tag{3.5}
\end{align*}
$$

Since $\varphi_{m+1}$ is an infinite Blaschke product, there exists a sequence $\left\{\lambda_{i}\right\} \subset \mathbb{D}$ such that $K_{\lambda_{i}} \in \mathcal{Q}_{\varphi_{m+1}}$ and $\lambda_{i}$ approaches to $\partial \mathbb{D}$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore, since $K_{\beta} \otimes K_{\lambda_{i}} \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $\psi_{m} K_{\beta} \otimes K_{\lambda_{i}} \in\left(\mathcal{Q}_{\psi_{m+1}} \ominus \mathcal{Q}_{\psi_{m}}\right) \otimes \mathcal{Q}_{\varphi_{m+1}}$, we have $P_{\mathcal{S}}\left(\psi_{m} K_{\beta} \otimes K_{\lambda_{i}}\right)=0, i=1, \ldots, n$ (by (3.4)). Thus

$$
P_{\mathcal{Q}} M_{\psi_{m}\left(z_{1}\right)}^{*} P_{\mathcal{S}} M_{\psi_{m}\left(z_{1}\right)}\left(K_{\beta} \otimes K_{\lambda_{i}}\right)=0 .
$$

Finally, from (3.5), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\langle\left[C_{\psi_{m}\left(z_{1}\right)}, C_{\psi_{m}\left(z_{1}\right)}^{*}\right]\left(K_{\beta} \otimes K_{\lambda_{i}}\right), K_{\beta} \otimes K_{\lambda_{i}}\right\rangle & =-\left\langle\left(P_{\mathcal{Q}_{\psi} \psi_{m}} K_{\beta}\right) \otimes K_{\lambda_{i}}, K_{\beta} \otimes K_{\lambda_{i}}\right\rangle \\
& =-\left\langle\left(1-\overline{\psi_{m}(\beta)} \psi_{m}\right) K_{\beta}, K_{\beta}\right\rangle \\
& =-\left(1-\left|\psi_{m}(\beta)\right|^{2}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

which does not converges to 0 as $\lambda_{i}$ approaches to $\partial \mathbb{D}$. This completes the proof.
Remark 3.6. Let $m>1$. For a decreasing Blaschke products $\left\{\varphi_{n}\right\}_{n=1}^{m}$ and an increasing finite Blaschke products $\left\{\psi_{n}\right\}_{n=1}^{m}$, we consider the quotient module

$$
\mathcal{Q}=\bigvee_{n=1}^{m} \mathcal{Q}_{\psi_{n}} \otimes \mathcal{Q}_{\varphi_{n}}
$$

Adapting the techniques in the proof of the above theorem, one can conclude that $\mathcal{Q}$ is essentially normal if and only if $\varphi_{n}$ is finite Blaschke products for all $n=1, \ldots, m$. In other words, $\mathcal{Q}$ is essentially normal if and only if $\mathcal{Q}$ is finite dimensional.

## 4. Boundary Representations for doubly commuting quotient modules

In this section we study boundary representations for doubly commuting quotient modules of an analytic Hilbert module over $\mathbb{C}[\boldsymbol{z}]$. First, we prove a general result in the setting of minimal tensor products of $C^{*}$-algebras. Before that we fix some notations. We denote by $V_{1} \otimes V_{2}$ the algebraic tensor product of two vector spaces $V_{1}$ and $V_{2}$, and by $A_{1} \otimes A_{2}$ the minimal tensor product of two $C^{*}$-algebras $A_{1}$ and $A_{2}$.

Theorem 4.1. Let $A_{i}$ be a unital subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}\left(\mathcal{H}_{i}\right)$ for some Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{i}$, and let $C^{*}\left(A_{i}\right)$ be the irreducible $C^{*}$-algebra generated by $A_{i}$ in $\mathcal{B}\left(\mathcal{H}_{i}\right), i=1,2$. Set $A:=\overline{\left(A_{1} \underline{\otimes} A_{2}\right)}$, the norm closure of $A_{1} \otimes A_{2}$ in $\mathcal{B}\left(\mathcal{H}_{1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{2}\right)$. Then the following are equivalent.
(i) The identity representation of $C^{*}\left(A_{1}\right) \otimes C^{*}\left(A_{2}\right)$ is a boundary representation relative to $A$.
(ii) The identity representation of $C^{*}\left(A_{i}\right)$ is a boundary representation relative to $A_{i}$ for all $i=1,2$.

Proof. Suppose (i) holds, and for contradiction, we assume that the identity representation of $C^{*}\left(A_{1}\right)$ is not a boundary representation relative to $A_{1}$. Then there exists a CP map $\tau: C^{*}\left(A_{1}\right) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}\left(\mathcal{H}_{1}\right)$ different from $\operatorname{id}_{C^{*}\left(A_{1}\right)}$, but $\tau=\operatorname{id}_{C^{*}\left(A_{1}\right)}$ on $A_{1}$. Then the CP map

$$
\tau \otimes \operatorname{id}_{C^{*}\left(A_{2}\right)}: C^{*}\left(A_{1}\right) \otimes C^{*}\left(A_{2}\right) \rightarrow B\left(\mathcal{H}_{1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{2}\right)
$$

is a CP extension of the map $\left.\operatorname{id}_{C^{*}\left(A_{1}\right) \otimes C^{*}\left(A_{2}\right)}\right|_{A}$ to $C^{*}\left(A_{1}\right) \otimes C^{*}\left(A_{2}\right)$, and $\tau \otimes \operatorname{id}_{C^{*}\left(A_{2}\right)} \neq$ $\mathrm{id}_{C^{*}\left(A_{1}\right) \otimes C^{*}\left(A_{2}\right)}$. This is a contradiction.

On the other hand, suppose that (ii) holds. It follows from [1, Theorem 2.2.7] that the identity representation of $C^{*}\left(A_{1}\right) \otimes C^{*}\left(A_{2}\right)$ is a boundary representation relative to the linear subspace

$$
\mathbb{C} I \otimes C^{*}\left(A_{1}\right) \bigvee C^{*}\left(A_{1}\right) \otimes \mathbb{C} I
$$

Thus it is enough to show that any CP extension $\tau: C^{*}\left(A_{1}\right) \otimes C^{*}\left(A_{2}\right) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}\left(\mathcal{H}_{1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{2}\right)$ of $\left.\mathrm{id}_{C^{*}\left(A_{1}\right) \otimes C^{*}\left(A_{2}\right)}\right|_{A}$ agrees with $\mathrm{id}_{C^{*}\left(A_{1}\right) \otimes C^{*}\left(A_{2}\right)}$ on the subspace $\mathbb{C} I \otimes C^{*}\left(A_{1}\right) \bigvee C^{*}\left(A_{1}\right) \otimes \mathbb{C} I$, that is,

$$
\tau\left(I \otimes T_{2}\right)=I \otimes T_{2} \text { and } \tau\left(T_{1} \otimes I\right)=T_{1} \otimes I \quad\left(T_{1} \in C^{*}\left(A_{1}\right), T_{2} \in C^{*}\left(A_{2}\right)\right)
$$

To this end, for $h \in \mathcal{H}_{1}$, let $\omega_{h, h}$ be the positive linear functional on $\mathcal{B}\left(\mathcal{H}_{1}\right)$ defined by $T \mapsto\langle T h, h\rangle$, and

$$
\left(\omega_{h, h} \bar{\otimes} \operatorname{id}_{\mathcal{B}\left(\mathcal{H}_{2}\right)}\right) \circ \tau: C^{*}\left(A_{1}\right) \otimes C^{*}\left(A_{2}\right) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}\left(\mathcal{H}_{2}\right)
$$

be the corresponding CP map. By identifying $\mathbb{C} I \otimes C^{*}\left(A_{2}\right)$ with $C^{*}\left(A_{2}\right)$, one sees that the CP map $\left.\left(\omega_{h, h} \bar{\otimes} \operatorname{id}_{\mathcal{B}\left(\mathcal{H}_{2}\right)}\right) \circ \tau\right|_{\mathbb{C} I \otimes C^{*}\left(A_{2}\right)}$ is an extension of $\left.\omega_{h, h}(I) \mathrm{id}_{C^{*}\left(A_{2}\right)}\right|_{A_{2}}$. Then, by the assumption, we have

$$
\left(\omega_{h, h} \bar{\otimes} \operatorname{id}_{\mathcal{B}\left(\mathcal{H}_{2}\right)}\right) \circ \tau(I \otimes T)=\langle h, h\rangle T=\omega_{h, h} \bar{\otimes} \operatorname{id}_{C^{*}\left(A_{2}\right)}(I \otimes T) \quad\left(T \in C^{*}\left(A_{2}\right)\right)
$$

By linearity, the above equality is also true for any linear functional $\omega_{h, k}$ on $\mathcal{B}\left(\mathcal{H}_{1}\right)$ for $h, k \in$ $\mathcal{H}_{1}$. Therefore

$$
\tau=\operatorname{id}_{C^{*}\left(A_{1}\right) \otimes C^{*}\left(A_{2}\right)} \text { on } \mathbb{C} I \otimes C^{*}\left(A_{2}\right)
$$

Similarly, by considering linear functionals on $\mathcal{B}\left(\mathcal{H}_{2}\right)$ and repeating the above arguments, we have that

$$
\tau=\operatorname{id}_{C^{*}\left(A_{1}\right) \otimes C^{*}\left(A_{2}\right)} \text { on } C^{*}\left(A_{1}\right) \otimes \mathbb{C} I
$$

This completes the proof.
REMARK 4.2. The above result can be easily generalized for finite number of irreducible generating $C^{*}$-algebras corresponding to unital subalgebras.

As a straightforward consequence of Remark 4.2 we obtain the following:
THEOREM 4.3. Let $\mathcal{Q}=\mathcal{Q}_{1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{Q}_{n}$ be a doubly commuting quotient module of an analytic Hilbert module $\mathcal{H}=\mathcal{H}_{K_{1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_{K_{n}}$ over $\mathbb{C}[\boldsymbol{z}]$. Then the following are equivalent.
(i) The identity representation of $C^{*}(\mathcal{Q})$ is a boundary representation relative to $B(\mathcal{Q})$.
(ii) The identity representation of $C^{*}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{i}\right)$ is a boundary representation relative to $B\left(\mathcal{Q}_{i}\right)$ for all $i=1, \ldots, n$.

Proof. The result follows from Remark 4.2 and the fact that

$$
C^{*}(\mathcal{Q})=C^{*}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{1}\right) \otimes \cdots \otimes C^{*}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{n}\right)
$$

and

$$
B(\mathcal{Q})=\overline{B\left(\mathcal{Q}_{1}\right) \underline{\otimes} \cdots \underline{\otimes} B\left(\mathcal{Q}_{n}\right)}
$$

where the closure is in the norm topology of $B(\mathcal{Q})$.
The following result is now an immediate consequence of Theorems 1.2 and 4.3 .

THEOREM 4.4. Let $\mathcal{Q}=\mathcal{Q}_{\theta_{1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{Q}_{\theta_{n}}$ be a doubly commuting quotient module of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$, where $\theta_{i}, i=1, \ldots, n$, is a one variable inner function. Then the following are equivalent.
(i) The identity representation of $C^{*}(\mathcal{Q})$ is a boundary representation relative to $B(\mathcal{Q})$.
(ii) The identity representation of $C^{*}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{\theta_{i}}\right)$ is a boundary representation relative to $B\left(\mathcal{Q}_{\theta_{i}}\right)$ for all $i=1, \ldots, n$.
(iii) For all $i=1, \ldots, n, Z_{\theta_{i}}$ is a proper subset of $\mathbb{T}$, where $Z_{\theta_{i}}$ consists of all points $\lambda$ on $\mathbb{T}$ for which $\theta_{i}$ cannot be continued analytically from $\mathbb{D}$ to $\lambda$.

Now we turn to the case of the Bergman module $L_{a}^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$. For $n=1$, boundary representations corresponding to a quotient module of $L_{a}^{2}(\mathbb{D})$ are studied in [14]. For a submodule $\mathcal{S}$ of $L_{a}^{2}(\mathbb{D})$, set

$$
Z_{*}(\mathcal{S}):=\bigcap_{f \in \mathcal{S}} Z_{*}(f)
$$

where

$$
Z_{*}(f)=\{\lambda \in \mathbb{D}: f(\lambda)=0\} \cup\left\{\lambda \in \mathbb{T}: \liminf _{z \in \mathbb{D}, z \rightarrow \lambda}|f(z)|=0\right\}
$$

It is easy to see that for a finite dimensional quotient module $\mathcal{Q}$ of $L_{a}^{2}(\mathbb{D})$, the identity representation of $C^{*}(\mathcal{Q})$ is always a boundary representation relative to $B(\mathcal{Q})$. On the other hand, for an infinite dimensional $\mathcal{Q}$, the identity representation of $C^{*}(\mathcal{Q})$ is a boundary representation relative to $B(\mathcal{Q})$ if and only if $\operatorname{dim}(\mathcal{S} \ominus z \mathcal{S})=1$ and $Z_{*}(\mathcal{S})$ is a proper subset of $\mathbb{T}$, where $\mathcal{S}=L_{a}^{2}(\mathbb{D}) \ominus \mathcal{Q}$ is the corresponding submodule (see [14, Theorem 1.2]). Using this and Theorem 4.3, we have the following result.
Theorem 4.5. Let $\mathcal{Q}=\mathcal{Q}_{1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{Q}_{n}$ be a doubly commuting quotient module of $L_{a}^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$. Then the following are equivalent.
(i) The identity representation of $C^{*}(\mathcal{Q})$ is a boundary representation relative to $B(\mathcal{Q})$.
(ii) The identity representation of $C^{*}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{i}\right)$ is a boundary representation relative to $B\left(\mathcal{Q}_{i}\right)$ for all $i=1, \ldots, n$.
(iii) If $\mathcal{Q}_{i}(1 \leq i \leq n)$ is infinite dimensional then $\operatorname{dim}\left(\mathcal{S}_{i} \ominus z \mathcal{S}_{i}\right)=1$ and $Z_{*}\left(\mathcal{S}_{i}\right)$ is a proper subset of $\mathbb{T}$, where $\mathcal{S}_{i}=L_{a}^{2}(\mathbb{D}) \ominus \mathcal{Q}_{i}$ is the corresponding submodule.

## 5. Boundary representations for $\mathcal{Q}_{\eta}$-TYPE quotient modules

In this section we study boundary representations for a special class of essentially normal quotient modules of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$. If $\mathcal{Q}$ is an essentially normal quotient module of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$ we denote by $\sigma_{e}(\mathcal{Q})$ the essential joint spectrum of $\left(C_{z_{1}}, \ldots, C_{z_{n}}\right)$. The following lemma is a standard application of Arveson's theory on boundary representations [1, 2].

Lemma 5.1. Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be an essentially normal quotient module of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$.
(a) If there exists a matrix-valued polynomial $p$ such that

$$
\left\|p\left(C_{z_{1}}, \ldots, C_{z_{n}}\right)\right\|>\|p\|_{\sigma_{e}(\mathcal{Q})}^{\infty}
$$

then the identity representation of $C^{*}(\mathcal{Q})$ is a boundary representation relative to $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Q})$.
(b) If the commuting tuple $\left(C_{z_{1}}, \ldots, C_{z_{n}}\right)$ has a normal dilation on $\sigma_{e}(\mathcal{Q})$, then the identity representation of $C^{*}(\mathcal{Q})$ is not a boundary representation relative to $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Q})$.
Proof. a) Since $\mathcal{Q}$ is essentially normal, we have the following extension

$$
0 \longrightarrow K(\mathcal{Q}) \hookrightarrow C^{*}(\mathcal{Q}) \longrightarrow C\left(\sigma_{e}(\mathcal{Q})\right) \longrightarrow 0
$$

If there exists a matrix-valued polynomial $p$ such that

$$
\left\|p\left(C_{z_{1}}, \ldots, C_{z_{n}}\right)\right\|>\|p\|_{\sigma_{e}(\mathcal{Q})}^{\infty}
$$

then the restriction of the canonical contractive homomorphism

$$
q: C^{*}(\mathcal{Q}) \rightarrow C^{*}(\mathcal{Q}) / K(\mathcal{Q}) \cong C\left(\sigma_{e}(\mathcal{Q})\right)
$$

to $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Q})$ is not a complete isometry. The desired conclusion now follows from [2, Theorem 2.1.1].
(b) The existence of a normal dilation implies that the above completely contractive map $q$ restricted to the linear span of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Q}) \cup \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Q})^{*}$ is a complete isometry. Then the conclusion again follows from [2, Theorem 2.1.1].

We now define a $\mathcal{Q}_{\eta}$-type quotient module of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$. Let $\left\{\eta_{j}\right\}_{j=1}^{n} \subseteq H^{\infty}(\mathbb{D})$ be one variable inner functions. Notice that $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{j}$, defined by

$$
\boldsymbol{\eta}_{j}(\boldsymbol{z}):=\eta_{j}\left(z_{j}\right) \quad\left(\boldsymbol{z} \in \mathbb{D}^{n}\right),
$$

is a one variable (in $z_{j}$ ) inner function on $\mathbb{D}^{n}, j=1, \ldots, n$. Let $\mathcal{S}_{\eta}$ be the submodule of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$ generated by $\left\{\boldsymbol{\eta}_{j-1}-\boldsymbol{\eta}_{j}\right\}_{j=2}^{n}$, that is,

$$
\mathcal{S}_{\underline{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}=\overline{\operatorname{span}}\left\{\boldsymbol{\eta}_{1}-\boldsymbol{\eta}_{2}, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{2}-\boldsymbol{\eta}_{3}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{n-1}-\boldsymbol{\eta}_{n}\right\} .
$$

Let $\mathcal{Q}_{\eta}$ be the corresponding quotient module of $\mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$, that is,

$$
\mathcal{Q}_{\eta}=\mathcal{S}_{\eta}^{\perp} \cong H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right) / \mathcal{S}_{\eta} .
$$

Set

$$
V_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}=\left\{\boldsymbol{z} \in \mathbb{D}^{n}: \eta_{1}\left(z_{1}\right)=\cdots=\eta_{n}\left(z_{n}\right)\right\},
$$

and

$$
\partial V_{\eta}=\left\{\boldsymbol{z} \in \partial \mathbb{D}^{n}: \eta_{1}\left(z_{1}\right)=\cdots=\eta_{n}\left(z_{n}\right)\right\} .
$$

The zero sets associated to $\mathcal{S}_{\eta}$ are defined by

$$
Z\left(\mathcal{S}_{\eta}\right)=\left\{\boldsymbol{z} \in \mathbb{D}^{n}: f(\boldsymbol{z})=0, \text { for all } f \in \mathcal{S}_{\eta}\right\},
$$

and

$$
Z_{\partial}\left(\mathcal{S}_{\eta}\right)=\left\{\boldsymbol{z} \in \partial \mathbb{D}^{n}: \lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} \boldsymbol{z}_{k}=\boldsymbol{z} \text { for some }\left\{\boldsymbol{z}_{k}\right\} \subset Z\left(\mathcal{S}_{\eta}\right)\right\}
$$

Then it easily follows from the definition that

$$
Z\left(\mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right)=V_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, \quad \text { and } \quad Z_{\partial}\left(\mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right)=\partial V_{\eta} .
$$

The following characterization of essentially normal $\mathcal{Q}_{\eta}$-type quotient modules is due to Clark [7] and Wang [19].
Theorem 5.2. A quotient module $\mathcal{Q}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ is essentially normal if and only if $\eta_{i}$ is a finite Blaschke product for all $i=1, \ldots, n$.

We now present a lemma that relates the essential spectrum of $\mathcal{Q}_{\eta}$ to the boundary of $V_{\eta}$.
Lemma 5.3. If $\mathcal{Q}_{\eta}$ is an essentially normal quotient module of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$, then

$$
\sigma_{e}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right)=\partial V_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}
$$

Proof. By Theorem 5.2 we have that $\eta_{i}, i=1, \ldots, n$, is a finite Blaschke product. Hence, together with [13, Theorem 6.1], we get

$$
Z_{\partial}\left(\mathcal{S}_{\eta}\right)=\partial V_{\eta} \subseteq \sigma_{e}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{\eta}\right)
$$

On the other hand, by Theorems 5.1 and 7.1 in $[7],\left(C_{z_{1}}, \ldots, C_{z_{n}}\right)$ on $\mathcal{Q}_{\eta}$ is unitarily equivalent to the co-ordinate multiplication operators $\left(M_{z_{1}}, \ldots, M_{z_{n}}\right)$ on $A^{2, n-2}\left(V_{\eta}\right)$, and

$$
\sigma_{e}\left(M_{z_{i}}\right) \subseteq \mathbb{T}
$$

Thus

$$
\sigma_{e}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{\eta}\right) \subseteq \mathbb{T}^{n}
$$

As $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{j}$ is a $z_{i}$-variable finite Blaschke product, for all $j=1, \ldots, n$, it follows that

$$
\left(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i}(\boldsymbol{z})-\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i+1}(\boldsymbol{z})\right)\left(C_{z_{1}}, \ldots, C_{z_{n}}\right)=0,
$$

for all $i=1, \ldots, n-1$. By spectral mapping theorem, it follows that

$$
\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i}(\boldsymbol{z})=\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i+1}(\boldsymbol{z}) \quad\left(\boldsymbol{z} \in \sigma_{e}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right)\right)
$$

for each $i=1, \ldots, n-1$. Thus

$$
\sigma_{e}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right) \subseteq \mathbb{T}^{n} \cap V_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}=\partial V_{\boldsymbol{\eta}},
$$

which completes the proof.
We are now ready to prove the main result of this section concerning boundary representations of $\mathcal{Q}_{\eta}$-type quotient modules.

Theorem 5.4. If $\mathcal{Q}_{\eta}$ is an essentially normal quotient module of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{n}\right)$, then the identity representation of $C^{*}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right)$ is not a boundary representation relative to $B\left(\mathcal{Q}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right)$.

Proof. By virtue of Lemmas 5.1 and 5.3 it suffices to prove that the tuple ( $C_{z_{1}}, \ldots, C_{z_{n}}$ ) has a normal dilation on $\partial V_{\eta}$. Note again that, according to [7, Theorem 5.1], the tuple $\left(C_{z_{1}}, \ldots, C_{z_{n}}\right)$ is unitary equivalent to the $n$-tuple of multiplication operators ( $M_{z_{1}}, \ldots, M_{z_{n}}$ ) on $A^{2, n-2}\left(V_{\eta}\right)$. Now on account of the appendix of this article, there exists a measure $\mu$ on $V_{\eta}$ such that

$$
A^{2, n-2}\left(V_{\eta}\right) \subset L^{2}(d \mu)
$$

Consequently $\left(M_{z_{1}}, \ldots, M_{z_{n}}\right)$ has a normal dilation on $V_{\eta}$. Since $\partial V_{\eta}$ is the Shilov boundary of $V_{\boldsymbol{\eta}},\left(C_{z_{1}}, \ldots, C_{z_{n}}\right)$ has a normal dilation on $\partial V_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$. This completes the proof.

The above result will be used in the proof of the main result, Theorem 6.3, in Section 6, on boundary representations of homogeneous quotient modules of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{2}\right)$.

## 6. Boundary representations for homogeneous quotient modules

The purpose of this section is to investigate boundary representations for homogeneous quotient modules of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{2}\right)$. First we recall a characterization of homogeneous polynomial in $\mathbb{C}\left[z_{1}, z_{2}\right]$ (see [13]). Given a homogeneous polynomial $p \in \mathbb{C}\left[z_{1}, z_{2}\right]$ there exist homogeneous polynomials $p_{1}, p_{2} \in \mathbb{C}\left[z_{1}, z_{2}\right]$, unique up to a scalar multiple of modulus one, such that

$$
p=p_{1} p_{2}
$$

and

$$
Z\left(p_{1}\right) \cap \partial \mathbb{D}^{2} \subset \mathbb{T}^{2} \quad \text { and } \quad Z\left(p_{2}\right) \cap \partial \mathbb{D}^{2} \subset(\mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{T}) \cup(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{D})
$$

Let $[p]$ denote the submodule of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{2}\right)$ generated by $p$. Suppose that $\mathcal{Q}_{p}$ is the corresponding quotient module of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{2}\right)$, that is,

$$
\mathcal{Q}_{p}=H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{2}\right) /[p] .
$$

The following characterization of essential normality of $\mathcal{Q}_{p}$ is due to Guo and Wang [13].
Theorem 6.1. Let $p$ be a non-zero homogeneous polynomial in $\mathbb{C}\left[z_{1}, z_{2}\right]$, and $p=p_{1} p_{2}$ be the factorization of $p$ as above. Then the quotient module $\mathcal{Q}_{p}$ is essentially normal if and only if $p_{2}$ has one of the following forms:
(i) $p_{2} \equiv c$ with $c \neq 0$,
(ii) $p_{2}=\alpha z_{1}+\beta z_{2}$ with $|\alpha| \neq|\beta|$,
(iii) $p_{2}=c\left(z_{1}-\alpha z_{2}\right)\left(z_{2}-\beta z_{1}\right)$ with $|\alpha|<1,|\beta|<1$ and $c \neq 0$.

The following result in [13] gives a description of the essential joint spectrum of the above type of quotient modules. For a proof we refer to the reader to [13, Theorem 6.2].

Lemma 6.2 (Guo \& Wang, [13]). Let $p$ be a homogeneous polynomial. Then $\sigma_{e}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{p}\right)=Z(p) \cap$ $\partial \mathbb{D}^{2}=Z(p) \cap \mathbb{T}^{2}$.

For our present purposes, however, we need only the fact that $\sigma_{e}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{p}\right) \subset Z(p)$.
We now state our main result of this section. This gives a characterization for the identity representation to be a boundary representation.

Theorem 6.3. Let $p \in \mathbb{C}\left[z_{1}, z_{2}\right]$ be a homogeneous polynomial. Suppose that $\mathcal{Q}_{p}$ is an essentially normal quotient module of $H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{2}\right)$. Then the identity representation of $C^{*}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{p}\right)$ is a boundary representation relative to $B\left(\mathcal{Q}_{p}\right)$ if and only if $p$ is not of the following form:
(i) $p=c\left(z_{1}^{m}-\alpha z_{2}^{m}\right)$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}, c \neq 0$ and $|\alpha|=1$,
(ii) $p=\alpha z_{1}+\beta z_{2}$ with $|\alpha| \neq|\beta|$.

Our proof of Theorem 6.3 on boundary representations for homogeneous quotient modules is based on the following two special cases. A couple of lemmas below describes these.

Lemma 6.4. Let $p=c \prod_{i=1}^{m}\left(z_{1}-\alpha_{i} z_{2}\right)^{n_{i}}$ be a homogeneous polynomial with $c \neq 0$ and $\alpha_{i}$ 's are distinct scalars of modulus one. Assume further that $n_{i}>1$ for some $i=1, \ldots, m$. Then the identity representation of $C^{*}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{p}\right)$ is a boundary representation relative to $B\left(\mathcal{Q}_{p}\right)$.

Proof. Without loss of any generality assume that $n_{1}>1$. Set

$$
q:=\left(z_{1}-\alpha_{1} z_{2}\right) \prod_{i=2}^{m}\left(z_{1}-\alpha_{i} z_{2}\right)^{n_{i}}
$$

Then $q\left(C_{z_{1}}, C_{z_{2}}\right)$ is a non-zero operator and $\|q\|_{Z(p)}^{\infty}=0$, and hence, according to part (a) of Lemma 5.1, the identity representation of $C^{*}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{p}\right)$ is a boundary representation relative to $B\left(\mathcal{Q}_{p}\right)$.
Lemma 6.5. Let $p=c\left(z_{1}-\alpha z_{2}\right)$, for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\alpha| \neq 1$. Then the identity representation of $C^{*}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{p}\right)$ is not a boundary representation relative to $B\left(\mathcal{Q}_{p}\right)$.

Proof. Let $\alpha=0$. Then $\mathcal{Q}_{p}$ is unitarily equivalent to $H^{2}(\mathbb{D})$ and hence the conclusion follows easily. Now let $\alpha \neq 0$. Then

$$
\frac{1}{\alpha} C_{z_{1}}=C_{z_{2}}
$$

and hence $C^{*}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{p}\right)$ is generated by $C_{z_{1}}$. Now assume that $|\alpha|>1$ (the $|\alpha|<1$ case is similar). Set $\beta=\frac{\alpha}{|\alpha|^{2}}$ and

$$
c_{n}:=\left(\sum_{m=0}^{n}|\beta|^{2 m}\right)^{1 / 2} \quad(n \in \mathbb{N})
$$

It follows that the sequence of homogeneous polynomials $\left\{p_{n}\right\}$ is an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{Q}_{p}$ [10], where

$$
p_{n}=\frac{1}{c_{n}} \sum_{m=0}^{n} z_{1}^{m}\left(\beta z_{2}\right)^{n-m} \quad(n \in \mathbb{N})
$$

Moreover (again see [10])

$$
\begin{aligned}
C_{z_{1}}\left(p_{n}\right) & =P_{\mathcal{Q}_{p}}\left(\frac{1}{c_{n}} \sum_{m=0}^{n} z_{1}^{m+1}\left(\beta z_{2}\right)^{n-m}\right) \\
& =\frac{1}{c_{n}}\left\langle p_{n+1}, \sum_{m=0}^{n} z_{1}^{m+1}\left(\beta z_{2}\right)^{n-m}\right\rangle p_{n+1} \\
& =\frac{c_{n}}{c_{n+1}} p_{n+1}
\end{aligned}
$$

for all $n \geq 0$, that is, $C_{z_{1}}$ is a weighted shift with weights $\left\{\frac{c_{n}}{c_{n+1}}\right\}_{n \geq 0}$. Finally, since lim sup $\frac{c_{n}}{c_{n+1}}=$ $\sup _{n} \frac{c_{n}}{c_{n+1}}$, the result follows from [2, Corollary 2].

We are now in a position to give a proof of Theorem 6.3.
Proof of Theorem 6.3. If $p=c\left(z_{1}^{m}-\alpha z_{2}^{m}\right)$, then $\mathcal{Q}_{p}$ is of the form $\mathcal{Q}_{\eta}$, where $\eta_{1}=z^{m}$ and $\eta_{2}=\alpha z^{m}$. Now it follows from Theorem 5.4 that identity representation of $C^{*}\left(\mathcal{Q}_{p}\right)$ is not a boundary representation relative to $B\left(\mathcal{Q}_{p}\right)$. Also if $p=\alpha z_{1}+\beta z_{2}$, then the required conclusion follows from Lemma 6.5.

For the necessary part, we fist note that, since $\mathcal{Q}_{p}$ is essentially normal, $p$ can be represented as one of those three representations as in Theorem 6.1. Now by Lemma 6.4, is it enough to consider the case $p=p_{1} p_{2}$, where

$$
p_{1}=\prod_{i=1}^{m}\left(z_{1}-\alpha_{i} z_{2}\right),
$$

$\left\{\alpha_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{m}$ are all distinct scalar of modulus one, and $p_{2}$ is as in Theorem 6.1. In view of the forms of $p_{2}$ in Theorem 6.1, we next consider the following four cases.

Case I: Let $p_{2}=c, p_{1}=\prod_{i=1}^{m}\left(z_{1}-\alpha_{i} z_{2}\right),\left\{\alpha_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{m}$ are all distinct scalar of modulus one, and that $p=p_{1} p_{2}$ is not of the form $c\left(z_{1}^{m}-\alpha z_{2}^{m}\right)$.
In this case we have $m>1$. Set

$$
q=\frac{1}{z_{1}}\left(\prod_{i=1}^{m}\left(z_{1}-\alpha_{i} z_{2}\right)-(-1)^{m}\left(\prod_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_{i}\right) z_{2}^{m}\right) .
$$

Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
q=\sum_{k=0}^{m-1}(-1)^{k}\left(\sum_{1 \leq i_{1}<\cdots<i_{k} \leq m} \alpha_{i_{1}} \ldots \alpha_{i_{k}}\right) z_{1}^{m-k-1} z_{2}^{k} . \tag{6.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

A simple calculation shows that

$$
\|q\|_{Z(p) \cap \partial \mathbb{D}^{2}}^{\infty}=1 .
$$

On the other hand

$$
\left\|q\left(C_{z_{1}}, C_{z_{2}}\right)\right\| \geq\|q\|_{H^{2}\left(\mathbb{D}^{2}\right)}=\sqrt{1+\left.\left.\sum_{k=1}^{m-1}\right|_{1 \leq i_{1}<\cdots<i_{k} \leq m} \alpha_{i_{1}} \ldots \alpha_{i_{k}}\right|^{2}} .
$$

Now if

$$
\sum_{k=1}^{m-1}\left|\sum_{1 \leq i_{1}<\cdots<i_{k} \leq m} \alpha_{i_{1}} \ldots \alpha_{i_{k}}\right|^{2}=0
$$

then (6.6) yields that

$$
p_{1}=\prod_{i=1}^{m}\left(z_{1}-\alpha_{i} z_{2}\right)=z_{1}^{m}-\alpha z_{2}^{m},
$$

for some $\alpha$ of modulus one which is an obvious contradiction. Thus $\left\|q\left(C_{z_{1}}, C_{z_{2}}\right)\right\|>1$, and therefore, by Lemma 6.2 and Lemma 5.1, the identity representation is a boundary representation in this case.

Case II: Let $p_{2}=\left(z_{1}-\gamma z_{2}\right),|\gamma| \neq 1, p_{1}=\prod_{i=1}^{m}\left(z_{1}-\alpha_{i} z_{2}\right)$ and $\left\{\alpha_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{m}$ are distinct scalars of modulus one. Also, without loss of generality, we may assume that $|\gamma|<1$. Otherwise, by interchanging the role of $z_{1}$ and $z_{2}$, we can consider that $p_{2}=\left(z_{2}-\frac{1}{\gamma} z_{1}\right)$ and $p_{1}=$ $\prod_{i=1}^{m}\left(z_{2}-\frac{1}{\alpha_{i}} z_{1}\right)$. As in the previous case, set

$$
q=\frac{1}{z_{1}}\left(\prod_{i=1}^{m+1}\left(z_{1}-\alpha_{i} z_{2}\right)-(-1)^{m+1} \prod_{i=1}^{m+1} \alpha_{i} z_{2}^{m+1}\right)
$$

where $\alpha_{m+1}=\gamma$. A similar computation shows that

$$
\|q\|_{Z(p) \cap \partial \mathbb{D}^{2}}^{\infty}=1
$$

and

$$
\left\|q\left(C_{z_{1}}, C_{z_{2}}\right)\right\| \geq \sqrt{1+\left.\left.\sum_{k=1}^{m}\right|_{1 \leq i_{1}<\cdots<i_{k} \leq m+1} \alpha_{i_{1}} \ldots \alpha_{i_{k}}\right|^{2}}
$$

Therefore, if

$$
\sum_{k=1}^{m}\left|\sum_{1 \leq i_{1}<\cdots<i_{k} \leq m+1} \alpha_{i_{1}} \ldots \alpha_{i_{k}}\right|^{2}=0
$$

then

$$
\prod_{i=1}^{m+1}\left(z_{1}-\alpha_{i} z_{2}\right)=z_{1}^{m+1}-\alpha z_{2}^{m+1}
$$

for some scalar $\alpha$ with $|\alpha| \neq 1$. Consequently

$$
\left|\alpha_{1}\right|=\cdots=\left|\alpha_{m+1}\right|=|\alpha|^{1 /(m+1)} \neq 1,
$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore $\left\|q\left(C_{z_{1}}, C_{z_{2}}\right)\right\|>1$, and the conclusion again follows from Lemma 6.2 and Lemma 5.1.

Case III: Let $p=p_{2}=\left(z_{1}-\gamma_{1} z_{2}\right)\left(z_{1}-\gamma_{2} z_{2}\right),\left|\gamma_{1}\right|<1$ and $\left|\gamma_{2}\right|>1$. Consider for each $\epsilon>0$ $q_{\epsilon}:=\left(z_{1}-\epsilon \gamma_{2} z_{2}\right) \in \mathbb{C}\left[z_{1}, z_{2}\right]$.
Set

$$
V_{1}=\left\{\left(\gamma_{1} z_{2}, z_{2}\right) \in \partial \mathbb{D}^{2}:\left|z_{2}\right|=1\right\} \text { and } V_{2}=\left\{\left(\gamma_{2} z_{2}, z_{2}\right) \in \partial \mathbb{D}^{2}:\left|\gamma_{2} z_{2}\right|=1\right\}
$$

Note that

$$
Z(p) \cap \partial \mathbb{D}^{2}=V_{1} \cup V_{2}
$$

and

$$
\left\|q_{\epsilon}\right\|_{V_{1}}^{\infty}=\left|\gamma_{1}-\epsilon \gamma_{2}\right|, \quad\left\|q_{\epsilon}\right\|_{V_{2}}^{\infty}=(1-\epsilon) .
$$

Therefore for a sufficiently small $0<\epsilon<1$ we have

$$
\left\|q_{\epsilon}\right\|_{Z(p) \cap \partial \mathbb{D}^{2}}^{\infty}<1
$$

On the other hand, for any $0<\epsilon<1$

$$
\left\|q_{\epsilon}\left(C_{z_{1}}, C_{z_{2}}\right)\right\| \geq \sqrt{1+\left|\epsilon \gamma_{2}\right|^{2}}>1,
$$

and the conclusion again follows from Lemma 5.1.
Case IV: Let $p_{2}=\left(z_{1}-\gamma_{1} z_{2}\right)\left(z_{1}-\gamma_{2} z_{2}\right),\left|\gamma_{1}\right|<1,\left|\gamma_{2}\right|>1, p_{1}=\prod_{i=1}^{m}\left(z_{1}-\alpha_{i} z_{2}\right)$, and $\left\{\alpha_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{m}$ are distinct scalars of modulus one. Set

$$
V_{\gamma_{1}}=\left\{\left(\gamma_{1} z_{2}, z_{2}\right) \in \partial \mathbb{D}^{2}:\left|z_{2}\right|=1\right\}, \quad V_{\gamma_{2}}=\left\{\left(\gamma_{2} z_{2}, z_{2}\right) \in \partial \mathbb{D}^{2}:\left|\gamma_{2} z_{2}\right|=1\right\},
$$

and

$$
V_{\alpha_{i}}:=\left\{\left(\alpha_{i} z_{2}, z_{2}\right) \in \partial \mathbb{D}^{2}:\left|z_{2}\right|=1\right\}, \quad i=1, \ldots, m
$$

Consider for $\epsilon>0$

$$
q_{\epsilon}=z_{2}\left(z_{1}^{m}-\epsilon q^{\prime}\right) \in \mathbb{C}\left[z_{1}, z_{2}\right],
$$

where

$$
q^{\prime}=\sum_{k=1}^{m}\left(\sum_{1 \leq i_{1}<\cdots<i_{k} \leq m} \alpha_{i_{1}} \ldots \alpha_{i_{k}}\right) z_{1}^{m-k} z_{2}^{k} .
$$

Note that

$$
\left\|q_{\epsilon}\right\|_{V_{\gamma_{1}}}^{\infty} \leq\left|\gamma_{1}^{m}\right|-\epsilon M, \quad\left\|q_{\epsilon}\right\|_{V_{\gamma_{2}}}^{\infty} \leq\left|\frac{1}{\gamma_{2}}\right|-\epsilon M,
$$

and

$$
\left\|q_{\epsilon}\right\|_{V_{\alpha_{i}}}^{\infty}=|(1-\epsilon)|, \quad i=1, \ldots, m
$$

where

$$
M=\max \left\{\left|q^{\prime}\left(\gamma_{1}, 1\right)\right|,\left|q^{\prime}\left(\frac{1}{\gamma_{2}}, 1\right)\right|\right\}
$$

We now choose $0<\epsilon<1$ so that $\left\|q_{\epsilon}\right\|_{Z(p) \cap \partial \mathbb{D}^{2}}^{\infty}<1$. On the other hand, since $\left\|q_{\epsilon}\left(C_{z_{1}}, C_{z_{2}}\right)\right\| \geq$ $\left\|q_{\epsilon}\right\|>1$, the conclusion follows immediately.

## Appendix: A measure on $V_{\eta}$

In this appendix we define $A^{2, n}\left(V_{\eta}\right)$ following D. Clark [7], and present an explicit Borel measure $\alpha$ on $V_{\eta}$ such that $A^{2, n}\left(V_{\eta}\right) \subset L^{2}(\alpha)$. In particular, therefore, $A^{2, n}\left(V_{\eta}\right)$ is subnormal. This important property was used in the proof of Theorem 5.4 in Section 5.

We first consider the holomorphic functions on the one dimensional variety $V_{\eta}$ as given in [7]. By definition, a function $f$ is holomorphic in an analytic variety $V$ of a complex manifold $M$ if for every $x \in V$, there is a neighborhood $U_{x} \subset M$ and a holomorphic function $F$ on $U_{x}$ such that $\left.F\right|_{V \cap U_{x}}=\left.f\right|_{V \cap U_{x}}$. In [7], Clark proved that a holomorphic function $f$ on $V_{\eta}$ can be recovered in following sense: Define $h$ on $\mathbb{D}^{n+1}$ by

$$
h\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n} ; \lambda\right)=\sum_{k=1}^{m} f\left(b_{k}(\lambda)\right) \prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\left(\lambda-\eta_{j}\left(z_{j}\right)\right)}{\left(\left(b_{k}(\lambda)\right)_{j}-z_{j}\right) \eta_{j}^{\prime}\left(\left(b_{k}(\lambda)\right)_{j}\right)},
$$

where $b_{k}(\lambda), k=1, \ldots, m$, is a pre-image of $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$ under the map

$$
\phi: V_{\underline{\eta}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{D}}, \quad \phi\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}\right)=\eta_{1}\left(z_{1}\right),
$$

and $\left(b_{k}(\lambda)\right)_{j}$ is the $j$-th coordinate of $b_{k}(\lambda)$. Then (see Clark, Lemma 2.1 in [7]), as a function of $\lambda, h\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n} ; \lambda\right)$ extends to a holomorphic $\mathcal{Q}_{\eta_{1}} \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathcal{Q}_{\eta_{n}}$-valued function in $\mathbb{D}$, and

$$
h\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n} ; \eta_{1}\left(z_{1}\right)\right)=f\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}\right)
$$

for all $\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}\right) \in V$.
We now proceed to construct the Hilbert space $A^{2, n}\left(V_{\eta}\right)$ of holomorphic functions on $V_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ (see Clark [7]). Let $f$ be a holomorphic function on $V_{\eta}$. Then

$$
f\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}\right)=\sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} f_{\nu}\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}\right)\left(\eta_{1}\left(z_{1}\right)\right)^{\nu}
$$

where $f_{\nu} \in \mathcal{Q}_{\eta_{1}} \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathcal{Q}_{\eta_{n}}$. For each $0<r<1$, set

$$
f_{[r]}\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}\right):=\sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} f_{\nu}\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}\right) r^{\nu}\left(\eta_{1}\left(z_{1}\right)\right)^{\nu}
$$

Now by the definition of $h$, we have

$$
f_{[r]}\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}\right)=\sum_{k=1}^{m} f\left(b_{k}\left(r \eta_{1}\left(z_{1}\right)\right)\right) \prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{r \eta_{1}\left(z_{1}\right)-\eta_{j}\left(z_{j}\right)}{\left(\left(b_{k}\left(r \eta_{1}\left(z_{1}\right)\right)\right)_{j}-z_{j}\right) \eta_{1}^{\prime}\left(\left(b_{k}\left(r \eta_{1}\left(z_{1}\right)\right)\right)_{j}\right)},
$$

for $\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}\right) \in \partial V_{\eta}$. Let $A^{2, n}\left(V_{\eta}\right)$ denote the Hilbert space of all holomorphic functions $f$ on $V_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ such that

$$
\|f\|_{2, n}^{2}=2(n+1) \int_{0}^{1}\left\|f_{[r]}\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}\right)\right\|_{2}^{2}\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{n} r d r<\infty
$$

where

$$
\left\|f_{[r]}\right\|_{2}=\sup _{0 \leq s<1}\left(\int_{0}^{2 \pi} \int\left|f_{[r s]}\left(w_{1}, \ldots, w_{n}\right)\right|^{2} d \mu_{e^{i \theta}}(w) d \theta\right)^{1 / 2}
$$

Here the measure $d \mu_{e^{i \theta}}$ is a measure supported in the fibre over the point $e^{i \theta}$ under the map $\phi$, that is,

$$
\mu_{e^{i \theta}}\left(b_{k}\left(e^{i \theta}\right)\right)=\left|\eta_{1}^{\prime}\left(\left(b_{k}\left(e^{i \theta}\right)\right)_{1}\right) \ldots \eta_{n}^{\prime}\left(\left(b_{k}\left(e^{i \theta}\right)\right)_{n}\right)\right|^{-1}
$$

We can represent the norm of $f$ as

$$
\|f\|_{2, n}^{2}=2(n+1) \int_{0}^{1} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} \int\left|f_{[r]}\left(w_{1}, \ldots, w_{n}\right)\right|^{2} r\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{n} d \mu_{e^{i \theta}}(w) d \theta d r
$$

It follows from [7, Lemma 4.1] that the constant function 1 is in $A^{2, n}\left(V_{\eta}\right)$.
We can now define a measure $\mu$ on $V_{\eta}$ as

$$
\mu(E)=2(n+1) \int_{0}^{1} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} \int\left(\chi_{E}\right)_{[r]}\left(w_{1}, \ldots, w_{n}\right) r\left(1-r^{2}\right)^{n} d \mu_{e^{i \theta}}(w) d \theta d r
$$

where $\chi_{E}$ is the characteristic function of the Borel set $E \subset V_{\eta}$. With this measure we obtain that $A^{2, n}\left(V_{\eta}\right) \subset L^{2}(\alpha)$.
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