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#### Abstract

In this paper we discuss some algebraic properties of Toeplitz operators with separately quasihomogeneous symbols (i.e., symbols being of the form $\left.\xi^{k} \varphi\left(\left|z_{1}\right|, \ldots,\left|z_{n}\right|\right)\right)$ on the Bergman space of the unit ball in $\mathbb{C}^{n}$. We provide a decomposition of $L^{2}\left(B_{n}, \mathrm{~d} v\right)$, then we use it to show that the zero product of two Toeplitz operators has only a trivial solution if one of the symbols is separately quasihomogeneous and the other is arbitrary. Also, we describe the commutant of a Toeplitz operator whose symbol is radial.
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## 1. INTRODUCTION

Toeplitz operators, or localization operators, appear in the literature in many different situations. They were introduced in time-frequency analysis by Daubechies in [8] as certain filters for signals. In [10], Lieb and Solovej reformulated problems in quantum mechanics in terms of coherent state transforms, where Toeplitz operators appeared in a natural way. Since then, boundedness and compactness properties of such operators have been investigated in many works (see e.g. [6], [14], [15], [20], [21], [22]). The aim of this paper is to study algebraic properties of Toeplitz operators with separately quasihomogeneous symbols on the Bergman space of the unit ball.

Let $\mathrm{d} v$ denote the Lebesgue volume measure on the unit ball $B_{n}$ of $\mathbb{C}^{n}$, normalized so that the measure of $B_{n}$ equals 1. The Bergman space $L_{a}^{2}\left(B_{n}\right)$ is the Hilbert space consisting of holomorphic functions on $B_{n}$ which are also in $L^{2}\left(B_{n}, \mathrm{~d} v\right)$. Let $P$ be the orthogonal projection from $L^{2}\left(B_{n}, \mathrm{~d} v\right)$ onto $L_{a}^{2}\left(B_{n}\right)$. For
a function $\varphi \in L^{\infty}\left(B_{n}, \mathrm{~d} v\right)$, the Toeplitz operator $T_{\varphi}: L_{a}^{2}\left(B_{n}\right) \mapsto L_{a}^{2}\left(B_{n}\right)$ with symbol $\varphi$ is defined by

$$
T_{\varphi}(f)=P(\varphi f)
$$

Since for any $w \in B_{n}$, the pointwise evaluation of functions in $L_{a}^{2}\left(B_{n}\right)$ at $w$ is a bounded functional, there is a unique function $K_{w} \in L_{a}^{2}\left(B_{n}\right)$ which has the following reproducing property:

$$
f(w)=\left\langle f, K_{w}\right\rangle, \quad f \in L_{a}^{2}\left(B_{n}\right)
$$

where the notation $\langle$,$\rangle denotes the inner product in L^{2}\left(B_{n}, \mathrm{~d} v\right)$. The function $K_{w}$ is the well-known Bergman kernel and its explicit formula is given by

$$
K_{w}(z)=\frac{1}{(1-\langle z, w\rangle)^{n+1}}, \quad z \in B_{n} .
$$

Then

$$
T_{\varphi}(f)(z)=\int_{B_{n}} f(w) \varphi(w) \overline{K_{z}(w)} \mathrm{d} v(w), \quad z \in B_{n}
$$

Quiroga-Barranco and Vasilevski [15] gave some basic results concerning Toeplitz operators on $L_{a}^{2}\left(B_{n}\right)$ with separately radial symbols (i.e., symbols depending only on $\left.\left|z_{1}\right|, \ldots,\left|z_{n}\right|\right)$, then they proved that the $C^{*}$-algebra generated by Toeplitz operators with bounded separately radial symbols is commutative. In [24], we studied algebraic properties of Toeplitz operators with radial symbols on $L_{a}^{2}\left(B_{n}\right)$. In Section 2 of this paper, we will introduce some properties of separately radial functions and characterize when a bounded holomorphic function on $\mathbb{C}^{n}$ is equal to zero.

In 1964, Brown and Halmos [4] proved that $T_{f} T_{g}=T_{h}$ on the Hardy space $H^{2}(\mathbb{T})$ of the unit circle $\mathbb{T}$ of $\mathbb{C}$ if and only if either $\bar{f}$ or $g$ is holomorphic and $h=f g$. On the Bergman space $L_{a}^{2}(D)$ of the unit disk $D$, Ahern and Čučković [1] showed that a similar result holds for Toeplitz operators with harmonic symbols. Louhichi, Strouse and Zakariasy [12] determined when the product of two Toeplitz operators with quasihomogeneous symbols (i.e., symbols being of the form $\left.\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} k \theta} \phi(|z|)\right)$ is a Toeplitz operator. Inspired by [12], we discuss the same question for more general symbols on $B_{n}$ in Section 3. We will give a necessary condition for the product of two Toeplitz operators whose symbols are separately quasihomogeneous to be equal to a Toeplitz operator.

In Section 4, we will consider the so-called "zero-product" problem. Brown and Halmos [4] easily deduced that if $T_{f} T_{g}=0$ on $H^{2}(\mathbb{T})$ then either $f$ or $g$ must be identically zero. Ahern and Čučković [1] showed that the same result holds for $L_{a}^{2}(D)$ if the symbols $f$ and $g$ are harmonic. Moreover in [2], they proved that if $T_{f} T_{g}=0$, where $f$ is arbitrary bounded and $g$ is radial, then either $f \equiv 0$ or $g \equiv 0$. Choe and Koo [5] got a result on $B_{n}$ which is analogous to [1] with an assumption about the continuity of the symbols on an open subset of the boundary, and solved the zero-product problem for several Toeplitz operators with harmonic
symbols that have Lipschitz continuous extensions to the whole boundary. In spite of all these mentioned former works, the zero-product problem for Toeplitz operators remains open and is far from resolved. In Section 4, we first provide a decomposition of $L^{2}\left(B_{n}, \mathrm{~d} v\right)$, then we investigate the zero-product problem for two Toeplitz operators, when one of the two symbols is separately quasihomogeneous and the other is arbitrary bounded function.

Brown and Halmos [4] showed that two bounded Toeplitz operators $T_{f}$ and $T_{g}$ commute on $H^{2}(\mathbb{T})$ if and only if:
(I) both $f$ and $g$ are analytic, or
(II) both $\bar{f}$ and $\bar{g}$ are analytic, or
(III) one is a linear function of the other.

Axler and Čučković [3] characterized commutativity of Toeplitz operators with harmonic symbols on $L_{a}^{2}(D)$. In [7] Čučković and Rao used the Mellin transform to study the commutativity of two Toeplitz operators on $L_{a}^{2}(D)$ and describe those operators which commute with $T_{\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} p \theta_{r^{m}}}}$. Later in [13], Louhichi and Zakariasy gave a partial characterization of commuting Toeplitz operators on $L_{a}^{2}(D)$ with quasihomogeneous symbols. The main reason for them to study such family of symbols is that any function $f$ in $L^{2}(D, \mathrm{~d} A)$, where $\mathrm{d} A$ is the Lebesgue area measure, has the following polar decomposition

$$
f\left(r \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} \theta}\right)=\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} k \theta} f_{k}(r),
$$

where $f_{k}$ are radial functions in $L^{2}([0,1], r \mathrm{~d} r)$. Zheng [23] studied commuting Toeplitz operators with pluriharmonic symbols on $L_{a}^{2}\left(B_{n}\right)$. Recently, QuirogaBarranco and Vasilevski gave the description of many (geometrically defined) classes of commuting Toeplitz operators on the unit ball (see [16], [17]). In the last section, we will give necessary and sufficient conditions for a symbol that produces a Toeplitz operator commuting with another such operator whose symbol is a radial function.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

For any multi-index $\alpha=\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{n}\right) \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$, where $\mathbb{N}$ denotes the set of all nonnegative integers, we write

$$
|\alpha|=\alpha_{1}+\cdots+\alpha_{n} \quad \text { and } \quad \alpha!=\alpha_{1}!\cdots \alpha_{n}!.
$$

We will also write, for $z=\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}\right) \in B_{n}$ :

$$
z^{\alpha}=z_{1}^{\alpha_{1}} \cdots z_{n}^{\alpha_{n}} .
$$

For two multi-indexes $\alpha=\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{n}\right) \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$ and $\beta=\left(\beta_{1}, \ldots, \beta_{n}\right) \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$, the notation $\alpha \succeq \beta$ means that

$$
\alpha_{i} \geqslant \beta_{i}, \quad i=1, \ldots, n
$$

and $\alpha \perp \beta$ means that

$$
\alpha_{1} \beta_{1}+\cdots+\alpha_{n} \beta_{n}=0
$$

We also define

$$
\alpha-\beta=\left(\alpha_{1}-\beta_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{n}-\beta_{n}\right)
$$

Moreover, if $\alpha \succeq \beta$ then we obtain

$$
|\alpha-\beta|=|\alpha|-|\beta| .
$$

Let $\mathrm{d} \sigma$ be the surface area measure on the unit sphere $S_{n}$, then it is known that the holomorphic monomials $z^{\alpha}\left(\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{n}\right)$ are orthogonal to each other in $L^{2}\left(S_{n}, \mathrm{~d} \sigma\right)$. We show a more general result in the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$ with $\alpha \neq \beta$ and let $t \in[0,1)$. If $\varphi$ is a bounded separately radial function on $B_{n}$, then

$$
\int_{S_{n}} \varphi(t \xi) \xi^{\alpha} \bar{\xi}^{\beta} \mathrm{d} \sigma(\xi)=0
$$

Proof. The result is obvious when $n=1$. Now suppose $n>1$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $\alpha_{n} \neq \beta_{n}$. Since $\varphi$ is a bounded separately radial function, it follows from Proposition 1.4.7 of [19] that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{S_{n}} \varphi(t \xi) \xi^{\alpha} \bar{\xi}^{\beta} \mathrm{d} \sigma(\xi) & =\int_{B_{n-1}} \mathrm{~d} v_{n-1}\left(\xi^{\prime}\right) \frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} \varphi\left(t \xi^{\prime}, t \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} \theta} \xi_{n}\right)\left(\xi^{\prime}, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} \theta} \xi_{n}\right)^{\alpha} \overline{\left(\xi^{\prime}, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} \theta} \xi_{n}\right)}{ }^{\beta} \mathrm{d} \theta \\
& =\int_{B_{n-1}} \varphi\left(t \xi^{\prime}, t \xi_{n}\right)\left(\xi^{\prime}, \xi_{n}\right)^{\alpha} \overline{\left(\xi^{\prime}, \xi_{n}\right)^{\beta}} \mathrm{d} v_{n-1}\left(\xi^{\prime}\right) \frac{1}{2 \pi} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\left(\alpha_{n}-\beta_{n}\right) \theta} \mathrm{d} \theta=0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

This completes the proof.
We recall some useful results from [15]. Denote by $\tau\left(B_{n}\right)$ the base of $B_{n}$, i.e.,

$$
\tau\left(B_{n}\right)=\left\{r=\left(r_{1}, \ldots, r_{n}\right)=\left(\left|z_{1}\right|, \ldots,\left|z_{n}\right|\right): z=\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}\right) \in B_{n}\right\} .
$$

Then for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$ and $r \in \tau\left(B_{n}\right)$, we will write

$$
r^{\alpha}=r_{1}^{\alpha_{1}} \cdots r_{n}^{\alpha_{n}} \quad \text { and } \quad|r|=\sqrt{r_{1}^{2}+\cdots+r_{n}^{2}}
$$

Note that $\mathrm{d} v(z)=\frac{n!}{\pi^{n}} \mathrm{~d} m_{2 n}$, where $\mathrm{d} m_{2 n}=\mathrm{d} x_{1} \mathrm{~d} y_{1} \cdots \mathrm{~d} x_{n} \mathrm{~d} y_{n}$ is the usual Lebesgue measure in $\mathbb{C}^{n}$, and for any bounded separately radial function $\varphi$, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{B_{n}} \varphi(z) \mathrm{d} v(z)=2^{n} n!\int_{\tau\left(B_{n}\right)} \varphi(r) r \mathrm{~d} r, \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $r \mathrm{~d} r=\prod_{i=1}^{n} r_{i} \mathrm{~d} r_{i}$. Corollary 3.2 of [15] tells that the Toeplitz operator $T_{\varphi}$ with bounded separately radial symbol $\varphi$ is diagonal with respect to the orthogonal
basis $\left\{z^{\alpha}: \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{n}\right\}$. Conversely, the following lemma will show that the symbol on any diagonal Toeplitz operator must be separately radial.

LEMMA 2.2. Let $\varphi$ be a bounded function on $B_{n}$. If for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$, there exists $\lambda_{\alpha} \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $T_{\varphi}\left(z^{\alpha}\right)=\lambda_{\alpha} z^{\alpha}$, then $\varphi$ is separately radial.

Proof. Assume $T_{\varphi}\left(z^{\alpha}\right)=\lambda_{\alpha} z^{\alpha}$, then for any unitary transformation $U$ of $\mathbb{C}^{n}$ with a diagonal matrix, i.e., $U=\operatorname{diag}\left\{\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} \theta_{1}}, \ldots, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} \theta_{n}}\right\}$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_{\varphi \circ U}\left(z^{\alpha}\right)(w) & =T_{\varphi}\left(U^{-1} z\right)^{\alpha}(U w)=\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i} \alpha_{1} \theta_{1}} \cdots \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i} \alpha_{n} \theta_{n}} T_{\varphi}\left(z^{\alpha}\right)(U w) \\
& =\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i} \alpha_{1} \theta_{1}} \cdots \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i} \alpha_{n} \theta_{n}} \lambda_{\alpha}\left(z^{\alpha}\right)(U w)=\lambda_{\alpha} w^{\alpha}=T_{\varphi}\left(z^{\alpha}\right)(w),
\end{aligned}
$$

which implies $T_{\varphi \circ U}=T_{\varphi}$. Thus $\varphi \circ U=\varphi$ and therefore $\varphi$ is a separately radial function. This completes the proof.

It is well known that a bounded analytic function on $\Pi_{+}=\{z: \operatorname{Re} z>0\}$ is uniquely determined by its value on an arithmetic sequence of integers. In fact, we have the following classical theorem (see p. 102 of [18]).

THEOREM 2.3. Suppose that $f$ is a bounded analytic function on $\Pi_{+}$which vanishes at the pairwise distinct points $z_{1}, z_{2}, \ldots$, where
(i) $\inf \left\{\left|z_{n}\right|\right\}>0$ and
(ii) $\sum_{n \geqslant 1} \operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{1}{z_{n}}\right)=\infty$.

Then $f$ vanishes identically on $\Pi_{+}$.
In this paper, we will need a similar result in higher dimensions. First, we give the following definition.

DEFINITION 2.4. Let $E$ be a subset of $\mathbb{Z}_{+}^{2}$, we say that $E$ satisfies condition (I) if the following statement holds:
(I) there exists a sequence $\left\{\alpha_{i}^{(1)}\right\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\alpha_{i}^{(1)}}=\infty$, and for every fixed $\alpha_{i}^{(1)}$, there also exists a sequence $\left\{\alpha_{j(i)}^{(2)}\right\}_{j(i)=1}^{\infty}$ such that $\sum_{j(i)=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\alpha_{j(i)}^{(2)}}=\infty$ and $\left\{\left(\alpha_{i}^{(1)}, \alpha_{j(i)}^{(2)}\right): j(i)=1,2, \ldots\right\} \subset E$.

REMARK 2.5. According to Definition 2.4, one can immediately get that, for a multi-index $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}^{2}$, if $E$ is a subset of $\left\{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}^{2}: \alpha \succeq \gamma\right\}$ and if $E^{\prime}$ is the complement of $E$ in $\left\{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}^{2}: \alpha \succeq \gamma\right\}$, then either $E$ or $E^{\prime}$ satisfies condition (I).

Now we are ready to show when a bounded holomorphic function on $\Pi_{+}^{2}$ is identically zero.

Proposition 2.6. Let $f$ be a bounded holomorphic function on $\Pi_{+}^{2}$. If the set $E=\left\{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}^{2}: f(\alpha)=0\right\}$ satisfies condition $(\mathrm{I})$, then $f$ vanishes identically on $\Pi_{+}^{2}$.

Proof. If $E$ satisfies condition (I), then for any arbitrary but fixed $\alpha_{i}^{(1)} \in$ $\left\{\alpha_{i}^{(1)}\right\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$, there exists a sequence $\left\{\alpha_{j(i)}^{(2)}\right\}_{j(i)=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathbb{Z}_{+}$such that $\sum_{j(i)=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\alpha_{j(i)}^{(2)}}=\infty$ and $f\left(\alpha_{i}^{(1)}, \alpha_{j(i)}^{(2)}\right)=0$. By Theorem 2.3, we can get

$$
f\left(\alpha_{i}^{(1)}, z_{2}\right)=0, \quad \forall z_{2} \in \Pi_{+}
$$

Condition (I) also gives $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\alpha_{i}^{(1)}}=\infty$. Applying Theorem 2.3 to the first variable, then we have $f\left(z_{1}, z_{2}\right)=0$ on $\Pi_{+}^{2}$. This completes the proof.

COROLLARY 2.7. Let $p, s \in \mathbb{N}^{2}$ and let $g(r)$ be a bounded function on $\tau\left(B_{2}\right)$. If the set

$$
E=\left\{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}^{2}: \alpha \succeq s \text { and } \int_{\tau\left(B_{2}\right)} g(r) r^{2 \alpha+p-s} r \mathrm{~d} r=0\right\}
$$

satisfies condition (I), then $g=0$.
Proof. Let $f(z)=\int_{\tau\left(B_{2}\right)} g(r) r^{z} r \mathrm{~d} r$. Obviously, $f$ is a bounded holomorphic function on $\Pi_{+}^{2}$ since $g$ is bounded. By Proposition 2.6, it is easy to see that $f(z)=0$ on $\Pi_{+}^{2}$. Therefore $g=0$ on $\tau\left(B_{2}\right)$. This completes the proof.

## 3. PRODUCTS OF SEPARATELY QUASIHOMOGENEOUS TOEPLITZ OPERATORS

In this section, we will show some basic results concerning Toeplitz operators with separately quasihomogeneous symbols on $L_{a}^{2}\left(B_{n}\right)$. The definition of quasihomogeneous functions on $D$ can be found in [12]. Below we give an analogous definition on $B_{n}$.

DEFINITION 3.1. Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}$ and let $f \in L^{\infty}\left(B_{n}, \mathrm{~d} v\right)$. Then we say that $f$ is a separately quasihomogeneous function of degree $k$ if it is of the form $\xi^{k} \varphi$ where $\varphi$ is a separately radial function, i.e.,

$$
f(z)=f(|r| \xi)=\xi^{k} \varphi(r)
$$

for any $\xi \in S_{n}$ and $r \in \tau\left(B_{n}\right)$. In this case, the associated Toeplitz operator $T_{f}$ is called a separately quasihomogeneous Toeplitz operator of degree $k$.

Remark 3.2. Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}$ and let $\xi \in S_{n}$. It is obvious that $k$ can be uniquely written as $p-s$, where $p, s \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$ such that $p \perp s$. Thus in this paper, the function $\xi^{k}$ is always understood as

$$
\xi^{k}=\xi^{p} \bar{\xi}^{s}
$$

A direct calculation gives the following lemma which we shall use often.

LEMMA 3.3. Let $p, s \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$ and let $r \in \tau\left(B_{n}\right)$. If $\tilde{\xi}^{p} \bar{\xi}^{s} \varphi(r)$ is a bounded function on $B_{n}$, then for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& T_{\xi^{p} \bar{\zeta}^{s} \varphi(r)}\left(z^{\alpha}\right) \\
& = \begin{cases}0 & \text { if } \alpha+p \nsucceq s ; \\
\frac{2^{n}(n+|\alpha|+|p|-|s|)!}{(\alpha+p-s)!} \int_{\tau\left(B_{n}\right)} \varphi(r) r^{2 \alpha+2 p}|r|^{-(|p|+|s|)} r \mathrm{~d} r z^{\alpha+p-s} & \text { if } \alpha+p \succeq s .\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. For each $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$, if $\alpha+p \nsucceq s$, i.e., there is an integer $1 \leqslant j \leqslant n$ so that $\alpha_{j}+p_{j}<s_{j}$, then $\alpha+p \neq \beta+s$ for any $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$. Thus by Lemma 2.1 we can get

$$
\left\langle T_{\bar{\xi}^{p} \bar{\xi}^{s}} \varphi(r)\left(z^{\alpha}\right), z^{\beta}\right\rangle=\int_{B_{n}} \varphi(r) \xi^{p} \overline{\bar{\zeta}}^{s} z^{\alpha} \bar{z}^{\beta} \mathrm{d} v(z)=0
$$

which implies that $T_{\xi^{p} \bar{\xi}^{s} \varphi(r)}\left(z^{\alpha}\right)=0$.
On the other hand, if $\alpha+p \succeq s$, then using Lemma 2.1 and (2.1) again, we can get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\langle T_{\xi^{p} \bar{\zeta}^{s} \varphi(r)}\left(z^{\alpha}\right), z^{\beta}\right\rangle & =\int_{B_{n}} \varphi(r) \xi^{p} \bar{亏}^{s} z^{\alpha} \bar{z}^{\beta} \mathrm{d} v(z) \\
& = \begin{cases}0 & \text { if } \beta \neq \alpha+p-s ; \\
2^{n} n!\int_{\tau\left(B_{n}\right)} \varphi(r) r^{2 \alpha+2 p}|r|^{-(|p|+|s|)} r \mathrm{~d} r & \text { if } \beta=\alpha+p-s .\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
$$

Then by the well-known identity (see Proposition 1.4.9 of [19])

$$
\left\langle z^{\alpha+p-s}, z^{\beta}\right\rangle= \begin{cases}0 & \text { if } \beta \neq \alpha+p-s \\ \frac{n!(\alpha+p-s)!}{(n+|\alpha|+|p|-|s|)!} & \text { if } \beta=\alpha+p-s\end{cases}
$$

we obtain

$$
\left\langle T_{\xi^{p} \bar{\xi}^{s} \varphi(r)}\left(z^{\alpha}\right), z^{\beta}\right\rangle=\frac{2^{n}(n+|\alpha|+|p|-|s|)!}{(\alpha+p-s)!} \int_{\tau\left(B_{n}\right)} \varphi(r) r^{2 \alpha+2 p}|r|^{-(|p|+|s|)} r \mathrm{~d} r\left\langle z^{\alpha+p-s}, z^{\beta}\right\rangle,
$$

which implies that

$$
T_{\xi^{p} \bar{\xi}^{s} \varphi(r)}\left(z^{\alpha}\right)=\frac{2^{n}(n+|\alpha|+|p|-|s|)!}{(\alpha+p-s)!} \int_{\tau\left(B_{n}\right)} \varphi(r) r^{2 \alpha+2 p}|r|^{-(|p|+|s|)} r \mathrm{~d} r z^{\alpha+p-s}
$$

So the desired result is obvious.
Proposition 3.4. Let $p, s \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$ and let $f$ be a bounded function on $B_{n}$. Then the following assertions are equivalent:
(i) For each $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$, there exists $\lambda_{\alpha} \in \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$
T_{f}\left(z^{\alpha}\right)= \begin{cases}0 & \text { if } \alpha+p \nsucceq s ; \\ \lambda_{\alpha} z^{\alpha+p-s} & \text { if } \alpha+p \succeq s .\end{cases}
$$

(ii) $f$ is a separately quasihomogeneous function of degree $p-s$.

Proof. If $f$ is a separately quasihomogeneous function of degree $p-s$, then there exists a separately radial function $\varphi$ such that $f=\xi^{p} \bar{\xi}^{s} \varphi$. Then (i) is a direct consequence of Lemma 3.3.

Conversely, suppose (i) is true. Then for any multi-indexes $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\langle T_{\bar{z}^{p} z^{s} f}\left(z^{\alpha}\right), z^{\beta}\right\rangle & =\left\langle T_{f}\left(z^{\alpha+s}\right), z^{\beta+p}\right\rangle=\left\langle\lambda_{\alpha+s} z^{\alpha+p}, z^{\beta+p}\right\rangle \\
& = \begin{cases}0 & \text { if } \beta \neq \alpha, \\
\frac{\lambda_{\alpha+s} n!(\alpha+p)!}{(n+|\alpha|+|p|)!} & \text { if } \beta=\alpha ;\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
$$

and consequently

$$
T_{\bar{z} p} z^{s} f\left(z^{\alpha}\right)=\frac{\lambda_{\alpha+s}(\alpha+p)!(n+|\alpha|)!}{\alpha!(n+|\alpha|+|p|)!} z^{\alpha}
$$

Thus, it follows from Lemma 2.2 that $\bar{z}^{p} z^{s} f$ is a separately radial function, which implies that $f$ is a separately quasihomogeneous function of degree $p-s$. This completes the proof.

THEOREM 3.5. Let $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$ be two bounded separately quasihomogeneous functions on $B_{n}$ of degrees $k$ and $k^{\prime}$ respectively. If there exists a bounded function $h$ such that $T_{f_{1}} T_{f_{2}}=T_{h}$, then $h$ is a separately quasihomogeneous function of degree $k+k^{\prime}$.

Proof. Suppose $k=p-s$ and $k^{\prime}=p^{\prime}-s^{\prime}$, where $p, p^{\prime}, s, s^{\prime} \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$ such that $p \perp s$ and $p^{\prime} \perp s^{\prime}$, then by Definition 3.1 and Remark 3.2, we have

$$
f_{1}=\xi^{k} \varphi_{1}=\xi^{p} \bar{\xi}^{s} \varphi_{1} \quad \text { and } \quad f_{2}=\xi^{k^{\prime}} \varphi_{2}=\xi^{p^{\prime}} \bar{\xi}^{s^{\prime}} \varphi_{2}
$$

for two separately radial functions $\varphi_{1}$ and $\varphi_{2}$. By Lemma 3.3, for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$, there exists $\lambda_{\alpha}^{\prime} \in \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_{f_{1}} T_{f_{2}}\left(z^{\alpha}\right) & =T_{\tilde{\zeta}^{p} \bar{\xi}^{s} \varphi_{1}} T_{\xi^{p^{\prime} \bar{\xi}^{\prime}} \varphi_{2}}\left(z^{\alpha}\right) \\
& = \begin{cases}0 & \text { if } \alpha+p^{\prime} \nsucceq s^{\prime} ; \\
0 & \text { if } \alpha+p^{\prime} \succeq s^{\prime} \text { and } \alpha+p^{\prime}+p \nsucceq s^{\prime}+s ; \\
\lambda_{\alpha}^{\prime} z^{\alpha+p+p^{\prime}-s-s^{\prime}} & \text { if } \alpha+p^{\prime} \succeq s^{\prime} \text { and } \alpha+p^{\prime}+p \succeq s^{\prime}+s .\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
$$

Let

$$
\lambda_{\alpha}= \begin{cases}0 & \text { if } \alpha+p^{\prime} \nsucceq s^{\prime} \text { and } \alpha+p^{\prime}+p \succeq s^{\prime}+s \\ \lambda_{\alpha}^{\prime} & \text { if } \alpha+p^{\prime} \succeq s^{\prime} \text { and } \alpha+p^{\prime}+p \succeq s^{\prime}+s\end{cases}
$$

then it follows that

$$
T_{f_{1}} T_{f_{2}}\left(z^{\alpha}\right)= \begin{cases}0 & \text { if } \alpha+p^{\prime}+p \nsucceq s^{\prime}+s ; \\ \lambda_{\alpha} z^{\alpha+p+p^{\prime}-s-s^{\prime}} & \text { if } \alpha+p^{\prime}+p \succeq s^{\prime}+s\end{cases}
$$

Hence, if $T_{f_{1}} T_{f_{2}}=T_{h}$ then by Proposition 3.4, $h$ is a separately quasihomogeneous function of degree $p^{\prime}+p-s^{\prime}-s=k+k^{\prime}$. This completes the proof.

REMARK 3.6. Theorem 3.5 only gives a necessary condition for $T_{f_{1}} T_{f_{2}}$ to be equal to a Toeplitz operator $T_{h}$. However, it is not known for which bounded separately quasihomogenous $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$ there exists a bounded $h$ with $T_{f_{1}} T_{f_{2}}=T_{h}$. The problem of determining when the product of two separately quasihomogenous Toeplitz operators is a Toeplitz operator still remains open, even in the one variable case. Louhichi, Strouse and Zakariasy [12] gave lots of examples of functions $\psi_{1}$ and $\psi_{2}$ such that $T_{\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} p \theta}} \psi_{1} T_{\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{is} \theta} \psi_{2}}$ on $L_{a}^{2}(D)$ is not a Toeplitz operator. Moreover, Theorem 6.7 of [12] illustrated the difficulty in characterizing more precisely those pairs of Toeplitz operators whose product is a Toeplitz operator.

## 4. ON THE ZERO-PRODUCT PROBLEM FOR TOEPLITZ OPERATORS

We start this section with a decomposition of the space $L^{2}\left(B_{n}, \mathrm{~d} v\right)$. Let

$$
\Re=\left\{\varphi: B_{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \text { separately radial }\left.\left|\int_{\tau\left(B_{n}\right)}\right| \varphi(r)\right|^{2} r \mathrm{~d} r<\infty\right\}
$$

and let $\Re_{k}=\xi^{k} \Re, k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}$. Each $\Re_{k}$ is a subspace of $L^{2}\left(B_{n}, \mathrm{~d} v\right)$ since for $f \in \Re_{k}$, $f(z)=f(|r| \xi)=\xi^{k} \varphi(r)$ and

$$
\int_{B_{n}}|f(z)|^{2} \mathrm{~d} v(z)=2^{n} n!\int_{\tau\left(B_{n}\right)}\left|\xi^{k}\right|^{2}|\varphi(r)|^{2} r \mathrm{~d} r<\infty .
$$

It is also clear that $\Re_{k} \perp \Re_{l}$ if $k \neq l$. Every polynomial $p$ in $z$ and $\bar{z}$ can be written as

$$
p(z, \bar{z})=\sum_{k=-\gamma_{0}}^{\gamma_{0}}\left(\sum_{\alpha-\beta=k} a_{\alpha, \beta} z^{\alpha} \bar{z}^{\beta}\right)
$$

for some $\gamma_{0} \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$. In polar coordinates, if $z=|r|\left(\xi_{1}, \ldots, \xi_{n}\right)$, then $p(z, \bar{z})$ has the following form

$$
\sum_{k=-\gamma_{0}}^{\gamma_{0}} \xi^{k}\left\{\sum_{\alpha-\beta=k} a_{\alpha, \beta}|r|^{|\alpha|+|\beta|}\left|\xi_{1}\right|^{2 \min \left\{\alpha_{1}, \beta_{1}\right\}} \cdots\left|\xi_{n}\right|^{2 \min \left\{\alpha_{n}, \beta_{n}\right\}}\right\} \in \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}} \xi^{k} \Re .
$$

Since the polynomials $p(z, \bar{z})$ are dense in $\mathcal{C}\left(\overline{B_{n}}\right)$ and $\mathcal{C}\left(\overline{B_{n}}\right)$ is dense in $L^{2}\left(B_{n}, \mathrm{~d} v\right)$, we can conclude that

$$
L^{2}\left(B_{n}, \mathrm{~d} v\right)=\bigoplus_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}} \xi^{k} \Re
$$

i.e., every function $f \in L^{2}\left(B_{n}, \mathrm{~d} v\right)$ has the decomposition

$$
f(|r| \xi)=\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}} \xi^{k} f_{k}(r), \quad f_{k} \in \Re
$$

Moreover, if $f \in L^{\infty}\left(B_{n}, \mathrm{~d} v\right) \subset L^{2}\left(B_{n}, \mathrm{~d} v\right)$, the following lemma will show that the functions $\xi^{k} f_{k}(r)$ are also bounded.

LEMMA 4.1. Let $f(z)=\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}} \xi^{k} f_{k}(r) \in L^{\infty}\left(B_{n}, \mathrm{~d} v\right)$, then the functions $\xi^{k} f_{k}(r)$ are bounded on $B_{n}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}$.

Proof. If $U$ is a unitary transformation of $\mathbb{C}^{n}$ with a diagonal matrix, i.e.,

$$
U=\operatorname{diag}\left\{\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} \theta_{1}}, \ldots, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} \theta_{n}}\right\}
$$

then we obtain

$$
f(U z)=f\left(|r| \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} \theta_{1}} \xi_{1}, \ldots,|r| \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} \theta_{n}} \xi_{n}\right)=\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} k_{1} \theta_{1}} \ldots \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} k_{n} \theta_{n}} \xi^{k} f_{k}(r)
$$

So for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\xi^{k} f_{k}(r) & =\frac{1}{(2 \pi)^{n}} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} \cdots \int_{0}^{2 \pi} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} l_{1} \theta_{1}} \cdots \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} l_{n} \theta_{n}} \xi^{l} f_{l}(r) \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i} k_{1} \theta_{1}} \cdots \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i} k_{n} \theta_{n}} \mathrm{~d} \theta_{1} \cdots \mathrm{~d} \theta_{n} \\
& =\frac{1}{(2 \pi)^{n}} \int_{0}^{2 \pi} \cdots \int_{0}^{2 \pi} f(U z) \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i} k_{1} \theta_{1}} \cdots \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i} k_{n} \theta_{n}} \mathrm{~d} \theta_{1} \cdots \mathrm{~d} \theta_{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

which implies that

$$
\left|\xi^{k} f_{k}(r)\right| \leqslant \sup _{z \in B_{n}}|f(z)|, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}
$$

Hence, the functions $\xi^{k} f_{k}(r)$ are bounded on $B_{n}$.
Our next result is a partial answer to the zero-product problem for two Toeplitz operators on $L_{a}^{2}\left(B_{n}\right)$.

THEOREM 4.2. Let $f \in L^{\infty}\left(B_{n}, \mathrm{~d} v\right)$ and let $g$ be a bounded separately quasihomogeneous function on $B_{n}$. If $T_{f} T_{g}=0$, then either $f=0$ or $g=0$.

Proof. Suppose $f(z)=\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}} \xi^{k} f_{k}(r)$ and $g=\xi^{k^{\prime}} \varphi(r)$. Then for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}$, Lemma 4.1 implies that $\xi^{k} f_{k}$ is bounded. Let $k=p-s$ where $p, s \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$ such that $p \perp s$. Here $p$ and $s$ depend only on $k$. Thus for $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$, it follows from Lemma 3.3 that

$$
T_{\mathcal{S}^{k} f_{k}}\left(z^{\alpha}\right)=c(k) \int_{\tau\left(B_{n}\right)} f_{k}(r) r^{2 \alpha+2 p}|r|^{-(|p|+|s|)} r \mathrm{~d} r z^{\alpha+k}
$$

where

$$
c(k)= \begin{cases}0 & \text { if } \alpha \nsucceq s, \\ \frac{2^{n}(n+|\alpha|+|p|-|s|)!}{(\alpha+k)!} & \text { if } \alpha \succeq s ;\end{cases}
$$

and consequently

$$
\begin{equation*}
T_{f}\left(z^{\alpha}\right)=\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}} c(k) \int_{\tau\left(B_{n}\right)} f_{k}(r) r^{2 \alpha+2 p}|r|^{-(|p|+|s|)} r \mathrm{~d} r z^{\alpha+k} \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Assume $k^{\prime}=p^{\prime}-s^{\prime}$ for two multi-indexes $p^{\prime}, s^{\prime} \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$ such that $p^{\prime} \perp s^{\prime}$, then the equality $T_{f} T_{g}\left(z^{\alpha}\right)=0$ for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$ together with Lemma 3.3 and (4.1) give

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\tau\left(B_{n}\right)} f_{k}(r) r^{2 \alpha+2 k^{\prime}+2 p}|r|^{-(|p|+|s|)} r \mathrm{~d} r \int_{\tau\left(B_{n}\right)} \varphi(r) r^{2 \alpha+2 p^{\prime}}|r|^{-\left(\left|p^{\prime}\right|+\left|s^{\prime}\right|\right)} r \mathrm{~d} r=0 \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$ such that $\alpha \succeq s+s^{\prime}$.
Now we are ready to show either $\varphi=0$ or $f_{k}=0$ for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}$. For the sake of simplicity, we will prove it in the case of $n=2$. Let

$$
E_{k}=\left\{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}^{2}: \alpha \succeq s+s^{\prime} \text { and } \int_{\tau\left(B_{2}\right)} f_{k}(r) r^{2 \alpha+2 k^{\prime}+2 p}|r|^{-(|p|+|s|)} r \mathrm{~d} r=0\right\}
$$

If $E_{k}$ satisfies condition (I), noting that

$$
\left.\left|f_{k}(r) r^{p+s}\right| r\right|^{-(|p|+|s|)}\left|=\left|\xi^{k} f_{k}(r)\right|<\infty,\right.
$$

then $f_{k}=0$ by Corollary 2.7. Otherwise, if we denote by $E_{k}^{\prime}$ the complement of $E_{k}$ in $\left\{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}^{2}: \alpha \succeq s+s^{\prime}\right\}$, then $E_{k}^{\prime}$ must satisfy condition (I) by Remark 2.5. It follows from (4.2) that

$$
\int_{\tau\left(B_{2}\right)} \varphi(r) r^{2 \alpha+2 p^{\prime}}|r|^{-\left(\left|p^{\prime}\right|+\left|s^{\prime}\right|\right)} r \mathrm{~d} r=0, \quad \forall \alpha \in E_{k}^{\prime}
$$

Using Corollary 2.7 again, we get $\varphi=0$. This completes the proof.
REMARK 4.3. In the one-dimensional case, a radial function is a separately quasihomogeneous function of degree 0 , therefore Theorem 4.2 implies the result of Ahern and Čučković in [2].

Using the same reasoning as in [4], we will show that there are no idempotent Toeplitz operators with separately quasihomogeneous symbols other than the identity and the zero operators.

COROLLARY 4.4. Let $f$ be a bounded separately quasihomogeneous function on $B_{n}$. Then $T_{f}^{2}=T_{f}$ if and only if either $f=0$ or $f=1$.

Proof. If $T_{f}^{2}=T_{f}$, then $T_{f} T_{f-1}=0$, and by Theorem 4.2, $f=0$, or $f=1$.
The converse implication is clear. This completes the proof.

## 5. COMMUTING TOEPLITZ OPERATORS

Recall that a function $\phi$ on $B_{n}$ is radial if $\phi(z)$ depends only on $|z|$. Then for each radial function $\phi$, we define the function $\widetilde{\phi}$ on $[0,1)$ by $\widetilde{\phi}(s)=\phi(s e)$ where $e$ is a unit vector in $\mathbb{C}^{n}$. It is obvious that $\widetilde{\phi}$ is well-defined. In the following, we shall often identify an integrable radial function $\phi$ on $B_{n}$ with the corresponding function $\widetilde{\phi}$ defined on the interval $[0,1)$.

The Mellin transform $\widehat{\phi}$ of a function $\phi \in L^{1}([0,1], r \mathrm{~d} r)$ is defined by the equation:

$$
\widehat{\phi}(z)=\int_{0}^{1} \phi(s) s^{z-1} \mathrm{~d} s
$$

It is known that $\widehat{\phi}$ is a bounded analytic function in the half plane $\{z: \operatorname{Re} z>2\}$. In addition, if $\phi$ is a radial function, then for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$, one can easily get

$$
\begin{equation*}
T_{\phi}\left(z^{\alpha}\right)=(2 n+2|\alpha|) \widehat{\phi}(2 n+2|\alpha|) z^{\alpha} \tag{5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

It was shown in [7], that a Toeplitz operator with a radial symbol on $L_{a}^{2}(D)$ commutes with another Toeplitz operator only if that operator also has a radial symbol. However, we will see that it is not true on $B_{n}$ with $n>1$, i.e., we can get a separately quasihomogenous Toeplitz operator commuting with another such operator whose symbol is a radial function.

THEOREM 5.1. Let $p, s \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$ and let $\xi^{p} \bar{\xi}^{s} \psi(r)$ and $\phi(z)=\phi(|z|)$ be two bounded functions on $B_{n}$. If $\phi$ is nonconstant, then

$$
T_{\phi} T_{\xi^{\rho} \bar{\xi}^{s} \psi}=T_{\xi^{p} \bar{\xi}^{s} \psi} T_{\phi}
$$

if and only if either $|p|=|s|$ or $\psi=0$.
Proof. If $T_{\xi p \bar{\xi}^{s} \psi}$ commutes with $T_{\phi}$, then for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$ such that $\alpha+p \succeq s$, from Lemma 3.3 and (5.1) we can deduce

$$
\begin{align*}
(2 n+2|\alpha|) \widehat{\phi}(2 n & +2|\alpha|) \int_{\tau\left(B_{n}\right)} \psi(r) r^{2 \alpha+2 p}|r|^{-(|p|+|s|)} r \mathrm{~d} r  \tag{5.2}\\
= & (2 n+2|\alpha|+2|p|-2|s|) \widehat{\phi}(2 n+2|\alpha|+2|p|-2|s|) \\
& \times \int_{\tau\left(B_{n}\right)} \psi(r) r^{2 \alpha+2 p}|r|^{-(|p|+|s|)} r \mathrm{~d} r .
\end{align*}
$$

Assume $|p| \neq|s|$, without loss of generality, we can assume that $|p|>|s|$, for otherwise we could take adjoints. Similarly as the proof of Theorem 4.2, let $n=2$ and denote

$$
E=\left\{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}^{2}: \alpha \succeq s \text { and } \int_{\tau\left(B_{2}\right)} \psi(r) r^{2 \alpha+2 p}|r|^{-(|p|+|s|)} r \mathrm{~d} r=0\right\}
$$

Then we will show that $E$ satisfies condition (I), which implies that $\psi=0$ by Corollary 2.7.

Suppose $E$ does not satisfy condition (I). Denote by $E^{\prime}$ the complement of $E$ in $\left\{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}^{2}: \alpha \succeq s\right\}$, then $E^{\prime}$ must satisfy condition (I) by Remark 2.5. Furthermore, we can get

$$
\sum_{\alpha \in E^{\prime}} \frac{1}{|\alpha|}=\infty
$$

On the other hand, for any $\alpha \in E^{\prime}$, (5.2) gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
(2 n+2|\alpha|) \widehat{\phi}(2 n+2|\alpha|)=(2 n+2|\alpha|+2|p|-2|s|) \widehat{\phi}(2 n+2|\alpha|+2|p|-2|s|) . \tag{5.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Denote

$$
F(z)=\widehat{\phi}(z+2 n+2|p|-2|s|)-\frac{z+2 n}{z+2 n+2|p|-2|s|} \widehat{\phi}(z+2 n),
$$

then $F$ is analytic and bounded on $\Pi^{+}$. Moreover, it follows from (5.3) that

$$
F(2|\alpha|)=0, \quad \forall \alpha \in E^{\prime} .
$$

According to Theorem 2.3, F must be zero, which implies that

$$
(z+2 n+2|p|-2|s|) \widehat{\phi}(z+2 n+2|p|-2|s|)=(z+2 n) \widehat{\phi}(z+2 n), \quad z \in \Pi^{+} .
$$

As in the proof of Theorem 6 in [7], the above equation gives that $\phi$ is constant, which is a contradiction. Thus we conclude that either $|p|=|s|$ or $\psi=0$.

Conversely, if $|p|=|s|$ or $\psi=0$, then we can easily show that (5.2) holds, and consequently

$$
T_{\tilde{\xi}^{p} \overline{\tilde{\xi}}^{s} \psi} T_{\phi}\left(z^{\alpha}\right)=T_{\phi} T_{\xi^{p} \bar{\xi}^{s} \psi}\left(z^{\alpha}\right)
$$

for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$, which implies that $T_{\tilde{\xi} \rho \bar{\xi}^{s} \psi}$ and $T_{\phi}$ commute. This completes the proof.

COROLLARY 5.2. Let $f(z)$ and $\phi(z)=\phi(|z|)$ be two bounded functions on $B_{n}$. If $\phi$ is nonconstant, then $T_{f} T_{\phi}=T_{\phi} T_{f}$ if and only if $f\left(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} \theta} z\right)=f(z)$ for almost all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Suppose $f(z)=\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}} \xi^{k} f_{k}(r) \in L^{\infty}\left(B_{n}, \mathrm{~d} v\right)$. By (4.1) and (5.1), it is obvious that $T_{f}$ commutes with $T_{\phi}$ if and only if

$$
T_{\tilde{\xi}^{k} f_{k}} T_{\phi}=T_{\phi} T_{\tilde{\xi}^{k} f_{k}}
$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}$. Let $k=p-s$, where $p, s \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$ such that $p \perp s$, then by Theorem 5.1, the above equation is equivalent to

$$
\begin{equation*}
|p|=|s| \quad \text { or } \quad f_{k}=0 \tag{5.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Obviously, (5.4) is equivalent to

$$
\left(\xi^{k} f_{k}\right)\left(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} \theta} z\right)=\left(\xi^{k} f_{k}\right)(z), \quad \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R} .
$$

Therefore $T_{f}$ commutes with $T_{\phi}$ if and only if $f\left(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i} \theta} z\right)=f(z)$ for almost all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. This completes the proof.

REMARK 5.3. We noticed that Le [9] studied the commutants of certain diagonal Toeplitz operators on weighted Bergman spaces of the unit ball when we were revising the manuscript. Obviously, Corollary 5.2 coincides with Theorem 1.2 of [9], though they are proved by different methods.
I. Louhichi and N.V. Rao [11] showed that the commutant of a quasihomogenous Toeplitz operator on $L_{a}^{2}(D)$ is equal to its bicommutant. Moreover, they conjectured that if two Toeplitz operators commute with a third one, none of them being the identity, then they commute with each other. The next is a counterexample to their conjecture when formulated for Toeplitz operators on $L_{a}^{2}\left(B_{n}\right)$, with $n>1$.

EXAMPLE 5.4. Let $n>1$ and let $p=(1,0, \ldots, 0)$ and $s=(0, \ldots, 0,1)$. Then for each bounded nonconstant radial function $\phi$, by Theorem 5.1, $T_{\phi}$ commutes with both $T_{\tilde{\xi}^{p} \bar{\xi}^{s}}$ and $T_{\mathcal{\xi}^{s} \bar{\xi}^{p}}$. However, it follows from Lemma 3.3 that

Therefore $T_{\xi^{p} \bar{\xi}^{s}}$ and $T_{\xi^{\varsigma} \bar{\xi}^{p}}$ cannot commute.
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